



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 26

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, April 30, 1986 — 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 Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

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

Liberal

Roger Coles	Liberal Leader Tatchun
James McLachlan	Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

ERRATUM

Issue No. 25, April 29, 1986, Page 485, line 56: "this side agrees with" should read, "this side disagrees with"

⁰¹ Whitehorse, Yukon

Wednesday, April 30, 1986 — 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: Introduction of Visitors?
Returns or Documents for Tabling?
Reports of Committees?
Petitions?
Introduction of Bills?
Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion?
Statements by Ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Child Welfare — Transfer of Responsibilities to a Yukon Indian Band

Hon. Mrs. Joe: On Friday, May 2, the president of the Champagne/Aishihik Social Services Society, Chief Paul Birckel, and I will formally sign an agreement transferring certain powers of the Director of Family and Children's Services to the Band-sponsored society.

All Members will be pleased to hear that the child welfare pilot project has resulted in the first transfer of child welfare responsibilities from the Yukon government to a Yukon Indian Band.

The powers and responsibilities that will be assumed by the Champagne/Aishihik Social Services Society include the investigation, placement, supervision and care of children in need of protection, foster home and adoption placement services, and preventative and support services to children and their families.

This agreement is significant and historical. It represents a tangible response to requests from the Yukon Indian people for more authority over those child welfare matters that affect their daily lives.

⁰² In addition, it reflects the policy of the present government to encourage citizen groups to work towards the solution of their own problems.

Furthermore, this agreement is consistent with the objectives of the Land Claims Agreement-In-Principle for Health and Social Services signed in November, 1982. The objective of this Agreement-In-Principle reads as follows: "To provide the opportunity for beneficiaries to participate in the planning and delivery of health and social services in the Yukon."

It should be noted that this agreement is unique in all of Canada. All other similar agreements in the provinces are restricted to on-reserve status Indians only. The Champagne-Aishihik Agreement covers both status and non-status members of the Champagne-Aishihik Band and is in effect for that band throughout the Yukon Territory.

The signing ceremony represents the culmination of thirteen months of discussion during which both parties negotiated successfully in order to achieve a common objective.

I am sure all Members of the House will join me in wishing the Champagne-Aishihik Social Services Society success in their new and challenging undertaking.

Mrs. Firth: We are very pleased indeed to see this project going ahead and the final agreement being signed.

For the information of the new Members of the House, this was a Child Welfare Pilot Project that was initiated under the previous government. I believe that Andy Philipsen had a lot to do with it in the way he approached the project. His mannerisms contributed to the final success of the project. We are also pleased to see that the chief has extended an invitation to the Member who represents the area, the Member for Kluane, to be present at the signing of the agreement. The Member for Kluane is looking forward to being

there.

We, on this side of the House, do join the Members opposite in wishing the Champagne-Aishihik Social Services Society success in their new and challenging undertaking.

Government of Yukon - Curragh Resources Contribution Agreement

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is my pleasure to announce that the Yukon government has concluded its Contribution Agreement with Curragh Resources that delineates the terms under which \$3 million will be contributed to the Curragh project at Faro under the Yukon Mining Recovery Program.

The funds for this program are provided by the Government of Canada through the Canada-Yukon Mineral Industry Recovery Sub-Agreement of the Economic Development Agreement.

⁰³ Part of our agreement with Curragh is a Business and Employment Opportunities Accord. This Accord outlines a co-operative approach, and the processes and mechanisms by which business and employment opportunities to Yukoners will be maximized.

The Accord contributes toward our government's goals of: targeted job creation, equality of opportunity, and community consultation.

I would like to emphasize that the Accord is a commitment by the two parties to co-operate on the achievement of these goals and not a regulatory document. We have no wish to hamper the efficient operation of the mine with over-regulation. We do recognize, however, that both parties have roles to play in achieving maximum benefits for the Yukon from the project and that these roles must be co-ordinated. This co-ordination is best achieved by the sort of non-confrontational relationship that has been established under this Accord.

The Accord provides for: senior representatives of Curragh, Yukon and Canada to liaise and facilitate the achievement of the objectives of the Accord; preferences for competitive Yukon businesses, and special measures, such as bidders lists and contract splitting to provide greater opportunities for Yukon business participation; hiring preference for qualified Yukon residents and graduates of training programs; the development of a Positive Action Plan to facilitate employment and business opportunities for natives, women and youth; co-operation in the development of training and the employment of apprentices; the publication and distribution of a quarterly newsletter to inform businesses and the public of the opportunities available and to provide information necessary to take advantage of them — it will also report on progress of achievements under the Accord; a community consultative process regarding opportunities; a consultative process between Curragh and the Government in planning for employment, business opportunities, and training, and for the exchange of necessary information and statistics.

I am confident that through this Accord of co-operative action, we can work with Curragh to achieve the maximum benefits to the Yukon, while, at the same time, not impairing the efficient operation of the project.

Mr. Lang: I rise to respond to the Ministerial Statement. At the outset I want to say that when we agreed with the general agreements in October of last year we felt it was going to be good for Yukon and Canada, and good for the Yukon taxpayer as well as the Yukon worker. More and more we see that there are glaring deficiencies. This agreement speaks to a major glaring deficiency and that is the fact that there is an accord reached between the parties for business and employment opportunities as opposed to an agreement.

⁰⁴ We all know that an agreement clearly expresses principles that all parties have to adhere to. An accord is strictly a number of principles where there is no requirement to adhere to them.

I believe, from where we sit, that we have waited too long. I say that because we are getting a steady parade of complaints about the few Yukon workers working at the project. We have estimates as low as 10 percent of Yukon residents working in Faro at the present time. They come into our offices and point out the difference in pay scales and various other things going on in that operation.

Employees are being hired outside, according to the information we have been provided with. These employees are doing a 90-day tour of duty and returning home to Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Alberta. To that end, I am also told that it is becoming more and more common that these employees have, on the 45th day, a party, because they have completed 50 percent of their duty.

That causes us concern, and we are very concerned with the fact that this is an accord. On the business opportunity side, it has been eight months since we discussed the initiation of the agreement, and now we have this contribution accord. In October, we pointed out that we needed some principles agreed to for business opportunities. We are now in a situation where the catering contract, the janitorial contract and the leasing of equipment contracts have, for all intents and purposes, gone to outside companies.

This is similar to what we have seen with the second mortgage where the Yukon taxpayer, in our judgment, has not been adequately protected. We are paying a minimum of an extra million dollars for the Skagway-Carcross Road, probably more. All I can say about the NCPC generator is that it looks to me like we paid \$3,000,000, and we have no agreement, but we have an accord. It would seem that it is too little too late.

Mr. McLachlan: Perhaps as the Member most affected by this announcement, I am pleased that an agreement of one substance or another has been reached with the company that will provide for the ongoing continuation of a term in the original master agreement. I would hope that this type of agreement is a continuing indication of what this government can continue to do for support of industry, with particular reference to other mining opportunities in the territory.

There are two points, however, that I wish that the Government Leader could expand upon in his announcement.

One, is the business and employment opportunities accord a public document that the government intends to make available to all Members of this Legislative Assembly?

Two, an original time limit of five years was talked about. The company could receive full funds if they created the jobs and kept them for five years. Is the business accord also for a similar time period?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am certainly gratified to hear the Member for Porter Creek East speak on this subject again. He has made it perfectly clear to citizens throughout the territory, by his actions as a Minister and by his comments since, that he really did not want this mine opened, that he was not particularly interested in the particulars of the agreement, and that he would have done it better himself, had he been in charge. Of course, he was in charge, and he did not do it, and he did not get the mine opened, he did not get the road opened, he did not put anything together that would facilitate this event.

We have had some experience of the Members opposite when they were in government guaranteeing jobs and business opportunities for Yukoners. The Yukoners are now coming out of a three-year recession that was the result of their great efforts on that score. I think it best that I say no more. It has been said before.

The Member for Faro asked whether the Accord will be a public document. Yes, it is my intention to table the Accord in the House tomorrow. I expect the Members may have further questions about it. In the Accord, the Member will note that, even though the contribution agreement is finite in time, the Accord is reviewable. As long as this project is going, we intend to be governed by it and to work with the company to maximize the employment and business opportunities for Yukoners that are described in it.

Speaker: This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Phelps: Recently, there have been newspaper articles in the papers with respect to words and even letters flying between CYI and YTG. The CYI indicated its displeasure of having Yukon

government priorities brought to the claims table, even though they were only indirectly related to land claims.

Was the Government Leader aware that the negotiators at the table were bringing these issues to the land claims table?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am not encouraged, by our rules, to comment on news reports. I have not seen the particular news reports that the Member refers to. I do know that the topic he has raised today was the subject of discussion between me and the Chairman of the Council for Yukon Indians many weeks ago. I think it may have even been before this House sat, which is quite a long time ago, as Members all recall.

This government has approached the problem of negotiations and the relationship with the Council for Yukon Indians and the Indian Bands in an effort to have a cooperative consultative relationship. It was our initial effort, in response to requests from CYI, to advise the table of any matters in which there was a substantial Indian interest, when government was taking initiatives in a large number of areas.

The view of CYI, having some experience with that, was that this government was taking so many initiatives of benefit to their community that they could not handle it all. They, upon reflection, decided they would rather have matters of government initiatives that did not directly affect land claims dealt with in bilateral relationships between Ministers of this government and the appropriate officer of CYI.

Mr. Phelps: That really did not answer my question. I asked whether or not the Government Leader was aware that these issues were being brought to the table more than two months ago. Could he answer that and advise us whether or not he gave instructions to the negotiators from the Government of Yukon to bring such issues to the table?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I thought I had explained that. The CYI had originally requested that, where this government was taking initiatives such as the one that was announced today, we would advise the table of such initiatives to make sure that there was no conflict, or that we were not doing anything to impede the progress of land claims negotiations.

The volume of information that we brought to the table caused CYI to decide that they could not handle all that. That might, rather than expediting land claims, impede it. Therefore, they requested that we change the process.

Mr. Phelps: I take it the answer is yes to both of those questions, although I am not really sure. Can the Government Leader tell us what political issues of his government's priorities that were not really relevant to land claims were brought to the table?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: There were land, Indian education, delivery of child welfare services, language questions, community planning and dozens of such issues that are of interest to the bands, and for which we would like to obtain CYI's cooperation as we proceed.

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Phelps: Did the Government Leader receive letters from CYI asking that this practice desist?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not recall a letter, but there may well have been one. I do recall very well the conversation I had with the Chairman of the CYI and a number of the members of the Board to discuss this question.

Mr. Phelps: Would the Minister be willing to table such correspondence in the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: If there is a letter from CYI, I assume I would require their consent before I tabled it in this House. In principle, I have no problem doing that. As I said, I do not recall a letter to me on the subject, but I do recall very well a conversation on the subject.

The conversation may, of course, have been precipitated by a letter requesting such a meeting.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Government Leader confirm that they are no longer playing politics by bringing government priorities to the land claims table, even though they were only indirectly related to land claims?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am sorry I do not know how to play politics, but I would be willing to take lessons from the Member opposite.

Question re: Security procedures

Mr. McLachlan: Is the Government Leader aware that vastly different clearances of security procedures exist for senior staff members handling sensitive documents in this government than exist elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When the question is stated in those terms, no.

Mr. McLachlan: Certainly, the evidence to this side of the House says that the material being handled here is handled very differently than it is handled by other people in the Government of Canada, specifically.

I am wondering if the Government Leader, in light of what has happened in the past week, will be taking any steps to check and see if he can secure some of his senior employees in a little more regulated fashion than leaving the door completely open to whatever handling they may be lax on in some other documentation?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not accept all the Member's assumptions, but it is an interesting question to compare our procedures with those elsewhere. Given some time, I might be prepared to do that. The Member is indicating that he has some knowledge of our security procedures and it raises a question about whether or not I should do an investigation to find out how he knows about our procedures.

Mr. McLachlan: I am not aware of what your security measures are. I am aware of what your security measures are not. I would simply ask him if he plans to implement soon a tighter measure that allows him to be able to control documentation within his office, as he obviously yet has not been able to do.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Leader of the Opposition and I, and possibly other Members of the House, were once students of logic. I am not sure how the Member can know what our procedures are not unless he knows what they are. That is probably not a suitable subject for debate in Question Period.

I am not sure that I accept the statements of the Member opposite, although, as I have indicated, whatever procedures are now in place will be reviewed again because of the recent incident. I should tell Members, out of a respect for the Member for Faro's Liberalism, there is a limit to how far one can go in restricting access to documents and still fulfill normal requirements of sensible consultation in developing policy. That is the tightrope and those are the competing principles or objectives that one has to reconcile when dealing with questions like this.

Question re: COPE Agreement

Mr. Phelps: I have a question regarding the establishment of a national park in the northwestern corner of Yukon. As part of the COPE settlement, it was agreed that the park be established north of the watershed in Yukon, and it was agreed in that land claims agreement that the Inuvialuit of the N.W.T. were to receive preferential treatment in the park with regard to employment, training and economic opportunities. At the same time, there was negotiated a draft agreement-in-principle for the benefit of the Old Crow Indian people on the same subject matters, but that land claims process has been bogged down for two years now. I am wondering what, if anything, the Government Leader is doing to ensure that the Indian people of Old Crow receive similar treatment to the COPE people in the national park.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Because the question directly impacts on my responsibilities I will answer that question. As the Leader of the Official Opposition points out, the question of the implementation of the COPE claim has been delayed for approximately two years. Recently we have received approval for funding from the federal government. More recently we have had approval from the federal government with respect to nominations received from this government to sit on two of the boards that will be implementing the COPE claim. With respect to what the government is doing to protect the interests of the people of Old Crow, my understanding is that just about two weeks ago department officials, who are

concerned with implementing provisions of the COPE final agreement, were in Old Crow to discuss with the people their concerns about the COPE claim.

Mr. Phelps: The concern is about the people of Old Crow losing out on any advantages from the national park. What representations has this government made to try to ensure that the people of Old Crow are treated on an equal footing with the COPE beneficiaries?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There has not been a lot done with respect to implementation of the COPE plan, due to a lack of funding, due to a commitment from the federal government to see this as a priority. With respect to what we have done, I believe that the representations that we have provided, with respect to the various boards that are going to be set up concerning the implementation of various positions of the final agreement of the Inuvialuit settlement, will clearly indicate this government's concern for the issues that affect the people of Old Crow.

In terms of what specific positions we are taking in terms of implementing the concept of North Yukon Park, a lot of those issues have not been dealt with in substance. I assure the Member that when we are dealing with those issues in substance, the people of Old Crow will be consulted, and their position will be protected by this government.

Mr. Phelps: The concern is that the people of Old Crow are not protected. They had agreed, and very much desired, to have the national park extended south, in an agreed upon area covering a small portion of the flats, and south of the watershed line. They had agreed that Old Crow would be the primary gateway to the park, for economic reasons. That has been agreed to. It is all in writing.

I am wondering whether or not this government is going to take steps, provided it is still the wish of the people of Old Crow, to have that portion of the Agreement-in-Principle made law, so that they will stand on an equal footing, with respect to economic opportunity and jobs and training, with non-resident members of COPE.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of ensuring that the people of Old Crow receive equal benefits with respect to what is provided for in the final agreement, that is a responsibility that we take upon ourselves to represent, in the interests of the people of Old Crow.

On the question of extension of the park south into the Old Crow Flats, my most recent conversations with the department and the representative of the people of Old Crow, indicates that the people of Old Crow, at this point, are not wholly decided as to whether or not that is desirable on their part.

Question re: COPE Agreement

Mr. Phelps: I would urge the government to carefully examine the position and the rights of the people of Old Crow, vis-a-vis, the people of the COPE land claims agreement. It seems to me that they virtually do not stand on an equal footing with people from the Northwest Territories under the COPE Agreement, unless the park is established, and unless a final agreement is made, whether it be a small final agreement with respect to their rights.

Would the Minister immediately look into that situation and take whatever steps are necessary?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Question re: COPE Agreement

Mr. Brewster: Under Section 12(16) of the COPE Agreement, signed in 1984, the parties agreed that Herschel Island is to be established as the Herschel Island Territorial Park. The land was transferred by Order-in-Council in January, 1985. When will the Minister live up to our obligations under the agreement, and designate and proclaim the park under the *Territorial Parks Act*?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not have a specific decision with respect to the timeframe, but I can inform the Member that there is an onus on our part to initiate park planning meetings. Those meetings were to be held in Old Crow, Inuvik and Aklavik. We sent the representatives of the government to those meetings. They did hold meetings in Old Crow, but because of the fact that the Inuvialuit were not prepared, they requested that we delay those meetings. They were in conflict with the negotiations that were going on with

Esso during the originally agreed upon dates. As a result, we have not held the meetings in Aklavik and Inuvik as originally planned. We are awaiting word from the Inuvialuit as to when a new date can be established to begin those particular meetings.

Mr. Brewster: Will all Yukoners have an opportunity to comment upon plans for the park before any decision is made?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would like to go over the specifics of the agreement that relate to the establishing of the park again to ensure that any public participation on our part would not in any way be in legal conflict with the provisions of the final agreement.

I clearly agree with the Member that any parks that we do establish in the Yukon should clearly have public participation as a central part of the development theme.

Question re: Wildlife Advisory Council

Mr. Phillips: I have a question for the same Minister. In answer to a question on April 23, concerning the establishment of the North Slope Wildlife Advisory Council, the Minister said he was waiting for Ottawa to agree with his appointments.

Will the Minister explain why he is waiting for Ottawa when wildlife management is the sole responsibility of Yukon? The Government of Yukon is to appoint the chairman of the council and other permanent members to provide administrative support. What is the Minister waiting for?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We have made our appointments.

Mr. Phillips: I wonder if the Minister could tell us when he made the appointments, and who are those appointments?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will check on the specific date that the government officially sanctioned those appointments. I would like to reserve decision on putting those names before the public prior to consultation with the Minister in Ottawa to ensure that we are totally in sync with the whole implementation of the COPE Settlement.

Mr. Phillips: I find it remarkable that we cannot divulge the names of the people on the committee when it is our responsibility to appoint a chairman to the council and to also provide the support staff, I find it difficult that we cannot announce who they are. I understand that the Northwest Territories government has already appointed a council and has it in place. I am wondering when the Minister expects these two groups to meet and carry out their functions?

¹⁰ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** As is outlined in answers to previous questions, there has been some delay in implementations of various provisions of the COPE Agreement. We have word from Ottawa about the federal OIC appointments that they have concurred with our nominees. The review board process of the COPE Agreement is going to be put in place. It is a question of priority in terms of the various boards that are being set in place and clearly the federal government, in response to development initiatives or proposals in the area, has decided that the Environmental Screening Review Board is the board that they want to proceed with to accommodate the developers. I think it is a question of the various aspects of the COPE Agreement being put into place in a timely fashion. As to a specific date when we will be structuring first meetings of those particular boards, that question cannot be answered to date.

Question re: Government security

Mr. Coles: On April 28, the Minister of Justice informed the House that there was an investigation going on to see if there had been a breach of security, yet he did not know any results of that investigation. Can the Government Leader tell us if the Department of Justice is even involved in the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not think it is useful for me to talk about who is involved in the investigation, but I hope the Member will be satisfied to know that the Minister of Justice and I have been in consultation on this matter and have informed each other on decisions taken.

Mr. Coles: On April 24 the Government Leader used the words "stolen document", and told us there was a "stolen document" upwards of seven times. Yesterday in *Hansard* the Minister said, "assuming it was stolen". Has the Minister uncovered any information that would lead him to believe that perhaps the

documents were not stolen?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No.

Mr. Coles: Has the Government Leader had any discussions whatsoever with the RCMP on this issue?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No.

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Nordling: My question is to the Government Leader on land claims. I have refreshed my memory by reading over the Ministerial Statement regarding the Coolican Report, which was made March 24, 1986, and incidentally it appears at page 63 under the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly. I remember that it was given by the Government Leader.

In that statement the Government Leader mentioned two areas of concern with the Coolican Report, notably the overlap and devolution sections. The Government Leader also stated that the government had already begun to review in detail the report's numerous recommendations. Has that detailed review been completed?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, it is ongoing in a number of respects. We are interested in not only trying to divine the intention of the authors so that we may be able to discuss matters with the federal government properly, but also to try to anticipate the consequences of the implementation of various sections of the report on our own negotiations here.

Mr. Nordling: In his answer yesterday, the Government Leader said that if the government got an inquiry from the federal Minister then he would consult with those in land claims and perhaps the Cabinet and respond. Does not the Government Leader plan to make the government concerns, as outlined in his Ministerial Statement, known to the federal Minister unless he is asked for it?

¹¹ **Hon. Mr. Penikett:** The concerns outlined in the Ministerial Statement have been conveyed.

Mr. Nordling: If there has been correspondence or written submission to the federal Minister, could it be tabled?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Most of the discussions between this government and the federal people, at this point, have been at the officials level. I do not believe that, at this point, there is a letter from myself to Mr. Crombie that I could table.

Question re: Curragh Contribution Agreement

Mr. Lang: I do have a concern that has to do with the Curragh Resources Contribution Agreement that the Minister spoke of. Since the people of the territory in conjunction with the Government of Canada are contributing \$3 million towards this agreement, will the Contribution Agreement in totality be tabled in this House?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is a question that I had occasion to check this morning. We cannot do so without the consent of the parties. However, I do not believe that I will have a great deal of trouble getting consent to do that. Once I have obtained it, I will table it.

Mr. Lang: Could the Minister try to get that consent today since the public announcement was made today?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. I told the House previously that I will be tabling the Accord tomorrow. It is not possible to get the consents I need today.

Mr. Lang: Is it going to be possible to see if we can have consent for the total agreement for tomorrow so that we can peruse the document, since we are also dealing the main estimates?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will attempt to get the consents from the other interests. I am not going to commit myself to an absolute time or date.

Question re: School superintendent

Mrs. Firth: The Minister of Education has recently made some announcements at the Annual General Meeting of the Yukon Teachers Association, and the Annual General Meeting of the School Committee Conference, regarding the regional superintendent who is going to service the north Yukon. There were no surprises to find that that superintendent would be located in the Minister of Education's riding.

Can the Minister tell the House if that position has been filled

yet? What schools will the position be serving?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: It just so happens that the Minister's riding is very central to the north Yukon area, and to the conglomeration of the schools north of Whitehorse. For that reason, it is quite an obvious choice to place the superintendent in Mayo.

The superintendent's position has not been filled, but it would serve the schools located in the communities of Old Crow, Dawson, Mayo, Elsa, Pelly Crossing, Carmacks, and possibly Ross River and Faro.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell us how often the superintendent is going to be required to travel to those communities, and to travel to Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The workplan for the three regional superintendents has made it easier for them to gain access to all the schools. I would expect that the travel to the various schools would increase commensurately with the increase in the number of superintendents.

How many times a superintendent would travel from Mayo to Carmacks, or to Dawson, would depend very much on the workload. I cannot give a specific number of trips.

Mrs. Firth: That is exactly my concern, the workload, and that a lot of the time could be spent travelling to those communities. I am sure that, because of the way the announcement has been made, the expectations of the communities are going to be that they see the superintendent on a more regular basis than they did in the past.

When will the Minister be advertising for the job? Is there any particular detail of the job that is different than the superintendent's position now?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: One of the reasons for placing another superintendent into the system was to increase the accessibility to the schools. One of the reasons why we are placing the superintendent in a community such as Mayo is to give the department and that superintendent a clearer understanding of what it was like to live in rural Yukon.

The placement of the superintendent, itself, has not been made. When it is, I will certainly let the Member know. We are going to make the best efforts to find superintendents to fill the various positions from the ranks of the teaching staff in Yukon now.

Response re: Skagway dock

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I just have a couple of quick answers to questions that were asked in previous days. The Member for Porter Creek West asked me, on April 22, about the Skagway dock. In answer to that question, I am advised by Curragh that the original October 26, 1985, agreement with White Pass for the use of the dock facilities by Curragh is still in effect. It was one of the agreements required to be in place prior to the master agreement being finalized.

Response re: Yukon Mining Recovery Program

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yesterday, I was asked by the Member for Faro about the Yukon Mining Recovery Program, and the delay in signing it. The Yukon Mining Recovery Program and the Canada-Yukon Mineral Industry Subagreement, the EDA under which it falls, announced last fall, had yet to receive federal Treasury Board approval. We did not receive the final approved version until early March. We signed it March 6. The press release under EDA procedures required approval by both governments here and in Ottawa, which delayed its issue until April 25.

Response re: Wood bison

Hon. Mr. Porter: In response to a question raised by the Member for Kluane, regarding buffalo bugs, yesterday, I have additional information. Last week a veterinarian was sent to the wood bison compound and did a thorough investigation of the animals and found no parasites. As well, hair samples were sent out to Saskatchewan Veterinary College for tests and, as well, found no parasites.

Question re: Northern Canada Power Commission

Mr. McLachlan: Although I realize Ministers cannot project the ending of the House and, thus, cannot establish a schedule for

getting out to do business outside the territory, could the Minister of Government Services indicate to the Assembly what he is targeting for the next date or time for the discussion between the Government of Yukon and Canada for the devolution of NCPC to the territory? When is it next on the discussion table?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There is no specific date established. We have had telephone consultation with the hon. Mr. Crombie in the last two weeks, I believe. We have not scheduled a specific personal meeting. I would expect, though, that there would be a meeting shortly before the fall session of the Legislature in September or October.

Mr. McLachlan: When does the Minister anticipate being able to complete the discussions between the Public Utilities Union Association and the members of the Northern Canada Power Commission who are presently represented by the Public Service Alliance of Canada so that those people could be assimilated into the Public Electric Utilities Association. I understand that is one of the major problems holding up further devolution talks.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is not a problem. It is a process that is continuing primarily between the YECL and the present employees of NCPC who will be the unionized portion of the employees.

Mr. McLachlan: If it is not a problem, how does the government intend to truncate one part of the Public Service Alliance of Canada union employees represented here in the Yukon Territory from the large group that represents employees in all of NCPC's operations in the Yukon and the NWT?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It never has been, it is not, and I cannot foresee it ever being the case that the government will be insisting in any way that union members belong to any particular union. That is a matter for those employees to decide among themselves.

Question re: Alaska Marine Lines

Mr. Lang: Approximately a week ago, I asked a question, and it does have a more pressing urgency in view of the regulations now in effect on the British Columbia section of the Alaska Highway. I will ask the Minister of Community and Transportation if the government has taken a formal position, or even an informal position, with respect to the licensing of barges to service Yukon?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I thought the Member was leading up to a question on weight restrictions on the Alaska Highway.

The government has taken a position with respect to the application by Alaska Marine Lines to extend its operating authority for one year, which is the maximum amount of time allowed under the act.

It is our position that unless White Pass can operate a route with the same frequency, the same reliability of service that Alaska Marine Lines has offered and can provide that service at the same rates as Alaska Marine Lines, Alaska Marine Lines would be given the right to operate for another year.

14

Question re: Alaska Highway weight restrictions

Mr. Lang: I do not want to disappoint the Minister or my fine colleague from Faro. Has the Minister made any representation to the Government of Canada on the weight restrictions on the BC section of the Alaska Highway, in view of the fact that consumer goods are going to go up, in some cases, as high as 12, 20 and maybe 25 percent. Has he contacted the federal Minister in that regard?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We were discussing the Alaska Marine Lines, and now we are finally on the weight restrictions on the Alaska Highway. As I stated, the position of the government is quite clear. It has been stated to the federal government a number of times. This Minister has expressed to the department the clear position that where weight restrictions are considered necessary to protect the integrity of the road, they should be kept to an absolute minimum.

We recognize the problem that the Transportation Association and consumers of the Yukon face with respect to lighter loads permissible on those highways and the increased transportation costs when trucking companies lighten their loads during a specific time of the year. We recognize their problems, and we are going to try to keep the restrictions to an absolute minimum.

Mr. Lang: To try to understand the Minister's response, is it the position of the government that they agree with the ban that is in effect with respect to weight restrictions on the BC portion of the Alaska Highway?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: It is our position that the weight restriction will be kept to an absolute minimum. I am not an engineer and am not familiar with the deflection tests that are done to determine the damage that may be done to roads as a result of heavy trucking at certain times of the year. It is the government's position that where serious damage can occur, and, therefore, incur significant capital costs to the taxpayer, that weight restrictions be placed on the road, but that they be kept to an absolute minimum, given the kinds of problems the Trucking Association and consumers will experience as a result of that restriction.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed. We will now proceed with Orders of the Day, Motions Other Than Government Motions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 33

Clerk: Item number one, standing in the name of Ms. Kassi.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with item one?

Ms. Kassi: Yes.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Old Crow THAT this House urges the government to strive to eliminate poverty in the Yukon.

Ms. Kassi: This motion deals with a topic that has never been debated in the Legislature in these terms. Poverty in the Yukon is a difficult and complex issue, like it is anywhere else. I am sure it is something that bothers and disturbs all Members, especially those who have experienced being poor at one time or another in our lives. We are among the fortunate who have now decent incomes and can afford the basic necessities and essentials of life, and maybe even some of the luxuries.

We see poverty in every Yukon community. Its causes are many — alcoholism, lack of opportunity in our communities, lack of jobs and a lack of education and training. A large number of native people in the Yukon live below the poverty line. Some people make up for it a bit by living off the land as much as they can, but still that is not enough.

¹⁵ There is not enough money to pay for proper food, clothing and shelter. Still, there is not enough money to pay for higher education or special training. It is not just the individuals involved who suffer; it is all of us in all of the Yukon who suffer with them.

Poverty can be very hard to break out of because of the way that the rules of the game are written. There are certain rules for social assistance, and certain rules for low cost housing. There seems to be enough money to keep the people alive, but never enough to support them to get ahead of the game, and into a position where they can start to succeed.

I think that by addressing the many problems that lead to poverty and that keep the people in it, such as alcoholism, such as the lack of jobs in our communities, this government can stop poverty from growing, and hopefully reduce it a great deal.

Perhaps we can never eliminate poverty completely. However, that should not be an excuse to say that there is no point in trying. I think society wants to see poverty reduced. I think it is this government's responsibility to put that view into practice by making job creation a top priority, and by making an improvement in the quality of life for all Yukon people. I believe we are on the right track.

I look forward to the comments by the other hon. Members on this motion. I hope they support it.

Mrs. Firth: We will be supporting the motion of the Member for Old Crow. We thank her for bringing it forward because, as she

has explained, it is something that this Legislature has not talked about, and that politicians very rarely like to talk about.

When you talk about measuring levels of poverty, you can do it in a monetary sense, and you can do it in a cultural and familial sense. I think the Member for Old Crow raised a good point about the monetary aspects of poverty.

For my own personal opinions about poverty, after living in the Yukon for almost 20 years now, I find that some of the people who are stricken with poverty, and who suffer from poverty, do have a tremendous wealth in the sense of their traditions and their culture. Of course, I am speaking about the native people of the Yukon. No matter how poor they are monetarily, they still have that extreme wealth of their culture, of their strong family ties, of the way they raise their children, of the importance of the family unit to them, of the structure of their society, and the way they like to preserve that structure, and to further educate their children.

We can talk in a very clinical sense and we can talk in a very emotional and traditional sense. I would like the Member for Old Crow to know that we have an appreciation of the poverty situation in the Yukon Territory; poverty for the native people, but also for white people who are suffering from some of the same circumstances, who may not have the rich traditions, and so on, that the native people do.

We are aware of the situation, and we commend this government and past governments for the efforts they have made in trying to improve people's stations and situations in life. We do respect and recognize that there is a wealth amongst these people. That wealth is in their family and in their culture.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

¹⁶ **Mr. McLachlan:** We agree with the intent of the motion that the Member of Old Crow brought forward. We agree that the situation affects a great many people in the territory. Perhaps, for various reasons, people find themselves in a position of being cash-poor. The Member for Riverdale South indicated that that is one method of establishing the measurement of poverty. I believe, of the rural ridings, the one that I represent has had the least, at least up until recently, problem with this sort of thing. I believe that Faro, at one point, has had one of the highest average annual incomes, so I am certainly not quoting from experience at home when I say that.

I believe that one of the things that we must do in the territory to be able to eliminate poverty, is to give the people some qualified basis for being able to continue working and living and existing together. I know that, amongst many of the territory's native communities, opportunities simply do not exist there to be able to continue on that. I would hope that, in the years to come in this territory, our legislators and our people would be able to provide those opportunities in some form or another to allow many of them, in the native ridings, to have a worthwhile means for working at something to eliminate these ends, whether you wish to believe that is money channeled through organizations, such as the Yukon Indian Development Corporation, or whatever.

I wonder if, at one point, the whole concept of something like a guaranteed annual income is one that would help to eliminate poverty within our territory. Although I am no expert on this, I am curious as to whether the Government Leader has some comments or some thoughts on this, since I know he has researched the topic and has had more than a passing interest in the past.

In conclusion, as I indicated earlier, we agree with the intent of the motion, and we will certainly be supporting the hon. Member for Old Crow in this motion.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The Yukon, as a place to live, has always been rich in culture and resources and land, but the Yukon, for all its riches, is still a land of poverty. I think that a lot of us have seen it daily and have seen it for years. If you have been concerned with the social wellbeing of people, you run into poverty just about every day. I think that most people can drive through any part of Whitehorse and see the differences, for instance, in parts of my riding and parts of Riverdale and Porter Creek. There is a difference that is quite visible to anybody who does take that little drive

around town.

If we want to see some kind of equality in the way of living, we have to look at different ways of dealing with that problem. There certainly are many things that create poverty. There are certain things that poverty creates, and you can look at it both ways, so that you have a problem that we all want to do something about. That is very hard to do, and it takes an awful lot of care and planning. As we noted in the Throne Speech, the quality of life in Yukon is important to this government, and the ability of Yukoners to support themselves is a key part of the quality of life.

There is work underway to review our social assistance rates for Yukoners. One very important program that helps those on social assistance towards independence is the Yukon Opportunities Plan. This program, as most of the Members of the House are aware, helps individuals on assistance to find employment. As well, recent daycare subsidy increases have been helpful to many people. My department is exploring the Canadian Job Strategy Initiative of the federal government to see if there will be any opportunity to expand these services, as are the other Ministers of Human Resources across the country.

I, personally, as a Minister of Health and Human Resources, support this motion that the House strive to eliminate poverty in the Yukon.

¹⁷ I recognize that there are those among us who have very little, and there are some of us who have a lot. We must all work together to enable those people to access a larger portion of the pie. For this reason, I have to support this motion. I am very happy to see that it is being supported by all parties of this House.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am pleased to participate in the debate of this important subject. I think, as the Member for Old Crow said, and as was also observed by the Member for Riverdale South, we have not had a debate on this subject in these terms before. I think that is something to note.

The Yukon Territory has both an historic and a contemporary reputation as a place to get rich quick. Over the years, many people have made their stakes here. Unfortunately, a lot of them have taken it elsewhere, but what they have left behind, notwithstanding popular imagery, is surprisingly widespread poverty. While many people have benefited from the booms, many more have suffered from the busts.

If I may, I would like to talk about poverty a little bit, in statistical terms. Other Members here have talked about it more in human terms, and I do not want to depersonalize the issue in any way; however, in preparing for this debate, I was disturbed by some of the numbers that came to my attention.

Poverty, as the Member for Whitehorse North Centre, the Minister for Health and Human Resources, observed, is not hard to find here. It is visible. The government Statistics Bureau has calculated the Yukon poverty level in four different ways. All of them are based on the national level, which is defined as a household unit that spends 60 percent of its income on basic food, shelter and clothing, compared to the national average of only 40 percent for these items.

Here, it has been extrapolated by government statisticians on the basis of the local cost of living; comparisons with Vancouver and Edmonton; average annual income; and average weekly earnings. All four methods produce comparable results. On average, poverty in the Yukon in 1985 and 1986 can be defined as a single person making less than \$11,000 a year, or a household of two making less than \$14,000 a year, or a household of three making less than \$19,000 a year.

It is worth noting that in 1983, nearly 20 percent of Yukoners with taxable incomes, one in five wage earners in the territory made less than \$10,000 — below the poverty level even for a single person.

Poverty in the Yukon hits hardest at four groups: women, children, Indians, and the elderly. The extent of impoverishment suffered by these people may not be apparent to some Members of the House, so I would like to take a few minutes to describe them in some detail.

For much of the world, to be a woman is almost by definition to

be poor. It is, of course, not that bad here, but it is far from perfect in the territory.

¹⁸ In 1983, the average Yukon income was \$23,000. For men it was \$27,000 and for women it was \$18,000. On average, a woman made two-thirds of what a man made. Notice that a single mother with two children, not an unheard of circumstance these days — in fact it is fairly common — making an average Yukon woman's wage, not a low wage but average, of \$18,000 a year, would be living at the poverty level. That surely is a sign that something is wrong. Even for single women with no dependants, fully one-quarter of them made less than \$10,000 a year in 1983; still below the poverty line.

Even more heartbreaking is the poverty experienced by children. As we all know, national surveys do not always include the Yukon, but in 1975 the National Welfare Council published a well-detailed report entitled *Poor Kids*, which came up with separate figures for the Yukon and Northwest Territories. These showed nearly 1,200 children, one in five, living in poverty. Worse, more than 700 of these were rural children; more than one-quarter of the children living outside of Whitehorse were, according to this report, living in poverty.

There is a cliché that holds that poverty breeds character. I personally believe that it is more likely that poverty breeds bad characters. Our jails, hospitals and mental institutions are full of poor people and I invite all hon. Members to reflect on both the injustice of this situation and on the economic cost, in terms of wasted lives and wasted human potential, in taxes and in lost productivity to society.

As all hon. Members know, Indian poverty is the most grim of all. In the 1981 Census, there were counted 4,000 Indian people in the Yukon. Of these, more than 60 percent, well over half the Indian people in the Yukon, lived in households below the poverty level.

We have all heard many instances of the cause and effects of Indian poverty: the discrimination, abuse, lack of education and training and lack of encouragement and employment, all coinciding with alcoholism, crime, violence and family breakdown and welfare dependency.

But we should not let familiarity blind us to the daily reality. This one appalling figure — that more than half of Yukoners of aboriginal ancestry are living in poverty — is simply not acceptable. I think that by adopting this motion today, Members will be saying that this situation is not acceptable to this Legislature.

Poverty, it is said, is relative. As Hugh Brodie points out in his book about the Indian people of Northern British Columbia, *Maps and Dreams*, there are different definitions of poverty. One measure established by the United Nations is a person's daily protein intake. By this definition, many aboriginal people are thriving despite their low cash incomes. But the lives of such people literally depend on subsistence hunting.

¹⁹ And as Thomas Berger, and others, have shown in their analysis of the Alaska land claims settlement, and Mr. Berger in his book, *The Village Journey*, subsistence hunting in the north is very much at risk.

Many Yukoners begin their lives in poverty, spend it there, and end it there. Three years ago, the New Democratic Party of Canada published a study on older women, entitled *No Cause for Rejoicing*. Its findings were, as the title indicates, not joyous. They were very sad. The single most telling statistic contained in that document is this: 75 percent, three out of four, Canadian women over the age of 65 had incomes of less than \$8,000, which was then the official poverty line in Canada.

Given that the Yukon figures generally coincide with the national averages, I could not help but look at the most recent population figures for the Yukon in the quarterly report, published by our statistics bureau, a few weeks ago. There I found a figure of 372 women over the age of 65 in the Yukon. If three-quarters of them are poor, then 279 elderly Yukon women could be living in poverty. That makes one stop and think.

I want to pause for a moment here and pay tribute to some of the work done by the previous government. In this respect, I think their social policy agenda had widespread public support. It was the

previous government that introduced the Pioneer Utility Grant, and Pharmacare, and a number of other measures of benefit to elderly people. One of the reasons why it was relatively easy to find popular support for such programs in the Yukon, was that in the days that these programs began, the numbers of senior citizens in our society were very small.

Those numbers are growing, both in real terms and as a proportion of the total population. As we look at the situation of elderly people, particularly those in rural Yukon, it is clear that more will need to be done in the future.

When I think about the 1,200 Yukon women living in poverty, and an equal number of Yukon children living in poverty, and twice that number of Yukon Indians living in poverty, and though I know the obvious, that some of these figures must overlap — many poor people are young or old, as well as Indians, as well as being women — I still realize that hundreds and hundreds of our citizens are living in poverty today, as we debate the subject here and now.

That makes me even more determined that this government — a government committed to economic and social reform — will act, every day, to eradicate poverty, more determined that fewer Yukoners will live in poverty every year that we are in office.

For many people, escape from poverty means a job. Even though we have been in government less than one year, our proudest accomplishment has been to create work for Yukoners.

²⁰ As recent statistical reports show, 700 more Yukoners were working at the end of 1985 than were working a year earlier. Our government and this Legislature's addition to the Capital Budget last winter created an estimated 400 short term jobs in construction and service industries. In the year ahead, we expect to see 1,200 construction jobs created by the current Capital Budget, and 1,000 direct and indirect jobs created by the reopening of the mine at Faro. More than 100 jobs were created at Mt. Skukum Gold Mine and many more jobs resulted from our efforts to encourage small business, tourism, forestry, agriculture, manufacturing and other industries.

As well, we will be providing better benefits to the government's casual employees, many of whom earn marginal incomes, and our positive employment program will, we hope, encourage Indian people to come to work in the Yukon public service.

For those unable to work, the elderly, the children, the sick, the disabled, and others, we must do what we can with limited resources. In the current budget, we are introducing a home care program and wider medicare coverage. We have already announced our intention to abolish medicare premiums next year, which is a regressive tax that hits poorer people the hardest.

We are offering more support for daycare, and have created the Women's Directorate. We will establish a half-way house for former inmates, and we have instituted a fine option program to prevent people from going to jail, simply because they are poor. We are committed to a social housing policy.

All these measures will certainly reduce and mitigate poverty in the Yukon in the short term. In the long term, as I have often said, our government is committed to diversifying and expanding our economic base. We believe this will reduce poverty in the Yukon, especially in our vulnerable rural communities, in two ways: first by creating employment opportunities that have not been available in the past, and also by giving us the economic strength to support assistance programs for those unable to work.

We must also take note of suggestions such as those that came in this debate from the Member for Faro, and seriously examine proposals, most of them emanating from national bodies to study proposals such as the guaranteed annual income.

For all these reasons, and for the benefit of the hundreds and hundreds of impoverished Yukoners, our government will indeed strive to eliminate poverty in the Yukon. I have to say to the Member for Old Crow, the mover of the motion, that we shall almost certainly not succeed in eliminating it. There is no place on earth where there are no poor, but we can and must do what we can to eradicate this, the most chronic of all diseases.

Speaker: The hon. Member will close debate if she speaks now. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Ms. Kassi: I thank the hon. Members who spoke to the motion today, for their comments and views. It is good to have this sort of debate here in the Legislative Assembly. To solve poverty in the Yukon, we have to recognize what it is, and then find solutions to it.

The native culture holds many riches, as the Member for Riverdale South stated earlier. It is those grassroots initiatives that we need to strengthen.

²¹ The best work to combat these problems can be done. They know the situation a lot better than people who do not live with it every day. We need to develop the personal skills of people in the communities, as well as in Whitehorse, so that they can find the strength and have the abilities to find the solutions to overcome these problems.

People in the communities, however, have to know there is a government that will support them and will get behind local initiatives to solve these social problems.

I think that all of us, as legislators here in this government, are working toward that goal. I want to thank you once again for supporting this motion.

Motion No. 33 agreed to

Motion No. 34

Clerk: Item number 2, standing in the name of Mr. Webster.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 2?

Mr. Webster: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Klondike THAT this House recommends the Government of Yukon consider ways of increasing services to seniors.

Mr. Webster: This motion simply asks the government to search for ways to improve services for our seniors, especially for seniors in the outlying communities where many kinds of services are not available. This fact was again brought to my attention just recently by a constituent who called about her father. He was originally referred to Macaulay Lodge in Whitehorse, but because there was no room in the Lodge, he was admitted to the Whitehorse General Hospital.

Following a lengthy stay, the hospital wanted to discharge him, but there is still no vacancy in the Lodge for this gentleman. The point is that it would be preferable if this senior citizen could get the kind of care he requires in Dawson City, but we are presently not capable of providing this care. For the time being, this senior citizen must stay in the hospital in Whitehorse, far removed from his family and friends.

I need not remind Members of this House that this is not an isolated case. There have been others, and I am sure there will be many more, not just from Dawson City, but from other communities as well.

It would be preferable for elderly people to remain in their home communities for as long as they so desire. They should not have to move to Whitehorse to get the kind of care they need. They should be able to get this attention in their home community, close to family and friends, where it is important that they share their knowledge and can participate in family and community life.

Our seniors and elders are an important part of Yukon life. The level of services, especially in rural communities, should reflect that value.

The answer for my constituent in Dawson is an improvement of the level of medical care available; the upgrading of our nursing station to cottage hospital status. This is something the entire community needs and can benefit from. In the case of our seniors, perhaps a level of intensive care could be provided in association with the hospital that is not offered at the present time, either by Alexander McDonald Lodge or through the nursing station.

This would mean an improved level of medical care practised by the staff at Dawson and, although this may appear to be an increase in cost, I ask all Members to consider that presently many Dawsonites must travel to Whitehorse for certain kinds of health care that is not available in Dawson. An upgraded hospital can

provide such care, thereby reducing medical travel costs for seniors and other citizens of Dawson which, in turn, will result in lower health care costs overall.

While I am on my feet, I would like to commend the Minister of Health and Human Resources for providing, in the budget, a homecare program for Yukon senior citizens. This is something we can certainly benefit from in Dawson City, as it will complement services such as transportation for shopping and Meals on Wheels that are provided by the helpful staff of McDonald Lodge to our seniors.

I am aware that seniors in the Yukon, as compared to other jurisdictions, enjoy a good level of care and service, but there is much more that we can do to make their lives easier, and to ensure they maintain their contribution to our society.

With that, I will end my remarks and ask all Members for their support when we vote on this important motion.

22

Mr. Phillips: First of all I would like to say that we, on this side of the House, will be supporting this motion and I would like to thank the Member for Klondike for bringing this motion forth. It is so common at so many times to see seniors reach the age of retirement in Yukon and be forced to move out of their communities, and in a lot of cases, out of the Yukon, because they cannot afford to live here. What we really need in the Yukon, and I think we have made a step in the right direction and I commend the Minister of Health and Human Resources for her home care program, is an overall coordinated program where seniors first of all are permitted to stay in their homes.

When we get into the areas of the existing homes we have, Macaulay Lodge in Whitehorse and the lodge in Dawson, there are some needs that have to be addressed. Specifically, I speak of Macaulay Lodge where I know there is a real need for recreational and occupational therapists. I think that we have a lot of seniors who come to these homes with a physical disability. Even if they do not have a physical disability, a recreational therapist could take them out for a day in Rotary Park. Just getting out would prove very successful. I think there is a real need for it not only in Macaulay Lodge, but also in the Lodge in Dawson.

It is important for us in government, and all Yukoners, to realize that one of the reasons we are here and enjoy the lifestyle we do enjoy is because of the commitments and work that the senior citizens have made and done in the past. I would ask all Members to support this very important motion.

Mr. McLachlan: One thing I think all residents of the Yukon and all Members of the Legislature will agree to is that the one thing we all have in common is growing older. If there is one thing we can relate to, it is the needs of the seniors. If those needs can be addressed, we can make the territory a better place to live in. I have a particular association with a lot of people who feel that what they want and what they would like to stay for and what they relate to often is not available in the Yukon and eventually they leave and wind up in such climates as Kamloops, Vancouver Island and Victoria. I believe if this can be done, the territory can be a better place for all. The feelings of association that older people have is very critical. If they can spend that time with friends and family, then it is in large part made easier by facilities that cater to people when they become 55 or 60 years old.

I have a particular association with a similar case that the Member for Klondike has referred to, that when people who can no longer take care of themselves want to become part of an existing institution like Macaulay Lodge and cannot get in there because there just is not room, I find that to be a tragedy, one that we must address in this Assembly.

23 I firmly believe that there is a great deal of work left to be done. We are moving along at speeds greater than was perhaps known in the last 20 or 25 years, but there is still a great deal of work to be done.

Without getting into specifics, the Member for Klondike has delineated and outlined problems that are particular to those people in rural ridings. Whitehorse has a lot to offer. Those 16 or 17 rural communities that have larger numbers of people, aged 55 or over,

are bereft of a large number of these facilities.

I would hope that, in the years to come, we are able to look at institutions that cater to older people in situations, not just that presently exist in Dawson City.

We wish to advise that we, on this side of the House, will be supporting the Member for Klondike's motion.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Fortunately, Members from both sides of the House have been parts of government who have made a great effort to improve services for senior citizens in the Yukon.

We have done things like introducing the home care. We have had a handbook printed and are now going into the second edition of *Information Please*. This is a booklet for senior citizens to help them find out what services and benefits are available to them.

We have also waived ambulance fees. That is a help to the senior citizens. Of course, Macaulay Lodge has had a lot of work done to it over the years, and it is now in phase three of the final completion of the lodge. It should be ready by this spring.

We are also, under the Housing Corporation, developing a 20 suite senior citizen complex.

We are all trying to do certain things for senior citizens, but as you work from day to day, you continue to get individual concerns from people who know of senior citizens who are having problems in their communities or in their homes. I get a lot of these complaints. Very often, you wonder if services are not enough to take care of these problems, and really sometimes they are not. So, we continue to look at ways of trying to improve the services that we have.

In my work, since I have been given this position, I have had the opportunity to meet with the Council on Aging. I find that those individuals are a very well organized group of people. I have spoken at two of their meetings, and it is encouraging for me to know that they are there to bring the concerns of senior citizens to me. They have done it. We certainly look at those concerns, and we try to do something about them.

We also have the Indian elders of the Yukon, and those individuals are taken care of, in part, by some of the services that we have. I still concern myself, because we do have a lot of things that we would like to be able to do, but right now we are not able to. Every time you try to do something, or you find out there is a problem, you wish that it could be acted upon immediately. We have to be able to do that sometimes, especially when there is an emergency.

In the last couple of weeks, people have come to me and expressed a fear that some senior citizens are not able to get the care that they need right now. A very good friend of mine was in that situation, as well, along with some other people whose names were brought to my attention.

24 You often wonder what goes through their minds, because very often, senior citizens who have lived in the Yukon for a long time are very strong and stubborn, and they do not like to take advantage of some of the services available to them. So you have a job trying to get them to take advantage of services available to them, even though they need it.

I am glad this motion was brought to the House today. I think, even though we are trying to do what we can for senior citizens, we will continue to look at what we do have and try to develop programs that would be good for senior citizens to take advantage of. I would like to thank the Members who have spoken and expressed their ideas, because I think some of them are very good and we will have them in *Hansard* as part of any planning we would do in the future.

Mrs. Firth: Before I start speaking to the main principle of the motion, the Member for Kluane has a message for the Member for Faro. That message is that the Member for Faro does speak for himself only when he talks about aging, and certainly does not represent the opinions of the Member for Kluane, who says he is getting younger everyday, and it is because of the company he keeps.

Of course, we, on this side of the Legislature, will be supporting the motion.

The Government Leader, in his presentation to the Legislature regarding poverty, complimented the past government for its performance in identifying the needs of seniors and responding to those needs. He indicated that we did have a good track record in that area.

To clarify the record, the Home Care Program was an area that the previous government was responsible for finally approving. It was initiated under the direction of the previous Minister. I see the Minister of Justice writing furiously, and he will stand and say we talked about it, but never took any action. I believe Mr. Philipsen was the originator of the concept of the Home Care Program. I remember many long meetings with him. I believe the decision was made sometime before the election was called in May; however, I will probably stand corrected by the Minister of Justice. I am sure he will stand up and let us all know exactly how it was.

I have a couple of comments to make about seniors and the approach I would recommend that the government take. We, in the Conservative Party, at our most recent convention, discussed a policy regarding seniors and found that seniors were very receptive to some of the ideas we were presenting and some of the new concepts we were looking at. However, I have always found seniors to be very undemanding people. Of all the people in society, they probably ask for the least. The ones who have contributed the most, ask for the least. They are very independent individuals, and they want to keep it that way. Before we take away that independence, in our enthusiasm and sometimes overzealousness to improve their situation, we have to be cautious about allowing them to maintain their independence and allow them to remain in their own home, make it easier for them to stay in their own home, their own community and their own territory, if we can do that.

When the government looks at enhancing programs to deliver to seniors, I think it is very important they consult with the seniors, such as the Council on Aging. The Minister of Health and Human Resources has mentioned she attended their meetings and found them to be extremely well-organized. They have a definite goal in sight. They discuss the various options and the changes occurring in other areas of Canada.

²⁵ Just to summarize very briefly, we encourage the government to go ahead and proceed and consider ways of increasing the services, but to keep in mind that we, as legislators and politicians, do not always know what is best for them, and that if we are going to take any new directions or bring in any new programs that we do it in a consultative way and after much discussion with the seniors and give them the time to accept the idea and be open and responsive to the new ideas that they may bring forward.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is a refreshing change to have motions that all sides agree with. It is refreshing, because it has not been the character of Wednesday of late. It is important that we spend some time in this chamber talking about our points of agreement, as well as our points of disagreement.

It is especially refreshing to be talking about seniors, a most important issue, and to be talking about home care. I remember this issue extremely well because I have brought forward, not one motion on home care in the past, but several. There was one on December 1, 1982, at page 326 of *Hansard*, if anyone is looking.

I remember a telephone conversation that the previous speaker, the Member for Riverdale South, and I had, just prior to the last election, about home care and a home care study. As this is a motion where all Members are agreeing to the general principle, I will refrain from raising these more partisan issues.

It is interesting that the previous Minister of Health, who did not establish a home care service during her tenure, is now in favour of it. We are extremely pleased to hear that she is in favour of it. I am extremely pleased to hear of the support for this program and this philosophy from all sides of the House.

It is an interesting evolution and, on the whole, a healthy and wholesome evolution, that the Member for Riverdale North is mentioning a philosophy of home care and an approach to seniors that was mentioned several times by several motions by me in the past four years in this House.

May I say that we totally agree with the philosophy. Independ-

ence of seniors is extremely important. It is extremely important to them. The first plank of the platform is that services enabling senior citizens to stay in their own accommodation, their own homes, is vital; it is extremely important. That is what the senior citizens tell us they want.

²⁶ It is extremely economic. It is more economic than Macaulay Lodge, Greenwood Place and the other senior citizen residences. It should be the first plank, not only because it is economic, but because it is dignified, and it is independent. Senior citizens deserve to have some dignity and some beauty around them. It is fortunate that we live in a territory where the aboriginal culture puts such a very high value on senior citizens, on the elders. The non-aboriginal culture, who traditionally in Europe and in North America seem to house seniors away from the mainstream of the population, can learn a substantial thing or two from Yukon aboriginal people about this issue.

It is particularly important in my riding, that is, the downtown area of Whitehorse. The preferred place to live by senior citizens after they leave their own accommodation is near the services, which are downtown. This is clearly established by the senior citizens, themselves.

The concept of Greenwood Place provides housing and independent units, which are extremely handy to senior citizens. It is a preferred place to live, and a very good program, sponsored by the Yukon Housing Corporation. I commend the Minister for being responsive to the waiting list, and to developing plans for another 20-unit complex. I would strongly urge that it be placed near the river, near First Avenue, just a block or so from this building.

It has been a preference of seniors from around the territory to move into Whitehorse, in their later years. This is certainly not for everyone, but there are many seniors who have lived throughout the territory who have moved to Whitehorse in their very senior years, and they very much appreciate the feeling of being close to the river and a view of the mountains. That dignity and beauty should be considered very seriously when deciding on the location of that senior citizens' complex.

²⁷ I must also mention that aside from services there is a question here of the rights of seniors. The Charter includes a prohibition of discrimination on the basis of age. This has been controversial, and is especially a challenge to the mandatory retirement rules very common, and indeed existing, in the government now.

The position of the government, as a policy, is that discrimination on the basis of age should be included as a prohibited ground in the legislation that this House, I hope, will eventually adopt about human rights.

It is also relevant to talk about services to the handicapped. Many seniors find themselves, in their declining years, handicapped to some degree or another in their sight, or their ability to move around, or in their hearing. They are discriminated against, often unintentionally, because of those handicaps. It is the position of the government that that factor should be included in the legislation that this government will eventually adopt concerning human rights.

Those are related issues of extreme importance to our senior citizens. I would encourage all Members to think of the seniors when thinking of the issue of human rights.

I remember debates in the past about person-years at Macaulay Lodge, and I look forward to the support of the Conservative opposition as we enhance those programs. I thank them for that on behalf of the government. It is refreshing that there are some issues where, even though an occasional partisan comment is made, we can put aside our partisan differences and emphasize the points of agreement.

There are more points of agreement than differences. Citizens, especially seniors, are demanding the legislatures around the country and the territory to put aside the talk and get on with services. I am extremely encouraged that all Members appear to be of the same view.

²⁸ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** It is certainly quite refreshing, but somewhat disorienting, to stand in my place as a Member of the House and agree on practically every point made by other Members who spoke on the motion today.

In my view, as a Member, support for senior citizens, the elders in our communities, must always be a top priority for the government and for the Legislature. We should not look at providing sanitized, impersonal services, or services that separate the elders from the rest of the community. We must, instead, recognize that seniors are an integral part of our community, that they are part of our identity, that they are deserving of our respect and are deserving of our continued attention.

I have taken from discussions, in part with the Member for Old Crow, the value placed on people's relationships with elders in communities like Old Crow, the value shown that is inherent in the character of the elders: their knowledge, their wisdom, the guidance they provide and the vision they provide to the community as a whole.

This respect that we show should be demonstrated in concrete action. The sorts of services that have been mentioned by Members in the House, undertaken by both the previous government and the present government, the recognition of the problem, the identification of the problems associated with housing seniors and with providing services to seniors are all indications that we have taken the time to understand the situation, to demonstrate respect and to show concrete action.

The concrete action that I speak of should include the need of our assurance that decent, affordable and trouble-free housing for elders should be a top priority, whether it be financial support to encourage our elders to remain living where they may be happiest in their own homes, or whether it is the provision of decent housing in all the communities, we must show it as a priority for government.

As some of the Members, especially from rural areas, have given an indication that there are special problems that are faced by seniors who wish to remain in rural communities, I, as a Member of the Legislature for some years now, have taken to heart many of the concerns expressed by seniors who wish to remain the fact that it is at times difficult to receive adequate medical service. At times it is not recognized that there are hardships associated with travelling to Whitehorse and outside the territory to receive medical attention. The cost of living and the cost of travel associated with living in rural communities, sometimes makes it very difficult for our elders to remain in those communities close to family and friends, close to the land that they may have lived on or near for decades.

For that reason, any variety of solutions that we may seek to resolve the problems faced by seniors, now and in the future, must include being sensitive to the communities in which seniors have lived and the seniors themselves.

For this government's part, we have recognized the fact that there is a lack of available housing both in Whitehorse and around the territory. For that reason, the government has undertaken to assist in the construction of a seniors' complex in Whitehorse and is encouraging the construction of another fourplex in Teslin to increase the number of units currently available for seniors in the territories by one-third beyond what is presently available.

There will continue to be needs expressed by the elders of our communities. There will continue to be requests for better housing. We will continue to respond favourably and sensitively to the elders. We have to recognize their value, the fact that they are, in part, our identity, as well. We will respond favourably, as I know all other Members will respond.

The extent of the unanimity of opinion expressed in the Legislature and the extent of the understanding should certainly be heartening to the citizens of the Yukon.

Motion No. 34 agreed to

Motion No. 35

Clerk: Motion No. 35, standing in the name of Ms. Kassi.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Motion No. 35.

Ms. Kassi: Yes.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Old Crow that this House recommends the Government of Yukon consider establishing a Yukon Youth Week.

Ms. Kassi: Although I am not the youngest Member of this

Legislature, I do feel very youthful a lot of the time. I am very proud to be introducing this motion in the Legislature today.

We have just come out of an International Year of the Youth, and it was marked by some celebration and awareness here in the Yukon. But, I feel that we need to do a lot more to support our young people. After all, they are our future, and our future deserves a lot of attention.

This motion asks the government to consider establishing a Yukon Youth Week. What I mean by this is a special time that we can set aside to focus our attention on the challenges and problems facing our young people and, therefore, our future. This is something we should do every year. It could be planned and organized by the young people themselves.

We all want, I am sure, to see more young people succeed in their individual futures. We want to see them grow and develop into successful and productive members of society and to become people who are able to achieve whatever they want to achieve in a Yukon that provides them with sufficient opportunities to remain here and contribute to the social and economic development to the territory. I am sure this is a goal that all Members of this House can agree on. What I am suggesting in the motion is that we take special time to focus our attention on the youth of the Yukon, listen to them, work and talk with them and help them deal with the problems of today, as well as their planning for tomorrow. We need to encourage them to stay in school. We need to show them there is a future for them in the Yukon. We need to make them feel needed and we can do this through encouragement. We must show them that there are places they can go for help, that there are people they can count on for support. We need to help them learn for themselves how to deal with the problems of life and give them good direction to follow, and help them formulate directions for their own lives when they are ready for that kind of step.

The youth of the Yukon must be made aware of the special gifts they have for art, music, thinking skills, sports, recreation and spiritual development, and just plain friendship and people skills.

There is also a need to show them they need not indulge in the harmful things of life such as drugs, chemicals, cigarettes and alcohol and sexual abuse as well, and that they become aware of the harmful consequences of these. Most of all we want to help them grow into productive and happy members of society, with confidence in the future and their own place in the Yukon and in the world.

I think we could also provide a forum for young people to respond to government policies that affect them and to express their views on a wide variety of social and economic political issues. We should encourage proposals for new strategies from young people to meet the economic and social development needs they have, at the present time and for those coming along after them. I hope we can have that sort of dialogue during Yukon Youth Week.

In particular, we have to give young people the means with which they can make the transition from dependence to independence in a somewhat complicated and often overwhelming real world.

I think we have to respond as leaders in government to youths' demands for better training, education and job opportunities, and their requirements for equality in a society that demands their independence. Most of all, we must listen to young people as equals. I feel that young people want to be taken seriously and treated as equals, as adults. They want an opportunity to share and develop their ideas, not just about youth issues as defined by adults, but about all of the concerns facing them now and in the future. Youth wants a real voice, not a token one, in the decisions that affect their lives. We could start this by appointing more young people to commissions and boards in the Yukon.

But first let us start by hearing what our young people have to say. Let us see what they think we should be doing as a government and as a society on behalf of young people and on behalf of all Yukoners to make this a better place to live for now and the future.

Mrs. Firth: The Member for Old Crow has brought forward an interesting motion that the Government of Yukon consider establishing the Yukon Youth Week. We, on this side of the Legislature, think that it is a good idea, and agree with the Member for Old

Crow that we should encourage the youth to have as much say and participation in the organizing of the youth week as they would like.

Last year, which was the year of the youth, I was in contact with the government in Alberta to see what they were doing for their youth. They had an extremely active program, which culminated in a conference from November 14 to 16. It was a conference celebrating Alberta youth. "Young and Alive in '85", I believe their slogan was.

They had a very active conference. They brought in all kinds of guest speakers to talk about a large variety of different subjects, many of which the Member for Old Crow has mentioned — topics regarding leadership and sex education, dealing with drugs and alcohol, communication, relationships, and so on. If the Member for Old Crow would like to have some of the information I received, I am quite prepared to share that with her.

The Premier, at that time, made a comment that, regardless of age, cultural background or personal belief, one destination we all have in common is the future. The youth of the territory, in particular, I have always found to be very knowledgeable, and almost inspirational, about the future, and what their expectations are. They tend to be rather practical, which we, as politicians, must always keep sight of. A little bit of practicality in our world of politics always adds a rather sensible light to the situation, I find.

As a politician, I find it very helpful to consult with the youth in the riding that I represent, to seek their ideas and their opinions. I do that as an opinion and an idea from an individual. I recognize that, in order for the special recognition to be given, and the security of a group, that we have to have structures so that youth can participate as a whole. I do not think we should ever lose sight of the fact that we should treat youth, as seniors, as everyone, as individuals, and seek out their opinions and their ideas as individuals, and assess them for the individualistic thought that has gone into that idea.

We look forward to seeing what the government does regarding this motion. We would be interested to know when this would be proposed, what time of year, and so on, and how it would be coordinated with the education program that we have in the Yukon.

³² We look forward to seeing what the government would bring forward, and, of course, we would support the concept of the Youth Week for Yukon youths.

Mr. Coles: Not being, perhaps, as youthful as the Member for Kluane all the time, but definitely younger, I feel fairly confident speaking to this motion. We will definitely be supporting the motion. I believe that the establishment of a Yukon Youth Week would be an extremely important first step by this government to show young people in the territory that we do recognize their importance in Yukon's society as a whole.

The young people in the territory are definitely the future of the territory, and we must always be listening and acting on their ideas and concerns as they bring them forward to the different representatives in the House.

Youth unemployment, I think, should probably be a major concern of all politicians in the country. Youth unemployment could quite possibly become one of the most serious crises that this country has faced in a long while, and we must all be seen to be working toward alleviating that problem.

Young people in this territory, as well as the country as a whole, need our support, and we are definitely going to need theirs in the future. We will be supporting this motion, and I hope all Members of the House do.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I speak in support of this motion. I think that we have all demonstrated that we do have a concern for what is happening with our youth today. We do, right now, in this government, offer certain services to youth in the form of an anger management workshop for young people run by Family Services Association.

We have grants that are provided to the Child Development Centre. We have community work placements for youth in conflict with the law to enable them to get back in positive contact with the

community. We have, under my department, education and schools by probation officers on the *Young Offenders Act*.

The department works with individuals and organizations in the community towards developing programs. In our assessment centre, we provide environmental programs such as camping, fishing, classroom mining and reintegration programs for youth and a social network intervention groups.

Volunteers work with youths and there are parents residential school programs for those who cannot attend school. In the fall, we will be offering workshops for adults working with youths who have problems with alcohol and drugs and who live in an environment where alcohol and drugs are abused. We will also be providing counselling for young people in the schools if they have been invited.

These are some of the things that are happening with the youth. However, we all know that there are many things that are not happening among our youth, and we believe that in order to provide those necessary things we have to listen to the people for whom we will be providing a Youth Week.

If we are going to be very successful in the planning stages of our Youth Week, we have to listen to the youth. I found that very helpful when I was meeting with a group of people who work with youth, who were parts of this government and part of the federal government. There were school teachers and a whole range of other people.

I was a Justice of the Peace at the time, and we felt that we were very knowledgeable about what was happening with the youth. We met for a long time and found out that we did not know as much as we thought, so we decided to bring in some young offenders and some children who were not young offenders, and I think we learned more after we started meeting with them.

Any time that we do plan on having something such as a Youth Week, we have to be very well prepared. We have to listen to the people who work with the youth and we definitely have to listen to the youth because they can help us a lot in organizing what is needed.

³³ I am thankful that other Members of this House and other Parties are supporting it and would look forward to having this in place. I realize it will take a lot of organizing and that we all can be a part of it.

Mr. Nordling: As a youth, I grew up in the Yukon. Growing up in Dawson City, I feel that I had more opportunity than many of my friends in Whitehorse. With the tourism industry in Dawson, almost every youth could have a job if he or she so desired. This is not the case so much now as it was when I was younger.

When I left the Yukon to attend university, I received assistance from the territorial government, which was very much appreciated. I felt that the Yukon was investing in me, and I felt that, in time, I would be able to provide a return on that investment, a return that would justify the investment. I believe that it is very important to assist young Yukoners to further their education and develop their skills both within the Yukon and outside.

This motion, which recommends that the government consider establishing a Yukon Youth Week, is a very important step in recognizing our youth and making them part of Yukon society; however, we must not only recognize youth, but we must develop a comprehensive policy, not to decide what we are going to give away or not how we are going to look after our youth, but to provide a framework of opportunity upon which youths can build and be proud of their own accomplishments.

The program of student financial assistance is one example, because in order to obtain assistance, students must take some initiative. I was pleased to hear the speakers before me discuss the value of our youth and the fact that we must listen to our youth. Many of our youth are in trouble with the law because they are unemployed and have virtually nothing to do. Many of these youths have very few opportunities to develop their skills and talents.

I believe Youth Week could be used to bring everyone's attention to our youth and their importance in the future of the Yukon. Youth Week could also be used to identify the programs and opportunities available to youth.

I know that the government spends a fortune each year in bringing employees from outside into the Yukon. I do not have an exact figure, but perhaps this motion will encourage the government to begin planning for long term stability in our workforce through our own youth. I am pleased this motion was brought forward today, and I certainly will be supporting it.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I had occasion to be listening to CBC radio this morning, and I heard a fellow named Jack Strapper who reminded me that I could be part of this Legislature's youth wing when comparing my suspected age to the length of tenure of some squatters.

His comment to Yukon respecting the time lapse since I last had a visitation from a diaper was probably a little more than incorrect and mildly discourteous.

«In any case, it is true that the Legislature is comprised of a number of young, vigorous people. I think there are 16 of them, including the most youthful Member of the Legislature, the Member for Tatchun. I give qualified support to the motion. We must. We should excite and promote people's awareness of young people in the community. To heighten their profile now is a reflection of our priorities. It is a recognition of the problems and the challenges that young people face daily.

So easily, young people can lose heart. They can fall into despair. They can turn to drugs and alcohol for diversion. It is our duty to society to offer alternatives. It is too easy, oftentimes, for politicians to concentrate their efforts on the improvement of water and sewer systems, on constructing buildings, as if the only measure of accomplishment for politicians was how well they can build, how well they can pave streets.

Too often, we pay insufficient attention to more people-oriented questions. Under those circumstances, a Yukon Youth Week would be very helpful. In some respects, direct action to resolve the problem is necessary and would be even more helpful.

The departments for which I am responsible have a good deal of contact with young people in the territory. Some of the new initiatives that have been taken by the government recently indicate our support for the youth in communities, and undertaking educational programs for the youth who want work, the youth who are desirous of being trained.

When we get into the Estimates debate, I will be more than prepared to explain the Department of Community and Transportation Services' reallocation of funds to support community recreation directors around the territory. I would hope that that would be an initiative that would help develop recreational programs for young people, whether it be straight recreational programs, or whether it be craft courses, or whatever is considered necessary, given the community.

The Member for Porter Creek West hit the issue dead on when he was discussing the need for employment opportunities for young people. Too often, they are faced with the problem of having little or no experience in a world that demands experience in order for them to achieve employment opportunities.

In that vein, the government has undertaken two new initiatives in this coming year: the Canada-Yukon Summer Program, which provides wage subsidies to municipalities, Indian bands and the private sector, to encourage those employers to hire young people; and also the Youth Employment and Training Program, which will encourage young people, and encourage the employers to give young people the work experience and on-the-job training.

We have also increased our emphasis on apprenticeship training, and have undertaken to increase our general level of training programs under the Work Yukon job training package.

«I think it would probably be somewhat dispiriting to the tenor of the debate today to simply list out in bureaucratic monologue the kinds of programs that may be available. It is the intent, the emotion driving the debate that is important today, and I will simply state finally that, as one Member of this legislature who has had some acquaintance as a youth in probably more recent days than others, I would certainly support the motion and encourage this government and all governments to take concrete action to improve the situation as well as simply identifying the problem.

Motion No. 35 agreed to

Motion No. 27 — adjourned debate

Clerk: Item number four, standing in the name of Mr. Phillips. Adjourned debate on the amendment, hon. Mr. Penikett.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I had a horrible moment there when I did not expunge from the record again, as was done in respect to the Coolican Report, the Ministerial Statement that the Member for Porter Creek East advised us of today. It is interesting how history can get rewritten sometimes when I believe I gave that presentation and the Minister of Justice believes I gave that presentation, but *Hansard* reports otherwise, and some poor archeologist or anthropologist will come along a thousand years from now and find the document and believe honestly and sincerely that the Minister of Justice made that wonderful speech, not me. I feel a deep sense of regret about that.

As I was saying last Wednesday, having entered the debate I did not plan to enter, I think there are two points on this subject. As an individual, I have never felt very comfortable with the notion that a humane society could institutionalize all of its problems. I have never felt comfortable with the idea that old people belong in old folks' homes and that kids should be out of sight and out of mind, as the Victorians used to say, in schools and nurseries, that mentally ill people should be locked away in institutions and that sick people should be hospitalized and so on.

I think we are moving to a more genuinely charitable and more compassionate and more humane approach these days. I think the home care program we have been talking about in this government and earlier today is just one example of that. I think day-release programs and so forth for mental patients are another example of that. I think the same holds true for non-violent or non-dangerous young offenders. I believe it is in the best interest of the community and for these young people that they remain integrated as much as possible with the community. They may be removed from their families; they may be placed under care, but I believe it is in their interest that whenever possible they continue to go to school and that they have training and counselling assistance so they feel they belong to the community and have a sense of responsibility and identification with the community.

«I believe that the idea behind the new *Young Offenders Act* is that these 13, 14 and 15-year olds, for the most part, are not incorrigible. They are not people who we have to give up on. They are not people who we should lock away, not just away from temptation, but away from contact with society. I believe they are people for whom we have some hope.

When it comes to adults, and adult criminals, I think there is a serious statistical argument, or debate, about whether the prisons — or the liberal idea of prisons — are there for rehabilitation. There is a serious debate about whether that argument holds any water. When you are talking about professional criminals, or habitual criminals, or people who have chosen a life of crime, or fallen into a life of crime, there is plenty of evidence that, once they are incarcerated, once they go to a penitentiary, once they go to what some people call crime school, that they will go again, and again, and again.

I think that says something, not only about the individuals who go into custody in those situations, but it also says something about the institutions themselves. It is quite likely that it indicates that, when it comes to rehabilitation, prisons, as we have come to know them — bars, locked doors, concrete, steel, locks and rigid regimes, denial of family and societal contact — does much to guarantee that people will continue to be criminals.

It does not surprise me that those kinds of institutions, which are relatively new, historically, do not reform and do not rehabilitate most of the people who have the misfortune to become their guests.

That does make an argument for me that, when young people fall afoul of the law, we should give up on them and simply doom them to the same kind of pattern as for adult criminals.

It should be noted that most of the people who find a way into jail in a place like the Whitehorse Correctional Institute are not professional criminals. They are not murderers. They are not

big-time thieves. They are not heroin dealers. They are not gangsters. Most of them are people who have problems with alcohol. Many of them are convicted impaired drivers. Many of them are people who we talked about earlier today, who are poor, without skills, without prospects, and who have problems with alcohol, drugs and petty crime.

Some of these people have demonstrated violent tendencies. Some people demonstrate those kinds of violent tendencies earlier than others. Some people become dangerous to society at quite a young age. There is no doubt in my mind that society, on balance, has to be protected, and that is why we have closed-custody provisions.

For the other young people who fall afoul of the law, and are destined for open custody facilities, the ones that have been designated in this new law, I think we should take a different approach.

³⁷ I do not think that we should treat them as jailbirds. I do not think that we should give them a permanent label or tag as criminals. I do not think that we should doom them to that deception of themselves as losers, failures, criminals, jailbirds, or whatever.

I think there is plenty of evidence that these people come from poor families. These people come from families, in many cases, without financial resources. They come from troubled families, people who are having problems of their own with alcohol and drugs, and they come from broken homes. The patterns are evident everywhere.

Most of them are still children, by any definition. I believe that what they need is discipline, and more importantly, love. If they can get both in a group home situation in open custody, if they can get the care, the counseling and the education that they need to find the straight and narrow path again, I think we should do our best to give it to them. I think we should do it not just for them. I believe we should do it for the whole of society.

They are our children. They are our future. They are the people on whom we are going to depend when we are too old to look after ourselves. To state the obvious, the young offenders are not the majority of children, but I believe we should not give up on them. I do not believe that we should say they are hopeless cases. I do not believe we should write them off.

I think, as one jurisdiction in a nation of 12 jurisdictions that have to grapple with this problem, that we should face the responsibility of providing the kind of open custody facilities and closed custody facilities appropriate to our situation, to our circumstances and to the needs of both the young offenders and our society.

I support the very earnest, open and very democratic effort of the Minister responsible in this government to try to find an acceptable solution, an acceptable way of housing these young offenders in a way that is acceptable also to the broad community.

Mr. Phillips: I was disappointed to hear the comments made by the Minister for Health and Human Resources when we last debated this issue. The Minister said several times, and was obviously trying to leave the impression in everyone's mind, that we wanted to put these young offenders in her words, out of sight, in the bush, out in the boondocks, or out in the country.

I am extremely disappointed that the Minister did not listen to my speech.

³⁸ I tried sincerely to offer an alternative to a serious problem. I understand the dilemma that the Minister is in. That is why we offered a constructive alternative.

I will, for the benefit of all Members, and especially the Minister of Health, spell out again, clearly, the reasons or the rationale for this motion, and the proposal we made.

First of all, and most importantly, we would house our young offenders here in the Yukon. Secondly, the families could work, almost daily, in the rehabilitation process with the young offenders. We would be accessible to schools, recreation activities, and the law courts. We could offer, at the same location, at a reasonable cost, a wilderness custody concept, in which all youth could take advantage, meaning both the closed and open custody youths.

We would not have the obvious emotional upset that has been created with respect to 501 Taylor and the Assessment Centre. The

staff and families could live in Whitehorse, and work and visit at the facilities. Open custody youths could easily be bused to school and, unlike the impression that the Minister of Justice tried to leave with this House, I do feel that youths should continue their education, and the location of the open custody home would facilitate that.

Sewer and water, supply and services would also be less expensive if the facilities were located close to Whitehorse, as opposed to further out of town. I am not talking about 10 or 20 miles out of town. I am talking about a lot closer to town.

The cost could be considerably reduced by utilizing the training and recreation facilities for all the youths, as opposed to building three different sets of facilities.

We have a very large city, area-wise. I feel it can easily satisfy the needs of the young offenders and, at the same time, satisfy the public concern.

I would just like to comment a bit about the impression the Government Leader left, when he inferred that we were saying that if a youth commits a crime, he or she should be locked away forever in a concrete, iron cell. That is a misconception that the other side has of this side. It is a long way from the truth, and I wonder why the Government Leader, and other Members of this party, are trying to drag the debate into one that would decide whether the youths should be in an open or closed, locked cell with bars.

None of us were talking about that. What we are talking about is an open-closed custody facility. They have tried to lead the debate down the wrong path.

In closing, we have tried to offer an alternative to assist the government in solving this problem. For this reason, we on this side cannot support the amendment, as it would destroy the intent of our motion.

Amendment agreed to

Speaker: Is there any further debate on the main motion, as amended?

Motion No. 27 agreed to as amended

³⁹

Mr. McLachlan: I request unanimous consent to waive provisions of Standing Order No. 12 and call the items under Motions Other Than Government Motions in the order agreed to by House Leaders and communicated to the Clerk.

Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: There is unanimous consent.

Motion No. 32

Clerk: Item number 13, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with item 13?

Mr. Brewster: Yes.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Kluane

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to recognize the importance of freshwater fisheries to the Yukon economy and accept its responsibilities in negotiating transfer of this important resource from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Brewster: Most Yukoners, I believe, are not very impressed with the current state of management of freshwater fisheries resources by the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans. I think it is fair to say that there really has been no management. Very few studies have been done and there has been very little restocking, except for a few pothole lakes.

Recently during the hearing of the Select Committee on Renewable Resources in Carcross, a Fisheries official made a presentation that only served to convince me that the department knows virtually nothing about fisheries in the Yukon, nor do they ever talk to anyone to find out about it. Similarly, at a hearing in Destruction Bay in 1984, the Fisheries official did not know that a proposed lodge was being built very near the best lake trout spawning area on Kluane Lake. The Yukon fisheries deserves better management, and I am convinced that Yukoners can do the job.

The Government Leader stated he does not want to inherit a skeleton from the federal government in this regard. However, the only other alternative to transferring the resource to us is to leave it in federal hands and try to apply pressure to have something done. Such an alternative, in my view, is unacceptable. It is high time Yukoners themselves took control of this valuable resource. In the short term, it is true we will have to spend some money, but if we do spend the money and we do manage the resource wisely we can also expect some returns. In the long term, I firmly believe Yukoners will benefit from assuming responsibility of this resource.

In addition to protecting and preserving the resource and deriving some economic benefit from it, there are also some other advantages that can be obtained from the Yukon accepting the freshwater fisheries transfer at this time. Let me give you some examples.

First of all, I believe that the transfer would lead to a better working relationship between the Government of Yukon and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans concerning different species of fish. If Yukoners can manage the freshwater fisheries resources well, and I know we can do a heck of a lot better job than the Feds, then we may even be able to ultimately aspire to assume responsibility for the management of fish such as salmon as well.

The second major benefit would be in the relation to advancing the cause of integrated resource management. At the present time, a state of war exists between the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and other resource users. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans places an inflated value on the freshwater fish resource that is out of all proportions to the value of other resources. The placer mining industry is a good example here. The requirements they would put on placer miners to protect the grayling would put many miners out of business.

When it comes to spending money in order to manage freshwater fisheries, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has done nothing. However, when it comes to protecting the resource from competing resource users, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans officers climb into their tanks, ready to do battle.

This situation must end, and only Yukoners can end it. By assuming control of freshwater fisheries, the Yukon would take an important step in promoting an integrated approach to resource management. The Yukon government must take the lead role in this regard.

Through sound resource management and land use planning, many needless conflicts between resource users can be eliminated. Most resource users are willing to make reasonable accommodations. The onus is on the Yukon government to ensure that there is cooperation and that all Yukoners benefit from the use of our resources.

I urge all Members to support this motion.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I think that if we were to check the record, at least dating back to the time that the Member for Kluane and I entered the House, we would be able to ascertain from the record that the Member for Kluane has been the most successful of all legislators in getting motions adopted by the Legislature on a unanimous consent basis. This speaks well of his intentions and of his concerns. He is more concerned about issues and his constituency as opposed to the simple matter of politics.

I would like to inform the Member for Kluane that once again I believe he is going to receive unanimous consent for the motion that he has brought before this House. I would like to take some time to inform the House and the public about the importance of the fishery resource to the economy of the Yukon and to the people of the Yukon.

Yukon sport fishery provided approximately 170,000 person-days of angling for almost 20,000 residents and visiting fishermen over the past year. These anglers caught and kept about 235,000 fish, of which approximately 50 percent were Arctic grayling, while lake trout constituted more than 80 percent of the fish by weight. The angling took place on some 277 lakes in the territory. In the recent year, approximately 8,500 visitors purchased angling licences in the Yukon Territory.

Outdoor recreational activity surveys indicate that 70 percent of

the Yukon population fish at some time during the year, making it substantially more popular than camping, hunting, recreational boating, cross-country skiing or snowmobiling. These figures indicate the relative importance of sport fishery as a recreational activity with substantial economic spin-offs in the territory.

The honourable Member and others in this House will also be aware that there exists an important subsistence food fishery in the territory for freshwater fish species. These species are netted by both native and non-native Yukoners as an important component of their diet. I might add that this is an activity that has been carried out by the aboriginal community of the Yukon for centuries. To date, this is one area that we lack data on, not only with respect to the consumption of fish but also to the other big and small game animals in the Yukon. One of the management situations that we are going to have to face down the road is to be able to obtain that necessary data, and the only way in which we can achieve that is by through a spirit of cooperation.

In the Yukon River Basin Study, I notice there are some data that speaks to the consumption of the fishery resource, but I would at this point suspect all data as it relates to fisheries, particularly as it relates to the harvest levels by aboriginal people in the Yukon. In many cases, we are underestimating the consumption levels.

As I indicated in my response to the Speech from the Throne, work has been ongoing toward the ultimate transfer of responsibility of freshwater fishery management to our government. Our government's intention to assume this responsibility has been conveyed to the successive federal Ministers. Personnel in the Department of Renewable Resources had ongoing, informal discussions with the staff of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and particularly the individual who is concerned in the department, the Director of Wildlife.

One significant aspect of these informal discussions has been this government's position that control and management of freshwater fishery habitat should be a part of the transfer of responsibility. This would be similar to the arrangement that exists in the provinces. We would also require a role in the allocation of an anadromous fish harvest on that partnership basis with the federal government, even though we recognize that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will, no doubt, continue to take the position that they should have ultimate jurisdictional responsibility with respect to the salmon species.

One of the questions that was raised in the Supplementary Estimates debate tried to elicit from the government some preference in terms of allocation of priority between salmon talks and the freshwater fish negotiations that have been going on with Ottawa. As I indicated, part of the problem is that we are such a small jurisdiction, and we have such limited manpower and, in many instances, there is a whole array of concerns that we cannot respond to with equal measure.

I would like to tell the House that the individual who has been involved in the salmon talks is now, and for the foreseeable future, going to be available for the freshwater negotiations. At the salmon talks held in Anchorage, it was decided that they will not meet until the fall. That would free up that individual to devote, between now and then, a majority of his effort, with respect to discussions with the federal government.

As I have indicated, and as the Member for Kluane will be aware, because of the correspondence he received from the former Minister of Indian Affairs when he was the Minister of Renewable Resources, the federal government has a firm view that the Council for Yukon Indians must be consulted in the issue of freshwater fishery management transfer. The matter has been raised with the Land Claims Secretariat, and has also been a formal discussion with CYI on this topic. Early indications in their response gives us reason to be optimistic that the transfer of fishery management will occur in the future, and that there are no large impediments that we can foresee to delay the transfer in any substantial way.

I have also taken up this view with the Wildlife Advisory Board in the meeting that I had with them about the desire of the government to assume responsibility. I would like to report to the House that the Wildlife Advisory Committee concurred, generally, with the position that I discussed with them at that meeting.

I was originally intending to speak about the salmon negotiations in greater detail, but because we are followed immediately on the Order Paper by that specific topic, we will reserve comments until we get to that issue.

⁴² One of the questions raised by the Members of the Opposition in the estimates debate was some indication of a timeframe with respect to a transfer. Unfortunately, negotiations are such that we cannot accurately predict a timeframe, but are optimistic that it will be soon.

In terms of our position, we have pulled together the necessary person-year resources that will be needed on our part to successfully manage the resource in the Yukon. What is yet needed in terms of our position for the negotiations is, more or less, an adding up of the dollar side of the position and the costing of what is required to adequately manage the resource in the Yukon. That work is going on at the present time.

I believe the former Minister is aware of the existing gaps in terms of the current management of the resource. He very clearly laid it out to us this afternoon. I believe that he also mentioned — and if he did not mention it I would like to bring it to the attention of the House — that in the Yukon I believe the federal fisheries allocates less than one person-year to fishery management.

So, I think it is clear that, on this side of the House, although there are details yet to be ironed out, we are in a situation where the new Minister, whom I have not had a chance to meet, informs us that he is agreeable to the transfer taking place. We are going to have a motion today that clearly articulates a unanimous position from this Legislature, and I am optimistic about the negotiations. There had been a meeting planned for the federal-territorial-provincial fisheries Ministers meeting set for May 9 in Winnipeg. Fortunately, that meeting has been cancelled. The Minister of Fisheries phoned today and said they are holding that meeting on June 9 in Winnipeg. We claim no responsibility for that decision, but are happy that decision has been made and we look forward, given the cooperative will of this House, to being present at that meeting to represent the interest of Yukoners.

Mr. Coles: I believe everything of importance has been said by the Member for Kluane and the Minister with regard to the issue. I believe everyone in the House understands the importance of the freshwater fishery in the territory and therefore the importance of the transfer of that particular department. We will definitely be supporting the motion.

Mr. Phillips: Obviously, I speak in favour of this motion and commend the Member for Kluane for bringing it to the House.

Freshwater fisheries is one of our most important resources. Thousands of Yukoners — in fact the Minister of Renewable Resources just told us 70 percent of Yukoners, young and old — wet a line each year.

I do not have to tell the Minister about the rapid decline of the fish stocks in the Yukon, especially in the accessible areas. The federal Department of Fisheries has been ready for well over a year to transfer this most important resource to Yukon. The Minister has said he has had meetings with officials and I guess all we can draw from these conclusions is: why has nothing happened? Is there really a political will on behalf of this government to obtain this important resource now?

⁴³ Has the Minister or the Government Leader written directly to the Minister of Fisheries, indicating that we wish to obtain the freshwater fisheries responsibility?

I suggest to this House, and all Yukoners, that the answer is no.

I am not suggesting that we accept the responsibility without any funds to carry out this responsibility. The past government was most successful in negotiations for funds for any of the responsibilities they received from the federal government.

The general feeling of the people of the Yukon, in my view, is that even on a limited budget, the decisions would be better made here and, certainly, would better reflect the wishes of Yukoners. The priority would change, and a very high priority would be put on the rebuilding and protecting of the Yukon's fish stocks. This is badly needed, even if we hope to bring this resource back to the

level it once was.

The message that I would like to give the Minister today is that we cannot afford to wait any longer. The Minister, or the Government Leader, must immediately ask the federal Minister of Fisheries to put in motion the immediate transfer of freshwater fisheries to the Yukon.

Mr. Phelps: I, too, want to say a few words in support of this motion. It is a motion that is of extreme significance to my constituents, the people of Carcross, Tagish, Little Atlin and Laberge. It is a move that we contemplated making, and commenced upon, well over a year ago. We had a commitment, at that time, from the Minister of Fisheries, that we would have had the devolution completed by last October. It is not a big deal. It is not a difficult deal, one would think — one person-year a fishery that has been badly neglected by the federal governments over the years. I am really disappointed by the lack of progress and effort and willingness to move by the present government.

We had meetings in Carcross and Tagish with Fisheries officials. We were forced to have these meetings to get some policies into place that were sorely needed, in the opinion of residents. Unfortunately, these meetings were made necessary because of the lack of action by this government. This winter, we did have meetings with respect to starting a pilot program to control the number of predator fish, namely of whitefish. A pilot program was going to take place in the Tagish Lake, Taku Arm, at the Six Mile River.

That program will be done in full cooperation between the residents of Tagish — the community club — the Carcross-Tagish Indian Band, and the federal government. It is contemplated that next November there will be a short fisheries, when the whitefish are spawning at the mouth of the Six Mile River. Some call it the Tagish River. I have had a debate with my good friend, the Minister of Transportation, about the proper name of the river. Long-time residents and the Indian population knows it as the Six Mile River.

At the same meetings, we agreed upon a further cooperative plan, involving the community club of Carcross, the Carcross-Tagish Indian Band, and the Department of Fisheries, to have a test netting program to net suckers in the Carcross area this summer when the suckers are in abundance and spawning within a mile of the Village of Carcross.

⁴⁴ The Carcross Community Club, on the one hand — for the sucker program — together with the Carcross Indian Band will be each appointing two members to a Board to consult with the Department of Fisheries and to determine who should net and what should be done with the catch.

The same program will be in place in the Tagish area. Again, two members from each of the band and the community club will be advising the department as to when the catch should commence, as well as to the distribution of the catch amongst Carcross and Tagish residents.

All this work has been made necessary because of the delay in the transfer of this small program. In addition, the people of Carcross and Tagish have shown a great deal of concern about the present policy of the federal fisheries department with regard to allowing commercial netting on Bennett Lake. Bennett Lake is a well known sports fishing area, and it has been felt that the commercial netting has been abused and ought to be stopped.

To that end, representations were made in the meetings by elders of the Carcross Indian Band to the fisheries department, as well as by many white residents of the area. We have circulated a petition that we intend to present to the federal Department of Fisheries and to our MP who was the Minister of Fisheries in the federal Department of Fisheries for a short period of time.

All this is necessary. It is probably unnecessary to send a copy of the petition to the Yukon government because they have not bothered to do a little work and get this program transferred. It is a shame, because with only one part-time person-year allocated — and it is not a full person-year — to the freshwater fisheries, there has been abuse. There has been a lack of contact and consultation with people throughout the Yukon. The fisheries, in some instances, has been placed in grave jeopardy.

Even more unfortunate is that no one from the government has taken the time, because of the lack of resources, to take down the oral perception histories of the people with regard to the history of freshwater fisheries, particularly in the southern lakes.

There are an awful lot of people, such as Johnny Johns and the late George Simmons, who grew up, who worked on those lakes, and fished huge quantities of fish for mink and fox farms, who have a lot to tell, and a lot of insight into the fisheries in the southern lakes. It is a real shame that the government has not moved quickly enough and may not have the time to follow up on the oral history that people such as these have to give.

This is really important to the management of the resource because in those days some of the people ran as much as a mile of nets a day.

45 Huge quantities of fish were taken from the lakes. The size of the nets were 3-inch rather than 4-inch mesh, which is allowed now. The net result was — the results from the nets was that they took an awful lot. An extremely large proportion of the catch were those fish that are now seen as predators of the eggs and of the sports fish. When there was that kind of use of the suckers and roundfish and whitefish species, there was a very healthy population of sports fish in the lake. Of course, as I have already said, all fish were used for the protein value of feeding mink and foxes.

These various people, many of them in their late years, Angela Sidney, Dora Wedge, and so on, have tremendous insight into the spawning activity and activities of all these fish. Again, it is a real shame that nothing has been done to take down their observations with regard to the southern lakes, which they know so well, the lakes that really feed the main river of Yukon, the Yukon River.

As has already been said by my good friend, the Member for Kluane, the transfer of freshwater fisheries is important, as well, because of the need to rationalize regulations surrounding placer mining in Yukon. We now have some very ridiculous situations that have been foisted upon us, in large part, by federal bureaucrats. We have situations where \$75,000 or \$80,000 worth of ditches have been built to protect a handful of grayling. There has been case after case cited of that kind of overzealous lack of balancing of interests, and a huge amount of money put into preservation, which would be far better if that kind of effort were put into other kinds of fish enhancement programs.

Yukoners have a deep-seated interest in this motion. I am very pleased that the Minister of Renewable Resources has indicated, finally, a willingness to move on this. I think it is tragic that it has been delayed so long. I would think that it is a fairly simple round of negotiations that is required. One has to be careful, but we seem to have a government that is afraid of its shadow, afraid to really move ahead with bold ideas.

I recall many, many years ago the transfer of management of highways from the federal government to the Yukon government. That was done with very little fuss or fanfare. There was a huge saving to the taxpayers of Canada, because this government did it far more efficiently with far fewer civil servants, when one took into account the operators here and the policy makers in Ottawa. It was done with very little fuss or fanfare. The net result was good, because the net result was a Department of Highways, which was responsive to, and understood, the needs, aims, aspirations and conditions of Yukon roads. I have always been a proponent of moving towards local control of issues, programs and jurisdictions that are of a local nature.

46 It seems to me that fisheries should be transferred as quickly as possible.

Speaker: The hon. Member will close debate if he now speaks. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. Brewster: I would like to thank the Minister for his kind words on my record on motions. However, I would like him to talk to the Minister sitting on his left, who seems to defeat me every time on mileposts. Maybe he could bring him around on this.

I realize that the government has been working on this, but all governments, not only when I was over on that side, and on this side, every once in a while need a little kick in the butt to keep

them moving. Sometimes it is not always the Minister's fault. Sometimes it is other people around the area who prevent the Minister from moving these things.

I hope that this motion will help the Minister get this on the road. There is only one little thing that bothers me. He stated that the meeting that he wanted to attend will be June 9. However, he did not mention the year. I am just hoping that it is 1986. I hope we do not have to go on further than that. I would like to thank everybody here for their support on this motion.

Motion No. 32 agreed to

Motion No. 37

Clerk: Item number 15, standing in the name of Mr. Coles.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 15?

Mr. Coles: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Tatchun

THAT this Assembly urges the federal government to insist that the "Equity Principle", as it pertains to the Canada-U.S. Pacific Salmon Treaty, remain a subject for negotiation during the Yukon River Salmon talks.

Mr. Coles: I raise the matter of the Equity Principle to the status of a motion, because I have come to the conclusion that, where salmon are concerned, Yukoners should take nothing for granted.

We believe that the Canadian government should be put on notice that the inclusion and retention of the Equity Principle in the salmon talks is an absolute and non-negotiable item.

I am alarmed that, during the last two major meetings between our countries, the Americans were not even willing to discuss it. The treaty of 1985 recognizes the principle, but in order for Canada to sign the agreement, they accepted the American position to put the Yukon River Equity Principle aside. This was a high price to pay for all Yukoners.

Our salmon needs, and our rights, are not flexible, back-burner issues. I note that we put forth these main issues: fishery management, salmon stock rebuilding, and the Equity Principle. Have we reached agreement on any? No one knows. After all, it is still a secret.

When this government was in Opposition, they demanded to know the answers. They demanded equal status at these talks. Do we have it? No, we still do not. The Americans presently receive about 90 percent of the catch, and we receive about 10 percent, from the Yukon River. To say that they are only willing to talk about salmon rebuilding, or allocations increase in 1994, is definitely unfair.

Japanese reductions begin in 1988, and from 1988 to 1994, the Americans want it all. Who knows, by 1994, there may not be any salmon left for us to even negotiate for. If this is the American and Canadian idea of free trade, it is definitely presenting some reservations. I have heard a lot of talk regarding bargaining tips, or concessions, for reaching a free trade agreement. I hope the Yukon salmon do not become one of them.

It also seems to me that we, as Canadians, especially as Yukoners, had better get our act together, and fast. It is an acknowledged fact that the Yukon River is split about 50/50 between the two countries.

It is an alleged fact that well over 50 percent of the salmon are spawned in Yukon waters. We must say "alleged", and therefore only circumstantial, because nobody really knows for sure.

Our bargaining position would be much stronger had we, a number of years ago, begun the process of determining how many fish were actually spawning in the territory.

The 1985 Treaty sets out the principle that the country that hatches the fish either catches it or is compensated. As it presently stands, neither Yukon, nor the Canadian government have the necessary leverage from which to enforce or make our point. We, as Yukoners, owe it to our people to go well beyond the present hat in hand approach with both the American and Canadian governments.

Our approach to this motion would even have been stronger were we not sensitive to the present and ongoing negotiations. As a Caucus, we

tried, on several occasions, to obtain, from the department directly, the necessary background and details. Although we were promised them, nothing was forthcoming.

I will hope that the Minister would use the opportunity of this motion to respond in such a way as to illustrate to all Yukoners that this government is right out in front on this issue, and that it has taken charge.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Given the Legislature's preoccupation with fish, you would think it was Friday.

With respect to the closing comments of the Member for Tatchun, I hoped, at the end of the speech, that he would agree that we have been directly involved in these negotiations and, in many instances, have led the negotiations.

At this point, I would like to talk about freshwater fish. I am responding to a charge laid by a Member of the Opposition that we have not responded to the federal Ministers by way of letter. Just to correct the record, we met with one of the three Ministers who has been responsible for this portfolio. Last year was the first time, and since then, we have responded by correspondence to the two succeeding Ministers.

I would like to thank the Member for Tatchun for introducing this important motion. I think it addresses a question that is important to the people of Yukon. It has been very important in the past, and it is critically important today. I would suggest that it is going to be that much more important to us in the future as a question of economic activity, as well as a question of supplying our consumption needs.

It is my hope that, during debate, we can achieve all-party support for such a motion on the Canada-US Yukon River Salmon negotiations. I might add that, should we achieve an all-party consensus on this issue, it would go a long way toward giving our negotiators at the table a stronger hand in being able to deal with the American negotiators.

I would like to take a few minutes to inform the Members of the events and details of the negotiations during the past year. As Members know, the Pacific Salmon Treaty was signed by Canada and the United States during the Shamrock Conference involving Prime Minister Mulroney and President Reagan on March 17, 1985.

Despite the serious concerns on the part of the Yukon, the federal government insisted that the agreement be signed without the issues of equity and accounting of the harvest being resolved. As a consequence, this left the Yukon in the untenable position of having very little leverage in negotiating equitable rights in the salmon harvest with our Alaska neighbours who share some of the Yukon River route.

« Since I assumed the position of Minister of Renewable Resources last spring, I have taken a very considerable personal interest in the issue and have made very strong representation to the federal government as well as to representatives of the Alaska State Legislature.

In order to repair the damage done to the territory's interest in the Yukon River salmon talks, because of the haste of the signing of the Shamrock Treaty, also known as the Pacific Salmon Treaty, I think that we have a difficult position from which to bargain. The prospects for an immediate agreement do not look good.

The negotiations between Canada and the United States began over a year ago, and the United States have been very tough on this issue. Some people on the west coast of Canada feel that the agreement has been equitable, but we in the Yukon do not share those particular views and today find ourselves in the situation of not having a satisfactory agreement and not being given any optimism at the table as to their being any fresh agreement imminent in the future.

The additional meeting held in Anchorage was on April 1985, and that meeting was conducted to review the treaty. That particular meeting achieved agreement on the process of negotiations and also set up the typical support groups concerning the discussions on the treaty. The Canadian delegation, led by Dr. John Davis, consists of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and External Affairs, and advisors, which includes the Department of Renewable Resources, Council for Yukon Indians, with representation from various bands,

and Yukon special interest groups including Yukon commercial fishermen, the Han Fishery outlet from Dawson City, the Yukon Fish and Game Association and other representatives from Yukon associations.

In late October, the Canadian delegation met in Whitehorse prior to travelling to Fairbanks for a second round. At that time, I spoke to the delegation and presented a Ministerial Statement in the Legislature that is dated October 23, 1985, outlining the Yukon government's position with respect to the talks. I had also communicated this to the then federal Fisheries Minister, the Honourable Erik Nielsen.

Up to that point the Yukon delegation had only been in an advisory capacity to the federal team. In Anchorage our people moved to the table as partners in the negotiating team and I would like to credit the Minister of Fisheries for the decision to include us directly on the federal negotiating team.

During that first real negotiating session in Fairbanks, in November, the Canadian delegation argued the following points as fundamental to the talks:

One, to establish a management structure or structures to provide for the integrated Canada-United States arrangement for a share of stocks of Yukon Chinook, Coho and Chum salmon; two, establish a technical-scientific committee to enable the exchange of scientific data to support and assess progress under the fishery management program; three, determine general targets for the maintenance of each salmon stock and allocation of harvest; four, determine an equitable allocation of allowable harvest between the two nations; five, the United States is to account for the percentage of salmon reared in Canadian waters that are harvested by United States fishermen.

The two critical principles of equity and accounting of the harvest were driven home. It was our position that the equity principle is recognized internationally in the Law of the Sea discussions and should therefore apply to the Salmon Treaty.

Briefly stated, these principles mean that the nation that rears the fish should have primary access to the harvest and any other nation that harvests such fish should have to account for its take.

It was also fundamental to the Canadian view that negotiations of these outstanding issues occur entirely within the Pacific Salmon Treaty and its structures, and the outstanding issues be annexed to the agreement.

The conclusion of the first round of talks was that further heated debate on broad principle was probably unproductive and Canada agreed to return with specific proposals. As well, the YTG position at the negotiating table was firmly established, an important move in terms of establishing Yukon's optimal interests in this important fishery. Our government's technical people were directly involved and agreement was reached with the federal representatives in January on detailed specific proposals.

« Before the second round of negotiations were held in Whitehorse in January of this year, the Canadian delegation again met in preparatory sessions. I took the opportunity to address our delegation for the second time, once again reiterating the Yukon's position, giving a political profile of our demands for an equitable share of the harvest.

At these meetings, the US delegation indicated that it would study the Canadian proposal before responding formally. It did indicate their optimism about many elements of the Canadian proposal.

In general, we felt encouraged by these meetings and looked forward to some real movement on the part of the negotiators during talks that were held this month. I believe those negotiations were held again in Alaska.

At this point, let me also inform the House of further international events that directly concern our interest in the Yukon salmon fishery. Recently the US and Japan, Canada was excluded, held discussions to increase levels of research and support for our fishery, and to phase out Japanese fisheries from the western side of the Bering Sea by 1988 and an area further south in 1994.

These areas are important to Yukon River chum and chinook. At the beginning of the month, I corresponded with the Minister of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, noting that although there are potential benefits that could accrue to Canada from this agreement,

we had concerns about Canada's late involvement in these discussions, as well as a need for increased enforcement of the agreement, or any new conditions in order for us to benefit from any increased escapement of Yukon River fish from the reduced salmon fishery in the high seas.

An extraordinary meeting of the INPFC was convened in Vancouver on April 8 and 9, 1986 to seek Canada's agreement to this amendment to the treaty so it would fit under the enforcement of the administrative net of the INPFC. The Government of Yukon was asked to participate in the Canadian delegation to this meeting by the Department of Fisheries and by the Commission itself.

This pending agreement is important to the Yukon as the Yukon River-origin chum salmon occupy much of the area involved in the talks. Canada, after very intensive negotiations, succeeded in there being an agreement for:

One, firm statements concerning enforcement and conservation programs;

Two, Canada was satisfied with the reduced interceptions of Yukon-origin fish and noted that Canada should be the beneficiary of these fish in accordance with the equity principle;

Three, we received assurances that Japan's land-based fishery would not increase and thereby not reduce these gains;

Four, drift nets, which are presently a major concern because of their unrecorded mortality of fish, were recognized publicly by the Japanese for the first time, and they stated their willingness to discuss the nature of the problem and to address remedial measures at the upcoming regular meeting of the INPFC in Anchorage in November, 1986.

In the closing remarks at the Vancouver meeting, the Chairperson of the Canadian National section stated, "With regard to benefits achieved, amendments to the annex will result in significantly reduced interception of Yukon's chinook and chum salmon as a result of the phase out of the Japanese mothership fishery in the central Bering Sea".

These talks are of particular significance to Canada and ongoing Canada-USA negotiations on the Yukon River, and it will be Canada's intent to ensure that the benefits from these reduced interceptions accrue to Canada in accord with the equity principle.

The annex agreement was signed by the Commission in Vancouver, but it does not take effect until the three national governments ratify it.

So in this case, this requires a federal Order-in-Council. My understanding is that, at the present time, this is in progress.

The third round of the Canada-U.S. Pacific Salmon Negotiations were held in Anchorage on April 16 to 18. In those negotiations, it became clear that our previous optimism was unfounded. The American delegation stonewalled the discussions. They continued to argue for a separate agreement outside of the framework of the treaty, and we continue to be far apart on an agreement as to an equitable share of the harvest.

I conclude my remarks today with the following points as to our present situation:

Number one, we had hoped for more progress at this meeting, but the political conditions in Alaska mitigated against this at this time.

Two, the hard line US position is coming from the State of Alaska government.

Three, the common interests of the main and upper Yukon River communities, with Canada, will help advance our common interests, particularly as these groups have opportunities to meet.

Four, strong cohesion among the Canadian delegation remains largely due to the team effort encouraged by both the Department of Fisheries, and our government.

Five, the regrouping of the Canadian delegation in late May to produce a 1986 Fishery Management Plan for the Yukon, and to assess our Canadian strategy, will occur in Whitehorse.

Six, political leverage by the federal and territorial governments and the CYI will be necessary to encourage a more reasonable position by the US in the October session.

As a last point, I would like to seek the support of the House for an amendment to the motion, which would produce an even stronger message that I could then communicate to the federal government and the Alaska Legislatures, to enforce just how

important a just settlement for the Yukon salmon talks is to the Yukon, and the many people here who depend on the harvesting of this resource.

In terms of the motion, although we agree with the intent of the motion, we feel that the motion, from our perspective, is not worded strongly enough to deliver the full impact of the situation to the negotiators at the table. Our negotiators have been swimming upstream on this one, all the way, ever since the Shamrock Summit, and they have had a very difficult time attempting to move the American negotiators off their position.

It is incumbent upon the Legislature, and the Members of the Legislature, to send a very clear, strong message to those who are charged with the responsibility of trying to reach an agreement on this particular resource issue.

With that, I would like to introduce a motion that reads as follows:

Amendment proposed

Hon. Mr. Porter: THAT Motion No. 37 be amended by adding, after the word "talks":

"And that the Minister of External Affairs be encouraged to note, through the most effective diplomatic channels, Canada's displeasure with the uncooperative attitude of the United States' delegation in discussions leading toward fulfilling joint obligations under the Pacific Salmon Treaty of 1985; and, in particular, noting the apparent complete lack of recognition by the United States' delegation in moving toward an equitable sharing of the salmon fishery of the Yukon origin salmon; and,

THAT the support of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Deputy Prime Minister be sought in supporting this intervention by the Department of External Affairs."

I table a copy for the Clerk's Office and, as well, for the Members present.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Renewable Resources:

THAT Motion No. 37 be amended by adding after the word "talks":

THAT the Minister of External Affairs be encouraged to note, through the most effective, diplomatic channels, Canada's displeasure with the uncooperative attitude of the United States' delegation in discussions leading toward fulfilling joint obligations under Pacific Salmon Treaty of 1985; and, in particular, noting the apparent complete lack of recognition by the United States' delegation in moving toward an equitable sharing of the salmon fishery of Yukon origin salmon; and,

THAT the support of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Deputy Prime Minister be sought in supporting this intervention by the Department of External Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am sure all Members have now had an opportunity to read the particular amendment. It is very clear, in terms of the intent.

Mr. Lang: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: On a point of order.

Mr. Lang: Would the Minister entertain a technical question on the motion?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Maybe. Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Lang: What exactly does the Minister mean by "fulfilling joint obligations", so that Members are aware of exactly what it means.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I had assumed that everyone would clearly understand this particular amendment. That is not the case. In terms of the specific question in terms of the joint obligations, a section of the treaty that was negotiated did speak to the fact that there would be an agreement reached with respect to the Yukon fishery, in terms of a quota, in terms of how much of that fishery should be accruing to the Canadian people and, more specifically, in its intent to the Yukon people.

One of the problems of the negotiations is that, although we have, as a negotiating position, been pushing for an inclusion of whatever agreement that we achieve with the Alaskans to the Pacific Salmon Treaty, there has been resistance on the part of the American

negotiators, as represented at the table, in that they view that there is no necessity to make any agreements that we reach a part of the Pacific Salmon Treaty, and that we should simply be negotiating toward some other agreement that is an agreement among user groups.

We feel that those protections are not adequate enough. It is our position that it was envisioned in the beginning that the Yukon salmon fishery would become, overall, a part of the treaty process. We understand, not only the political importance but, more importantly, the legal importance of the enforcement of the treaty. We would suggest that provisions of treaties between two countries has a greater degree of force and political impact than an agreement between neighbouring jurisdictions that concern themselves with a joint use of a particular resource.

It is because of the problems that we have had at the negotiating table that we are asking for a strong position to be put forward to the negotiators at the table.

³² I think, that we should clearly signal to the United States, as represented by the negotiators, that we are serious about this resource and that we feel we have a right to an equitable share of the resource and we are not going to sit back and allow the negotiations to proceed in a direction that will be contrary to the interests of the people of the Yukon. I think that has to be forcefully said and I think it will also signal to our negotiators at the table that this government, this Legislature, and all the Legislators in this House, do support their efforts, and a signal of that nature would be very helpful to coalescing our position at the table and aiding our negotiators to put their positions to the opposite side more forcefully.

I believe the issues are very clear and we have indicated to the House our stand on this issue and look forward to the support of the Members opposite.

Mr. Phelps: We would be pleased to support an amendment such as this. We do have some minor concerns with the wording, however. We would ask the mover of the amendment if he would entertain, firstly, putting a qualifier after, in the fifth line, "fulfilling certain joint obligations"; just add the word "certain". That is for obvious reasons when asking External Affairs to take this fairly severe step.

The second minor point of concern is again with the wording. It has to do with the concept of moving towards an equitable sharing of the salmon fishery of Yukon origin. It seems to me that it might be reworded because my understanding is that there are salmon from Yukon, as opposed to the Yukon River, in the Klukshu area, where the principle would apply under the Pacific Salmon Treaty. Is that not the case?

My question is whether or not those salmon that come to the Yukon but go to the Pacific Ocean from that south-west corner of the Yukon do not already come under the principle of equitable sharing?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: On a point-of-order. I was listening to the Leader of the Opposition in presentation and it seemed to me he was making two points. One, a technical point about the wording of the motion, which I do not think we will have any problem accepting. The second one was a substantive policy point which may be worthy of debate. I do not know what the facts are on that matter and it would be interesting to hear, if we can procedurally, the Minister of Renewable Resources on the question, except perhaps on a surreptitious point of order, which I have just raised.

Let me raise a serious point of order, so we may be able to facilitate this discussion. The serious point of order is that under *Robert's Rules of Order* but perhaps not *Beauchesne*, and that is where I need a ruling, it is permissible for an intervenor in a debate to suggest a friendly amendment to improve the quality or the text of a motion. Under *Roberts*, if a mover and a seconder accepts that friendly amendment, then debate can proceed on the basis of that friendly amendment without a procedural hassle.

Therefore, my question is whether we could get a ruling on one of two ways: either that a friendly amendment such as has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the first

technical point is in order under *Beauchesne*, or if it is not under order in order under *Beauchesne*, perhaps there is an even greater rule or a higher court we could appeal to, and that is the court of the will of the House, which is of course that the rule the House can do anything it wants by unanimous consent, even if that wish is not expressly provided for in any of the rule books which govern our behaviour.

³³ The second point was not just a technical point. It was a substantial policy question as to the meaning or the effect of certain words. Mr. Speaker, before ruling on this point of order, if you would allow the Minister of Renewable Resources to speak on the point of order, he may be able to convey the information that is being sought to allow us to expedite this motion.

Mr. Phelps: The intention was that both proposed amendments be friendly amendments for greater clarity. There is an issue of fact wrapped up in the second amendment. My understanding was that the concern of the parties in these ongoing talks, resulting from the disadvantaged position that we found ourselves in after the Shammrock Treaty was signed, was that it was the Yukon River salmon that were missed and that the Pacific watershed, all rivers flowing into BC rivers and through BC from the Yukon, are a substantial source of salmon to the people of Champagne-Aishihik were covered.

I will await word from the Minister of Renewable Resources. If I am right, then it would merely be a technical amendment to the last part to make it clear that it ought to apply to fish originating in the Yukon River itself.

Hon. Mr. Porter: On the point of order, I would suggest to the Members opposite that, as the mover of the amendment, I have no difficulty accepting that change that has been suggested and view it as a friendly change to the motion.

The Member has raised the issue as to whether or not this motion speaks only to those salmon that originate on the Yukon River system. He points out that there are other rivers in the Yukon that do support salmon and that are Pacific in origin from the point that they enter the Yukon.

As I read the motion, I think that can be accommodated. I am not specifically sure as to whether or not the treaty did encompass all Yukon salmon, and I would like to check that. My immediate recollection is that it spoke to the Yukon River salmon. If I am wrong, and we were able to read this amendment as it exists, it reads as follows: "in moving toward an equitable sharing of the salmon fishery of the Yukon origin salmon".

It does not specifically say river origin salmon. It simply states Yukon origin salmon. I would make a case to the Member opposite that the amendment would encompass his concerns on the question of Yukon salmon as well.

Speaker: Order, please.

³⁴ I would like to take this matter under advisement. I would suggest that a Member move to adjourn debate.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that debate be now adjourned.
Motion No. 37 — debate adjourned

Clerk: Item number 9, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 9?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 7, standing in the name of Mr. Lang.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 7?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 11, standing in the name of Mrs. Firth.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 11?

Mrs. Firth: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 12, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 12?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 5, standing in the name of Mr. Phelps.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 5?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 6, standing in the name of Mr. Phelps.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 6?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 8, adjourned debate, hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Speaker: Is the Minister of Justice prepared to proceed with Item number 8?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 10, standing in the name of Mr. Nordling.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 10?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number 14, standing in the name of Mr. Lang.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 14?

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Speaker: Motions Respecting Committee Reports?

MOTIONS RESPECTING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Clerk: Item number 1, standing in the name of Mr. Coles.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item number 1?

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

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 resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. The time now being 5:30, we will recess until 7:30 p.m.

Recess

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

Bill No. 5 — Second Appropriation Act, 1986-87 — continued

Chairman: We will continue with Executive Council Office, general debate on the Public Affairs Bureau.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I was asked when we came to adjournment last night about the reasons for the increase in the Other category in Public Affairs. I am advised that there are areas in which the Public Affairs Bureau budget was increased over the past year that give the impression of sizeable percentage increase.

The first was the Bureau's zenith line service. Increased publicity on the use of this service plus a very large increase in public usage at the time of Yukon's mine closure saw our billings increase by 100 percent in less than a year.

This budget jumped from a projected \$36,000 a year to an estimated \$96,000 a year. We have reduced our costs in this area by utilizing a new service provided by Northwestel and are tightening up on the use of the service by government employees.

The second increase occurred last year when the previous administration approved a \$50,000 increase to permit the bureau the flexibility to hire freelance writers, photographers and graphic arts services. If you take the two totals, \$60,000 for the phones and \$50,000 for the freelancers, plus six percent for inflation in one year and four percent in the second year, you will find that it equals \$260,000. That explains the growth in recent years in that other category.

Mr. Lang: In looking at the estimates for 1985-86, Yukon Info was \$12,000. Exactly what is projected for 1986-87?

I apologize profusely. I am on the wrong budget. It is the first mistake I have made all session. I was in the right area but the wrong year, so I was half-way there.

⁰² I do not understand this. If Yukon Info for 1986-87 is estimated at \$12,000, does that include mailing, as well?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This is the third mistake. That is not thousands of dollars, that is numbers of editions.

Mr. Lang: I guess maybe he is right, for the first time this session. Exactly how much does Yukon Info cost?

Why do we not just break down the \$260,000. I am assuming that that is where the money comes out of. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: There is \$2,000 for travel outside the territory. That is for a specific item for the Public Affairs Bureau for attendance at the National Council of Government Communicators in Toronto; contract services, \$35,000, for professionals, free-lance writers, artists, special project coordinators, graphic artists, and so forth; postage and freight, \$200; advertising, \$27,400, and that is based on \$18,000 for newspapers, \$5,000 for radio and TV, and \$4,400 for exhibits and audio visuals; program materials, \$100; communications, long distance charges, telephone, et cetera, \$900; for a total under Other under Public Affairs of \$66,690.

Under Information Services, we have a total of \$62,200, which is made up of \$1,200 for communications and long distance; \$61,000 in program materials, \$21,000 of which is assigned to the annual report, \$10,000 for the *Sluice Box*, \$30,000 for *Yukon Info*; photography travel inside Yukon, \$7,000; contract services, \$15,000, to obtain services of professional photographers for short term assignments; repairs and maintenance, \$1,000; rental expense, \$3,000, for four wheel drive vehicles or charters if necessary; program materials, including purchase of film, chemicals, photographs, reference books and so forth, for a total of \$25,000; communications under that line is \$600.

⁰³ We have the enquiry centre that is costing us \$74,600. Program materials for that operation is \$3,500, which includes Yukon fact sheets, reference books, et cetera. There is \$1,000 for employee travel outside. That is to attend one conference.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate the breakdown from the Minister. The other evening we were talking about the overall policy direction. We talked about the Public Affairs Branch. We only touched on it for a few minutes, but I would like to quote the Minister to remind him of what was said. "We used to have two." — he is referring to two local advertising agencies — "We only have one now, which does a lot of business for this government. I do not think we can put all this work in one agency." What exactly did he mean by that statement?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: There are two things. I think the remarks I made arose from the need of media changes, from an emphasis on print to the need to have the government communicate more successfully in radio, television and other means. We obviously have to develop the capacity to do a lot of the preparatory work for doing that in this government. A lot of the orientation of the people we now have working for us is obviously primarily print. That is what we have been doing for most of our history.

The point I made about only having one advertising agency is that it does limit us in the sense that a few years ago there were two so you could get competing proposals, or you might be able to get competing bids for things. We have one agency that does an awful lot of work for us, especially Tourism. I think they did a periodic review lately, there being only one agency, and that was chosen as the agency of record again, so there is no question about their status there.

☞ We are, as are all governments and all large organizations in this country, going to have to improve in the next few years our capacity to get the government's messages out in those other mediums, besides just the newspapers.

Mr. Lang: I really do believe that the agency that we are talking about does do a good job. I will tell you the historical background of it. The decision was made by the government quite a number of years ago to have that work done locally as opposed to going out to Vancouver, which was done previously. It has worked out very well, and I think it has given us a base of expertise that we would never have had without government providing the work to be done locally. I think it has been successful.

What area in this budget does the Minister see going towards the media that he refers to, radio primarily, since TV is not really available in most of the communities — at least cable TV?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As you know, we do not have a large amount out of this budget allocated for that. We have \$27,000 for advertising. What I perceive happening, over time, where as the preponderance of that money has been, and even in this budget is, allocated towards newspaper advertising, is that we are, in future years, going to have to spend a larger proportion in electronic media.

Let me give the Member one example of what I mean. We now have a situation where not only CBC radio is reaching rural Yukon, but we have, through the means we know about, CHON-FM and CKRW reaching rural Yukon. At the same time, I am discovering, as I go to meetings in rural Yukon, that many people there do not get the newspapers, or get them late. There are certain programs, or opportunities, that may be available that the government wants to announce. We may, for example, in the coming years, decide to go to radio ads rather than newspapers ads. I am only hypothesizing here, but that could happen.

The most frequent complaint that I have heard, from rural Yukoners, is about people not finding out soon enough about, say, a job posting that is advertised in the newspaper, because the newspaper does not come there, or not enough newspapers are available, or the circulation is not that great. I do not see us putting job ads on the radio, but it is that kind of communication problem with the whole of Yukon that I think we have to think about. This is the agency that clearly has to play a special role in dealing with that problem.

☞ **Mrs. Firth:** I would like to follow up on that because I am getting the impression the Government Leader is talking about having a department within public affairs that is going to do its own radio productions. Am I overstating the issue?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, I do not see that happening. I have enough experience in this business to know that, if I can use a print analogy, if you go to a newspaper with photo-ready copy it makes their job an awful lot easier. If you go to someone like AV Action or Jan Harvey and Associates with the electronic equivalent, some raw tape of a message you want to get across, or some script material of the kind of message you want to get across, it makes it easier for them to do their job than if one goes totally unprepared. The preparatory work I am talking about is going to have to be done in the government. People are going to have to learn how to interface better with the electronic media. The government's

corporate experience, I think heretofore, has been, in the main, with the print media.

Mrs. Firth: I have a concern about that because I personally feel that the private sector in the Yukon can provide that service to the government, and I know how the Government Leader feels about the terminology, "propaganda". If the government were to go into its own production work or preparatory work, then it is telling the advertising agency it is going to be dealing with, "this is the message we want to get out". It is not going to the agency and telling them that this is what we want to inform the people about, and can you give us the best way to do it. It is a fine line, but it is a great concern of mine as to how the information is prepared and disseminated to the public.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I know what the Member is saying, but we are not getting into radio and television production inside the government, nor are we getting into audio-visual production in order to compete with those businesses. I understand very well the message the Member for Porter Creek East was talking about earlier, and I was one of the people who petitioned for the former Government Leader very hard to have Myron Balagno & Associates replaced by Jan Harvey and Associates, or by a local company, without specifying one, at the time that was done.

What I am talking about is something I think is a little different from what the Member is saying. Let me use an analogy: if I am going to build a house or the government wants to work, relate to, and communicate with architects on major building projects, it is helpful to have an architect to communicate with the architects. If I have a legal matter, rather than arguing it with a lawyer I would normally retain a lawyer in order to make sure that my case is being put.

Our experience in government is that we have communicated in the main in print. We do need, over time, to develop the ability in this government to know how to prepare ourselves to communicate in the other mediums as well. That is all. I am not making a terribly profound point. I am talking about a slight shift that will have to take place over time, as the world changes around us.

☞ **Mrs. Firth:** The world is changing. That is my concern. I appreciate what the Government Leader is saying, and I want to raise the same point I raised the other night about having guidelines to take care of the concern that we are bringing forward about the propagandization of information that leaves the government.

I know the Government Leader shares the same concerns as he has espoused in the past. My concern would be that that is set in place before they proceed with any of the preparatory work being done so that people know within which limits they are preparing this work.

The Government Leader also made a comment about having material print ready. I know the Queen's Printer would do that. Do they set things to be print ready?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I was not making the argument about the government doing that. I was trying to make an analogy. We do not have a typesetting department in this government and we do not intend to have one. All Members occasionally have columns or articles in the *Yukon News*. The difference in my mind is that between taking in a hand written article to the *Yukon News*, which they would have trouble reading, interpreting and doing the punctuation on, and something that is nicely typed and proofread. Then, it simply a matter of typing it up.

We do develop material for preparing ourselves to communicate in this other medium. We have very little experience. The other night, the Member was talking about the vignettes. I think that is about all we have done. We do not have an awful lot in comparison to the Northwest Territories. We do not have much advertising on CBC North. There is more media now that is electronic than there is print, even in this community.

Mrs. Firth: I think I recognize the analogy that the Government Leader was trying to make. I think he used a poor one, however, because the comment is a political one, and I do not think I would be too happy if I hear that the taxpayer was paying for the NDP comment in the *Yukon News* every week. I am sure that was not the Government Leader's intention.

I have a concern that the Queen's Printer not get into typesetting

and getting things print ready because that is a service that the private sector does provide to us. There are two or three companies that can provide typesetting. I know that because I have newsletters done myself for my constituents. The capacity is out there for that service to be provided to the government.

We on this side would caution the government against going into their own typesetting and requiring more sophisticated equipment in the Queen's Printer to go into direct competition with the businesses that are struggling out there right now.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I hear the Member loud and clear. If she wants to talk about the Queen's Printer, she should wait until we get to Government Services, because I do not have any direct responsibility for the Queen's Printer.

Understand that when we are talking about advertising here, we are talking about a total expenditure of \$27,000. The point I made is that right now we have been allocating \$18,000 for the newspapers and \$5,000 for radio and television. My expectation is that, over time — months and years — that ratio would change.

Mrs. Firth: Just one final comment. We may only be talking about \$27,000 in the Government Leader's mind, but this is a fairly hefty budget. I recognize the ability of the department to move money around and spend it. I would not see that it would be unlikely that the government could be coming back and asking for a lot more money. I just want the government to be aware of the concerns that we have regarding information that is given to the public, and the competition it has created directly with the private sector.

Mr. Lang: Just to follow up on that a little further, is the government in the process of putting guidelines in place for the radio media, that the Minister referred to? If he has, could we get copies of them, once it is completed?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. The Member for Riverdale South was asking me a question the other day about guidelines to prevent the abuse of government information programs for propaganda purposes. It is something I raised in the Public Accounts Committee, and it was the subject of some discussion in that Committee. At the time, the then Communications Advisor for the government indicated that they might be looking at it. Nothing was done, and that person did not stay with us.

I said to the Member the other night, when she raised the question, that I had not thought about it much since we had the discussion in committee. Now that she reminded me, I was inclined to want to think about it again, and perhaps do something about it. I think it would be months before I can turn my mind to that problem. It is not an urgent problem. I do not see that there is a problem now. I think there is a need to put some guidelines in place. If we can get a sensible kind of rule, then it will become the standard, not only for this government, but for all governments to come.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate that. It has come to my attention that there is a communication consultant presently in town here, working with the government. Is he working with the Cabinet, or the government in totality? What areas is he looking at?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We are working on a couple of projects, one of which may have to do with squatters, but none of it is under this department.

Mr. Lang: To get further information on that, one would have to address the Minister of Community and Transportation Services? That is the problem, it is an area that, when I was in the government, and the Minister in the next year or so will realize that there is money throughout the various budgets for the purposes of communication. Towards the last couple of years, it is an area that has become a concern. There did not seem to be any coordination of those dollars, if one takes a look through the budget.

Chairman: Any further general debate?

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$147,000 agreed to

On Information Services

Information Services in the amount of \$184,000 agreed to

On Photography

Mr. McLachlan: Was there ever any attempt made to recover money for specific requests made to the photography department for

people who have pictures taken under various situations? Or is it just decided that the paperwork is too great to ever get involved in invoicing and billing for recovery?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Only Archives charges. There is a complicated reason for that, so I will take a minute to explain it. Occasionally, we will have somebody come along and ask us if they can buy some reprints of some photographs taken by the government photographers. The former government adopted a rule of not providing those prints for a fee, because private, freelance photographers were also taking pictures of Yukon mountains and rivers and wildlife, and they would feel that the government was unfairly competing with them, as freelancers. So far, I see no reason to change that rule.

Mr. McLachlan: Of the four particular line items in this department, this is the only one that shows a decrease from the previous year, and that is commendable. At a time when the Minister of Tourism has a lot to show for Expo 86 in Vancouver, are you planning to use the photography department for showing off our building in Vancouver. Would you use Vancouver services for photography in Vancouver, or would you assign our own people there? Furthermore, when the government photographer travels with government people to do photography, for example, the signing ceremony in Skagway, are those travel costs specifically within this item, or is travel related to the government photographer assigned to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. If a person from this department travels, it comes out of this departmental budget. As a matter of fact there is a government photographer, I am told, at Expo now taking pictures, and he will be there for awhile. Yes, there will be a lot of photography work associated with Expo, and it will involve our people.

Photography in the amount of \$132,000 agreed to

On Inquiry Centre

Inquiry Centre in the amount of \$139,000 agreed to

Public Affairs Bureau in the total amount of \$602,000 agreed to

On Public Inquiries

Chairman: Any general debate?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This is a \$1 vote that is required to provide for administration of inquiries under the *Public Inquiries Act*.

Mr. Lang: Is that what he just read out of the budget?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As the Member opposite will know, I have a fine appreciation of poetic language and succinct expression of ideas, and this seemed to summarize it so well, in so few words, I did not think I could improve upon it, so I just read it from the book.

Public Inquiries in the amount of \$1 agreed to

On Plebiscites

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is in the book.

Mr. Lang: Does the government intend to hold a plebiscite in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Not until now, but the Member has given me a couple of ideas.

Plebiscites in the amount of \$1 agreed to

On Bureau of Statistics

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe this branch is reasonably well known to people, but let me just say it does, in its own quiet way, very useful work for the government. I believe we have developed quite a good capacity in this area in the last few years. I remember the days when what we did in this field consisted of Ragu Raganathan basically analyzing the statistics from other jurisdictions to see how they would correlate or break down or extrapolate here, and then he would give the information to the then Commissioner, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Lang: We have a small, sophisticated, capable unit who provide a service to many branches and many agencies in this government. I know that the Minister responsible for Economic Development has made considerable demands on this agency and will be making more.

Mr. Phelps: As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I would like to introduce Don Young and Alan Beaton from the Auditor General's Office who are here to watch us perform our tasks. Greetings.

I wonder if we could have an explanation of Other under Allotments, and why it has been going steadily down, or has gone down from the year 1984-85 to the present estimate while everything else has been going up. What is the rationale for that? I know that the person-years have gone from 3.5 in 1984-85 to 8.5.

Chairman: That has been corrected to 5.5.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I was so distracted by the presence of the Auditor General's staff in the gallery that I was not sure that I completely understood the question. I wonder if the Member could repeat it.

Mr. Phelps: I am just curious as to why Other was dropping down in this program. It has gone from \$145,000 to \$118,000 and now \$128,000. I am wondering what expenses we have under that item.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Let me first introduce Ryan Grant who has come with his father to observe proceedings tonight. He is sitting in the gallery. He may not know what we are doing, but I hope that he understands that it is important that we are keeping his dad here tonight.

The \$145,000 goes back to a point where this unit was just really being established. I understand that the situation was that they had a lot of contract people during that period until such time as we evolved to the point where we were creating permanent positions that became salaried employees of the government, rather than people who were hired on a contract basis to help set up the unit.

Mr. McLachlan: What is the expertise of the Bureau of Statistics in gathering data? I am wondering if they get involved at all, in any sort of secondary assistance or secondment, for the federal census in the first week of June?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Statistics Bureau has, in the case of this census, provided a lot of methodological assistance and advice to the federal people in conducting the census this year in the territory.

Mrs. Firth: I see that this Bureau of Statistics program is turning into a nicely rounded program with three activities under it now. Instead of one from the previous year, which was just statistics, we now have administration, information services and data development. Can the Government Leader give us some idea of what the long term plans are for this department? How big is it going to grow and how fast?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I cannot indicate anything about how big it is going to go and how fast. I think it is now up to a good operating size and can provide most of the needs that we have off it at its present size. When we pointed out the error in the figure between the 5.5 and the 8.5, there are three NOGAP positions, which will not be with us for very much longer.

The department is developing a sophistication in a number of areas. We have only just started to have unemployment data begun again. The Members have seen the quarterly statistical report. I think it is excellent information that is in good quality and good format. I think we will continue to have some steady, reliable statistical information that will be public.

This department can, and it does all the time, provide statistical information to line departments, such as Health and Human Resources and others that may need it, about the demographics of the Yukon territory and other trends that are important for us to be aware of in making policy decisions.

Mrs. Firth: Does the Government Leader have more confidence in statistics than he used to? He used to question their accuracy and relevance quite often in light of how numbers could be made to look any way you wanted them to, and you could present them any way. Can the Government Leader reassure me that he has more confidence now in the data?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: If the Member is asking if I have absolute confidence, Mr. Grant will not mind me saying that there was a time when the unemployment numbers that were put out by this government were garbage, statistically. That is no longer the case.

Mrs. Firth: I am sure that is simply due to the quality of the staff and the sophistication of the computers that we have for collecting the data now.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It certainly has not got anything to do with improving the sophistication of the Government Leader.

Mr. Lang: I would be the last to argue that.

Has the Minister got any plans about legislation for this department?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I thought someone might ask me that. For the Members who were not here at the time, there was a bill brought before this Legislature a few years ago called the *Statistics Act* that proposed to make it compulsory for small businesses and other people to answer questions of the Statistics Bureau. On civil libertarian grounds, this Member opposed that bill at the time, and it was withdrawn. Mr. Grant and others may propose a bill sometime in the near future. No one has had enough courage to do so yet.

Mr. Phelps: The person-years have gone from 3.5 to 5.5. Allotments in Personnel have gone from \$83,000 to \$255,000, an increase in two person-years and an increase in that time frame of \$170,000. Is there any explanation for that?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The primary reason for the increase in that area is the result of hiring a director and a senior statistician in the department. That is the major result for the trend line on the Personnel side.

Mrs. Firth: If there are only two personnel being hired, why is there such a tremendous increase in the allotments for Personnel. That does represent a significant increase. It would represent their salary dollars, would it not?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe at the time when they had 3.5 person-years budgeted that, because those positions were not filled by public servants, but by contract, the money did not show on the Personnel side. It showed in the Other.

Mrs. Firth: Just to give us a better idea of what we are talking about, what would the average salary for the two new person-years be?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Apparently both these positions are approximately \$50,000 a year positions.

Mrs. Firth: That is quite an interesting figure. Could the Government Leader tell me the title of those positions again?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: A director and senior statistician.

Mrs. Firth: I wanted to go back, just for a minute, to a question about the legislation, and so on, the same direction, but not the same question. What kind of services would this Bureau of Statistics be able to provide to businesses within the community, in Whitehorse and in the outlying areas? Are they going to be able to give them information that is going to be helpful to their business, perhaps their marketing strategies and their planning for growth or expansion of their business?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: A lot of the information that comes out of this body is made public in the statistical reports to quarters seeking that information. I am advised that the branch also responds to inquiries about market research information, which we get from Stats Canada, about this market and about this economy, that they can provide. Some of that is public, but a question of interpreting income information, demographic information, population stats, that kind of thing.

Mrs. Firth: That information would be readily available to the business community. Should they come and make inquiries?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I found the branch to be very amenable to inquiries. Part of the information they provide is information from Statistics Canada, but information that is not published by Statistics Canada. In other words, we have access to it. We can make it available to people who have need of it.

Mrs. Firth: Does the Government Leader have any plans to make that kind of information available regularly to organizations like the Chamber of Commerce, or the Association of Yukon Communities — particular demographic information — and so on?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This part of the branch is mandated to serve the private sector. As a matter of fact, I am told that we do provide an awful lot of information to groups like the Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Firth: I feel very strongly about this area, because I think it is an area where the government can provide a very useful service to the businesses in the Yukon that would not have the resources to find out the information themselves. It is one place where government can serve a dual purpose. They get their own statistics

and information to justify their budgets, and whatever, but they can also provide a useful service to the business community.

Could I have a list of the information that goes out, say, at regular intervals, if there are regular requests made, and to who that information goes to, please?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I think we could give a pretty representative example. If the Member would be happy to have me communicate that in writing, rather than waiting now, I will undertake to do that.

Mrs. Firth: Yes, I would agree with that.

Mr. Lang: Talking about statistics, I am sure that there are probably a few people who could inform us of how many goals Edmonton had or had not scored tonight, if they happen to be listening.

Could the Government Leader break down the \$128,000 in Other?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Travel outside the Yukon: federal-provincial council meetings, project administrative meetings, Stats Canada, et cetera, \$8,375; Travel in Yukon for non-government employees, which may be people we may take on, as we talked about before, \$500; Contract Services, professional computer assistants, \$1,000; Entertainment, meetings, workshops, meetings with Stats Canada, \$350; Supplies, computer supplies, stationery and office supplies, \$1,500; Postage and freight, \$230; Program materials, technical books, subscriptions to journals, \$1,000; Communications, telephones, service charges, long distance charges, telex, Dex, \$3,260; Other professional memberships, Program Evaluation Association, Statistical Association, conference registration, et cetera, \$600; Travel in the Yukon, travel to communities for in-services, \$730; Bureau of Statistics attendance, \$895; Contract services, professional computer acquired information from Statistics Canada, \$1,000.

This is under Information Services: Supplies, \$200; Postage and freight, \$200; \$1,500 for telephone; Program materials, \$4,700. Under data dissemination, we have for travel, contract services, photo typesetting, Yukon Statistical Review, covers, et cetera, \$26,000; Supplies, \$500; Postage and freight, \$200; Program materials, data book development and production, \$8,000.

Under Library line, we have: Travel outside the Yukon, professional workshops, \$1,300; Supplies, stationery and office supplies, \$1,500; Communications, \$1,200; Program materials, \$9,000.

Data development: Travel in the Yukon for community surveys, \$2,680; Travel outside the Yukon, \$5,200; Contract services, data processing, consumer association coordination fee, \$2,000; Supplies, \$1,500; Postage and freight, \$300; Communications, \$1,400; Program materials, \$33,000. These include Yukon Special Price Survey, Community Special Survey, Yukon Labour Force Survey, Yukon Economic Accounts Contribution, Update Yukon Business data base.

¹³ We have travel for \$3,400 for contract services and \$500 for data processing. Computer supplies and survey materials is \$1,500. Postage and freight is \$300. Telephone, communications is \$1,308. Program materials, professional tax publications is \$500. This gives a total of \$7,580.

Mr. Lang: Are we still being denied some information from Canada because of the lack of a statistics act?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes.

Mr. Lang: When the Bureau was attached with the Department of Economic Development, there was a library that was there for everyone in Economic Development and for the public if they knew what they were looking for. Where is that person-year for the librarian? Is it in Economic Development or is it here? Is it a permanent person-year or is it a contract position?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The librarian is a .5 person-year. The library is now computerized.

Mr. Lang: When you say it is computerized, just exactly what do you mean? Do we have to get a cassette and see if someone else can read it for us? What has happened to the various reports and the vast information?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When it is computerized, it is listed and catalogued in an accessible and organized way in the computer.

There are still hard copies, of course, and we can provide that information to anybody who wants it.

Mr. Lang: We talked about an economic model. Does that come out of here or is it in Economic Development?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The economic model is in the computer. It is basically for people who have most use for it in Economic Development. The econometrician who is going to be operating that model is in the Economic Development vote. It is a new person-year under Economic Development. We will see it then.

Mr. Lang: Will we no longer be going through the University of Alaska for the individual involved who developed the model? If we are, is the money that will be required as a stipend for him coming out of this department?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Dr. David Reume did come over in the past year, brought over by Finance, to check the way the program that he developed was running. Sometimes things have to be approved, adjusted and tinkered with to refine them over time.

Mr. Lang: If he were to come over this year, would it come out of this branch of the department?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not know how many programs he developed that we are using. It is possible that he could be used here, but I think it is more likely that he would be brought in by Economic Development or by Finance. At this point, however, I do not see why he would be brought in. The program that he was looking at had not been used very much, and we wanted to use it, so he needed to look at the runs we were doing.

¹⁴ On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$115,000 agreed to

On Information Services

Information Services in the amount of \$117,000 agreed to

On Data Development

Mrs. Firth: Before we clear the whole amount, I wanted to ask a question about the other transfer payments. Would that be appropriate to do now?

Chairman: On page 37?

Mrs. Firth: Yes.

Chairman: No. We will do that separately.

Mrs. Firth: All right. I will ask the question when we come to that item.

Data Development in the amount of \$151,000 agreed to

Bureau of Statistics in the amount of \$383,000 agreed to

On Revenue and Recoveries

Chairman: Page 37. Any comments on the information that appears on this page?

Mrs. Firth: Unless the Government Leader wants to lead off with some comments about the items.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We are talking about the Revenue and Recoveries?

Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The \$8,000 is money that Statistics Canada gives back for our attendance at meetings where we are in consultation with them. The \$15,000 is money we get back from the federal government for a service we render them through the operation of our inquiry centre, which also accesses federal phone numbers and federal departments.

Mr. Lang: Grants, Contributions and Other Transfer Payments. I took it the Chairman was clearing the page. Is that correct?

Chairman: Yes, I was. We are on page 37.

Mr. Lang: The Chairman is never wrong, so I was remiss. Would the Government Leader make some comments about the Asia Pacific Foundation Grant, and whether or not we have gotten any information from that particular body since he took office.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It will be four times in one night, Mr. Chairman. It is really amazing.

The Asia Pacific Foundation Grant was something that was originally approved by the previous government. I gather it is the view of the Asia Pacific Foundation that we made a commitment for a number of years, not just one year.

I have met with Mr. Rolf Hougen, who is this government's appointed representative to the board, once or twice in the past year to discuss it with him. In sending the cheque for \$25,000 to Mr.

Brook, I indicated to him that as the Asia Pacific Foundation is up and running, it is a contribution, in our view, and we will expect some demonstration of the benefit to the Yukon Territory from the \$25,000 in his reporting.

Mr. Hougen has advised me that in 1987, the Board of Directors will be holding a meeting here in Whitehorse, and that will provide an opportunity, not only for the government, but also for the citizens of the territory to have access to the people who are doing this. I have been provided with some publications from the Foundation, showing their work. They are quite glossy publications. I do not know if I could get more copies. If Members are interested, I would be pleased to make xerox copies of that information available to all Members in the Legislature.

Mr. Lang: I would appreciate that. I think that the Minister is going in the right direction, to ensure that we do take advantage of the various services that are provided by this organization. Although it is relatively new, as he knows, it is under federal legislation. This particular organization does have its mandate and its authority.

I hope, maybe in the fall, to have a further debate on this, just to see what benefits we are getting. The idea was to foster a better relationship with the Japanese and the Koreans, if possible, because of their proximity, which the Government Leader has taken an interest in, in his capacity as the Minister of Economic Development.

It was the thought of the previous administration, and I still hold that view unless I am told differently, that this particular organization is another vehicle that can be utilized for various purposes on the diplomatic front.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Let me simply say I hope it is a benefit. My one concern about having made this contribution is that there are literally dozens of other such organizations, some of them national and local, that believe they may be equally as entitled to contributions from us. I do want to establish the precedent and the expectation fairly thoroughly with this group that we do expect some indication of a return for our contribution.

Mrs. Firth: In the manner the Government Leader has given the answer I would be looking for confirmation and gather that Mr. Rolf Hougen is going to continue on as the government representative for the Asia Pacific Foundation.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We certainly have not had a better idea. *Executive Council Office in the amount of \$4,080,000 agreed to*

Chairman: Before moving on to the Department of Community and Transportation Services we will recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

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

Department of Community and Transportation Services

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The budget for Community and Transportation Services totals \$41.6 million, which represents a two percent increase over the 1985-86 Main Budget Estimates.

While the budget increase is small, it does contain new program initiatives to reflect the government's priorities. The following five major strategic priorities were established and guided the direction of the department in the budget preparation process.

The priorities are: devolution, policy development planning, improved information systems, training and human resources planning.

Devolution planning has been advancing rapidly through the latter part of 1985-86. Department officials focussed on the transfer of responsibilities for airports, lands management and highways. We hope we can finalize a transfer of Arctic B and C airports for the Yukon in 1986-87. Discussions regarding the transfer of A airports at Whitehorse and Watson Lake will commence later.

Discussions are also progressing on the transfer of highways included under the Engineering Services Agreement with DIAND. On the matter of lands, I spoke at some length already, and I would be prepared to speak further on this matter in the future.

Policy development, as Members have noted already, is a high

priority. The broad mandate of the department, combined with an historical absence of significant policy development activity, has led to the need for a major thrust in this area. We are planning to tackle a great number of legislative and policy initiatives this year.

Two major policies being embarked upon in 1986, over and above policies referred to in the Throne Speech, will be a comprehensive transportation policy and a Yukon-wide communications policy.

Significant funding is provided in the policy development area to overcome past policy shortfalls. This funding was established by internal cost-cutting, and by the reallocation of existing resources.

I would also like to inform you, Mr. Chairman, that the operation of the Yukon Housing Corporation will be scrutinized, and its mandate will be evaluated this fiscal year. In this regard, we have commenced planning for a major social housing policy by commissioning a housing needs study. We will also take steps, during this session, to provide increased user involvement in the planning and decision making process of the Corporation.

¹⁷ We plan to increase the role of the local housing authorities to make them more active partners in the delivery of quality housing programs.

Planning will proceed in a systematic manner with emphasis on the economy, efficiency and effectiveness. We will place priority on the department's planning capability at corporate strategic and operational levels. A full review of the department and each branch's objectives was carried out. You will notice that the final result of this review is in the budget before you.

In the planning area, I expect the department to complete in the coming year the following: the departmental role definition and mandate objectives review; the development of departmental planning systems; the development of capital project approval decision system; the development of a multi-year departmental resource planning system — this is combining O&M and capital planning; and the development of a project management methodology.

Implementation of strategic and operational planning will ensure that we make optimum use of our limited resources, while maximizing the department's contribution to the government's overall objectives.

In support of this planning thrust, we will develop a comprehensive data base for transportation statistics that will be compatible with national transportation statistics.

I mentioned, as well, the introduction of one of the department's priorities, the improved information systems. In this field, the department will improve, hopefully dramatically, its information systems by the introduction of microcomputers and automated systems in all branches. This will increase work volume capacity, which is another way of saying, "It will work better", as well as efficiency.

Included are training of supervisory and management support personnel, which has already commenced. Departmental personnel must be well versed in the capabilities of the system and the equipment to maximize the benefit of the technology.

I see great possibilities in the area of human resource planning and training. We plan not only to increase the capability of our staff and assist existing employees to gain skills for advancement, but we also plan to further the goal of local hire and the career development of people in the civil service.

¹⁸ A few budgetary items which may be of interest to the Members include a relatively major increase in the Management, Policy and Planning and Administration Branch. This increase reflects the cost of much increased policy and planning capability. This increased capability is expected to be of a temporary measure and will be dissolved once major policies have been developed, mainly in the areas of transportation and communications.

Special provisions were made in the Transport Services Section of the Highways Branch to redraft the *Highways Act*, the *Motor Vehicles Act* and the *Motor Transport Act*.

To assist tourism development in the northern area, we will increase our road maintenance effort on the Top of the World Highway. We also plan to apply calcium chloride to 50 kilometres of this road.

It is also noteworthy to note that 50 kilometres of subdivision roads will receive applications of calcium chloride.

We have separated the program Lands and Housing into two programs, mainly Lands and Assessments and Yukon Housing Corporation in order to provide better information to the House. Lands and Assessment Branch shows a three percent increase over last year's forecast. A detailed review of Lands Branch organization and operations will be carried out during this fiscal year to determine current needs for change and to prepare for the transfer of federal lands.

Yukon Housing Corporation, the Community Services Branch and the Municipal Engineering Branch show minimal additions reflecting mainly cost of living increases.

At the close of my opening remarks I would like to thank the officials of the department who spent many long hours preparing this budget and who Members will recognize, through internal economies and redistribution of funds, have provided for the new directions they plan to take with minimal change in the department's budget and the department's delivery programs.

Mr. Lang: Since some of the information committed to us was during the discussion on the supplementaries, can the Minister supply us with the information outstanding on the questions that were asked of him then? The understanding was that information would be provided to us prior to beginning the Main Estimates. Does he have it with him?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There were a whole series of areas for which I did provide information. There is one area that was a costing of the Skagway Road O&M and a few other matters with respect to the Skagway Road. I do not have a copy, but I do have them in front of me. If the Member wishes to discuss them now, we could discuss them now, and I will verbally state the information, or we can wait until tomorrow and we will have the information copied and distributed.

Mr. Lang: I will go quickly through my notes, so that the Minister is aware that we are doing our homework and what we are expecting for information.

The commitment was made, vis-a-vis, a letter to be tabled for reassurance of the American-Canadian customs and the availability thereto. One letter was tabled, but that was for a year previous. I think there was another letter that was outstanding.

You were going to table the methodology for the construction of the Yukon Skagway Road. You were going to give us a cost, in conjunction with customs, on the 24 hours, and who was going to pay for it. You were going to double check...

Chairman: Order, please. The Minister was.

Mr. Lang: The Minister was, Mr. Chairman. I would never want to infer anything on the Chairman.

The Minister was going to double-check the figures on the municipal financing to ensure that they were accurate. He was also going to check on when the construction on the Skagway Road was going to start. The Minister was going to check the maintenance costs on the American side, and provide estimates of the October plan, vis-a-vis the plan now, which is what they have agreed on.

The Minister was going to provide for us the comparison of the highway maintenance — Haines Junction versus Whitehorse — in view of the debate that took place with the MLA for Kluane, and the Minister, on snow removal and the million dollars of federal money he so graciously gave back.

Along with that, also on the Carcross-Skagway Road, there was going to be the cost of the maintenance on the Alaska side, and the department's analysis of existing roadbed on the Alaska side, the quality and thickness of the hard surface, to give us an idea of what our capital costs were going to be.

He was also going to give us a date of the tender for the contract for the upgrading of the road, monies to be spent on the reconstruction of the road next year, and, I assume, a three year forecast. The Minister was also going to check to see whether or not Linden Transport had a contract in effect with the Teamsters. He was going to provide information on whether or not the Alaska Teamsters had cause of action with regard to union versus non-union in the trucking business.

Further to that, the Minister was going to provide the amounts of

specific money spent on the Bear Creek subdivision project. He was also going to provide the cost of the Water Board recommendations. Since you do take a special interest in this area, he did debate at some length about that. I would like to get a ballpark figure about what we are dealing with. I will be pursuing that in this committee.

I could go on if the Minister wants me to continue. It was quite an undertaking he took a couple of weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There were a number of items that the Member mentioned that he suggested that I give him commitment to provide the information. He mentioned the costing of the Water Board recommendations and our plans for the Bear Creek subdivision.

We are talking about establishing a budget that will allow for work to be undertaken during the course of this coming year. I gave indication that that is the kind of work that we will be undertaking. I cannot foretell the work, unless we sit in this Legislature all summer and next fall when the work that the budget is for now takes place.

The department is under a lot of pressure to get a lot of things done. We do recognize our responsibility in situations like Bear Creek. We do realize that if we do seriously accede to any of the Water Board recommendations, we would have to undergo costing of the various options.

That costing has not taken place, to my knowledge. It is on the departmental agenda, but they cannot do everything, and they cannot predict the kind of work that they are going to be doing over the course of the year.

I just indicated that I would provide the Member with the information on the Skagway Road and numerous other items here. I could read it into the record or I could provide it on paper tomorrow. I have it in front of me. That commitment will be fulfilled very soon.

I am not exactly sure what the Member is referring to when he speaks about the customs letter. I think this came up in Question Period. I provided the correspondence to the extent that I had on the questions of customs on the American and Canadian sides. We stated that the customs operation on the American side would be a federal responsibility with no cost to the Government of Alaska. For that reason, it would not be covered under the sharing arrangements in the agreement.

I can provide the information with respect to the technical aspects, the quality of construction on the American side of the road and the analysis of the road itself in Carcross and in Skagway.

I can provide projected costs over the years in terms of capital construction. I am not sure I can provide a specific tendering date until such time as Treasury Board approves passage of the request for funding. I believe May 1 or 2 is the date I gave to the Member for Riverdale South in Question Period.

I can provide the comparative costs of the Haines Junction Highway Maintenance costs and the Whitehorse Main Camp during the Estimates, I think I have it here right now.

On the Lynden Teamsters cause of action, our information is that Lynden Transport has a number of operations, some of which are unionized and some of which are not. It is not a company that has been organized in total. It has operations and subsidiaries that are organized, or not, depending on the will of the employees. We did not seek a formal legal opinion with respect to whether or not the Teamsters in Skagway would have a formal cause of action because they had started preliminary negotiations with Trimac and then had a situation where Lynden finally got the contract to haul the ore. That was considered to be a matter for the Teamsters and the trucking company to resolve. We would be very hesitant to get involved in matters of that nature. Otherwise we would certainly be dragged into their business.

I can tell the Member, and will provide the information tomorrow in writing, that the capital one-time costs for opening the Skagway Road, as of the May 1, 1985 agreement, show Fraser Camp at \$400,000. The agreement of October 28 shows Fraser Camp maintained at \$400,000, and the present agreement shows it at \$400,000.

On May 1, 1985, two Yukon snowblowers cost \$800,000. They still cost \$800,000 in October and they will still cost that now,

approximately.

Fifty percent of the Alaskan startup, which includes the additional Alaskan grader as of May 1, 1985, would be \$250,000 in Canadian dollars. With the agreement of October 28, 1985 it would be \$150,000 Canadian dollars, because we would not be purchasing the additional Alaskan grader, we would be doing the work ourselves. The present agreement shows \$250,000.

The long term capital costs, with any degree of certainty, are not known at any time.

The ongoing annual winter O&M costs with the agreement terms as of May 1, 1985 show the Fraser Camp to be consistent with the present agreement at \$660,000.

²² Fifty percent of the Alaskan O&M, as of May 1, 1985, there would have been \$173,000. As of October 28, 1985, it would have only been \$100,000. Under the present agreement, it has returned to \$173,000. The total O&M cost is \$833,000 as of May 1, minus \$500,000 worth of recovery from the net costs of \$333,000. As of the agreement, October 28, 1985, the total O&M costs would be \$760,000 minus \$500,000 recovery for \$260,000. The present agreement would be a return to the agreement terms of May 1, 1985. It would show the Fraser Camp winter O&M at \$660,000, fifty percent Alaskan O&M, \$173,000 for a total cost of \$833,000 minus \$500,000 recovery for a net cost of \$333,000.

I will provide the information. There is a lot of other information, but I do not think it would be useful to deliver it now unless the Members want me to.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate the accommodating manner of the Minister. We would like that information; it is a very important item. There is a fair amount of debate centering around that area in view of some of the figures that he just rattled off.

I recognize that there is some information that he will not be able to provide the House. I just want to remind the Minister of the commitments that he made, because he did give the inference, for example, on the Water Board hearing recommendation — if he checks the record — that he would have that information, at least a ballpark figure for the Main Estimates. If this department does not have it, I am prepared to wait until a little later on — even until the fall. It is outstanding, and I want to point out to the Minister that we take very seriously what is said in the House, and when a commitment is made, we are going to expect it to be followed up. Some Members may take what is said about some issues quite lightly, but we are taking it very seriously. There is a basic principle regarding what we are dealing with in the House; if they are not done in good faith, then we are wasting our time here.

The Minister indicated that there was a systems analysis and some discussion about that. Hopefully he is in a position to give us a further updating on that somewhere in the budget. A fair amount of money was contracted out for looking at systems, particularly in the area of motor vehicles, in conjunction with Government Services. I would like to hear some comments as to what exactly is being done.

We have had some debate on bridge repairs. The Minister has assured the House, including the Member for Faro who raised some questions about it, with regard to the new GVW we were talking about. We have a situation in BC where they are going down to half of their payloads. Here in the Yukon, we are increasing the GVWs by 15 tonnes, which is considerable. I am concerned about these bridges. I will state it for the record again: when I was the Minister, I was informed, for whatever reasons, that the standard of our bridges was suspect in view of when they were built. In some cases, the question of the strength of the foundations was raised.

²³ I just raise this from a safety point of view. I hope that the Minister has some information. He was going to see if there was an internal study done by DPW which, at one time, was contemplated, and to see if it could be made available to us. I wish to have that for the public record. He was also going to check into the state of the bridges along the route that we are talking about, with these increased GVWs.

I see the Minister going through his papers there, so maybe he has something there. I just hope he has the necessary assurances, because it is a major concern. It is definitely no laughing matter.

In the area of seniors housing, the Minister was going to determine what monies were spent on seniors housing, and how

much in the purchase of the six-plex and another facility. He was also going to check on the special projects officer, check the terms of reference, and when it was expected to end.

We also discussed the devolution of airports. I notice in his opening remarks, which I appreciated, that he talked about the devolution of airports to the Government of Yukon. That is an area that warrants a fair amount of debate as well, especially on the A side of the coin, as far as the transfer of that responsibility to YTG is concerned. I am sure the government is taking it very seriously, and I want to voice my reservations that that would be a pretty good deal.

At that time, there was a debate between him and the Leader of the Official Opposition about the principle of devolution. He said that at one time there were hidden costs that he had not been told about. The Minister gave some inference that costs had been buried by the federal government in the course of negotiations, and he was going to identify this and bring any correspondence forward, or whatever. He could check the record on that.

He was going to check to see if there was any other major policy research done in the past year in Community and Transportation Services that he may not have been aware of and he would notify us on that portion of the O&M Budget.

The Minister was going to provide us with information on a communication policy, especially in view of the fact that significant amounts of money had been contracted out for that. That is an area of concern on this side of the House, as well.

He was going to get the various reports that had been commissioned and were to conclude on March 31, in most cases, and he was going to see about tabling them in the House. That would provide for a fair amount of debate.

In my notes I have a report on the community block funding that was going to be made available to us, and also the study on land. There was also a report that the Minister had prepared, called the Radio Transmission Report. It had something to do with Stewart Crossing. It will be interesting to see how that policy relates to other communities in the Yukon that do not have CBC. I hope it is not just for one small community that policies would be made in such a context that people such as the Swift River or White River Lodge, who do not get CBC Radio, will be made available — that kind of service. It is very important that it be done in the territorial context.

²⁴ There was also a commitment on the update on the recreation committee that we can deal with later. Further to that, the Minister was going to provide this House with background information as to when the land was applied for and what was requested from the office. He was also going to provide us with any correspondence, primarily political, between this government and the Government of Canada. I think that is important to this issue. It is a major issue, and it is one that we are going to continue to push.

I think that is all I have at the present time. I am sure there are a few other things that will come up. It would be interesting to hear from the Liberals if they have any questions. Maybe the Minister has a few comments with respect to the list I just gave.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I will respond to list B. I would like to preface my remarks by simply stating that I take the commitments I make to the House very seriously. I do not want to get into an angry discussion, but I do not always like being lectured about my responsibilities. I most certainly take them seriously, and I will provide the information that I commit to the House that is humanly possible to provide.

Perhaps a little bit of clarification might be necessary. What may be perceived to be a commitment because we discussed something may need some clarification; I would like to know exactly what the Member referred to as a commitment. If I have made a commitment, and it is humanly possible to carry it out, I will.

The last item on the Member's list, the political issue, he mentioned some correspondence. I did not catch what political issue he was talking about. I cannot give a blanket commitment to pass on all political correspondence from my office. If the Member would like to tell me what issue he was referring to, I would appreciate it.

The Member talked about the promise to discuss the recreation

committees. I am not sure what that refers to. We will discuss recreation in great detail, I promise you.

Stewart Crossing Radio Technical Study was not a study to determine the viability of various options to providing radio at Stewart Crossing. It is not a policy initiative. It was an initiative to put radio into the next to the last community in the territory, if not the last. The decision on whether or not to put CBC, or other radio services, into the communities will be part of the communications policy initiative. Perhaps during that discussion, we could refer to the delivery and the type of service then.

The Member mentioned a study on land. Perhaps we could discuss that further, because there is all kinds of work being done in lands. I am not sure which commitment he may have been referring to in regard to lands study. We are doing a number of things. We are studying the lands branch reorganization. Perhaps that is what the Member was referring to.

²⁵ With respect to community block funding, I am prepared to discuss anything the Member mentions. If the commitment was that we were going to discuss this later, or discuss it now in general terms, I would be happy to do that. I do not have a policy that I can table on that score.

The Member mentioned reports by March 31, presumably meaning the policy work that had been done in 1985-86, and was making specific reference to the service contracts that were undertaken in terms of policy preparation in the last fiscal year, in preparing for work in the coming year. I am certainly prepared to discuss the intent and the character of those reports. Some of them have not reported. I cannot make a commitment on the tabling of documents until I have read them. We can discuss that later.

We will discuss communications policy. It is an exciting area. There is a lot to do. In the past, the government has really had no real capability to resolve communications issues. I am very excited about the prospect that we can now undertake this study in this area.

With respect to other policy development over the last year, in terms of reports that may not have been covered by the list of service contracts that the Member already received, I will double-check that area for the Member, and have the answers in hand tomorrow.

With respect to the issue of devolution and the statement that is attributed to me that in negotiations between Yukon and the federal government there were hidden costs identified by our people, the Yukon government personnel, that were not quickly and religiously offered up on the federal side, I will undertake to identify what some of those hidden costs might have been.

²⁶ The Member suggests that I bring correspondence forward. I do not think that I have ever seen this in correspondence, and I cannot promise to do that.

I think that we should discuss the devolution of Arctic B and C and Arctic A airports. Clearly, this is a significant endeavour for the department. With respect to our positioning and with respect to our timetable, I will be more than happy to discuss it with the Members.

On the Special projects officer, I would not mind be refreshed as to which special projects officer the people may be referring to.

On Seniors housing I do recall, even though it was a capital item, that we were discussing seniors housing in the O&M estimates. The six-plex, I think the Member was referring to, was built last year. The construction efforts that are anticipated to take place this year were identified in the speech made today on promoting more programming for seniors. I believe that I mentioned that there was a unit expected to be built in Whitehorse, 20-25 units, and a four-plex in Teslin, which would be, in concrete terms, the kind of housing that we would anticipate constructing this year.

On bridge repairs, the Member was quite right, I was shuffling through my papers, and I was coming up with a rating factor on various bridges: Takhini River bridge, Yukon River bridge, Pelly River bridge, and the bridges between Faro and Skagway. I have the various ratings for each of those bridges, depending on the loading factor.

When the time comes, we will discuss the Motor vehicle systems analysis.

Mr. Lang: I can assure the Minister opposite that I am not conjuring the information I am asking for up from memory. I deem it to be our responsibility to do our homework and to see what outstanding information is supposed to be there, and it is pretty clear, unequivocal, that commitments were made. I wanted to forewarn the Minister what we were expecting for debate. I would appreciate it if he could ensure that copies of the Carcross-Skagway Road be run off first thing in the morning, so that we can have copies prior to coming into the House, if that is okay. I think it would aid debate.

²⁷ As an overview of the department, it did concern me when the Minister pointed out a one or two percent increase in the department. It makes me wonder where all the money is going. To start with, you have a forced growth in salaries. That is something you have no control over once negotiations have been concluded and a settlement is reached with your employees. I am reminded also of the JES, yet, at the same time he says he can stay within \$1 or \$2 million of last year. With the 327 employees we have, that really makes me wonder.

I want to put the Minister on notice that this is an area we will be following as well.

In order to take the responsibilities from the busy House Leader on the other side, I will move progress on Bill No. 5.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Porter: Speaking of my busy responsibilities, I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Porter that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

²⁸ **Speaker:** I will now call the House to order.

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

Mr. Webster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act, 1986-87*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker's Ruling

Speaker: The Chair would like to draw the attention of all Members to an occurrence this afternoon which was out of order. When the order of business was called for resuming debate on Motion No. 24, the Minister of Justice rose and said, "Next sitting day." The Chair, perhaps, recognizing that it was the will of the House not to proceed with further business so late in the day, said, "So ordered", and the House proceeded to the next item of business.

This was a violation of our rules and practices, as the Minister of Justice should not have been allowed to delay proceeding on the adjourned debate on Motion No. 24.

The Chair would like to inform Members that this occurrence is not to be treated as a precedent.

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

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

