



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 71

3rd Session

26th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Wednesday, February 4, 1987 — 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**

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

## **GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS**

### **New Democratic Party**

<b>Sam Johnston</b>	Campbell
<b>Norma Kassl</b>	Old Crow
<b>Art Webster</b>	Klondike

## **OPPOSITION MEMBERS**

### **Progressive Conservative**

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

### **Liberal**

**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
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	Frank Ursich
Hansard Administrator	Dave Robertson

<sup>01</sup> **Whitehorse, Yukon**  
**Wednesday, February 4, 1987 — 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:** At this time we will turn to the Order Paper.  
 Are there any Introduction of Visitors?  
 Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

## TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I have two documents: the Janitorial Study as a result of the Motion passed in this Assembly; and, a review of the Yukon Business Incentive Policy investigating the concept of value added.

<sup>02</sup> **Speaker:** Are there any Reports of Committees?  
 Are there any Petitions?  
 Introduction of Bills?  
 Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?  
 Notices of Motion?  
 Statements by Ministers?

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Measuring "Value Added" for Government Contracts

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** In our ongoing policy of promoting local employment and business development, this government is proposing a value added concept to be used in conjunction with our existing business incentive policy.

A value-added approach has advantages over a restricted local preference policy in that it will provide additional incentives in the areas of creating jobs and stimulating local business development.

Starting today, with the Contractors Association, a consultation program will be carried out with the business community and interest groups. This concept will be proposed to apply to contracts where bids exceed \$100,000. The proposal will be to use the criteria of the amount of local labour, manufactured goods and retail goods for measuring the value to the Yukon Economy.

This system has been used in other jurisdictions, such as the NWT and Newfoundland, and we believe it will strengthen the Yukon economy. A "value added" system will encourage both local hiring and local purchasing, thus decreasing the leakage of taxpayers' dollars out of the Yukon.

<sup>03</sup> **Mrs. Firth:** I am responding to this Ministerial Statement because I believe the Minister of Government Services and I were entering into some debates in the Capital Budget about this particular issue and concept.

The concerns we have deal with the whole concept of value added and the consultative process that the government has chosen to take with the business community. In that particular instance the process of having the report done up and presented to the business community in a way that is almost irresistible for them to accept. I have already raised a concern about more bureaucracy and more intrusion into business.

It is quite interesting that the government has just announced a new business incentive policy a few months ago, and I do not know if the business community would agree it has had enough time to see if it will work satisfactory before they are introducing another new business incentive policy. That will be one of our concerns.

Also, whether this is a way of raising more government revenues through indirect taxation will be a concern. We look forward to debating the issue after we have had an opportunity to read the report and are more informed as to what the government's real direction is.

**Speaker:** This then brings us to the Question Period. Are there any questions?

## QUESTION PERIOD

### Question re: Land use planning

**Mr. Phelps:** I have some questions that go back to a Ministerial Statement delivered in the House on November 26, 1986 regarding land. At that time, the Minister of Community and Transportation Services spoke about cooperative land use planning. I quote from the Ministerial Statement: "Steering committees have been struck and plans are beginning in the critical areas of Whitehorse West and Klondike Valley. Many of the land management problems we have experienced will be avoided in the future if we plan now."

I am wondering whether the Minister could advise the House as to the make-up of each of those steering committees, who are on them and why were they chosen?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I can provide the names of the people and the organizations whom they would represent in a written response, shortly. I can provide any other detailed information and requests in that same response.

**Mr. Phelps:** What we would really like to know about, given the lapse of time, and nothing much having been said about these committees, is what kind of a process is going to be set in place and how are residents in the area of Whitehorse West and the Klondike Valley going to be guaranteed input into the processes.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Perhaps what I could do would be to make available the terms of reference for the two regional planning processes so the Member can see for himself the detail that he is requesting. There is no particular reason why we have not mentioned these processes in the House since then. It is simply that they have simply been doing their job.

<sup>04</sup> **Mr. Phelps:** What timeframe are we looking at? The Minister said that they have started their job, and they have been doing their job. Could he tell us what that is?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The timeframe differs between the Klondike Valley. I will check tomorrow if I am mistaken, but I believe it is to report to the end of this year. The Whitehorse West planning process would be approximately 18 months from its inception, which was last fall. It may, too, report within this calendar year, or early next year.

### Question re: Land use planning

**Mr. Phelps:** The reason for these questions is that constituents in the area do not know what is going on. They have not been consulted. I would like to have some indication of what they have been doing. It has not included consulting many of the residents in the area.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The consultation will be quite extensive, as the Members will note in the terms of reference. The full public consultation has not yet commenced. There is a good deal of groundwork to be done prior to that. I would remind Members that things are still happening in the way of land transfers, nevertheless.

In a sense it is bogged down, because land use planning has not been completed. Land transfers are being sought and requested. I am sure they will be transferred to Yukon in the coming year.

**Mr. Phelps:** Does the area of Whitehorse West include the Wheaton River Valley and the Watson River Valley?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** No, it does not. The area for Whitehorse West subregional plan is primarily exclusively north of Whitehorse.

<sup>05</sup> **Mr. Phelps:** Can the Minister advise as to just how far north the planning area encompasses?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Approximately to Fox Lake.

### Question re: Lottery Tatchun

**Mr. McLachlan:** I have a question for the Minister of Government Services.

Will the hon. Government House Leader confirm that he and other Members of Cabinet and Caucus set up, and participated in, a phony lottery scheme last week, called "Lotto Tatchun", without gaining permission and gaining a license from the Yukon Lottery Commission.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** It is true that the government Caucus played a game concerning who could best guess the results of the Tatchun byelection. This is not a lottery; of course, it is a game of skill.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I gather that a question on lotteries is a very sensitive issue on the other side.

Would the Minister of Justice then confirm that with the knowledge that it is a sensitive issue, the Minister of Sport, Recreation and Physical Fitness initially refused to participate, uttering such predominances as "No, it is not a good time", and "Over my dead body", and then the Minister of Fitness finally agreed to participate when he was bullied by the rest of the Caucus. Is that true?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Caucus discussions and activities are confidential.

**Mr. McLachlan:** Early Tuesday morning, the Executive Assistant to the Government Leader was seen to be coming to the government building with a wad of money so thick it could choke a horse, and whistling the lead song from "Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs", "Hi Ho, Hi Ho, It's Off To Work We Go". Can the Minister of Justice confirm that the Executive Assistant to the Government Leader was the lucky winner of the phony lottery?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The preamble to the question is fantasy, but the winner — or the person who most accurately guessed the results — was Jim Beebe, and Art Webster was a very close second.

#### Question re: Lottery contract

**Mr. Lang:** Hi ho, hi ho, here I come.

While they were going through their complicated game of lotteries, I am sure the question of the takeover of the Yukon lotteries probably came into the conversation as well.

In view of the fact the government has made the decision that Sports Yukon and the Arts Council are incapable and have not done the job that is necessary to be done with respect to the distribution of lottery tickets, could the Minister of Recreation tell me how many individuals or organizations who have applied for retailer licensing have been turned down?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I will, again, take issue with much of what the Member said in his preamble. The question was asked yesterday, and I am attempting to seek the information in the detail the Member requests. I will provide that detail to the House as soon as we know it, as soon as it is provided to me.

**Mr. Lang:** This is one of the problems. The Minister does not have any answers to the questions, yet he made the policy decision, which makes it difficult to understand how he could make the decision without having the necessary knowledge to make it.

Is the present policy that only non-profit organizations affiliated with Sports Yukon and the Arts Council are the only ones allowed to have a retailers' ticket?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member made the allegation yesterday that I did not have my facts straight, and suggested that I was quite wrong in suggesting that the contractors were the ones who issued the licenses. I was not wrong at all. The Member for Porter Creek East had his facts clearly wrong.

The licenses are issued by the contractor, as per the terms of the agreement. The contractor can choose who is going to be selling tickets.

**Mr. Lang:** The Member for Porter Creek East was right. All applications for retailers' licenses go before the contractor and then go to the Lottery Commission for final decision. He calls it a veto. I call it somebody making a decision. Quit waffling.

Yesterday, the Minister intimated to the House that the Sports Yukon and Arts Council affiliates were the only ones eligible for a retailers' licence. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The policy was to contract the distribution of the licenses to the Sport Fed/Arts Council. If you want to ask them their policy, you should ask the question of them.

With respect to the delegated right to distribute the licenses, as I indicated before, the contractor makes the decision as to who will receive licenses. They take those licenses to the Lottery Commission for approval and for veto. It is not the Lottery Commission

who can make suggestions as to who gets the licenses.

**Mr. Lang:** Going back to the Minister in charge of lotteries, he stated the day before yesterday that the major reason that the government was taking this over, like they are taking over everything else, was "because of the desire of many groups to have a fair allocation of retailers licenses". Now I want to know, and I think the public wants to know, and Sports Yukon and the Arts Council would like to know, what groups want these retailer licenses. I asked the question yesterday. Could he please inform me today, in view of that being a major policy variable and making the decision that he has made, which groups are after these retailer licenses that have not received them to date?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member repeats the question once again, and the answer I will repeat once again.

The Member asked some details about who specifically may have put forward an application to the Sports Federation and Arts Council and was specifically turned down. I am trying to seek that information as I will have to seek that information from the contractor. That information is not here today.

With respect to other people who might want to sell, I would suggest that there are probably a lot of people who would want to sell tickets, because that business is worthwhile. All retailers should know exactly what the terms of reference are for applying for and receiving a license, and they should have equal access.

**Mr. Lang:** Just for the record, I should clarify that there are 21 retailers, approximately, I believe: 13 affiliated with Sports Yukon, one with Arts Council, and the remainder are non-profit organizations such as the Teslin Community Club.

What I want to ask the Minister is: he said the reason he brought in this policy was, and I go back and I quote his words again, "Because of the desire of many groups to have a fair allocation of retailers licenses." Now I would like him to explain to me which groups he is talking about. Is there some deal that nobody knows anything about. Who are we talking about? Who is going to get these licenses who do not have them now.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member again asked the question on detail. I will not repeat the answer again. I will just allow people to read through the *Hansard* and readthrough the Blues to acquire the information.

With respect to the management of the lotteries, the Lottery Commission recommended that there be a fair and open process, not through contractors, not through essentially the people who are paid to distribute the lottery tickets, but through the fair and impartial body, which was what the Lottery Commission was created to be, and they have recommended that in order to be fair the system should be thrown open to all people and the guidelines for who gets the licenses should be very clear and everybody should have equal access.

**Mr. Lang:** Is he then saying to the House that Sports Yukon and the Arts Council were not fair in their distribution of retailers licenses?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** My answers have already spoken for themselves on this matter. I have indicated in the past that for its own purposes and the benefits of its member groups, the Sports Federation and the Arts Council did a fine job. I have said that already. I expect they have done a fine job. I do not know the details of the operation, but I will give them the benefit of the doubt.

With respect to the proposals for the change in policy, I mentioned that there was the introduction of new technology that was, in a sense, displacing the retailer element in the community and creating great profits for the managers, not the retailers. That was one aspect of the decision.

The other aspect was that there should be a fair allocation of the retailer licenses, and it should be done according to guidelines that are open for discussion and a process that is open for scrutiny.

#### Question re: Lottery contract

**Mr. Lang:** I will go back to lotteries. Since the Minister made the policy decision that the government knows best and the statement has been made by government that there is going to be a requirement for four person years to run the administration of the

distribution of lotteries, could he now report to the House that that is correct, that it is going to require four people?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member is wrong. First of all I did not make a statement that there were going to be four person years. The statement that there would be four person years associated with the managing of the lotteries came with the contractor as a recommendation. I indicated already that the staff required to manage the lotteries would be determined specifically in terms of individual job descriptions and that sort of thing. When I have that information secured I will provide it, but I never said there would be any specific number. The Member is quite wrong about that.

**Mr. Lang:** In view of the fact that the government has taken steps for job descriptions, is it not true that there are job descriptions for the following positions: one of general manager, one for the purposes of financial accounting, a sales person, as well as a receptionist/secretary?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** If the Lottery Commission was doing its job, I am sure it would be working up some proposals for the staff establishment to manage the lotteries. There is existing staff established to manage lotteries provided by a contractor, so I presume that the Lottery Commission would be doing the right thing now and working on that very matter. They may well have got some job descriptions drafted. I am not aware of that. If they have, I am sure they will come forward.

**Mr. Lang:** Are these four positions going to be funded out of general revenue, or will they be funded out of proceeds from the lottery?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member again assumes that there will be four positions, and there is no reason for that assumption at this time.

#### **Question Re: Lottery contract**

**Mr. Lang:** I am just amazed that the Minister can make a policy decision and have no answers.

Is it the position of the government that these positions will be paid out of general revenue, or will they be paid from the proceeds of the lottery?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** When the Member makes reference to these positions, he is again assuming that there will be four positions. That is an incorrect assumption. The Member is refusing to recognize that for his own purposes. I do not know why, but he is refusing to recognize that.

I would presume, and certainly assume, that the funding for the management of lotteries would come out of lottery commission funds as it currently does.

10

#### **Question re: Commission on Indian Education and Training**

**Mrs. Firth:** With respect to the Joint Commission on Indian Education and Training, the Minister was in negotiations with the former support staff with respect to a settlement for having breaching the contract that the support staff had. Can the Minister report to us whether the negotiations have been completed, and whether a payment has been made?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I have not spoken to the support staff. There have not been negotiations, as I think the Member implied. The support staff feel that they have a claim for severance. They are making that claim through their lawyers. The government will be responding through its lawyers, as it is the government's position that there is no rightful claim for severance.

**Mrs. Firth:** Can the Minister tell us if the position has been filled for the new executive director?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I am not sure whether it has. The Management Committee — Mary Jane Jim and I — met with the new Commission. At that time they said that they had not only shortlisted, but had interviewed, and were preparing to make an offer. That was a couple of days ago. I have not heard any information back, but I would presume they have probably made an offer at this time.

**Mrs. Firth:** Could the Minister say if that offer was for the executive director's position, or if it was for the coordinator for public consultation position? I have not seen the executive director position advertised in the paper. I wonder if that position had been

eliminated.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I think they are talking about an executive director position. As I mentioned before, the hiring of staff for the Commission will be the Commission's business. Neither the CYI nor I was involved in the hiring. As a matter of information, they provided to us the fact that they had shortlisted and interviewed people for the position of executive director. I am not sure whether that also includes other people in the Commission, but I will find out this afternoon for the Member.

#### **Question re: Commission on Indian Education and Training**

**Mrs. Firth:** Can the Minister tell us what the total amount of the contracts are for the new chairperson of the Commission and two commissioners?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Firstly, I can say that there is no contract with individual commissioners from this government. There has been and will be a contract with the chairperson of the Commission, rather than with the executive director, to manage the operations of the Commission.

I believe the funds allocated for the position are in the neighbourhood of \$26,000 per commissioner, based on the same daily rate as the previous commissioners were provided.

**Mrs. Firth:** The Minister has not answered my question as to what the total amount of the contract is with the new Chairperson of the Commission. If he would give me that and tell me what the salary breakdown is for the Chairperson and the two Commissioners I would appreciate it.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I misread the question. I thought the Member was asking for the salaries of the Commissioners themselves. I can provide the specifics for the Member today or tomorrow.

**Mrs. Firth:** If the Minister would provide me with a copy of the contracts, I think it will save a lot of questions. Is he prepared to do that?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I see no reason why not.

#### **Question re: Furniture manufacturing**

**Mr. McLachlan:** I have a question for the Minister of Government Services.

Last year, during the debate on local furniture manufacturing, the Minister was asked if he agreed with the idea of storefront space so other people in the Yukon could see this fine product being distributed on Main Street and perhaps it would lead to other initial sales.

Can the Minister advise if anything further has been done about securing space that would allow these local manufacturers, whom the government is intending to build up and assist, to assist them in putting their product into commercial display?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** No.

**Mr. McLachlan:** In the report entitled "Yukon Based Furniture Manufacturing" the recommendation is made that the government begin to carry the cost of product warehousing. The Minister's other portfolio ran into some problems with a million-dollar warehousing renovations. I am wondering if the Minister can tell us if he agrees with that particular recommendation: that the government warehouse furniture output of these furniture manufacturers?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** That is a relatively simple question, but it involves a whole complex of factors. It is impossible to give a short answer without running a grave risk of creating a false impression. The government is generally interested in the creation of a manufacturers' association here to promote Yukon-based manufacturing, and we are planning in that general area. It is in that area that government activity is now directed.

**Mr. McLachlan:** The conditions to the Small Business Loans Assistance Program were recently changed to allow such things as bonding and inventory, allowance for inventory in business loan programs. Would it be the Minister's intention to use the provisions of that program to assist furniture manufacturers in their inventory costs to further promote furniture manufacturing?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The question was specifically about the government's intentions. The government has not formed any intentions, specifically. We are consulting widely concerning the

possibility of assisting Yukoners with bonding. We are generally interested in import substitution.

I cannot answer specifically, but the government is very aware of these problems and, at the present time, we are consulting.

**Question re: Watson Lake Forest Products**

**Mr. Nordling:** With respect to the Yukon Development Corporation, in answer to a question regarding Watson Lake Forest Products on January 27, the Minister of Economic Development said that the YDC was in the process of retaining private sector management. Has private sector management been retained at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I am answering because of the temporary voice difficulties of the Government Leader. The answer is no.

**Mr. Nordling:** The Minister also indicated that day that his Deputy Minister, Mr. Alward, is a member of the board, and that his department was assisting with the conduct of business of the Development Corporation board.

Does the Minister foresee this assistance continuing after private sector management has been hired? Will the Deputy Minister continue to sit on the board?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I will take that question as notice, on behalf of the Minister.

**Mr. Nordling:** On January 27, the Minister of Economic Development also agreed to provide information on Management Board decisions, which bring the Yukon Development Corporation out from under the contract directives.

Does the Minister now have that information? If not, when can we expect it?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Again, on behalf of the Minister, I will take that question as notice.

**Question re: Moose harvest**

**Mr. Brewster:** Three months ago, I sent a letter to the Minister of Renewable Resources with respect to a November 4 Yukon government news release entitled "Moose Survey Expanded This Year", in which it stated, "...and has recently developed a new program to encourage native hunters to report moose harvested."

The Minister has not responded to my letter. I would like to have the details provided to me.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I apologize to the Member if he has not seen a response to that letter. My recollection is that, in fact, a response was drafted. I will immediately, when I have an opportunity to get out of the House, phone and rack the response and find out where it is.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would like to thank the Minister for that. Could the Minister possibly tell me when this program went into effect, if it did go into effect?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I believe at the beginning of the fiscal year in which we hired the individual to take up those duties. I will doublecheck that, but that is my understanding.

**Question re: Minister of Justice, executive assistant**

**Mr. Phillips:** I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Can the Minister of Justice advise the House if Joanne Bill has been appointed as the Minister's Executive Assistant now that the Tatchun by-election is over?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The answer is no, but Joanne Bill is an excellent candidate, and I am considering her very seriously.

**Mr. Phillips:** Can the Minister advise the House when Miss Bill will receive her reward, and if she is not appointed as an executive assistant, what reward will she receive?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The question is totally argumentative and deserves no answer.

**Mr. Phillips:** I think the general public would be interested in that. Can the Minister advise the House if Mr. John MacDonald, Danny Joe's campaign manager, will be appointed as the Minister's executive assistant or to any other political job in the Yukon government?

**Question re: Squatter policy**

**Mr. Lang:** I would like to direct a question to the Minister of

Community and Transportation. Some time ago there was a decision taken with respect to the question of the squatter policy. A fair amount of money was invested into attempting to come up with a policy that was acceptable. Can the Minister update the House as to exactly where it is at?

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I have been informed from the federal Minister's office to expect a letter in the next week or two indicating what I anticipate to be a favourable response to the proposal that we have made. People have been in discussions at the administrative level in the last couple of months. The federal Minister is now in a position where he can make his final decision known to me.

**Question re: Access to information**

**Mrs. Firth:** On two or three occasions I have asked both the Minister of Justice and the Government Leader for some reassurances about the information that they are collecting on behalf of the business community of the Yukon that is being stored in the microfiche within this government; regarding access to it and confidentiality. I was given a commitment by both Ministers to come back to me with an answer, which I have not yet received. I would like to know if one of the Ministers could answer my question now, please?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The Member for Porter Creek East had raised that general issue several times, as well, and I have prepared information to discuss during the budget debate concerning the procedures and the policy and the policy direction of the government. It will require a fairly long complex answer, and I would suggest a thorough debate at budget time is most appropriate.

**Mrs. Firth:** Which budget debate? We have covered the most pertinent areas in the Supplementary Estimates when the question was raised. We have done both areas in the Capital Budget when the issue was raised. When does the Minister anticipate this discussion?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I am anticipating it in the discussion of the Operation and Maintenance budget, especially for systems and computing systems and the records branch of the department. There was a specific answer about income tax records tabled in the House last week. If there was a specific question about a specific matter we would be pleased to answer it at any time, of course.

**Mrs. Firth:** I am not prepared to wait until the O&M Budget. If the Minister has, as he has said, prepared a written statement that explains the issue, I would like to know if he is prepared to table it for us so that we can answer the requests we have had from the business community. In light of the fact that both Ministers recognize it is a very serious and important issue, I would like a commitment from the Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I have nothing specific to table except Volume II of the information plan for the government, which I am expecting to table before the debate on the spring estimates. I have a series of notes, most of which are in my own handwriting, which is virtually illegible to anyone else, but I will be pleased to discuss the issue of security of records at any time in the appropriate forum.

**Question re: Predator program**

**Mr. Brewster:** Were there any predator programs carried out this winter?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** To my knowledge, there has not been any predator program carried out anywhere in the Yukon this year. With respect to the Finlayson program, our intentions will be made known this spring.

**Mr. Brewster:** Were there any game counts carried out this winter?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** There are usually game counts carried out in the fall and spring and throughout the winter. If the Member wants to know which species were counted and where the counts took place, I will provide that specific detailed information.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would appreciate having that from the Minister. Were there any studies or surveys done in game zone 7 during this winter?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I do not know whether surveys were conducted. I know that we did instruct the department to continue

to monitor game zones 7 and 9.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Speaker:** Motions other than Government Motions?

## MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

### Motion No. 55

**Clerk:** Item number 1, standing in the name of Ms. Kassi.

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

**Ms. Kassi:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Member for Old Crow: THAT the following matters be referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges for review and recommendation:

(a) indemnities, expense allowances and salaries payable to Members of the Legislative Assembly;

(b) limits on and rules respecting expenses for which Members may be reimbursed;

(c) benefits payable to Members of the Legislative Assembly;

(d) levels and utilization of caucus funding and services; and

(e) levels of death benefits and retirement allowances as found in the *Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowances Act*.

**Ms. Kassi:** I am moving this motion today on behalf of all Members of this House. There have been requests from all three parties, through individual MLAs, for a review of paid benefits, expenses and services they receive as MLAs. It should be pointed out that it soon will be three years since most of these items were reviewed.

This motion would require that a review of all services and benefits, including space, travel within large rural ridings, et cetera, take place within the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges.

We will be seeking all party agreement for a package dealing with all of the above-mentioned items.

**Speaker:** Are you prepared for the question?

*Motion No. 55 agreed to*

**Mr. Lang:** In view of the fact we need unanimous consent to reorder the order of business as far as the motions before you on the Order Paper, I would like to move that the following motions be debated in the following manner: Motion No. 94, Motion No. 85, Motion No. 89, Motion No. 95, Motion No. 86, Motion No. 90, Motion No. 91, Motion No. 93, Motion No. 96 and Motion No. 97.

**Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Speaker:** There is unanimous consent. Proceed.

### Motion No. 94

**Clerk:** Item No. 8, standing in the name of Mr. Phelps.

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with item No. 8?

**Mr. Phelps:** Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Government of Yukon should amend its present Agricultural Policy so that parcels of land less than 20 acres in size may be disposed to third parties as agricultural land.

**Mr. Phelps:** This issue is one that I have raised from time-to-time in the House during Question Period. I will continue to push for a satisfactory resolution of the issue, because there are a large number of people in the Yukon, and particularly in my riding of Hootalinqua, who have a desire to obtain plots of agricultural land that are less than the 20 acres that is required under the present government policy.

It is true that agricultural policy has been under review by this government for some time. The real problem is that it seems to have become a very low priority with this government and the result, as I

have already said, is a lot of very deep-seated frustration on the part of a lot of people who would like to get on with their lives or businesses as full or part-time farmers.

I would like to quote from a letter just recently received from one constituent who states, "We presently have an agricultural application on file with Renewable Resources and have actively been pursuing the acquisition of a parcel of agricultural land for three years now, although the present application is only a year old. It concerns a piece of land that is within territorial boundaries and, therefore, within the ability of the territorial government to grant for use as agricultural land. Our previous application was on federal land which we gave up as not likely to be granted for many years to come."

"The agricultural division within Renewable Resources has evaluated this land including site analysis, soil testing and found it to be up to their standards for arability and suitable for its intended use. That, unfortunately, is where we now stand at a standstill in the application process."

"The problem is that this parcel is only 10 acres. The current policy does not allow the disposition of land less than 20 acres in size. Agricultural advisors agree with me that this is absurd under certain circumstances. Ten acres is certainly enough to profitably undertake some types of intensive farming such as greenhouse and market gardening."

"In further discussions with the staff at Renewable Resources, the following information has been passed on to me: 1) For some time now, and currently, Renewable Resources has said they were drafting a new agricultural policy that addresses this issue as well as other problem areas that have been identified;

"2) Approximately 100 other applications await this new policy before they can be moved on through the application process and either granted or rejected as unsuitable;

"3) Drafting of this policy is virtually at a standstill and will, at the very least, take many more months to complete at the present rate. It has essentially been relegated to the back burner."

"We understood, after two years of pressing the government on our previous application, the problems associated with federal land for agricultural purposes, but now it seems that acquiring territorial land is just as difficult."

This is a complaint from one of many constituents, and the frustration is growing. Back in July, a government discussion paper was made public. It was prepared by the Agricultural Planning Advisory Committee; it was entitled Options for Protecting Agricultural Lands. That document clearly identified this issue and made certain proposals to deal with it. This document states in part a number of options for protecting agricultural lands have been proposed. These options fall into three categories: zoning, limiting the subdivision of land with agricultural potential, and preferential tax treatment for agricultural land uses.

The paper discusses four possible zoning categories: AG1 soil base extensive, which is what most of us view as agricultural land under the present policy — that is the large areas — to be used for pasturing animals or growing of forage or cash crops and speaks to a minimum size of 20 acres. That is what most people have identified under the current policies as typical agricultural land. The other three kinds of land that this report speaks to is land that could be much less than 20 acres. They are AG2, not soil-based intensive. This speaks to situations for greenhouses or for animal farming in confined areas, chicken barns, piggeries, things like that. The recommendation in this paper last July was the minimum lot size of two hectares, or about five acres.

The next category, AG3, was classified as soil-based intensive. Again, the minimum lot size recommended by APAC was about five acres, or two hectares. That would be the situation where you had extremely good soils for growing crops or produce, market gardens and for horticulture.

The third category that was discussed in this paper, AG4, was agricultural industrial, which would include intensive agricultural activities that were not soil-based, such as greenhouses, hydroponic operations and horticulture in artificially prepared beds; no livestock or poultry. There the minimum size would be 1.0 hectares, or about 2.5 acres.

The advisory body to the Minister, back in July, was fully endorsing the concept that has been put forward in this important motion.

I can see no reason for the government not proceeding as quickly as possible to meet the needs of rural Yukoners. I feel that the acceptance and endorsement of the motion, and the support of the motion by all Members, would be beneficial. I urge everyone in this House to support the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I would like to begin by saying if the intent of the Member's motion, in terms of reference to the third party, means disposal by YTG to individuals — and he nods affirmatively — then this side of the House will be supporting the motion brought forward by the Member.

With respect to this question, there has been some discussion in the House. The other day, the Member raised this particular question in Question Period and asked about the present policy, as it applies. At that time, I told the Member that he was correct with the information that he provided to the House. In order to be able to understand the discussion, I think it is also pertinent to review some of the past history of the development of policy with respect to how it impacts on the question of the size of the land.

The current policy in question was originally proposed by the Agricultural Development Council which, as the Member knows, was a creature of the previous government. That policy proposal was adopted by the previous government and the same policy is still in effect.

However, as I stated to the Member the other day, our government is reviewing the whole question of development of an agricultural policy and that review is ongoing. The Member makes the charge in his statement about the delays in the agricultural application process. I think there is no merit in arguing the point. I would agree with him that the process has been one of delay from the inception of government's intention to make agricultural land available, and this goes back to 1982.

We feel, with the kind of streamlining that this government has been putting into place with respect to the disposition of lands, that the potential for agricultural land and the disposition of those lands will be much quicker in the future. I am talking about the efforts of my colleague from Community and Transportation Services with respect to policies that his department has developed in conjunction with the land claims process under the land availability program.

As I have reported to the House previously, we have gone through a computerized system of monitoring applications that will meet a lot of demands that the agricultural applicants have expressed in the past that they did not know where their applications stood at any given time. That issue has been resolved.

I did meet with a group of concerned citizens that had agricultural applications. I thought the meeting was very frank and the discussion very open. We put our position before them quite openly and spoke about what the position of the government was.

The Member raises a question that this government is not seeing agriculture as a very serious issue. I would agree that agricultural development does not rank in priority with such things as the mining economy or the tourism economy. That is the reality of our life here in the Yukon. It is never going to be an industry that would challenge those premiere industries, and the fact that this government has made a decision to concentrate on the economic front and to promote mining and tourism is a very clear stated in policy. I will not argue that.

This government has clearly indicated its support of the agriculture industry. As a matter of fact, when we did assume the responsibilities of government, we moved with relatively quick speed to set up a distinct branch in the Department of Renewable Resources created solely for the purposes of enhancing the agricultural industry.

So there is some merit in slowness that the Member talks about. Through the efforts of government, hopefully, we will see the movement of land much quicker than it has historically been done. There are a number of problems with the process, as you can appreciate. As we go through a review of the various applications, there are a number of issues we have to address.

20 The Yukon has been built not on an agricultural base, but historically on a fur-trading base, on big-game hunting and on mining. That has been the historical uses of Yukon's resources. I think that we have a paramount obligation as a government to recognize prior and existing users of the land. The trappers, the outfitters, the bands that are out there: those interests must be taken into consideration when we look at allocations of land.

As I discussed with the concerned citizens group, there are many interests that we have to abide by when we consider agricultural applications, such as conflicts with band lands, existing land uses, adjacent land use access, planning concerns, mining conflicts, wildlife-trapper concerns, outfitter concerns, fishery concerns, heritage park recreational concerns, soil suitability, and, of course, it is stipulated that they must put forward a management plan.

The purpose of putting out clearly the history and the problems that are associated with obtaining agricultural land in the Yukon will help people to better understand the situation that the applicants and the government find themselves in, in terms of dealing with this issue.

In terms of the Agricultural Development Council and their previous policy on this question, in fairness to them, it was not anticipated at that time that there would be such a requirement for land development. I do not think that they envisioned the problems created when they lay down the policy with respect to land size.

The Members opposite would have to agree that this government has been promoting home-grown Yukon products. In the agricultural development that has happened, that has been seen as a priority. The focus has, to some extent, shifted from the views of the Yukon's agricultural sector and Yukoners general. It is clear that we believe in a healthy and growing market for Yukon products, and we have encouraged that. The Government Leader made a statement to that effect in this very House the other day.

In terms of the program we have encouraged, through the use of the EDA funds, financing a number of agricultural pilot projects, for example, Hyland Farms, which was aided by the EDA program. This operation now supplies a significant portion of the sprouts that are marketed in Whitehorse, and is branching out to produce other fresh vegetable products.

It is clear that we, as a government, are interested in replacing some of the food items that we are importing from the south. We have made that very clear as a statement of the government's policy.

In short, the motion that the Member does bring up has a great deal of merit to it. Many of the market gardening projects that we are seeing coming on — the people who want to raise chickens, the people who want to raise eggs — they do not need a lot of land. The demand, in many instances, for these specific areas of development of agriculture only require small plots of land. The Member's suggestion does make a lot of sense.

Another issue that should be considered is that, should we incorporate in our policy the changes as suggested by the Member, I think that we would be in a situation where we are not alienating huge blocks of land; it would cut down on the amount of land that we do alienate, and some of the conflicts that we are experiencing with trappers and with outfitters and other wildlife users would be diminished.

21 I would like to again express my support and the support of the government for this motion.

**Mr. Brewster:** I am very pleased that the government side appears to be in support of this motion. I find it very hard to believe that anyone would make a regulation that you have to have 20 acres. As the Minister has stated, there are an awful lot of small family businesses that do not need that much land. If they have to have that much land, they have to buy it, and this costs them more in expenses. They have to pay more taxes because they have more land. This brings up their expenses. The small family business has to keep their expenses down, and I am quite sure that most of them can work on 10 acres — for instance chicken farms.

You might say I am becoming an expert rather rapidly. You need a building about 14' X 20' and a small place to fence and you are in business. Incidentally, in my case, because I cannot get any more



land than 2.6 acres, I have my home, four horses, 48 chickens and a dog. We all live quite comfortably on 2.6 acres, so do not tell me we have to get 20 acres to do things because we do not.

The ravens come and go, but they belong to the good Lord and they sometimes fly up above and leave the land.

I also find it rather strange that we should be getting into a position like this. I recall a case where a woman wanted 40 acres for a greenhouse and when all the smoke settled, she was cut down to 10 acres. I really cannot understand how she can get 10 acres when we are debating the motion here. However, undoubtedly the government or the bureaucrats will have an argument as to what really happened there. It is very, very strange that one piece of land has that.

This would lead me to the fact that I would wonder if there is a policy. This was done long before we debated this, and she ended up getting title to only 10 acres and she wanted 40. According to the policy of the 20 acres, she should have been entitled to at least 20, but she all of a sudden had 10.

I realize there are going to be remarks as to why she got this, but it is another instance of red tape that probably held up a flourishing little business.

I am very, very pleased that the government is supporting this, and I hope some of my remarks have not changed the minds of some of the Ministers on that side.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I do not have much more to add than what has been said by Members already.

The question of land transfers themselves is an issue and will continue to be an issue as long as there are two governments and there is land to be transferred. The conflicts mentioned by the Minister for Renewable Resources do exist and will create problems that will have to be resolved. I would like an opportunity at some point during the session to discuss the matter more fully with all the Members, because I think that any suggestions they have to improve the situation would be well received.

I agree primarily with the remarks of the Member for Kluane with respect to tailoring land transfers and land sales to the needs of a particular business. I realize that there was perhaps some need at some stage in the development of the policy to provide some guidelines that were clear and concise and understood by all people. For simplicity sake, I presume, they opted for the 20-acre minimum.

From my own experience as a Member from a rural riding, I do not understand why administrators cannot provide land that suits a particular application.

<sup>22</sup> I think when it comes to the transfers of lands in areas that are moderately congested, such as the lands around Whitehorse, it probably would be unreasonable to force or to encourage people to swallow more land than they need when there are a lot of people competing for available land. I think if the program was rationalized to the extent that it allowed land transfers or land sales to accommodate a given business plan so that it would make some sense, then I think that would be an initiative well taken. I certainly would support the Member's motion and support the comments from the Member for Kluane.

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

**Mr. Phelps:** I am very pleased that we are going to enjoy support of all Members on this motion. I hope that the process will be speeded up somewhat as a result, because there are a lot of people waiting who would very dearly like to get into various kinds of agriculture on parcels smaller than 20 acres. Thank you.

*Motion No. 94 agreed to*

**Motion No. 85**

**Clerk:** Item number two standing in the name of Mr. Phelps.

**Speaker:** Is the Member prepared to proceed with item 2?

**Mr. Phelps:** Yes.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Leader of the Official Opposition: THAT it is the opinion of this House that many rural

residents in Yukon are paying too much for telephone and telecommunication services and that rates for such services should not be increased until the quality of services to rural areas, particularly in Hootalinqua and along the Alaska Highway, is dramatically improved.

**Mr. Phelps:** I felt it appropriate to raise this issue at this time in the House. As we all know, the issue of telephone rates has been in the public domain recently and also, partly as a result of that, and partly because of long standing grievances in certain rural areas of the Yukon, the complaints are often cited to many of the Members in this House about quality of service. I think it is perhaps necessary that the view of this Legislature be made clear on this important issue and, for that reason, I brought this forward.

<sup>23</sup> I intend to speak about and summarize many of the complaints that I have received as the Member for Hootalinqua. I think it is important to put that into the record of today's debate. I understand that my good friend for Kluane will also be citing a number of complaints that he has received and reviewed from constituents along the Alaska Highway. For the purpose of this exercise, I would like to talk about Hootalinqua divided into two sections — Hootalinqua south and Hootalinqua north — to outline and summarize the nature of complaints that have been received. There have been many complaints.

In Hootalinqua south, with respect to telephone services, the primary concern is the high cost of cable and connection from the Golden Horn Subdivision along the Carcross Road to the Cowley area. I have received numerous complaints with respect to the high capital cost associated with telecommunication services within this area, as well as complaints concerning monthly rates.

Several residents reported problems with the Carcross exchange. Complaints include experiencing disrupted long distance calls and receiving busy signals or recordings indicating that a line is either busy or no longer in service when, in fact, the line is not busy or has not been disconnected.

The land line along the Carcross Road has been out of order on numerous occasions. Residents complain about the slow repair service. At Spirit Lake Lodge, an operation that relies upon the business it receives from tour buses and travel agents, the telephone was down 17 days in August and nine days in July. The phone rang busy when it was not busy; it was not even functioning. Consequently, a loss of thousands of dollars of business has been estimated.

As most Members are aware, highway lodge owners are financially dependent upon the business received during the summer to carry them through the remainder of the year. Telecommunications problems experienced during the summer months for days at a time have significant financial implications. This particular business has also reported that NorthwesTel has refused to make repairs on weekends, and that some repairs were charged to the lodge owners.

With respect to mobile radio services, those in Hootalinqua south who rely on the mobile radio have also reported a number of problems. Some have indicated that they want land line service and rate their present service as fair to poor, stating the problems occur frequently.

These problems include channels not functioning, an inability to contact the operator and inform the company that the channels are out, being informed by the operator that channels were working and learning later that would-be callers could not make contact.

One constituent reported that such channel problems occur several times in the year and have resulted in lost contracts when employers were unable to reach the resident on the mobile radio. With the individual's contracts averaging five days in length, at \$150 a day, this situation creates considerable frustration and financial loss for this individual.

<sup>24</sup> Residents with rural radiophones are concerned that their signal could easily be picked up on radios. One rural radiophone user located at Mile 7 of the Carcross Road reported that their signal is received on WHTV. Not surprisingly, this individual's gravest communication concern is a lack of privacy. Another radiophone user reported that clients attempting to call become frustrated when they cannot make contact. It is impossible to estimate the loss of

business that results from this occurrence. Furthermore, the constituent reports operators are usually ill-informed regarding the nature of the phone problems and when they will be addressed. This particular constituent suggested that service and consideration should equal the high price charged for telecommunication services.

In Hootalinqua north, constituents along the Mayo Road registered an even greater number of telecommunications complaints than those in the southern area of the riding. The Mayo Road landline is the source of a number of complaints. These include a reporting of party line problems and numerous quality and service complaints. As a few examples, residents of Mile 1 of the Mayo Road report inconvenience and a considerable loss of business as four businesses and two private phones must share a multi-party line; residents of Mile 4.5 on the Mayo Road have an estimated loss of \$500 per month as they must share a multi-party line with other businesses; residents at Mile 3.3 on the Mayo Road have stated that calling their number is impossible 80 percent of the time; another resident has reported the business loss of \$200 to \$300 per month due to a variety of telecommunication problems including the telephone not functioning, calls cut off, and an inability to dial long distance.

Residents, as well as business people along the Mayo Road, have reported problems with the party lines. These include: the general inconvenience and frustration created when too many users share a party line; loud and persistent static; and, disconnections during long distance calls. Constituents have reported that monthly charges are excessive given the quality of service received. A number of residents, particularly those operating businesses, want private lines, and while there are plans to replace the present lines with cable, the general reaction to the cost of upgrading the present service will almost certainly be one of outrage. This prediction is based upon the recent reaction of the residents along the Carcross Road cable and those on the Alaska Highway north cable when they became fully aware of the cost.

With regard to mobile radio service, some of the Mayo Road residents have reported problems with the service. One resident has advised me that radio equipment is frequently down and that improved radio transmitting equipment is required. Another resident has stated that given the nature and extent of telephone problems on the Mayo Road, it has become necessary to maintain a mobile radio for backup purposes.

These complaints keep coming in. A lot of them were received because of efforts made at public meetings to collect the complaints for documentation and presentation to the CRTC. In the course of receiving numerous letters and survey questionnaires that were completed by constituents, I received one letter that I will read into the record, if I may, because I think it is so well written in the sense that one gets the sense of outrage just from reading the letter. It says, "In April 1984 I noticed that my bill for phone was higher than a friend that lives across the street, so the next time I went in I questioned the amount of my bill, but not mentioning the other one as I did not want to get their bill raised. They looked on the computer and said that my bill at \$17 was correct, so I thought that probably he was being undercharged, so I left it at that. About a month later I was talking to another friend and asked him what he was charged. He said \$12, which was what I heard before. So I went back down to NorthwesTel and told them once again I thought I had been overcharged. They checked again and said I was being charged 12 airline miles and that all of the others were being charged six airline miles, but mine was correct. That seemed reasonable to me at the time, because I lived 12 miles from town. I did not want to see everyone else's phone bill go up so I left it alone.

"About four months later I got a letter from NorthwesTel with a computer printout of services provided to me. It stated I was being charged 12 air miles, had one desk phone and 50' of cord. This seemed correct to me.

"It was later that I found out from an Northwestel employee that I should only be charged for six airline miles' as it comes from the Wolf Creek exchange. So down I go again. This time I talked to the boss. I told him this whole story and he said that he could only credit me back to January 1 as they could not dip into last year's

profits, if you can imagine that. I told him that I had been overcharged for the past four years and wanted my money back, and needless to say, the conversation got quite heated.

"Finally, I decided to let him give me the one-year rebate, knowing that when I received it, it would prove that I had been overcharged all along. The reason that he did not want to pay anymore is that he said it was my responsibility to make sure I was not being overcharged.

"How am I, or anyone else, supposed to know that 12 or six miles are correct? Anyway, after I received my one-year rebate I went down and screamed at Erik Nielsen, CRTC and newspapers, and all of a sudden he could dip into last year's profits and did repay me all I was owed. I will bet you that the average person would not have got it back as it was quite a battle.

"Now for the second unbelievable. Northwestel came in my yard when I was not home and told my wife they were putting a phone in for a person that lives on the lot behind us. They asked her if it would be okay to use one of our trees to attach the wire to. She said it would be okay.

"When I came home I could not believe my eyes. They picked out the biggest and nicest tree in my front yard, right next to my driveway, climbed up it, limbed it completely and cut the top off. If this was not bad enough, they did not even clean up the mess.

So I went down and raised hell again. The very next day we had a bad wind storm and it blew a tree against this new line. Northwestel came out and felled the tree right on my wife's clothesline, wiping it out.

"If this was not bad enough, it dislodged the wire they had attached to my tree and they never did hook it back up again. So I feel they killed my tree for nothing, or maybe it was revenge.

"Do you suppose they would do that to someone's tree and clothesline in Riverdale?"

\* The sense of outrage comes across in some of these letters. I think the outrage is justified. It is important that we show concern in the Legislature about the quality of service in some areas of Yukon. I ask the Members for their support.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** Nothing I can say can parallel the feelings of the person who wrote the letter to the Member for Hootalinqua. It has been my experience in the last few years that I have been in political office that this has been one area of heightened emotions, especially when it comes to the quality of the service. It has only been in recent months that I have been able to take the time to thoroughly analyze some of the background that has contributed to this debate in terms of the financing required for NorthwesTel's operations and the requests they have made, historically, for further rate increases.

In that time, to make a long story short, it has become quite apparent to me and to the government that we had to make a very definite statement before the CRTC for precisely the reasons that the Member for Hootalinqua mentions, and also because we have felt, quite conclusively — especially after interrogation of NorthwesTel representatives at the hearing — that rate increases were hardly justified, and promises to improve the quality of service had not been met.

I should state at the outset that we will support the motion wholeheartedly. We are aware of many of the kinds of complaints that the Member for Hootalinqua mentions. In my own riding, the high cost of installation of poles and lines has been an ongoing irritant, which has cost many good people the service that has come to be expected and enjoyed throughout the rest of this country, and even through some parts of the Yukon.

Even once the land lines were put in, or the radio telephone service is established, many of those little irritating problems that the Member for Hootalinqua mentions continue to plague people's lives. It has even plagued my own life. I remember stopping to help somebody on the highway. I picked up the radiophone and it took me probably about 40 minutes to make contact with the radiophone operator. Either it was a long lunchbreak or a coffeekick, or the service was not quite as dependable as NorthwesTel would give us all to believe.

It was fascinating during the CRTC hearing to discover what it

was that brought NorthwesTel to feel that they could reasonably apply for an increase of existing levels of service.

I think it is important to bring it up. I will not restate all the arguments that were made as they are all on public record, and certainly the Member for Hootalinqua and the Government of Yukon's position is on public record. I think one interesting point for Members' edification should be brought forward now to put this matter in perspective. NorthwesTel and its parent company CN, has felt that it should have a return on equity, which is rather significant and certainly much more than the market forces and the demands of providing the service would seem to justify. I think one of the things that we have to spend some time analyzing and, ultimately, recognizing is that NorthwesTel's relationship with CN is a very cushy one indeed.

It appears that CN does very well by NorthwesTel. They regard it as being as an off-shoot of its own operations. They regard it as being a very lucrative sub-company and, in fact, it did a very, very handsome return from NorthwesTel. Not only do they get a handsome return as primary shareholders, they also receive taxes from NorthwesTel that they manage to absorb internally and never actually transmit to the federal government. I think the rate of return by the parent company is well over 20 percent that most Members would consider to be excessive.

Certainly Northwestel is a monopoly corporation and does not, therefore, face the same market forces as a business would in a competitive environment. I think that has to be taken into account when we are talking about financial risk as well.

I think the CRTC ultimately is going to have to make the decision here with respect to whether or not NorthwesTel has made a believable case to increase its rates and whether that case can possibly be justified given the tremendous outflow of capital to its parent corporation. Clearly it is the Government of Yukon's position, and all reasonable persons' positions, I believe, that they have not made a reasonable case at all. Their performance indicators with respect to the quality of service have shown that they really need to pull up their socks, because there are continuing irritations, both in terms of what the Member for Hootalinqua has mentioned, but also in terms of the capital investment that the corporation is prepared to put into the territory.

I think that the rate of return that they have is able to put them in a position where they can provide significant capital investment into our community and, therefore, improve the level of service and equipment, which we, the ratepayers in the Yukon, are entitled to.

To cut a long story short, we will be supporting the motion. We will also be watching CRTC's reaction to the rate hearing very carefully, and we will be very interested in their reaction to the points that the Member for Hootalinqua has made as well as the points the Government of Yukon made with respect to the corporation's financing.

We feel that there are a lot of questions yet unanswered, and there are a lot of commitments yet unfulfilled by NorthwesTel. I think in their deliberations ultimately they are going to have to take into consideration the kind of relationship that CN enjoys with NorthwesTel in that mix. We will be supporting the motion wholeheartedly.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I am rising also to support the motion brought forward by the Member for Hootalinqua. There is no doubt that Yukon rural telephone service is appalling. Many, many times in rural Yukon people are without telephone service due to equipment failures and poor maintenance. At times they are often without telephone service for days.

During the times of extended service outages, the residents have a difficult time in even getting any refunds for being without service. Rural residents often feel they are a low priority with NorthwesTel and the cost and quantity of the service they undergo bear this out.

I certainly want to tell the other Members of the Legislature and the Member who brought forward this motion that he has, by no means, cornered the market in Hootalinqua for poor telephone service.

Throughout rural Yukon, I have run into very many cases where people have that on their number one complaint list. I am aware of

situations, one at least in Carmacks, where people are after rural telephone service and the telephone company has quoted a rate that sounds like they are trying to rebuild about three or four major trunklines in town. It is well beyond the capabilities of most individuals to be able to pay for some of the line cost running to their situation.

I want to sound an alarm for all Members of the Legislative Assembly to be aware of. I have some concerns for the situation that Northwestel is going to find themselves in, if one situation, which I will enunciate, in Faro continues to happen.

I have no doubt that their revenues are falling. That is causing a request for increased funds and that gets back on the existing rural services and more people are disappointed and fall off the system. We get into a catch 22 where revenue goes down, the costs go up and they tend to give less service.

The situation specifically is this: Curragh Resources are, at the moment, entering into a contract with a private supplier to provide satellite telephone links with Toronto, Whitehorse and Vancouver, through the use of a satellite dish. The installation is well beyond any of our means; it is about \$250,000, but they will be saving in the amount of \$1,000 per day in long distance charges. They will be able to pick up the telephone on their own private system and reach Toronto directly.

The problem, as I see it, is when some of these large industrial and commercial businesses drop off the system, NorthwesTel will feel that sort of lowering immediately. That could be in the range of \$500,000 a year to them. The situation is simply this: and I realize there are people in rural Yukon who do not have the financial resources and are not in the position to be able to afford it, but we are on the brink of a point where a normal land-line service is expensive to maintain by the company, is costly and is not the solution to that.

The Department of Community and Transportation Services is undergoing a total review of communications policy in the territory. I am sure that one of the results of that study is that there are better and more efficient methods of communication. At the moment, as I have said, unfortunately that is outside the cost parameters of many people in rural Yukon. There will be a time, I would hope, in five years or less when that changes and people will be able to get better telephone links, but not at \$5,000 per rural household unit.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that I feel that any rate increases in the near future granted to the company, would not only be unjust but would also not induce the telephone company to be any more responsible to the rural customers than they are now.

29

**Mr. Brewster:** I am going to go about this in a little different way. I am going to just speak for the people in the Kluane area who have written in to me and told me different horror stories. Some of them are not very nice.

This is one from a small business. "We have four business phones on one line. When someone is in line to hook up, it takes an hour or more to wait for her to get on the other phone. The charge for this service is \$35 per month." This is for pay phones. "Also, when you phone in your problems, it is not recorded on your records, which looks really good when they have the records given to the CRTC."

"Re: telephone problems. My greatest concern is when anyone is trying to locate our phone number through the directory assistance operator, let us say from Calgary or from any other city in the south, the person cannot obtain that information unless he or she knows to ask for Destruction Bay exchange. Therefore, I know that it has cost me a very considerable amount of money and disappointment for our clients not being able to book a reservation with us in Burwash Landing. Separate listings in the phone book should be made for Burwash Landing and Destruction Bay, which are 10 miles apart. Also, this information could be changed and relisted properly on computers and operator centres. Otherwise, what is the purpose of having a telephone.

"At our very busiest tourist season, our pay phone was out of order for six weeks. We had to let the tourists use our own private office phone. The reason it was not fixed was because the lineman was on holidays for six weeks. Does the NorthwesTel only have

one lineman or repairman?" You will have to excuse me. Some of this is a little hard to read. "It just almost drives us nuts when people come in all the time to use our private phone. We do not believe they tell the truth to the CRTC. They do not seem to have any complaints in writing to the CRTC."

This one is another one. "Very poor service. Repairs or connections take as long as one or two months. Poor communications. The line connection is sometimes static and cannot hear a proper sentence. Less communication is a hindrance to the work of the church. Improved technology has cut overall costs for operators, so what is the need to increase the price. Is this mere greed?"

"Insufficient power transmission from the repeater sometimes will not allow calls to come through or calls could be cut off the line. I have to dial, on the average, three times per call to get out of the Haines Junction exchange. Waiting for repairman to come out from Whitehorse is sometimes a long wait, if you just happen to miss his bi-monthly trip. I also certainly feel that we are paying more than enough for our service. Long distance call prices are becoming quite prohibitive."

"Our phone service has been terrible for so long that we have almost resolved ourselves to living without it, except that there are certain things you cannot change. Considering the service in comparison with other rural areas, we are already overcharged."

"That is just what a few of the people in my area think. I can tell you a couple of stories about the things that happened to me. When I was first elected as a Member of this House, we moved three miles out of town. The telephone line went by there and went up onto the repeater station, and I asked for a phone. I went four, five months without a phone. When my friend, the hon. Minister for Porter Creek East, would want me, he had to phone the police and they would come down and get me. Finally it got to the point where they were a little teed off about this. I got in here and they went after me, and I just made it plain to them that if they were so damn smart why did they not do something about it."

This is an example of what happens. They phoned and when I got home the next morning, they were out there hooking it up. That made me about five times as mad because I learned what political pull was, and I did not think very much about things like that. When a private individual cannot get it and then the Government Leader phones and the man is there the next day. I also found out after three lines there, they were holding these three lines for the lights at the Haines Junction Airport, which incidentally, we still have not got, and that is a number of years ago."

I will be having brought in very shortly pictures of two live moose that were wrapped up in telephone lines that they just abandoned and left. The man is sending me the pictures and we will be having more motions on the floor here. I presume the Minister of Renewable Resources, who is shaking his head, will give some support on that one."

I can tell you another story of our doctor out there, Dr. Henderson, who lives at Canyon. People across the road have a phone but he does not have one, so when the people phone for a doctor, the people across the road have to run across the road and get him. They came up with a bright idea to hook onto their phone and run a phone across into his house. The cost for this was \$985 which Dr. Henderson paid. Then along came the road crews and rebuilt the road up about a foot and, therefore, they did not have any poles long enough to get over it, so he still has no phone."

It took him a year to get his \$985 back, and believe me he is just as stubborn as me and he had some real ferocious fights, but he did succeed in getting it back. It was a year later and he did not get any interest."

He informed me yesterday, the Champagne-Aishihik Band, who now have a little village at Canyon, are going to get a pay phone immediately. I have no objection to them getting a pay phone, I agree they should, but it is very strange that after all this time our doctor still cannot get one, and they are putting one across the road."

In closing I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, that when this debate is over, to forward all of this to the CRTC."

*Motion No. 85 agreed to*

**Motion No. 89**

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

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 4?

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

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the government should introduce legislation which would amend the *Motor Vehicles Act* for the purpose of requiring that, on designated Yukon highways, motor vehicles be driven with their headlights on at all times.

**Mr. Phillips:** I brought this motion forward today as one example of small but significant action which we, in this Legislature, can take to make our highways much safer.

For the past several years, Yukoners have observed signs on most major roads that clearly state, "Drive with headlights on at all times". The vast majority of Yukoners have realized the safety value of preserving this practice. One only has to drive on Yukon highways during the early dawn or twilight hours to appreciate the increased ability to see oncoming vehicles when both drivers are using their headlights.

As Yukoners have been encouraged on a voluntary basis to observe these signs, there should be little or no problem in formally adopting this policy and making its observance mandatory. For those Members in the House who need some convincing, I have gathered a few statistics to prove the Lights on for Life program does save lives, and no one can argue this point.

In Sweden, in 1977, when the policy became law, daytime accidents dropped by an amazing 32 percent. In Finland, when this policy became law in the winter months only, accident rates dropped by 20 percent. Closer to home, it has become mandatory for all motorcyclists to observe this practice, and a 40 percent reduction in accidents has been reported.

Grayhound Bus Lines, which travels all over this country, has reported a 24 percent reduction in accidents since adopting the policy. Many trucking companies — for example, the Yukon-Alaska and White Pass trucks — have this policy in place now also have had a significant reduction in accidents because of this policy.

Some provincial jurisdictions, such as Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, are beginning to do what we, in Yukon, started several years ago. These provinces are now moving toward implementing mandatory Light for Life programs. The federal government recently announced that in 1989 it will be mandatory for any vehicle manufactured or sold in Canada to contain an automatic daylight driving system.

I would like to take a few moments and read into the record from a report, "Potential of Daytime Running Lights as a Vehicle Collision Countermeasure." This report was prepared by the Road Safety Unit, Road and Motor Vehicles Traffic and Safety Branch of Transport Canada.

"The use of a vehicle's lighting during the daytime can increase the visibility of a vehicle and can improve the driver's ability to estimate its location and direction of travel. Collision surveys conducted by both industry and government have demonstrated that the use of driving lights during the daytime can reduce the number and severity of multi-vehicle collisions. Vehicles can be made more conspicuous by making them larger or by increasing the contrast between the vehicles and their backgrounds."

"The maximum size of a vehicle is clearly limited. In fact, the current trend is toward smaller, more economic cars in Canada; the average size of vehicle population is continually decreasing. The contrast between a vehicle in its background is typically greater for light-coloured vehicles and for vehicles equipped with highly reflective or fluorescent materials, but the contrast between any colours or reflective materials and their background does not change appreciably with the change in the level of ambient illumination."

"As illumination decreases, therefore — for example, at dusk or dawn or on heavily overcast days — conspicuity will decrease despite constant contrast. The luminance of a light source, on the other hand, is constant and, if the source is bright enough and large enough, its luminance would be greater than that of most unlit

objects on the landscape."

<sup>32</sup> Even under the brightest daylight levels, if a vehicle was masked by its background, properly designated lights could improve its conspicuity. In addition, the contrast between a light source and its background increases as the ambient illumination decreases. Consequently, during daylight conditions in which the visibility of a vehicle is reduced to the point where it might not be detected, the use of daytime lights would certainly be an advantage. Daylight conditions in which vehicles would certainly benefit from having running lights include twilight, dusk, dawn, adverse weather conditions such as rain, fog and snow, and when silhouette against a bright sky at sunset or at sunrise.

It will be two years before the federal program that is mandatory and is implemented nationwide. In the meantime, many lives can be saved if we in this Legislature today take action. I believe that Yukoners are very concerned about highway safety, and when researching this topic I found a great deal of encouragement and support for this motion. In fact, the general comment that I received, and I talked to possibly 20 or 30 different individuals, was that this was a commonsense approach to this problem.

Our heavy highway traffic and our types of weather and road conditions lead me to believe that we should take this important step now. We can take the lead in this issue. We do not have to wait two years until the law becomes mandatory nationwide. We can save lives today. The evidence is conclusive, the Lights On for Life Program does save lives and saving lives is worth the cost of implementing this policy. For this reason I urge all Members to support this motion. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I hope the Member who put forward the motion is not upset if I do not speak at some length because I can tell him that we do support the motion, and I think the Member would expect a little bit more than to watch me sit down again.

I believe that the statistical evidence that the Member has brought forward is what causes us as well to review the issue and has caused us to want to vote in favour of the motion now and to, as the Member puts it, help save lives in the coming months. Perhaps, in order to fill a little bit of time and to show respect to the Member that we are interested in supporting this wholeheartedly, I can tell him from personal experience travelling Yukon highways, either in blowing snow or even following a truck that picks up snow and following a truck that kicks up dust, it has often been my experience that close calls have been experienced from meeting up with other cars coming in the other direction who meet you at 20 feet in the midst of a snow or dust cloud. I have noticed that safety on the road has been greatly improved when people voluntarily switch on lights at the beginning of their trips and have their lights on while they are highway driving. It certainly helps from a number of perspectives, not only in cloudy, dusty and snowy conditions, but also the times when the night is pitch black and it is necessary when you are travelling down the centre of the road as most Yukoners generally tend to do when they are all alone, it certainly helps to know that there is a car coming in the near future and you are going to have to slow down and pull off onto a soft shoulder.

Certainly from my own experience, it appears that the provision to have lights on at all times is very useful and we see no reason why we should not be making this mandatory. It is definitely a safety rule that ought to be obeyed and really has to be obeyed. So, ultimately, what I am saying once again is that we support the motion and I want, on behalf of the Legislature, to bring the necessary amendments forward to the *Motor Vehicles Act* as soon as they are drafted.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I also rise in support of the motion brought forward by the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale North. As enumerated by the Member for Mayo, frequent and long driving on the Yukon Alaska highways at all times of the day and night leave one to believe in the intent of this motion and that it is a very good suggestion as brought forward by the Member.

<sup>33</sup> Not only at times of dusk, twilight, early morning light, or with snow or rain storms, I find that if one has his or her lights on when coming around corners it warns one just a little sooner. As many of

us know, in the Yukon, roads are not as straight or as rigid as many of them in the prairies. Who knows, that few seconds of early warning might be quite enough to avoid an accident.

The only reservation I have with the motion is that I am not sure, and the Minister did not allude to it, how enforcement would take place. It is a little difficult when going by, since one only knows when meeting a vehicle whether his lights are on or not, and then they are gone. I am not sure what the enforcement provisions would be. I am sure that whenever the *Motor Vehicles Act* review is completed that is a particular issue that could be addressed.

There is very little else I can add that has not been covered by the two previous speakers. I would like to conclude by saying that it is a very good motion. It is one that many of us who spend a lot of time driving the roads in the Yukon would wholeheartedly agree with.

**Mr. Brewster:** I will, of course, be agreeing with this motion. I think the Members of this Legislature who have to come in here every Sunday night or Monday morning realize just how important lights are. I would like to correct the record a little bit for the Minister. I believe he said the lights should be on when it is pitch dark, and I think we are talking a little bit more about daylight.

I noticed lots of times when you are driving and a tourist is coming along they have their lights off because they are not used to it. As they pass you, quite often they will put their lights on, which indicates to me they realized how much faster they saw you than you saw them. Cars seem to blend on these roads, especially with chipseal. Maybe because of the long miles you have gone, you may be daydreaming and you do not pick it up, but those lights you do pick up almost immediately and a long way away, so you are very alert that it is coming. They are very important.

I notice more and more tourists driving this way. We have signs up now telling people to travel this way; I would suggest these signs be changed, and I know the Minister of Transportation will like this put on the signs that it is the law. You must drive with your headlights on. It is very important, as the Minister mentioned, to trucks. Or when the snowblowers are going down the road blowing snow all over the place and half the time you cannot even see them, but you can still see those lights shining. I think it is a very good motion.

The fact that the Government of Canada is going to apparently make it law within the next two or three years that your lights automatically go on when your car is turned on indicates that there is something to this.

The Minister of Justice is always trying to beat the rest of Canada in doing something first. Listen to this one. We all agree.

<sup>34</sup>

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I had not intended to speak, but I will intervene very briefly. This is a social control measure, but it is motivated by public safety. It appears that all Members are agreeing. I would wish to compliment the Member for Riverdale North for his research and his introduction to this motion. I rise, primarily, to ask a question, which the mover of the motion can answer in his summation.

The statistical information and the survey information was extremely interesting. I would ask the mover of the motion if he has compared the effect on public safety of mandatory use of headlights and mandatory seatbelts. I would ask if he has compared the public safety effect of those two issues, which are substantially related. I would thank him in advance for the benefit of any answer he may be able to provide.

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

**Mr. Phillips:** I would like to thank all Members for indicating their support for this motion. In answer to the question from the Member for Whitehorse South Centre, no, in my research I did not compare the differences. In the literature that I have received from the Saskatchewan government, I do not believe it compares the differences. I suggest that the difference I see here with this legislation is by you turning your lights on protects me. When

someone buckles up they protect themselves. In this particular case, I think that it serves two purposes. It is your safety for the other car seeing you and you being able to see the oncoming vehicle. I think it is important. Maybe the issue the Member brought up is an issue we should address in the future. I am sure we will.

I would like to thank all Members in the House for support on this motion. If anyone who has driven the highways has ever encountered vehicles that do have their lights on, you can see them in the distance. The Member for Faro mentioned the legislation is something that can be worked out without a great deal of problems. I think a little more signing on some of the highways, possibly some literature in our tourist information booths when tourists arrive in the territory, making them aware of the program, a little more public awareness, and I think a great many Yukoners now do drive with their headlights on at all times.

Lots of times, when I am driving on the highway, and I see an approaching vehicle that does not have its lights on, if you just flash your lights at it, they usually realize that they do not and they turn them on and you are just fine.

It might serve two purposes. Down south, if there is a speed trap ahead you flash your lights. So, they may not only turn their lights on, but they may slow down. It might kill two birds with one stone.

I thank all Members for supporting this motion.

*Motion No. 89 agreed to*

#### **Motion No. 95**

**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:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Member for Kluane: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Government of Yukon should urge the federal Department of Public Works to improve the condition of the Alaska Highway between the Donjek River and the Alaska border at Beaver Creek.

**Mr. Brewster:** In speaking to this motion, I should point out that this is not the first time I have called the Minister's attention to this section of the highway. It is very much like the BC section of the highway that we voted unanimously to have upgraded on December 1986. The motion was presented by my colleague, the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North.

In many places, this section of the highway is still the old, original Alaska Highway roadbed that was laid down on miles and miles of muskeg. Further, it is very narrow, being only the width of the original road. There are also many sharp curves that should be straightened out.

The road is now so full of humps and bumps that it literally shakes cars, trucks and buses apart. The road crews do their best, but they do not really have much to deal with. Each year, a little patchwork is done, so that there are a few short stretches that are now quite good. However, little has been done on the muskeg-like sections, or can be done. A new roadbed is required.

If the Members opposite had voted for my previous motion with respect to the relocation of the Highway Superintendent West to Destruction Bay, the government would be more aware of the problems with this section of the highway.

There are several good reasons for upgrading this stretch of highway. First of all, it would help promote the much-needed tourist traffic. Yukoners cannot take the tourist traffic for granted. Many tourists simply will not make the effort to travel here if they know our roads are bad. Many of them invested a lot of money in their recreational vehicles, cars, trucks and campers, so they do not want to shake them apart.

Currently, the highway lodges are doing a thriving business welding trailer hitches, axles, springs and other parts of vehicles and putting them back together. Word travels fast. All it takes is a few motorists who have had such a bad experience with our roads and our tourist traffic will start to decline.

In previous debates in this House, I have mentioned the fact that the tourism statistics in Kluane are declining. We have to do something to improve these statistics. I feel this is a good place to

start. Accordingly, I anticipate the support of the Minister of Tourism for this motion.

A second and, perhaps, more important concern is the safety of the travelling public. Every year, there have been deaths on this treacherous piece of road. The narrowness of the highway and sharp curves have been contributing factors. I believe the Minister of Community and Transportation Services will be sympathetic to this request, having recently experienced himself what it is like to leave the highway.

His colleague, the Minister of Justice, will attest to the fact of how hard it is to stay on the road in this area. Accordingly, I will anticipate the support of these two Ministers as well.

I would also like to advise the House that I have the support of the Alaska Highway Lodge Association and nearly every lodge on the north highway is a member of that association. I urge every Member of the House to support this motion, and urge the federal government to improve this section of road.

In this House, we have already voted to improve the eastern portion. Let us complete the job and improve the western section as well. Let us bring this up to the same standard as the rest of the roads in Yukon.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I hope Members do not think that because I have left the road once that I make a habit of it every time there is a curve in the road. I am also aware that there are other Members who have first-hand knowledge of that very thing. We should form a club.

We will say at the outset that we will support the motion. We do recognize the value of the road for the tourism industry and for the businesses along the highway. We recognize that every time a motorist has a bad experience on the Alaska Highway coming to the Yukon, that that experience will inevitably be translated to friends and acquaintances elsewhere in the territory and probably in the United States. That publicity is something that the tourism industry does not need.

Because it has not come up in the debate so far, I should make the point that there is an agreement called the Shakwak Agreement, which has the U.S. government paying 100 percent of the capital costs for improving the Haines Road and, also, the Alaska Highway from Haines Junction to the border. The deal is attractive, if the federal government puts the money forward and if the state government makes this a priority.

The deal is meaningless if the U.S. federal government does not put forward the money and the state does make this particular project a priority. If the federal government of the United States and the state government are prepared to assume the capital costs of the upgrading, and are prepared to do that in short order, we would encourage Public Works to remedy the situation through the agreement.

In the coming months, we will attempt to determine what the state government's intentions are, with respect to this project. I can inform Members that, at one stage last year, the state government expressed a lot of interest in supporting the project and stepping it up so that the construction would be done in a fairly tight timeframe to cover all the section of the road between Haines Junction and the border in a construction blitz. That was not an official communication; it was an informal one. The state's priorities have been changed in the last year or so, given the serious budget cuts that they have undergone and the realigning of their priorities. We will have to determine whether or not the Shakwak Agreement is an agreement on paper only and can bear any fruit.

If it is obvious that it can bear fruit, then it would be our preference for the U.S. government to upgrade the highway in accordance with that agreement; that the cost not be borne by the Canadian taxpayer.

However, clearly, if the agreement does not bear fruit then the Department of Public Works is going to have to assume this responsibility for the road and recognize it as a greater priority than they have in the past. They must recognize the value of this particular road to the tourism industry in the Yukon, and certainly to the businesses along the road.

Having said that, clearly we will support the motion. Not only do



we want to see the Alaska Highway South upgraded, we would also like to see the Alaska Highway North upgraded. Our preference is to have the Shakwak project approved, but if that does not hold out any hope, we will urge the Department of Public Works to put funding forward to ensure the necessary work for this project will be undertaken.

**Mr. Phillips:** I will be brief when I speak to this motion. It ties in very closely with the motion I raised in this House earlier in this session with respect to the condition of the Alaska Highway. I think it is extremely important as our federal and territorial governments have spent many millions of dollars with Expo and with other tourism promotions encouraging people to come north. Most of these people are not only coming to Yukon, but on their way to Alaska. That section of the road certainly does need some work.

The Member for Mayo also mentioned the tie-in with the Shakwak project. I would just suggest to all Members that for any Members who happen to be fortunate enough to go on the exchange to Juneau, it would be a grand opportunity for us to lobby our American friends in Juneau. I can assure all Members that when I leave the House this evening, I will begin my lobbying with my American friend also working towards making the changes necessary to upgrade this road. I encourage all Members to support this very worthwhile motion by the Member for Kluane.

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

**Mr. Brewster:** The one reason I brought the motion up is that I was scared we would start talking about the Shakwak Project. I have been in this Legislature for five years and worked two years before that on the Shakwak Project, so that is seven years. They have done less than 140 miles in seven years, so the poor people in Beaver Creek will be six feet under if we are going to wait for this. That is why I brought this up. This is very urgent. I am not saying that we should run around next spring and build new roadbeds. I realize we cannot do this.

Somehow we must get proper roads up there. This is very dangerous. These cars are snapping off their trailer hooks, the big trucks are flying around up there and it is a very narrow road. Anyone who has not seen the original Alaska Highway should go up and see what the original Alaska Highway was. There is just a cigarette paper between the two cars and if one is over just a little, that is it, you hit and you cannot help it. On some of the corners you almost have to stop to get around them; they are almost 90 degree. This could be straightened out with not a great deal of work.

We are looking for work for people so I urge you to bring this to the attention of the federal government very forcefully that this is something that has to be done, even if next year they tear up some of the chipseal and straighten some of this road.

There are people killed up there every year and there are two reasons for it. One is the bad curves and one is the narrow road and the other one is that the distance between places to get emergency help is so far.

I do not know why I am always having to scream for poor little Beaver Creek. There are 37 people up there who have gotten a lot of my attention, and I am going to keep right on fighting for them because they need a lot of these things up there. If you check customs records, you will find a lot of people turned and went up over the Forty Mile and down into Dawson City because of that stretch of road. The rest of the road is wonderful. If you find that the Shakwak project is going, I would plead with the Minister not to let it start at Haines Junction, let it start at Beaver Creek and come this way because the road in between is quite passable. Let us do the worst part of the road first.

*38 Motion No. 95 agreed to*

**Mr. Clerk:** Item No. 3, standing in the name of Mr. Lang.  
**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 3?

**Mr. Lang:** On the next sitting day.

**Speaker:** So ordered.

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

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 5?

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

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

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with item 6?

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

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

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with item 7?

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

**Mr. Clerk:** Item No. 10, standing in the name of Mr. Brewster.

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 10?

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

**Mr. Clerk:** Item No. 11, standing in the name of Mrs. Firth.

**Speaker:** Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 11?

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

**Speaker:** Motions respecting Committee Reports.

## MOTIONS RESPECTING COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

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

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

**Speaker:** So ordered.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I move that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and 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:** Committee of the Whole will now come to order. Before we continue with Bill No. 7, we will recess for 20 Minutes.

*Recess*

**Chairman:** Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

## Bill No. 101 — An Act to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Act (No. 2)

**Mr. McLachlan:** I have one amendment I would like to table immediately that will clarify one issue that was raised by the Minister of Justice at the Second Reading speech.

Further to that, I have some problems, at times, trying to discern the government's real intent or feeling in this. The Minister is saying one thing in his second reading speech, but seems to be indicating another thing. For example, he has used expressions that say we are not really in opposition with the Member for Faro's aims, then again saying it is clearly intended as an incentive or as an encouragement to increase home ownership in the territory. He then has made definitive statements about a special relationship with a particular company.

The amendment tabled today is designed to clear up that special relationship that the Minister has referred to.

I would like to draw your attention to a couple of other things. Reference has been made to applicability to 50 or 60 homes in Faro, and I would like to point out to all Members that that was the figure for 1986; it could get higher in subsequent years — 50 or 60 refers only to 1986 and that is simply because many of those home purchases were signed after June 30, 1986, thus obviating the 180 day residency requirement.

The Government Leader has often stated, in October of 1985 when the original deals were signed, that the government supported the principle of home ownership in Faro. They saw it as something the community needed, something the community did not have before and something that contributed, in some small part, to the problems that Cyprus Anvil Mining Corporation had.

40 The Minister has also referred to the fact that Faro Real Estate Limited could, with a special provision as afforded by this Bill, then take advantage of and jump into the private housing market in other areas of Yukon and I want to point out to Members that that is not the case. An inter-company agreement between Faro Real Estate Limited, the Government of the Yukon Territory and Curragh Resources specifically restricts the activities of Faro Real Estate to the municipal boundaries of the Town of Faro. The real estate company can only operate in that town because there was some concern about the mortgage being paid down, and any opportunity for Faro Real Estate to operate elsewhere in the Territory could lose the cash flow and cause cash equity dilution problems, plus they would not have capital to be able to pay off the mortgages outstanding to CMHC, Toronto Dominion Bank and Government of Yukon.

I have a further amendment that I would like to table that will clarify some problems that have arisen or some interpretation of the term in clause 3, the so called sunset clause, which makes reference to conventional mortgage financing available to the residents of the Town of Faro.

Finally, I have another document that will refute statements made by the Minister of Justice that conventional mortgage financing is available now to the people. This is a document from CMHC to the firm of solicitors in Toronto for Curragh Resources in regards to the sale of the units to Faro Real Estate. The relevant item I have outlined is on page two and is highlighted, and it makes it very, very clear by the programs officer for the B.C. and Yukon Regional Office in Vancouver that conventional mortgage financing is not available under NHA to the people of Faro who are purchasing these homes from Faro Real Estate.

41 **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I will have questions about those concerns. I was aware of the restrictive covenant, or the nature of the restrictive covenant, if not the specific agreement between Curragh and Faro Real Estate, but saying that that answers the problem I do not think is accurate. Covenants in contracts are of an entirely different level than laws passed by the Legislature. It is entirely possible for contracts to be changed, and the remedies, of course, are entirely different. If a person breaches a restrictive covenant, they are not breaching the law.

The answer that there is a restrictive covenant is simply a partial answer, and it does not answer the real concern.

After saying that, it is not necessary to continue this kind of debate, because the proposed amendment — this is not formally moved, of course — is tabled, and it adds the concept that this Bill would only apply to rental option to purchase agreements within the municipal boundaries of the Town of Faro with Faro Real Estate Limited or the Town of Faro. That has restricted the application of the proposed Bill even more than it originally was, which certainly answers that concern about the restrictive covenant. It is clear that it would only apply within the municipal boundaries of the Town of Faro.

I will deal with the questions one at a time, rather than making a longer speech than necessary in order that I will not be called confusing or trying to have it both ways. The aim, of course, is to facilitate, or to gain, an advantage for the holders of these rental option to purchase agreements, which would be an advantage to both the occupier and the company, Faro Real Estate Limited. It is

certainly accurate to say that we have sympathy with that aim. It is a question of how you do it. The Member proposing this Bill has proposed to do it by changing the law, which is not the only way to do it, but this law proposes a scheme that applies to Faro, and does not apply elsewhere.

42 I am going to ask the Member who is proposing the Bill to justify that, in that I will ask the question about if some other community, and I am sure there are rental-option to purchase agreements in other communities, asks for the same treatment, why should they not get it? What is the reason to entrench in a law a special treatment for Faro?

**Mr. McLachlan:** I want to correct the record on one comment the Minister made. There is no benefit to Faro Real Estate Limited. The benefit is to the homeowner who has entered into the purchase agreement. The benefit is to the homeowner. I want to make that clear. He or she is simply getting the homeowner's grant to which they are entitled to, under the purposes for which the Bill was introduced in 1976. Further to the Minister's question, the particular clause should now read, or will read, I hope, when the amendment is introduced, "A person who has entered into a rental option to purchase agreement for property situated within the municipal boundaries of the Town of Faro with Faro Real Estate Limited, or the town of Faro." The reason for putting in Faro Real Estate Limited and the town of Faro is that if the rental option agreement and its applicability is not specified it may very well open the doors to people within the municipality of Whitehorse who are renting an apartment and who will then say a portion of my apartment rent is for taxes, insurance, water, sewer and garbage and, under my rental agreement, I should then get the Home Owners' Grant. That was not the intent of the legislation. The intent of the legislation was clearly for those, as an incentive, as the Minister and Government Leader has stated, to encourage home ownership in the territory.

I believe that by putting in the particular relevant applicability to Faro, or the Town of Faro, or Faro Real Estate Limited, I have made the situation easier, done the Minister of Justice a favour, and have simplified it and kept the doors closed to a flood of other applicants from other parts of the territory, realizing that this particular type of agreement is unique to the municipality of Faro and, as I have indicated at second reading speech, has been occasioned because of the refusal of a Crown Corporation to provide conventional financing.

43 **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I understand that answer, but it does not answer the question that I asked. I understand very well that this amendment will clear up a potential loophole that was identified at second reading. I understand that it will make the administration really quite simple and understandable, but it would only apply in Faro. The question is: why should the scheme only apply to Faro? Why is it not fair for someone in some other community to say, "Why not me, too?"

**Mr. McLachlan:** I believe the answer is yet more simple. The conventional mortgage financing exists for the residents of Dawson City, Haines Junction, Watson Lake, Whitehorse. The document that I tabled earlier specifically says that anybody purchasing in Faro does not have an equal chance at financing that the other residents of the territory do have. I have tried to make that clear by outlining the particular relevant clause.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Well, I will go on to that issue, but I will come back to the general issue of fairness for all of the communities. I dispute the two claims that were made. I dispute that in the very technical sense, or in lawyer's language, in a legalistic interpretation, conventional mortgage financing is available, in fact, but this scheme does not fall within the conventional mortgage financing guidelines. That is really what the Member is saying. The scheme that exists between Faro Real Estate Limited and the various occupiers does not fall within the conventional mortgage guidelines. That is certainly accurate, and it is well documented here, but we already knew that.

The other concern and the other statement is that conventional mortgage financing is available in other communities. In the sense that he means it, that is not accurate. The problem of mortgage financing is a problem in all of the communities outside



Whitehorse, every single one of them. Rural Members, I am sure, will attest to that. We have had motions about the availability of mortgages in this House. In fact, the Member for Faro has participated in some of them. It is clearly the fact that mortgage financing is a problem for the residents of all communities.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I agree that it is a problem for all communities, but in no community that I am aware of have the CMHC people specifically said no, we will not look at it, we will not consider it. They are, at least heretofore, under this situation with the purchase agreements in Faro. I did not set the national policy; I cannot change it, and I must abide by it as best I can.

I would also like to draw the Members' attention to something else. We underwent a substantial debate in this Legislature in April 1986 when, I believe it was, the Leader of the Official Opposition raised a number of questions about the way the existing mortgage documents were written for the purchase of those homes. The Minister of the day at that time stood up and said "there is nothing wrong with the mortgage, we signed it the way we did, we drew it the way we did, a little bit rushed in order to get the mine operating and to establish a principle of home equity." Having said that in the Legislature, having demonstrated it on numerous occasions, as I say, by both the Member, the Minister and the Government Leader, I find it a little strange that they are now running for cover. When the Member from that particular community then says that it is fine and we agree with the principle to, but why can the provisions of the Home Owner's Grant not be available to us. Again, that is the intent of the legislation. I am not sure why the Minister of Justice is drumming up problems at every turn of the wording. There is not a lot more I can say that I have not already said in trying to make the amendments as clear as possible to clear up the loopholes. The Bill is simple in itself, four clauses. I rest my case.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The questions are not about the interpretation of the Bill or the simplicity; it is about the policy of the Bill and I am asking for a justification of the policy.

The Member raised another issue and he compared the statements made by Government Members about the mortgaging in Faro. Indeed the Official Opposition questioned the Government at some substantial length some months ago about the mortgage safeguards, and this is an example of a completely different kind of safeguard. As all of us are aware, there already is mortgaging on these properties but the mortgages are not signed by the occupants of the properties; they are originally signed by Curragh. I am assuming through the business relationship between Curragh and Faro Real Estate Limited that Faro Real Estate Limited has mortgages that are secured exactly by these properties.

"It is a problem for the government, in the sense of treating different mortgages differently. We are aware that there is mortgage financing on these properties. It very well may be that mortgage financing can be discharged and other mortgages put in place on the individual units. That, I know, is legally possible, and I know that there are substantial commercial interests in all of that, and there are commercial reasons why that is not happening. I know that.

To state that mortgage financing is not available in Faro is not accurate, because there certainly are mortgages in place on those very units. It is not the conventional mortgage that the average home owner knows and understands.

The concern of the government is that we know perfectly well that it is possible to arrange things so that the "conventional" type of mortgage would be more readily available and would be possible. What we are asked to do, as Members of this Assembly, is to vote on a special law to accommodate a particular commercial relationship.

That has two aspects of it. The first one is that if it is fair for some people, why is it not fair for all people. The second one, which is more complex, which we will come to, is the concern of the public interest generally in the Faro deal, and all of its ramifications and all of its details, in that the government was certainly involved initially in the plan to separate out the housing from the assets of the mine generally. That was a consideration in the start-up package, as all Members are aware.

Dealing with the simpler of the two questions first, I am still stuck on the concern about why it is desirable to pass a special law

for Faro that is not applicable to the other communities. I have not yet got a satisfactory answer from the proposer of this Bill, and I would anticipate an answer that dealt with the alternatives. The alternatives obviously are changes in the commercial relationships.

**Mr. McLachlan:** The Minister is raising a red herring when he says that there are mortgages on those already, therefore there must be mortgage money available. The mortgages that presently exist on the houses are there simply because they are assumable mortgages. Some of them have two, either CMHC or TD, and everyone has a general YTG because of the \$3.4 million loaned to Curragh and secured by a loan. They are there because the government requested it. They are not there because there is mortgage money available.

Unless the Minister of Community and Transportation Services is going to jump in and say, "Yes, there could be, if Yukon Housing Corporation purchases them all and looks after the housing problem in Faro." I have heard no such venture to date. If we believe the Government Leader's statement so far on the subject that he want to proceed with the private home ownership deal, I do not think the idea of Yukon Housing Corporation getting involved with mortgage money is an issue that would really fly.

I would throw the question back to the Minister, or the Minister of Community and Transportation Services, or the Minister of Finance who is administering the program, and ask them how many home ownership grants have been refused in other communities. Faro is the only community that the home ownership grants are being turned back by saying, "I am sorry, but your deal is rather unique, and it is not covered in the legislation."

I said earlier that the financing is available for other communities in the Yukon. The programs are being followed through. The home ownership grants are being completed and granted. They are not in Faro; they should be. They should be under the principle recognized in the original 1976 Act. I do not have as much of a problem as the Minister does in simply saying this is a specialty clause with a specialty company for a specialty purpose. I am simply saying that the government is duty-bound to recognize the principle established in the legislation that we have been following for 11 years, and recognizing the right of Faro residents to that home ownership grant money.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The proposer of the Bill did not answer the question, but I will speak about the red herring, or the additional red herrings, which are raised by Mr. McLachlan. One of the options is for Yukon Housing to be involved. That is rejected by the proposer of the Bill; it is rejected by the Housing Corporation, and I am sure it would be rejected by the Conservative Party as well, but they can speak for themselves, of course.

Yes, that is one option, but it is an option that I would suggest, in commercial language, is a non-starter, because it is simply impractical. It would involve Yukon Housing discriminating among communities to do something entirely different in Faro than they were doing in all of the other communities.

"That is one option, but the other options, which are not non-starters, are changing the nature of the commercial interests here, or the private agreements, either between individuals and Faro Real Estate Limited, or among the other actors, the banks, the mortgage insurance company, the mine and Faro Real Estate and even, perhaps, the government. Those options have not been specifically considered or answered by the proposer of this Bill.

I would emphasize that the government has certainly come to the aid of Faro in a very, very major way in opening this mine. We cannot change the laws in order to make Faro a special case for all sorts of things. It would be entirely reasonable, I would think, for someone in Haines Junction, Dawson City or Teslin, or even Riverdale — probably more in Riverdale, in fact — who have rental agreements with options to purchase who would say, "Me too". I am asking for consideration of all of those options. That is the general question.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I did not get an answer to my request about whether home owner grants are being turned down or rejected in other communities.

The Minister has brought up changes. He has alluded to the idea of changes, and I certainly want to point out to him that Curragh Resources has indicated that they are in no way getting involved in

the housing market. The banks appear to have made a decision. The banks' decision is that they get involved only in mortgages when CMHC will, and CMHC has said no.

The Minister has alluded that maybe the government has changed. That is interesting. Community and Transportation Services has announced a major housing program in the next five years, but they are not sure whether that included all of the housing stock in Faro or not.

It would serve the Minister's cause if I simply said, "Okay, I would agree to a change, and I think maybe the answer is an agreement for sale." I am not going to do that, because although I agree it would work, what the Minister is failing to recognize is that, again as a number of people in the Legislature realize, what we are dealing with here is rural Yukon.

That particular side of the House, the government, has one — not two — rural Cabinet Minister. Sometimes that is difficult to get home. The Minister should realize that people who move into a situation for a job do not anticipate being in that situation for a long period of time, are interested only in accommodation only for the length of time they are at the job. If it requires renting, fine; if it requires living in the bush, that is fine. If it requires purchasing a home, that is fine too. Some of the people who come are only there for a short-term period. You can define short-term as anywhere from three days to three years. Those people will depart the situation overnight, upon their last pay cheque, under any circumstance; they will leave. When they leave, they leave the particular premises they are living in, sometimes with unpaid bills, sometimes leaving the house empty, with no regard whatsoever to their obligations.

« That then leaves the owner of the property, one who has entered into a proposed agreement for sale proposed by the Minister, then in a situation of trying to take repossession. As the Minister well knows, that can take 12 months; it will take at least six months repossession time. In the meantime, it is entirely possible that 50 or 60 housing units are tied up in Supreme Court trying to get possession of a vacant unit under a terminated agreement for sale.

The Minister and the Members have to realize that the particular option to purchase or rental agreement was drafted in Faro to take care of, or to look after, that situation. It has brought its headaches, I agree, but it has also brought a situation that allows people to come in, in some cases, with all of their personal possessions in the back of a pickup truck and to get housing immediately and to espouse the principal of home ownership.

The agreement for sale makes it easy for the Minister; it is already covered in the legislation. The agreement for sale option was negated a year ago when the original documents were signed. Although the Minister would clearly like me to say that that is fine by us, I am not going to make it that easy. Again, I am saying that the government should realize its obligation to the homeowners in Faro and make that grant money available. They have fulfilled the terms: they have purchased the home; they have paid their tax bills; and, they have lived in the home for 183 days, as required by legislation. I do not believe it particularly onerous upon government to worry or to be concerned that the proposed legislation makes it specifically relegated only to a Faro Real Estate Limited situation or in the municipalities on the boundary of Faro.

« **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The proposer of the Bill used the phrase "the Minister of Justice's cause". I think he has a misunderstanding of the nature of the debate. This is not my cause, this is his cause. I am trying to completely understand the implications, and I am, in the words of some Opposition Members, not getting any answers, so I have to continue asking the questions.

The concern that is made is raised by the Member for Faro, Mr. McLachlan. At least he has attempted to address himself to the commercial interest and has talked about essentially the law of equity and the concern about repossession of properties on a mortgage foreclosure and the difficulty of that. Yes, it is a cumbersome procedure for the mortgage holder, and I understand that. I have been in those situations myself as counsel but in looking at the answer that the proposer has given it clearly illustrates a difficulty with this measure, and I will explain it this way. It is recognized by the proposer of the Bill that the *Home*

*Owner's Grant Act* is an Act in order to promote a principle, and that principle was accepted by the Legislature by passage of the Bill and it continues to be acceptable and promoted and I am sure on all sides of the House. What the Member is talking about — and I will use some of his words — is that the occupants are "only there for a short term" and he commented about the instability of their employment and the fact that they may leave overnight and simply abandon the home.

Those, unfortunately, are characteristics of tenants; those are not characteristics of home owners. Home owners do not do that because they have an interest in the property and it is obviously in the owner's interest if they move or if they are intending to vacate the property to get paid out and to sell the property. That is what common people mean, and what everyone means, about home ownership — that you have a stake in the property, it is yours and you protect it because it is yours and it is something that you own. The problem here is that under this scheme, in the proposer's own words, these people do not have this kind of a stake. And, I am not saying all of the occupiers of these dwellings are doing that. I think, in fact, some of them do and some of them do not.

« The problem is that the legal arrangement does not give the occupiers this ownership interest. The legislation already recognizes the concept of an ownership interest, which is not actually title to the property. An agreement for sale is acceptable. The problem here is that these are simply options to purchase; they are not agreements for sale, or that is the real characterization of the commercial contract.

The next question — although I would emphasize, we have not left the first question — is that if the government were to accept this principle for Faro, it would be abandoning the principle of the whole Bill, of the home ownership grant program, because it is accepting something that is not an ownership interest. If that were the policy, it would only be appropriate to apply the grant or to make the grants available to renters as well as owners. It would be administratively less cumbersome to give the same benefit in terms of lower taxes in the first place so the owners would not be put to the expense of trouble, and the administrative expense as taxpayers, of paying their taxes and applying for a portion back and waiting for the cheque and all of those things.

The concept is substantially changed if we do not hold to the principle that this program applies to owners, and should apply to owners.

« I apologize for not answering one of the earlier questions that were put by the proposer of the Bill, and he put it as a question. The question was: "Why is it that the applications from Faro are being turned down and other applications are not being turned down?" The clear answer is that renters characteristically do not apply because they know that the program does not apply to them. The problem in Faro is that there is confusion as to the status of the people who occupy those premises. In fact, they are tenants who have an option to purchase. They are not owners, and they do not have an agreement for sale; they do not have an ownership interest in the land. That has obviously been a source of the confusion. It may have been the case that they were encouraged to apply in order to test the system, but I am sure that it was only in the nature of testing the system. I do not know the specific facts of all of that; I have not been involved personally. I would be interested if the Member for Faro has specific information for that. The answer to that question is clearly that people who do not have an ownership interest generally do not apply, and if they do apply, they are turned down just as anybody who does not have an ownership interest is turned down. That is the answer to that. If there is specific information I am not aware of, I am sure the proposer of the Bill will be pleased to give it.

I would essentially return not to the more complex question about the policy of the Bill, because we have not really got there yet, but to the first question about the policy of passing a specific measure for one community that would not apply to other communities. I ask again in different words essentially the same question: What is the rationale for that? When residents of other communities say, "Me too," what is a defensible answer?

« **Mr. McLachlan:** When I asked the rhetorical question about

why the home ownership grant applications are being turned back, I was not referring to renters. I know that the renters are not applying. I am referring to those people who have entered in to the option to purchase agreement who have applied because they have filled all the terms and are being rejected by the Department of Finance.

I would like to come back to an issue that the Minister brought in reference to those people whom I referred to who only come for short term employment. They had the option to rent; they had the option to purchase. They chose the option to purchase, bought the house, signed the documents, got the downpayment together and moved in. And, for whatever reasons, I do not know, they decided to go under a short term arrangement that did not work out, and they left. I am not referring to renters. They had the option to rent and chose not to. They chose to purchase and, for whatever reasons, decided that they would have to leave.

Thirdly, other corporations that are doing business with those people under the option to purchase agreement have recognized the principle that the Minister has alluded to called ownership interest. That is the coverage provided by the insurance companies who have recognized the term insurable interest. They have recognized that with each monthly payment a homeowner acquires more equity for each month. I tabled the document, I am not sure where the Minister has left his, showing the increased equity in the house on each annual anniversary date. That clearly establishes an ownership interest. The insurance company has recognized the term insurable interest by including a tenant as a loss payee for part of what is owing in the event of a fire.

<sup>53</sup> The only people who are not recognizing the insurable interest, the equity interest, is the Government of Yukon. I am asking them to recognize that by making the provision of the grant money available.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Mr. McLachlan has used three terms that I am going to ask for an explanation of. He has spoken about equity and he has used the term "insurable interest" and the term "ownership interest". I would ask that he would explain the difference, if any, between ownership interest and insurable interest.

**Mr. McLachlan:** The term "ownership interest", I am referring to simply as the continuing monthly basis upon which the owner is acquiring more and more equity in the property. The term "insurable interest" is one used by the insurance companies to define to whom the loss payable should be made in the event of a fire. Insurance companies have recognized when the documents were drawn up the decreasing amount owed on the unit with each monthly payment, and consequently have boiled that part into their formula. The insurable interest description simply refers to that particular term or those relevant terms that the insurance company is using when the policies were written for each individual tenant.

<sup>54</sup> **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I am still not clear on the difference between ownership interest and insurable interest, but it appears from the proposer of this Bill's answer that there is a difference, and he is recognizing a clear difference. I would ask for further explanation about what that interest is.

I have a further confusion. The term "ownership interest" was defined by Mr. McLachlan as, I believe the words were, "acquiring more and more equity in the property". As I understand it, the only way to acquire equity in the property is to have an interest in the land, which is acquired not through an option to purchase or a rental agreement in that an option to purchase does not grant any equity. The only possibility of any equity is after an option is actually exercised and some equity is gained. So I am confused about the definition of ownership interest in terms of equity and vice versa. I am still not clear as to the interpretation here between ownership interest and insurable interest.

<sup>55</sup> **Mr. Phelps:** If the quasi opposition on the side opposite keeps filibustering like this we will never get out of here.

**Chairman:** The time now being 5:30, we will recess until 7:30.

*Recess*

**Chairman:** The Committee of the Whole will now come to order. Bill No. 7, *First Appropriation Act, 1987/88*, Department of Justice, Program Corrections Facilities. General Debate continued.

### Bill No. 7 — *First Appropriation Act, 1987-88* — continued

#### *On Corrections Facilities*

**Mr. Phillips:** When we closed debate the other day on this issue, the Minister was describing to us the positive aspects of the Haines Junction correctional work camp. Can the Minister elaborate a little on any problems that they had in that camp. Did the camp proceed well with no problems during the summer? Could he tell us about that also?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** There was a minor problem that the Member for Kluane has questioned me about in Question Period. There was a disturbance one evening at the camp, and all of the inmates were returned to Whitehorse and punished. The disturbance involved alcohol.

<sup>62</sup> **Mr. Phillips:** I understand from rumours that up to 80 percent of the inmates were actually punished for this. How were they punished?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** All of the inmates were punished, I believe. They lost 10 days of what they call their "good time", except for one person who lost 20 days.

**Mr. Phillips:** Were there any criminal charges laid? I understand there was a truck stolen; they obtained some liquor; there were accusations of a break-in. Can the Minister tell us whether or not there were any charges laid by the RCMP?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** There were no charges laid except under the *Corrections Act*, which received the punishment of, in effect, a jail term for 10 or 20 days, but there was an RCMP investigation which was inconclusive.

<sup>63</sup> **Mr. Brewster:** The Minister has had a pretty easy day today, and I thought we should ask a question so that it is not quite as easy as it was. It rather bothers me that once again we pass it off to the poor RCMP who cannot defend themselves; that they investigated and did not have clearance. I presume that is right. I have no problem with that but, with that in mind, I have to accept that the rumours I pick up all over Haines Junction are true, because I have nothing to dispute them.

**Mr. Lang:** I guess my concern here is security. Here we have a situation where there were 10 inmates and we had a situation where they left the area that they were supposed to be in. Well, I see the Minister shaking his head. Were they supposed to be down breaking and entering into a church? Is that part of the terms of reference?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** In answer to Mr. Brewster, I am in no way blaming the RCMP. I simply indicated that there was an investigation that was inconclusive, which I am certain was not the fault of the RCMP. It is my information that this disturbance did not involve people going off the property. There was liquor involved, and the liquor came from somewhere, obviously, off of the property, but I do not know where it came from.

<sup>64</sup> **Mr. Lang:** Is it not correct that there was, I believe, one church broken into? Was that not where the liquor was at least thought to have been obtained? There was liquor missing from that particular institution. I believe it was wine.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I have heard that rumour, but the RCMP did an investigation and were unable to come up with evidence to substantiate the charge, obviously, so I do not know for sure. That is certainly the rumour that went around Haines Junction at the time. I do not know if it is true or not.

**Mr. Brewster:** I am not going to carry this on any further.

I realize that you are not blaming the police. I just have a problem when things like this come up. Rumours are floating around, and the police say it is inconclusive, which I am prepared to accept. I realize that the Minister is not passing the buck. I would think that two personnel, two guards, trying to guard 10 people is rather ridiculous. It is quite apparent that you are going ahead with these correctional things. I personally disagree. A lot of people agree; however, I am an older type, and I believe that if people break the law in society, they should be punished, not turned around and allowed to sit around in deck chairs in the churches and such things like that; having people delivering tea to them. However, I am not going to get into that. I do think that the security should be looked after.

I recall, right after they were out there, that I saw a movie where, down in Tennessee, they had the same problem with young people. The American Marines took them over and put them through boot camp training. This just did not start; this has been going on for about 10 years. The return of people to that camp was less than five percent, and all they did was give them the same training that they get in the military. I do not think that our little moddelling-coddling here is going to be anywhere close to five percent, I will tell you.

**Some hon. Member :** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lang:** I want to go further on the question of security. Does the Minister feel that two personnel for the purpose of guarding these individuals, who are there for a reason, is sufficient?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** For those particular inmates, yes. They are selected on the basis of the potential security risk, and they are not security risks. I would ask Members to consider the implications of the extra security. It is extremely expensive. It is expensive to the taxpayer. The situation is that at the jail there are certainly people who require substantial security, on a staff-to-inmate ratio of approximately one-to-one, and the assistance of the maximum security facilities. Those inmates are a minority. The majority of inmates are nuisances when they are drunk, but when they are in the jail, they are not a substantial security risk.

I am not advocating that we have no security. It is certainly possible, and it is desirable, to have a minimum security setting for those inmates who qualify for that classification.

**Mr. Lang:** I would like to pursue this a little further. I noticed that the Minister picked up on the cost of security, and I am not going to argue that. I would say that your ability to screen is very much in question, in view of the experience that we have just had in Haines Junction.

Obviously, one might term this as an innocent little party, but quite conceivably something could have happened which was well beyond any capabilities of the two personnel involved. Obviously, it was beyond their capability at one stage, because the party took place. Further to that, the MLA for Kluane indicates that the RCMP were called in:

That brings into question just exactly what we are doing and how we are doing it. I recognize that there is a cost to anything we do. Just as we stated earlier to the question of young offenders and the secure custody project that the government is launching where you are not going to be able to lock anybody in. Yet we are going to have 30 personnel there and \$1 million of O&M costs to the taxpayers of the Yukon.

Did the Minister ever explore the idea the MLA for Kluane suggested with respect to what is happening in some of the states, a boot camp if you like, for the military?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The work camp experience is designed on that same philosophy as the boot camp experience. It is not precisely the same thing, but the philosophy is that the inmates serving time should not be watching TV or lying on their beds during the day, they should be working and acquiring work skills. That is the same philosophy, generally, as the work camp.

The Member for Kluane, Mr. Brewster, has a concept which he has explained to me privately, and also on the floor of this House, which is generally that there be more discipline than there is in the jail now.

The experience at the work camp is that the people on the work crew performed very, very well. Part of that was because the supervisors are simply excellent. They have a style of working along with the inmates and teaching them jobs as they go along. The spirit of work was simply excellent all last summer. That kind of work skill and work spirit on a work crew is the kind of atmosphere we are wishing to have at the camp.

The military atmosphere, although it has some substantial positive points, is not the same work atmosphere as might be expected on a work crew in the Yukon.

**Mr. Brewster:** I am sorry that we got into this this far. I would like to point out that it is my understanding that when they were given the tough job down on Kathleen Lake to move and put the path in, it was refused. All the work they did was around town, putting up and painting fences. However, when there was a job that required a lot of work, to move the rocks and get that trail in, that

was turned down. If it was turned down by the prisoners or by the guards, I do not know, but I think it is rather ridiculous.

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** It is my information that the community resisted the work performed in the park. The rationale was that it was taking away work or potential work from other people. That is the rationale that I am aware of.

**Mr. Brewster:** This is the last time I am going to get up. I would like to move on to something more pleasant.

Maybe they did. If they did, they were right in doing it; however, I find it very peculiar that the community would resist that and yet they let them tear down all the buildings there and do all the other work that took work away from people. They then told the National Park that they could not do the same thing. That is rather hypocritical, but that could be what happened.

**Mr. McLachlan:** The Minister enumerated where the camps for 1987, 1988 and 1989 will go. Who determines, or how does one get on the selection list for a rural camp?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The list I gave is not conclusive, but I gave the list on purpose because it is necessary to do some advance planning. It assists in the planning if we know where we are going to go. The plan was to start in Haines Junction in the first year because of the availability of work in the national park. The community made it quite clear that they did not support that, and we are making every attempt to accommodate the wishes of the community.

The next consideration is the distance from Whitehorse as it is an expense to move inmates and staff back and forth. That is a consideration.

The third consideration is to spread the benefit. Because of that, it is seen as desirable to go to the various communities around the Yukon. It is certainly possible to put the mobile camp in every community. In Old Crow, it would be extremely expensive, but it would be impossible in other communities. If this program continues over the course of 12 years, it may be that it occurs once every year in all communities.

Other than that, the selection is arbitrary. The communities are close to Whitehorse. If any community has a project that they want performed in 1988 or in any future year, that could possibly be accommodated.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I raised the issue because Mr. Brewster said at some point there would be some concerns in the community about cutting out jobs for people who live there. We do not have that situation in Faro; in fact, we have the opposite. There are sometimes too many jobs and not enough people to go around, and that is why we have imported help. I am just wondering if that could be a logical conclusion, some time in Faro, and I realize it would have to be taken up with the town council.

I would like to ask the Minister if the camp is only available for rural communities or does the Minister envision work being done, such as if the Member for Porter Creek East wanted trails cut in his riding, they could be cut?

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The camp, as the trailer units exist, are in Whitehorse the majority of the year. Although I have publicized this, this is essentially not a new program; it has been going on for some years.

**Mr. Lang:** Just for the record, if I want something in Porter Creek East I will ask for it myself. I do not need any help from the Member for Faro.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is there anything further on the general debate? *Correctional Program, Administrative and Security Equipment in the amount of \$74,000 agreed to*

*On Departmental Program Equipment*

**Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** This is primarily occupational health and safety equipment, and is a training and loss prevention equipment. The larger amounts are for test equipment, for water, for noise, for chemicals in the air, and the like.

*Departmental Services Equipment in the amount of \$28,000 agreed to*

*Department of Justice in the amount of \$178,000 agreed to*

**Department of Renewable Resources**

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Renewable Resources informa-

tion appears on pages 63 to 65. General debate.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I am pleased to present the 1987-88 Capital Budget for the Department of Renewable Resources. This \$1,747,000 budget represents a continuation of this government's strong commitment to improving recreational opportunities for Yukon residents and visitors.

Before getting into the detail of the budget, I would like to draw Members' attention to page 64 on the Capital Estimates; in the Expenditures category the line reading Campground Management should read Campground Development.

I would like to begin by breaking down the information on page 64 to give the Members the specific project capital allocations on parks. We have five items: \$360,000 for Herschel Island Park Planning and Development; \$200,000 for inventories analysis and site identification work for the parks system; \$70,000 for the Heritage Rivers Project; \$70,000 for work on Coal River Springs Territorial Park; and, \$50,000 for the Frenchman/Tatchun Interpretive Centre.

Under Campground Development there are 11 items: \$158,000 for Campground Rehabilitation; \$225,000 for campground replacement; \$30,000 for Campground Planning; \$40,000 for expansion of the campground at Teslin...

**Mr. Phillips:** Point of order. Could the Minister go a little slower, we are trying to absorb all these figures.

**Chairman:** Would the Minister proceed, going a little slower?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** ...\$150,000 for Campground Boundary Surveys and Land Acquisitions; \$35,000 for development of a management plan for the Dalton Post Recreation Area; \$20,000 for planning for the Tarfu/Snafu Recreation Area; \$20,000 planning for the Watson/Wheaton Recreation Area; \$10,000 for planning for the Frenchman/Tatchun Recreation Area; \$40,000 for a Natural Features Access Plant; and, \$95,000 for Recreation Access Development.

There are no new capital expenditures planned for 1987-88 under the Wildlife Management Program.

Under Departmental Services there is one main item; that is \$174,000 for the replacement of existing equipment and acquisition of new equipment for the department.

I would like at this time to provide some comments on some of the larger items in the capital budget. I would be pleased to provide Members with more information on the smaller budget items if they want when we go line-by-line through the budget.

The largest single item in this budget is \$360,000 for planning and development of the Herschel Island Territorial Park. As Members are all aware, establishing the park is a commitment arising out of the COPE claim settlement, and we are acting to fulfill that commitment and create our first territorial park; \$90,000 of this item is for salaries for two park planners. Other costs include funds for architectural and pre-engineering design work, upgrading and renovating existing structures on the island, rental expenses, travel and communication and the necessary equipment and supplies. Because the creation of this park is part of the COPE Agreement, this \$360,000 is recoverable from the federal government under the terms of the Canada/Yukon COPE Cost Recovery Agreement, which I signed with the Minister of Indian Affairs.

Another major capital item is \$200,000 for Park Systems Inventory Analysis and Site Identification. This includes \$150,000 identified as Parks System on page 69 of the Capital Estimates. That \$150,000 is budgeted for the continuation of the Recreation Features Inventory.

The intent of this project is to identify significant recreation features within a 50-kilometre corridor along Yukon highways. The other \$50,000 is for the Analysis and Site Identification Project that will take information from the inventory project and use it to identify potential sites for new parks. This budget item will allow us to develop our information base and analysis upon which our new territorial parks system will be based.

The \$158,000 budgeted for campground rehabilitation will allow us to replace facilities and rehabilitate campgrounds that have deteriorated through usage over time. During the next fiscal year, we expect that most of these funds will be spent on the campgrounds in the following locations: Simpson Lake, Ethel Lake,

Francis Lake, Minto Lake and Squanga Lake.

The \$225,000 budgeted for campground replacement is part of an ongoing project to provide funds for the replacement of campgrounds that no longer meet our standards and that cannot feasibly be rehabilitated or renovated. The campgrounds identified for replacement in 1987/88 is the Big Creek Campground located about 40 miles west of Watson Lake. This campground, which is used heavily, is now worn out, and the existing site needs time to recover from the usage. Because of this and because there is no space at the existing site for expansion of the campground, it will have to be relocated. It is expected that this relocation will require the full amount budgeted to Campground Relocation in 1987/88. Subsequent budget years will provide funds for replacement of other campgrounds.

The \$150,000 for campground Boundary Surveys and Land Acquisitions will allow us to complete the surveys of boundaries of existing campgrounds. In addition, this will allow us to consolidate title to the lands on which our campgrounds are situated.

The final major budget item that I want to address is the \$174,000 for departmental services. The Members will note that this \$174,000 represents an increase of \$104,000 over the 1986/87 Capital Year. This is because the 1986/87 figure of \$70,000 was an historical figure, a rough estimate that was not based on any analysis of the department's equipment requirements in view of the current inventory, as well as upgraded standards and criteria for equipment.

The 1987/88 Budget of \$174,000 is based on a detailed analysis of worn equipment that must be replaced. We have identified requirements for additional equipment to meet the department's program commitments. If the Members so desire, when we get to that line item, I can break it down to the last snowmobile, boat and power saw that we are delivering, by community.

The Members will note that the Budget that is being presented is a considerable decrease over 1986/87. The main reason for the decrease in funds allocated is for funds that were allocated for campground development. That decrease reflects the completion of two major campground projects, on the Dempster Highway and the one on the Nahanni Range Road. That is the Budget that we present here today.

**Mr. Brewster:** I know it would help an awful lot if some of those figures could have been given to us before we had to go into this. It is very hard to pick those up and try to debate at the same time. However, it would probably delay debating a little as we try to figure out what they are.

I note on page 49 that you have Campground Management; should this not be Campground Development too? On page 69. Until you corrected that, in one or two places you had Campground Development and then you had in two places Campground Management. Now, you have corrected the one on page 64, and I presume the one on page 69 should be corrected, too. Is this not correct?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes, that is correct.

**Mr. Brewster:** Our Leader has gone through a lot of this budget, particularly the parks one, with this COPE thing; however, I would like the views of the Minister. Really, we are spending all this money up there, and I realize that we recover it, but, realistically, how many tourists will get into those areas in the next 15 years?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The Member states that the numbers given at the beginning were too quickly done. What I would like to do is, when we go line by line, give the numbers again, break them out again, so that you can have another go at them.

I believe around 300 people registered at Herschel Island. The initiative for Herschel has been in the works for quite some time, and I believe the previous government were insistent that that be set aside and developed as a park in the negotiations with COPE.

**Mr. Brewster:** I do not have a great problem with doing these things; however, we have that one; we have Coal Springs, and we have a few more where we are isolating them out and about the only people who can get in are a few people who hike in, backpack in, or have a lot of money to hire airplanes. Quite frankly, and, as Minister of Tourism, the Minister will agree that these are not the

people who really keep the economy of the Yukon going.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I do not have the specific figures that the tourism industry brings in broken out to the degree that the Member speaks about. I think that we can obtain that information from Tourism as to what the impact is, by sector, if you will, as to what is expended. I think that it is safe to say that the Yukon is recognized in the world community as a very attractive wilderness area to visit. I think that the effort that Canada and the Yukon is doing in the northern part of the Yukon is speaking to that attraction by developing parks and setting aside certain areas of the Yukon for use by ourselves and the world communities. I think we should be proud of that particular area. It is a very unique area in the world, and I believe that we should be showcasing that part of our wilderness.

**Mr. Brewster:** This is getting back to one of my favourite subjects. The Chairman will realize this when I bring it up. A great deal of this budget is for tourism, and I fail to see why conservation officers, who are trained for four or five years, have certificates to look after game are running around looking after these campgrounds. I fail to see why this is not transferred over to Tourism where it belongs so the conservation officers can get back to looking after game. Maybe the Minister has a view on this.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I think there is a direct correlation between what we do in parks development and how that translates into tourism impact. I think that it is recognized throughout the tourism industry that the Yukon has some of the best campgrounds, bar none. In other words, neighbouring jurisdictions do not have the quality of campgrounds that we possess. I think that speaks well of the Yukon, so there is a direct impact. When we do develop our campgrounds we initiate some developments within our parks in terms of interpretive signs and trail development. All of those expenditures do benefit the tourism industry.

When the mining industry was down on its knees in the Yukon, thank God there was a tourism industry that picked up a lot of the slack. I think the Yukon has a very healthy tourism industry, and if we can spend some capital dollars on parks development to enhance that, I, for one, believe that we should.

Quite frankly, the transferring of the responsibility from Renewable to Tourism has never been a point of discussion between the two departments. I would be prepared to sit down and talk about the merits and see if it is an idea that can be followed through.

**Mr. Brewster:** The Minister is being like Mr. Chairman was when we had these discussions. I am not disputing that we have the best campgrounds in North America. I am trying to point out, and maybe I do not get my words across very clearly, that we are using conservation officers who are trained for four years in universities to look after wildlife. They are spending a great deal of their time running up and down the road, checking wood in campgrounds and things for which you could get another person who does not have quite that much education, and does not have a diploma, to do the same job. It is related to tourism, and it should be with Tourism.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The Member is correct; The COs are involved in campground management, but the percentage of time that they spend on campgrounds are relatively miniscule as opposed to the time they spend in wildlife enforcement.

**Mr. Brewster:** I wonder if the Minister could give me a breakdown, because in my travels around the Yukon I find them very, very often making out contracts for wood or checking wood or such things as that. It would be very interesting to see just how much time they do put into these places.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The guesstimate is 20 percent of their time.

**Mr. Lang:** I just want to follow-up a little further after my colleague, the MLA for Kluane. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister's very well-founded praise of the campground system that is in place. Incidentally, just for the record, I think one individual who is no longer with the department can take a great deal of credit — Mr. Dennis Connelly — for being able to provide the service he did within the small budgets we had over the years, and the superior campground facilities that we have throughout the territory.

I want to go back to the observation about the amount of money that is being spent in out-of-the-way places. I think that is the point

that is being stated here. Like the Minister, I have been to Herschel Island. This year we are projecting \$360,000. That is over \$1,000 per visitor, according to your figures. Now I am not here to get into a statistical battle, but it is safe to say, and fair to say, that we are not going to get a lot of people on Herschel Island in any given year. Now what concerns me, based on my knowledge of Herschel Island. How are you going to spend \$360,000 other than to spend, say, \$90,000 for two park planners to have a look around and have a nice summer — it is a nice way to spend the summer, I will not argue about that — but what are you going to do? There are only a couple of buildings. The buildings have weathered well. Very little work, as the Minister knows, has to actually be done to the buildings because, fortunately, it is in a very cold climate so they have not deteriorated to any extent. Maybe if we followed the MLA for Kluane's point of view, it would be better to spend \$200,000 at Silver City where the buildings are falling down. I think that is the point that is being made; it is all relative in respect to the priorities that we have, and that is the observation that is being made.

I know we will get into it in line by line items, in respect to the question of how you will spend \$360,000 on Herschel Island. What I would like to know, and what this budget does not tell me, is how much are we going to spend in total at Herschel Island? Are we starting a 10-year program of \$360,000 a year or what are the projections until we have completed the Herschel Island program?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Herschel Island is not something we have decided to spend money on out of territorial funds. As I pointed out in my introduction, the funding for Herschel Island is coming from the federal government, and we will receive a full reimbursement for those costs. The reason why we are in Herschel Island is because there is a piece of legislation that has been negotiated among COPE, Canada and the Yukon Government, which is constitutionally in French, so we are driven by this legislation to perform this work on Herschel Island.

**Mr. Lang:** I am not arguing that at all. We are fully aware, especially the Member for Kluane and myself, and are very familiar with the Herschel Island and COPE Claim. I am not arguing that at all. I think it is safe to say that the Leader of the Official Opposition can take full credit for the fact that the Yukon did come out of the whole situation with something.

You are planning \$360,000 that you can say is federal money, but I would like to take the point of view that it is all our money and forget federal versus YTG. The question is how much are you planning to spend up there? You could spend \$2 next year and meet the constitutional obligation.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The figure that is projected over the next four years is that approximately \$1 million to be spent on Herschel Island. If the Members are advocating that we should walk away from the agreement and simply not control the development, I am sure it is going to be spent by the federal government and they would take up management with the Inuvialuit. That is the question before us.

**Mr. Lang:** That is not the point being made. I hope the Minister is not taking it in the context that the Members of this House are saying to turn our backs on Herschel Island. That is not the point at all. It is difficult to say that any Member of this House, at least any Member on this side, is opposed to Herschel Island, because we are the ones who fought for it.

How do you spend \$1 million on Herschel Island? That is my question. I do not have any problem with doing some preservation work with various things there, but I do question how far all levels of government are going with respect to that particular project. Maybe the Minister does not think \$1 million is a lot of money. In general government terms, perhaps it is not. This side thinks it is a lot of money, and maybe you could get away with spending \$400,000 and meet our obligations and provide a pretty good service with respect to that particular park. That is the point I am making.

At that stage, maybe we can say to the Government of Canada, "Instead of spending \$1 million on Herschel Island, if we can get away with spending \$400,000 or \$500,000, could we direct some of those dollars into areas that the MLA for Kluane expanded on, where we do get a great deal of traffic and provide a service for the



people who do go through those areas? Has the Minister considered that proposition?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The agreement for the work on Herschel Island is to spend two years in developing the park, then there will be a review of the expenditures to see if there will be a continuation of the additional two years that are deemed to be necessary.

We are constantly, as we move through the system, looking at other areas for development. We can ask the federal government to give us \$360,000 to develop, for example, Silver City, if they are prepared to joint fund, but there is no way that we can get monies identified by Treasury Board for Herschel Island moved over to expend in another part of the Yukon.

**Mr. Phillips:** I understand that we cannot get the funds moved over, but has the Government of Yukon not gone to the federal government in negotiations and set out a list of priorities? I, too, agree that we should preserve and protect what is on Herschel Island. If the federal government has \$1 million to give us for parks, we could really enhance Yukon tourism by building that road into Kluane and providing access to some of the facilities there. That would bring up thousands of tourists to see one of the most beautiful parks in the world. Maybe the government should be sitting down with the federal government and looking at redirecting some of those funds.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** It would be different if they did that, if they gave us \$1 million for parks. The Member for Kluane knows that some of us have been after the federal government for funding to develop Kluane Park, and they tell us that there is no money in Parks Canada to promote that kind of development. The federal government is saying that there is \$1 million to meet our constitutional legal obligations to develop Herschel Island under the COPE Agreement. That distinction has to be made. We do not have control over these funds. They are being spent because of the constitutional commitments that were made by Canada when they signed the COPE agreement.

**Mr. Brewster:** I understand that once money is appropriated, it is appropriated. The Minister mentioned the national parks, and there is quite a difference between this and the national park. The national park has a superintendent. He is in the civil service bureaucracy. He is told what to do from Winnipeg who is told what to do from Ottawa. We have a Minister who should be in Ottawa lobbying and saying what we want.

It is not just Silver City that we are talking about. The Montague House in Carmacks is falling down and has been for years. No one has done anything to that. We should be lobbying for some of these things that people can see. It is quite apparent that the government spends money any place. It rather shocked me to hear the Minister say that it did not matter, it was federal money.

That federal money came out of my pocket too and out of everybody's. There are too many people in this world who have this philosophy. Where do they think the federal government got the money? It comes out of our pockets. It is time that we started to get realistic. We are blowing money, and no one is advising the government differently. They are literally throwing money and they do not know what they are throwing it at.

**Mr. Phillips:** I have one last thing on Herschel Island. The Minister said earlier that approximately 300 people visited Herschel Island last year, is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** Those are the numbers I recollect. I can get the specific number, but that is the number I remembered.

**Mr. Phillips:** When the Member comes back with that information I think it would be interesting to know how many of those 300 were actually private citizens and how many were the Minister and his entourage, or other groups who arrived on a cook's tour. I would like to know how many government groups versus private people were actually there. I would like to know how many people went to Herschel Island with their own money to see Herschel Island. If the Minister would bring that back, it would be very interesting to see.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I will attempt to ask for a breakdown as to the origin of the visitors.

**Mr. Phillips:** To move off of Herschel Island for a minute, the Minister gave us a speech on parks. A great deal of this budget is

for parks development. Can the Minister tell us, with all the parks development that is going on within YTG, the local parks, is the basic policy of the Minister and the government that these will all be multiple-use parks?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** As the Member probably knows, Section 10 of the *Parks Act* very clearly lays out a public consultation process. The results of that public consultation process will be folded into a park management plan. The management plan will then be the document that guides and speaks to what use the park will be made of. That is how the system works.

**Mr. Phillips:** Right now we have a large number of parks. I think 15 or 16 percent of the Yukon is alienated by national parks, wildlife preserves, sanctuaries and that type of thing. Are there any more plans for any more of those types of sanctuaries or singular-use parks or restricted-use parks in the territory?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I think the figure the Member talks about, 15 or 16 percent, is wrong. I will ask the department to do an assessment of what kind of park land we have withdrawn from normal use. I will come back with that figure to let you know as accurately as we can predict how much land in the Yukon has been reserved for park status.

In terms of the question about whether we have any other park developments planned outside of Herschel and Coal River, there are not any other parks actively being planned. Kusawa was looked at at one time, but there was a major problem with the clay — part of the hill shifting and cutting off the road. There was a study then that indicated the likelihood of another major mudslide in that area, and it is very likely that we will have to take a second look at that proposal.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would like to ask the Minister that if Kusawa, the way he talks, is doubtful, then why did we put that big, fancy road in there this year?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The expenditure for the road was done under the Community and Transportation Services budget. They initiated that planning.

**Mr. Brewster:** I have trouble. I do not care who it was put in there by. Why was it put in if you people are not planning on keeping the campground going? What is the point of it? Where is it going to? What is it doing up there?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I am not the Minister of Community and Transportation Services. The question should have been put to him in the budget debate under Community and Transportation Services.

**Mr. Brewster:** I do not know how I could put that to the Minister when I did not know that they were not planning on renewing the campground at Kusawa. I presume that when they put in a big road like that, and I passed it every day coming to town all year, that the campground was going to go again. Now I find out it is not. If I had known that, I could have suggested that we take that money and put it on the Aishihik Road and looked after the two campgrounds that are in there that are not falling apart.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The Member, I think, misunderstood my comments to say that we were not going to do anything. We still have a day use area in Kusawa that people use. There is part of the campground, which was originally there, still intact. We will be looking at relocation of the campground. That is one of the areas that we will be studying as to whether or not we should relocate that campground. The park concept for Kusawa, although we are not actively pursuing it at this time, in the future may again surface as a desirable site for a park.

**Mr. Lang:** I just want to go to another issue, and that is the question of Big Creek. You talked about the problems with that particular campground and the fact that you would allocate, I believe, a couple hundred thousand dollars in any event to rectify the situation and put in another campground. I am just wondering if the Minister has had the opportunity of sitting back and asking if it is necessary to have a campground there.

The reason I am asking that question is that I believe we are within 40 miles of Watson Lake. Watson Lake has quite a large campground, and it has also just put in a private recreational vehicle campground. You are within a half-hour drive of the community of Watson Lake. It is not as if the highway is very difficult terrain; it is probably one of the better stretches of road on the whole Alaska

Highway. Would the Minister maybe have an assessment of this and talk to the people in Watson Lake, primarily the municipality and the Chamber, and see whether or not we should maybe try going for a couple years without a campground there, put up a large sign notifying the travelling public what services are available are in the community of Watson Lake, and take it from there, and just see what we do in a couple of years and see if there really is a necessity. You know, people are travelling 60 miles an hour as it is now. It is not as in years past where it was quite a long ways to travel, you know.

**Mr. Porter:** The campground at Red Moose Creek is one of the busiest that we have, but the current campground under discussion is Big Creek and it is one of the busiest on the highway. What happens is that there is a different level of traffic flow from the Highway 37 that goes up the highway and they do in fact stay there. The Member's suggestion is a one that we should ponder. I think that maybe we can look at delaying it a year and see if we can do some signage at highway 37 to try to see if we can get people to go on to Watson Lake and utilize those services. Also in the department are other campgrounds that have been slated. Fisheye Lake in Faro is one, and there are additional campgrounds that I know have to be rehabilitated over the next couple of years. We will take that suggestion under advisement, and I will meet with the department and discuss this as a possibility.

**Mr. Lang:** I appreciate that, and we will make sure that Watson Lake gets copies of the *Hansard* so that at least they have the opportunity of making an observation.

I am just thinking, in view of traffic flows and whatever — and I recognize it is the North and South situation and I just concentrated on the South element of it — that it may have some merit. The only other observation I want to make about campgrounds is, as we have all said, we do have a good campground service, and I think that the people involved in it have to be commended for the work they do, because they do do a good job. I want to make one more observation — I do not see it this year, but in the next couple of years — and that is Fish Lake. There are quite a number of people who go to Fish Lake to use the lake and that is primarily local people. I understand there is some work being done on the road, but maybe down the road here some thought could be given for at least a foundation for a camping area, if you like, being laid out on one side of the lake or the other, because I know it would be appreciated by the people in Whitehorse as an area to go to that had some facilities, primarily toilets and that kind of thing.

**Mr. Porter:** You and your colleague for Kluane did in fact recommend, as I recall, that there be no new campground developments in the Yukon. I think it was in the Select Committee Report. I think, for the most part, government will abide by that because I do not think we need an awful lot more campgrounds, but in certain areas where the Member makes a representation, such as for for Fish Lake. Old Crow, for example, does not have a campground and the people there have recently come to us and indicated that they would like a campground. I think in certain exceptions we will probably look at additional new campground development. For the most part, our money is going to be spent on rehabilitating existing campgrounds.

**Mr. Lang:** I want to make it very clear that I am talking about a day use area. I am not talking about a major tourist campground, and I am not looking at a lot of money being spent. All I know is that a lot of people go up and utilize that lake and primarily for sanitary purposes there should be some outdoor toilets and that type of thing being put into place in the area. I am not looking for a great deal of money; do not get me wrong.

**Mr. McLachlan:** I would like the Minister to explain how we wear out a campground. I understand that the tables get damaged and the physical plant facilities have to be replaced, but the stall sites, the land and the water is still there. What is the Minister's interpretation of wearing out a campground.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** For the most part, it is environmental damage. Big Creek is heavily used and people do, through usage, destroy the top cover with the overburden. Bank erosion occurs, trees are climbed on and limbs are broken. There has been some serious environmental damage done by visitors at Big Creek.

**Mr. McLachlan:** In the case of rebuilding the Fish Eye Lake Campground in Faro, one of the problems identified in the Renewable Resources report was the recommendation about land locked lakes. That lake at Fish Eye has no outflow or inflow source of water. The Renewable Resources Committee had identified some special usage for it. There were some divers using that lake who wanted to be able to use it without having the water murky from boats and motors.

When the department rebuilds the campgrounds, will it be taking that recommendation into consideration and eliminating boat ramps? The Minister has yet to tip his hat on anything in the Renewable Resources report. I wanted to use this opportunity in Budget debate to ask the Minister about this recommendation.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** We will be debating the Renewable Resources report next week. There will be a full accounting from the department on its immediate response to the recommendations as they were presented. If the Member would like us to seriously consider that, we would look at that recommendation. We would consult with the people in the community and ask them how they would like the campground managed and if they want the elimination of gas driven boats.

**Mr. McLachlan:** More importantly, would the Minister tell us what the response of the department is to the recommendation? I would assume that is policy and that you would be following it.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The specific recommendations contained in the report will be answered to by the department when we debate the report.

**Mr. McLachlan:** What is the budgetted amount for reconstructing the campground at Fish Eye Lake?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I think it is \$225,000, but we will come to it in line by line debate.

**Chairman:** Do the Members wish to continue or take a recess?  
**Some Members:** Recess, Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman:** We will now recess for 15 minutes.

#### *Recess*

**Chairman:** Committee of the Whole will now come to order. We will continue general debate.

**Mr. Brewster:** I have a couple more questions I would like the Minister's view on. One thing I should correct, and help defend the Chairman on this, is that he made the point that the Select Committee Report was our report. We were only dictated to by the people of the Yukon. It is the opinion of the people of the Yukon. It is not our report; we brought back to the Legislature. I would like that on the record.

We have had letters between us on this, and it is a problem on both the South and North Alaska Highway; rest stops where people stay all night and irritate the private campground owners all around. What does he think should be done about this, and what is he going to do about it?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** We did believe it was the responsibility of the Department of Highways. We talked to that department about ditching these sites. They started ditching these sites and the local residents got up in arms to take us on for that, because a lot of these rest stop sites are used by them as well. All of a sudden, when we got the Department of Highways to ditch them, they were not accessible. So it is a tough situation in terms of how we control those particular sites. We may, in some areas where there is no local use, make the determination that we will have to consult with the communities and find out which areas are being used and which areas are not used and ditch those sites not used. Over the years Highways has built a whole series of gravel pits and some of those pits are not being used. Maybe we could concentrate the effort on those sites.

**Mr. Brewster:** I realized what happened when they were grading, however, if the gentleman they put on the grader had not been so overzealous in his job, this might not have happened. They not only closed up the rest stops, they closed off all the roads down to the river the elders have used since the Alaska Highway has been here. They went plumb out of the way and graded things there was



no reason to grade; what their reasons were I do not know. This caused the uproar, and I agree with the uproar because I think it was ridiculous. What people were trying to do then was to close the old gravel pits that most of the local people do not use. At that time, they turned around at Kluane Lake and graded the stops where the buses always stop on the lakes. I had many tourists tell me they used to take about five hours to go up the lake because they pulled into all the stops. The stops are now two hours apart and there is a different view all the time. It is now like an obstacle course to get in there and it was irresponsible for someone to allow this to go on. If they had done what was asked, there would have been no more problems.

It is an issue. For instance, last year, after Horseshoe Bay was closed it was immediately opened up again. I had to appeal to the Minister to get it closed again because there were private campgrounds on both sides that desperately need help. We have a 100-one at Congdon Creek. One night there were a lot of people complaining that there were 15 people parked in there and we got no revenue from them at all. They were hurting local businessmen.

It is a problem, I will agree. Something has to be done to control this. They seem to be able to do it in Alaska, and we should be looking to see how they do this.

**Chairman:** Is there any further general debate?

#### *On Parks Development*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I indicated at the beginning of the debate that the funding breakdown is \$360,000 for Herschel Island; \$200,000 for Parks System Inventory Analysis and Site Identification; \$70,000 for Heritage Rivers; \$70,000 for Coal River Springs and \$50,000 for Interpretative Centre and Frenchman/Tatchun.

**Mr. Brewster:** Are there public hearings when these heritage rivers are put in?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** When we move to the dedication part of the rivers designation, there is opportunity for the public to comment on those. Because we have not gotten to that point yet, we have not experienced that in Yukon.

**Mr. Brewster:** No, we have not gotten to that point yet. I have seen correspondence from Ottawa saying that these are heritage rivers. The Minister says that we have not gotten to that. If a river is designated as a heritage river, if traplines run along that bank, if there is a placer miner in that area, are they moved out of the area? What happens to them?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The Management Plan that will be adopted for the river or the section of the river that is developed will address that question. I see no reason why trapping cannot continue. I would argue that, in no way, when we move toward these designations, should we affect the rights and livelihood of the trappers.

**Mr. Brewster:** I would like to thank the Minister for that. I think we pretty well agree on that line of thinking. When we talk about heritage rivers and national parks, I am quite skeptical. Soon there is nothing left. It would bother me if sometime someone said that skidoos cannot be taken down there because there may be some oil left on the ice when they are going trapping. Things like this bother me because originally the trappers and elders were there first. I think that they should still be able to travel these rivers. After what the Minister said, however, both him and I agree. Whether or not we will be able to control it, I rather doubt it, but at least we do agree on it.

**Mr. McLachlan:** Can the Minister tell us where the Tatchun/Frenchman Park Interpretive Centre is to be built.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** No, that is not being built. As you will recall, there is a cultural interpretive study that was being compiled under the second portion of the \$50,000 that was allocated to develop a plan for an interpretive centre, and this money will facilitate initial construction of the interpretive centre.

**Mr. Lang:** Is this not the Inventory Park Program on this line item?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The history on this particular project is that in 1985-86 there was \$50,000 appropriated for phase I of the Cultural Interpretive Study. This fiscal year that we are in now, 1986-87, completion of the Cultural Interpretive Study as well as to begin the concept and feasibility of a cultural interpretive centre.

The \$50,000 we are talking about now would be for design, engineering, and the two additional capital years following we would be looking at actual construction of the cultural interpretive centre.

**Mr. Lang:** How much money are we talking about in total?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** We are talking about a total \$450,000 over five years.

**Mr. Lang:** That is a lot of money considering nobody wanted it. I would like to get back to the question of the inventory parks. We were just told here a little earlier that we were satisfied with the number of campgrounds and parks that we had in the territory, with possibly two other projects in mind Herschel Island, which is a line item, and then Coal River Springs, and now we are also told that we are doing \$200,000-worth of park inventory. It is inconsistent with the policy the government is expressing and basically the policy that we have been expressing on this side. Why are you doing an inventory?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The history of park development and campground development has been, in the past, a very sporadic affair, where simply there was, I think, a policy that every 50 miles along the highway system there was to be a campground developed and to a large extent most of our highways met that criteria. I guess we have not, in any way, changed from that policy that was set out before, although the Select Committee report did talk about the question of a new park development.

In terms of the park inventory planning that will be done, we are going to go through a planning process that will identify the natural features. We talked about, with respect to the supplementary debate, the recreational features throughout the Yukon in terms of that particular work. We are also going to be looking at 50 kilometre corridors along all Yukon major highways to classify any unique sites that may exist within the corridors.

**Mr. Phillips:** There is a 50-mile kilometre corridor around Yukon highways? What are you going to allow in this corridor? Or, is this just a study corridor?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** The Member is correct. We are going to go through those corridors and examine in detail exactly what is contained by way of natural features along the corridors. I know that the Members do not like this particular aspect of government spending, the planning aspect, the inventorying process, but in terms of proper park/campground development we see this as necessary. There are sites along the highway that are, in fact, unique, and we should give access to our public and, as well, to the travelling public.

**Mr. Lang:** A little earlier, you said to this House that you agreed with the Select Committee's recommendation. The Minister said to this House that he agreed with the recommendation of the Select Committee — with very little deviation — with the principle that the campgrounds and the parks system throughout the territory was satisfactory, with some emphasis on rehabilitation. We do not have a problem with that. I do not understand. We are going to spend two hundred thousand bucks for some jerk, I am sure it will be a jerk, from outside, because there will not be anybody smart enough from inside the Yukon Territory, to wander around and tell someone in Watson Lake where the natural features are 25 miles on either side of the road.

That has to be absolutely silly and stupid. I think we are going to get through this section really easily. We have a responsibility to point this out. I mean here we had \$150,000 last year for trails; we are going to have trails. In the appropriation, we had another \$150,000 for recreational trails. I mean, you have too much money. How else can you come to any other deduction? Surely, surely, if you went down to Watson Lake and had a public meeting with the people you represent and said to them, without batting an eye, without smiling, "We are going to spend \$200,000 studying the natural features 25 miles on either side of the road", they would think that you were absolutely crazy. We have all been in the Yukon, collectively, for what, a thousand years?

**Some Hon. Member:** Thirty.

**Mr. Lang:** I said "collectively"; its added all together. The point I want to make is that surely the Minister should have another look at this kind of expenditure. Why do we not move the \$200,000

from this inventory to Silver City?

<sup>24</sup> I do not understand. Who is going to tell you that there is something unique in the natural features between here and Rancheria? Would the Minister consider, in view of our obvious concern about this expenditure, with his colleagues, delaying this inventory, delaying another onslaught from the University of Toronto? Would he consider taking this \$200,000 and putting it into Silver City instead of letting another year go by?

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I suspect that this will be an ongoing debate throughout the life of this government. I also suspect that, one day, when the side opposite resumes government, they will find themselves in a position that they will have to spend money for planning as well.

The Member talks about the Select Committee. I did not realize that we would get into debate on that report. The Select Committee is very clear. It recommends that the Government of Yukon should develop a policy to establish a territorial parks system. The policy to establish a territorial parks system should formulate site selection criteria for parks designation and arrange protection measures appropriate for each. Ideally, a broad range of features such as unique landscapes, historical and cultural sites, recreational opportunities, et cetera, should be included in the parks system.

I submit that the work that we intend to carry out on the development of a parks system plan meets, to a T, the recommendation as put forward by the Select Committee.

**Mr. Phillips:** I would like to express some reservations about this \$200,000 inventory that the government is going to do. I guess the reason that it raises so many concerns with myself is that I was on the Task Force on Northern Conservation. I have, at home, and I will make it available to the department since it may save them \$100,000, all the documents that I was given from all over northern Canada, and probably 50 documents from the Yukon that identify ecologically significant environmental areas that we should protect.

Why are we reinventing the wheel? Can the Minister tell us why we are doing all this work again? We not only have all that stuff available to us right now, but we have one of the Members, Nancy McPherson who is on the same committee as I was, going around and identifying protective areas again. Now the Government of Yukon is going to get into the act and identify areas that are significant.

<sup>25</sup> I get frustrated when we study it for the sake of studying it. We are going to find out, probably in the next statistical report, that the number one industry in the Yukon is consulting and studying. That is where all our employment has come from. Most of them are not Yukoners.

The Committee went around and asked Yukoners in virtually every community what they thought they needed. They did not tell you they wanted more parks or more studies. Most of the Yukoners sent a clear message to us that they are fed up with being studied. They are studied more than any other people in North America.

Let us spend some of the money where we can use it. We know we have a problem with Silver City, but no, we should study it first. We could take 10 years to study it and what is left we might be able to fix up afterwards.

The Minister has got to believe that in the communities in the territory, the native and non-native communities, these people have told him what areas should be protected or what is there. They do not need to hire somebody for \$200,000 to run up and down the highway and do the whole thing all over again. When is the government going to come to its senses and stop spending money for the sake of spending money?

**Chairman:** Anything further on Parks Development?

**Mr. Lang:** I have just an observation to conclude the debate. The tragedy of this is that we are putting forward a position that a lot of people in the territory share. I hope the side opposite gives it serious consideration because there are a lot of good things that can be done with this money. That is the point we want to make to the side opposite. In the representation I made, it was to reassess exactly how this money was being spent. They do have the legal authority vested in Cabinet to reappropriate money from within the department. The point is, there has been at least one area identified, Silver City, and there are a number of other real heritage points of

our history that can be preserved now, and if we let the years go by, we are not going to.

My colleague, the Member for Riverdale North, is correct. At times I recognize the burden a Minister has in compiling his budget and perhaps this has slipped by.

I feel strongly that it should be reassessed to see what we are doing. Are we getting the best clout for our dollar. I want to emphasize that point from this side.

<sup>26</sup> **Mr. Phillips:** I guess the Minister is not really concerned, or just not interested in responding. I just leave the Minister with one other caution before he leaves. Yukoners are very concerned that there are currently enough parks in the territory. If there are to be any more parks, I feel that we should be looking at multiple use parks. Fifteen percent of our land has now been alienated, and the Minister should look at a map and see. It is probably more. When adding things in like land claims, which is going to alienate land for certain uses for non-native Yukoners, we are going to be looking at 20 to 25 percent of the land being alienated. The Minister has to recognize that most of the land we are talking about is land that is in the areas where most Yukoners have access.

There is a lot of land in the Yukon, but there is a lot of land that I cannot afford to get to, and neither can a lot of other Yukoners. We have to be careful that we are not setting our place up as an environmental shrine. We have to protect the environment, but I think we can make wise use of it.

I see this government heading in the direction of almost putting a fence around it so no one can use it any longer. I express that as a genuine concern. There is a lot of concern out there. The Chairman can tell you that it was expressed quite a bit when the committee went around the territory. People were worried about land being alienated for one reason or another. I think the Minister should take that into consideration when he is making his decision.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I undertook for the Member that we would research what percentage of alienation has occurred. My understanding of the park development that we are responsible for is something like less than four percent. We will undertake to review that particular situation.

With regard to the idea that somehow we are creating fenced-in environments, I think that that is not the intent. The intent is to recognize those environments that should be developed so that people can gain access to them and appreciate them.

<sup>27</sup> *Parks Development in the amount of \$750,000 agreed to*  
*On Campground Development*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** This breaks down as Campground Rehabilitation, \$158,000; Campground Replacement, as we have discussed, \$225,000; Campground Planning, new and expansion, \$30,000; Campground expansion, Teslin, \$40,000; Campground boundary surveys and land acquisition, \$150,000; recreation areas, Dalton Post, management plan, \$35,000; Tarfu/Snafu, \$20,000; Watson/Wheaton, \$20,000; Frenchman/Tatchun planning, \$10,000; and, the Natural Features Access Plan, we have discussed, recreation access development, \$95,000; Heritage River, Thirty Mile, that was last year's expenditure. Those are the numbers.

**Mr. Lang:** I have an observation. I understand that you are looking at an expansion of a park at Teslin. Has there been any consideration given, or has there been any applications sought for the purpose of the Economic Development Agreement for loans for an RV park in the area? Instead of us putting further expansion into the Teslin public campground, maybe we could be encouraging somebody, privately, to put in an RV park. Then, they could make a few bucks and the taxpayer could save a few bucks.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** My information is that there has not been anyone we know of who has come forward with a campground application for Teslin as of yet, but that does not preclude the possibility of that occurring in the future. If that were to happen, we would definitely be looking at that.

The major part of this expenditure is the \$35,000 for upgrading the boat launch and construction of some additional sites. That boat launch is being utilized by local residents, as well.

<sup>28</sup> **Mr. Lang:** Maybe the government should be trying a test pilot case where they advertise to see if anyone is interested in building an RV park in the area. There are enough government programs that

there would be enough assistance of some kind. Other than for the boat launch that will be required, maybe it would set up a small business in the community. Government gets so overbearing and overwhelming to everybody that they begin to wonder if there is anything but government.

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** There is an individual who has expressed an interest to get some land in that area for trail rides and some guided fishing tours. I have not seen the details of the application because they are at the point of trying to get access to land before bringing the application before government. It is quite possible that that application does contain some element of campground development.

**Mr. Brewster:** The line item says Recreation Areas, and below that is Recreation Access. What is the difference between those? What are those? That is on page 69.

» **Hon. Mr. Porter:** I am just going through the book to locate the specific recreation areas: Tarfu/Snafu. We are talking about detailed facility site planning there. That is going to be scheduled for this summer. As we discussed earlier, we are talking about getting together with the residents. We have tried to hold some meetings, but they had to be cancelled. There has been an expression from the community people that they do not want a fullblown recreational-area development. We may be down-scaling the plan for the area to simply rehabilitate the campground site there.

As well, we are talking about the Watson/Wheaton recreation area. Again we are talking about site planning and development in that particular region. We are hopefully going to build up to a recreation area management plan for the Watson area, as well as work toward a planning concept that involves the Band, the members of the community and the mining interests that are in the area. We will be getting those interests together to work reasonably on a land-use plan.

Recreation Area - Frenchman/Tatchun: site planning and development in this area, we are working toward a recreation area management plan for that particular site.

Ongoing planning for natural features: access planning of \$40,000 will be spent in this area.

Recreation access development: we are talking about actual development of sites under the natural features access plan that will be carried out throughout the Yukon. What we are talking about there, for the Member's information, on a detailed basis: Wolf Creek Trail, signage, surfacing, general upgrading, day labour materials for a total of \$7,500.

Tombstone Trail Campground Interpretation: clearing, surfacing, signage, labour, travel and accommodation for a total of \$20,000.

Million Dollar Falls Trail: labour for clearing, signage, materials and supplies \$10,000.

Five Fingers Trail completion: labour expenses for travel, signage materials and supplies for \$12,500.

Rancheria Falls: labour, expenses, signage, materials and supplies for a total of \$60,000.

Additional boat launch areas on the Tagish Day Use Area and at Congdon Creek for a total expenditure of upgrading those boat launches of \$10,000.

For historic sites access: Dalton Post, signage, road work, area posts, brush clearing, an additional \$10,000 as well.

» **Hon. Mr. Porter:** There is the clock, and it says that it is time to go. I request that you report progress on Bill No. 7.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Porter:** I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

*Speaker resumes the Chair*

**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. 101, *An Act to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Act (No. 2)*, and Bill No. 7, *First Appropriation Act, 1987-88*, and would like

me to report progress on same.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

May I have your further pleasure?

**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., Thursday, February 5, 1987.

*The House adjourned at 9:29 p.m.*

#### **The following Sessional Papers were tabled February 4, 1987:**

87-3-103

Janitorial Study (Kimmerly)

87-3-104

Review of the Yukon Business Incentive Policy re "value added" approach (Kimmerly)

