



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 18

9th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Monday, December 5, 1977

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Volume 10

Part 1

1977

Orders & Proceedings

Monday, December 5, 1977

Printed and Published by the Queen's Printer for Yukon

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory

December 5, 1977

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

We will now proceed with Prayers.

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a Point of Personal Privilege this morning. I feel slandered this morning. On radio, on CBC this morning, a representative of a business agent from an outside union actually, not even a Yukon based union, accused the politicians in the Yukon of promising riches from the pipeline to the people in the Yukon and not doing anything else, just putting those promises out to the people.

I would like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, to say that I never did promise riches to anybody on the pipeline, it is just the opposite: I am warning people of the detrimental effect this pipeline could possibly bring to the Yukon.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to the Order Paper.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Documents for Tabling?

Reports of Committees?

Are there any Petitions?

Introduction of Bills? The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

BILLS: INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, moved by myself and seconded by the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale that a Private Member's Public Bill, entitled *Animal Protection Ordinance* be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that a Private Member's Bill, entitled *Animal Protection Ordinance* be now introduced and read for a first time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: When shall the Bill be read for a second time?

Ms Millard: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Bills for Introduction?

Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion or Resolution? The Honourable Member from Kluane?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, regarding Commissioner's Order 1977/242 re: the *Public Inquiries Ordinance*.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by the Member from Hootalinqua, that the Papers dealing with the Alberta Heritage Fund be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Riverdale, that Public Announcement of Proposed Planning Prog-

ram of Whitehorse North be moved into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: Notice of Motion, by myself, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, with respect to the mining industry in Yukon.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion or Resolution?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period. The Honourable Minister of Education.

QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling answers to Oral Questions asked by the Honourable Member from Kluane, concerning the cost of school busing in the City of Whitehorse and the population statistics to be used to determine the amount of recreation per capita grant available to certain communities.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a Legislative Return in answer to Written Question Number 28 concerning Legislative Return Number 26.

If I may, while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, announce that signs regarding livestock on highways are being produced presently by the Highways and Public Works and they will be installed in the month of December. They will be four feet by six feet of size, and they will be placed at Milepost 4, 8, 12, 16 and 20, on the Klondike Highway.

Also, our Director of Renewable Resources has been in touch with a Mr. Allen Lynn, who is the Director of Agriculture for the State of Alaska, to get particulars on the scotch-lite program, which had been proposed in this House. He, unfortunately, has never heard of it and they do not know of any such programs, except fish and wildlife personnel, putting collars on moose and caribou for surveillance purposes. We are trying to get further information on that program, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Human Resources.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a Legislative Return in answer to Written Question 29 concerning the Commissioner's Office using the services of the Federal Department of Justice for legal advice.

Mr. Speaker, while I am up, I would like to give a reply to a question from the Honourable Member from Ogilvie from the Question Period on Wednesday, November 30th, regarding equal pay for equal work in the Corrections Branch.

The Government of the Yukon, Mr. Speaker, pays equal wages for equal work.

But there is a distinction in the assignment of responsibilities and duties between a Corrections Matron and a Corrections Officer I, similarly, a Senior Matron and a Corrections Officer II. These distinctions are recognized in the class specifications of the Public Service and within the negotiated pay scale. The percentage remuneration difference is 4.3 per cent.

When the Juvenile Training Home existed, it was staffed with Corrections Officers and Corrections Matrons. The Corrections Officers and Corrections Matrons were subject to re-assignment to the Whitehorse Correctional Institute as and when required from Wolf Creek Training Home. But on the conversion of the Juvenile Training Home to a youth services centre, the Public Service Commission reviewed the assign-

ment of work to all employees in the restructured youth centre and employees performing equal work received equal pay.

Positions were reclassified to a Youth Service Worker I or a Youth Service Worker II, class level. These class levels are open to both males and females.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua?

Question re: Workers' Compensation

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a written question for the Honourable Minister of Local Government this morning. In view of the fact that the House is considering proposed amendments to the *Workers' Compensation Ordinance* and taking into consideration the proposed merit system dealing with premiums that industry pays into the Compensation Fund, would the Minister advise me as to the following: Is the Government considering allowing exemptions to the mining industry from Worker's Compensation, as suggested in this report to the Chamber of Mines ending October 31st, 1977? What would happen to the remaining employers with respect to the merit system, and would the remaining private businesses involved with Workers' Compensation be expected to pay higher premiums once this exemption is made?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question re: ERPU Information

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, a written question for any member of the Executive Committee. Sometimes ago we were advised that the Economic Research and Planning Unit were involved in the examination of the impact on Dawson City and the Yukon of the closure of the Clinton Creek Mine.

1. Could we have the information gathered by ERPU at this time?
2. What plans are there for publication of this information in its final stage?
3. The ERPU is also to have assessed government's role in mining in the Yukon, is this done and may we have the assessment?

Question re: \$200 Million Loan Repayment

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, if I may, a further written question for any member of the Executive Committee. Would the Executive Committee give us in detail the payment schedule per year over the life of the pipeline project of the \$200 million loan proposed on tax revenue, indicating when the loan will be repaid and how much will have been paid in interest by the time the loan is repaid? Also, what is the current estimate of costs to the YTG beyond normal expenditures expected each year of the pipeline due to pipeline construction?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike.

Question re: Speed Limit Reduction

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, an oral question for the Minister of Human Resources: last week, at the Energy Ministers' Conference, between the provincial energy ministers and the federal energy ministers, a program of home insulation was discussed and it came to my attention that the Federal Government dropped the demand of reducing speed limits in the provinces to 90 kilometers an hour. My question, Mr. Speaker, is will this also apply to the Yukon and can we expect an amendment to the present *Motor Vehicles Ordinance* before this House accordingly?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Human Resources.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, there has been no such change indicated to us by the Federal Government, but we will look into the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre.

Question re: Green Papers

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, we are now going into our second month of this Session. I am wondering if the Minister of Local Government could supply us with any information as to how the birth of the Green Papers on housing strategies, land development and rent stabilization are coming?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, my staff and I have been working assiduously the last two weekends and as far as I know, it is at the Printer's, the Land Development Paper and I would ask other Ministers to answer their particular responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the other two papers, drafts have been up and I would just like to think that they would be into the House by sometime during this week.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The Honourable Member from Klondike.

Question re: Upgrading of Government Employees

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Human Resources where she recently announced to this House that two people have been hired from outside the Territory, and my question is, Mr. Speaker, what programs has the Territorial Government initiated or will initiate to upgrade present employees in this Territory in order to maybe accommodate them in higher positions?

Mr. Speaker: To whom is the question addressed?

Mr. Berger: The Minister of Human Resources.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Human Resources.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member is referring to the recent announcement of the appointment of a Director of Corrections, I can assure the House that we went to some trouble in this Government to obtain a man of calibre sufficient to head a training program and establish such training for the local members of the staff. That is one of the main strengths in his particular background, that he will be able to initiate training programs for our people and encourage them to go on and take other courses and academic training, if they so wish.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

Mr. McCall: Yes, supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, to what the Honourable Member from Klondike said, what type of policies does this government have as to its screening of its own employees in order to enable them to get into a higher more responsible job? Are these policies being changed?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Human Resources?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the Honourable Member is referring to aside from the usual practice of the Public Service Commission. If he would like to give me more details, the Public Service Commissioner can be queried.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? We will now proceed to the Order Paper to Orders of the Day, Motions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Madam Clerk: Item Number 1, standing in the name of the

Honourable Member, Ms Millard.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item Number 1?

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, THAT this House requests the Executive Committee to forward to all Members immediately upon receipt, the recommendations which will be given to the Commissioner from the Yukon Electrical Public Utilities Board in the next weeks, concerning the feasibility of electrical equalization throughout the Territory.

The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read in the Annual Report, 1976-77 of the Electrical Public Utilities Board that, and I quote: "As a result of submissions made to it from various interested persons, the Board has requested its consultants, Price-Waterhouse, and Associates, to conduct a cost analysis and make a report to the Board on the feasibility of electrical rate equalization throughout the Territory."

I think this is a most important development in the thinking in the Yukon Territory towards equalization of rates, particularly for places like Dawson City, which has a tremendous amount of inflation, which isn't dealt with in places like Whitehorse. Perhaps Members will recall that the Member from Klondike and I attempted to pass a motion in regard to equalization rates of electricity throughout the Territory some time ago. We weren't successful. I am hoping that some day we will be successful in this effort.

This report from the Electrical Public Utilities Board will go the Commissioner in the next two months, I am advised, and I feel that we should have time to study that report before we have our spring session so that the motion emphasizes that we receive the report when it is available to the Commissioner so that we have time to study it prior to the spring session.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, there is no problem at all when such recommendations are given to the Commissioner that they be forwarded to all Honourable Members. I would like to just caution all Honourable Members that the first priority of this Government that we have to deal with and has to be dealt with in the next Budget Session, is how we are going to continue our present rate equalization program unless there is some further submissions that are accepted by Treasury Board, because the fund, with its present front end loading and with the escalation in electrical rates, is broke and will be broke by next year.

We have all known this for some period of time, that this was about to take place. There has to be further cost-sharing, there has to be further negotiations with Treasury Board, and I have no problem in informing Honourable Members up to this point that we have not been successful in such negotiations with Treasury Board and that is the number one priority of this Government, is how we continue with some sort of rate equalization plan, which we now have in effect, because I can and I think all Members know the tragedy of the situation, if we are not capable of continuing with some type of electrical rate equalization plan, at the present time.

So, looking down in the future, it is nice to think of an electrical equalization plan standard throughout the Yukon, but the priorities that we are trying grasp with and cope with at the present time is a continuation of the present program and I would be less than honest if I said that it was totally encouraging at this present time.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the Honourable Member from Ogilvie brought up this motion. I, too, noticed it in the Annual Report of the Electrical Public Utilities Board, the fact that they were doing some analysis into the feasibility of an electrical rate equalization scheme throughout the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, it was also interesting to hear the remarks of the Minister of Local Government, who advised us that the rate equalization fund in existence and the scheme that is in existence in the Yukon today, is on very shaky financial grounds. It is most imperative, Mr. Speaker, that this Report be made available to everyone of us and that the Government consider this Report, when they have to also consider the existing scheme in hand, and it may be that if some adjustments and some compensations have to be made for the existing scheme, we may be able to work in and adapt some of the features of a complete electrical rate equalization in the Territory.

So, I don't think that one problem is separate from the other and I am very happy that this work is being done by the Electrical Public Utilities Board, so that some information is available to the Government and to us, so that some decisions can be made for the future for electrical rates in the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be looking forward to receiving this Report.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on seconding the motion, I, too, was very happy to see that there was some thought as to some equalization program being even thought of or talked about in the Yukon Territory, because I have been an advocate of this for a long time and I have run into pretty rough opposition usually, in the area of the larger centres, of course, where the rates are cheaper.

Possibly, this may not be the answer, just a rate equalization program, as Price-Waterhouse may come up with, but I am very interested in seeing their Report and seeing what they have to say. I would hope that we get it as soon as possible, because we have quite a few things, I think, to think about in the next few years, what is going to happen in the next few years, with the Franchise Agreements and everything coming up, with Yukon Electric. I, myself, can see us getting into quite a bind if we don't get all the information that is available, as soon as possible, and looking at the whole problem of power in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I welcome this motion. As the Honourable Member from Ogilvie pointed out that we attempted a motion quite a while ago, but Mr. Speaker I would like to say to this House maybe we are looking at the wrong avenue of rate equalization. Maybe we should attempt another way of making living easier for people living in the outlying areas outside of Whitehorse. I know this mining industry talks about having no incentive to come into the North or the Yukon specifically, and I think they are talking about an income tax reduction or incentive. Maybe that is a route that we should follow.

The Yukon is going to be, in the near future, possibly collecting their own income tax, the provincial taxes, and maybe we should look at the possibility of getting an income tax reduction to people living outside of Whitehorse and that way overcome the hardship of those people living in Dawson, Mayo, Haines Junction, Teslin, and Watson Lake. I think they are just looking at one particular route. We should take an overall view of the situation and the problem in the Yukon.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the motion, but I would like to draw the attention of members, and I am sure most of them realize this, that we do have a form of equalization fund right now and we have made a very good attempt at it, and I realize the critical situation we are getting to. As the Minister says, we are broke. But certainly we are going to have to do something about it. There are some areas that we are going to have to look at and to tap some other resources for sure. This is a consideration that has to be given.

You know, you may well be looking at the creation of the Heritage Fund and one of those areas may well be to provide some dollars and relief to rate equalization for the rest of the Territory, but certainly this is of prime importance, and I am sure we will give it that consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

Motion agreed to

Madam Clerk: Item Number 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item 2?

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Government of the Yukon Territory should provide Pharmacare for old age pensioners as soon as possible.

The Honourable Member from Mayo?

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Speaker, shortly before the opening of this session I attended a seminar at which old age pensioners and elderly people attended, and I was a member of the panel in that seminar. There were a number of major concerns that these people had, and one of the principle ones was the provision of Pharmacare. It is true that old age pensioners can apply for Welfare and receive their medicines free of charge, but many of our old age pensioners are unwilling to, as they put it, humiliate themselves by applying for Welfare. I think it is time that this government undertook to provide some form of Pharmacare for these people.

I realize that, in other jurisdictions, there have been problems with Pharmacare for not only old age pensioners, but for the general public, in that there has been some abuse, but I think that with the small population that we have, the very small number of people in the medical profession, the fact that there are only three pharmacists in the Yukon, that control can easily be maintained.

Another point to consider is that the Yukon has the smallest proportion of elderly people of any jurisdiction in Canada and I think we can therefore well afford to provide this service to our old age pensioners.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Motion, I have done some research on Pharmacare, and particularly Pharmacare for the elderly and I am still supporting the Motion, but with some reservations and I would like to make the reservations clear.

I think the question of Pharmacare for the elderly has been brought up quite regularly in this House, and has been turned down fairly regularly, as well. I think we look at it as an emotional issue and maybe we should look at it a little more reasonably and with a little more information.

It is true that the elderly population is only 4.8 per cent of our population and that it seems to make a very small impact on our costs. However, in studying the very competent report which was given to us, "Beyond 60", which is being printed by

the Department of Human Resources, I find that they are not in support of a program of Pharmacare at this time.

Before I go into that, though, I would like to make some comments on some of the things that are said in "Beyond 60", because I think it is a golden opportunity to do so. I think there are some shocking statistics in this Report. Twenty-eight per cent of our elderly are in deteriorating or poor health. The high percentage of deteriorating or poor health in the elderly is in Whitehorse, with 32 per cent. The low is outside of Whitehorse, 23 per cent. I think that says something for the outlying areas.

Eyesight is a problem with the elderly, 26 per cent, at least, have trouble with eyesight, and it may be higher because they did not very scientifically go about finding those statistics.

The same with hearing, 13 per cent of our elderly have poor or deteriorating hearing and the statistics should be higher because they did not go about it in a scientific way.

Twenty-five per cent of our elderly have poor or deteriorating mobility. One-quarter of the elderly cannot move to the...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with the Honourable Member moving a report into Committee for full discussion, but I do feel that she is speaking to a particular motion at this time which is not a concern of that report.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the Honourable Member is speaking to a motion respecting Pharmacare and, if the Honourable Member is not straying, then perhaps she can continue, but if the Member should stray from the position of Pharmacare, then the Chair might have to rule her out of order.

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's my opinion that health has a lot to do with Pharmacare. Eighteen per cent of our elderly have mental or emotional problems which could be helped with medication. Thirteen per cent have inadequate nutrition. In other areas, which also are relevant to a social program helping the elderly, the report states that most of our aged are very much in need of financial aid, but they are anxious to maintain their lifestyle, not to change it. In other words, they do not need additional income to make their life a little better, but just simply to keep it the way it is.

Inflation, of course, have the greatest threat against those on fixed incomes, that has been made clear to us all along, and of course, the pipeline will have its first victims, the old age pensioners who are on fixed incomes from the Federal Government, which we don't have much to say about.

I am anxious to see the White Paper on Rent Controls in this House, because I feel that this is one of the first areas in which old age pensioners will be affected.

The Territorial Government's policy towards old age pensioners has always been, or has been at least verbalized lately as being respect for their independence and support where it is needed. I think support is needed very badly in health care, but it is also needed in many other areas. Other costs to old age pensioners are greater in the way of fuel, rent and food, far more expensive to them than pharmaceutical requirements. They have other needs such as home care and even their glasses and dentures need to be subsidized.

It has been suggested to me that the way to go about the Pharmacare program might be to change the chronic disease list to include heart disease and arthritis, which would cover most of the needs of our old age pensioners as far as pharmaceutical requirements. I would like to make that suggestion to the Department of Human Resources and this is why I am supporting this motion in principle, because I feel that all other areas have to be investigated and that the one possible way, reasonable way would be to change the chronic disease list.

It has been, in my investigation, I discovered that Ontario had had a very bad problem with Pharmacare. There was an overuse of non-prescription drugs because they were paid for, and there was apparently an overuse of any drugs in treatment. This has been pointed out to be one of the hardest problems that old age people have is overdosage of medicine, because they may give it to themselves and do it wrongly, or else there is an overuse of a Pharmacare program simply for profit.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I support this motion wholeheartedly in the hopes that the government will investigate fully a Pharmacare program for our elderly and hopefully, eventually, for everyone and to, more importantly, investigate other needs of our elderly with a view to subsidizing them in very important areas.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre.

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Motion. It is, indeed important to these people that they do have some support in some way.

I would like to point out that it has been pointed out by these people themselves, the chronic disease list in itself is not a support for them. They are more interested in support going to the people who actually need it, who actually feel the pinch. Therefore, the Chronic Disease List, in itself, is more important.

As it is now designed, there are two lists. One of them merely lists people who have a chronic disease, but offers no support for them. That is where most of the illnesses are categorized.

The second list is where people are actually helped, on the Chronic Disease List, and almost invariably, these are very rare diseases, so it has very little effect in giving relief to the elderly people.

There are many other problems that this gives rise to, which have already been alluded to, such as visual aids and hearing aids, and it is a complex problem, Mr. Speaker.

On that basis, I would move that this Resolution Number 8 be moved into Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I will second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Item 2 be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Madam Clerk: Item Number 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member Ms Millard.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 3?

Ms Millard: No, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer this to our next sitting day, if possible. More information is available to me today

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

The Honourable Member from Pelly River.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would move that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order.

We will be dealing with Resolution Number 2, regarding the Yukon Impact Information Centre.

Recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order.

Resolution Number 2, THAT it is the opinion of this Assembly that immediate action be taken in connection with the Alaska Pipeline Project to implement a Yukon Impact Information Centre similar to that as recommended by the Lysyk Report, to be funded by the Federal Government and such a centre be controlled by a board of directors composed of representatives of community interest groups, industry, labour and government. Further, that such a centre be initially staffed to a maximum of three persons with a review to be carried out with respect to the operation and effectiveness of such a centre by the Government of Yukon after twelve months operation.

I would refer you to the Green Paper on Yukon Pipeline Impact Information Centre.

I think for orientation I will read just the first part of this Green Paper: "Recognizing the unique level of public interest in the proposed Alaska Highway natural gas pipeline, the potential that that project has for impacting the lives and businesses of Yukoners and the need for broad access to socio-economic information regarding those impacts, the Government of the Yukon Territory has indicated its intention to create a Yukon Pipeline Impact Information Centre.

"From various quarters before, during and since the Alaska Highway Pipeline Inquiry, there have been many differing suggestions as to the role of such a centre, the resources and responsibilities it would have and the relationship which should obtain between the centre and government. These suggestions have been put forward with such vigour and diversity that, notwithstanding a general desire for early action on an information centre, your government felt it should seek the views of the Assembly before proceeding. Accordingly, this paper will present a range of options for the consideration of the Assembly. Further executive action awaits your direction.

"The three basic questions with respect to an Impact Information Centre are:

- 1) What should it do?
- 2) What should its relationships be to government?
- 3) What will it cost/who will pay for it?

"Costs and Funding

"The last of these questions is probably the easiest to answer. If it is this Assembly's wish that the Government of the Yukon Territory cause to be established an impact information centre, according to terms and conditions of its own choosing, then presumably your government will be responsible for its funding. These funds will be payable from present or future revenues of this government. The cost of the information centre will vary according to decisions taken by this Assembly on the first two questions.

"Roles and Responsibilities

"Members are undoubtedly aware of, and/or will seek public views on the wide variety of proposals that have been made as to what an impact information centre should do. There are those who argue that an impact centre should have social and economic research capabilities and responsibilities ranging

beyond the pipeline both in terms of time and scope of interest. The responsibilities of such a centre would also go beyond the collection and publishing of data of socio-economic issues affecting Yukon to include policy research and the development of policy options for government's consideration. Such a broad role would, of course, require commensurate resources in money and man years indefinitely.

"At the other extreme, in the continuum of proposals is the view that an impact information centre should be largely a physical distribution plant for pipeline information generated from a number of other sources e.g. government, industry, associations, academics. Such a centre obviously would require little by way of staff or plant and would endure only for the period of pipeline construction.

"Between these two extremes lie a virtually limitless number of options for which can be found in some quarter and scorn in another. The Fairbanks North Star Borough Compact Centre can be described as falling somewhere in between. Its role was limited to acquiring and publishing factual data relating to pipeline impacts. In fulfilling this role it sought out information from various existing sources but also had some resources to do original research when information was not otherwise available. The Fairbanks North Star Impact Centre published monthly data reports on various socio-economic indicators, convened community meetings, provided a 'drop-in' information centre for the public and media, and met periodically with the Borough government to exchange views.

"Member of the Legislative Assembly may wish to replicate this model in Yukon or to add or subtract responsibilities to a Yukon information centre as they see fit. In the subsequent presentation of the models in this paper, however, responsibilities analogous to the Fairbanks model have been assumed in arriving at cost projections. These cost projections have been increased over the Fairbanks experience to compensate for a wider geographic area of responsibility and perceived staff shortages in the Fairbanks Centre which inhibited their fulfilling their proclaimed role.

"Relationship to Government

"There has been a rough consensus of those outside government that the impact information centre should be entirely independent of government. The alternatives would be to develop an in-house government information centre or to achieve some blend of government and community participation. These three options are developed in Appendices 'A', 'B', and 'C'.

"In summary, the advantage of a completely independent centre lies in the credibility its information would have in the community and in the opportunity it presents for community participation.

"The advantage of an in-house government centre is the credibility of the information for government and the opportunity the centre provides to bolster government's policy research; and information capabilities.

"The middle option has the potential of recognizing both advantages or of being perceived as offering neither.

"From a point of view of costs, there will be a tendency for the information centre to be more expensive the more independent it is of government. This simply reflects the lost opportunity to utilize government personnel, plant and services.

"Geographic Coverage

"While undoubtedly the most visible impacts of the pipeline will be apparent in and around the City of Whitehorse, the smaller rural communities will experience socio-economic changes which, for them, are just as profound. In the Alaska experience, an essentially separate, late and inadequate information agency was established for rural areas.

"Members will want to ensure that the information needs of Yukoners outside Whitehorse are attended to. In this regard, three basic options present themselves:

- 1) A single, separate rural impact information centre;
- 2) Individual centres for each community;
- 3) Provision in a single Yukon centre for rural participation.

From a point of view of economy and performance, the latter option would seem to be the most efficient.

"Resources Required

"As indicated earlier, the cost of an impact information centre will vary according to the resources required. This in turn depends almost entirely on the number and nature of responsibilities assigned to it. For purposes of illustration and comparison in the options described in the Appendices, responsibilities similar to the Fairbanks model have been assumed. Specifically:

- gather, research and present factual information and data relating to the socio-economic impact of pipeline construction activity;
- issue periodic reports to the public on specific indicators;
- provide a drop-in information function to the public and media;
- convene public information meetings on topics of interest.

"The responsibilities will require a core staff of four to five people, part-time community workers, travel, office, publishing, publicity expenditures. Costs related to public participation/management are in addition to those operating expenditures.

"Summary

"This Assembly has before it options with respect to the role of an impact information centre, its relationship to government, its geographic scope, the process by which it will be established and the amount of funding it should receive from the Yukon Government.

"The federal government has indicated it considers the establishment of this impact information centre to be a responsibility of Yukon. Members of this Assembly have indicated their desire to participate in this and other pipeline related matters. Accordingly, the Executive Committee awaits your views with respect to the options cited above.

"While it is recognized that there is some urgency about the formation of the Pipeline Impact Information Centre, we should record the action that has been taken that will help when the centre is formed.

"We have a pipeline co-ordinator's office which has, for approximately one year, been compiling data and pipeline impact information.

"We have a qualified staff person in Archives, working under the Pipeline Co-ordinator, who is collecting, co-ordinating, and cataloguing pipeline information and data.

"We have Mr. Al Wright, presently representing the YTG at any pipeline meetings here, and in Ottawa, and providing data from these sources.

"We have a network of community libraries competent to establish rural community data centres for dissemination of pipeline information, if needed.

"The YTG Information Branch is available to mount information campaigns or to assist in the distribution of information."

Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just would like to commend the Government in bringing in the Green Paper, finally. I still question, in my mind, why we

didn't have this at the start of the Session, when, certainly, mentioned in the Speech from the Throne indicated that some thought had already been given to this.

However, as I say, I welcome it and I think that it certainly whets our appetites as far as making us think of exactly what type of centre we require. It encourages me, Mr. Chairman, in presenting the resolution, or Motion Number 2, and I feel that it was fairly close to the type of centre that I would certainly like to see provided and now, having the information and the other work that I have done on it, I feel it is right on.

The only problem, as I think I mentioned when I spoke to the motion originally, that I think there could be some concern, there could be a problem with the fact that I have asked that it be funded by the Federal Government and I think in my comments earlier, I suggested that Committee would give consideration to this because I feel that it should be independent.

I guess the only way, in this day and age, that can achieve that independence that we so want is to be independent of financial constraints as well, and be able to fund the thing in a responsible manner from an independent source.

I am encouraged that there is, I think there is a way to get inbetween as far as, there is a model here that provides some independence and certainly a relationship with government that, I am sure in Yukon, we are going to have to have because I feel that an independent centre is still going to have to depend on Government to provide some of the research and back-up and I think this can be achieved without a strong tie that dictates and takes away from the independence of the board.

I am interested in hearing other people, their other views. I am certain that, as I said earlier, that this thing should have been put in place yesterday and not today. I can't help but change my mind on that and certainly the baseline data that must be provided to an established centre such as this has got to be well in hand and we have got to go back in time, considerable, if we are really going to realize what the impact of the pipeline project has been on our community and on our Territory, because the day that we started talking about pipeline and the day the decisions were made, that is the day that the baseline data should be established and it should be provided from that.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure Members have their own ideas as to what this impact centre should be, let us hear them.

Ms Millard?

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have great qualms about the way the three alternatives have been given to us. I think that some alternatives have been missed and very important ones particularly in the relationship between public input and government input. I don't see the joint government/public model as being anywhere near what I would like to see. The only input of the public is from the board and I feel that there could be other ways of having direct public involvement.

I feel that the process is one of gathering data and analyzing it, not computer analysis, but people analysis of what does the data mean, as a second level of process; and a third level is information. Any number of those three efforts could be public or government, and we are sitting here considering only that they should all be sort of in layers of part public and part government. I feel that the data gathering could certainly be government, and the public could be involved in the recommendations to the government in analyzing the data, information could be either public or government, and we are not given this kind of alternative in the joint government/public model.

I would like to see a witness, if we could have one, because there are a lot of questions I have on the costing and relationships back to the government seems to me that in the government model, it can be said that simply because it is not going to

be an additional expenditure, we are not going to go out and hire four independent people to do this. We are going to use government people to do it, then it is not a cost. Well, of course it is a cost. We are told that every budget that if somebody is doing a job in the government, it is a cost: it is a cost to us; it's against the budget. Somewhere in the paper it is mentioned that three different departments are planned to be expanded, and you can't do that without it costing something. So I think it is quite misleading, and there are some very direct questions I would like answered before I could ever make a decision on the models that are in front of us.

Is it possible to have a witness? I don't know who it would be, it seems to me this was put together by the Committee that advises the Executive Committee on pipeline matters, and I am not sure who they are, but since the Commissioner isn't here and has gone on holidays until after Christmas, he would be the ideal one unless the members of the Executive Committee who are directly responsible for this paper.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the member responsible directly for this paper, in the Executive Committee is Mr. Bell. If it is Committee's wish, maybe we could have him appear before committee in respect to this paper.

Mr. Chairman: Is that Committee's wish?

Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Could we not have general debate before we call witnesses in? We always seem to get a paper and then we have to have witnesses. I would like to have more general debate on an impact centre before we get into the specifics of the paper.

Mr. Chairman: Well, Ms Millard was requiring information. If that is going to contribute to her general debate, perhaps we should have the witness first. I do not see any objection to having the witness here and continue with general debate in this instance.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I do. So often we get a witness here and they seem to become part of our debate and I don't think this is the proper use of the witness. I would like to see us debate and then if we have specific subjects, get our witness in, ask the witness the question and then excuse them.

Mr. Chairman: I beg to differ, Mrs. Watson. I don't think our witnesses have been participating in debate.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a Point of Order. I don't think you are allowed to beg to differ.

Mr. Chairman: What is Committee's wish?

Committee doesn't have any wishes.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss and debate the paper and then when we have specific questions, we can get our witness in.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of general debate first and I have a couple of points I would like to explain to the Committee first before we have any witnesses.

I want to look at a practical end of it, of an impact centre. I want to look at the way that the people in the outlying areas are going to view an impact centre, and the practical use of an impact centre because I think, to me, I can feel the impact and I think that most other Yukoners are going to feel the impact in their pocketbooks, when the price is going to rise and what good is the information to them a month later when some statistician is going to tell them that the price of bread has gone up. He already found that out because his salary he takes home is not going to buy him that same amount of bread anymore.

I have nothing against the impact centre, basically, because it could be useful for further construction, we are talking about another pipeline right now, but, what I would like to see, instead of the paper on the impact centre, which, to me, is an after result gathering centre, after the fact, is what will the Government do with all that information? What protection is this Government going to come up with, prior to the price increases? What protection will the Government give to the people who have to pay the higher rents? What protection will the Government give to the people in the outlying areas, in Dawson, in Mayo, where there is no pipeline, where the price of food and fuel is going to go up?

I don't need a statistician to tell me that the price went up, because, as I said already, my pocketbook is already smaller. I mean this is the easiest information the Government could bring forth. There is nothing forthcoming on the regulatory body on pipelines. There is nothing forthcoming on anything concerning the real concern of the people in the Yukon.

It is all nice and fine to say well we study things. Well we are overloaded with studies in the Territory, by federal government, by all sorts of people. I think what is happening now, there is another group of people trying to find a job. I think this is a real concern of the people in the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear what the other people have to say in this House, yet, impact is fine, but let's gather the facts that really affect the people.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to hear the remarks from the Honourable Member from Klondike. I myself feel very much the same way. I really can't, at the present time, see the great need for an impact centre. I think too that it is a type of emotionalism and it is a type of a reaction that says why aren't we doing something about the pipeline, and somebody hit upon the idea of an impact centre and everybody sort of got on the bandwagon and we come in here and say why haven't we got an impact centre to the government and they brought forward the Paper.

The Honourable Member is so completely right. I hear everyday from my constituents about the impact of inflation on their pocketbook. I hear every day that fuel has gone up. I know, no impact centre has to tell me that fuel has gone up and has continued to go up. I know that we could be looking to higher electrical rates. We don't need an impact centre to tell us. We know if groceries go up, you don't need an impact centre to analyze that. We are going to know it when we go with our shopping cart and pay for groceries.

I am concerned. I think we could be building up another small bureaucracy that could be growing, and advising us, when my constituents themselves can advise me of how their rent is going up, and how their cost of living is going up, and how there is a shortage of certain supplies within the Yukon Territory. We don't need this type of thing at this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting that in Alberta that we are looking at approximately 800 miles of pipeline in the Yukon Territory, and yet Alberta Trunk Gas Line has built approximately 800 miles of pipeline every year in Alberta. I don't think I have ever heard of anything like an impact centre. I think we are just getting ourselves worked up into a frenzy. I do think, though, Mr. Chairman, that government does have an obligation to form some sort of contingency plans so that if certain situations do arise, then we have a scheme or some proposal that we can fall back on to help alleviate the situation within the Yukon Territory. I don't think an impact centre is going to tell that rents are— you have to wait until they tell you that rents are going sky high, or that some of our senior citizens are just not able to meet the costs of the day.

It is not going to take us too long to determine this, and it is

going to be up to you and I in this House, and it is going to be up to our government to come forward with some sort of contingency plans. I get very, very concerned when I read cost and funding of the impact centre. "These funds will be payable from present or future revenues of this government." If I even thought, and I my suspicions will probably be well founded, that we might be looking at funding this impact centre with our \$200 million, and there is no way I would ever approve of using revenue of my children and my grandchildren to pay for an impact centre were I not to absolutely needed.

I look at \$172,000. I look at \$132,000 and I think that might do well in funding that Pharmacare program that the Member from Mayo was talking about or it could be used to help that equalization scheme. Those are bread and butter items that people of the territory are faced with and you and I are faced with. I just don't think that we should even commit ourselves to an impact centre at this stage of the game. There are too many other important things. If we keep on this sort of emotional frenzy about getting ready for the pipeline, we are going to create the inflation ourselves.

I don't really think that the pipeline is going to that affect our lifestyle that much. When I do read about the impact centre and I read some of the recommendations from the one in Alaska, it is most interesting that most of their recommendations are provisions for information from the rural areas. The larger centres like Whitehorse, government is here. Government, right now is gathering information, baseline data on cost of living in the Whitehorse area, but what about the rural communities that will be directly affected by the pipeline?

That in itself is one of the biggest areas that if there is an impact centre, where it should be operating and it is quite significant in the recommendations of the one in Fairbanks.

I think that I can be as good an impact centre in Haines Junction, Destruction Bay and Beaver Creek as anybody else because they don't mind telling me when their cost of living goes up and they tell me in no uncertain terms. I get some very specific information from them too. I know that every Member in this House does.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I cannot be supporting an impact centre at this time and I certainly can't support paying Yukon funds, whether present funds or future funds, for an impact centre when there are so many other areas where that money could be used. People areas, direct people areas.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I always am amazed when my colleague from Klune and usually says what I wanted to say before I could get to it.

However, I have something to add. I read this Green Paper over very carefully and I think possibly rather than trying to create an impact centre, we should be creating a prevention centre. I don't think we need to find out what the impacts will be, I think we should be preparing ourselves for some of the impacts which we know are already coming.

Maybe after discussions on this Paper, we should get together possibly and talk this out, caucus or whatever, but this whole committee, as the Government of the Yukon Territory or supposedly the Assembly that is to run this country and come up possibly with something to help the government to prevent some of these things that are going to happen to us.

It is very interesting to note that in this paper and all through it, you will find that it didn't take much research to come up with the actual problems that bothered most of the people in Alaska because they are so visible to us already.

On the first page what will it cost and who will pay for it, I think that is one of the main things, and I have to agree with

the Member from Klwane there, I would in no way ever see any of the \$200 million, in fact, I hope we never look at that \$200 million borrowed to try to find out what is going to happen to us that we have to pay back afterwards. I think we know what is going to happen to us and I think we should be prepared to sit down and come up with some answers in the areas where we should be able to see where the problem is.

If you go through the paper, and I have read it carefully, you will find pages in it, where, on the topics that the citizens in Alaska were mostly interested in and came to the impact centre on was: housing was one, it wasn't as great as you would think it would be, but the main one was the food prices and the cost to the public. That was one that you will see was the largest topic they had. Another one was fuel of course, and gasoline prices, and the other one was employment, I think were the three biggest ones.

I think this is exactly where we should be looking; we should be looking to see that we do get advantage of all the employment that is possible. We should be looking into the fact that we should not have our people that are working now really pushing those jobs and rushing off to a job that is going to last for possibly a year or two years and then kaboom, they are gone, just because of the high pay. I think if this could be brought to their attention, I don't think we need an impact centre to do it. I think it can be brought to their attention here today that we don't need an impact centre to do that. We can come up with the answers right here, we shouldn't do that. Controlling our rental for housing and situations such as this in Yukon, I think we can come up with an answer there somehow. It is hard, I know, to control people, the civil rights of people and so forth. You can't stop people from going and taking a job if they wish to have it, but somehow you can warn, you can let them know. I think we could do that.

I find going through the whole paper that the little problems that exist are just here, you know the money that was spent to find out what they have found out in this paper as far as I am concerned, up around possibly from \$170,000 up to \$200,000 to find out what is in this paper, and I think we know it all today and we knew it before we got the paper.

I think it is just up to us to sit down and forget impact centres, forget spending money that we have to borrow. Make the people aware of what is going to happen to them, and the impact will probably not be half as much as it would be if we just started trying to gather data today.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am really amazed to hear some of the comments. I have to agree with many of them from the practical side. Certainly, I don't think the exercise should be to spend a lot of taxpayers' dollars wastefully. I don't think that is the idea at all and I think even the motion, the original motion tried to put something like that forward in keeping the formation, if we did form an impact centre, down to a very minimal amount of staffing.

But, what does bother me is that I just hate to see this Assembly making some of those decisions just off the cuff, with respect to rents and real estate costs and wage rates and accommodations and hiring practices and in-migration and the rest of it, without any baseline data of any sort, without some indication of what the trends have been, because, Mr. Chairman, in my mind, I think there is a lot of costs that are too high right now and some trends are occurring that are very adverse and should be checked. If this Assembly is, by its indication right now, is so responsible that is going to do that, then I think that we had better start to specifically discussing some of those matters and see if we can make some decisions pertaining to it.

If you are prepared to do that today, I am prepared as well. I don't think an impact centre has to be, you know, it can take

many forms. I think the idea of it, I think the function of such a thing, what it should do and what should its relationship to Government be, is the question and certainly, maybe there is an in-house department now that is doing all these things, but let us hear about it. I want to know who is looking at all the functions.

Can the people relate to that department? Can they provide that department information? Is that department providing Yukoners with the information that they want to know? If that is in place, then we don't need the impact centre at all. I agree and if Members around here can tell me that that is happening, good, then let's forget it.

The idea is not to spend a lot of money wastefully. People in Yukon presented their views to the Lysyk Inquiry, and I think it was a pretty fair consensus, was good participation on behalf of Yukoners to that Inquiry, and they indicated that they wanted some way of knowing what the impact was going to be.

Sure, it is easy to say, I can tell you that the real estate costs have soared already, since May, but what is the control point? When are you going to start to put in the controls? Is the Minister of Education going to tell me when this is to be done? Is he going to press the button? Or is the Honourable Member from Klondike going to tell me that prices are too high today?

Mr. Berger: I will.

Mr. Lengerke: That's good, and I know you will. I know that Member will, but I want to know if we are prepared to act on that Member's decision, or his indicator?

You know, maybe it is a crazy idea. I have no idea, but I have no definite consensus on that at this time. I am a little bit ill at ease with putting in place an impact centre. On the other hand, I am ill at ease without one.

I admit it, because I haven't got the answer. But I am glad to hear that you people have got the answer. So, I will listen a little further, I would like to hear some more views from the government side.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the timing of this Resolution is a little unfortunate, because we all have been informed that there are two important papers coming before us in the next day or two regarding policies of this Government to handle some of the impacts of a pipeline, and they may very well affect the opinions of members here regarding this particular motion.

But aside from that, I have a problem because I see here two separate requirements. I see the need for an information centre, a pipeline information centre, which will be the main channel through which all information would pass which the average person wants to know. This I would visualize, as I said before in this House, as being something done on Main Street, not hidden away in a government office here, to which people can go and ask a specific question or file specific information or whatever. I visualize this, Mr. Chairman, as a public relations project requiring 100 per cent co-operation from the contractor who is going to build this pipeline, because that is one of the main sources of information and with the City of Whitehorse and with this Government.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that when we have an opportunity tomorrow to speak with Mr. Blair, all members will be having that opportunity, there might be some discussion on that point, because I see really very little hope of operating a competent information centre without the main sources of the information being involved. I know that this can be done at reasonable cost, starting in a very small way, and being very practical. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, there has to also be a monitoring of impact from this project. As a number of members have already said, it is being felt in some areas, although I think there is a great danger, and some of us are

being trapped into this temptation of throwing everything at the pipeline right now, increased cost of eggs, the increased cost of fuel, the increased cost of anything is now being blamed on the pipeline. I think we have to be a little more rational in some of these remarks.

We know the prices have gone up, but do we know it is because of the pipeline. There has to be someone doing the monitoring and analysis job, quite right, and it is going on in this government now. There is analysis and there is co-ordinating of this information. As it tells you in this paper, Mr. Chairman, there are some very competent people working on this subject. Every bit of pipeline information is being filed and co-ordinated in the Archives by a competent person who has training in that field. There is a Pipeline Co-ordinator who is putting it all together from the federal, and every other source, all information pertaining to the pipeline in the Yukon and elsewhere for the use of this Government. There is a Research and Economic Development Unit working as well in preparation of some of these things.

I just feel that we should be going very cautiously into any additional structure than we have present, and that we should be doing two things: One, an information centre, which is a practical, useful, down on the level of the average thing, for which we have people available now. The other thing is the monitoring and the impact for planning purposes of this Government. There has to be data of course, on which to base any plan of action to control any harmful impact.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, have problems with this particular resolution and some of its wording. I don't know whether the mover and seconder wish to revise it or whether they wish to refer it to a later time until they have had an opportunity to study these papers which are coming in, and an opportunity to speak to Mr. Blair.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Ms Millard.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, as seconder of the motion I have absolutely no impulse at all to change the motion. I think that this should have been dealt with yesterday, as the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale said, and we are, I am amazed, Mr. Chairman, that we are standing here even arguing about the concept of an impact centre. It really floors me that it hasn't gotten through to Members what an impact centre is. I had the suspicion that it didn't, and I am now certain.

It may appear less important than other pipeline matters and it will be less important if we go ahead and be reasonable and set it up and it will work, fine. Then we can get down to the basic things of trying to understand a regulatory body and what do we do about taxation and what about inflation controls. If we can't even understand what an impact centre is, how are we ever going to do anything about inflation controls?

I think we should give a listen to some of the experts around here. The University of Canada North has said, "It has been apparent for quite sometime to researchers in the Yukon, that there is a considerable lack of reliable baseline data in the economic, cultural and social fields".

An independent voluntary organization says, "There is no doubt in our minds that the immediate creation of an effective impact information centre, is of utmost importance and should be given top priority".

Dean Lysyk's Inquiry, all three of them agreed that one of the most critical needs that should be met as soon as possible, "Whether or not the Government approves construction of the proposed pipeline, is the establishment of a sound data base for the Yukon. Such a data base would assist decision making on other possible developments and it would enable proper monitoring of any proposal that may be implemented"

And then right this morning, we get a letter from the Fairbanks North Star Borough. If anybody isn't an expert on impact of pipelines, these are the people who should. The first thing they say in their letter, "It is necessary to begin monitoring socio-economic conditions before the project begins. This was not done in Fairbanks and the lack of baseline data often made it difficult to identify and quantify changes".

If we don't have that data, how can we change anything if we don't know what needs changing and we don't have any recommendations how to change things. Are we just going to say, "There isn't an impact because we don't have any data"? This is the key to changing things, is information, data, reasonably put together by reasonable people who aren't being influenced. Who is going to make the decision on what is an impact?

The other day I was asking the Commissioner who is going to decide whether a certain cost is due to pipeline impact or not. He told me the Executive Committee will decide that. Are we going to have them doing the research on inflation in the Yukon all over the place? I mean, they keep complaining to us they have too much to do already and they are now going to be an impact centre as well? Mr. Chairman, we have come to the point of the ridiculous many times, but this is the ultimate.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I hope we are all going to receive a degree after that lecture. Mr. Chairman, I can see a need as I said before, for an impact centre, but we have to look at two different things. The immediate impact of inflationary trends because of pipeline construction, as I said before, it is going to be felt by the people without an impact centre. I think this should be our major concern.

The secondary impact, and this is what I said is going to be felt after the fact, it is going to be concerned with the Honourable Member from Riverdale always seems to have in his mind as a favorite expression, a so-called heritage fund. Where he gets the money from, I don't know, but I would like to inform the House on something that Mr. Fleming said, maybe the government wants our help. Well, last summer we had a meeting with the Commissioner. Well, Mr. Commissioner, at that particular time, said to me I do not want any of your political speeches, because I said to him you had better think carefully how you are going to use the \$200 million. He said I do not have to listen to you, I can leave the room. There were some members in this House were present there. There is nobody, except the Honourable Member from Mayo after a while who spoke up about the whole thing.

I mean those are the impacts we are gathering, after three years, after the pipeline is over, we are going to find out that the cost was \$300 million maybe \$500 million, maybe the Honourable Member from Kluane's grandchildren and great grandchildren, or maybe their children are still going to be paying what the impact of this particular pipeline left in the Yukon.

Those to me are impacts, but the immediate concern of the Yukoners, I think as the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua said, this should be our concern in this House right now. We have enough information and our own information on hand to go that route. We know that the inflationary trend is increasing, maybe because of speculation in the Yukon. Maybe the real estate people in Whitehorse decided, well there is a good thing going, let's increase the prices. I don't know, but we have enough information, all we have to do is look at the newspapers every day and you find information.

Talk to the people that go to the grocery stores, you get the information. Maybe do your shopping yourself for a little while and you can get your own information. You know there is a definite impact.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have listened to the debate with quite an interest. I am personally not, at this point in time, an advocate of an impact centre. I think the Honourable Member from Klondike brought up a couple of valid points, that the impact that we have been feeling for the last two or three years dealing with the main enemy, which is inflation. I know of no impact centre that was created when the inflation started spiralling upwards the last two or three years, which has put our country in quite a difficult position, economically speaking.

I have some reservations when we talk about an impact centre and I don't think some members of the House are really aware of just what this is all about. For example, if we are to create an impact centre, with all its points or analysis it may draw or assess, we should look at our own Government of Yukon as to what it has done as far as setting an example in the past.

I make reference to such things as rent control. We talked, this morning in the House, or, I should say, the Minister for Local Government expressed his concern dealing with subsidization of fuels. It is nearly exhausted as far as the fund. But to go back to the rent control formula that the Government has in place now for its own employess and they base their rent on comparable market rents, I would be curious to find out just how many government employees are going to get ripped-off by their own Government once the escalation starts because of a shortage of accommodation. Are they still going to base it on comparable market rents, because I have a sneaking suspicion they are? That is the impact they are feeling right now and I think it has been expressed many times.

We look at another example of our Government and, supposedly, the examples they are supposed to express towards people of the Yukon as setting programs into motion and there has been reference made, Mr. Chairman, to training programs. I don't think this Government really realizes what a training program is all about, because they don't have one themselves.

I think reference was made again this morning, in the House, to the hiring policies of this Government. If you don't have a training program for a person to move through the particular department that he be working in, is it any wonder that the Government goes outside to hire expert people when they can't be bothered to train their own people to compete for that particular job.

These are the impacts that people are seeing right now, Mr. Chairman. I could go on with many others, like the costs of food that is escalating, the cost of transportation, how that is escalating, other commodities that we purchase on a daily basis, you can see them literally rising in front of your own eyes. We don't need an impact centre for that. I think it already has been expressed.

But I go back to what our Government is actually doing. We are discussing the pipeline impact centre right now and I have said, I believe, also, that we have been in this Session for the last approximately five, six weeks, and we are still only on this pipeline impact centre. I don't think it is of great importance at this time, when we see that our Government has not presented this House with any proper direction, what they would like to see, where we could debate it, perhaps, and encourage it or change it somewhat.

We heard this morning, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Mr. McIntyre, present a very good Resolution, and yet we are discussing where we can spend some hundred and some odd thousand dollars on what I would say "passing the buck" or maintaining a low profile and let somebody else get the flack.

The question was asked here many times dealing with other expenditures of government and public funds. I don't see any

reason why we need an impact centre. There is no logic in it. The impact centre we have is the government itself, and if they cannot present us with proper policies and proper legislation to cover off such a project of the magnitude we are anticipating, then they are being irresponsible in their display to the people of Yukon. I think we should consider looking at passing the responsibility over to a group of people called an impact centre. There is no logic.

Mr. Chairman: Committee will recess until 1:30.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order.

Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to carry on and complete my remarks that I proceeded with this morning, dealing with the proposed pipeline impact centre.

I was speaking generally on the ramifications that were taking place right now, and very little interest is shown by our Government and it is now proposed that we consider looking at a pipeline information centre, which I said this morning, from my point of view, serves no useful purpose at this time.

I did make reference in my remarks to a number of areas, like rent control and cost of living which is escalating continuously, and the lack of interest shown by our Government in its own policies. I would like to go further, Mr. Chairman, and there was various remarks made this morning dealing with other segments of industry which could have some effect, the pipeline could have some effect on them and the one I am referring to right now is the mining industry.

The interest that has been shown to the mining industry as the number one industry of the Yukon leaves a lot to be desired, and yet we seem to be wanting to advocate an impact and information centre for the pipeline. I often wonder just what is going to happen when this particular project is completed and the dust starts settling, just who is going to be left holding the ball.

I would suggest that it would be probably the mining industry, yet again. Not that I am an advocate to increase the mining, I just like to see things done properly. If we advocate or suggest for one moment that we should look at an impact centre, strictly for one particular project, I am not really interested, because there is a lot of other ramifications involved after the project is completed and everybody has gone their own merry way.

When the dust starts settling, I think that they will fully realize just how serious a situation it really was and will not be prepared for the after effect. Presently, I don't see where this impact centre is going to resolve anything at all. It is just creating another structure that is not really necessary, because if this government was, you might say, on the ball, we wouldn't even have to worry about an impact centre. I think a lot of questions are being answered right now of just what are we setting into place apart from the so-called impact centres, socio-economic planning and all this paraphernalia which really is just bogging us down in a lot of paper work and nothing else.

I don't know, I could make many comments on many issues and we talked this morning, many members of this Committee got up and gave their feelings on fuel costs, food costs, rent control, cost of living, training programs, you name it, we have got it now. I think the government should be setting a good example by presenting something constructive instead of just coming up with this side issue like an impact centre.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't think

it is any side issue. I think, at least I was under the impression that most members in this Assembly were in favour of such a centre. Be it, you know, an impact centre should be created. Possibly the way it was done might be debatable, but certainly the need for an impact centre is there and I am totally convinced of that and I haven't changed my mind one little bit.

I think that we, as Canadians and as Yukoners, certainly are not emotional, we don't get alarmed about construction projects and development of this nature in the same way as our counterparts in Alaska and so on. So maybe we don't have to tackle this in the same way, but I would suggest that Lysyk made his recommendations and he made those recommendations as a result of public hearings and public participation and support and also, the impact centre concept was supported by, I believe, some fourteen interest groups, community interest groups.

Personally, I put a lot of merit into those recommendations and I feel very strongly that an impact centre should certainly be created and put into place. I think we have spoken enough on that, that the fact that it could be a small office located downtown, as the Minister of Health indicated. I think that is something that should be considered, a small office located downtown, available to the general public. It doesn't have to be staffed by many people and, as the motion originally said, up to three.

I would suggest that all the baseline data information and statistics that have already been gathered by Government sources be provided to those people that are set up in that particular impact centre and from then on, they are available to the public, they are available for John Doe Public to go in and express his concerns and get further information or provide further information.

I think that concept is simple enough. I think it does provide the kind of thing that people of Yukon are expecting. Certainly, you know, in Lysyk's Report, I think it says it very well, it says, "In our view that data should be gathered by an independent group, unrelated to any government or agency or to Foothills".

I agree, I agree with the independence and I stand by that. I say it should be totally independent. The centre should restrict its activities to obtaining and to organizing factual material. "Policies and conclusions, based on information supplied by a trusted and independent source would be subject to less criticism than data provided by a courtisan agency".

Mr. Chairman, with that, as I said, I don't think the debate has even got into the actual make-up of a centre, but, to first find out if we even want one, because it appears to me that maybe it isn't Government's idea or the idea of this Legislature to provide an impact centre, but it certainly is mine and I think an impact centre is needed.

I am totally in support of it.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to get the different points of view in the debate today, regarding the impact centre. I think it is rather refreshing and it is a credit to our House that we have at least got some different points of view and people are expressing them very strongly and with some very good and adequate arguments.

I certainly haven't changed my position and, Mr. Chairman, in the Paper that we had, the government in-house model refers to the fact that a long-term program for monitoring the socio-economic cultural changes presently being developed by the Economic Research Planning Unit. Now, during last Budget's discussions, we provided, I believe, 20 some man years for this Economic Research and Planning Unit and we have all sort of been wondering what their function is.

We were told they were supposed to be gathering informa-

tion and preparing base line data on which studies and further programs could be developed.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a vehicle within our government right now that is doing exactly the type of thing that we want an impact centre to do. Now the Honourable Member from Riverdale referred to the point that he thought an impact centre should be complete and separate from government. This is fine, if you have the funds to do both. I think every one of us realizes that government needs information. They have to have statistics. They have to have these available to them so that they can accommodate and develop various programs as a result of these statistics and this data that is available to them. So government has to have it.

Now, we are saying just so we have an independent agency gathering data that people will rely on more, we have to duplicate what we are almost doing now within government. Now government says that they could establish a complete impact centre by the addition of three more man years, I believe they said, yes, three more man years. I think they have the broad parameters for an impact centre right now in that Economic Research and Planning Unit.

We have people within the government side who sit in this House, they know that they will be able to use the facilities of the Economic Planning and Research Unit. When that Unit cannot provide them with the data that will be required as a result of the pipeline or the Shakwak Project or whatever it is, then it is up to them to come to this House and say we need another man year, we need two more man years, because we don't feel that the data that we are getting is accurate enough or is up to date enough so that we can plan our programs and do our contingency planning. At that time the decision could be made. Okay. Do we hire the extra staff and attach them to government, or do we let the community hire the staff and establish some co-ordination between what we have in government now and what the community is proposing to do? But until there is specific need for it, why not use what we have within government. When we see, and we will see, and government will see, when that data isn't sufficient, then they come back here to the House and say really, we need more, we need a little better means of gathering data than what we have.

At that time, we will make the decision, but not now.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I might say as I saw the unfolding of the pipeline responsibilities in this government that there was two immediate areas where I thought that we should move: one was within the aspect of the single regulatory agency. I believe that we have stated pretty well what Yukoners want to Ottawa which was repeated in the Opening Address as we see the single regulatory agency function. That is a function of the federal government through legislation and through the workings of the National Energy Board to see whether our input and our suggestions will be accepted by the Government of Canada. We will know that when the legislation is put forward whether we were successful or whether we did fail.

I can say that we have made strong representation, we have made continuous representation in that area and only the proof of the pudding will tell whether we have been successful or not.

I was convinced, after the public outcry, that not enough immediately was not only not being done, but seemed to be being done by an area where people could go to a central location asking for information on impacts as to immediately concerning the pipeline or whether they did not concern the pipeline.

I thought that that was a sensible and a common sense approach, until I started looking at the funding of it and who-

was going to pay for it. It was obvious, when the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development came here, he said, it seems that all of the movement towards an impact centre and all of the pressure is coming from the Yukon for an impact centre, well, it is very easy. We, as a federal government, have no objections at all to you creating an impact centre, as long as you are willing to pay for it.

Now, I might say that everything that this Government has done up until this point in time, is try and take the pipeline in stride through the normal growth of Government goods and services, so that most of the funding can come from the normal growth pattern of deficit funding, with the federal government.

When we start asking for the loan of \$200 million to be made available and monies coming out of that which have to be paid through taxation on the pipeline, then I think that we are going to be in trouble and the benefits to the people of the Yukon, from the pipeline are going to be minimal. I think that all Members recognize and realize this.

That is why we were attempting to go through the Government of the Yukon Territory and the Administration as it now stands, because not only the pipeline, as the Honourable Member from Pelly says, but other great impacts are coming on the Yukon in the economic development area.

Now, Members over and over again have asked for a Department of Economic Development, under the control of an elected member. They have asked for a Department of Corporate and Consumer Affairs, a Department of Manpower. We thought that we could put these things together under the control of a fourth elected member and fit them into the normal growth pattern of the Yukon Territorial Government and have that funding coming through normal growth, through the normal deficit grant funding, being able to take care of the pipeline and all of the other related economic development projects and not losing our heads on this one project and not having to start tampering and filtering this \$200 million loan that we could have from the Applicant for specific pipeline oriented and related matters.

Now, we have received an independent analysis of what it would cost to be able to do the totally government-independent type of impact centre, and we see that that comes into the Budget at some \$319,000 a year. We are looking at a million dollars before the first pipe is laid on that pipeline project.

That money is coming directly out because the Minister said it and we know that that's a complete and total impact of the pipeline and the pipeline only, and it is going to come. Don't ever kid yourself, I know it is going to come if we do it that way out of that \$200 million that the Applicant can put aside for socio-economic effects upon the people of the Yukon Territory.

Well, Mr. Chairman, with the knowledge that all of us have of the needs of the people of the Yukon, whether it be electrical rate equalization or Pharmacare, how could we justify that kind of money coming out of that funding at this point in time?

I was looking with very great interest at the make-up of the Fairbanks Impact Centre, and I think it is extremely interesting to note that the Impact Centre, which everybody agrees was a fine impact centre, started at the same time as they started the pipeline project itself, not three years ahead, Mr. Chairman, but in April of the year that construction started. The Impact Centre and the pipeline were synonymous. They both started at the same time.

It was also interesting to note that the Fairbanks part, which was the only portion in place, the first year of the pipeline, ran at an estimate of I think about \$60,000 a year, and it rather disturbs me to see this same person who was responsible for the creation of the Fairbanks Impact Centre, running on a

\$60,000 budget in the same year as the pipeline started, advising people like the University of Canada North that it has to start now and the budget should be \$319,000 a year. I find that a little difficult at this point to accept, Mr. Chairman.

Where can information come from and where can the public go for information prior to the actual start of the construction of the pipeline? I think that we are starting by any of the methods, as approached in the Green Paper on a much richer basis than I think any of us want to at the present time.

I would suggest that most of the information that is being asked for by the public is presently being gathered somewhere in government offices, whether it be the Department of Welfare, the Department of Education, the Department of Local Government, Highways and Public Works, or the Economic Research and Planning Unit.

I also say that all of the formal information that has come out so far out of all the northern pipeline activities experience hearings, there has been a girl who has been hired by the Yukon Territorial Government in the Archival Branch to make sure that none of this material is missed and it is all present and compiled and all catalogued. Now it seems to me that what we really need at this point in time, three years before any construction takes place is someone to co-ordinate all of the information that is presently made available into one place with a phone number that people can contact and say what is the latest spacial price index, what is the latest review of the rent and housing situation in Yukon, where can I get such and such a piece of material on such and such a project, where can I get such and such a brief that was given to such and such a hearing and that is the type of centre that is needed at this point in time.

It may grow into something further somewhere down along the line. There may have to be more people involved and there may have to be, because of the inability of those gathering agencies which the taxpayer has already paid for, to be able to get the type of information that the public is desirous of obtaining.

But I would think, at this time, knowing the cost of any of the alternatives, plus the one from the University of Canada North which we have before us, that the cost at this moment is just too great for what we expect from an impact centre.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should try it for at least some period of time, for at least six months down the line or at least for a year, with some type of a co-ordinating body and there can be public input on that co-ordinating body, as to what information is actually required and what information is not being gathered and what further things that government should be doing in trying to make sure that information is forthcoming to any group, body or individual that needs it.

I would suggest that we cut our cloth accordingly at this point in time, that we see some type of co-ordination in pipeline matters and in all economic development related matters of this Government in the form of some co-ordinating unit that is capable at this moment, of supplying the information that is needed for the public groups and agencies and individuals that are saying that we don't have a single number that we can go to in order to be able to get answers in all of these various areas.

I am saying that is all we can afford right at this moment, until we absolutely know the parameters and know exactly what the pay out in interest rates and all the other related matters, which we don't know at this time, are going to be attached to that \$200 million. But, if we go the whole route and if we go the complete independent funded agency, I know that at this point in time, I don't think it is needed and I know that the funding is going to come out eventually from the benefits that all Yukoners are looking forward from the taxing on the pipeline itself.

I suggest that this is not the moment and this is not the time to be going into that very extensive impact centre, that perhaps will have to grow as the pipeline project and all of the other economic development projects come about.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say in conclusion that there were as many alternatives when examination of the types of impact centres came up, as the Honourable Member from Ogilvie mentioned, that there is so many alternatives that aren't even looked at in these papers and she is correct, because everytime you looked at one alternative, then all kinds of alternatives also kept coming about. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we could do something to satisfy the public pressure and satisfy the legitimate right of the public for information at this time, without going into the total concept of a new agency and a totally new program of Government, with all of the costs upon the taxpayers of the Yukon, because if there is one thing that we know, which the paper indicates, that this is one area where we aren't going to get away from saying that this is just a normal government growth area and that we are going to be able to seek the budget for this impact centre from deficit financing, because we have already been told where the money is coming from. It is going to come from the taxpayer of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to just discuss for a moment Appendix "A". What I see staring or glaring me in the face, it looks like to me that the terms of reference for the socio-economic planning unit which was set into motion not very long ago, we still don't know whether they have accomplished anything or not. Well let us just try item by item, Mr. Chairman, when you go to Section 1 there, it says "Government has a responsibility to identify the impact of industrial development". Well if they haven't done it by now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we are going to accomplish anything by that statement in Section 1.

It goes on to item 2 there: "The measurement of socio-economic impact of industrial development requires data related to prices, rents, labour force, wages, population, business activity, housing and social-cultural change." Well as far as I am concerned, when it was proposed to us, the socio-economic planning unit, these particular matters I just made reference to is what we should have been studying since the introduction of that particular planning unit.

It goes on in 3: "The YTG, as a member of all federal-territorial government committees, would be able to co-ordinate activities to avoid needless duplication." Well this is exactly what we are talking about right now, Mr. Chairman, duplication. An impact centre is only duplicating what we already have into place, and that is a socio-economic planning unit.

"A long-term program for monitoring the socio-economic-cultural change is presently being developed by the Economic Research and Planning Unit." Exactly, we need not go any further.

You look at the other model in Appendix "B" Mr. Chairman, it says at the bottom of the first page, "such a public board would clearly require representation from the following sectors:

- Native organizations
- Business Associations
- Consumer Associations
- Environmentalists
- Labour Organizations"

and it goes on. If the need is so imminent, then why have they not created their impact centre without the government getting involved? Why are we to look at costs again to the tune,

according with this particular paper, of \$135,000. I see no logic in it, the Minister, a moment ago, mentioned perhaps \$1 million that is going to be needed. That is a loan, Mr. Chairman, it is not outright money. Straight loan, that's all it is.

If we have a so-called socio-economic planning unit in place, which I believe we have, they should be studying what we are looking at today and we should not be looking at the next step and start pyramiding with another impact centre or another group.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments on the suggestions by the Honourable Minister of Local Government regarding the co-ordinating unit rather than an impact centre. I can't agree with his concept of a sort of conciliatory something to give the people who are wanting an impact centre, rather than saying no, we are not going to have an impact centre, we will let you have the co-ordinating unit, because to me it is a nothing thing.

I don't think we should do this type of thing. A co-ordinating unit, from what I understand from what the Honourable Member said, would be there to disseminate information, to gather information, to give out information, so if people wanted to know information about the pipeline, or about the economic growth of the government as he stated, they would phone this number or go to see this one unit.

But, Mr. Chairman, that has been one of the biggest problems that Government always has had and always will have, is getting information about its activities out to the public and, because of that, Mr. Chairman, the Government now, and I read, from appendix "A" again, "In addition, an efficient and Territory-wide information gathering and disseminating network exists throughout the combined efforts of the YTG's Departments of Tourism and Information Services and the Library Services Branch".

Further, within the Library Services Branch, they have already established a pipeline librarian to establish and maintain a Yukon-wide index of pipeline related publications and records, and, Mr. Chairman, I know that in our small library, and in some of these small libraries in some of the communities in the Yukon Territory, you can go and get information regarding the pipeline, the proposals that they put forth, some of the copies of briefs that were presented at some of the hearings, and so on. I was quite surprised when I was in there the other day.

So, Government is actually doing this and, in many instances, we don't know exactly what they are doing, but those small libraries are doing it and I wouldn't doubt one bit that the library here in Whitehorse is doing it. The pipeline is giving out, the pipeline company is giving out as much information as they have information to give. They have press releases. Why should we send up a, set up a body and pay someone, or the public pay someone to give out information that the pipeline company is obligated to give out, then they will give it out. They have their public relations men.

So, I just can't understand what good would be served by having a co-ordinating unit, because we already have government giving out information. We have the pipeline company giving out information and, Mr. Chairman, we have a very enlightened news media in the Yukon Territory, who are giving out and gathering information for the public.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Are you smiling when you say that?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, they do give out the information and if you notice the pipeline folders that we get everyday, the Government Information Services are compiling for our benefit. Maybe if we circulated them in the community we wouldn't need the co-ordinating unit, but a lot of the clippings, the newspaper clippings in these pipeline circulations are

from our own Yukon papers. So, I think that is quite noteworthy.

So, we do and our news information does get out in the Yukon Territory and I don't think the co-ordinating unit would be solving anything at all, and we have the Economic Research and Planning Unit and I think that all of us are looking at them to do something about providing the baseline data and interpreting some of the reactions on the life of the people in the Territory as a result of the pipeline or any other local large project.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Ms Millard.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested to hear the Honourable Member from Local Government talk about this Green Paper, because I am beginning to think we are getting back into candy-striped papers again.

I understood, when I learned the rules of this House, that a Green Paper came from the Government for direction. Our Member from Whitehorse North Centre is now saying this isn't quite what we are talking about. We are talking about another kind of thing altogether. I am really curious to hear what the other two Members of our Executive Committee think of this Green Paper. If they are going to bring something forward, let us have some input into the paper that we are discussing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: With respect, Mr. Chairman, the Green Paper is here for the suggestions and advice of all members and that is exactly what we are looking for in trying to put out three different options as the Honourable Member mentioned that there were so many different options, we could have come up with twenty, thirty, fifty alternatives, if you had wanted, we just would have made it ten times as big. All we were doing was trying to show the different methods that could be used to set up an impact centre and the Green Papers are there for the suggestions and the advice of members to give to the government. White Papers are government policy, and that's exactly what it is. Here are three types of alternatives we could choose, we choose none of them, all of them, something in between, please let us know what the cost and what type of centre you would like government to participate in or set up?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the sponsor of the motion for information, what is the impact centre going to do with information? Are we going to give the government further power of governing by regulation or through regulations? Are we going to be in a continuous session to change the legislation around because the impact centre is coming forward and saying that the egg prices have increased, or the price of the mini bus system in Whitehorse has to be increased or something like this? I mean, what are we looking for.

I said before, I have a picture of an impact centre gathering information to be useful maybe two or three years from now, or maybe longer. We have this already. They have an impact centre set up in Fairbanks, Alaska; all the information is available to us. They can tell us what people were interested in, what people had the main concern in, where the greatest impact was, simply because of pipeline construction. But we are not following through with anything.

I say it is a poor excuse to come up just because newspaper headlines were we need an impact centre, so some Honourable Members stand up in the House and say yes, we need an impact centre. This is not the road to follow. It is for us here in the House to say that the people are concerned with the rent and price increases in the Yukon. What are they going to do

about it? Factually, not to set up another piece of paper on information centre, study centre. What are we going to do with the increase of inflation in the Yukon Territory?

I haven't heard any positive suggestion come out of this House yet, and if nobody came up and said yes, we need rent and price control in Whitehorse where the greatest impact will be, does nobody from Whitehorse representation come forward with a suggestion like this. Oh, no, we stop it at setting up another agency. And as the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre said, in three years it will possibly cost over a million dollars, and I say possibly more because once we set up a bureaucracy, it has a tendency to grow. There are all sorts of people looking for jobs these days and that is an easy job to handle.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, very interesting. The Minister of Human Resources said there was some papers coming to this House and I was very interested in what she said in what she had thought they were going to try to do, because I think that that is my way, too, the way, possibly through the government and through the agencies we have already, an information centre to get information from the people and also to get information to the people, back to them.

I think we want to stress a little bit, too, while we are here, we have got a job to do, as the Honourable Member has just said, Mr. Berger, but, also I think we had better stress to the people, too, that 99 per cent of us are living beyond our means and we should know it, all of us. Any pipeline or any big structural project, big mining operation, anything is going to have an impact on somebody and somewhere. Normally, the impact would be on the lower income group. You can't hurt somebody that is already getting more than he needs, very badly.

I think those are the people we should be thinking of, protecting, possibly, their rights to have jobs and so forth, in the Territory.

I would like to see this motion or whatever, set over, maybe, until we do have a little more information and then take another look at it.

Mr. Chairman: Ms Millard.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat the question I asked before, that I would like to hear from the other two Executive Committee members. This paper has been brought in by the Government and, obviously, they must have had some idea that they wanted some kind of impact paper and I would like to know if the Executive Committee is still supporting that concept or not. It doesn't matter what kind, at this point, but if they are supporting one, I would like to know.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I found the debate up to now very interesting. I see we are ranging from all sides in respect to the economy, to impact centres and whatever.

I just would like to say a few comments and that is in the pipeline itself. I find so many negative things being said about the pipeline and personally I think that we have to assess our position and our economy in Yukon for the next five to ten years. We have a Shakway Valley Project, which is a \$330 million project over an eleven year span, which is probably going to have more effect than any pipeline, and you have a pipeline which is just begin construction in 1981.

You look at North America, and Canada for that matter, and you see the people in Sudbury all standing up and saying that they want jobs, they want to go to work and they just seem to be saying the exact opposite that some of the Members in the House here, everybody in Sudbury is concerned whether or not they can pay their bills at the end of the month. I think that, personally, we are in a very good position with our economy

being assured as it is, at least for the next five to ten years.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should really assess the pipeline, just exactly what it is going to do. I had the good fortune to work at the Aishihik Project when it was being constructed. I see the Member from Kluane has left, but I didn't see that many detrimental things happening to Haines Junction, which was approximately 30, 35 miles from the camp site.

What you are looking at, in the area for construction camps, you are looking at, strung along the Highway, maybe six to eight major camps, consisting of 400 men who are working seven days a week contrary to some people's impression that people in construction, all they are worried about is, as one professional person in town is quoted as saying is that all they were worried about was is women and booze and making money. I don't take that attitude. I think that the people that work on construction happen to be the backbone of this country. If they are working seven days a week, they certainly haven't—

No, I do take exception to that, Mr. Chairman, public statements like that being made maligning the working people, because somebody has got to make this thing go and they are the ones that make this thing go.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is these people are working seven days a week and they are working ten hour shifts, they don't have that much time to carry on after hours. In fact, if their camps were situated in such a manner I am sure that most communities really won't see anyone from these camps if they are situated a fair distance away.

At the same time I think I have to agree with the Minister of Local Government, we do have an individual on staff that has the information, compiling the information and it is right at his or her fingertips there. I can't see why not, at least at this time, that that individual's phone number can't be advertised a little bit more, and if people are looking for information they can go and get it, or else we direct it to the specific department that has information.

I think that, personally, we are premature, we have got the paper out. We felt that we do know that people are asking the questions so we had some people look in this area of what it would cost, and we have the consequences of the various options that are available to us. As the Honourable Member from Pelly River says, it is a loan. You are going to go this route, you are borrowing that money and right now we don't even know what the interest rate will be. It is going to have to be all paid back.

I would sooner at least take a small step now and work within the resources that we have and after a year evaluate it, if we feel that we have to go further then a decision can be made at that time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Just a few more comments, Mr. Chairman. First I just want to react to the Member from Klondike, and I would like to just tell him for sure that you know the motion wasn't put forward as a response to a story in the newspaper or anything like that. I can assure you of that. I think it was a little more responsible in that we took a look at what was happening by way of, again as I said about four times today, that the response to the Lysyk Inquiry and the response by various community organizations in Whitehorse, in Yukon, and I don't think there is anything wrong with that. I make no excuses for that whatsoever, because I think that is where we like to take our direction is from some of the people out there that want to be part of it and know what is going on.

As I say, I can envision an impact centre in different forms, and I was hoping that the exercise that would be taken on by this Assembly today will be to come up either in full support of

a motion such as we have had on the floor, or come up with the alternate. I hear, certainly, some direction to an alternate, and I would like to hear some positive suggestions with that, possibly another motion would come forward or an amendment.

I realize that, you know, maybe the timing of this thing is wrong, I don't think so. I think some kind of an information and impact centre, independent, has to be put into position today.

Maybe as I said, the staffing of it is questionable. The degree of information that it is going to gather or to send out is debatable, but I would like to know for sure if we are to have an independent impact centre. If people are not in favour of it, then I would like to know that.

Because then we could put away the issue and forget about it. If we are in favour of it, then I would like to see us at least take some positive action in putting in place that independent office downtown, as was suggested. I think that was a good step.

I am not in favour of a co-ordinator within the Government to do that. I think it has to be an independent person. I know that, you know, it has been mentioned, and I have been a very critical person of the Economic Planning Unit many times, and it has been mentioned that some of the people should be taken from that particular function. I don't think we are even doing enough in our planning in relation to planning for Yukon right now, never mind give those people another job, because we have those other areas, everyday areas that we are concerned about.

The Member from Kluane got up and mentioned it, with respect to the Shakwak Project and other major projects that are going to affect Yukon, so certainly we are going to have to keep the pressure on there. It would be interesting to be able to really differentiate the trends that are happening in Yukon today, with respect to high costs and rents and what have you, if they are really, in relation to the pipeline or if they are in relation to the other projects mentioned, or what they are.

I, we will never know if we don't soon get off our butts and get something going with respect to this. I know, I am just as concerned with the costs and I can do my multiplication, too, I have a little adder, and the rest of it, and I know how many dollars it is going to cost for eight or ten years of this kind of thing, at a \$172,000 or \$143,000, but I think we have got to be prepared to make that kind of decision. And if we think the exercise, if it is important enough, we are going have to spend that money and if it comes from a Heritage Fund of the \$200 million or if it comes from a subsidy by this Government for that purpose, is it something that we want to do? Are we not responding to what the wishes of the people of the Yukon are?

If we are not responding to those wishes, then I suggest to you that we don't do it, that is for sure.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am quite surprised at the last speaker, Mr. Lengerke. I would like to give him assurance right now that I will not support his resolution, emphatically I won't support it.

When I see an individual at one end holding out something and he has the other hand behind his back, sorry, I don't think the previous speaker has taken into consideration just what the public of the Yukon is wanting at this point in time and it is not an impact centre.

It is not to consent for us to waste public money on something that is not necessary at this point in time and I think the Minister for Local Government has already expressed a position and described fairly well, the probabilities in a few years time, as to the costs.

Here we go, we have a resolution, fanatical support for

something that has no foundation, for something that doesn't make sense, for something that is not necessary, and here we are back again. The Honourable Member says well we shouldn't waste time doing this and doing that, and here we go, he is wasting time right now. If you want to do something constructive, then maybe you should start reading the members of the public that are complaining about other more important things than a so-called or suggested impact centre.

I notice that the name on this piece of paper goes by the name of Mr. Pearson, not any one of our Members of the Executive Committee. When there is a suggestion that the Minister should get up and explain their position on the Green Paper, I don't think that's really necessary. They didn't put the signature on it, and I don't think they fanatically support it and I wouldn't ask them for a comment. Anyway that is their decision.

What I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is that we are wasting time here. We have a socio-economic planning unit and questions should be asked in this House, just what have they done to date? We have a consumer association that I wholeheartedly support, who is documenting continuously the inflationary aspects of prices of food, et cetera, et cetera. So let's stop fooling around, let's get on with the show and let's scrap this thing, we don't need it.

Mr. Chairman: Ms Millard?

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I think up to this point in this entire Session that we have been in, I have never once stood up and said that I felt that the Executive Committee was not giving us leadership. I am afraid I am going to have to say that right now. We have only heard from two out of three of the Ministers, and both of them have said that they have other alternatives in mind than what they have given us in the Green Paper, and now we have a member standing up and saying because it is signed by Commissioner Pearson that our Executive Committee doesn't even need to be responsible for it. Where are we? What sort of government is this? Is it run by Mr. Pearson, do we stand here and argue with somebody who is on Christmas holidays?

I would like to suggest to Committee that this Green Paper be taken back by the Executive Committee and be brought back with whatever they are trying to tell us they want.

Mr. Chairman: There is a motion on the floor at the present time Ms Millard and it has to be dealt with or amended.

Ms Millard: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I might as well state my position, never mind talking about pipelines or anything else as to the motion, I will not be voting for the motion, because I, too, am really worried about us mistaking that \$200 million is the money that we can get and spend and possibly pay it back without really going in the hole and there is no such thing, and I hope the people in the Yukon Territory realize this, that if we do have to take some of that money for a motion such as this one, which I don't think we need anyway, because I think we are coming up with better solutions than impact centres, we will in the future. We would be just putting ourselves into a position where we will never get out of it, and I am not prepared to even look at any motion in this House at any time that has anything to do with spending any part or borrowing any part of the \$200 million to do something that has anything to do with the pipeline. That's my stand, I am going to remain that way.

I wouldn't loan somebody my car and then have him give me \$1,000 and then turn around, when he brings me the car back and pay the money back and have him have the car and wreck it for nothing. It is just that simple.

With that, I will say, too, that I will not be supporting the motion, and that is the end of it. It saves a lot of argument.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to answer very shortly, the Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Mr. Chairman, this Executive Committee and this Government, over the last few months, has been under a tremendous amount of pressure, as far as interest groups and as far as the public is concerned, on bringing forward an impact centre. If we had bowed to that pressure without regarding the advice of the House, we would have been giving you a White Paper, stating that we had formed an impact centre and this was the method that it was being formed. There was pressures on the elected members of the Executive Committee, and all members of the Executive Committee, to do this.

The elected members of the Executive Committee said that we think that we can read the political feeling of the people of the Yukon and we are not sure whether all of our elected members agree with us, that the immediate institution of an impact centre that is going to be extremely costly is what the elected members of the people of the Yukon want, nor what the people of the Yukon want.

We would really be standing here getting roundly condemned from all sides if we had have put in that impact centre without coming to the members of this Legislature and asking them what their reaction, advice and input into such an impact centre would be. This is exactly what we are doing and, in my mind, that is leadership, bringing it to the representatives of the people, rather than doing something that they are not sure of and then asking the approbation of the members, whether they were correct in doing so or not.

Now, it is for this House to show the leadership as to whether they accept the motion that the Honourable Member put in, one or part or all or none of these areas that were suggested. One of the alternatives or options by another motion, after accepting or rejecting the Honourable Member from Riverdale. You know, it is just one of those instances where there is no way that you can be all things to all people, bringing in a firm policy and dumping it down and say, there, we have done it and that is all there is to it and get condemned from the members from doing it that way, or do it this way, which I consider to be the proper democratic and responsible method to do it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I must say from the Chair that it seems that the Green Paper is doing just what a Green Paper should do. It is offering various directions for us to take.

The Motion before us at the present time is one possible direction. I would suggest that we go ahead and vote on that motion and then, if there are any other considerations, they can be brought forward as further motions.

Are you ready for the question on Resolution Number 2, THAT it is the opinion of this Assembly that immediate action be taken in connection with the Alaska Pipeline Project, to implement a Yukon Impact Information Centre, similar to that as recommended by the Lysyk Report, to be funded by the Federal Government and such a centre to be controlled by a Board of Directors composed of representatives of community interest groups, industry, labour and government. Further, that such a centre be initially staffed to a maximum of three persons, with a review to be carried out with to the operation and effectiveness of such a centre by the Government of the Yukon, after 12 months operation.

Motion defeated

Mr. Chairman: We will have a brief recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order.

Is there any further consideration of the Green Paper on Pipeline Impact Information Centre at the present time? The

Paper will be remaining in Committee for further consideration.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Then we will turn to Bill Number 9, *Workers' Compensation Ordinance*.

Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, as I presented to Committee last week for their consideration, the amendments that I proposed which you have before you, a copy thereof, the members of Committee have had their copies for well over a week now, and with the Committee's concurrence, I would like to proceed through those amendments at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. McCall: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you are in a position to start going through the proposed amendments to this Ordinance, I would appreciate it.

On Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: Clause 1 had not been carried previously, so I will go through and you call your amendments, Mr. McCall, and then we will go on.

I am sorry, Mr. Booth and Mr. Taylor are available as witnesses, and perhaps they could join us at the witness table.

Clause 1 agreed to

On Clause 2

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: We are starting into my proposed amendments, Mr. Chairman, where it would read the clause to be amended by deleting Sections 2 and 3 thereof and substituting the following therefor and it gives you the new Section 2.

I think before I go into this, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank a number of people and two of them were witnesses with us when we went through the first review of *Workmen's Compensation* and those are Mr. Brian Booth and Mr. Crawford Laing, the actuary who gave us a considerable amount of assistance when we went through the *Workmen's Compensation Ordinance*.

I would like to personally thank these two individuals, as well as the Minister for Human Resources, for allowing me to use the expertise of Mr. Crawford, in preparing these amendments to the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we have Mr. H.J. Taylor here, in his capacity as Chairman of the *Workmen's Compensation Board*, and he has delayed leaving on a holiday in order to be with us today if there is any information that can come from the Board to assist us in considering the amendment, and particularly the amendment regarding the changed status of the Board, which we felt would be something the Board should comment on to Committee of the Whole.

I will be having some comments to make regarding the proposed amendments as we go through the Bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall, your first amendment is to Section 2.

Mr. McCall: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. Do you wish for me to read them out or is the Chair going to read them out?

Mr. Chairman: No, the Chair will read them out.

Mr. McCall: Very well.

Mr. Chairman: (a) By deleting Sections 2 and 3 thereof and substituting the therefor:

2) Subsection 2.(1) of the said Ordinance is amended a) by adding immediately after the definition "accident" the fol-

lowing definitions:

"administrator" means the administrator appointed by the Board, pursuant to subsection 10.(1)(2)

"Board" means the Workers' Compensation Board, established pursuant to subsection 10.(1);

(b) By adding immediately after the definition "child" the following definition:

"Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory or such other person as may be authorized by the Commissioner to act on his behalf, including the Workers' Compensation Board;

(c) By repealing the definition of "flight crew member".

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Do you wish to speak to each subsection?

Mr. Chairman: Pardon?

Mr. McCall: Is this one—

Mr. Chairman: They are, collectively they form the amendment.

(b) By renumbering Sections 4, 5 and 6 thereof, the Sections 3, 4, and 5 respectively.

(c) By adding immediately before Section 7 thereof, the following Section:

6. The following Ordinance is further amended

(a) by repealing Section 10 thereof and the heading immediately preceding Section 10 and substitute the following therefor:

10.(1) The Workmens' Compensation Advisory Board, established by regulation under Commissioner's Order 1976/278, shall be continued as a corporation with the name Workers' Compensation Board.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I haven't cleared the first section.

Mr. Chairman: No, it hasn't been cleared.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, when are we going to?

Mr. Chairman: We are just going to read this and then go through it. I understand from the mover of the amendment that this hangs together as one amendment and would best be discussed as one.

Is that correct, Mr. McCall?

Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify on procedures, are we to understand that all the amendments suggested in this one document are either to be voted on or refused individually or collectively, that is what I am not clear on?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: There is difficulty in putting them together in this particular amendment, Mr. Chairman, to try and cover off really what the intent was of the amendments that were presented at the beginning, the proposed amendment to the original Bill. The difficulty we had in putting these particular amendments together, is because they are all inter-related. When you look at one, you cannot isolate any one particular subsection of the proposed amendments, so it is suggested, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps we should read through the proposed amendment in its entirety in order for the opportunity of each member of the Committee to understand the total amendment and its construction, because it is inter-related in many, many subsections of the original proposal put forward by the government.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I hope I will be able to come back with comments on each subsection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: You will be free to come back with comments over any part of it, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to comment that the practice is somewhat unusual inasmuch as if the member wishes to change anything that is in the Bill he does it section by section. I find this procedure very unusual.

Mr. Chairman: Well you will just have to get used to it, Mr. Taylor, because that is what we are going to do.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Proceed.

Mr. Chairman: I seem to have lost my place.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Let's take a vote on all the amendments then right now.

Mr. Chairman: Ten, subsection (2): The Board shall consist of not fewer than five members appointed by the Commissioner on the recommendation of Council, as follows:

(a) one member shall be appointed from among representatives of industry in the Territory;

(b) one member shall be appointed from among representatives of labour in the Territory;

(c) one member shall be appointed from among representatives of government of the Territory; and

(d) the remaining members shall be appointed from among representatives of the public-at-large in the Territory, one of whom shall be designated as Chairman.

(3) Members of the Board shall hold office during good behavior for such term, not exceeding three years, as may be designated by the Commissioner upon their appointment, and may be reappointed upon the expiration of such term.

(4) The Commissioner may fix the remuneration of each member of the Board and such remuneration shall be paid out of the Compensation Fund.

(5) Three members of the Board constitute a quorum and the Board may act on all matters and things required to be done by it on the decision of the quorum of the members.

(6) The Chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the Board, having the supervision over and direction of the work of the Board, and shall not engage in any other business or employment for remuneration during the term of his appointment.

(7) Where the chairman or other member of the Board is ill, absent or unable to act, the Commissioner may appoint an acting Chairman or an acting member who, for the period of his appointment, has all the power and shall perform all the duties of the Chairman or member, as the case may be, in respect of whom he is acting.

Mr. Chairman: (8) No vacancy on the Board impairs the right of the remaining members to act.

(b) by adding immediately after section 10 thereof the following heading and section:

Jurisdiction of the Board

1). (1) The Board may administer this Ordinance on behalf of the Commissioner and the Commissioner shall delegate to the Board all administrative duties under this Ordinance that are not inconsistent with the provisions of the *Yukon Act*.

(2) The Board shall appoint an Administrator and a staff of such other persons as it considers necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Ordinance and it may designate their duties.

(3) The Board may delegate all or any of its powers of administration to such of the staff as it designates.

(4) The Chairman, the Administrator and the staff shall be deemed to be members of the Public Service of the Yukon, but the Commissioner may recover the cost of their salaries, benefits and other expenses of administration out of the Compensation Fund.

(5) The office of the Board shall be situated at Whitehorse, but meetings of the Board may be held at Whitehorse or at such other place in the Yukon as the Board may direct.

(6) The Board shall sit at such times, not less often than once each month, and conduct its proceedings in such manner as it considers most satisfactory for the proper discharge and speedy dispatch of its business.

(7) The Board may appoint doctors, lawyers, accountants, actuaries and such other professionals as it requires to assist and advise it in the administration of this Ordinance, and the functions, duties and remuneration of such advisers shall be fixed by the Board and the administration shall be paid out of the Compensation Fund.

(8) The Commissioner shall designate the Board to act as referee, to have and exercise all powers, duties, responsibility and jurisdiction vested in the referee pursuant to this Ordinance.

(9) Without prejudice to the generality of the duties imposed on the Board pursuant to this section, the Board shall advise the Commissioner in respect of

(a) investment policies concerning the assets of the Compensation Fund;

(b) actuarial reviews of assessment rates;

(c) actuarial reviews of the liabilities of the pension and other reserves and provisions forming part of the Compensation Fund,

(d) financial and management practices, plans and policies, and

(e) such other matters as the Commissioner requests,

and the Commissioner shall not initiate any administrative or financial matters concerning the Compensation Fund without first obtaining the advice of the Board.

Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the Government has considered the amendments proposed by the Honourable Member and there are no serious policy objections to his objective, which I think we all share, and that is to provide for a statutory independent Workmen's Compensation Board. But, we do have some concerns about various minor sections in these amendments and if Committee would permit me, I would like to give just a little brief background information before we consider each specific section.

The establishment of a corporate body to be known as the Worker's Compensation Board had been recommended by the Auditor General's Department, the Internal Auditor, the Worker's Compensation Advisory Board itself, and Mr. W.D. Huff, who is Workmen's Compensation's consultant, who drafted the present Ordinance.

They had recommended that a corporate body be established to administer the Fund. A Worker's Compensation Advisory Board was established on November 1st, 1976 by Regulation, to perform the duties of the referee and to give advice to the Commissioner on financial and management practices, plans and policies. The Advisory Board, in their capacity as referee have eliminated the hardship to claimants, who before the appointment of this Board, had long waiting periods for a decision on their claim. The referees costs have been reduced as a result of the appointment of a local referee.

The terms of reference of this Advisory Board are to provide:

advice to the Commissioner on financial and management policies, and that is not now considered a suitable arrangement. It is confusing to employers and claimants and it slows the decision-making process. It means that the Administrator must first consult the Advisory Board and then obtain the approval of the deputy head before the matter can be referred to the Executive Committee. This is time consuming and sometimes results in increased costs.

The employers in industry are responsible for paying the entire cost of compensation. Therefore the Compensation Fund is an employer's collective liability insurance fund, broken into 19 funds here in the Yukon, according to industry.

In all other provinces, corporate bodies were established to administer these funds, as they were employer's funds. This practice ensures employers that government may not use these funds for general purposes.

When we were discussing the need for a full or part-time board in earlier consideration of this Bill, Mr. Chairman, the feeling was that we had not yet reached the stage where we require it full-time, and in order to substantiate this, I can tell members of Committee that the Province of Prince Edward Island and the Northwest Territories are comparable in size to the Yukon. The Boards of these two jurisdictions employ a full-time Chairman and part-time members. They adjudicate over 3,000 claims per year. The Yukon adjudicates approximately 1,600 claims a year. On this basis it is considered that a part-time Chairman would be required at this stage of the Yukon's development.

The Workmen's Compensation Advisory Board meets approximately 18 times per year. If the recommended change is approved, it is estimated the Board will be required to meet probably twice each month. The purpose behind this change in the proposed amendment is of course to provide an efficient administration by expediting the decision-making process through one body for all employers and claimants.

Now, if we could move to the proposed amendments, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add only in preface that the government has received a letter from the Workmen's Compensation Advisory Board, which strongly recommends that a full autonomous corporate body be established under the *Workmen's Compensation Ordinance* to be known as the Worker's Compensation Board.

Further, we have been informed that the Members of the present Advisory Board have all expressed a desire to serve out their present term of office on the Workers' Compensation Board if this change is made.

In the proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, Section A (2), 1(a) our only suggestion to the sponsor of this amendment is rather than use the word "administrator", we would have preferred to say "secretary". "Secretary" means the secretary appointed by the board pursuant to subsection 10.(1)(2).

This is a preferable way to go in the opinion of the department concerned. There is already an administrator of the fund and they felt that "secretary" was a preferable nomenclature in this particular area. I would be interested in hearing the opinions of the motion sponsor.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: I have no great reservations with that, Mr. Chairman. My only concern would be that if there no suggested definition of the "administrator", I would try to answer the Minister's question with a further question, if we do not consider the definition of "administrator" within the Ordinance, if we have no reference to it whatsoever, we could be faced with some difficulties.

I have no great hang-ups Mr. Chairman as to the definition itself if it is the Minister's wish to consider deletion or acknowledging a typo error, there is no problem but I think that we are

perhaps going to be faced with a problem withing the total *Workmen's Compensation Ordinance* as to that interpretation. I have reservations on that point.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, could I take Mr. Cosman's advice and suggest that we would retain the present definition of "administrator" and simply add this definition of "secretary" as part of the amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Just for the record, Mr. Cosman is present now as a witness.

Mr. Cosman: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the word "administrator" is used anywhere throughout the *Workmen's Compensation Ordinance* as it presently stands. If we were to strike the word "administrator" from the proposed amendment and substitute the word "secretary", I don't think there would be any difficulty with respect to the word "administrator" whatsoever.

It does find use, I think, in regulations, however.

Mr. Booth: There is just the one regulation that appointed myself as administrator. That is the only regulation that is referred to and it is not referred to anywhere in the Ordinance.

Mr. McCall: This is my concern, Mr. Chairman. I would not like to see it start reverting back to the regulations when we should have the definition within the parent Bill itself. This is one of my concerns. By substituting the principal's secretary, we are being retrograde in our intent and I would strongly suggest that we should perhaps consider that as a proper definition within the *Workmen's Compensation Ordinance* so we know just where it is without relying too much on regulations because regulations can always be changed whereas once you have the definition inserted in the Ordinance, then it is there. This is my concern and if you can get along without an administrator, fine. We will change the regulations, no problem.

But I have some reservations on the point.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I have no wish to eliminate the definition of administrator from the amendment. I am simply saying that we can review this and make sure that we have "secretary" in there in the position that we are both referring to, at the same time retaining the administrator in the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, in 10.(1) of the amendment, where it says the "Workmen's Compensation Advisory Board established by Regulation" and so on "shall be continued as a corporation", I think that's not very precise wording. The Workmen's Compensation Advisory Board will cease to exist in the passage of this amendment so it can't continue as anything.

What we want is something similar to what we have in the *Housing Ordinance*, which says "there shall be a corporation entitled the Yukon Housing Corporation with powers, duties and functions pursuant to this Ordinance" and we should have a similar section in this Ordinance stating definitely that there shall be a Workmen's Compensation Board, because the present wording of this is very indefinite and is quite improper grammatically, because you can't continue something that has ceased to exist.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Cosman?

Mr. Cosman: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the member's remarks are well taken. I would point out there was an attempt in this subsection to give statutory recognition to a board that had been established as a corporation in the regulation referred to. I think it is a small matter as to whether we retain the wording suggested here. I find no difficulty in redrafting as the member might suggest. I just wanted to point out that was our

intent, to continue the existing board.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we deal with 10.(1) when we get to it, because the member has raised a very valid point.

Mr. Chairman, do you wish me to continue?

Mr. Chairman: On the same area, on the definition?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: On the next Section?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, please.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, under (b) we would propose no changes in this proposed amendment, and under 10.(1) I would suggest that we should indeed look at redrafting of the positive statement as proposed by the Honourable Member from Mayo. Is that the opinion of the Chairman?

Mr. Booth?

Mr. Booth: Yes, but we sort of agreed that it should be spelled out in the Ordinance, something to the effect that there is hereby established a body corporate to be known as the Worker's Compensation Board. This is the way it is in every other act and ordinance, and this is what has been recommended for change.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Our suggestion is that we change the proposed amendment in 1. to read: "There is hereby established a body corporate to be known as the Worker's Compensation Board, consisting of four members appointed by the Commissioner as follows: one member shall be appointed from among representatives of industry in the Territory, one member shall be appointed from among the representatives of labour in the Territory, the remaining members shall be appointed from among representatives of the public at large in the Territory, one of whom shall be designated as Chairman."

This makes the Board slightly smaller than the proposed Private Member's amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall

Mr. McCall: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept that, because of the specific reason for the principle of 5.

The first point dealing with 10.(1), I quite welcome Mr. McIntyre's suggestion and he has a very, very valid point. It was an oversight on our drafting and I am only too pleased to take 10.(1) back for redraft, with the concurrence of Committee, as I have no reservations whatsoever, and Mr. McIntyre brought up a very valid point. I can see what he was getting at.

But, as far as the suggestion on going back to a four man Board, there is an inconsistency there which I cannot accept and it is a principle behind a five man Board, as to a three man Board and I don't really welcome or cherish the fact that we are going to reduce it from five to four, whether it be part time or otherwise.

There is a very important factor to deal with, when you look at the principle of three, five or seven, when you are dealing with boards, and I hope the Minister would take that into very serious consideration and not try to revert back to the original four.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: We do have a four man board at present, do we not? Could we ask Mr. Taylor if he would like to comment on the size of the Board?

Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I understand what Mr. McCall has in mind, when he says, three, five or seven, but, the reason we set it up at four members is that the Chairman would not be in a position of casting a deciding vote.

There would be three members on the Board who would make a decision, therefore the Chairman would not have to make a decision. That is why it was set at four members.

The Board themselves expressed a desire that the Board shall carry on, at least for the first term, as it is presently constituted, because it seems to be working out exceptionally well right now.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: I think we are being deceived by the intent of the Workmen's Compensation Board, by the suggestions that have just been made, and I can't accept them, Mr. Chairman. There is a lot of importance shed on the principle of a five man board as to a three man board. It gives you far better representation, whether or not the Chairman is in a position to vote on any matter is irrelevant.

My concern is this, that we are moving into a period of far greater, shall we say, industrial activity and if we do not have a proper board in place now, it is going to come back and haunt us. I prefer it in my suggested amendments to go to a five man board so that we could have proper representation from the public at large, proper representation from labour, proper representation from industry as a whole.

By defeating that intent, there is no point in having any four man board. There is no logic behind it.

The also proposed amendments are taking into account, the Bill that was proposed to us as to the government's concern, taking that into account, it gives the Chairman considerable amount of power than he has ever had before. By taking that into consideration, he is going to have a properly constituted Board of equal representation from other people, because if he is going on a part-time or full-time is irrelevant also. My concern was this: that we start fracturing now the purpose of the Board, it will come back to haunt us in the not too distant future and that is my concern. I want to see a proper representative board and not just an ad hoc situation, put together, simply because the number four is a nice figure.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, we could hardly call it ad hoc since it has been operating at that number of members for over a year now, and I would also like to ask the Honourable Member if he could clarify for me what he means by (2)(c) "one member shall be appointed from among representatives of government of the Territory", would he not consider that the administrator, in his advisory capacity on the Board, is already fulfilling that position which makes it, in effect, a five man group?

Mr. McCall: Well, we go back to the original point Mr. Chairman, when the Minister brought up the question of the administrator as a definition and its validity. If it is the purpose of the government to delete that job, I don't mind. It will probably save us a lot of man years and a lot of money. By taking that into consideration, it puts the government in a position of input and there is nothing wrong with that. I don't believe we should completely silence them altogether.

I brought this particular question up to the Legal Advisor who was assisting me in this and perhaps he can give you a better clarity or clarification on this particular subsection (c) of 10.(2). Mr. Cosman?

Mr. Cosman: Yes, I simply saw the addition of paragraph (c) as balancing paragraphs (a) and (b): representatives of industry, representative of labour, representative of government. It could very well be left open with paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) allowing the remaining members to be appointed from the public-at-large.

I wonder if I might pass the buck, so to speak, if Mr. Booth might have some—

Mr. Booth: It was my understanding, I thought that we were looking at a full-time chairman when we were looking at

the government position here. I would like to just point out that all I can point out at this time is that the other larger boards have three members, one chairman and two, what they call commissioners, and the Northwest Territories have five members. This was recommended by the consulting actuary on his experience in the Northwest Territories. But as I say, the other provinces have just three board members.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the way I was lead to believe, the way I understood how this worked was if a worker had a claim, he would first go to the Administrator, is that not correct? To the Workers' Compensation? He would look at it and then he would go before the Board, in respect to recommending a claim or a particular workman that has been hurt. Is that the procedure?

Mr. Booth: No, we have a claims administrator who supervises the claims section and they handle it first. I don't get involved until it becomes an appeal to the referee or Workmen's Advisory Board.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to answer the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West. The administrative report would not be working for the Territorial Government, he would be working for the Worker's Compensation Board and therefore is not a government representative.

So, in other words, the Government if they want to have any representation on there, they should welcome the opportunity to have a member on there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: I think if all Members study the proposed amendment, we have to cover off and take into consideration that, in any event, the Chairman becomes a full time person, he would probably come under the Public Service Commission. That was one of the facts that we took into consideration and also, if you don't want a representative on the Board, say so. I think Members will feel only too happy to delete subsection (c). I don't care.

I was prepared to take into consideration all aspects of our society to formulate a proper Workers' Compensation, with its own independence, to a degree.

Now, if it creating a concern with Government, by all means we can take out subsection (c), but you could weaken your position because the largest sector of the work force is government employees and it may assist them in going through Workmen's Compensation, unless they are not covered by it, I don't know.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that was my concern the last few remarks that Mr. McCall just made.

I, myself, can see the five member Board as being a very productive situation, where there is a real decision to be made by two, three, four people, that I could see five people making a much better decision, I think, on it. It may cost a little bit more, but we are going to expand in the Yukon and there is going to be many accidents, whether we think so or not, or, hopefully, we are going to keep away from them, but we are not going to just keep away from them.

We have got to remember that they are going to be here, with the work that is going to be here in the next few years.

I am wondering if the witness could tell us, or the Member that has put the amendments forth, could tell us if there is a, where it states where there will be a quorum or not on this Board, or what constitutes, a quorum of the five members?

Mr. McCall: Three constitutes a quorum.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding

that the addition of another member on the board would add about another \$2,500 or \$3,000 cost in respect to running the Board. We are dealing with monies put forth by the employers. I don't really understand why you need more members to make a decision in respect to the Board. I think four is adequate and if one can't make it you still have a quorum. So I mean in respect to what the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua said, it is just that much more money that has to be paid out.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, any decision made by any board, if it is a serious decision, and is made by one person, is usually very bad, I would say, and could be very bad. By two people can still be very bad sometimes, depending on who they are and what they are. We might as well bring it right out in the open, they can't hack it. Any person that has a claim or something in there more or less hasn't got the opportunity to fight it, only just by that board, the board says what is going to happen to him, and I would like to see enough representation there from all sides to make that decision, even if we have to pay for it a little bit.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: I have reservations when I hear the Minister of Education get up and start criticizing an amendment that you might say he has no knowledge of, because when I recall when he was going through the Bills proposed by the government, he was negative in his response then and he is being negative in his response now. When I consider the background of the Honourable Member, will all due respect, I don't know, I don't know what he is thinking sometimes, Mr. Chairman,—

Hon. Mr. Lang: It works two ways.

Mr. McCall: Here we are, we have been harping on today Mr. Chairman about the pipeline impact and all its ramifications and something positive here, a step being made in the right direction, where you have a board constituted that will consider every aspect, hopefully, of our industry in the Yukon, and we have a representative of government on our behalf criticizing a positive step.

You know, it is beyond my imagination why the Honourable Member, with all due respect, would get up and say this. I don't think he has any idea just what the Workmen's Compensation is all about, in all its ramifications and all its impact it has on industry today and the amount of work that goes on. I don't think he fully realizes. Maybe he would if he got into a serious accident when he has to go to the Board to perhaps get a claim or perhaps a life pension, and the amount of work that goes into it. I don't think he fully realizes it, Mr. Chairman, and I have a lot of concern when I hear a member that once used to work in the same operations as I do. He knows what it is all about. He has seen accidents like I have, and I wish he would stop getting up and giving his negative responses to something when he is not sure of what we are talking about, sit down and shut up and be quiet.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one comment with the political rhetoric by the Honourable Member from Pelly who has always been so positive, who I have seen shut down the mining industry at great lengths and great times in the Yukon. I just want to make one point and I am saying in respect to the make-up of the Board, I am saying that the number of four is adequate. I am not opposed to it being a corporate body, an autonomous board. I am just saying that the numbers in respect to the membership on the Board should be remain at four.

At least for this time, and I would suggest maybe a year down the road, maybe it would have to be evaluated and then subsequently have to be amended, but I think it is a good start.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was about to point out that the composition of the present Board is three, plus the Chairman, and that their terms of appointment do not expire until next Fall, and that they have expressed a willingness to continue to act under this new administrative structure.

I would hope that we would allow them to do that and to have the experience of acting as an independent corporate body and at the time of re-appointment, consider then whether or not the work load has increased sufficiently to require another member and whether or not they wish at that time to have a full-time chairman.

We have gone a considerable distance already to establish these different terms of reference and authority for the Board, at this time.

Mr. Chairman, could I ask if I should go on to the next section?

Mr. Chairman: Hold on for a minute.

Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no difficulty with going on to the next section and I have no difficulty at all with the amendments. I welcome them. I think they are a pretty positive step, but the one question I wanted to ask, which is really just in response to the Minister who had the same concerns as myself.

We have a present Board who have indicated that they would be willing to serve out their terms. I am quite in favour of a five man Board. I think it makes sense and some statements have been made supporting that already, but my question is, and I will ask the movers of the amendment if they see any difficulty in retaining the present four members and getting an appointment made for the additional one, if that additional member has to be appointed immediately or if they would be happy to see some deferment in that appointment. It doesn't matter which way to me, whatever accommodation we can make here to come up with our five man board, I think that is the important thing, and to retain some continuity with the present members.

Is there any difficulty in doing it, by presenting somebody immediately or putting on another appointment immediately, or deferring that?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Well, I think the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is self-explicit. We have taken into account the existing advisory board and, although I have already commented the concerns that have been displayed about the language format by Mr. McIntyre, I am prepared to take it back and redraft it, as I said before, with concurrence of Committee.

As far as the five man board, I am adamant on that position for many, many reasons, that I don't want to belabour it right now, but the concept and principle behind the five board is to take into account any future ramifications or anything that might happen in the not too distant future. I don't have to drag all that up.

A three man board is inoperative at this point in time, because there is less and less input by the public at large. There is less and less input when you look at the industry at large.

So, in trying to answer Mr. Lengerke's concern, we have taken one into account, the advisory board. As far as the punitive time they have left in their term of office, that will have to be determined by this Government. I have no control over that.

I am not saying we should implement a complete turn-over at this point in time. That is not what I am advocating.

As far as the remaining one member that would be, you

might say, outstanding, if these amendments would be adopted, then by all means we should move that person at this point in time, if the amendments all pass.

But as far as the formula which is applied now to the Advisory Board, I do not see that being suddenly turned over or moved to one side, because I think the amendment expresses itself that we take the Advisory Board into account.

If it remains that we have approximately a year left in some of the reforms fine, but it is just normal attrition really. So long as you get recognized as a corporate structure, separate and aside from government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness, in the provinces I understand they have a board comprised of three people. Do they have alternates if a member is ill or away or something like this in respect to those appointments of the provinces?

Mr. Booth: No, two members then would constitute a quorum. If there is two away then the work stops until they can return, but these are full time people of course.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that Section 10.(2) provides that one member shall be appointed from the representative of the government of the Territory, it seems to me that this gives the government the control of whether they want, five or four, because all the government needs to do is not appoint their representative and that will leave it at four. So I don't know what we are arguing about.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, we propose no change in subsection (3); (4) remains the same; the quorums can remain, depending on how many seats constitute the Board. We have a slight change to propose under (6) at the top of page three in the proposed amendments. Our proposal would be rather: the chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the Board, having the supervision over and direction of the work of the Board, and shall not engage in any other business or employment for remuneration during the term of his employment, which may create a conflict of interest with his duties of chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is pretty clear to all members, because if you have a part-time chairman of this board, he may also be available in some other way throughout the community. There may also be some kind of small remuneration, I don't know what, but so long as it did not create a conflict, you would not be barring him from doing community duties.

I think that we have to be careful when we ask for citizen's at large to serve on these various boards and advisory bodies that we are not completely cutting them off from all other sources of remuneration, so long as there is no conflict.

Mr. Chairman: Could you repeat your—

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Section is the same down to the word appointment and we would read it, "for remuneration during the term of his employment which may create a conflict of interest with his duties of chairman."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I differ on that particular point. I don't want to see any Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board sit on any other Board for the Government of the Yukon and if that is the intent of Government, you had better scrap this amendment, because I am not interested.

If I became elected to this House, I allow myself when I get the time off to fulfill my obligations to the people that elected me and so does every other member of this House. But the point is this, when you look at such a very important issue as a Chairman of a Workmen's Compensation Board, then we

either go part-time or full-time on this matter. Part time you can still be accommodated, but I do not want to see this individual working on any other board or representing any other committee for the Government of the Yukon and that is my reservation.

You say, a conflict of interest, well, any board or representative of this Government is a conflict of interest when you are dealing with Workmen's Compensation. I want to see total independence.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I did not say working for this Government, with respect.

If the Honourable Member will examine this section carefully, he may interpret it a little differently, but we are at the wishes of Committee. I would like to hear opinions from others and I would like to hear, perhaps, an opinion from Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor

Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any terribly strong feelings about the wording of the suggested amendment, but there are occasions when some person may be asked to serve on another committee entirely, as separate from the Government of the Territory, which couldn't possibly have any conflict with his interest as Chairman of the Board, but, as I say, I don't have any strong feelings about that. If the Member wishes that to stay in there, well, I think, probably, we could live with it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, from what the Honourable Member is saying, he is saying that the individual cannot work or do anything else other than, for say, a part-time Chairman, which, really, the remuneration for that appointment is, if you were to look at it as an annual salary, it just isn't possible.

So, you know, I find it kind of out of place, really, where the Honourable Member is talking about being in charge of a committee and not working some place else or whatever, when you view his own position.

I think that you have to leave it open. If you have ever tried to get people to serve on a board, no matter what that board or committee is, it is very difficult to find people. So you have to leave some flexibility.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable Member if he would spell out for us how far he wants to go on this not engaging in any other business or employment for remuneration? Does that mean, for example, that he could not serve in any election office, at the federal or the municipal level? Would it mean that he could not engage in consulting, if he happened to be a professional person? If he was a doctor, for example, something that had absolutely no conflict of interest with being on this board would be barred, in any case?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: The sole purpose of intent of this subsection, Mr. Chairman, is to prohibit, and I use that word generally, prohibit this individual that may take the charge of Workmen's Compensation as a responsibility. It seems to me the impression I am being left with, there is a turn around going on right now as to attitude, as to what this Board is all about, and I am not going to be in a position, or be an advocate for defeating what we are trying to get off the ground. The principle behind the Chairman of the Board is a full-time job. That is in every other jurisdiction in this country. We are now embarking on restricting that duty. We now are talking as the Honourable Minister from Education in his naive way saying well we have go to look at the dollars. Well I am going back to the principle which I serve quite often, for his own information, of dedication on committees.

I don't give a hoot and holler about the money. I spent a lot of time at it, and we are going back to that concept. If you find a person dedicated enough, he's not going to get hyperfanatical

on the dollar sign, because that is not how you formulate committees, and that is why you formulate the Workmen's Compensation Board.

If it is the intent to restrict the Workmen's Compensation by only considering a part-time chairman, then you are not allowing the Workmen's Compensation to operate properly. I make reference to the Yukon Housing Corporation. Take a bow. Or any other corporation, like the NCPC for example. Is he part-time? I am very concerned about this Mr. Chairman, because we are locking into place here, something that will better the concept of Workmen's Compensation, if we make it work properly. Here we have it, we want to shrink it down to a third of the size by restricting it to a part-time concept. Chairman of the Board, for example, you want him on every other committee that he may not always be available for Workmen's Compensation and all its matters and related problems? No, I am not interested. There is no half way measure when we start talking about Workmen's Compensation. You are not dealing with government funds. You are dealing with employee funds, and they want proper representation for that board just like the employee that perhaps may have a claim.

Taking everything into consideration, I would say don't try to undermine it or undercut it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have a full-time chairman, then to me the full-time chairman is going to get paid a salary that will enable him to do that job in its fullest capacity, full-time. Now, the other side of the coin was that no, he is going to be a full-time chairman, but he is going to have the ability to be able to do other duties, or other work. Is this correct? If he is, then he can certainly have another job, but not related, or not in conflict with the duties as Chairman of the Compensation Board. Now, I don't know, I am still sitting here trying to figure out exactly what we are going to get out of it. Is it going to be that full-time person, on total salary? You know, that is a consideration we are going to have to give. If the movers are willing to accept a chairman on a full-time basis in duties as chairman, but can have another job, well I guess that's another matter. I want to get a little bit closer to that one. Maybe Mr. McCall can just comment there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think we should look at that particular problem, in light of 10.(4), dealing with the jurisdiction of the Board in this amendment, which says that the Chairman, the Administrator and the staff shall be deemed to be members of the Public Service of the Yukon, but the Commissioner may recover the cost in salaries and so on.

Now, the fact that they are deemed to be members of the Public Service would mean that the regulations and the *Public Service Ordinance* would apply to them and, in this case, persons who have retired from the Public Service for the Territory, it seems to me, would not be qualified to be Chairman of this Board and this would eliminate our present Chairman.

I think we have to look at that very carefully. If we are going to make this a full-time position, paid on a full-time basis, then we are looking at, I would guess, \$35,000, \$40,000 a year, to get the kind of person that you are talking about and this would certainly knock a great big hole into our Workmen's Compensation Fund.

If we are thinking of a full-time Chairman who would only be contributing part-time service, then we should get out of this section 10.(4), that the Chairman be deemed to be a member of the Public Service, because he is going to have to be dealt with outside of the Public Services regulations and the *Public Service Ordinance* and treat him in a special way.

In that case, we may have to make some allowance for a

person who has no other means of income, except if we bar him from taking employment other than being Chairman, and that is his only means of income, it is going to be a pretty tough thing to find somebody to do that, because, obviously, we are looking for somebody who is retired and if he hasn't got the—, in that case, if he has got an adequate pension we can get a good Chairman, but otherwise we can't.

We have got to make up our minds whether we are going to knock a big hole into this Workmen's Compensation Fund by finding a \$40,000 a year man, or carry on the way we have been.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I should perhaps have asked the same dispensation that the Honourable Member got and had read all our proposed alterations throughout, because of course we have changes to propose when we get down to 10. (4). It does have some relevance in this Section 6.

It is not the intention of this Government to hire a full-time Chairman, at this stage. We have said already we consider that they will be meeting, probably, twice a month for the next year or so, until the workload increases and they might have to meet more frequently. There has been no consideration to changing the per diem rate or the per diem system of paying the people on this Board.

The other three, of course, all have other employment full time.

I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is also not the intention of this Government to have the Chairman be a member of the Public Service of this Government. We still maintain that he should be a citizen at large. But the secretary and the staff, of course, would be members of the Public Service and I would not consider, for a moment, a proposal from this Government that we should add a full-time executive level position, without consulting the people who are going to have to pay it and that is the employers of the Yukon.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if I could proceed and give the rest of these proposals for change so that they can be considered in context with this section?

Mr. Chairman: Please do.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, in the amendment subsection (7), our version would read, "Where the chairman, or other member of the Board is ill, absent or unable to act, the Board may appoint an acting chairman from amongst the members, who for the period of his appointment, has all the powers and shall perform all the duties of the chairman in respect of whom he is acting." It's just a little cleaning up with the phraseology there, I don't think it makes any difference in the meaning.

We have no objection to subsection (8).

Going on into 10. (1), we would not change 10. (1). Ten (2) we are simply referring to a secretary where it says administrator, because we prefer that set up for the board. We would not change (3). In 10. (4) we would read, "the Secretary and the staff shall be members of the Public Service of the Yukon."

Going on, Mr. Chairman, we would see no change in (5); no change in (6); and we would suggest a slight rewording for (7), to read, "the Board may, from time to time, appoint one or more persons having special technical or other knowledge to inquire into and report on any matter before the Board or in respect of which the Board deems it necessary to have information." That simply provides a little maneuvering room there to bring somebody with technical, if not professional, knowledge. We would not suggest any change for (8); and in (9), a slight change in wording to say, "the Board shall report to the Commissioner once in each year or oftener as directed

on all matters respecting the administration of the Ordinance, including reports on: (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e)", as written here, and the final phrase, "and the Commissioner shall lay the report or reports of the Board before the next session of the Territorial Council."

Those are our changes, Mr. Chairman, and I think all members will see now that because we would not consider at this time having the chairman as a full time member of the Public Service, the other section does make sense.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Just one question, before we get off that to Section 9, the very last. The Minister did indicate that they were going to alter that last three sentences there, "and the Commissioner shall not initiate any administrative or financial matters." I am wondering, did you suggest to leave that in and make the other amendment, or does your amendment just take that completely out?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, we are suggesting that instead of that last paragraph, we would read, "and the Commissioner shall lay the report or the reports of the Board before the next session of the Territorial Council", and the advice regarding the proposed amendment by the private member, that final section is that in any case the administrative and financial matters concerning the Compensation Fund do emanate from the Board. If Mr. Booth would like to expand on that.

Mr. Booth: Yes, I will recommend that changes go in front, from the Board, from the Advisory Board right now, to the Deputy Head, from the Deputy Head to Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I think these amendments proposed to the amendment by the Government, I think they are far-reaching and I think I would like to request to see them in writing, because I can't keep up with all the amendments.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that Mrs. Whyard, maybe you could submit your proposed sub-amendments.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: And they could be made available to Committee Members.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Before taking a vote on them

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, would you like that in a form of comparison with the Honourable Member's sections and ours, so that you can compare them as you read them?

Mr. Chairman: Which ever is easiest for Committee Members to understand, Mrs. Whyard.

For tomorrow's agenda, Mr. Blair will be appearing as witness before Committee in the morning.

We had also considered going on, hopefully, to complete Committee work on this Bill Number 9. Then, I would also like to consider Private Member's Public Bill 103, *Animal Protection Ordinance*. There is a witness available for tomorrow afternoon for that purpose.

The following morning we will be returning to consideration of the *Legislative Assembly Ordinance*. Mr. Clegg will be back with us.

Mr. McCall:

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would move Mr. Speaker resume the Chair.

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: The witnesses are excused. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered Resolution Number 2, respecting the Yukon Impact Information Centre and the question being called, defeated the same.

Committee also considered a Green Paper entitled "The Establishment of the Yukon Pipeline Impact Information Centre" and directed me to report progress on same.

The Committee also considered Bill Number 9, *An Ordinance to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance*, and directed me to report progress on same, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees, are you agreed?

Some Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted.

May I have your further pleasure? The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I move we now call it five o'clock.

Mr. Lengerke: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that we do now call it five o'clock.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Adjourned

**The following Legislative Returns were Tabled
(December 5, 1977)**

77-2-33

School Busing
(Oral Question - Page 14 - November 7, 1977)

77-2-34

Recreation Per Capita Grant
(Oral Question - Page 214 - November 21, 1977)

77-2-35

Re: Legislative Return No. 26 - Private Business Restricting
Employment on Pipeline
(Written Question No. 28)

77-2-36

Legal Advice to Commissioner's Office
(Written Question No. 29)

LEGISLATIVE RETURN #
1977 (Second) Session

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On November 7, 1977, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon asked the following oral question:

Could the Minister calculate the cost of the school busing in the City of Whitehorse, within the City of Whitehorse limits, and the revenue which the Government of the Yukon derives from the taxpayers in the City of Whitehorse, taken on a percentage of the total school population and the number that are bused.

The answer to the above question is as follows:

The total school population (K through Gr.12) in Whitehorse as of October 31, 1977 was 3,632. Of this number 1,667 or 46% live beyond the two mile limit and are transported to and from school. The total cost for busing in Whitehorse for the 1977/78 school year is \$351,344.00. The cost per student attending school in Whitehorse is \$96.73, whilst the cost per student transported is \$210.76.

Total school taxes collected in the City of Whitehorse in the 1977 tax year were \$1,062,342. Taxes collected per pupil attending school were \$292.50.

29 November, 1977

LEGISLATIVE RETURN # 34
1977 (Second) Session

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On November 21, 1977, the Honourable Member for Kluane asked the following oral question:

What population statistics will the Yukon Territorial Government use for the Communities of Haines Junction, Burwash, Destruction Bay and Beaver Creek, in order to determine the amount of the recreation per capita grant available to each of the communities?

The answer to the above question is as follows:

Section 4(3) of the Recreation Grants Regulations states, "For the purposes of ascertaining population the latest figures provided by Statistics Canada taken pursuant to the Statistics Act shall apply." Therefore, the latest population figures provided by Statistics Canada viz. 1976 Census, will be utilized.

The 1976 census figures for each community will be utilized to calculate the per capita recreation grants. The 1976 community census figures are outlined below and the 1971 census figures are also listed for comparative purposes:

Community	1976 Census	1971 Census
Haines Junction *	268	179
Destruction Bay	72	82
Burwash	71	67
Beaver Creek	123	120

* Does not include the Indian village which is listed in the 1976 census as having a population of 36.

1st December, 1977

LEGISLATIVE RETURN # 15
(1977 Second Session)

Mr. Speaker,
Members of The Assembly

On November 29th, 1977, Mr. S. McCall asked the following question:

Re: Legislative Return #26. When you submitted your question to each Executive Committee member, did you receive a negative response from the Commissioner and the Department Heads of this Government?

The answer to the question above is as follows:

A negative response was received from the Commissioner in answer to Written Question #16.

The Department Heads were not polled as all Department Heads are answerable to a member of the Executive Committee.

11/2/77
Date


Signature

LEGISLATIVE RETURN # 16
(1977 (Second) Session)

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On November 30, 1977, the Honourable Member from Klondike asked the following question:

"Is it true that the Commissioner's office is using the services of the Federal Department of Justice for legal advice? If it is true, could the Minister advise this House:

- a) Where does this leave the YTG Legal Department?
- b) Is this a move by the Commissioner's office to separate itself from YTG affairs?
- c) Who will pay for the service and will it be charged to YTG?
- d) Will this legal advisor reside in Yukon?
- e) Will YTG pay for the housing and/or the salary of this advisor?

The answer to the above question is as follows:

The Commissioner's office does use the services of the Federal Department of Justice and has, either directly or through the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, for many years.

- a) This does not affect the YTG Legal Affairs Department.
- b) No.
- c) The Department of Justice has never billed the YTG for legal services to the Commissioner and does not intend to now.
- d) No.
- e) No.

December 2, 1977


Signature

