



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 56

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, December 17, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

CABINET MINISTERS

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

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

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

Liberal

James McLachlan Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

01 Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, December 17, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have for tabling a joint ministerial statement supporting the fur industry, done by myself and the Minister of Renewable Resources for the Northwest Territories. As well, I have for tabling the Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee Recommendations.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I have for tabling a copy of the Yukon government's response given today in Anchorage, Alaska on the American government's proposal for offshore oil leases in the Beaufort Sea.

I also have for tabling information in response to Motion No. 3, a copy of the terms of reference and job description of the Principal Secretary to the Government Leader.

As well, I have for tabling a report, the Watson Lake Sawmill Viability Study.

02 Speaker: Reports of Committees?

Petitions?

Introduction of Bills?

Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?

Ministerial Statements?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Development of a New Education Act

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Today I would like to formally advise the Members of this House about the development of a new *Education Act* which will replace the current *School Act*. The legislation under which our schools and education are currently governed was passed in 1974. There have been no substantive changes made to this legislation in the past 12 years. The *School Act* is out of date in many respects, and we have chosen to open the entire *School Act* and to completely rebuild it. The option of simply making amendments to the current legislation was reviewed, but it is preferable to engage the Yukon public in a wide open discussion of schools and education in the territory. Such broad discussion will develop not only a better Act but a firm directional framework for this government to follow in its planning and policy development with respect to public school education.

In September, I met with representatives from the Education Council, the Yukon Teachers Association and the Council for Yukon Indians to discuss what shape the process for developing this new Act should take.

03 Following that meeting of the Steering Committee, an outline was put together for the development of the new legislation. We are committed to extensive public input into this Act. We wish to reflect the requirements of Yukon peoples. This is evident in the intended process that has been set forth. The process will have five steps spanning approximately 18 months with public involvement during all major steps.

The process will begin with five working groups, each of which will deal with a specific topic area. These main topic areas were identified by the Steering Committee during initial meetings which I had with them. The five working group topics will be: student requirements and student management issues; administrative guide-

lines; employee management issues; student transportation and accommodation; and, school committees and school boards.

Each working group will examine its topic area and will develop initial information/discussion papers. Each report will outline the current status of the topic, and the elements that could be covered by the proposed new Act — a framework that the public can use as a jumping off point. These reports will form the basis for public consultation during the next step. I have received confirmation that in each of the five working groups there will be representatives from each of the Yukon Teachers Association, the Education Council and school committees, the Council for Yukon Indians, the Department of Education, and the Principals and Vice Principals Association.

A member from each of the five working groups will then join together to make up a task force. This task force will travel around the territory to solicit recommendations and opinions from Yukon people in response to the working group discussions papers. This phase will span April to June of 1987. This is the stage of intense public involvement. A White Paper will be prepared following an analysis of the information gathered during the public consultation. The White Paper will be made available to interested groups, and the public will be invited to submit comments during September and October of 1987.

04 The proposed legislation will go to Cabinet and then to the Legislature in the spring of 1988.

Through a complete review of our educational policies and legislation and by developing thorough groundwork for policies that arise out of the interests and requirements of the people of Yukon, we will build a solid educational system for our children. We trust the process we have outlined for the development of this Act will facilitate such a solid foundation.

Mrs. Firth: I want to respond fairly briefly to the Ministerial Statement that the Minister has given today which, of course, is an extremely ambitious undertaking that the Minister is going to be proceeding with. The implications and impact of the Ministerial Statement are going to be very overwhelming, I think. It will be an ongoing discussion for some year-and-a-half in the Yukon Territory. People will be spending their time talking about education and the direction of education.

I do not disagree with the Minister that there was some talk in the past two or three years that the *School Act* should be looked at. Whether a total revision was necessary remains to be seen, but I believe that the educators of the territory were looking in that direction.

I have a concern about the five working groups that we are going to have. It is going to involve a lot of people — some 30 individuals — to cover all of the working groups and we are going to be requiring six people from each of the representative groups, that is from the Yukon Teachers Association, the Education Council, School Committees, the Council for Yukon Indians, Department of Education and principals and vice principals, and it is going to require officials from the department to spend time in the working groups, as well as people from all of the aforementioned organizations. It is a big commitment.

05 I would be interested in hearing more, whether it is going to be done on a volunteer basis or whether they are going to be paid for that time.

I also have a concern about the Commission on Indian Education and Training, which will be having some input on this huge undertaking. We are hoping that their deliberations will be finished when it comes time to develop the White Paper and go around to the communities with it.

I wish the Minister well in his endeavours, and we look forward to seeing what kind of public participation will take place. I am sure I will get many phone calls and questions about the whole review process that is going to take place.

Mr. McLachlan: We would welcome the initiative by the Minister to reopen the legislation governing the Department of Education's mandate. By the time the task is completed, it will be 14 full years since the legislation was passed in that respect.

I find that the subject of schools in the Department of Education is one that is very near and dear to the hearts of some. For others, the legislation that regulates the department and our school system is very confusing. The only cautionary note I would add is that those people in the Yukon be made very aware of the direction in which the study is proceeding, and that it be well advertised in the communities and that they are well aware of what is happening, so that we may not fall behind or get into the information gap that, at times, appeared to be happening when we started the human rights review work last November.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I thank the Members for their comments. I do not believe that this is the proper time to get into detail of what sort of voluntary resources are required to fill this commitment with respect to reopening the *School Act* and the creation of a new Act.

We do intend to put forward a very clear statement to all school committees and people in the territory as to what has been agreed upon as a proper course of action, which will ensure full public commitment and public consultation.

We did take into account the reporting of the Commission on Indian Education and Training. I would hope that the Commission's recommendations will be placed on the table and for the public well in time for consideration for any changes to the *School Act*. We are committed to incorporating all groups who are interested in the development of the Act and giving consideration to all ideas in determining what is best for the territory.

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

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Land disposition

Mr. Phelps: There was a press release issued by the government two days ago. It talked in terms of 1,800 plus acres and X number of hectares being released as a result of negotiations with the Champagne/Aishihik Band. It was a big announcement, but there were less than three miles of land released. Can the Minister of Community and Transportation Services tell me why the government saw fit to release this information in terms of acres and hectares rather than square miles?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That is the way it has traditionally been done. If the Members want it broken out in terms of square miles for all land transfers, or square kilometres, that can easily be done. It is simply a matter of tradition.

We wanted to be able to identify parcels within the block of land that was transferred, so that people could understand where the land was going. We did that.

Mr. Phelps: My supplementary is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. Is it true that this land release only satisfied two agricultural applications?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It is true that that information was contained in the news release.

Mr. Phelps: My next question is to the Minister of Community and Transportation Services. How many other agricultural applications are going forward to FEDLAC at this time?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not have the figures in front of me, but there are some other agricultural plots being requested. I indicated I would get a list to the Member for Porter Creek East, when he requested it, and I will make sure that that list is forwarded as soon as possible to the Member for Hootalinqua as well.

Question re: Homesteader lots, Mendenhall

Mr. Phelps: Could the Minister of Community and Transportation Services tell us about the homesteader lots that are going to be made available near Mendenhall, and at what price?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I would have to check on the number of lots. The government will be reviewing the homesteader policy with respect to the price. We did feel it was necessary to identify land as soon as we could so we would be in a position to release homesteader land in the new year.

With respect to price, et cetera, the policy will be finalized

shortly, perhaps before the end of this calendar year. Once that policy has been approved, the price of properties will be made public.

Mr. Phelps: The policy involves selling land at market value and forgiving, over the course of a number of years, the price over and above the actual cost of government. How is government going to set the market value?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: First of all, market value is established in the same way it is established for all properties in the territory. I am not in a position to comment on the basis on which land will be sold under the homesteader policy, because it has not been approved by this government. Suggestions have been made and are being put forward to the government for consideration, but nothing has been finalized yet. I am not in a position to say what price the homesteader lots will be.

Mr. Phelps: We have made it clear that we would like to sell land fairly cheaply if we can and still be consistent with our other land sale policies.

Mr. Phelps: The Minister spoke in a statement given in the House a couple of weeks ago regarding land policy about land to be released for homesteader lots near the Takhini River past the Hot Springs. Can the Minister tell us whether or not that application has gone forward, has it cleared the FEDLAC, and where exactly that application for land is?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If the Member is referring to the application for homesteading, I do not know what the Member is referring to. Is he referring to the application that was made for agricultural plots in the Flat Creek area or whether he is referring to something else. Oh, he is.

That application is going forward to FEDLAC. My understanding, if my memory serves me correctly, would mean that there would probably be about 20 agricultural plots available as a result of that transfer.

Question re: Watson Lake Forest Products

Mr. McLachlan: I have a question of the Government Leader on the Watson Lake Sawmill. Does the government endorse the principle of selling logs directly out of the territory and the country rather than processing the logs here in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As the Member knows this is a matter of some controversy nationally, especially in British Columbia in recent years. Let me say, as a Canadian, I would prefer to see our resources processed to the maximum extent in the country. However, I do recognize that should the British Columbia government continue to permit the export of raw logs from leases in British Columbia, we will not have any right to prevent that happening.

Mr. McLachlan: Does the plant become viable then by allowing the export of logs? Rephrasing the question, will it carry its own without the export of logs out of the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We are talking about the plant operating to supply this market region. There are some potential export markets we think more interestingly in Alaska in the short run than the Orient. I believe the consultant's report that I just tabled today indicated that the last export of raw logs from the previous plant was an extremely dubious proposition from an economic point of view.

Mr. McLachlan: Although I realize that the future of the sawmill operation had to be stabilized before discussions on the potential gluelam plant could be initiated, can we infer from the Ministerial Statement of Monday of this week that Watson Lake is being actively considered by the government for the location of this plant?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, not to my knowledge. The purpose of the remark in the Ministerial Statement was to speak to the question of a reliable supply of construction grade lumber. A gluelam operator working in the territory would require a secure and reliable supply of construction grade lumber. The plant that has the best potential to do that now is, in fact, the Watson Lake plant.

Question re: Watson Lake Forest Products

Mr. Nordling: My understanding is that the government

reached an agreement with the Kingsgate Group in order to avoid a bidding war. Can the Government Leader tell me if that understanding is correct, and has this agreement been put into writing?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am advised that yesterday, before our representatives appeared in court, the representatives of the other party contacted us to indicate their desire to drop their bid on the Yukon assets of Watson Lake Forest Products if we were to drop our bid on the British Columbia logs. An agreement was verbally reached in the presence of lawyers — and I do not know if it has been documented in any way yet — that would allow us to keep the logs in the bush and move them to the Watson Lake Mill as soon as possible. Discussion about allowing the private operators to exercise cutting rights on BC leases for a certain period took place. They are to pay us a certain amount of money, \$50,000, for those cutting rights.

At the end of the period during which the cutting would be allowed, the possession of the BC lease would remain with us. This speaks a little to the question that the Member for Faro asked. The interest of the private operators is to export those logs. Our interest in reaching an agreement with them will be to secure the asset and to make an agreement that will guarantee the employment of local labour and businesses in the BC logging operations and towards creating some immediate benefits.

Mr. Nordling: Will the Government Leader table the agreement when it is reduced to writing?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Unless there is some legal reason why I cannot, I am quite prepared to do that.

Mr. Nordling: Can the Government Leader give us some idea of when he expects the deals to be finalized?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am sorry, but, with respect, I think the Member opposite, being a lawyer, may know better than I how long it takes to do the closing paperwork on this kind of transaction.

Our interest is in seeing the deal closed as soon as possible, proclaiming the *Development Corporation Act*, appointing a Board and seeing a contract awarded to a private manager of the plant as soon as possible. Our aim is to have people in the woods as of January cutting logs.

Question re: Watson Lake Forest Products

Mr. Lang: In view of the fact that a lot of the information regarding the transaction has not been made available to the public — most of us on this side are relying on press reports — and in view of the fact that the Minister has tabled the Feasibility Study, would the Government Leader be prepared to move that report into the Committee of the Whole at a later date in order to have a constructive and informative debate?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Member opposite knows that that can be done by motion. I understand there will be some agreements about House business for this week. Let me suggest there are a couple of ways. If the Member wishes to have a debate on this subject when we resume in January, we will be more than pleased to do that. In the meantime, I am prepared to make the offer that, in addition to the substantial information tabled today, if Members on all sides of the House would like a morning briefing — I would even be prepared to arrange it for tomorrow morning — from officials of the Department of Economic Development on the details, I am quite prepared to arrange the same.

Mr. Lang: The point is that we feel that a lot of the information should be on the public record. That is one of the reasons we have these Chambers. I was not indicating that the cycle of work for this week, which had been agreed to previously, be interrupted. I was implying that, in January when we do come back, we do put the information available into the Committee of the Whole. It would generate some very interesting dialogue between all sides to see exactly what the situation is.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I cannot comment on the wisdom of putting it into Committee of the Whole, or the whole House, on a Wednesday afternoon or some other time. I will leave the Member opposite to make those representations to our House Leader and to work out those arrangements. I am quite happy to do both things I suggested: provide a briefing to Members opposite from departmental officials, if they request that, on as much as we know. I did give

an undertaking to the Leader of the Official Opposition that as soon as the court transaction was decided that I would make public the consulting study on which we were basing our actions. I have done that today. I recognize that Members have not had a chance to study it, and I understand that. I am not in control of the circumstances or the timetable on this.

If Members wish to have a debate on the subject, I am in their hands. How that debate wants to be conducted I am sure will be subject to negotiations.

Question re: Northern Yukon National Park tour

Mr. Brewster: I understand that, earlier this year, the Minister of Renewable Resources chartered a flight through the park in northern Yukon, and that he was accompanied by a select group of six people. Can the Minister advise this House who accompanied him on this trip and what the purpose of the trip was?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I indicated by way of a press statement this summer, we did take a trip to the new park in the northern Yukon, Northern Yukon National Park. We did visit Herschel Island and we did do a trip on the Firth River. The trip was put together by a private company. I went on the trip, a representative of the Department of Tourism went on the trip, a representative of the Department of Renewable Resources went on the trip, and other private citizens also bought seats on the trip.

Mr. Brewster: Was there any film footage taken on that trip? If so, whose property is it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, there was a film camera on the trip. That camera was owned and operated by Northern Native Broadcasting Yukon. They took extensive film footage. It is their property. Like any other private organization or citizen, they had the right to purchase the trip and take their camera, and they did. It was an excellent trip.

Mr. Brewster: To the Minister of Renewable Resources: was that trip then paid for by Native Broadcasting?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Northern Native Broadcasting did pay their own way on the trip, yes.

Question re: Commission on Indian Education and Training

Mrs. Firth: I have a question for the Minister of Education regarding the Commission on Indian Education and Training. I asked the Minister, regarding the premature termination of the Chairman and the Commissioners, whether there was any penalty payout to the Chairman or Commissioners. In the Minister's reply on December 10, the Minister said that no penalty is going to be paid by the government to the Commissioners who are leaving the Commission voluntarily.

My question to the Minister is this: was there any financial settlement paid to the former Chairperson of the Commission?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No. The former Chairperson of the Commission is going to be teaching in the teacher workforce and will be teaching school, I would think, at the beginning of next term, and his salary will be paid to him as teacher's salaries are paid.

Mrs. Firth: If he is not teaching until the beginning of next term did he get paid until such time as he goes back into his job with the government, and what is the former Chairperson's position at this time?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not have the details of how the Chairperson is being paid week to week with me. I would have to check on this.

With respect to what the status of the person who is now resigned from the Commission is, he is not presently teaching school. I presume he is at home or doing something. I do not know specifically what he is doing.

Mrs. Firth: I would like the Minister to come back and tell us if the former Chairperson is being paid for this time and if it is coming out of the Commission's funds for the Commission on Indian Education, and I would like to ask the Minister, for my final supplementary, if any consideration has been given to payment to the other Commissioners?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Firstly, the former Chairperson has resigned and will not be charging any of his wages, if he is

receiving wages, to the Commission. With respect to the other Commissioners, I am currently in discussion with the Council for Yukon Indians on a full range of matters with respect to the Commission and would hope that by Friday we could come to some permanent resolution. I would say things look fairly good that we can.

Question re: Liquor store lists

Mr. Phillips: I have a question for the Minister of Justice. The question is regarding the recent investigation and conviction of bootleggers in Whitehorse. I think the Member for Faro asked a question about the same group yesterday. Can the Minister tell this House if he, or anyone in his Department, authorized employees of the Liquor Corporation at the local liquor store to establish a list of Yukoners who appeared to be buying excessive amounts of liquor?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I know nothing at all about that. I did not authorize anything of the kind, and as to the staff members of the Liquor Corporation, I have no knowledge at all.

Mr. Phillips: I understand that in the process of the trial such a list was produced, and the list was evidently gained, by my understanding, from the Liquor Corporation. Can the Minister tell me if this government has a policy in effect where they do gather such information for the RCMP or other officials?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, not to my knowledge, but we do have a policy that where people are breaking the laws, we will investigate and bring them to trial and to justice. That is certainly our policy.

Mr. Phillips: I do not really have a problem with that. I understand that sometimes undercover investigations have to be carried out, and government has to assist where necessary. The thing that has been brought to my attention, and rather scares me, is that many people, in the past few weeks, have been going in and out of the local liquor store, and companies. Are their names on this list? Whose names are we gathering? Are there people behind windows who are gathering names of people who purchase excess amounts of liquor? What are we doing?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am absolutely confident that people who are not bootlegging have absolutely nothing to fear.

Question re: Liquor store lists

Mr. Lang: Our information is that there are at least 14 names on the list. People are very concerned as to exactly what the policy of the government is. When they go into a public place to purchase liquor, are people under scrutiny by officials? That is the question. The Minister said he had no knowledge of it, yet, at the same time, he says that they are not under scrutiny. Would the Minister check into this and find out exactly what the policy is? There have been concerns expressed to me on the invasion of privacy. What exactly were the terms and conditions of the agreement for such an investigation?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation

Mr. Lang: I have a question for the Minister of the Yukon Housing Corporation, the first future tsar of housing in the Yukon.

Speaker: Order, please. Is this a supplementary or a new question?

Mr. Lang: It is a new question.

I have asked a series of questions in the last three days, and I have not gotten answers to them. Has the government approved a new position for the Yukon Housing Corporation referred to as a Counsellor as a result of the three studies that were done?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: World history will show that the public dealt severely with tsars approximately 80 years ago. We have not had tsars or tsarinas since.

With respect to the positions that the Member mentions, the answer is no, the government does not approve of those positions.

Mr. Lang: There is no question it will be dealt with properly within the next year or so.

Has the government approved the new position of a policy analyst for the lean, mean, tough housing corporation who is going to be necessary to oversee this \$72 million project?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Here we go again. The Member is trying to bootleg a lot of rhetoric on a question that was just answered only a minute ago. I will have to respond again, for the umpteenth time, to the assertion that the government is about to engage in a \$72 million capital program. That is not true. I mentioned yesterday that it was not true. I believe I mentioned the day before that that was not true. It remains not true.

The capital projections for the government are indicated in the Capital Budget, which has now been tabled for the Members' consideration, and is in response to the worst housing conditions in the country. That is the reason why we are moving in the direction we are.

I have already answered the question in a previous discussion.

Mr. Lang: He has not answered the question. I would ask the Minister, the man who would be king, has he approved the new position of a policy analyst for the Yukon Housing Corporation, to keep the Yukon Housing Corporation lean, mean and tough?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The answer is no. I will be brief on that. I will also state in response to the bootleg that yes, we would like a lean and very friendly Yukon Housing Corporation to do the job that we expect of it.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation

Mr. Lang: The Minister always sets a good example. With respect to the Indian Affairs program and the \$72 million that was disclosed by the Housing Corporation — it is public information, and I do not know why he keeps denying that it has not been announced — does this five-year capital projected program for the Yukon Housing Corporation include the dollars that have been allocated by the Government of Canada, in most part, through the Indian Affairs program, for housing through those programs?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not deny for a second that the Yukon Housing Corporation has made public its proposed capital program for over five years. It includes \$72 million total. The housing construction of which \$19 million would be YTG's if YTG were to agree to that expenditure. YTG has agreed so far, and this Legislature is about to peruse a Capital Budget that incorporates a fairly modest amount in terms of improving the housing conditions of the people of the territory.

¹⁴ With respect to the question at hand, I would indicate to the Member that it is still being researched, and I will try to have an answer to the Member tomorrow.

Mr. Lang: That just does not fly. I asked this question four days ago. You have a \$72 million program you do not know anything about and then the Minister does not know if it includes some federal programs as well. This makes our job very frustrating.

Could I ask the Minister: in view of the fact that some communities have already voiced some concerns about further social housing going into their communities, is it the position of the government and the Housing Corporation that they will not start on a major social housing program in a community unless they have the Municipal Council's blessing?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Firstly, I would like to remind the Member that as a Minister I respond to his requests as quickly as I can. There are many requests, and the responses have been very quick in my view.

With respect to, essentially, a municipal veto over housing starts in a particular community, I would like to remind the Member that, at least at this point, we have not devolved housing to municipalities, and until such time that we give that consideration, if we ever do, the Government of Yukon, the Yukon Housing Corporation and the local Housing Associations in those communities will be responsible for housing delivery.

Mr. Lang: That was not the question I asked. I asked if it was the position of the government and the Housing Corporation that they will not proceed with social housing program unless they have the blessing of the municipal council?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I just answered that question. I said that the municipal councils are not responsible for housing currently and, therefore, they would not be given a veto over housing. They will be consulted as they have been already, but currently the Yukon Housing Corporation and the local Housing Associations in

those communities are responsible for housing delivery.

Housing policy is the responsibility of this government. We are about to engage in a housing policy discussion that will incorporate the views from the municipalities as well as the Housing Associations, et cetera, as well as the public. That housing policy discussion, I would hope, would be initiated in January.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation

Mr. Lang: This is a very serious question because there are a lot of people in the area that I represent, and I am sure throughout the territory, who are very concerned if this government is going into a \$72 million social housing program that the local authorities should have a say on whether or not it is going to proceed in a community or a given part of that community. Is it then the policy of the government that the municipality will only be consulted, and it will be the ultimate decision by the Housing Corporation whether or not to proceed, despite the decision of the municipal council?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There is nothing that this government has tabled in this Legislature that suggests that this government is about to embark on a \$72 million capital program. The Member, again, is wrong. He is completely wrong. He is as wrong today as he was yesterday and the day before that and the day before that.

With respect to municipal councils, we have done our very best to consult with municipal councils on matters that affect the municipality. It does not stop at housing, it includes a whole variety of government activities. We talked about the decentralization of the Housing Corporation and we talked about the creation of the local Housing Associations, and I am sure those Housing Associations in those communities will have a more significant say in the future, but certainly we do not want to engage in housing programs that are to be rejected by the communities.

15 That is obvious.

Mr. Lang: If the Minister checks *Hansard*, he will find that two answers ago, the Minister indicated that there was a five year program for \$72 million. So, who is not telling the truth here? That is what the Minister said.

Is the Minister prepared to table the contracts that were entered into for the Institute of Urban Studies on Yukon Housing Needs Study, the Future Mandate of the Yukon Housing Corporation and the Decentralization of Housing Experience in Western Canada?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I have to keep clarifying this matter. I feel I must because it is not right to leave the Member in such an ignorant state as appears to be the case. The Yukon Housing Corporation Board of Directors has adopted a long term capital program to try to meet the criticism and the concern that this territory has the worst housing in the country by any comparative analysis. We have approved the first year of that capital program. That is the only year that we have approved, and it is tabled before this Legislature.

I will reiterate, time and time again, that the government is going to be engaged in a social housing policy that will determine future directions for a large part, and will also determine the direction of the Yukon Housing Corporation itself.

Question re: RCMP investigation in Kwanlin Dun

Mr. McLachlan: Has the Minister of Justice now been able to establish that a government van and government equipment were used in the sting operation conducted by the RCMP on the bootlegging charges?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have information that the Member opposite's information came from a newspaper story. I have no further information than that.

Mr. McLachlan: I guess that is why we have Question Period, to try to get the answers from the Ministers. Why was a government van turned over to a native of the Province of Saskatchewan who was not even qualified to drive in the Yukon Territory? He did not even have a driver's licence.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: As to the question of the ability to drive and whether or not the person had a subsisting licence valid in Canada, I do not know.

Mr. McLachlan: With regard to the question asked by the Member for Riverdale North, is the Minister aware that the General

Manager of the Liquor Corporation was required to testify on the stand and under evidence gave statistics as to the amount of liquor being purchased? How could that information have come from none other than an information gathering procedure generated by the Corporation?

16 **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I was not aware of that, but I now am. It is an interesting fact.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed. We will now proceed with —

Point of Order

Mr. Lang: Point of order. I have a question with respect to House business. There was some discussion on it this morning. At this point, I would like to ask if the House Leader can confirm that we are going to continue with our understanding that we will be proceeding with the Capital Mains, or if there are going to be any changes.

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I informed the House Leaders this morning at the meeting, it is the intent of the government today to proceed with the order of business, once we have reached the Committee stage this evening, to begin general debate on the Human Rights Bill and tomorrow to revert back to the Capital Budget.

Mr. Lang: I rise from this side to publicly state our opposition to the sudden change in business. It was our understanding that there was a clear understanding that we were going to attempt to get through the Capital Mains. I think this side has been more than cooperative. We have indicated we are delaying asking questions in order to help the government get through the work necessary, confirming the public statements made by the House Leader with respect to the need for the Capital Mains to be discussed and, in good part, gotten through and agreed to by all sides of the House.

I want to register our concern from this side. I hope all the Members on that side are here tonight for a ride, because she is going to be a long one.

Speaker: I would like to rule on this. I find there is no Point of Order. We will proceed with the Order Paper and Motions for the Production of Papers.

MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Motions for the Production of Papers No. 1 and No. 3

Speaker: On the Point of Order, it would appear to the Chair that the intent of Motions for the Production of Papers No. 1 and No. 3 have been satisfied by the documents tabled earlier today by the Minister of Renewable Resources and the Government Leader. I would, therefore, rule that these motions should not be called for debate and that they should be dropped from the Order Paper.

Motion for the Production of papers No. 2

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

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

Mr. Brewster: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Kluane: THAT a copy of the game ranching study commissioned by the Government of Yukon in June, 1986, to be completed by December 15, 1986, be tabled in this House.

Mr. Brewster: In requesting this study, I am attempting to determine whether or not the government has taken the necessary precaution to safeguard our wildlife, particularly our mountain caribou, prior to importing reindeer and elk into the Yukon.

I am a little afraid that, once again, as is the custom, the government has put the cart before the horse and is going backwards.

On November 24, I asked a question of the Minister of Renewable Resources with respect to a project approved under the EDA for \$53,140 to establish a herd of 45 reindeer in Yukon for tourism and meat sales.

17 I asked the Minister why this project, and another involving elk,

were approved prior to the game ranching study being completed. I expressed the concern that the importation of reindeer into Yukon may have a detrimental effect on the mountain caribou in the area. I sought some assurance from the Minister that there would be no detrimental effects and that there would be no contamination of our local herds. The assurances I received were not satisfactory. The Minister said, and I quote, "With respect to the question of contamination of native caribou in the Yukon, I am satisfied that because of the way that the EDA proposal was brought forward that there is little likelihood of that occurring." Some assurance, some safeguard. What was the proposal EDA put forward? We have no idea. It was not given to us. Did the Renewable Resource Department officials actually see the EDA program before it was started?

I realize that the proposal does not involve free-ranging reindeer, that the reindeer be corralled, but what would be the effect if some of them escaped? Can the Minister answer that one? The simple fact is that the Minister does not know. Perhaps the study, if it is released, will tell us or, at least, set out some safeguards.

Mountain caribou have been sighted along the lakeshores and along the riverbanks where these reindeer will be fenced. The questions I have asked are very pertinent. An escape-proof fence has not been invented yet. Moreover, the information regarding the potential impact of reindeer intermingling with our native caribou is almost nonexistent. It is known that there is an overlap of the breeding season of the two species, reindeer and mountain caribou. The question of whether or not the two species will interbreed is not known. I talked to the caribou biologists for the Northwest Territories, since the Northwest Territories has more experience in dealing with reindeer than the Yukon. They did not seem to have an answer to the question of interbreeding. Most of the information regarding reindeer comes from Finland and neighbouring countries; however, it is of limited value because these countries have no caribou and no predators. The information is not suited to the Yukon.

In view of this lack of scientific information, I doubt very much if the biologists within the Department of Renewable Resources would have recommended the course of action that the Minister has adopted. I have more confidence in these people than that. The Minister may not know it, but he is playing with fire and he might get burnt. What diseases do these reindeer have that they could possibly bring in?

I have another concern, and it involves the sale of reindeer meat. Reindeer are domestic animals and, as such, must be treated like cattle and horses. Therefore, I presume that they can be sold like domestic animals. The *Wildlife Act* does not apply to reindeer. The control of reindeer still remains with the federal government pursuant to Section 47 of the *Yukon Act*.

Accordingly, I would like to know what discussions the Minister and his department have had with the federal government regarding the sale of reindeer meat. What regulations are now in place to govern the sale? Can the Minister assure the House that there will be protection to ensure that caribou meat is not being sold as reindeer meat? These are some of the questions that should be answered before we go too far down the road.

I want to make it clear that I am not against game farming. In fact, I am very much in support of it. I just want to be sure that the government knows what it is doing. Precautions must be taken. I would have preferred that the game ranching study was completed before any projects were approved.

¹⁸ The people who applied under the EDA for game ranching proposals cannot be faulted. They have put a lot of work, money, sweat and effort in. These people should be protected regardless of what the study comes up with as they proceeded in good faith on this project. The onus is squarely on the government to do some proper planning. In relation to game ranching, this planning simply was not done. This study is late, but perhaps it would help us all to better understand the impact game ranching will have on the wildlife. I urge every Member of this House to support this motion.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The information that is requested in the motion will be made available to the Member.

I would like to respond to some of the questions the the Member for Kluane raises. I would like to state at the outset that the questions the Member raises are important questions, and they are necessary questions and have to be answered.

With respect to the idea of diseases being brought in by the importation of reindeer, it is my position articulated to the department that prior to importing any new species into the Yukon they must be given a clean bill of health and the necessary veterinary checks must be done to ensure that the animals that are brought into the Yukon are disease-free.

The operation that is being proposed under the EDA submission will be a contained fence operation. In other words we are not talking about free-ranging reindeer; they will be fenced. The Member quite frankly points out there is always the element that animals will break or jump a fence and that is a reality that we will have to live with.

On the question of diseases that are transmitted from reindeer to caribou, the only area that is close to us that would suggest information is the Northwest Territories herd that is located in the Mackenzie Delta. To my knowledge, there has not been any cases, that I am aware of in recent years, of diseases being transmitted from the reindeer to caribou. The reindeer in that particular area are a free-ranging herd, and they do intermingle with the caribou and, as a matter of fact, intermingle with the hunters and are taken as caribou. It is good meat; I have tasted it.

He raises questions about future sale for reindeer. That is obviously an end product of the exercise. At some point, it is my hope that we will have developed a sophisticated enough enterprise with game ranching that we will be able to replace some of the red meats that we consume, as people, with indigenous species of animals such as reindeer, elk and wood bison. I think that the countries like Sweden and Finland have led the way on this issue. There is a very large industry set up in that part of the world that consumes the natural resources. I think every way you look at the issue, it looks like a positive development and should be one that we pursue.

The study that the Member's motion speaks of is not complete. There has been a delay with respect to the terms of reference for the study. Although the original intention was to get the study underway earlier than we had, in fact, we did not issue the contract and get the study underway until the end of August.

¹⁹ As a consequence of that delay, the study will not be completed until February 15. I spoke to the successful contractor who is conducting the study. That contractor assures me that the study will be complete on February 15.

As the Member cautions, we must be careful to ensure that we do not contaminate our indigenous species here with the new developments that we are proposing for game ranching. The attempt to pull the study together, to get all the relevant facts on the economics and the questions of viability and public policy as it relates to other interests will be done.

A portion of the EDA monies have been structured to provide demonstration projects. This falls within this category. Nobody in the department has given me cause for concern that we are endangering our wildlife stock by importation of those animals. The Member has my personal assurance that when the study is complete, it will be tabled in the Legislature.

Mr. Phillips: I am pleased to hear that the Minister will be tabling the study in the House. I too, like the Member for Kluane, share some concerns. I have been involved most of my life in wildlife in the Yukon. I have had the opportunity recently of going to Ottawa and taking part in two game ranching seminars where very strong concerns were expressed from wildlifers all across Canada about the direction that game ranching is going.

I too, like the Member for Kluane, am not against game ranching, but I think there is a great deal to be learned from the provinces that are developing game ranching policies. I think that we can learn from the direction in which they are going.

I do have to differ with the Minister when he says he has talked to officials in his department and has been advised by those officials that there is no concern here. I have talked to those same officials,

and I think the Minister knows who I am talking about, and they have told me that there is concern.

There is very much concern, more concern now because of the fact that people in his department were not involved in the actual application, because they went through the Agricultural department. It was not perused by the officials of his department. Now they are alarmed to the concerns, and they are investigating the concerns, and cannot give interested people and groups assurances that there may or may not be problems. We just do not know. That is the concern that I am trying to express to the Minister.

Let us slow down on this one. I know there could be great potential in the Yukon to do it, but there is also a great potential to harm the indigenous species, especially when we are talking about a mountain caribou herd in the southern Yukon, which is so few in numbers. In Zones 7 and 9, the Minister and the previous governments have protected these herds and issued only permit hunting on those herds because of their small numbers.

All we have to do is get a few reindeer getting into that herd and interbreeding with that herd, and we will have destroyed the whole integrity of the southern Yukon mountain caribou herd. We have to be very conscious of that. I am not saying that the government should not go ahead with the project. I am saying that we should be very careful where we are going. I think that there are some concerns out there, and I ask the Minister to carefully look at all the concerns when he addresses this problem.

²⁰
Speaker: The hon. Member will close debate if he now speaks. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. Brewster: It is rather unfortunate that two people who worked very hard on this should have to get into what apparently is something that the government has completely bungled on. I am not prepared to back down on that. The Minister gives me his assurance that nothing is going to happen. I talked with a biologist in the Northwest Territories for over half an hour, and he could not give me an assurance of any kind that something would not happen. Anyone who tells us that they are fenced in and will stay is not right.

We must point out that these are domestic animals. They are not under the Department of Renewable Resources. They are under the Department of Agriculture. I presume this means, unless somebody has a law or they are going to slip one in here quick, that theoretically this person could sell these animals to every little farm for sleighrides. They are like a horse or cow or sheep. There is nothing stopping them. This means that we could have them on five or six farms. These farms are not all going to have good enough fences. I do not think we have to worry too much about the bull, but if the cows get away, there is a month overlap in breeding. I have been around animals long enough to know they can adapt to this. There is no problem.

You say they are going to come through here health inspected. We do not do that with horses coming out of Alaska. We do not do that with horses coming out of Montana. We do not do that with cattle coming out of Montana. We do not check anything coming in or out of the Yukon. We never have. I doubt that, as domestic animals, you are going to be able to check these. I think that they can turn around and legally say that you cannot check them. I heard stories that reindeer have gone through here. They were dying in the trucks, and the Department of Renewable Resources could do nothing about these because they are not under their control. They are under the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa.

Motion for the Production of Papers No. 2 agreed to

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Porter: The House Leaders have reached an agreement as to the order in which Motions Other than Government Motions shall be called. To that effect, such an agreement required unanimous consent of the House. I would therefore ask unanimous consent to have the Motions called in the following order: 75, 77, 80, 73, 79, 72, 74, 76 and 78.

Speaker: Is there unanimous consent.

All Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 75

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

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

Mr. Webster: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Klondike: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the names of those who make contributions of a significant value to political parties or candidates should be disclosed; and

THAT the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges should advise the Assembly on the guidelines and regulations which should govern such disclosure; and

THAT, in its study of this subject, the Committee review the draft amendments to the Political Contribution Income Tax Credit Regulations tabled by the Government Leader and be empowered to make an interim report.

²¹
Mr. Webster: This motion speaks to public disclosure of political contributions, an important principle in the partial public financing of election campaigns. Implicit in this principle is the right of the public, which underwrites political contributions, to know who may possess influence with elected representatives as a result of such contributions.

Under the *Canada Elections Act*, the identity of individual contributors of aggregate amounts of \$100 or more is recorded for public scrutiny. Disclosure of contributions over \$100 is a practice in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories. This is currently not the requirement of the Yukon's Political Contribution Income Tax Credit Regulations and this motion suggests that the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges review draft amendments to these regulations, which address this omission.

It should be noted that the proposed amendments do not suggest public disclosure of contributions by those who do not request an official receipt for income tax purposes.

Mrs. Firth: I guess I was a bit slow, I was waiting for more to come but nothing more came.

We will be supporting the motion. Upon my research, I found that disclosure of contributions, as the former speaker has said, is disclosure of contributions only for those individuals who will be requiring tax receipts for the disclosures so that does not disallow people to make contributions of whatever amounts they may want and to have that information remain confidential in the event they do not request a tax receipt.

Our research tells us that in Alberta disclosure for contributions over \$375 is the practice; British Columbia has no requirement for disclosure of contributions; Government of Canada for contributions over \$100 disclosure is required; Province of Manitoba \$250 or more disclosure is required; New Brunswick has disclosure for over \$100 for individual contributions and also full disclosure is made for corporations and trade unions that has contributed to parties or candidates; Newfoundland has no disclosure of contributions, however, it does have draft legislation, which is going to provide for funding of parties limits on expenses and contributions and the disclosure will be \$100 or more in tax benefits; the Northwest Territories is for over \$100; Nova Scotia has no disclosure of contributions; Ontario has disclosure for over \$100; Prince Edward has disclosure for over \$250; Quebec has disclosure for over \$100; Saskatchewan disclosure for over \$100; and, of course, the Yukon Territory has no disclosure.

We agree with the principle that the public should know, there should be public accountability and, therefore, we extend our best to the committee in its deliberations and in its review of the regulations.

²²
Mr. McLachlan: I am a little uncomfortable with the way the motion is worded. I feel that perhaps the second clause should have come first. I only mention it in that I feel that the Standing Committee, Rules, Elections and Privileges really is the vehicle

wherein this motion could be discussed, where the discussion could be opened up to a much fuller, longer review of all of the procedures.

We have some problems in defining what is meant by "significant value" because many people contribute a large amount of work to political parties that is of significant value and does not relate in any way to monetary returns. The term "significant value" does mean different things to different people.

I am interested to know if the proposer of the motion is willing, in the discussion, to define the limits that would be set on political contributions. For example, does he think that a top limit of \$3,000 would apply to a corporation, an individual or any situation for defining how much goes to any political party?

We will be supporting the motion on the basis that the current system of financing political contributions and controlling election expenses, although not rampant in its abuse in the Yukon, could be at some point. We have had many cases in Canada where there have been examples of this. It is because of this possibility of the opening up of the chance of abuse in some situations that we will be supporting the principle of the motion.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As the Member for Klondike observed, I did table some draft regulations on Monday. The Member for Riverdale South indicated the full range of regulations in this regard across the country. What she did not note was that our Act is based on British Columbia's, which is generally viewed by people who are interested in this question as the least satisfactory in Canada.

The important principle that I think should be noted here is that — and this was something I raised at the time of the second reading of the Bill in 1981 — only British Columbia and the Yukon permit a tax credit for political contribution with no disclosure whatsoever. During the course of this sitting, we have had arguments made about public disclosure and public expenditures. I am very much persuaded by those arguments that have been made on all sides of the House.

Presently, anyone can make a \$100 contribution to a registered political party in the Yukon Territory and receive a \$75 tax credit. Anyone may also donate \$100 to a federal political party and receive a \$75 tax credit. The difference between the federal law and the Yukon law is that, in the case of a \$100 contribution to a federal political party, there will be disclosure of a person's name and the contribution for an amount over \$100.

²³ In the case of the Yukon Territory, there is no disclosure whatsoever. In effect, you have a grant of public money amounting to \$75 for a tax credit, with no disclosure. That is the principle that was argued quite strenuously by the three federal parties in 1973, when this Act came in. In the end, all parties were persuaded that it was morally necessary that if there was going to be a gift of public money to donors of political parties — in other words, an indirect subsidy by the state of political parties — that the people who benefited from those tax credits, from those gifts, of a significant amount — in the federal case, being \$100 — should have their names disclosed.

In tabling draft regulations on Monday, I would note that the government of course could have done this by Order-in-Council. Notwithstanding some of the less than flattering things that have been said on the other side of the House during the last two weeks, I remain persuaded that I have, personally — and my party has — a very good record with respect to a proper regard for what are the constitutional proprieties of the House. I believe that matters governing the conduct of elections ought not to be, in any case, the exclusive domain of the government party, and that, wherever possible constitutional issues, such as this, should be dealt with on the basis of an all party agreement, if possible, or dealt with by an all-party committee.

Ultimately, if we are to move on this question, a Cabinet decision about regulations will have to be made. In proposing, as we are proposing to do today, to refer this matter to Committee, we have a chance to consult with representatives of all three parties represented in this House.

I am saying that the goal of disclosure can be accomplished through amendments to the Political Income Tax Credit Regula-

tions. As I believe has been made clear, I requested the chief electoral officer to draft a set of amendments based on the disclosure provisions found in the federal election financing laws. That is the draft regulations that have been tabled in the Assembly.

What I and my colleague, the Member for Klondike, are asking through this Motion is that the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges examine these regulations and make recommendations as to their desirability to the House and, if necessary, do an interim report upon which the Cabinet can act, if the committee sees fit to complete its work expeditiously.

I feel it necessary to say that I do not intend in any way to prejudice the work of the committee by tabling a reference of these draft regulations. The committee is free to recommend that something be done with them, nothing be done with them, or something more be done. The Member for Faro made mention of the different kinds of contributions and what constituted significant. The \$100 may have been significant in 1973. Some people may not think it is significant today. It still is for me, but it may not be to other Members in the House. In the federal Act, there are regulations governing gifts in kind, which is only proper.

²⁴ It may be, having listened to the Member for Riverdale South, that full disclosure of political contributions is an idea whose time has come. The Member mentioned the contributions of trade unions and corporations. Certainly, the trend in the United States law and the trend in many other countries in the democratic world is for full disclosure, to cite the principle uttered by the Member for Klondike, so that the citizens of the public may know who may have potential influence with their elected representatives.

Whatever the committee decides to do, I would submit that the draft regulations are a useful first step in the process. They can be enacted to provide a short-term measure until the committee gives further indepth consideration if it wishes. It might also be the view of the committee that the amended regulations should be enacted and after a few years reviewed to determine whether anything further is required in legislative measures. In reference to the draft regulations, I should make clear that they are only a draft. It may be desirable in the future to embody these changes in legislation, but we will see what the Committee has to say about them.

The Member for Riverdale South correctly pointed out that the proposal here is to include people who receive income tax credits only. That is quite true, but it is also, I submit, entirely within the powers of the Committee to recommend a set of recommendations of broader scope than that if they so desire. I would not presume to anticipate the Committee's decision. It appears that the motion will be supported on all three sides of the House. I will, therefore, conclude my remarks and perhaps you can call the question.

Motion No. 75 agreed to

Clerk: Item number 11, standing in the name of Mr. Nordling.

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

Mr. Nordling: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West —

Motion No. 77

Clerk: Clerk's mistake. Item number three standing in the name of Ms. Kassi.

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

Ms. Kassi: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Old Crow: THAT, to express the desire of Yukon people for world peace and nuclear disarmament, the Yukon Legislative Assembly declares all land, inland water, coastal waters and airspace within the territory as a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone and this Assembly will use all means within its power to ensure the Yukon is used solely for peaceful purposes; and

THAT this Assembly declares the Yukon's opposition to the testing and/or establishment of nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapons-related technology and nuclear waste dump sites in the Yukon.

²⁵ **Ms. Kassi:** It so happens that this is the International Year of Peace. I think it is a good time now to think about taking initiatives such as this, as a Legislature, as it is close to Christmas.

This year we have some change for the better between the superpowers, and efforts are being made to reduce the nuclear stockpiles around the world. This should be encouraged by all of us.

We have also seen expressions from people around the world in support of nuclear arms reduction. New Democrats and Conservatives united to make a statement for nuclear disarmament in Manitoba, and we can do the same here. More recently, the Legislatures of Ontario and the Northwest Territories adopted a similar motion to declare themselves nuclear weapons free zones. In Alaska, a resolution has been introduced in the State Legislature to work towards the same initiative. In August, a referendum at the State Primary showed big support for a nuclear weapons free zone.

Earlier this year, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference met in Alaska and fully endorsed the motion for a nuclear free Arctic. This was one of the biggest gatherings of the Inuit people ever from Alaska, the Northwest Territories and Greenland. This motion passed unanimously. In the Province of British Columbia as well as in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland, various communities have declared themselves nuclear free as well.

Many countries around the world such as Greenland, Iceland, New Zealand, Sweden and a number of smaller countries have proceeded with this initiative. With Sweden, Iceland, Greenland and the Northwest Territories joining this group, now the Yukon would make five jurisdictions in this circumpolar north that would be nuclear weapons free. It is my hope that this would be extended to northern countries in Europe, Alaska and the Soviet Union. I think it is interesting to note that despite uranium exploration in the Northwest Territories, their Legislature voted as part of their motion to oppose exploration and exploitation of materials related to the nuclear weapons industry.

I know that my people are concerned about signs of uranium near our community. I want to make it clear to this House that we do not want any uranium mining or development near our community. I think it would be a very negative thing for other parts of the territory as well. We fear the possible contamination that would come from uranium mining. There are many dangers associated with uranium development, and we fear a lot of damage would be done to the land and its habitat.

The motion before honourable Members does not address this, but I felt it important to make this statement that we have these fears about uranium mining in our area. The motion, however, is clear in terms of making the Yukon a nuclear weapons free zone, and I consider this a first step. As well, Canada is unofficially a nuclear weapons free zone and has been since the 1950's when the Conservative Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, decided against putting nuclear missiles on Canadian territory. Perhaps with enough support from territorial and provincial Legislatures, the present government in Ottawa will make us an officially nuclear weapons free zone. That would be strong message for peace throughout the world at this special time of year.

This motion also puts this Legislature on record as opposing the establishment of nuclear waste dump sites in the territory.

²⁶ I think the reasons for opposing this are obvious. Hon. Members should note that there is no obligation under NATO for Canada to test the cruise missile or other nuclear weapons, or to have nuclear weapons on our soil.

As all hon. Members well know, Canada has a proud history of being a peaceful nation, as well as a nation of peacekeepers. Our participation in the peacekeeping efforts of the United Nations points to this. It is my hope that all hon. Members will support this motion for the Yukon Territory being a nuclear weapons free zone. I look forward to your participation in this debate.

Mr. McLachlan: I agree with the intent of the motion, but mainly because of the inclusion of the word weapons and nuclear weapons-related. In order to illustrate that, I want to say that it is not my intent to make Yukon entirely nuclear free. Nuclear

weapons, yes. If I may take just three lines to explain that, someday there may be a possibility of being able to use nuclear-generated power in the territory.

If that should shock the Members opposite, let me remind the Members for Old Crow and Watson Lake that the possibility of using slowpoke type nuclear reactors has come up as close to us as Inuvik and Fort Nelson in the south, some 334 miles away.

I do agree with the Member for Old Crow that the Yukon people are striving for world peace and nuclear disarmament. I think that is very important.

I would like to illustrate my feelings with this story that was related to me by a friend, of two fellows discussing the issue of nuclear war in a bar. One fellow, not too informed on it, leaned over to the other and said, "George, I would really hate to see my son come back from a nuclear war. I think he would be kind of scarred up." The other fellow leaned toward him and said, "You will not have to worry about your son returning from a nuclear war." That was the end of the discussion.

My party is on record at the national level as illustrating the fact that Canada remain free of nuclear weapons, that the country have no involvement in SDI, nor in the production of chemical and biological weapons, that Canada's armed forces should be dedicated to the efforts of international peacekeeping and the protection of sovereignty — an issue that we have heard much about recently — and, further, that Canada work with all circumpolar nations to achieve a nuclear-free zone north of 60.

We will be giving our consent to this motion.

Mr. Phillips: I am pleased to have been given the opportunity to speak about an issue that concerns all of us as Yukoners, as Canadians and as world citizens. I found it a bit interesting that the Member for Old Crow used Manitoba as an example. It seems to me to be a little bit hypocritical for a New Democratic government in Manitoba to be passing a motion like this and, at the same time, screaming, making trips to Ottawa, doing everything they can to get an F-18 contract. It seems to me that the two do not go together. ²⁷ I have a bit of difficulty with that. Both of them are instruments of war and it does not make much sense when the government is taking both actions.

I am speaking today about an issue that crosses party lines and even appears to be of interest and a concern to people who have considered themselves to be apolitical. This issue has inspired and motivated different groups and individuals to take action, and while the nature and extent of their action may differ, and while we may disagree with some of their action, and support one group rather than another, we, all of us, share a very common concern. That concern is world peace.

Amendment proposed

I would like to make an amendment to the motion that has been proposed by the Member for Old Crow, and I would like to read the amendment for the record.

The amendment reads: THAT Motion no. 77 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "THAT" where it first appears, and substituting therefor: "to express the desire of Yukon people for world peace and nuclear disarmament, the Yukon Legislative Assembly requests that Canada make representation to the United Nations, requesting the declaration of all land, inland water, coastal water and airspace within the world as Nuclear Weapons Free Zone."

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North THAT Motion no. 77 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "THAT" where it first appears and substituting therefor: "to express the desire of Yukon people for world peace and nuclear disarmament, the Yukon Legislative Assembly requests that Canada make representation to the United Nations, requesting the declaration of all land, inland water, coastal water and airspace within the world as Nuclear Weapons Free Zone."

Mr. Phillips: The amendment to this motion is simply that we, on this side, believe very strongly that it is much larger than a

Yukon issue. I am speaking today about some reasonable action that we, as Yukon Legislators, can and should take in this matter on behalf of our constituents, out of concern for our children, and the children of the world, and in the interest of long-term good government.

It is most appropriate that we take this action now in the spirit of the Christmas season, taking this action for several very simple but basic and important things.

28 Taking this action says several very simple and basic, but important, things. We recognize that we are not only members of our communities and of our territory, but are part of an international system. We have responsibilities and concerns about the whole system. We are not isolated, and we cannot isolate ourselves. What happens elsewhere will affect us in this manner. Rather than simply fence ourselves in, hoping that the problem will go away or that someone else will handle it for us, is not the solution. We can make a positive contribution.

We might as well aim a little higher. By aiming higher and by doing our small part in a very carefully thought out manner, we demonstrate our true commitment to achieving an important goal. We encourage and join with others in reaching that same goal.

This is not a pie-in-the-sky dreaming. It is a feet-on-the-ground possible thinking. The motion we are talking about today has to come about. I am pleased to have been able to speak to this issue in this season and to have been able to suggest that one small way of extending the spirit of the season into the months and years ahead.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I wish to first thank the Member for Old Crow for bringing forward this most important motion to this Assembly. It is entirely appropriate and fitting that we take time to discuss this matter, which is of the ultimate importance. It may be considered that it is of not immediate practical importance, or within the immediate jurisdiction of this Legislature. I argue strongly that it is most appropriate that we add our voice, or the voice of this Legislature, to the growing voices in the world to declare our opposition to war generally and the nuclear madness specifically.

The Member for Old Crow spoke primarily about nuclear weapons. I will emphasize more the issue of peace as a general aim. I wish to first tell a story that I heard at a forum on peace a week or so ago.

The story is about the perception of children. What happened was that many children were asked about nuclear war and asked if they were afraid of nuclear war and what they thought of it. As I understand it, it was a kindergarten class in a southern city.

The kindergarten class was 18 small children. They were asked, are you afraid of a nuclear war or dying in a nuclear war?

29 They were asked: "Do you think there will be a nuclear war?" There were 17 of the children who said "yes"; one of them said "No". She was asked why, and she said: "because all the time my daddy goes to meetings to stop it".

I think that is an extremely significant story. One child is comforted and is living and growing in a positive spirit because her daddy is trying to stop it. I think it is the duty of all Members here to try to stop it. We are not completely powerless. We can add our voice, our expression, and it is significant because we here represent the population of the territory, and as representatives, if we add our voices to the growing numbers of voices in the world to simply proclaim that we wish an end to this nuclear madness, that we wish peace, that is one of the most significant things that we could do.

I occasionally listen to popular music, and I am moved to mention the words of John Lennon when he said, "Imagine a lasting peace and a world without war". He says, "You may say that I am a dreamer, but I am not the only one". What we can do as a Legislature is to say here that those who dream for peace are not the only ones. We can add our voices to that most worthy goal, and I would ask all Members to support this concept.

The madness of nuclear war is promoted not by individuals, but by governments or world powers. Many have said that we are powerless because of that. I wish to just think a moment about the relationship between governments and individuals. Of course, we in

democratic traditions have no difficulty at all in thinking about the fact that governments are, or should be, the expression of the collection of individuals who live within the governed jurisdiction.

30 It is important that we, as individuals, express our views to government, and it is important that municipalities and provinces and territories express our concern to the national government. I welcome the amendment from the Member for Riverdale North, because it also adds the concept of adding our voice in the international forum which, of course, is extremely important and it is entirely appropriate that our views be expressed in the world community and the United Nations.

Peace is an issue upon which many religions speak and I wish to, for the purposes of clarity and to lead into another concept about the individual, to quote from some of the expressions about peace that have been made by various religious doctrines or religious traditions. I would quote what many of us know as the Golden Rule. These quotes are collected in a book published by the people of the Bahai Faith, and I would quote some short sentences which reflect religious teachings essentially about peace.

From Buddhism, I quote, "Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful."

From Zoroastrianism: "That nature only is good when it shall not do unto another whatever is not good for its own self."

From Judaism: "What is harmful to you, do not to your fellow men. That is the entire law, all the rest is commentary."

From Hinduism: "This is the sum of all true righteousness: deal with others as thou wouldst thyself be dealt by; do nothing to thy neighbour which thou wouldst not have thee do to thee after."

From Christianity: "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."

And I quote, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law of the prophets."

From Islam I quote, "No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself."

31 From Taoism, I quote: "The good man ought to pity the malignant tendencies of others, to rejoice over their excellence, to help them in their straits, to regard their gains as if they were his own and their losses in the same way."

From Confucianism: "Surely it is the maxim of loving kindness. Do not unto others that you would not have them do unto you."

From the Baha'i Faith, I quote: "It is our wish and desire that everyone of you may become a source of all goodness unto men, and an example of uprightness to mankind. Beware lest ye prefer yourselves above your neighbours" and "Blessed is he who prefereth his brother before himself."

I go through those primarily to emphasize the thought and to emphasize the universality of that thought. I wish to lead into a story that is reflective of that particular thought. This occurred to me over the summer. I attended a course in Ottawa on human rights. This was a course for leaders concerning human rights. One of the students was a Jewish person, an Israeli, who had just retired as an airforce pilot from the Israeli army. He also spoke of his brother, who was currently a tank commander in the Israeli army. I asked him, "Why are you here from your military background and your military experience?" He explained to me in a way that I will always remember. He said, "I am now spending my life in the pursuit of world peace and world human rights because I am confident that I will do more in that area than I ever did as a soldier." He said that if you think about it, the ultimate peace issue is about human rights. The ultimate issue in human rights is about peace.

The reason for that is that if you are a soldier and you meet the enemy and it is your job, as a soldier, to kill the enemy, or gun them down, or bomb them, or whatever, how can you possibly perform that act if you respect that person's religion, or that person's right to exist, that person's right to be there. How can you do it? How can you be at war with people if you respect those people's right to exist and to be different from you?

32 I believe that that is an important example of the relationship between individuals and governments on this issue. We, as individuals, know full well the madness of nuclear war. It is time

that governments generally expressed the views of all individuals in this area.

Specifically concerning the amendment, the concept of Canada making representation to the United Nations, we believe is an excellent one. We have no problem whatsoever with that. It will be important if we can get a unanimous motion. However, what the amendment leaves out is that the original motion clearly states a very important principle, and that very important principle is that we here in this House declare that this territory is a nuclear weapons free zone. That is central to the original motion. It is unfortunate that that concept would be left out of the amended motion if the amendment were accepted and nothing else.

Amendment to amendment proposed

Therefore, concerning the amendment, I wish to move: THAT the amendment to Motion No. 77 be amended by adding at the end the following words: "and THAT this Assembly declare the Yukon a nuclear weapons free zone".

³³ **Speaker:** It has been moved by the Minister of Justice THAT the amendment to Motion No. 77 be amended by adding at the end the following words: "and, THAT this Assembly declare the Yukon a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone."

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Briefly on the amendment to the amendment, I explained it in the introduction that the amendment we consider to be a good amendment; however, it leaves out one of the very essential ingredients of this motion, one of the central concepts, and that is the declaration by this Assembly that the territory be a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. It is our intention to stand by that principle; that is why the amendment to the amendment is moved.

Mr. Nordling: I am pleased to see that we have made progress today with respect to the motion. With the amendments I am sure that we will eventually have unanimity in the House. In the context of this motion, to me, world peace is peace looked at from a military and political point-of-view. There is no question that throughout history most people have wanted a lasting peace. The development and deployment of nuclear weapons has threatened the goal of global peace. Over the past five or six centuries, many great men have proposed various plans to achieve a lasting peace. In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War, tried to ensure peace by establishing a balance of power. This balance of power proposal hoped to maintain an even distribution of military and economic power among nations so no nation, or group of nations, would be strong enough to conquer any other nation or group of nations.

As with most proposals, there are weaknesses. The balance of power theory has two weaknesses in international affairs. Firstly, nations are always changing and upsetting the balance of power; and secondly, governments are run by human beings who often make mistakes.

³⁴ Since the Second World War, many attempts have been made by governments to achieve lasting peace among nations. Five areas that come to mind are: firstly, the area of diplomacy between nations, the exchange of diplomats; secondly, international organizations such as the United Nations; thirdly, disarmament, which is difficult but, in 1968, the United Nations approved the nonproliferation treaty to prevent nuclear nations from giving nuclear weapons to other nations, and there have been the United States's and Soviet Union's involvement in Strategic Arms Limitations Talks; fourthly, there has been an effort in improvement of international trade and communications; and, fifthly, collective security based on the balance of power theory.

As Yukoners, we must work within this framework for peace that has developed over the centuries and deal on a government-to-government level to establish certain rules by which all nations should abide.

The major problem we face is the lack of understanding and acceptance. People in one country see their own interests more clearly than they see the interests of another country. Our desires seem reasonable, and the desires of others look selfish and

unreasonable.

This motion, and the amendments to the motion, is a step that we, as Yukoners, can take toward world peace to set an example to the rest of the world by declaring the Yukon a nuclear-free zone and requesting of the United Nations that the rest of the world be declared a nuclear weapons-free zone.

We should then take the initiative and request other countries to follow suit. Now that we have established contact with the Premier of the Soviet Union, as a result of our debate over the testing of cruise missiles, which was held in this Assembly on April 2, 1986, I would suggest that the government again contact the Soviet Union to ask it to make their Arctic a nuclear weapons-free zone, as well as ask the United States to make Alaska a nuclear weapons-free zone.

As was pointed out by the Member for Old Crow, who brought the motion, this has already been done with respect to Greenland. I think that we can all agree with this amendment referring specifically to the Yukon and, following that, to the amendment by the Member for Riverdale North. I am sure that we will have unanimous agreement for the motion.

³⁵ **Mr. Phillips:** I am left a little confused by the amendment. My own feeling when I read it is that the problem is widespread, and I think that the amendment to the motion that we proposed was addressing the widespread problem. As far as I know, the Yukon is in the world.

What I see happening on the other side, and it rather annoys me on an issue that is as important as this, is that they have again decided to play politics so that they can use this issue somewhere down the line.

I think that is wrong. I think it is a very important issue to address. We addressed it responsibly. For the other side to try and drag it back into the political arena, I think, is wrong. I will be supporting the amendment to the motion, but I am certainly not very pleased about the types of games that they like to play on the other side.

Mr. Webster: I do not think that it is a matter of cheap political games at stake here. The intent of the original motion was to address a specific area, our area. The amendment was to address, in general, the world. The amendment to the amendment is speaking to both. It includes, in the general sense, the world, and the amendment to the amendment speaks to the Yukon. I see no problem with anyone in this House accepting these amendments.

Amendment to amendment agreed to

Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment as amended?

Amendment agreed to

Speaker: Is there any further debate on the motion as amended? *Motion No. 77 agreed to as amended*

Motion No. 80

Mr. Clerk: Motion No. 80, standing in the name of Mr. Nordling.

Speaker: Is the honourable Member prepared to proceed with Motion No. 80?

Mr. Nordling: Yes.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the deduction for travel by northerners, as found in Bill C-23, (*An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act*) should be available to all Yukoners; and THAT the Government of Yukon should urge the Government of Canada to introduce amendments to section 110.7 of Bill C-23 which would provide a deduction for the cost of two trips outside per year, if incurred, for each Yukon taxpayer and each member of his or her family.

³⁶ **Mr. Nordling:** Before I begin talking to the motion itself, I would like to mention a slight error in the terminology I used. I do not believe it requires an official amendment. In the second

paragraph, the motion asks that the Government of Yukon urge the Government of Canada to introduce amendments to Section 110.7 of Bill C—23.

To be perfectly correct, the amendments would be made to Section 34(1) of Bill C—23, which adds Section 110.7 to the *Income Tax Act*. As I said, I do not think it is necessary to make a formal amendment. If this motion does pass, I am sure that in contacting the Government of Canada, the Yukon Government, perhaps with the assistance of the Minister of Justice, can clarify the wording of where the amendment should be made.

The first part of the motion advocates that the deduction for travel benefits should be available for all Yukoners, and I stress the words "all Yukoners". For years, some Yukoners have received benefits that were ignored by the Income Tax Department resulting in a tax saving to those people. This was done by the department in recognition of the high cost of living in the north. This system, or lack thereof, was not fair as some Yukoners benefitted and others did not.

Bill C—23 attempts to clarify the problems of the past; however, on examination of the wording, Bill C—23 also appears to discriminate against some Yukoners. The proposed addition to the *Income Tax Act* of Section 110.7 provides that, and I will read the relevant portion, "In computing the taxable income for a taxation year of an individual, there may be deducted...", and we go down to Subsection (d), "an amount received, or the value of a benefit received or enjoyed in the year by him in respect of his employment. This limits the amount deducted to income received in respect of employment."

By restricting it to employment, people like old age pensioners who receive pension income, income from interest, or income from the cashing in of Registered Retirement Savings Plans for which they do pay tax, may be left out of this deduction.

Secondly, the wording of Section (d) goes on to say, "in respect of his employment in the area by a person with whom he was dealing at arm's length." Now, by restricting it to employment benefits received from an employer who is at arm's length, this possibly leaves out small businessmen, self-employed businesspeople who work for themselves and give themselves the benefit of a trip outside the territory. It also leaves out partnerships whereby the partners take the benefit of a trip outside the Yukon.

Thirdly, the section goes on after arm's length to say, "In respect of travelling expenses incurred by him".

³⁷ By limiting that to the word "him", it appears to exclude travelling expenses incurred by him and his family so that, possibly, on interpretation, a taxpayer would not get a deduction for the expense involved in his family travelling outside the Yukon.

In the technical notes issued by the hon. Michael Wilson, Minister of Finance, with respect to this clause, it states, "An employee may claim a deduction in computing his taxable income in respect of certain travel benefits provided to the employee and his family by his employer", and I stress, "and his family". Obviously, they meant to include the expense incurred for the taxpayer's family. This section should be amended to make that clear.

The other part of the motion speaks to two trips outside per year. The reason that I have mentioned two trips is because Bill C-23 provides, also in Section D, that the travelling expenses were incurred in connection with, and I am quoting, "not more than two trips made in the year."

I have expressed the concerns we have with it. The federal government obviously intended to provide a deduction for the cost of two trips out of Yukon per year per family, and they do not appear to have done it on a fair basis. I will not attempt to provide the wording to address these concerns and to amend the section today, but these are matters that the federal government should look at before the Bill is passed. I am sure there are others in this House who have concerns with this section and are more knowledgeable with respect to the history of Bill C-23 than I am, and the effect it will have on Yukoners.

However, I would urge all Members to support this motion as a general statement of concern that there should be no discrimination against some Yukoners.

I believe that if a Yukoner has sufficient income from whatever source to be taxed on it, then he should receive the same tax deduction as those Yukoners who receive their income from an arm's length employer.

I believe that the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce is also working on this issue and has been in contact with the Minister of Finance. I think it would be very helpful if this House took a united stand on the issue for the benefit of all Yukon taxpayers.

³⁸ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** This issue has been very close to my heart over the last few years. I have been involved in the discussions on this matter with a number of the federal governments over the last six or seven years. I have been involved on various committees that have been set up within the Yukon to discuss the matter with federal Ministers. It has not been until recently that we recognized that there is some resolution to the issue. Whether or not it is considered to be fair and desirable to people who live in isolated areas is yet to be determined. I think we do know and recognize that something is happening that will have some finality to it.

I recognize, as well, that in the past we have simply counted ourselves lucky to delay this issue and to encourage federal Ministers to extend the remission orders to allow the existing state of affairs to continue. That is an initiative that was considered by the people making representation to be somewhat unfair. There was a desire to ensure that any tax breaks be given to all Yukoners, not simply to those who are in the employ of someone who was providing them.

At the same time, the only politically acceptable route in the past has been to simply continue the delaying of any new measures and to ask for the extension of the remission orders. Back in the early 1970s, the original legislation was passed to tax northern benefits. The primary intent of that legislation was to tax benefits that were allotted to company employees as a condition of their employment. Persons working in isolated posts in northern Canada were lumped into that category.

Because there were certain items that were not well thought out in the original incarnation of the Act, it was never enforced. It was not until 1979 that the government, once again, indicated a willingness to proceed with the taxation of northern benefits. Resurrecting the issue caused somewhat of a public outcry primarily from people living in isolated regions, certainly from people in the Yukon. Remission orders were passed continuously year after year until such time as a resolution was found.

I recall that back in 1979, 1980, it was largely the mining companies and unions that were leading the charge. There was a committee struck to incorporate all Yukon interests, and that Committee was chaired by the Commissioner of the day, Doug Bell, to make representation to federal Ministers.

³⁹ I certainly think that the initiatives of the Commissioner of the day were lauded and praised by all concerned.

Ultimately, the Committee for Fairness was struck, at which all interests were incorporated — the unions who were initially the prime movers, plus the Chambers of Commerce and the major employers, et cetera — who essentially worked out a consensus position, which I believe this House adopted at one time in the past, and which was communicated to the Federal Minister. The Federal Minister certainly was willing to accept some of the recommendations but not all, and in speaking as a constituency MLA, I can only say that the proposal for the change will hurt one significant employer in my riding, that being United Keno Hill Mines, who does pay benefits to their employees that would be greater than that which would be allowable under the proposed changes to Bill C—23.

Clearly, that is, in my view, a bit of a tragic situation, given that the employees of that particular operation have taken a 25 percent pay cut in order to keep the mine alive, keep the jobs alive and keep the wealth flowing in the territory. That the long arm of the tax collector is going to come in and perhaps take more of their available income seems to me to be unfortunate, and it is something I do not particularly support at all.

In any case, it is of great benefit to the people of the territory that a fair tax system is being proposed, but as the Member for Porter

Creek West points out, good intentions have not been followed up through detail, and clearly I think the proposal the Member makes here is a worthwhile proposal and one well worth supporting.

It is necessary to note as well that not all employers, as a condition of employment, pay employees an air fare, or are even in the position to pay their employees an air fare or even two air fares, so I think, recognizing the classes of persons that the Member for Porter Creek West points out, as well as giving consideration to the persons who may work for an employer, but an employer who is not wealthy enough to pay a certain kind of benefit to employees, it is nevertheless important that the system of taxation in the north ultimately be a fair one and be applied evenly across the north.

I would say that if we were truly promoting a principle of fairness we would also recognize the differences between various communities. The cost of living in some communities is much greater than in others. The cost of living in Old Crow is certainly much greater than it is in Mayo, which is again greater than it is in Whitehorse. I understand the difficulty that federal finance officials and revenue officials would have in delineating degrees of isolation, making it eminently complex if we were to attempt to pay benefits on a pro rata basis on the degree of isolation.

40 We have to recognize that there will be some lack of fairness, at least for administrative purposes. In any case, we will be supporting this motion. We support the principle of fairness. We recognize that the whole tax initiative is better than the status quo of the past and will be welcomed by most Yukoners.

The one minor note that I would put forward again, as a constituency MLA, would be that it will have unfortunate consequences on the community of Elsa. I would hope that that community has at least an ounce of resiliency left that it will withstand yet another shock to its system.

Mr. McLachlan: There is not much further that I can add to the arguments. The Members for Porter Creek West and Mayo have enunciated the situation very well. The revisions to Bill C-23 were put forward as an end to the remission order that had been continually brought forward.

Until such time as a study could be made of the situation, we have all known that it could end at some time. Some of my constituents had a benefit through employers; some did not. To the degree that the Act is stipulated and specified, I stand behind the motions and the intent in the Act because, as the Member for Mayo has said, it is an attempt to impart a degree of fairness that did not previously exist.

Also, coming from a small business background and coming from a situation that, for 15 years, had the scales tipped enormously in one direction as opposed to those who could not compete through the *Income Tax Act*, through the trips, through the subsidized benefits, it was often brought home to me how very many small business employers, especially outside of Whitehorse, were not in a position to compete with the large employers. In the riding of Faro, that situation has switched in the last one-and-a-half years, due to a change in ownership.

A number of measures in Bill C-23 will be of benefit to the people of Faro.

Specifically related to this particular motion and the trips outside, I understand why the Member has brought it forward. I believe that the benefits should be extended to those people in a number of situations that the Member has alluded to in his speech, who would not heretofore get the benefits. I believe that, in order to do it fairly, to extend the benefit universally, that I will be supporting the motion that the Member has brought forward because of the degree of implying fairness in all aspects of the way the changes are being made in Bill C-23.

Mr. Phelps: Like the Member for Faro, I have very little to add to the debate. The point has been covered well by the Member for Porter Creek West and the Member for Mayo.

41 It is a very important motion. I have received copies of correspondence from several small businessmen who have written the Minister, Mr. Wilson, about this issue. The issue is one of equality. It is one in which we have to look at the high cost of

living in the Yukon. It is a justifiable kind of amendment to ask the federal government for, and I am very pleased to support this motion.

Amendment proposed

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have a factor that I believe will improve this whole situation. I have an amendment for this motion. It is a simple amendment. I move that Motion No. 80 be amended by adding to the end of the Motion: "and;

THAT the Yukon's Member of Parliament be encouraged to move the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Justice THAT Motion No. 80 be amended by adding to the end of the Motion: "and; move the amendment."

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is, as everyone will recognize, a simple little amendment that adds to the motion. We, from time to time, pass motions in this Assembly that are technically beyond our jurisdiction, but which speak to other jurisdictions, primarily the federal government and occasionally other provinces. In the case of the recent debate about peace and nuclear weapons, we spoke to the United Nations and indeed the whole world.

This amendment will put that clearly into perspective, and it will be a simple addition, because we already know that all Members are in favour of this principle. The logical way to promote this principle in the federal jurisdiction is to have the Yukon's Member of Parliament promote the wishes of this Assembly. This amendment simply identifies that. I am sure that Mr. Nielsen will exercise his influence in the federal House. I am sure that he will want to follow the wishes of the Conservative Party here in the territory and the unanimous view of all parties in the territory. This adds a little to the motion.

42 **Mr. Lang:** Once again the Minister of Justice has done his utmost to give us a clear definition of sleeze. I have to say we all know that Mr. Nielsen has not been in the House. Whether or not he is going to be in Parliament tomorrow or the day following I do not know, and I am not here to defend why he is not there because I really do not know. I do know that things are changing in the House here dramatically. For example, earlier today we had an agreement for the week of what kind of order of business we were going to conduct and then the House Leader informed us, with no good reason, we were going to change the House business here for the purposes of two hours to discuss the most important legislation that has been put before this House for two hours this evening. Now I honestly have to say this has to be one of the sleeziest amendments to a motion that I have seen brought forward, primarily from the point of view that the Minister of Justice has not been up front to say that is the reason why put it here. Secondly, it has been the custom of this House, generally, that a copy of a motion is sent either to the Speaker of Parliament or to the Government in question or to all three political parties and perhaps our Member of Parliament depending on the issue we are discussing.

Here we are dealing with a Bill, an amendment to a piece of legislation, which has been brought in by the present Conservative Government at the request of all Members of this House to ensure that the people north of 60 got an appropriate tax break as far as the cost of living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories is concerned.

The Government of Canada did that and they did it with all good intentions. The Member for Porter Creek West noted a discrepancy in the Legislation from what the political objectives and the political statements of the government of the day had indicated was to be incorporated into the legislation. Hopefully, it can be rectified.

The Minister of Justice did not stand up when he spoke of the Member of Parliament, who was then the Deputy Prime Minister, who was very responsible in getting that legislation to the Commons, and getting it on the national political agenda, through the Ministry of Finance and then into a forum for the purposes of debate in the House of Commons. He did not give one bit of credit, but, no what he does — and it is the utmost sleeziest conduct I have ever seen of a Member — he has the audacity to come into this

House to say, to try to point out indirectly that our Member of Parliament is not present in the House of Commons. Like I said at the outset, I do not know why he is not there. I really do not know why, but to put this into this sleazy kind of format and try to do it under the pompous guise that he wants the Member of Parliament to put an amendment forward, when it is against the general procedures and the precedents that have been set by this House for the purposes of sending messages to Ottawa, I just find totally and absolutely unparliamentary.

The ethics of the Minister of Justice and his ability to recognize that maybe there is some sort of standard that should be undertaken, is beyond me.

We will vote for the motion. Maybe the Member of Parliament will be there tonight, but the fact is that it is adjourning by tomorrow or Friday, I believe; they are going on their Christmas vacation. I just want to conclude that nothing, nothing this man does, nothing this man does surprises me.

⁴³ *Amendment agreed to*

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

Motion No. 80 agreed to as amended

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

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

Mr. Phelps: No, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand it aside.

Speaker: So ordered.

Motion No. 79

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

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

Mr. McLachlan: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Faro: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Government of Yukon should give serious consideration to ways through which medical doctors can be attracted to and induced to remain in Yukon communities outside Whitehorse.

Mr. McLachlan: This motion is brought forward as a clear attempt to resolve a problem that is existing in some situations in Yukon and could exist in others at some future time. I am aware that by bringing forth the motion, I am asking the public sector to become involved in a private sector area in an action that, to some, may be viewed with suspicion or some degree of emotion, depending upon your private feelings.

I feel the motion has extenuating circumstances. Every community in Yukon does not have the population base to support a full-time doctor, but I would urge this government to consider some incentives to encourage doctors to locate in communities that are close to borderline population situations.

This problem is universal all over northern isolated areas. What I can envision is that some areas in Yukon be considered as a type of regional centre for health care and for placement of doctors. Ironically, that is working out a situation that we now have. There are doctors outside Whitehorse at Dawson City, Mayo/Elsa, Watson Lake and Faro/Ross River, which is currently vacant. I feel that a doctor on the north highway would also be of some benefit. There is an enormous stretch of Alaska Highway there that is not serviced. ⁴⁴ The incentives to which I refer suggest that help be given to communities in soliciting a doctor to locate in their areas, to take a form of relocation assistance, some clinical support and assisting in the area of support staff. Although, at the outset, it may seem to be a costly endeavour, there are very many medical situations that exist in some communities that require evacuation to Whitehorse.

The Minister of Health and Human Resources has some access to what those figures are. I am led to believe that every medical evacuation flight has a pricetag of at least \$700 to \$800, depending upon the support staff who come with it.

In my recent efforts to try to secure a doctor for Faro, I have found out that Dawson City has experienced a situation that it has

taken nine full months to fill — with a great deal of hairpulling on the part of very many — the position. I would like to remind the Members for Watson Lake and Mayo that if anything should ever happen that they should lose their medical practitioners. I would predict that it would take a minimum of one-half to three-quarters of a year to fill those vacancies. There are not a lot of medical doctors lining up to come north. There are not a lot of medical doctors available to fill those positions. In so many of the situations that we investigated, inevitably, they are all considering practice in a clinic with seven or eight other doctors in some exotic place like Vancouver or Victoria.

I must state that by encouraging the development of services in Yukon communities we will encourage the growth of the Yukon and improve the quality of life for a number of Yukoners if we can answer the problem of pressing medical facilities in some of our rural situations.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I rise today to support the motion by the Member for Faro. I will give a brief rundown on what this government has done in conjunction with Northern Health Service, which my department funds for the provision of medical services. It has been active and will continue to be active in recruiting practitioners for outlying communities and ensuring that their practice is made more viable.

We believe that it is important for all Yukoners to have reasonable access to essential medical services and to take special measures such as to subsidize the travel of doctors to communities without resident practitioners. The department also assisted communities with physician recruitment efforts, most recently in the case of Dawson City, although it has also recruited one who served in Faro after the resident physician left. We have arranged with the Northern Health Service for heavily subsidized clinic space for rural practitioners and remain prepared to pay the relocation costs of physicians who are both acceptable to the community and eligible for Yukon license insurance.

I have also initiated a major study of the health care needs of residents of Dawson City, Faro, Mayo and Watson Lake in conjunction with an evaluation of the services and facilities presently employed in those communities.

⁴⁵ A major issue within this study is the need for and alternative to positions here in the communities. In these steps I believe the government is demonstrating a real commitment to providing an appropriate level of medical and health services in the communities of the Yukon.

It remains our policy to help to attract doctors and other health care professionals and to assist in making their continuing residency viable, and I appreciate the suggestions made today by the Member for Faro in regard to the study that is being done. The suggestions made by that Member will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Brewster: I noticed, of course, that the Haines Junction-Kluane area did not get mentioned too much, and that is because we solved our own problems. I would think that medicare is probably one of the best anywhere in Canada. The nurses in the area — although I do have a little problem with the one nurse staying in one place but maybe we will get her hobbled there one of these days and keep her — is the best we can get.

Also, we have done another thing that very few people do, and I think that this is the problem with the nurses who come into our area. Unfortunately when they go through the Public Service Commission they look at your degrees, they do not look at whether you will fit into a little community of 30 or 50 people, they see how many degrees you have and you are qualified and so they send you there. You do not belong there, you belong in a hospital where your degrees are. We have a very good example in the doctor who we have there. I recall a few years ago a doctor was coming there, the government was going to subsidize him and then we found out he wanted to come because of the beautiful scenery, he did not care about the people there. Anyway, we have a good doctor there at least once a week or at least every two weeks. We have no problems with doctors in the Haines Junction area, and also this doctor travels up the road. We now have a doctor that came because

he wanted to come because of the people. Quite often he says to me, "You know I do not understand why people like me." And I say, "I can tell you why they like you, because you are a character, you are just like the people on the highway, you are a little bit crazy, but you are really happy." If you have something wrong with you you may have to climb under a bucket or a Cat to get it fixed, because he is a mechanic. He does everything, he mechanics, he placer mines, but he is one of the best doctors in the Yukon. They use him all over. He has been sent to Old Crow, Dawson and everywhere, and he fits, so there is no problem, there is no expense to the government, he looks after himself, but he fits because he likes the people, and he stays there.

I should tell the one funny story that happened to him to show what kind of a doctor he is. Some of the very important officials of McDonald's hamburger one time were out on Kathleen Lake fishing and they upset their boat, and here are all the guides and everything running around trying to save these guys and here is the doctor out there yelling, "Save the motor, save the motor, never mind, get the motor out of there." But anyway he is a doctor who fits in with everybody out there. He is a character like them and he stops at nothing. If the Public Service Commission and a few others would look at people like this instead of saying, "They are qualified, they have to go." They are not qualified because they do not like to be in the community club, they do not like to help at the community club, and they do not like to have to wash dishes there because they are trained, they belong in a hospital. But you have those other type of people and you have to look for them and when they get there they sit there and they stay there. You cannot encourage people by buying them houses and that. That does not mean they are going to be good doctors and nurses in these places. They have to like the people they are going to live with.

46 Mrs. Firth: I rise to speak to this motion. When I first read the motion on the Order Paper, I found it rather sensible and quite harmless and was a motion to give the government some direction. After I heard the Member for Faro speak, he did not sound quite so sensible and not quite as harmless. I feel I must really speak in defense of the medical services provided to Yukoners. I do not think that I would get any disagreement from the Minister of Health and Human Resources who, some years ago, used to be a participant in those services and is still aware of the quality of medical care that is delivered to the people who live in the Yukon Territory.

We, as Yukoners, enjoy what I feel is a very high quality of medical service. We also enjoy a good relationship between our doctors, our medical staff, the nursing staff at the hospital who serve the public, and the Department of Health and Human Resources and the public. We have individuals who are at odds with other individuals and there are isolated incidents. That is not unusual, nor is that not to be expected. People have different ideas and sometimes problems can surface.

The problem that initiated the Member for Faro's motion was one that was very extreme. It is not something that I think has happened in all Yukon communities. Therefore, I can see where he would feel more emotional about it and feel it was necessary to bring this motion forward; however, I do want to talk a bit about how the doctors have been servicing the communities in the Yukon, how they have been going to communities and providing additional care, holding office hours within those communities. They go everywhere in the Yukon, and some to Atlin, BC. Patients are able to have access to specialist's services, also.

I recognize that the specialist services are located in Whitehorse; however, they are services that a lot of people who live in very large centres do not have access to. I talk about the visiting specialists who come to the Whitehorse General Hospital at regular intervals, either three or four times a year, specialists like rheumatologists, pediatricians, specialized surgeons, oncologists. Yukoners really have an ability and are fortunate to have access to those kinds of services. I do not think that we should be totally negative in our criticisms of the health services that are delivered and, particularly, in the context of one of the professions, and that is the doctors.

The Member for Faro may have some personal feelings about

where the doctors like to go, where it is warm or whatever the comments were. I feel that those comments are somewhat uncalled for, because I think we have been fortunate in the Yukon to have some doctors who have been extremely dedicated to the public they are serving.

47 I can see that the Department of Health and Human Resources, from the comments of the Minister, is moving in the area of helping to recruit doctors for some of the positions that may not seem to be as financially viable. That can be done in a very positive way, it can be done by consulting the Yukon Medical Association and getting suggestions from them as to how they could help out the areas that are having difficulty recruiting and keeping doctors. It can be done by getting some input as to the kinds of incentives that can be provided like travel subsidies. Office accommodations have been made available to the doctor in Dawson City so that he can hold office hours in the facilities that are provided by Medical Services there.

It is a positive and cooperative relationship that we are striving for. I would encourage the Minister to pursue in a positive direction, and I know she will, some discussions with the Medical Association so that we can continue to improve the quality of medical services that are provided to Yukoners. However, let us not lose sight of the good services that are there. I rise to speak in support of those services and to say that I am certainly prepared to offer, in any way that I can, some positive input. I will be following up on the issue and inquiring from the Minister as to what developments have taken place. We look forward to increasing the quality of the service delivered and to recognizing the quality of service delivered.

Mr. Webster: There have been ways that medical doctors have been attracted to remain in Yukon communities that is supported by all levels of government. For example, financial assistance has been offered by the Government of Yukon to assist the City of Dawson to bring up a doctor, Dr. Kennedy, from the outside for an interview. The City of Dawson has offered a clause to pay for relocation costs when a doctor decides to take up a position in Dawson so that he and his family can move with little financial burden. There is even a clause that states that after four years of service in the community, the City of Dawson will pay for relocation expenses out of the territory.

The Member for Riverdale South has already mentioned another one about the office that was provided by the federal government. In another situation, the federal government and the City of Dawson have combined to construct a home in Dawson City for a doctor. The City of Dawson subsidizes it to the extent that it offers a very reasonable monthly rental rate.

I wanted to mention those few areas where the government has done a lot already to ensure that we attract and maintain some good quality medical doctors in our small communities.

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

Mr. McLachlan: I have a couple of comments in relation to the last speakers. I feel, to some extent, that the Member for Riverdale South is speaking for Whitehorse only when she makes some of the comments she does. The Yukon Medical Association, to the best of my knowledge, is not recruiting medical practitioners outside of Whitehorse. When I made the remarks about Vancouver or Victoria, that has been our experience that if you are interviewing medical practitioners for the territory, invariably they are considering several different options. A lot of them do involve private membership in an outside clinic in an area that may, for professional reasons, involve practicing in more populated southern climates. It was not intended as a slur. I am simply saying that often you are recruiting against situations that, to a doctor who has been practising for a number of years, do appear to be more attractive than rural Yukon.

In closing, I would like to say that the Government of the Northwest Territories is miles ahead of us in recruiting practitioners for a number of locations. I realize there are specialized exceptional

circumstances there, because a number of them are isolated. It is very difficult to move a household of furniture into some of those areas.

In addition, for the consideration of the Minister of Health and Human Resources, the number of those situations do not bill out of the plan. Perhaps there is a misconception as to what my motion may cost, but they are given a flat rate sum per day to be there to attend to all situations. Billings are not recovered from the plan. That is another way of looking at it.

The situation in Faro is difficult. The situation in other Yukon communities could be. That is the direction I wish to bring this situation to the attention of the Legislative Assembly. Others may have different views of it. I want to leave the Assembly with the notion that if vacancies occur, if for one reason or another, doctors do leave the current situations that they are in, it is not always easiest to fill those and to fill them at a method and means by which medical services may continue uninterrupted.

Motion No. 79 agreed to

Motion No. 72

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

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

Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Porter Creek East: THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Government of Yukon should examine the establishment of a "Cottage Hospital" in Dawson City.

Mr. Lang: It is interesting that we are discussing the question of encouraging doctors to come to the Yukon and how we can enhance our medical services in Yukon.

« I think that when one takes our medical services in perspective and stands back, whether we be in Dawson City, Watson Lake, Faro, Whitehorse or Haines Junction, I think that we can say that the administrations, primarily in this particular case the federal government, has done a pretty fair job within the financial capabilities and the commitments that they have made to the territory.

We can always find areas where we can be critical, but I would like to think that when we are dealing with something as important as this, something of such social significance to individuals and to the community, that we would be prepared to bring forward constructive ideas on how we can perhaps enhance our services and yet at the same time recognizing the economics of the world that we live in. I think that you have to weigh the two together, recognizing that there is a real world outside there when we leave these chambers, where the taxpayer can only pay so much, there are only so many dollars available and we can think of not only next year, but ten years from now down the road.

That is one of the reasons we are elected. We are not only elected to make immediate decisions on crisis that present themselves, whether they be in the Chambers here or primary to the government, but looking down the road at how we are going to be able to ensure the services we are putting into place can be provided five years down the road and further enhanced.

One of the concerns of getting rid of medicare premiums was the \$3 million that was directed towards the medical services and the premiums did provide at least a financial base that no matter, good, bad or indifferent, the government of the day could always depend on that particular revenue coming into the government to recognize the significance of medical costs. We recognize further that this debate is not only in this House, but is all across the country, with respect to the cost of medical services and exactly what we expect as individuals, politicians and as legislators with respect to the services that would be provided.

The motion you see before you today is brought forward primarily for the fact that I do know a number of people in Dawson City and speak to them on an ongoing basis, and I have had the opportunity as well visiting the community three or four times in the last four or five months. I want to say at the outset that I am very impressed with the way the community is growing. A lot of

credit has to go to the various levels of government for the growth in the community. Primarily, at this stage, I want to provide some accolades to the mayor and the council that is presently in place there, and the past ones of course, but the work that they are doing and the services they are attempting to provide and the expansion they are looking at is no mean job, especially when you take a look at the ability for being reimbursed. I am sure the MLA for Klondike can stand up as a past councillor of the City at one time and tell us how quickly he could spend his annual pay cheque.

There is a lot of work done by these individuals and as the MLA for Klondike, in speaking to the previous motion, talked about what the City of Dawson provides for its doctor, I recall when I happened to be part of the government, quite a number of years ago now, when the mayor and council came forward and said they needed some help with respect to providing some accommodation for a doctor.

⁵⁰ It took some time, but it was resolved. Subsequently, we moved onto the agreement that the MLA for Klondike cited — perhaps it is a new house now, I do not know. There is a communication there that is very important to ensuring that services do get to the communities.

The motion before us is very carefully worded. I did not bring the motion forward to commit the government. I think that we have a responsibility to examine all the ramifications of changing the status of the medical services in the area. If the government reads the motion very carefully, I utilized the words "examine the establishment". That gives the government the flexibility to look at the medical services very closely to see exactly what could be provided and enhanced for the communities.

I do think that there can be some improvements. There has been some improvement to date. There is the nurses residence, which is a very impressive building from the outside, and it enhances the whole community. There are a number of other areas that I would like to bring forward for general debate. I brought the motion also from general debate from a number of points of view, not only looking at the status of facilities in the communities, but also from the fact that there are a number of other elements in the community that are growing but also has a history. We are dealing with a situation where there are a number of older people who need care to some degree. What we could provide in terms of care has to be examined.

Perhaps at the outset of the examination of the prospects of increasing and enhancing the medical services, we should be looking initially at the swing of populations, for instance, in Dawson City. Within the economics that we work with, a cottage status for six months a year could be looked at. Then, a little less service for the remainder of the year could be considered.

We all know Dawson City expands in numbers over the summer. We have a very successful thriving tourism trade in Dawson City, which gets the largest portion of the 350,000 to 400,000 people that we host over that 2½ to 3 month period. We have a prosperous and expanding placer mining industry that is a summer operation that continues from May until September or early October. That is expanding even more because there is more hope that there can be some hardrock mining in the area. Some of the placer mining operations are working year round. I know the government is working in conjunction with one organization to open the Taylor Highway so that the miners can get a couple of months work in during the winter.

⁵¹ You obviously have a population that is fairly stable, and that is the Government Services. That population is stable.

We see a dramatic swing in population. That dramatic swing in population no doubt brings in to question the ability to cope with the medical problems associated with the increased numbers of people during the six months of the year.

I know when we are dealing with this particular issue we are dealing with a situation where we would be going to 24-hour service, where the number of staff would be increased to some degree — all those would have to be considered in the economics of an elevation of status for the community.

I cannot see why it should not be seriously considered, in view of the fact the community is growing. There is an ever-increasing

young population in that particular community. For those who have not had the opportunity to visit there in the last three years, you will see on the side of the hill, further streets being built, new houses being put up. It is really adding to Dawson and the future of that particular community.

From where we sit, it is time to take a serious look at the question of elevating the status of the medical services there.

I said earlier there were some areas that I thought had to be looked at. One of those is the question of what you would term geriatrics, or chronic care. There was a situation in Dawson last spring where one of the pioneers, a well-respected member of the community, was thought to have to come to Whitehorse. As it turned out, there was some accommodation made within the community, but this is an area that should be looked at with respect to examining the prospects of a cottage hospital status. That would be added to the examination, but it is something that should be looked at, in view of the numbers of people we are talking about.

Unless it is a very severe situation where medical attention is such that you have to send individuals from a community, whether it be Whitehorse, or Mayo or Watson, to communities such as Vancouver or Edmonton, when people are getting to their last days and they are suddenly in a situation that they do not understand. We can all understand why, especially when someone has lived in a community for 50 years. You can imagine the mental trauma it has on the individual and family and friends involved.

It is really something that should be examined in looking at this situation, just to see whether or not there is enough to warrant a further increase of the services being provided.

The other area I would like to touch on is in the examination of the situation, you also have to look at what would be provided to increase the ability to do further diagnostic tests and the capabilities of the medical services in the community. It is important from the perspective of anyone who is there in a medical capacity to be able to look at the possibilities of allowing and permitting further tests for the purposes of medical examinations, so that the proper direction can be given to treat whatever the ailments are.

⁵¹ The other area that I think should be touched on here is an area that we have debated in the House. We considered bringing in a motion to transfer the health services to the Government of the Yukon Territory. As you know, there has been a reluctance from the side opposite to even get into serious negotiations with respect to the transfer of health service. I should add that at one time it had been agreed to between the two levels of government. I am talking about three, four or five years ago. In fact, the Public Service Commission had done a very thorough examination of what would happen with personnel and how they would be transferred and what the implications would be to the employees, the Government of the Yukon Territory and what the significance overall was as far as such a transfer was concerned.

I have to say that it is indeed too bad that we are in a situation where that transfer has not taken place, especially when we have a government in Canada that is more than prepared to sit down and negotiate and come up with an agreement for transfer.

The reason I am speaking of that is that it is one of the problems that has been brought to my attention with respect to the administration of the medical services in the community, some of it being YTG with the senior citizens, then we have the federal administration with the nursing stations, then we have the doctor that is a combination of municipal, territorial and federal, depending on what we are dealing with at what given time. It is a situation where the public is totally confused, and, depending on what you are looking at, it is a public nightmare and a bureaucrat's dream. If we do not make a decision we can always blame it on the other guy. I do not think I am being unfair when I make that observation.

From what people have told me and from observing what is going on, I think that is perhaps one of the major impediments in enhancing the services in that particular community. The reverse could be done, and maybe all the responsibilities that are YTG should be transferred back to the federal government. If we are not prepared to take on the federal responsibility, maybe we should go the other way. I am not being facetious when I say that. I am very serious. I think that in some cases we get duplications of

responsibilities. For example, you have to go into the doctor's office through one part of the building and go around to the other part of the building to get other services. Then the story goes on. That may be attributed, to some degree, to some people's impression of what service they are being provided and brings into question if the public is getting its money's worth in some cases.

I have heard one case here, and I raised it, I believe, in my reply to the Speech From the Throne, where an individual did not get there on time, the doors were closed, or something happened, and he wound up driving to Mayo and when he got to Mayo it was found that he had bleeding ulcers. He stopped four times on the road to take a breather to try to recover. That is how serious it was. Obviously he did not realize how serious it was. I do not think anybody denied him the service. It was a question of how do you get the service and ensure that the service is being provided. Those are comments being made.

I think personnel coming under one administration would help, at least to some degree. That is why I am talking specifically of the YTG/federal government relationship.

Another area that comes into question is the ability to provide backup to medical service if there are major complications.

⁵² There is the situation where the Mayor, the Council and the government have been working together. Credit has to be given to the prospects of relocation of the airport. In the wintertime without landing lights, there are many problems that can arise. We need to ensure a service for the public so that the practitioner and the nurses have the necessary backup if there are complications. If relocation were to go ahead, that problem, in part, would be arrested.

There has been some thought that a system could be put into place where medivacs would start out of Dawson City instead of having to rely on them coming from Whitehorse to Dawson, then back again. I do not know if that would be viable. I am saying that this is a serious situation. I brought the motion forward for public debate, to highlight the issue. I am sure the Member for Klondike will have some observations. Hopefully, they will be in the same vein as mine.

I look forward to bringing the motion before the House because I think it is time that there was some debate on the issue. There have been some interdepartmental discussions, but there has not been public debate to any extent. I recognize the difficulty of being a backbencher, raising an issue and trying to lock the government into a situation that they would prefer not to be put into. That is, of course, the role of the Opposition, to bring issues that have not been publicly up front for general debate to get a tentative government position brought forward. We also have a duty to monitor how it is brought into place.

The motion has been carefully crafted using the word "examine". I do not propose with the idea of trying to lock the government into providing figures and facts. I recognize that a decision of this type will take some time. All aspects have to be looked at. I look forward to comments from other Members. I am very pleased to see the growth in the Klondike area. In the last four or five years, it has really improved primarily through government-instigated initiatives. I think that from here on in most of those initiatives can be private, although I recognize that government had to provide a base from which to work. Hopefully, we can get a consensus on this motion.

Mr. Webster: As the MLA for Klondike and as a mostly full-time resident of Dawson City, I welcome this motion wholeheartedly. I want to bring to the attention of all Members of the House that the Government of Yukon is currently in the process of examining the establishment of a cottage hospital in my community. There is indeed much justification for such action. The Member for Porter Creek East has mentioned a number of good reasons, and I commend him for his presentation.

I would like to read into the record a letter addressed to the Hon. Margaret Joe, Minister of Health and Human Resources, which includes additional reasons for justifying the establishment of a cottage hospital in Dawson City.

⁵⁴ This letter is dated August 6, 1985. It reads as follows:

"May this letter serve as a formal request for you, as Minister of

Health, to consider upgrading our Dawson City nursing station to cottage hospital status. Although arguments that justify this request have been made in earlier discussions, I feel it is imperative that they be recorded in a thorough and orderly manner to assist you in arriving at a decision.

"First, the size of our population warrants the need for improved medical services. According to figures appearing in Appendix A, Table 1.3, Health Care Population Estimates, June, By Community, in the Yukon Statistical Review, First Quarter, 1985, page 3, the population for the Dawson City area is 1,467. This compares favourably to that of two Yukon communities who, for years, have enjoyed cottage hospital status: Watson Lake at 1,489 and Mayo, 478. Note also from this table that the growth rate over the last two years, 1983-85, that Dawson City has increased far more dramatically than the other two: Dawson 18 percent, Watson Lake 12.4 percent, Mayo three percent. From all indicators, this trend will continue.

"Perhaps of more significance, however, is that the Dawson City area population annually increases to a minimum of 2,200 — that is a 50 percent increase of permanent residents — for approximately six months of the year as a result of seasonal activity in the tourism and placer mining industries. As well, the influx of a few hundred tourists on any given day further swells Dawson's numbers.

"An additional consideration regarding population statistic is its high proportion of those age groups which characteristically demand greater medical/risk attention: children and the elderly. Appendix B on page 5 of the Yukon Statistical Review, illustrates that nearly 20 percent of Dawson City's population falls into this category. That is zero to four years of age and 55 years of age plus. Given these facts, it should come as no surprise that admissions and patient days have been gradually increasing.

"The second reason is the rise in both number and variety of emergency cases over the past few years. It is believed that this can be attributed, in part, to the growth of those industries involving high accident risk occupations: construction, farming and placer mining, including underground in winter. As a result, there is a growing concern that our medical facility be better equipped as a basic emergency unit. The additional space needed to accommodate both the additional equipment and extra staff necessary to function as a cottage hospital has recently been made available with the completion of the new nurses residence. Thus, that part of the nursing station once used as a nurse's living quarters is now free to provide a separate area for a doctor's practice.

"This would constitute a progressive development, improving the overall operation of our medical facility, and may contribute to making the community's task of recruiting a doctor an easier one. Note that \$60,000 is presently available to carry out such modifications to the building.

"To conclude, I can assure you that this request for improved medical services has the full support of all segments of the community. Cognizant of this, Dawson City Council remains committed to assist in provision of physician services to the community by offering an attractive housing arrangement, as it has done for the last few years. In short, residents believe our Dawson City medical facility needs cottage hospital status now and are prepared to assist in any way possible to achieve this end.

"Should you have any questions or require additional information regarding this request, please do not hesitate to contact me."

Over the course of the last year or so since this letter, I have corresponded and met with the Minister on many occasions. The most recent letter here being November 13, 1986, reads in part, and it pertains to an item raised by the Member for Porter Creek East:

"I am providing an update with respect to the population figures. According to Yukon Health Care Insurance registrations, compiled October 1, 1986, the population of Dawson was 1,620, compared to 1,610 for Watson Lake. Thus, Dawson is the second largest community in the Yukon and, considering all the other sound arguments outlined in my previous correspondence attached, it should have what it needs; cottage hospital status."

As I mentioned, the Member for Porter Creek East did mention the growth of the community, not only the number of residents, but also the growth in new industry in the community. I

recognize that he suggests perhaps we do not need a year-round cottage hospital but perhaps just for six months when the bulk of this industry takes place.

I would like to suggest that I think we do need it on a year-round basis for a number of reasons. You were talking about an increase in underground mining and other such industries in which there is a high accident risk involved. The Member mentioned hard-rock mining as well. The construction season has also expanded. This year, for example, construction on the dike and the water and sewer mains went well into November, late November, and in 1987 will begin in early March with the expansion of the water and sewer system on a new block. Of course, the dike work will continue until May 1st.

The increase in activity in these dangerous activities points to the need for medical units. I think that instead of just six months for a Cottage Hospital status it should be for a full year and in particular, as the Member for Porter Creek East has said, with the increased activity in the summer we could have certainly had two doctors on staff at one time to spell off one another.

Another good point the Member for Porter Creek East raised was the increased, or more care, for seniors in our community. This is very important. If we did have Cottage Hospital status and the additional staff we could certainly have the seniors requiring medical attention stay in the community where they would be with their family members in their time of need as opposed to sending them to Whitehorse. More diagnostic testing could take place, therefore, preventing the need to refer more people to Whitehorse.

I think that the Member has raised a number of good points indicating the growth of our community and the need for this kind of service in the future. I think it will only increase in the future. As the Member mentions, we are looking at a new airport. I can assure him that new airport is a go, which will in turn increase demand on our medical services.

I fully support the motion brought forward. I think that such a motion can only help to accelerate the planning process and the eventual establishment of a Cottage Hospital in Dawson City, and I support it fully.

Mr. McLachlan: I rise to give my support to the motion by the Member for Porter Creek East as I have gone through some similar changes in Faro. We do not have the situation at the moment, of course, for the obvious reasons, but we have had it in the late 1970's when population moved rapidly from 1,400 to almost 2,000. A similar request was put forward to Health and Welfare Canada. The change in the community was immediate and very noticeable. It meant having nurses on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and fortunately at that time we did have two doctors. It made a tremendous difference to the community. It gave people the feeling of confidence and most importantly the demand was there, as sometimes is needed in a 24 hour, seven-day-a-week operation that the mine had at the time.

⁵⁶ That is not unlike the situation referred to by the Member for Porter Creek East. The tourist activity is prevalent in the community on a very regular basis, and certainly the mining activity would justify it. Having gone through this, knowing what effect it could have on a community, knowing the benefits to the people who live there, I can only support the motion that has been put forward this afternoon.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The Member for Porter Creek East has brought a very important motion to the House today. I am happy to say that the Member for Klondike has continued to lobby me on behalf of his riding in regard to expanded services.

This gives me an opportunity to provide the House with some information on what is happening in my department over the last little while. I am not sure whether or not the Member for Porter Creek East is aware that a study was undertaken last year by the federal government to review the situation in Dawson City. At that time, they came to the conclusion that a cottage hospital was not needed. They determined that by statistics of people who entered the hospital and other things like that.

The Department of Health and Human Resources launched a

separate study at that time. We wanted to evaluate the long term care needs and the feasibility of serving those needs through expanded hospital facilities. Most recently, the federal authorities and my department have agreed that a review of the facilities, their effectiveness and their service is required for the communities of Dawson City, Mayo, Faro and Watson Lake.

I have instructed my department to proceed with that examination and to look at the long term care needs and the community health services and evaluating the options of local versus regionalized service delivery. They have met since then. That Steering Committee is comprised of department officials, officials from Medical Services and representatives from the Association of Yukon Communities, as well as representatives from the Council for Yukon Indians.

Some of the objectives of the study are to determine the needs of emergency treatment services in the communities of Mayo, Dawson City, Faro and Watson Lake, to determine the needs of non-emergency treatment services in those four communities, to determine the needs for obstetrical services in those four communities, to determine the needs for acute care institutional services for those communities and to determine the needs for long term care services in those communities among other objectives.

We have continued meetings with officials from Medical Services in regard to the health care transfer. That is ongoing. We continue to meet with John Mar from Medical Services. There is also ongoing consultation with the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I think that the Member for Porter Creek East has brought some very valid concerns to this House and so has the Member for Klondike on behalf of those ridings.

We intend to look at the services that are needed and to support the motion today on the examination of the need to establish a cottage hospital in Dawson. I cannot name any time limit of when we would have that review finished, but hopefully, it will not be that far away. As soon as we have established some kind of decision in regard to that, we will need the input from the Members of this Legislature.

⁵⁷ **Speaker:** The hon. Member will close debate if he now speaks. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. Lang: I am very happy to see that the government is doing some work on it. I recognize that further research has to be done. I was aware that there had been a federal study. I did not realize the outcome was that there should not be an increase of services in the community. As the Minister has pointed out, going with statistics and how do you judge whether the community is ready for further enhancement of services and be able to provide it, not only from a social basis but on an economic basis. I encourage the Minister that with the numbers they are looking at perhaps they were asking for too much. I refer to the MLA for Faro's point of view. I am sure that over the course of the summer months that, at times, it is almost required that there be two practitioners, at least, in the area. At times, I am sure the workload for the doctor in the community must be tremendous.

If you get a couple of situations at the same time, it really piggybacks on itself to the point that it puts the doctor in a difficult situation to be able to provide the excellent service that is being requested by the public.

It would seem to me that just the numbers in the summer months would justify the expansion to a cottage hospital. I notice the statistics that the MLA for Klondike quoted, giving him an edge by about four or five families, which may have been something to do with the maternity ward, but it is obviously expanding. I think it is significant that Dawson City has got to the situation where it is the second largest population in the Yukon Territory.

With that knowledge, in view of the fact you may have very good services being provided in Watson Lake, in Faro and in Mayo, then it would seem to me that Dawson City definitely deserves the same. I am not asking for anything more than anyone else is getting, but requesting that a serious look be given to elevate that service to an acceptable level, looking at 1986 and 1987.

I recognize that the Minister is not in a position to give us a firm

date when the review would be done. I would like to think it could be done by this spring. They have reviewed it once. Most of the homework has been done. It is just a question of elevating some of the statistics and points in the report for justification. I cannot see the requirement for another six-month or year wait with respect to getting to the point where a firm decision has to be taken.

We are prepared to give you some time, but we are not prepared to give you all the time in the world. Hopefully, this spring, during the debate on the Main Estimates perhaps there can be some news and some progress in a report brought forward that is positive to meeting a consensus of all Members in the House.

⁵⁸ I want to say that it is an area that we are going to continue to give attention to in our role as the Opposition and as Members of the Assembly. We hope, in the next year, that some progress and some definitive decisions can be made that are going to provide that service that we all concur is very badly needed.

Motion No. 72 agreed to

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

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

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

Speaker: So ordered.

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

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

Mr. Brewster: Next sitting day.

Speaker: So ordered.

Clerk: Item number nine, standing in the name of Mr. Phillips.

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

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

Speaker: So ordered.

Mr. Phillips: I move the House do now adjourn.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North that the House do now adjourn. Division has been called.

⁵⁹ **Mr. Clerk,** would you please poll the House?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Disagreed.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Disagreed.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Agreed.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Disagreed.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Disagreed.

Mr. Webster: Disagreed.

Ms. Kassi: Disagreed.

Mr. Phelps: Agreed.

Mr. Brewster: Agreed.

Mr. Lang: Agreed.

Mr. Nordling: Agreed.

Mrs. Firth: Agreed.

Mr. Phillips: Agreed.

Mr. McLachlan: Agreed.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 8 yea, 6 nay.

Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to

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

House adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled December 17, 1986:

86-3-88

Joint Ministerial Statement Supporting the Fur Industry in the Yukon and Northwest Territories (Porter)

86-3-89

Statement by the Government of the Yukon in Response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Sale 97 Lands (Penikett)

86-3-90

Information in response to Motion for Production of Papers No. 3 re job description and benefits package of John Walsh, Principal Secretary to Government Leader (Penikett)

86-3-91

Report on the Watson Lake Sawmill Viability Study, December, 1986

The following Legislative Return was tabled December 17, 1986:

86-3-23

Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee Recommendations (Porter) Oral, Hansard, Page 260