



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 2

10th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Monday, March 6, 1978

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory

March 6th, 1978

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. We will proceed with morning prayers.

Prayers

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Privilege. I request, Mr. Speaker, a ruling from the Chair on a happening last Wednesday, March 1st, 1978 in the Committee of the Whole. The Honourable Member from Riverdale stated, and I quote: on page 797 from the Debates & Proceedings: "if the Honourable Member from Klondike wants my opinion on rent stabilization, I am not just for it, and I say it, period." On page 795, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member moved an amendment to my motion and I quote from Mr. Chairman: "I have a corrected amendment by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mrs. Watson, THAT the motion as proposed by Mr. Berger, seconded by Mr. McCall be amended by striking out the words 'after the Government of the Yukon', and substituting the following 'recognize that the concept of rent stabilization has some merit and as a last resort method in providing affordable housing'..." and so forth, Mr. Speaker.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, on March 1st in the "Yukon News" edition in the Yukon "Buy and Sell" and this is from March 1st and March 3rd, there is an ad, Mr. Speaker, in there from Williams, Yamada and Gosse Limited: Real Estate Agent's Appraisals and Property Management, and the Honourable Member's name and telephone number is listed in there.

I, Mr. Speaker, accuse the Honourable Member of having a direct conflict of interest in proposing an amendment to my motion and even sitting in the House and debating rent control, because property management, as my understanding of it, is imposing rent on people and everything connected with what we discussed in the Committee of the Whole.

The Honourable Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs had the courtesy to leave the House during the debate because he figured he may have a conflict of interest.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like from you a ruling on this and I would like, also, if possible, to restore my motion to the original version.

Mr. Speaker: In reply to the Honourable Member from Klondike, as the Chair has ascertained it, the question, the grievance arose in Committee of the Whole and, Committee of the Whole having made no report on this matter to the House, it would not be competent for the House to deal with the question.

If the Member has a problem in future in Committee of the Whole of such nature, it ought to be raised in Committee of the Whole and it would come to this House by report. But I would not think it competent upon the Chair to accept this as a Question of Privilege for those reasons.

May we now proceed with the Order Paper?

Are there any Documents for Tabling?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**TABLING OF DOCUMENTS**

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling the green paper on Decentralization of Yukon Territorial Government offices.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling correspondence from the Yukon Fish and Game Association, directed to the Honourable Hugh Faulkner, dated February 9th.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning the Yukon Outfitters' Association brief.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning the Planning Council Position, Yukon Indian Land Claim, Document 1, Document 2, Document 3 and Document 4.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning a report on Electric Rate Equalization.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Documents or Correspondence for Tabling?

Are there any Reports of Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills?

Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion or Resolution.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, a Notice of Motion this morning regarding the Outfitters' Brief.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, WHEREAS a revised northern land transfer policy was recently announced by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development restricting future land transfers from Federal to Territorial Government control on a parcel to parcel basis to meet essential new community needs only; AND WHEREAS the development and expansion of several Yukon communities has been impeded in recent years by the Federal Government's refusal to make block transfers to land under an earlier policy.

IT IS THEREFORE the opinion of this Assembly that the Territorial Government immediately undertake the identification of all requirements, growth projections, and preliminary development plans for all Yukon communities in order to support the demonstrable and immediate need for land in those communities.

THAT immediately thereafter, the Territorial Government request the Regional Director, Northern Program of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, for the review of any proven and identifiable needs for land in any Yukon community pursuant to the terms of reference outlined in the revised northern land transfer policy.

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

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of all Honourable Members to a very significant action taken on Wednesday, March 2nd of last week when the second conference of the Yukon Labour Force Development Council was held. Representatives of Yukon industry, labour and native organizations jointly have agreed to enter into the project design phase of a manpower consultative services agreement. This is the first time in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that labour and industry have agreed to sign an agreement on a jurisdictional basis, rather than a regional basis, and have made a commitment to work together to seek common solutions to common problems affecting Yukon's labour force.

This agreement is the result of a lot of hard work and effort on behalf of the Co-Chairman, Mr. Norm Rudolph of White Pass & Yukon Route representing industry, and Mr. Dave Dornian, business agent, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners representing labour.

Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Labour Force Development Council was first established following a conference last

June, 1977 under the auspices of the Federal/Territorial Manpower Needs Committee to look into the problem of skilled tradesman shortages in Yukon. Subsequently the task was defined in broader terms of labour force shortages and a high rate of labour turnover in community instability in Yukon.

This council consists of representatives from the mining, construction, transportation and service industries, from Labour Steel Workers of America, Teamsters, Public Service Alliance of Canada, Carpenters and Joiners, Canadian Union of Postal Workers, Operating Engineers, to name a few, and representatives from the native organizations.

The Manpower Adjustment Committee, consisting of five representatives from industry and labour and two representatives from native organizations, has been established to oversee the project design phase.

Throughout the next five months, Mr. Speaker, the committee will be seeking the views of employers, employees, native organizations and special interest groups so that they may decide which problems are the most crucial and which problems should be researched and subsequently acted upon.

I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that the Chairperson that has been appointed to the Manpower Adjustment Committee is a former colleague of ours, Mr. James Smith, who has agreed to serve in the capacity of impartial chairman.

Government acts in a supportive role only. It is industry and labour who must accept the responsibility and commitment of working together, and last week, they accepted that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that the officers of my Department of Education and Manpower played an important role in initiating and supporting the establishment of this Council.

In closing, I congratulate Yukon industry and Yukon labour for taking the first step. The work will not go easily, but it is a challenge industry and labour have shown they are committed to accepting.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period. Have you any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, last week the Member from Riverdale asked me a question regarding the Transport Public Utilities Board. I am pleased to announce this morning that the new Chairman of the Board is Mr. Douglas Clark, a Whitehorse businessman.

The other members of the Board, who assumed their duties as of the first of March this year, are: Mr. Roy Eby, Mr. Don Cox, and Mr. Kip Fisher. Mr. Fisher is the only returnee from the previous Board.

Question re: Native Affairs' Terms of Reference

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, a written question for the Minister responsible for native affairs: would the Minister supply us with the terms of reference of the position of Native Affairs, advise what consultation has taken place with the native organizations in defining this position, and whether each organization fully supports the concept of this position and the position of Native Advisor in this Government.

Question re: Minister of IAND's/Discussions With

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Education. I am wondering if the Member could tell me,

specifically what subjects were discussed with the Minister Hugh Faulkner, other than the revised land policy when he was here meeting with the Executive Committee on Friday? Could they give us an idea of what other topics, what other discussions took place, what other problems arose?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, a great deal of the time spent with the Minister was discussed on the concept of block land transfers, but other than that, of a great deal of importance was the funding available through the pipeline, the \$200 million credit which no terms and conditions have been put to and we have agreed that we would get our officials together with the Federal Government to look and just see what would be pipeline related expenditures. At the same time, there were discussions on the Heritage Fund and we are going to be discussing that at a later date as well.

At the same time, the Minister tabled, with the Executive Committee for consideration, some aspects of possible review, a review process of the constitutional position of the Yukon Government. We made it very clear that we felt that this should be going to the Constitutional Committee, but at the same time it was felt that first of all he wanted discussions between the Government of Yukon as well as the Federal Government and then subsequently a plan of action could be taken from there.

I think that outlines roughly what was discussed during the short time that we had with the Minister. I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, when people with the positions such as the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development come to town and you only have two and a half hours to discuss very important matters, which are going to affect all Yukoners, I am hopeful that one day possibly we could get somebody in that position that would be prepared to stay a day or even two days to discuss the problems that we all are encountering in our various ridings, as well as a government.

Mr. Lengerke: Supplementary to that, I was wondering if the Minister did indicate when he would be making a statement on the constitutional position and if in fact our Executive Committee have agreed to some of those terms, and the other part of that question, I am just wondering, the Minister has stated that there is going to be discussions at a later date. I am wondering when those discussions will take place, if there has been any firm date set?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there have been no decisions made in respect to the terms of reference as the Minister sees it for a constitutional review process in the Yukon. Obviously we could not make any decisions because it was presented during the brief two hours that we had with the Minister. I would like to think that possibly within the next couple of weeks, once we have had an opportunity of considering the proposal and having some further discussions with the Federal Government that the terms of reference, as we see them, could be relayed to the Constitutional Committee. The Minister specifically asked that the Executive Committee consult with him prior to a decision being made in respect to transferring the terms and conditions to the Constitutional Committee because we raised that specific point, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: French Language Training in Yukon

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, a written question for the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that Canada is a bilingual country and in view of the fact that the Yukon is part of Canada and in view of the fact that children in Yukon should have the opportunity to become bilingual, what opportunities are in fact being given to Yukon students at the secondary level and the elementary level in Whitehorse

schools and in schools outside of Whitehorse to learn the French language, and at what cost to the Yukon?

Question re: Human Rights Act/Access to Information

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, a question for Mr. Commissioner: since the *Human Rights Act* guaranteeing access to certain Government information has now been passed, how does this affect access to Territorial Government information? If it has no effect on our Government, does this Government intend to legislate these rights for the Territory? +

Question re: Women Status in Yukon

Ms Millard: Another written question, Mr. Speaker, to any Government Member: in view of the fact that International Womens' Day is March 8th, and in response to the urging of the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, and in the interest of furthering human rights, would the Government tell us how far along are they in the following areas of concern to women:

- 1) marital property law, which reflects the reality of women's contribution to the material assets of marriage;
- 2) daycare legislation which would regulate the construction and operation of daycare centres, which will be more prevalent with pipeline activity;
- 3) civil service expenses for single parents who must travel in their work and pay childcare expenses while away
- 4) encouragement of promotion of women to senior management positions, and
- 5) review of the state of equal pay for work of equal value in our Government.

Question re: Native Content in Education

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have another written question for the Minister of Education: how much money is the Territorial Government presently spending on injecting native content into the native school curriculum, at the instructional level, at the developmental level and at the administrative level?

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Riverdale Elementary School Funding

Mr. Lengerke: A question for the Minister of Education: in view of the very excellent reasons in the case made by a number of Riverdale residents at a recently held meeting, I believe held last Thursday, for a new elementary school in Riverdale, I am wondering if the Minister of Education has revised his thinking on that and has included, for consideration, at least some funding to carry on an architectural study on getting some plans done for a new school?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think there was some good points raised at the meeting the other evening, but at the same time, I would like to point out to Members that approximately a year and a half ago here we tabled a paper outlining the classroom space that is available within the Whitehorse area, which could approximately bring in another 500 to 600 students for the Whitehorse area in the present facilities we have.

I think, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that we have to take into consideration the fact that if one uses the statistics from 1971 to 1978, from grade one to grade seven, that the school population is down by 140 students. I think it reflects the national trend, Mr. Speaker, that is going across the nation, in respect to the number of students, the children of today are having, as opposed to ten or fifteen years ago, when they used to have families of three or four or five children.

Prior to making any commitments, Mr. Speaker, to another school in the Riverdale area, I think there are three things that

have to be taken into account. One, I stated the availability of classroom space has to be researched within Whitehorse, because I think we have to take into consideration the fact that we are heating and lighting these facilities and the operation and maintenance costs are going up in an ever escalating manner.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the meeting, that we are looking at the Whitehorse Elementary School at the present time this year to decide whether or not we are going to continue as a school in that area or whether or not there is some other purpose that building could be put to.

At the same time, I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that we must find out just exactly the numbers of students that are going to be going to an elementary school in the Riverdale area for a long term basis. In other words, there are 135 lots that have been sold in that particular area over the past year and it is our intention to do a thorough evaluation of the lots that have been sold to individuals to try to find out the number of students, or number of children, each family have as well as what the grades these students would be in.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to look at it on a long range basis in respect to building any new schools in the Whitehorse area to ensure that five or ten years down the road we do not find that we have vacant, say partial or half-vacant school that the taxpayer is paying the operation and maintenance costs of.

But I am prepared to review the situation and I am sure I will be speaking with the Honourable Member in the very near future on this particular subject.

Question re: Public Money/Banks Deposited In

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the Commissioner. What banks in the Yukon has the Commissioner designated for the deposit of the public money of the Yukon? Mr. Speaker, it may be handled as a written question.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that. To my knowledge, all of the deposits and all of the monies of the Yukon Territorial Government are being handled by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. It was a decision made prior to my assuming the role of Commissioner and it is one that we have maintained of consolidating government accounts within one institution so that we do not have to receive various reports from various banks at different times, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? We will then proceed on the Order Paper to Orders of the Day and Public Bills.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PUBLIC BILLS

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 1, *Third Appropriation Ordinance, 1976-77*, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Bill Number 2: Second Reading

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 2, *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78*, Dr. Hibberd.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 2 entitled *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill Number 2 be now read a second time.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this Bill on Second Reading. It is a Supplementary Budget for fiscal year 1977-78.

In the Speech from the Throne, the Commissioner referred to it and the explanatory note also says: "The Yukon Territorial Government has had an under-expenditure of \$3,444,700".

This, I believe, is rather misleading, because the meat of the Bill is very obvious when one gets into it and I would like to draw attention to the fact that even though there is an under-expenditure, most of that is due to the fact that capital was not able to be expended in the past year.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that, of six departments in the Territorial Government, there was an over-expenditure beyond what the Estimates gave them in the original Budget, of \$1,403,800, which is a significant amount of money.

I would also like to draw attention to the fact that one of the Departments had an over-expenditure of \$348,900. We also have another supplementary, the one that was not dealt with this morning, with the same Department, had an over-expenditure of three hundred and some thousand dollars.

This, to me, is quite significant, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand where there is an over-expenditure of certain amounts of money, when things that you could not predict arise, it is necessary to make the expenditure, but when there is such a large over-expenditure as \$1,400,000, I think there should be some questions asked.

The fact that the balance comes out, that there has been an under-expenditure, is due to the fact that a lot of the capital projects were not completed. There was \$2,600,000 left over from the Highways Budget, because they were not able to complete some of their roadwork, because of the fact that there was a light snowfall last year. So that certainly was not on the basis of good management.

There was an under-expenditure of \$2,000,000 with the Whitehorse Sewage Plant. Three million had been budgetted and only \$1,000,000 had been spent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should remind the Honourable Member that it is not competent for any Member to refer to sections of the Bill. It is to speak only to the Second Reading to the principle of the Bill.

Proceed.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, when there is over a million dollars and a Highway program has been cancelled, again I make the point it is not because of good management that there has been an under-expenditure of \$3,000,000. There has been poor management, because of the over-expenditure in the Operation and Maintenance, and the under-expenditure is because of the fact that certain projects were not proceeded with and the money will have to be re-voted again this year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Agree.

Some Members: Disagree.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Bill Number 3: Second Reading

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 3, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79*, Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 3, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education, That Bill Number 3 be now read a second time.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, again, very briefly, I would like to refer back to the Speech from the Throne where there was a reference made to an under-expenditure again where there is a decrease in operation and maintenance. Mr. Speaker, there certainly is not a decrease in operation and maintenance for the year 1978-79. There has been an increase of at least \$7 million, which is a very large percentage when you take it over the basic amount of the budget last year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that that has been a concept put forward that we have held a pretty tight reign on it and in the type of time that we have at the present time, it is impossible to hold to the existing budget without cutting programs, so for goodness sakes, let's say so.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think that the budget reflects a realistic approach for the 1978-79 year. The Government has done everything they possibly can to keep the costs of government down to a minimum, but at the same time, reflect the services that this Government is responsible to the people of the Yukon Territory.

I think at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the increase in man years can be reflected in respect to the bringing on of the remedial tutor program which is 17.5 man years in itself to bring it into the Main Estimates. A lot of the programs that have been reflected into the Main Estimates here, Mr. Speaker, are actually programs that are presently under way.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that all Members in this House that have been asking the Government to get prepared for the economic development that appears to be coming towards the Yukon in the next three to five years and we are attempting to bring in a budget which reflects that through natural growth so that we don't have to go to Ottawa and borrow on monies that would have to be paid back at a later date.

Trying to do it within the man years that we have within the Government and at the same time perhaps expand the terms of reference of the various departments concerned so that we can cope with the situation as it develops, and at the same time, attempt to keep Government to a minimum and provide the services that are necessary to the people of the Yukon on an every day basis.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, to note that we have not increased any revenues accruing to this Government through taxation, because we feel that the people of the Yukon at the present time are paying enough, and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I know I can speak for my colleagues, this is of vital concern to all Members on the Government side and I am sure all Members in the House that we try to keep the costs that are borne by the taxpayer, the tax base that we have in the Yukon to a minimum. I think that will be reflected in the debates to come in the next month as we discuss the Main Estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Bill Number 4: Second Reading

Madam Clerk: Second Reading, Bill 4, Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 4, *Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1978*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education that Bill Number 4 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Shall this Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Second reading Bill 5, *Municipal General Purposes Loan Ordinance*, Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Second reading Bill 6, *An Ordinance to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*, Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Second reading Bill 7, *Loan Agreement Ordinance '78, Number 1*, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: Committee come to order.

The business of the day is beginning the *First Appropriation Ordinance* and the Main Estimates, after a recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee come to order.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Privilege, I raised a Point of Privilege this morning in the House. Mr. Speaker more or less referred me to Mr. Chairman in Committee of the Whole. I am going to try and repeat the Point of Privilege as close as possible.

On Wednesday, March 1st we debated rent control in the Committee of the Whole and I put in a motion in effect asking the Government to establish rent control. The Honourable Member from Riverdale amended my motion to the effect that it completely is different. I quote, Mr. Chairman, on page

795 of the Debates & Proceedings when Mr. Chairman said "I have the corrected amendment by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mrs. Watson that the motion as proposed by Mr. Berger, seconded by Mr. McCall, be amended by striking out all words after 'the Government of Yukon' and substituting the following: 'recognize the concept of rent stabilization has some merit as a last resort method in providing affordable housing, therefore that the Government of the Yukon only consider this type of legislation after having exhausted all other efforts such as providing adequate land for housing programs and attempting, together with the provincial jurisdiction, to seek methods to provide lower interest rates in approved mortgage terms.'"

On page 797, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lengerke stated, and I quote again: "if the Honourable Member from Klondike wants my opinion on rent stabilization, I am just not for it, and I say it, period."

Mr. Chairman, I charge the Honourable Member from Riverdale with a direct conflict of interest. On March 1st, I purchased the "Yukon News", and in its advertising section, in the particular section of "Yukon News Buy & Sell" of March 1st to March 3rd, the ad says Williams, Yamada and Gosse Limited: Real Estate Agents, Appraisals and Property Management. Listed also is the Honourable Member from Riverdale with his telephone number. Mr. Chairman, I say that it is a direct conflict of interest. To me property management is imposing and levying rents on people. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a ruling from the Chair and if necessary a ruling from Mr. Speaker on it. I would also like to get my motion restored to the original form again.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just for clarification to the Chair, I would just like to say that Mr. Berger well raises a point of concern. I give him full marks for it. I think that it demonstrates the maturity of this House and demonstrates the maturity of Members by raising such a point.

I considered it. I certainly did consider my position at the time, at the situation, and I would just like to explain to the Chair that, yes, my name does appear in the ad of Williams, Yamada. I have an association with them. I am involved in the sales, but mainly my prime function with them is through via the Pulse North Group, and that is in the area of the feasibility studies and transportation studies that we have been involved in in the resource management studies. My involvement is a little further away than the direct field of real estate.

However, just the mere fact that my name appears in the ad, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if that raises some concern, then be it, but that is my position with it. I know of other Members in other instances that are involved on a broad spectrum with certain topics and I don't think we have raised too many points of conflict with them.

However, as I say, I think there could well be some merit with what the Member has to say. A ruling by the Chair is fine with me.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Member from Klondike be satisfied with the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale's explanation?

Mr. Berger: No, Mr. Chairman, because I still say, and as it says in the ad, that the Honourable Member from Riverdale is directly involved in property management. I am not satisfied with his particular suggestion.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am very interested because I think, you know, that in the Yukon Territory it is a unique situation. We are almost involved in everything.

I, myself, stood up in the House the other day, and the Honourable Member has a point, I will agree. I possibly might have voted, that does not make any difference. I realize myself that there is a possibility that I may have had a conflict of interest, too. I am not sure. I do not know that much about this thing, you know.

But, owning a small motel and renting rooms, I presume, would come under that same situation if there was rent control placed upon anybody. So, in the context of that, if it comes down to the point of whether we are going to check and see who has a conflict of interest and who has not, I would be obliged, I think, to withdraw my vote on that motion at that time, which ever way I voted, I am sure.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to further advise that, just to make it more clear, that I have no direct interest in rental properties, whatsoever. There is not, and I know the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs, for instance, who correctly withdrew from debate, because I would think that he probably did have a direct conflict because he does own some properties and is in direct business with rental people.

As I said, I examined my position, I talked to a number of other people about it who felt that there was no conflict. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the Honourable Member from Klondike has a point and this matter will have to be referred in our report to the Speaker for his decision and I would request the Clerk to include that in the Report of the Chairman of Committees and bring it to the attention of Mr. Speaker who can review "Hansard" and take any other steps that are required to determine whether or not there is a conflict of interest.

We will turn to the matter at hand, Bill Number 3, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79.*

On Clause 1

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion to make, and it may not meet with the approval of the Assembly, but apparently we are going into the Main Estimates. We have not cleared the supplementaries for 1976 and 1977 and the Government asked to have those stand until the other Members are back. I can understand that. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that maybe we could consider the Capital that is not tied on an operation and maintenance basis to the 1976-77.

Mr. Chairman, some of these departments had a significant deficit in the 1977-78 operations and I think that should be cleared before we consider the 1978-79.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, consideration has been given to this idea of going through to the Capital, but it is our position that we should be going through the Mains and if need be, not necessarily clearing the various Votes in difference to our colleagues who are out of the Territory on business that affects the Government as well as this Assembly, which I believe is very important.

I feel that we have two or three Votes here that we could consider in the next couple of days that really do not reflect into the Supplementaries that the Honourable Member has alluded to. I feel it is important that possibly once the Members get back, we can get into the aspect of discussing the Capital side of the budget, because all the various elected Members have Capital that is the responsibility of their various departments and could be discussed in total if that is the wish of Committee.

But I do think, Mr. Chairman, that if we proceeded with

Vote 1 as well as Vote 2 and went into Vote 3, I think it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is very little in respect to Supplementaries in these areas. In Vote 3, we have approximately \$23,000 which I think could be alluded to in the discussion of the Main Estimates. With the wish of Committee and concurrence, I would appreciate it if we could go through the Main Estimates. This is the way I discussed with my colleagues that left and I feel that this is the way to proceed. Once the Members get back, then possibly we could go back to the Supplementaries if it is the wish of Committee or go straight to Capital and possibly get tentative approval so that obviously then we could maybe proceed with the contracts and this kind of thing that are essential at an earlier date, if it is the wish of Committee.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member is incorrect, however, we blindly go along.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest then that we do not consider the departments that have had a large over-run in '77-'78. It is not fair for the Government to ask us to consider a department that has had a large over-run before we have had the opportunity to consider the reasoning why there is the over-run. There may be some very, very legitimate reasons, but you cannot approve this year's Budget, when you have to prove the base on which the Budget was established, and the base is reflected in the Supplementaries.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that since the Honourable Member who is responsible for education only had an over-expenditure of \$23,000 on a \$14,000,000 budget, possibly we should be doing education.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think we could do at least vote one that is our own Legislative Assembly and Clerk of Assembly part.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect, I do not think, know why we should give ourselves any more special consideration than any other department and if we should have to approve the supplementary, there has been an over-expenditure in the supplementary as far as our Assembly and our support services, and this should be dealt with before we go looking at the amount of money we should vote for next year.

So, I would really suggest we do Education, where there is not a large over-run.

Mr. Chairman: What is the wish of the Committee?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think that we could go through Vote 1 and, where the major over-runs are in the Supplementaries, they could be set aside.

For an example, you have Economic Research and Planning, which is a major amount of money as opposed to what was voted. That could be left until we discussed it in the Supplementary.

But I think, in difference to the Government, this is what we had organized and I think we should proceed accordingly, to get on with the business of this House. I feel that it is imperative that we do get on with Vote 1, clear, or at least discuss the various areas that we feel that we can discuss. The areas where there is major supplementaries, as I said earlier, we could leave until discussions in the supplementary.

But, in difference to my colleagues that are away, once again they are on Government business, I do not want them, it is not a case of them wanting to be away on their own volition, it is a case that they have been called, on behalf of the Government, to discuss various areas of concern to this House, that I believe that we could carry on with Vote 1.

Areas that could be set aside could be set aside and then we could carry on with Vote 3. Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Honourable Member that has just spoken, I would like to point out to him that the Members of this House have agreed that two Honourable Members should be absent from the House and that we would not be dealing with anything that relates to their departments or to their interests. We are prepared to be very careful on the business that is dealt with and is even voted on. In fact, I withheld a Motion this morning in respect to the two Members to make sure that they are back when the Motion will be dealt with so, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is asking too much for the Government to comply a little bit with the wishes of the Members.

The Honourable Member stood up and said the Government's opinion is such and such and such and such. Well, the Members said, "Fine, we will respect the position you are in but for goodness sakes, be a little more bending and deal with the Department of Education."

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would say that we are prepared to compromise on this situation. I think that I have pointed out the way that it can be done. I think that we should be trying to go according to the way the Main Estimates are outlined. Those areas where there is a cost overrun, I think that we could leave it in abeyance and go back on it and the Clerk can take note of it when other Members are back so that we can discuss the Supplementary and go back to this particular Vote. I think that is the obvious compromise and I think it is a good one. The Honourable Member has said "Members" are not "Member", and I do believe from my vantage point that that would be the most operative way to handle the Main Estimates at this time.

I realize that it is an imposition on all Members, but at the same time I would request that we continue with Vote 1. I know that the Speaker who is in charge of the Yukon Legislative Assembly Vote is prepared to speak to his section of the Vote and I cannot see any reason why we cannot continue.

Mr. Chairman: Any other opinions on what we should do?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, it only seems reasonable, I do not know, we are getting bogged down in a procedural mess again. It only seems reasonable to me that the suggestions made by the Honourable Minister of Education are reasonable, and if we could go through the budget point by point, vote by vote, in its proper order, I think it would save an awful lot of confusion deferring those matters as referred to by the Honourable Member.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would put in my request for the Department of Education, the Government of the Territory seems to be as flexible in their compromise as the Minister of Indian Affairs and it is becoming more obvious every day.

Mr. Chairman: Could I have some indication from the Members? I will ask two questions. The first one will be: shall we proceed with Vote 1, and the second will be or shall we proceed with Vote 3. Vote 1? A show of hands please. Vote 3?

We will proceed with Vote 1. We have for witnesses this morning, Mr. Pat Sherlock and Mr. Grant Wilson.

On Clause 1

On Clause 2

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could ask of the Territorial Treasurer a general question regarding an Appropriation Ordinance. The Section 15 of the *Financial Administration Ordinance*, the one that was amended in 1976, the latter part of 1976, states: "All estimates of expenditures

submitted to Council shall be for (a) payments to be made during the fiscal year pursuant to an Ordinance or contract, and (b) goods and services required during the fiscal year.

My question, if a grant is being made outside of an Ordinance beyond what the terms of the Ordinance are, does the Appropriation Ordinance cover that grant?

Mr. Sherlock: I am not sure that I fully understand your question. I would say, yes, it does.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, but, under Section 15, and if the Treasurer would like to review "Hansard" with my question and then bring back an answer, referring specifically to 15.(1), which gives you the guidelines for what expenditures should be submitted to Council under an *Appropriation Ordinance*: "only payments to be made during the fiscal year pursuant to an Ordinance or contract". "Pursuant to and Ordinance or contract and goods and services required during the fiscal year".

Now, my question is, does the *Appropriation Ordinance* cover a grant that goes beyond the terms of an existing Ordinance which defines the grant? I don't mind if you take that under advisement.

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, could she give me the example she is after?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, have you an example?

Mr. Sherlock: Could you give me the example, Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would rather not. I would rather get his answer first.

Mr. Sherlock: Well, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is really fair. If she is talking of Yukon Housing, for example, we are now talking in terms of net voting, where we are showing a grant to be paid to the Yukon Housing under Section 17 of *Yukon Housing Act* legislation. If you are talking about that, it is certainly covered under Section 15 of the *Financial Administration Ordinance*, but if you are talking of something else, I am sorry, I just do not understand the question fully.

Mrs. Watson: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the Yukon Housing Corporation, and I can give you the example and it has bothered me for some time, the *Appropriation Ordinance*, and, going through the *Financial Administration Ordinance* lately, I have come across Section 15.(1) and last year, when grants were made to municipalities by the Government of the Territory, beyond the grants that are payable under the *Municipal Grants Ordinance*, *Municipal Aid Grants Ordinance*, I objected, at that time, and said that this could not be done. It had to have an ordinance or amend the existing ordinance or bring in a one-time ordinance.

The ruling was that it could be done under the *Appropriation Ordinance*, but, under the new *Financial Administration Ordinance*, this type of thing cannot be done anymore. This is the question, you know, review it.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I will bring back an answer.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: We will look at, on page 14, Vote 1, Yukon Legislative Assembly, \$433,200. Any discussion?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, actually on the previous thing, we talked about the \$70,000,000 O & M Budget and the Commissioner outlined in his Throne Speech to go to Ottawa and request advance funding of about \$23,000,000. My question to the witness would be: is there a possibility that some of the \$23,000,000 we are asking for right now that the Federal Government give us in advance, could that possibly be that

they, in return say, why don't you take it out of that \$200,000,000 loan we have arranged for you?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, do you want an answer to that?

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure what the exact question is.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, it has nothing to do with the Budget. It seems to have something to do with the statement made in the Speech from the Throne. Whether that should be discussed here now or when we are discussing the Opening Address, it is up to your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we are on Vote 1, the Yukon Legislative Assembly and we can have a general discussion on this particular vote.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, in respect of Vote 1, which of course covers the Yukon Legislative Assembly estimates for the forthcoming year, I can give you some detail and that is if you will proceed to page 16, you will find under for instance, Primary 10 and 15 that an automatic increase to Member's salaries is reflected here to coincide with the percentage change in the average weekly earnings, pursuant to Section 21 of the *Elections Ordinance* and additional salary increases are a result of the salary of the fourth elected Executive Committee Member being transferred from the Executive Committee Office budget. The expansion of the Legislature from 12 to 16 members due to the redistribution of electoral boundaries is also reflected in Primaries 10 and 15.

In Primary 20, Professional and Special Services, an 8 per cent increase was granted to the YTG personnel and therefore we have increased our Professional and Special Services fees to coincide with this overall 8 per cent increase to the YTG personnel on our staff.

In Primary 31, the creation of new committees, for instance the Labour Standards Committee, travel and per diem costs of an additional four members mentioned previously and to provide for sitting days. Present provision of 50 sitting days was understated and that was what was programmed for this year. Unfortunately, the sitting days now amount to, we have already sat 61 days, so we have made a provision in the Estimates to reflect 60 days rather than 50.

As we proceed through to the Clerk of the Assembly on page 18 which is provision for support services to the Assembly, you will note that there is an increase in man years. There is an additional Clerk Typist II who was formerly a casual employee who is now permanent. There is a Research Assistant who was formerly casual and now is permanent. There is a Clerk Typist III who in fact was transferred from Legal Affairs to support our new Law Clerk, and there is the Hansard Editor and two Hansard Reporters. In the case of the Hansard Reporters, this money was taken from money formerly payable to the contractor and has been transferred from Professional and Special Services to Salaries.

In relation to the breakdown on page 18, total man years is 19.25. The salary reflects staffing required to support the Legislature in its committees.

In Primary 30, last year the Association of the Clerks at the Table Conference was held in Whitehorse and for the fiscal year 1978-79 the conference will be hosted by Quebec, and it will be necessary for our Clerk to travel to Quebec to attend and it is also necessary for our Law Clerk to attend the Uniform Law Conference, which, of course, enables him to keep abreast of uniformity of law across Canada, and of course we have participated in this for many years.

This is a transfer from the Director, or the department of the Director of Legal Affairs now to our Budget.

In a primaries 32 and 33, this provides for the communication requirements for the four additional MLA's who will be coming in following the next election and, in Primary 41, reflects a general increase of more MLA's and committees, as well as, or as well as committees.

Primary 61 covers the rental of the mag card system, which, as you know, is the storage and, well, it is a machine which handles all our legislation. It is somewhat, as I understand, a retrieval system and this type of thing.

In 90, in Grants, this is the payment to the Uniform Law Conference, which amounts to \$800.

If there, you will notice in Expenditure Recoveries, we have not shown any recoveries, although we felt that perhaps last year we would get a recovery from the Ambassador's Tour, but we have made no provision for expenditures recoveries.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, my question: the man year breakdown does not give us the opportunity, but is there provision for the year '78-'79, for the services of a full-time clerk?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, yes, provision is made, however, the decision as to when this will be implemented will be made, I believe, primarily by a new committee of the House, a Members' Services Committee, which will be dealt with at a later point in this Session. I believe that that decision or that implementation of any decision coming from that Committee, be a favourable, on splitting the clerk from the Executive Committee function, would probably come at or about the next election.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, a question on the building space, with the addition of four extra members, will there be enough space in the present office space of the Clerk of the Assembly and with any other space available, in case there was some needed.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I think that matter is being undertaken at the present time and perhaps we could bring in that information at a later date. It is being looked at, at this time.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, is the Executive Committee portion of the Salary of a Member of the Legislative Assembly shown in the Legislative Assembly Vote or in the, what do we call the other one? The Administrative Services.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, it is shown in the Legislative Assembly section. It is reflected there.

It is extracted from the other.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I may have missed it in the very thorough report from the Speaker, but I am wondering in the reduction in Primary 20, what is the explanation there? In Establishment 110.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: What page, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: What page is it?

Mr. Chairman: Page 18.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could assist. Mr. Speaker did answer the question. It relates to the changeover from contracting of "Hansard" work to manual or staffing, local staffing.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I just had one other item and I neglected to draw it to the attention of Honourable Members. That relates to the amount of money spent within our activities of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Around the 15th of December last, they amounted to an expenditure of \$4,457 and there was an unspent balance of \$3,359 and we have had since that time further expenditures related to the

visit of the delegation from Saskatchewan and so these totals would have to be added to that. There is no change in the amount budgeted for the activities of the Yukon Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, Vote 1, Establishment 100, Primary 10, page 16, Salaries for Legislative Assembly, \$310,000 for 1978-79. In 1977-78 it is \$251.7. Does that forty some thousand dollars or fifty some thousand dollars cover the extra Members, four more members, plus an increase in salaries as defined in the *Elections Ordinance*?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the new salaries for the new members, based on the formula which escalates the salaries every year is reflected here. Also, some of the differentials here, I cannot explain it, perhaps Mr. Treasurer could in more concise terms than I could, but they are reflecting the split we are now showing between the administrative service and the Legislature and in this interchange comes partially these differences. Perhaps Mr. Treasurer could explain it better than I could.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I think he has done it very well. Yes, the salaries of the additional members are included for half a year. I do not know what else I can say. The split is there.

You might find some confusion in relating to the point that Mrs. Watson brought on earlier. There will be some confusion if you are looking say at the Supplementaries and looking at the Main Estimates because of the changes in the organization. I want to make it clear that if you just look at the Main Estimates you will not have the confusion, because what we have done is transposed or brought forward the figures from the previous year and inserted them into the Main Estimates so you can then compare just the figures in the Main Estimates and do not go back to the Supplementaries, because you will get confused between the splitting and dividing up between the different organizational changes.

If you want to go back into the Supplementaries, then maybe, you know, you may cause yourself some problems. So, you just have to wait and ask your question at that particular time.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if the Supplementaries is how you are doing it now, and this is how we are doing it so it is easily understood, I might be dumb but I would like to know how we are doing it now.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that this split that is reflected in the Budget was on the request of the, I believe the Rules, Privileges and Elections Committee that was struck by this House and subsequently asked us to reflect the difference between the Legislative arm and the Executive arm of Government.

In Vote 100, I think it is very straight-forward. You have the salaries of the twelve Members of the Legislature. As well, it points out the allocation of funds to Members of the Advisory Committee on Finance, as per the Ordinance. At the same time, it reflects the increase of what four additional people that will be in this House, as of the next election, which would probably be October or November.

So, subsequently, you have a four to five month salary base that is reflected in the Budget.

At the same time, as the Speaker has outlined, it reflects the request of the House to break the Legislative arm of Government from the Executive arm of Government. In other words, that is supplying a full-time clerk for the Legislature.

So, I think Vote 100 is very straightforward and very thorough, if you examine it from that light. It is just reflecting

the cost of the Members in the House with the increase of four members, as well as the break-out of the Legislative arm of Government, as opposed to the Executive arm of Government through the Clerk's Office.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, thank you, and the fact that you are budgeting only for a half year for the four, I am wondering whether you are budgeting for a full year for the other twelve? Tell us.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am curious about the Legislative committees and how much was budgeted for last year, because I think there should be a substantial increase there since we are much more active and expect, in the Fall, to be more activity in the committees area.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, last year the amount that was budgeted for the Legislative committees amounted to \$34,600.

Ms Millard: So, Mr. Chairman, we are reducing it. Could I have some reason for that?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Clerk's Office did not really know the amount of money that should be budgeted for the amount of work that the Legislative committees would be doing and, obviously, the figures in here reflect in a more accurate manner, the amounts of money that will be spent in the forthcoming year in this area.

Ms Millard: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, my understanding was that we had used up the Legislative committees' budget this year. Is that not true, then?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I would have to bring that information back to the Honourable Member because it is extracting out of for instance travel. I can tell you, for instance, the Labour Standards Committee, which has been struck has already spent or should, by our estimate will have spent by the end of this fiscal year at the end of this month \$4,540. I have no idea how much more money that that particular Committee will require to complete its duties, but I am going to have to try and bring back this information. I really cannot provide it at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Ms Millard, if you look at page 15, Legislative Committees, it has been increased from 34.6 to 46.5.

Ms Millard: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Government could table, for the information of the House, because I have lost track, and for the information of the public the salaries that will now be payable to each Member as of the year 1978 and to each Member of the Executive Committee. I think this would be very interesting, particularly for people who are interested in seeking election for the next Territorial election.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I would be more than pleased to bring that information to the House.

Mr. McCall: Yes, I would like some clarification, Mr. Chairman. Last year we budgeted, I believe, for a legal draftsman which now the Government has seen fit to continually use as a legal advisor. I am just curious as to which Primary does the legal draftsman for the Legislative Assembly come under. Is it under Legal Affairs or is it under Primary 20?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the Law Clerk used to be the one that attended this House, used to be under the Director of Legal Services. He now comes under our budget, under our administration or our personnel and his salary and expenses are reflected within our budget.

Mr. McCall: Where, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That would be Establishment 110.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion of Establishment 100?

Establishment 100 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion of Establishment 110, Clerk of the Assembly?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, there is such a significant increase there and this I guess is where some of the split comes under Primary 10, from the 77-78 \$76,000 to 78-79 to \$223,000. What salaries, what people are provided for in this Vote, the Clerk of the Assembly, for the Support staff?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I have already outlined that but I will restate it. It's for a Clerk Typist II, who was formerly casual and now is permanent, it is for the Research Assistant who was formerly casual, it is for a Clerk Typist III who was transferred from Legal Affairs to support our Law Clerk, and it is for the Hansard Editor and the two Hansard Reporters.

I might say, in addition, in relation to the two Hansard reporters who are the lovely ladies in this Chamber, that these people are hired locally. We do not have to go outside to find people of this talent and this has resulted in reduced cost in terms of hiring and travel and this type of thing, and I personally would complement them on the fine job they are doing, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 110?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the question I am asked, that I just asked on 10, was the difference is now reflected in salaries for the Hansard, rather than by contract as it was in the past. Is this the difference in the cost?

Mr. Chairman: Shall Establishment 110 carry?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker is going to bring forward some more information on expanded facilities for the Clerk of Assembly, I do not think that we can carry this thing.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member's concern was to whether we would have additional space for the four members, if I read it correctly. The answer to that is clearly yes, but it was my intention to try and, as soon as we had determined just where everything was seated and could draw the map, so to speak, then I would bring that to the attention. But, if he wants a definite answer, yes, it is provided for.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I think that everybody in this Committee should be concerned with it. I mean, this building was planned for not expanding. This building, at the present time, is bulging at the seams and I think I am not only concerned about the four members that are going to be added there, but what are we going to do with the support staff for the Clerk of the Assembly? This is what my question really was related with and I think until we have the correct information on the thing, we should not pass the thing and not clear this section.

Some Members: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate that yes, provision has been made for all of these things, but I certainly will bring back the information, whether they pass it or not.

Mr. Chairman: We will stand 110 over.

Two, Administrative Services. The Executive Committee.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, Primary 10 and 15 provide for a fourth Executive Committee Member, the '77-'78 Main Estimate provided for a fourth Executive Committee Member, which has since been transferred to Vote 1. Since the decision to split the Clerk's Office, the support staff, some

of the positions have been split out and are reflected in this Establishment and this is to go along with the wishes of the House to split the Legislative arm of Government, as opposed to the Executive arm of Government.

You will note that in Professional and Special Services there has been a deduction of \$20,000 and that reflects the fact that we have accomplished the work that was set out last year to complete the rewrite and the drafting of the *Elections Ordinance* which we passed here at the closing of the last Session.

Section 30 also reflects a decrease as the travel funding requirements for the Deputy Commissioner was transferred to Establishment 210 of the Commissioner's Office.

In Primaries 32 and 33 it also reflects a decrease of some funding in this Primary as opposed to last year with the transfer of the Deputy Commissioner.

Section 41 with the breakout of a \$5,000 increase reflects the additional personnel with dividing the Executive and the Legislative arm of Government. I should add that the total man years have remained the same as were last year quoted.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, could we know what the \$2,500 grant is for?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I should apologize, the \$2,500 is for the Canada West Foundation, and I believe Members have been receiving copies of the work that they have been doing in Western Canada. I do believe that it is important that we, as a Legislature, as well as a Government, be involved with the Canada West Foundation.

For the interest of Members, there is a meeting here at the end of the month that has been arranged by the Canada West Foundation to look at the concept of confederation and tentatively the Canada West Foundation has asked for delegates through their representative here, Mr. Phelps, who has invited myself and I believe as well as the Honourable Member from Kluane to go down to that meeting at the end of the month, which could be important for Canada in the long run.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, just out of curiosity, what sort of information were we supposed to get on the Canada West Foundation because I have not received any?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, if I just might interject, also one great monumental piece of information which the Honourable Member from Ogilvie has in her possession, as Member of the Constitutional Committee was a new prospective on Canadian Confederation. I might say that it is very, very important that we maintain, as a Government and as a Legislature, a link with this Foundation because of the work that they are doing in terms of constitutional matters which will, in effect, affect Yukon and the North in general.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that that great monumental piece of work I do not admire. I think that there is a lot more that can be done. It was a finicky kind of way to go about constitutional development and I think that this grant could have been discussed with the Constitutional Committee who are much more concerned directly with that kind of thing. I feel disappointed that the Standing Committee, which is a part of this Legislature has not been consulted on whether or not we should become a part of this Canada West Foundation.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the other point is that this particular foundation is concerned with the energy requirements of Canada and they do various research and study programs of various parts of Canada, and at one time, I would expect, they may be coming even to the Yukon to have a look

at the energy requirements of Yukon, but, more than that, of how it would apply to western Canada.

I believe that it is important that we at least give a token amount of money to them as recognition of the work that they are doing. I am sure that, with the Government making an allocation in this direction, that a lot more of the studies and programs that have been undertaken by the Canada West Foundation will be distributed to all Members.

I understand they are doing an in-depth study of the coal requirements in Canada and this kind of thing, which is very important. So, the constitutional aspects, just a portion of just exactly what this Foundation does.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That was one of my points, is that they have done other fields. Actually, they have done a great deal of work in petroleum and mining resources, as well, and I know that the coal study is underway.

Also, I was just going to make another point, too, that in the question of the new, the constitutional question in Canada, the new prospective, there is one big series that is very, very blank there and it affects the northern Territories and it would be my hope that the grant which is being allocated in this Budget will assist them in preparing a proposal for constitutional change in the general context of the Canada West proposal.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'm just curious about how much influence Canada West Foundation is going to have on the policy of this Government.

If we are giving \$2,500 now, maybe it will be \$5,000 next year and we are obviously going to be reflecting the information we are getting from them. Have we really looked into other committees, for instance, Canadian Art Resources Committee and whether or not we should give them a grant? They certainly are concerned directly with the North and that's far more relevant, as far as I can see and they are involved in a lot of research in energy resources and environmental concerns and constitutional development things that we are very much involved in.

How come you made this decision that this is the Foundation that we want to pursue?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member is sort of often off on a tangent and I can understand that she is not too familiar with the background but the Canada West Foundation is not a political organization where I think you could say that the Canadian Artic Resources certainly are a political operating organization.

The Canada West Foundation has been in operation for quite a number of years and most of the Members are non-political people. They have some pretty creditable people, some very knowledgeable ex-politicians, such as the former Premier of Alberta for many, many years, Manning, and quite a number of people of this type of stature, a lot of business people who are involved and who are interested in doing research on specific subjects that are a problem with western Canada, or have. They have done work on transportation, on tariffs and these papers are available.

Now, in 1970 or '71, I believe, Canada West approached the Territorial Government and asked them if they were interested in contributing to this Foundation and naming representatives, two of them, to the Foundation so that the North was not being excluded out of the western picture.

They were in operation long before many of these other organizations were even interested in the West. At that time, the Yukon did say that they would make an annual grant to the Canada West Foundation which is absolutely minimal com-

pared to the grants that are being made by provinces, particularly the Western Provinces. Two Members were appointed to represent the Yukon and I believe they are Willard Phelps and Bill Drury. I believe Bill Drury is the second one.

Now, when this conference arose on the confederation question, they are looking at it not, I do not think, from a political point of view, they are doing an analysis of it on a realistic financial, regional point of view and looking at it from the West's point of view. At that time, the two delegates from the Yukon were asked that they allow the Yukon to have five delegates and so the two delegates came forward to certain people. I do not know, I think they have gone out of the government too, I think they have one from the Executive Committee and one from the Legislature. I think one from business, there are two people outside of government that are going as delegates to the Canada West Foundation.

It might be interesting to note that they have some very good speakers lined up. I believe Mr. Blakney, the Premier of Saskatchewan is giving the opening address, the Premier of BC is speaking, I believe the Premier of Alberta is going to be there, the Yukon Senator has been asked to present a paper, so it is not really tied to constitutional type of conference as you would expect a government to, it is a private organization that is concerned about Canada's West, economically and in its political structure.

Mr. Phelps was the gentleman, as the Yukon delegate who approached me and asked me if I would be interested and at that time I never thought that I would be conflicting with the purposes of the Constitutional Committee within this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Watson. We have several people who, I think, want to speak about Canada West, so we will recess now until 1:30 and Mr. Lengerke, Mr. Hibberd and Mr. Berger can say their little piece after 1:30.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee come to order?

We were dealing with Vote 2, Establishment 200.

Mr. Lengerke: No, Mr. Chairman, I have no further comment.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mrs. Watson covered it this morning, thanks.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger is not here.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, we should have lunch between every argument, it cuts down.

On the comments made this morning, I would just like to say that it seems to me whenever an organization is mentioned that is a little bit left to centre, it becomes a political organization, but when it is an organization of businessmen who are getting together and advising the Government, that is good for the country. So, I still believe that something like Canadian Artic Resources Committee could use a grant as well as the Canada West Foundation.

My fear of this is that it really is a mini tri-lateral commission, I believe, and I think we have to hesitate before we get really involved into something like this, where a lot of businessmen, although it may not be people that are political at the moment, are on something like Canada West or the Tri-lateral Commission, eventually they come into politics and their relationships to that commission are very strong, so that there is a lot of influence on what Government decides.

What I would like to know, on the grant itself is is that grant for the expenses for our Members to go to that conference, or is it in support of the Foundations itself?

Mr. Berger: I have not got the answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: You have not asked the question.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is strictly in support of the Foundation for the work that they are doing for western Canada.

It should be pointed out that the people involved in the Foundation are not politicians. Some have been ex-politicians, as the Member from Kluane alluded to. Some are members of universities, like Mr. Roberts, who, I believe is Vice-President of the University of Simon Fraser.

So, it is a combination of people in the business sector, as well as people that have had experience in the political sector, and also in the world of academics.

The point is, as the Member from Kluane described so well this morning, the concept is to try to demonstrate to the rest in Canada what western Canada has and how they operate within the economic sphere, as well as what can be done from the point of Confederation.

So, it is a non-political organization. It is trying to bring the various sectors together in western Canada, so that people in eastern Canada are aware of what is happening in western Canada. This is the Foundation and this is their purpose and I think it demonstrates from the fact that the two Members here that are on the Board of Directors, Mr. Phelps and Mr. Drury who have been appointed by the Canada West Foundation, not appointed by this Government, to serve and to bring the interests to the Yukon to the table when they are discussing various areas of concern as it affects western Canada as well as northern Canada.

I should point out that the study that was done in respect to the various regions of Canada that you alluded to earlier on the constitutional question, if my memory serves me correctly, I do not think the Constitutional Committee had formally been set up at that time when they were initially doing their work in that area.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the Member asking the questions has not been able to meet with her Committee all the time, because she has such a distance to travel, but if she would like to review the Minutes, she will find that that Committee decided to support Canada West in any way it could. That was a constitutional decision made on the part of that Committee, which you and I are both members.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reassure, as much as I possibly can, that this is not a second Tri-lateral Commission, the fact that the Tri-lateral Commission is really a commission that has been structured in the eyes of the media. There is actually no proof that there is such a thing as a Tri-lateral Commission and the influence they have. This has been done by the media, but I would hope and I am quite sure that the Canada West Foundation is not that. Being a Westerner, being born in the western part of Canada and raised there, I know that the western part of Canada has for years and years felt that they have not got their fair share of the benefits of Confederation. There have been movements going on like the Canada West Foundation. This Canada West Foundation started many, many years ago, before it was actually organized and I know that members of my family were involved in the original organization of it, so I can feel quite confident in saying that it is not another Tri-lateral Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I do have a question. On 200, Mr. Chairman, I would want to know, there are 11 man years. Are there any new man years in this Establishment?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the budget in 200 reflects the decrease of the Assistant Commissioner and in its place the transfer of the Special Projects Officer. The remainder are the same, as per outlined in the Budget last year. I realize there is difficulty associating to the budget last year because we are trying to meet the requests of the Members in dividing the Legislative arm and the Executive arm of Government.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I did bring in a motion a few days ago on the Production of Papers, and I asked for a chart structuring the new structure of Government and each department head's responsibilities and each Executive Committee's responsibility. If we had that before us now, it would certainly help us in this regard.

I am not quite prepared to have a Member stand up, I would like to see what you have done with your Executive Committee with your man years and I would have hoped that you would have prepared a couple of short papers for us to show us where your man years are transferred from one to the other.

It is one thing for you to stand up and say the Project Manager, well who is Project Manager, has been transferred from one place to another.

We're standing up and asking questions and it would save a lot of time if we had this information before us.

Now this same thing came up last year, so I would hope that before we go into some of these things, you try and bring the material ahead. Lead us to the questions.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I can outline the eleven man years, if you like, and their duties and responsibilities as outlined for the functions to the Executive Committee.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would sooner have them in writing.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, you will in "Hansard".

The special projects officer--

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a Point of Order. Would not it be easier for them to pass this around to us, rather than have to--I have to go back to "Hansard" to review it and then try and ask the questions on it, and then by that time, we will be finished with this section.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: On a Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, there can obviously be no Point of Order and I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Member and ask her if she is going to nit-pick her way through this total, total Budget or can we get down and deal with the matters pertaining to the Budget.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order, is it possible for one Member to question another one across the floor?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, to outline the functions of the eleven man years, including the Executive Committee portion of the Budget 200, three are secretarial staff to the elected Members of the Executive Committee; one is the special projects officer, which is a transfer from Local Government; one is the Secretariat to the Executive Committee; a clerk steno, an assistant clerk, what we, executive; the permanent Advisory Committee secretary, which is a revision internally within the Government to attempt to get more liaison between the departments in preparing various papers for the Executive Committee and this was a position that was revised from the Clerk's office, a secretarial position; and then there is a clerk typist, as well as two clerks.

So, that roughly runs down the eleven man years within the Department.

I should elaborate, possibly, Mr. Chairman, on the duties of the projects officer. We have been finding it very difficult in the past year, in respect to trying to get various papers done and research done for the Executive Committee. For an example, in the area of equalization, in the area of land claims where we have to go in-depth in one area, and it was felt that we needed somebody that we could draw on immediately to draw their expertise in these various areas.

At the same time, for an example, the decision for reducing the taxation within the Territory from 16 mills to ten mills, this was done with a lot of prepartional a lot of work by the projects officer and it is one that we can draw on that Treasury can work with, as well as Executive Committee, to get the necessary information compiled in as short a time as possible and I think that it is fair to say that this particular individual is going to be utilized more and more in the future, because it is a case were the Executive Committee has the ability of drawing quickly on somebody that is available, that can do these research papers and do them well, and do the necessary background so that when we make a decision, we have all the factors in front of us and then, subsequently, a decision can be made which we feel is for the good of the Territory.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member from Kluane did have a good Point of Order, and I think I have to support her on this particular thing, because I think as the Minister of Education stood up and talked about the Project Manager and the Research man. We were told in last year's Budget Session that we have a special department to do all those things right now. What happened to that particular department. I would like to see it also in black and white what happened to all those things, because we approved funding for this thing last year and all of a sudden we were told we had to hire a different person or maybe that person was transferred, I don't know. I think the Honourable Member made a point.

I would like to go back to the Canada West Foundation once more. I had no intention of getting involved in that, but when the Honourable Member from Kluane stood up and said they are non-political, well it is a laugh. How can you explain Alberta as being non-political, I do not know? The thing is, I think the Member from Ogilvie made a point. If there are other foundations and other organizations to support the North, well should not they be also putting money into those things in order to get their support? It is exactly what we are doing with the Canada West Foundation. I find it quite curious, Mr. Chairman, to see that the Canada West Foundation is mostly comprised of business people, it is the point of view of business we are getting across. We have not heard of anybody being involved on the union sides, and those people live in the Territory too, they make the money for those business people so they can support those organizations. I think the Honourable Member from Ogilvie made a very good point in saying maybe we should also take a look and support other organizations.

Ms Millard: Thank you very much to the Member from Dawson. I have to support the Member from Kluane about the material that was asked for in the Production of Papers. I seconded that motion and I was certainly hoping we would have it for the budget. It seems to me that every time we have a budget we go through this same mess, and I am highly suspicious since the Economic Research and Planning Unit started out in Intergovernmental Affairs and then became a separate entity altogether, and I want to see it in paper before we start passing these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, does the Government have an organizational chart?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there is one around, possibly we can bring it in tomorrow morning. I do not have it with me.

Mr. Sherlock: May I make a point, Mr. Chairman, just to help out a little bit on the man years, at the end of each Vote there is a man year summary, which in fact starts at the base of '78 and shows the adjustments and shows what we have done through '77-78 and then the new years being added. Maybe that would be useful. For example, we are dealing with Vote 2 on page 34. I think you will find the information you are looking for, starting with the base, of course.

Mrs. Watson: That is fine, but it takes the total, it does not signify what Primary though, that they come from. My question is, you are saying that the support staff of the Executive Committee is still 11 man years and yet we are being told about two new officers, a Secretary to an Advisory Committee, which I would like more information on, who do they advise and who are they made up of and what kind of advice do they give; and I would also like to know more about a Project Officer who is supposed to prepare papers that I thought we hired departmental people for.

For example, papers on rate equalization could well be one, but Consumer and Corporate affairs is taking care of Utility Boards. We are talking about taxation. This is usually the role of the Treasurer and the financial department of the Territory. Have we got one super, super agent who can write papers for all departments and do you use the paper that this one person submits to the Executive Committee as the last word?

I think if I were a departmental person I would resent it. Does this project officer consult with the departments that he is supposed to be writing papers for?

I'm sure that you are sort of setting up an executive assistant, with no relationship to the departmental people who were also supposed to be almost at the deputy minister level. So I think there should be some further explanation from the Government, regarding these two positions and what happened to the other two?

You know, you are saying, we still have eleven, but we have got two new people, two new positions.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if one looks at their budgets from last year as opposed to this year, the breakdown of the Legislative arm as opposed to the Executive arm is fairly well brought out. Last year there was 17.5 man years voted in the Administrative Services and I think that reflects in the Budget that you have here before you, the difference in the man years.

All I am saying is that the project, special project officer works with the departments when there has to be a paper drawn up, whether it be with land or whether it be with the Treasury for equalization, whether it be with land claims or whatever, and it gives us an individual with the necessary expertise to draw on to get these papers up in a time specified.

We found that it has been very helpful to the various Executive Committee Members responsible, who draw on him, which is really in the area of Mr. McKinnon's responsibility, as well as with the Commissioner in the area of the equalization and up to now, the equalization as well as the land problems that we are in contact with on an everyday basis.

Mr. McCall: Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman, are we just dealing with the expenditure summary 200 on Vote 2 or are we under general discussion on all the expenditures summaries?

Mr. Chairman: Well, this is the Administrative section and we can discuss anything in it.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, then I would like to go on to Expenditure summary 210, if I may, Office of Commissioner.

I would like an explanation as to, the man year has gone up from four to five and there is a substantial increase in the costing on these particular figures from the 1977 budget to the 1978-79 budget and I was wondering if the Minister can assist us with some clarification as to why there is a substantial increase and the extra many year.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that possibly we deal with 200 and then when we get to 210 then I would suggest that possibly the Commissioner should be in attendance to discuss that section of his Vote. If that is all right th the Honourable Member.

Mr. McCall: That is fine with me, Mr. Chairman. I was just seeking clarification which we you are moving through the Vote.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to go back to what the Minister stated before on research. This is exactly what I said before. We voted a Vote last budget for research staff and we created a separate department in this Government to conduct all the research, now all of a sudden we are told that Executive Committee Members need a special person to conduct that research that that department is supposed to do. We were told that we need to do research on taxation, we need research on land claims, which I find very, very strange, because we have a land claims secretariat where I believe there was three people present in it last year. What happened to all those things? I mean there is absolutely no information forthcoming on this thing. Before we go any further, we should have all that information on hand.

Some Members: Here, here, agreed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I can bring in the terms of reference for that particular position if this is the Members' wishes.

Mr. Chairman: We will stand over 200 and go on to 210, Office of the Commissioner.

Ms Millard: If we are on 210, I would like to know what 99, Miscellaneous is, is that the rent subsidy again for the Commissioner?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, do we should have the Commissioner here to discuss this important item?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could briefly recess while we get the Commissioner in to help us.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, we will recess for ten minutes or so.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I believe he is at a meeting, I believe he said he was going to be in a meeting this afternoon, so I am not sure whether he is in or not.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, at the pleasure of Committee, I have answers to the questions raised this morning, respecting Vote I and I will attempt to have it circulated to all Members.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

We are dealing with 210, Office of the Commissioner. There were some questions.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, my question was on Primary 99, Miscellaneous, is that the rent subsidy from the Territorial Government?

Mr. Commissioner: Primary 99? No, those are the funds that have in the past been called, Mr. Chairman, the Enter-

tainment Budget.

Ms Millard: Then, Mr. Chairman, where would the rent subsidy be put?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that is in Primary 52, Subsistence.

Ms Millard: Well, just in passing since we seem to have a blank spot here, I would like to register again my objection to having to pay even \$3,000 rent on a federal government employee's domicile.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know the five man years that are attached to the Office of the Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, there currently is the Internal Auditor, the secretary to the Commissioner and the secretary to the Deputy Commissioner and the Native Advisor is within Vote 2.

In the year 1978-79, there will be added an assistant internal auditor, giving us five man years.

Mr. McCall: Yes, while we are on this particular expenditure summary 210, I would like to know why there has been a significant jump in the Estimate for this year, as compared to last year.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, almost the entire increase is in salaries, reflecting the change from three man years to five man years.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Commissioner would indicate why the necessity of the Assistant Internal Auditor and why in fact they would be on his own personal staff, the Internal Auditor, both he and the Assistant Internal Auditor?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, the internal audit function in government or in business is one that is generally kept separate from the Treasury or Finance Department reporting directly to the Chief Executive Officer. It is a procedure that not only has been traditionally held, but it is strongly recommended at the present time by the Auditor General's Department in Ottawa and other people doing the books of the Government of the Yukon. It provides a certain independence of reporting straight to the Chief Executive Officer and thus to the Executive Committee on management systems and programs, functions of government.

Mrs. Watson: Supplementary, Mr. Chairman, was it the recommendation of the Auditor General that the Government get an Assistant Internal Auditor to assist the one man year?

Mr. Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Chairman, over the years, for several years now, we have been encouraged by the Auditor General's Department to strengthen the internal audit function in this Government.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that can only lead me to one very, very important question. Now that the Internal Auditor's position has been strengthened, it would follow then that perhaps Mr. Commissioner would consent to turning the Treasury Department to one of the four elected Members from this House?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that that is not in the books at this day and age at time in development. It is a situation of under the *Financial Administration Ordinance* and under the *Yukon Act*, the Commissioner is directly responsible for the ultimate control of financing and as such, finance cannot be turned over to an elected Member, although as you will understand, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake will understand, we have indeed evolved almost all other government functions to elected Members of the Executive Committee, with pleasure.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I do not really understand the answer, but I guess I have to accept the answer. It is not really up to the Commissioner's Office, it is up to some being down in Ottawa in the 'Far East'. My question to the Commissioner, Mr. Chairman, would be on Native Advisor. I mean, we now have an elected Member in charge of native affairs, and I am wondering why the Native Advisor is still under the Commissioner's Office and why should not this post be transferred to directly under the Native Affairs Minister?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason is clearly obvious, that we did not commit and did not intend to create a Department of Indian or Native Affairs in this Government, although, in discussion of this, where the Native Advisor's Vote should appear in the Budget, it was felt that it was best to keep it under the Establishment 210 and under the administration of the Administrative Services Vote. This is for purposes of bookkeeping more than anything else and the Native Advisor works closely with both the Commissioner and the elected Member of the Executive Committee who is responsible for native concerns in this Government. It does not reflect any direct control or direction over that person by the Commissioner, as opposed to an elected Member of the Legislature, of the Executive Committee.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just would like some clarification, first on the Special Advisor to the Executive Committee: who is this person and is he an advisor to all Members of the Committee or is he an advisor to the Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, he indeed is an advisor to all of the Members of the Executive Committee. His name is Walter Bilawich, a well known member of the Administration, who is working on about, on the last count I think seven projects. I do not think any of them are directly related to the Commissioner, although one of them, being a representation on an inter-governmental task force on the MacKenzie River Basin, there is nobody else, really, on the Executive Committee who is handling it either, so I suppose, in that sense, he does report to me to Executive Committee, but, a number of projects. **Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, I was wondering, perhaps, about, I believe there is a Mr. Musgrove, who is also another special assistant to the Commissioner. Do I then assume that this is a person employed by Ottawa?

Mr. Commissioner: That is correct.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know just how much we are paying for the position of Commissioner. For instance, in Primary 30, any of that travel by Government employees, is any of that Commissioner's travel?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, yes, on occasion there is travel that I do that is strictly, strictly representing the Executive Committee and this Legislature and this Government and, when that happens, I have to make a judgement and charge some of it to Territorial Votes.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, back on the Native Advisor again, Mr. Chairman, I still think we have a Department of Native Affairs and I do not care what anybody wants to call it, but we are in the process of creating that Department of Native Affairs.

My question is, Mr. Chairman, what is the function of this Native Advisor, at the present time? I mean, what is the statute of this person? The information that I have is from the press in particular, that this person is not recognized by any of the native organizations, so what function is this person doing, at the present time, in Government? I mean, what

advice can they give and what liaison is there created by having a person like this on the staff?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I believe that one organization came out *post facto*, one native organization, saying they did not recognize this position, the reason not being that they disagreed with the position but they felt they did not have any input into the terms of reference for that position.

Dr. Hibberd, when he assumed Executive Committee responsibility for native concerns, and myself, went to speak to native organizations, a joint meeting, and we fully acknowledged that they did not have that input, but we were more than willing to listen.

I personally feel, and I can only speak for myself that our Native Advisor does create an awareness at the Executive level of native concerns as recommendations for policies and programs are developed. I would ask Dr. Hibberd if he would like to add anything to that that could perhaps clarify the position more for the honoured Members here.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is fair for all the reports that we hear about the lack of acceptability of this particular person or position in terms of native organizations. I think the person who is fulfilling that job, and I think doing it very well, is certainly recognized by the majority of people that she has to deal with. Her job has been to involve herself in areas where there have been problems, where she feels the native concerns are not being fully met, and I think she is doing an excellent job of that. It is only as she functions more and more in that role will we have the terms of reference under which she will be able to operate and she is defining them for us the more she works. She builds up each project she goes into and she, therefore, really is defining her own role.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that she could possibly define the fact that she needs an assistant next budget year? I am serious.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Perhaps I should ask her, Mrs. Watson.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what did this person do in the past year since we have this person on staff? What is the function of the Native Department in this Government? What role is this Government going to take away from the Federal Government? Are we going to take on some responsibility of Native Affairs?

As I said in the House before, I am totally against specialized departments on people, because people should be people on equal terms. We already have one department of Indian Affairs in the Federal Government and I question the wisdom of creating another department, another bureaucracy, and I think the Honourable Member from Kluane is right when she questions, will this person have to have an assistant by next year? What are we doing in the Indian Affairs in the first place? What are we doing in there? If we do not recognize people as people, well there is something wrong with this Government.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member is really creating his own dilemma. He says he is against the proliferation of Government in terms of more departments and saying that there is a duplication of services that we have already created by creating this department.

We have taken the stand all along that there is no Department of Indian Affairs in this Government and there is not, Mr. Chairman. You ask where this one figure should go, as far as paying for the Native Advisor is concerned.

As an accounting purpose, she has gone into this Estab-

shment for the pure and simple reason that there is no where else that she could go. There is no where you could look in this budget that says Department of Native Affairs.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am really quite upset and particularly because the debate is concerning one individual, who is a very competent individual and it is most unfortunate that the Government of the Territory did not have a job description, terms of reference when they in fact hired her.

Imagine standing up here and saying, we hired someone and, as they work, they will define their own role within the Government, a native advisor to the Government of the Territory. I agree with the Honourable Member from Klondike, that we cannot divide our Government departments along the type of lines that we have in the Federal Government and we know what damage has been done there.

Surely, a native person that is the head of any department in this Territory is acceptable to everyone, as long as they have qualifications and do a good job.

I cannot understand the type of segregation that we are bringing into the Government. If the native organizations had asked for someone to be available that we could contact on a day-to-day basis, if you wanted some advice on something, but not to be an employee of the Territorial Government. It is almost a tokenism.

I would much sooner support and be pleased with having native people in other departments, exercising their capabilities, their administrative capabilities, any other capability, and nobody, but nobody would object. I think we would all applaud.

But, to think that this person was hired and then ask them to write their own terms of reference, is just ludicrous. It is not fair to the person involved.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, we all would like more native involvement in this Government and that is certainly the direction we are trying to head, but as has already been pointed out, we want that input at every level possible and this is a situation where we can have input at the Executive level of this Government by having someone available who can advise us on native organizations, who can go back to the native organizations, find out what their views are, their representations, and bring them back to us.

It certainly is a line of communication that has been opened that was not in existence before she was there.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I just worry that the Honourable Member may have got a misinterpretation about developing her terms of reference. Indeed, the job did have terms of reference and I think that they are very sound and they are good basic terms of reference, of creating an awareness at the Executive level of native concerns, of facilitating liaison with the native organizations and the native people so that this Government can become more responsive to their needs and concerns.

It was those terms of reference, ones that we established, that one native organization rejected out of hand because they claimed they did not have any input into creating the terms of reference.

I can go back to the Honourable Member and look at speeches made in this House, not only by elected Members, but by eminent leaders of native organizations where they demanded this Government to create an awareness, and an awareness of the native concerns and the creation of that job was a direct response of that direction from the elected Members of this House and the native organizations and the native people.

I am sure that with indulgence and with co-operation and support, this can create and will create a better responsiveness in this Government in which there truly will be native representation at each of the departments and at the program level. Indeed that is one of the major responsibilities of this position is to try to facilitate that type of an approach in the Government of the Yukon.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have one very, very basic difference. I think that the Government of the Territory certainly should have concerns for the native people, but I do not think we should have one person and say now that is the person who is going to advise us on native concerns. Every department, every person within the Government, has an obligation to be concerned with the native people of this Territory, not because they are natives, but because they are people of this Territory and by singling out one sector of the population and then trying to single out one person within the government who is going to express all the concerns and be the funnel for all of the departments of the Government of the Territory is wrong. Until the native people themselves want to be in here, within Government, become qualified, run for election, that is the route we should be going, not by parachuting people into say we just have to have a line of communication. It is an artificial one and it is letting off your departments.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I just wanted to make a point here too, that in I have listened with some interest to the debate as far as it has gone on the Native Advisor. Whether we like it or not, we do have a situation which is very, very serious in this Territory and I have spoken on the subject many times and I have very rarely changed my views towards this situation. That is the fact that the Federal Government and the native people have created a problem over which we have no control at all. I have always stated that it is the Indian people that need help and I am not a believer that the young radicals across the river are representing the native people. I feel that basically it is a responsibility of the individual Members here in this Legislative Assembly who attempt to represent native people as I do within my constituency as equals. But, whether I like it or not and whether anyone else, Mr. Chairman, likes it or not, the Federal Government and the young radicals, as I call them, are creating differences.

I think it is a very, very good point that our government, this Government of the Yukon Territory recognizing that, have a person to bring perhaps on an advising basis to the Executive Committee in this Government, the problems of the real Indian people down at the village level who are the ones that need help and who are unfortunately, not by their own design, involved in a separate, distinctly different situation in many respects.

As far as I am concerned, I feel that this is a very necessary function within Government. I think it shows that we are not all wearing red jackets. I think that we owe it to those people to offer them at least that hearing by this Assembly, and I commend the Government for taking the move.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that was a very nice speech with absolutely no content.

I asked a question before: what did this Department of Indian and Native Affairs accomplish, up to now? I mean, what did this advisor accomplish up to now. It is a very serious question, Mr. Chairman, what responsibility do we have over native people, except recognizing them as people, as equal people.

I mean we can sit here and talk about the young radicals or old radicals or middle-aged radicals and red jackets and all

sorts of things, Mr. Chairman. We are not going to accomplish anything. What is the responsibility of this Government over its native people? What is the responsibility of this Government in Pelly Crossing, for example, besides the TV station in that village. What can this Government do about the education system? What can this Government do? I mean, what are we going to do? Create special departments for every race? Are we going to create a special advisor on Ukrainians or Polish or Italians or Germans or anything like this?

I mean, my point, Mr. Chairman, is we are supposed to represent all people and treat them as people, as equal people. Do not make the same mistake as the Federal Government did by having a separate department of white people at the Department of Indian Affairs and segregate people in that respect. And this is exactly what happened.

I mean, what are we going to do this time? Are we going to create special positions for native people in this Government and say, because you are of a different race and a different colour, I hire you, give you a job with absolutely nothing to do, maybe? Or are we going to look at them as people, are you qualified to fulfill a position like this?

This is the question I am raising. I am not in a dilemma, Mr. Chairman, like the Honourable Minister pointed out. I am raising, am having serious doubts that this Government really knows where it is going.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the Member started out his remarks by asking a question and I believe it was to the effect what have the Department of Indian Affairs done for the natives of this Territory?

My answer, Mr. Chairman, is that the Department of Indians Affairs of the Yukon Territorial Government has done nothing.

Mr. Chairman: I think, Mr. Hibberd, what you meant was there is no Department of Indian Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms Millard: Well, then, why did we give our fourth Member the responsibility of native affairs if there is no responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: I am merely trying to point out, as best I can, but the Honourable Member from Klondike does not seem to get the message, there is no Department of Indian Affairs, there will not be a Department of Indian Affairs.

Ms Millard: Well, and that is precisely why I asked the written question this morning that I did, because I would like to know what are we assigning the Native Affairs Executive Committee person who is responsible for native affairs? What are we really assigning him? A nothing?

If that is the case, then I do not want to have anything to do with it.

Mr. Chairman: You are having something to do with nothing.

Ms Millard: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The point has been made I think twenty times so far that there is no Department of Indian Affairs within this Government and I will not entertain any more questions asking if there is one. It has been answered twenty times that there is not one. Now could the Members please ask some questions that have not been answered.

Ms Millard: Could the Executive Committee Member then in charge of Native Affairs tell us what he does with native affairs?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Well, I finally got there. Mr. Chairman, if I may, the Member asked this question in

the House this morning and I have a written question to that effect which I would like to give a proper answer to in written form if I may hold it until then.

Ms Millard: I would rather have it in that form too, that is why I wrote the question.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 210?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, going back to the Internal Auditor, I do not think we have thoroughly explored that. The Internal Auditor and the Assistant Internal Auditor will report to the Commissioner so that it is separate and apart from the Department of Finance, so it is supposed to be separate and apart from government so you can review management. In this case, the Internal Auditor is reporting directly to the Commissioner and probably to the Minister. In provincial jurisdictions, the Internal Auditor reports to the Legislature or to the Members of the Assembly so that in fact it truly is separate and apart from Government which is the Executive arm of Government. What justification is there in this case to have the Internal Auditor just reporting to the Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, in reporting to the Commissioner he is reporting to the Executive Committee, which is the Executive arm of the government. The Internal Audit, I would have to check on the Honourable Member's assumption that they report to the Assembly. That does not sound to me, correct. It would make it a very difficult situation indeed and if it does indeed report to the Assembly, it does I am sure through somebody in the Cabinet process.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, there is a requirement by legislation for them to report to the Assembly. This is a requirement under our *Financial Administration Ordinance* for the Territorial Treasurer to submit the Territorial accounts and then the Auditor General's report, but there is nothing where the Internal Auditor's report also comes to the Members because the Internal Auditor does an overview of all the management, the financial management within the Government, and the Government is the Executive arm. So, really, you are having the Internal Auditor doing an inspection and reporting to his own boss and in provincial jurisdictions they report to the Legislature. If you want to do some more background on that to prepare an answer I would be quite willing to wait.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that, he does not report to his own boss, the Internal Auditor reports to the Executive arm of Government and he surveys and reviews financial management systems programs. The programs and systems are developed by the Finance Department and sometimes from the development stage to the implementation and operations stage there are anomalies that occur. Thus, the Executive looks to an Internal Auditor to identify and delineate those anomalies and areas of possible problem so that they can direct their Finance Department to correct those problem areas.

They are trulyly administrative. The Internal Auditor should not be confused, and his function should not be confused with the Auditor General's function of producing Territorial accounts. That is not the Internal Auditor's job. His job is to review financial management systems.

Mrs. Watson: Well, then, Mr. Chairman, one supplementary question: if the Internal Auditor and the assistant are advising the Executive Committee, why, then, is the Internal Auditor and the assistant defined in the structure within the Government as part as the Commissioner's personal staff.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, the function or the principle is that they should report to the Chief Executive Officer, who is

ultimately responsible for the financial administration and that, indeed, is the Chief Executive Officer in this Government, by the statute, happens to be the Commissioner. It is that simple.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe that, in last year's Estimates, he was part of this support staff of the Executive Committee. Now, I would like some correction on that, if I am wrong.

Mr. Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Chairman, she is wrong. The Internal Auditor, since his day of creation, has reported directly to the Commissioner.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one further question on this Primary: the salaries of the Deputy Commissioner and the Advisor to the Commissioner, Mr. Musgrove, and the Commissioner's salary are paid by Canada. Am I correct?

Mr. Commissioner: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: Does the Yukon pay for office requirements, telephone requirements, travel requirements, these types of things for all three of these federal positions?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it is a shared situation. The federal government paying for some of these things and the Territorial Government paying for some of them, depending upon the function and the situation.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, what percentage would the Commissioner be able to tell us of Mr. Musgrove's expenses are we responsible for?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give you a percentage, but certainly not a large percentage of Mr. Musgrove's.

Mr. McCall: Yes, on the same line of questioning, I would like to know if the Government of Canada has a special assistant to the Commissioner's Officer? Would it not be most obvious for the Government of Canada to pick up their own support staff and expenses that may be incurred by this particular special assistant and not the Government of Yukon?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose we could turn that around a bit and say that since there is a large deficit grant coming from Ottawa, that they are paying for it, but I do not think that is fair. I think that Mr. Musgrove and Mr. Bell and myself, when we charge an expense, such as travel, against the Territorial Government or something like that, we are acting for the Territorial Government.

When Mr. Musgrove were to charge something like that, if he indeed does, a telephone for example, it is on my direction. If I ask him to phone Ottawa to get some information, he is not doing it for the Federal Government's benefit, he is doing it because I require the information so I can report to Executive Committee. He performs a function of liaison for this Government, directly to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

So it is true that the Federal Government are paying his salary and he is a member of the Federal Civil Service, but when he contacts Ottawa and when his liaison travel or whatever is at the direction of the Commissioner or of the Deputy Commissioner, it is done so to obtain information for this Government, not for the Federal Government.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: One question arising out of the answer given by Mr. Commissioner a moment ago where he referred to perhaps—. It would be unfair, of course, to use the argument of the large deficit grant. I would just like to ask Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Chairman, if he would agree that a great amount of the deficit grant consists of direct legitimate charges for services to the Federal Government, legitimate

charges to the Federal Government in costs of education, et cetera to the Federal Government, a charge for those services which are simply lumped into a deficit grant and are not really a deficit grant at all?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I find it impossible to answer the question. I do not know what it was.

Mr. McCall: Yes, I am not satisfied with the explanation I got of the Commissioner dealing with this so called liaison officer. If I need support staff, it has got to be justified in the budget. My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that if the Federal Government saw fit in its wisdom to provide a liaison officer for the Commissioner's Office, then therefore they should be picking up the tab totally and we should not be justifying any expenses in our budget. For this to be socked into some sort of deficit grant given to the Government of Yukon, there is no logic here and I prefer a better clarification on this particular matter. Just what is this liaison officer supposed to be doing for the Government of Yukon if it means that every time he is instructed to make a phone call by the Commissioner's Office we have to pick up the tab? There is a little one-sided communication trip going on here dealing with the finances, Mr. Chairman, and I am not satisfied that we really need a liaison officer in the first place. If we are going to justify expenses in our budget for a liaison officer, surely it must be a little better structured economically?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I think we are building a mountain out of a molehill in terms of costs. The cost of the Commissioner's telephone charges, for example, are charged to the Territorial Government. That is because the Commissioner, in communication with Ottawa or with the Minister, is doing so to obtain information for the help of this Government for the people of Yukon.

The question of Mr. Musgrove's expenses and the purpose of having a federal liaison officer arose as a result of what Members of this Legislature felt was a fairly significant constitutional step forward in which, when Mr. Peter Gillespie left, Mr. Peter Gillespie was indeed on the same category of employment as Mr. Musgrove. He was Assistant Commissioner in charge of line responsibility for many departments of this government, and at the same time he was an employee of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and provided that internal liaison right to the Department. With his departure, the position of Assistant Commissioner was dropped entirely and the position of a Deputy Commissioner was created in which the individual was hired by an Order-in-Council from Ottawa, but responsible not to the Department, but to the Minister.

This left us without anybody in our Administration or anybody responsible to the Commissioner or through him to the Executive Committee, nobody who had that internal working relationship with the Department, to provide input at the official level, the level of the Director Generals and the Directors and so on.

As a result, at our request, at the request of the Government of Yukon, we managed to get another man year from the Federal Government, seconded, seconded to this Government, and they pay his salary and we pick up some small amount of expenses for an office, for example, and perhaps for a few telephone calls.

It looks to me, on that basis a pretty good bargain for Yukon and certainly not for the Federal Government.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect then, when we received the paper on the Decentralization of the Government of the Territory, we were advised that it would cost about \$89,000 to move an employee to set up office and

transportation and communication, plus his salary, so his salary, I think, was estimated at \$20,000. So, Mr. Commissioner, if it is a bargain, to pay the costs of office expenses and so on for an employee, well then Yukon Territorial Government should consider it a bargain to decentralize and move some of their employees to Dawson City.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, we are not discussing the paper on Decentralization at the present time. We are discussing the Commissioner's Office.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, she had her chance. I would like to say to her that that is her choice to make, if she wants to spend the \$89,000.

Mrs. Watson: You said it was not much.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, a very interesting discussion. I am concerned that here we have a Deputy Commissioner who is an appointed person all right, under Order-in-Council and who is a Yukoner, but I just wonder if we really defuse or take away the effectiveness of such a person when we say now we are going to have another special assistant who is going to be the liaison and what have you with Ottawa.

I would have hoped that we would use the Deputy Commissioner's position to develop that expertise from a Yukon standpoint and from within this Government and not have to worry that we are going to have to depend on somebody from Ottawa to always carry that function.

It seems to me that, fine, we are paying lip service to wants of Yukoners by appointing a Deputy Commissioner in the name of a Yukoner and then not giving him all of the tools to carry out his job. We are diffusing that somewhat with a special assistant appointed from Ottawa.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, in defense of the position we took and with regard to the Honourable Members' concerns, all I can say is that there are certain levels at which various people operate in communication and the Deputy Commissioner indeed does and is establishing a liaison with Ottawa, at senior levels and he does meet with the Treasury Board and represents the Government at Treasury Board meetings. He does liaise and is developing for the Yukon a good rapport with Ottawa.

I do not think that the Member would suggest that the Deputy Commissioner should start delving into the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and discussing ideas and programs and soliciting information from the official level. This is the differentiation. The Deputy Commissioner does not phone somebody junior in the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to discuss with him the development of some program or some idea.

This is the reason we have a member of that department seconded to us to provide that inside look, shall we call it, of what is happening.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one last question. At what level does Mr. Musgrove communicate then with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs? Does he communicate at the Deputy Minister level?

Mr. Commissioner: No, Mr. Chairman, no he does not. He speaks at what we consider to be the official level of the Director General's staff members of various types within the various arms of the Department and of course there are three arms, Northern Program, Indian Program, and Parks.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I find it very strange. This person is communicating directly under the request of the Commissioner. Why would he communicate at such a low level? Would it not be much better for the Territory to go

directly to the horses mouth, instead of dealing down in the back end someplace? What if the Director has to do something. The policy is laid down from the top, not in the bottom. This is my understanding and I find that explanation very, very strange.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Ms Millard: Yes, I would say the reason he communicates at the regional level is that is the way Ottawa regards us, and we even have to send somebody in from Ottawa to do it. I would say that a Deputy Commissioner by any other name, including Assistant Commissioner smells just as awful to me and the sooner they give us the right to do that as elected Members, the better off everybody will be.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 210?

Establishment 210 agreed to

On Establishment 224

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 224, Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe we were going to get a format of Economic Research so that this ties in with that so maybe we should not carry it until we get that.

Mr. Chairman: It is carried.

Mrs. Watson: Nobody said yes.

Mr. Chairman: We did that with 200.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, this is one Establishment I would really like to know what the activities were over the past year.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, Intergovernmental Affairs means just that. They create the form of the liaison for a multitude of activities between this Government and other governments in Canada, not just the Federal Government. For example, Mr. Murphy, the Director, is our representative on the Permanent Liaison Committee between the Government of Yukon, the Government of British Columbia and the Government of Alaska. Indeed, he was responsible for co-ordinating the Head of State meeting.

There are a number of activities such as this that this agency carries out for the Government of Yukon, but a considerable, I would say, part of their time is responsible for the activities of the Commissioner and various committees of the Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee. As such, there is better than 50 per cent of their budget that reflects a direct grant from the Federal Government specifically for carrying out that function.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think this is where the Special Assistant of the Commissioner should be under.

I mean, here we have a special department, a liaison between inter-government affairs and I think this is where this person should be, really, and we have not got him in there and we have not got him under our control.

We have a special department here and I think mostly the function, so far as I know, is to greet visiting dignitaries and create a proper atmosphere when they come up here and make them welcome, but I think the liaison between the Federal Government departments and the Territorial Government should be in this department.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that is the question that comes to my mind. There must be a conflict in Intergovernmental Affairs, the functions, when they deal with Canada, the Government of Yukon and the Government of Canada, and also with the function of Mr. Musgrove, who is also dealing with the Department of Indian Affairs and that is who the Yukon Government deals with most of the time.

I wonder if the Commissioner could indicate whether there is, in fact, a conflict and an overlapping and whether these two heads of these two branches, the Administrative Services and Mr. Musgrove, of course, being on the Commissioner's personal staff, he only reports to the Commissioner, who does the Chief of the Inter-governmental Affairs report to? Does he report to the Commissioner directly or to the Executive Committee?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, the Director of Inter-governmental Affairs reports to the Executive Committee, through the Commissioner. He does work for all of us, depending upon the situation.

He facilitates work on, with the federal-territorial or federal-provincial secretariat, for example, and this involves many members of the Executive Committee, depending upon the situation, but he does report to the Commissioner.

Mr. Lengerke: That brings up an interesting point and, perhaps, just as an example, I can maybe get my answer. I am wondering, I think the recent trip that the Commissioner made to Yellowknife would be classed as some inter-governmental activity as well.

I am just wondering, would a question to the Members of the Executive Committee elected, there were a number of matters discussed at that meeting between our Commissioner and the Commissioner of the NWT, as I understand it, and would have the Executive Committee Members, elected been totally aware of all the points for discussion, prior to the Commissioner going to Yellowknife?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, another point here, the Special Assistant to the Commissioner, the liaison man working for the Territorial Government and himself. This Department of Intergovernmental Affairs, is this Special Assistant also available to Executive Committee. For instance, one of the Ministers would like to get direct contact with the Department of Indian Affairs or Northern Affairs Department or any one of those people down there, all do they have to do is go through Intergovernmental Affairs to get the information?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, both the Special Assistant and the Liaison Officer with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and the Intergovernmental Affairs office, their services are available to Members of the Executive Committee. There are many occasions over the past month where they have performed functions for both of those, for both the Commissioner and other Members of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman: We will recess for a short while.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order. We are still on 224 in the Financial Affairs.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the witness to what amount we recover for this Primary? I cannot find the recoveries where it is shown.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, there is a figure of \$65,000, I believe, that directly reflects the grant from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to provide the costs of FICC, Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee, and associated activities to do with the Advisory Committee on Northern Development, which is a Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee.

Mr. Sherlock: May I just add to that, that \$65,000 does not show as a recovery because it is included in the base and in fact is part of the deficit grant. Over the years it was built into the base so it does not show as a recovery item at the end.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That was my very point, and as I say, when we got to Education I was going to ask if all the money that we recover from the Federal Government were legitimate charges to the Federal Government of this nation, whether or not they are considered and lumped into the deficit grant or whether they are identified as a legitimate charge.

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we are prepared to answer that right now. Perhaps if we get to some specifics maybe we will be able to come up with the answer, but I do not think it is that easy.

Mrs. Watson: But Mr. Chairman, it is significant that we originally had an agreement that we would have this Inter-governmental Affairs Department. We were performing a function for the Federal Government, they would cost-share it. We would use the branch for some Territorial functions and some of them would be on behalf of the Government of Canada. So now it is thrown into the deficit grant and it appears as though that \$65,000 is what Canada is helping Yukon meet their deficit. It certainly distorts the picture and I agree completely with the Honourable Member from Watson Lake.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 224?

Establishment 224 agreed to

On Establishment 225

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 225, Land Claims. Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, again this was a cost-shared arrangement that we had with the Federal Government. Again I could ask any of the witnesses what share of these costs is the Federal Government and is it being shown as a recovery or is it also being lumped in with the deficit grant?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I believe all of the funds originally were included as an extraordinary item and then included in our base, but, our participation in land claims and the work done by the Land Claims Secretariat is not for any Federal Government agency, such as is a legitimate statement with regard to the FICC activities in the Inter-governmental Affairs.

The Land Claims Secretariat works only for this Government and totally for this Government and for this Legislature.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Treasurer, at one time this was cost-shared with the Federal Government. In fact, I believe they did pay all of it originally.

Mr. Sherlock: The Honourable Member is quite correct. It was an item that was cost-shared, but the cost-sharing of it, over the years and in agreement with this Government and the Federal Government, through IGC, the cost-sharing fell out and it became a budget item in our base budget and that is the way it appears.

Ms Millard: Yes, I really would like to know what these three people have done over this past year.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, in general terms, they have provided the research and administrative back-up to myself and to the other Members of the Executive Committee in preparing for discussions of land claims, in a nutshell.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the elected people on the Executive Committee objected to having these things rolled in as part of the deficit grant?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this took place last year in the budget that was presented last year. Is that not correct?

Mr. Commissioner: Many years ago, many years ago.

Mr. Sherlock: I would hate to guess when it happened. It certainly happened long before last year.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, there was always a recovery shown.

Ms Millard: I think I am getting a clearer picture of the complicated procedure at the top of this Government and I am just wondering why is land claims, since it is really a research service and an advisory service to the Executive Committee and to the Commissioner, why is it treated so separately? Why can we not put this all into one lump?

I understood that the Economic Research and Planning Unit was supposed to be taking over some of these things. In fact, some of these people were overlapped. Why are we still treating it as such a separate thing? Can we not lump them all together? Would it not be more efficient?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, indeed last year the Land Claims Secretariat was put together with the Economic Research and Planning Unit, and as Honourable Members will recall, the rationale was that it is socio-economic planning and surely land claims is part of that. This year it became clear, let's say this, that land claims is indeed socio-economic planning and research, but it is certainly something that we feel will come to an end, land claims settlement is something we see in the future and the idea is to highlight it and that it will indeed disappear from our budget when the land claims have been resolved.

Again, we do not want to hide a Department of Indian Affairs within any budget. This is here and it is fully our intention that when land claims are resolved that the Land Claims Secretariat will dissolve with it. This is not something new at all. It is something that was created indeed when the Land Claims Secretariat was created four or five years ago under a different Commissioner and a different Executive Committee and we are simply following on the pattern established at that time.

Mr. Berger: Two questions, Mr. Chairman. Those three positions are permanent positions under the *Public Service Commission Ordinance* and my question is where would this position be transferred to because I can foresee that those positions are not just going to disappear, they are going to be hidden in some other department again?

The other question is Mr. Commissioner said that those people are doing it for the Legislature, which I take a strong stand on because we have not seen any reports from this particular Committee. We have no views from these three people. We are asking questions and there are very little answers forthcoming. The answer is always shrouded in secrecy because of negotiations. I would say that those three positions are probably directly responsible to the Commissioner's Office and secondly to the Executive Committee Members.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Ms Millard: I would certainly like to agree with the Member from Klondike. There seems to be a shroud of secrecy around this Secretariat which is not necessary. For instance, I had to pursue getting the four documents from the Planning Council. Those kind of things, if there were services to the Legislature from this Secretariat, why are we not at least getting what has been settled in land claims? We do not have to know what is going on all the time, but there should be some kind of communication otherwise I would hesitate very much to say that they had anything to do with us.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the area of land claims is very difficult situation for this Government. I think it should be pointed out that the Government of the Yukon Territory is

there as a third party at the negotiations. You have gone through an era of a Planning Council co-operative planning situation which now appears to have come to an end and we really do not know what the format is going to be for the land claims once they resume again, which appears to be tentatively at the end of March.

We have agreed at the table that papers would be released by all three parties with prior agreement and it would appear at this time that the Government of the Yukon Territory is the only one that really has maintained the agreement that was made at that time.

I think that is fair to say, is that not correct, Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: As far as we are concerned, that is absolutely so. We have not broken any trusts.

Hon. Mr. Lang: But at the same time, I agree with the Honourable Members, that we are kind of stuck in the middle and in respect to the secrecy involved at the land claims and we would like nothing better than to have the permission of the two parties to let the people of the Yukon know what is going on, but I think it is fair to say, at the same time, that the Commissioner alluded to the fact that this began five years ago and I think the Honourable Member from Kluane, at that time, was on the Executive and here we are, still in a state of not knowing exactly where we are going and we do not know exactly what the federal policy is.

All I can do is assure Honourable Members, once we find out exactly what is taking place, we are going to do everything we can to inform the public and, hopefully, get the necessary debate and public input that is so crucial on this subject, because it is important to all Yukoners and it is going to be important for many years to come.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is very correct. In 1974, I was on the Executive Committee when the Land Claims Secretariat was set up and, at that time, we got funding. In fact, I think they paid for the whole shot, originally.

But, the Land Claims Secretariat developed a Yukon position, which was tabled in the Legislature, which was debatable, which could be talked about in public, but at the present time, we do not see anything from the Land Claims Secretariat, which gives us a Yukon position.

I think this is the point that the Honourable Member from Ogilvie is taking.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, two things I would like to comment on: first of all, I will certainly take note of the Honourable Member from Ogilvie's concern that she could not get the documents released by the Planning Council and I can assure her that all she need to do is call me and I would have made sure she would have had those papers. There is no problem whatsoever.

Secondly, I would like to assure the Honourable Member from Kluane that we have not deviated from the position established by the Legislature previously and we still represent those views, as outlined in the Opening Address and as outlined, and reflected I hope, in the goals and objectives agreed to at the Planning Council.

Those are indeed policies that were acceptable and accepted by this Legislature in 1974.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not mean to say that I had trouble getting the papers. I got them soon after they were published, right from the Federal Land Claims people, but I knew where to go.

What I am saying is that if we are paying the Land Claims Secretariat to do some work, some of their work could be

informing the people in the Legislature and informing the other Yukoners who should know what those four papers say and what is the Territory's stand.

They just seem to operate completely incommunicado with the rest of the Yukon and we are paying for it and that is my objection. It is just simply that I have some connections that I do get the information, but my connections certainly are not with the Land Claims Secretariat. I do not even know who is on it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, just let me point out that the Land Claims Secretariat is strictly an administrative research group within the Government.

In respect to getting the information and this type of thing, I think it would be the responsibility of the Member to approach either the Commissioner or one of the elected Members on Executive Committee and the information would be forthcoming. In respect to whenever we can, I would suggest that informing the public of what is going is the responsibility of the Executive. Until such time, as I said earlier, we can get some concurrence from the other two parties involved, we would like nothing better than to inform the people of what is going on so that we can get people to put their views forward.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, with respect, that is rather an opting out, that is a poor excuse. That Document 4, was made public in July of 1977 and none of the Members received copies. The Government did not have the courtesy to put them in an envelope and send them to the Members and say this is Document 4 from the Yukon Land Claim Negotiations. In fact, I read about it in a report from Ottawa and started searching back. I asked the question in the Legislature before Christmas and I got a reply after Christmas. By that time I discovered it myself and had to go and ask for the papers. I think that it is up to the Executive Committee to make sure that any of these documents that are public are sent to the Members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that was obviously an oversight on our part and the next time anything is made public, I am sure that I have the concurrence of my colleagues that the information will be sent forthwith to the Members.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, the Member from Kluane made my point. I was just going to ask, I would think that if it should be certainly the responsibility of the Executive Committee to get that material to the elected Members.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly my point that I wanted to make. There was absolutely nothing up to now volunteered that came out of this particular department, whether it the responsibility of the Executive Committee and Mr. Commissioner's Office. The point is, unless we ask for information from this particular department, we do not receive any. This is the very curious part about it. The taxpayers of the Yukon are paying for this thing and the people of the Yukon are the last to find out what this department is actually doing. They usually find out either from the Indian side itself or from the Department of Northern Affairs.

Ms Millard: I am curious since we talk about research so flipantly and everything, how do these people do their research? Do they have people seconded from other departments or do they have a budget where they can go out and hire people who are not in the government to do research for them, to do statistics and data and stuff to be presented to them, or do these three people just operate completely alone?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, they do both of the things that the Honourable Member mentioned. They have a modest sum of \$14,000 or \$15,000 in Primary 20 for Professional and Special Services. I believe it fair to say that most of

the expenditures under that Primary go to obtain competent legal advice on issues relating to land claims. They also work very closely with the Departments on particular fields, for example if there was a question about education or wildlife or local government and this type of thing, then they work with the departments involved in developing positions and highlighting questions that should be asked and should be considered if they are brought up at the land claims.

Ms Millard: Just pursuing that, would it be possible if they were investigating, for instance, local government structures or territorial government structures, which I believe should be coming up fairly quickly, would they be using any of the Legislature's capabilities for forming their opinion from the Territorial Government on, for instance, government structures?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly we have not excluded that at all. We, in fact, have been stressing that the consideration of local government, and we call it government structures, which means government at all levels, should be something to be considered at the working table.

In fact, we were instrumental in sort of putting this forward, but, unfortunately, it has not really gone anywhere at this stage and it does look now like the Planning Council is not going to be the procedure followed in the future, so, I cannot guarantee that indeed we will be continuing on in that vein, in the near term.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just a question with respect to the working of that Secretariat: I was just wondering, we had all known that the negotiations were being carried out on the basis of a co-operative planning process and then, all of a sudden, and this may just be in my own case and maybe it is my own fault that I am ignorant of what happened, but here we have a co-operative planning approach being used and that is the basis of the negotiations, so we are told, and then all of a sudden one day I read in the paper that the native people have said, no, it is no longer the way that we are going to carry on.

But we did not get anything from our people, from our own representatives, to tell us that they had, in fact, agreed to that. At least, I never received it, other than through a news media situation.

Now, I do not know if others are in the same situation or not, that may well be, but I certainly did not.

Where would that decision be made?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, with all respect, we did mention in the Opening Address that it appears, it appears, and I must stress this, we are not sure and I am not going to be the one to announce in this House that indeed the Planning Council has come to an end, because we do not know that yet. It simply appears and we have been getting the message the same way you have, from the news media, that something is brewing and that we will not know, truthfully, until we get back at the negotiating table or the Planning Council table, hopefully, some time this month.

Certainly, there will have to be and we will insist upon a communication to enlighten the people of Yukon, all of them, as to what is going to happen at that time. It is essential.

Mr. Lengerke: It was a fact, was it not, it was a fact that Mr. Naysmith has already indicated that this has come to an end? You know, how can he make statements like that and not let you know?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I have seen nothing from Dr. Naysmith that says the Planning Council is over.

Mr. Lengerke: The process, the co-operative process,

Mr. Chairman: The co-operative planning process has come to an end, is what I would say.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, again, I may have missed that statement, but I have had nothing that says in black and white, definitely, the Planning Council process is over.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, since we are on this subject of land claims, just a question of interest, I am always left with the impression that the final decision is going to be made right here in this Legislature. I mean the government, the negotiators of the Territorial Government are going to sit in the negotiation process, hammer out an Agreement in Principle, and this is going to come to this Legislature. The question has always been in the back of my mind, what would happen if the Legislators of this Territory decided not to accept this Agreement in Principle? What would happen then, since we had absolutely no input into the thing.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions? Any further discussion on land claims?

Establishment 225, Land Claims, \$83,300.

Establishment 225 agreed to

On Establishment 240

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 240, Public Inquiries, \$100.

Establishment 240 agreed to

On Establishment 250

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 250, Plebiscites, \$100. Any discussion on Plebiscites?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of interest, I would direct a question to anyone on the Executive Committee that can answer it. Has there indeed, up to this point, been any requests from the public or any group in the Yukon for a plebiscite at the next election?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, no.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, under 250 and under Public Inquiries, under 250 then, we have \$100 or is it \$10?

Mr. Chairman: No, \$100.

Mrs. Watson: We have \$100. Would it be possible then for under the *Yukon Act* for a Member to bring in a Resolution or even a Private Member's Bill requesting that a plebiscite be set up. Would that be considered a money bill since there is money appropriated already if it does not come from the Government?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I understand that only the Government can bring in a money bill so if there was such a presentation, it should come through the Government, but certainly, I am sure, the Government would have to answer for themselves whether they would accept or not. It would have to come through the Government.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Establishment 250 agreed to

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Before proceeding to Vote 3, I am wondering if Members might give attention to the information I have tabled in reply to the Honourable Member from Klondike, this morning, so that we might be able to pass Vote 1.

Mr. Chairman: Is that agreeable that we go back to Vote 1 and it was 110, Clerk of the Assembly, on page 14, \$369,100. We held that up, pending this information, which Mr. Taylor has just handed around.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the information I have circulated to Honourable Members, I might say that I have determined that there are approximately seven people, down in our Legislative section that will now be removed to the Executive Committee function, upon the split.

With the removal of these seven people, as you can see, there will be more than sufficient room for the four additional Members, plus any additional staff that may be required at that time. We will send the rest up to visit with Mr. Commissioner and his colleagues on the Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion on 110?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, one further, I do not think it was related, the passage of Vote 1, however, I have the information that the Honourable Member from Klondike requested and I will have it circulated.

Establishment 110 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We stood over 200, so we will go on from there to Vote 3, Department of Education, on--

Yes, Mr. Commissioner, you may go.

Page 37. Is there any general discussion on the entire Vote, but not a particular question on individual items? This should take place when we are discussing Administration, so, this will be your opportunity to discuss the budget in general terms, but not on any particular item in the Vote.

We are on 300, Administration, a total of 1,177.6.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, in respect to Vote 3, I would just like to make a few comments in introduction to the Education budget.

The increase in this particular Vote has largely come across by the escalation in prices, the operation and maintenance of our facilities, as well as salary increases to the various employees that we have in the Department of Education from teachers to custodians to the administrators within the administration of the Department of Education.

I think it is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that within the Main Estimates is reflected the costs of the remedial tutor program as per the Ministerial Statement that I made here at the close of last session in the Fall.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that we have increased the administration of the Department of Education as per the comments that I made during the last budget Session. As I pointed out, we were not capable of performing and doing the necessary functions outlined by the present Legislation that is in place, and as I expressed at that time and I think a lot of the colleagues agreed with me at that time that we were not in a position to evaluate the teaching staff that we should be doing on an ongoing basis. With the advent of the dividing of the Yukon Territory into a north and south regional basis, as well as an Assistant Superintendent to work with the Regional Superintendent in the vicinity of Whitehorse Centre, we are finding that we were capable of doing the necessary evaluations, but at the same time it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, it is going to take some time to catch up, if you like, in order to do all the evaluations that are necessary. I feel that within the next couple of years we should be capable of doing an evaluation on an ongoing basis once we have managed to do the initial teachers that have been ' ' for a couple of years and then hopefully do the ones that... been here for a number of years in order to help strengthen the areas where there could be possible weaknesses in their classroom teaching positions.

Mr. Chairman, the Government, as I outlined last session was looking very actively at transferring man years from

within the government to one consolidated area within the administration of the Department of Education responsible in the manpower area. Since in the education area we have responsibility for the Vocational School, it was felt that we should look at the Government in total and just see what other people were involved in this particular area so we have transferred two man years under the auspices of the Department of Education to take responsibility in the manpower area which we are going to become more and more involved as times goes on.

At the same time, it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, Vote 3 reflects the costs of the teacher training program which appears to be going quite successfully this year and we are monitoring it very closely. I think it has been a plus for Yukon not only from the benefit of people having the opportunity of taking an accredited teacher training program, but at the same time, these people that are coming up as professors are working with the teachers as well to strengthen their professional development. I think it is accomplishing a couple of things in the area of teacher training.

It think it should be pointed out also, Mr. Chairman, that we are looking at offering more university courses, accredited, in Watson Lake. Since we do have a working arrangement, as Members know, with the University of Alberta and Watson Lake is on the way of our transportation corridor to Edmonton by our airlines, subsequently we feel that we can work out an arrangement with Watson Lake and give them some of the university programs. It is going to be interesting to see how it works out, but it appears to be gaining some favourable comments from the people in Watson Lake.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, one of the major areas that we have taken over that is reflected in the budget is we have taken over the area of recruitment from the Public Service Commission. At one time, it should be noted, that the recruitment of the teaching staff, was in the Department of Education, then, subsequently, transferred to the Public Service Commission, and now it is back to us again.

It was felt that with the regionalization of the outlying areas in, with various people responsible for the outlying areas as well as within Whitehorse, it was felt that we should take it on, because the regional superintendents are the ones that are working on a day-to-day basis with the teaching staff.

So, subsequently, we have agreed with the Public Service Commission to take on this responsibility. It should be pointed out that it is a new man year, but the Public Service Commissioner has pointed out to me in no uncertain terms that even if it was not transferred to us, that, in view of the workload that they have within the Government, they would be required to increase their man years.

So, they felt that, with a clerk typist working with the departmental staff within the Department, that we could accomplish the job and, at the same time, it would not require the individual that they would have to hire, which would be a personnel officer. So, they feel that we can do it for the cost that would accrue to us less than when it would cost the Public Service Commission if they were to retain the recruitment to function within their Department.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that the Public Service Commission still has the ultimate responsibility for recruitment.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I should be pointing out that the student accommodation Section 309, does require one more man year and it is reflected as a permanent man year as opposed to last year, which was casual. The reason for this was with the negotiations with the Civil Service Union, it was

felt that the individual who is involved in this capacity should be a permanent man year. So, it reflects an increase in this particular area.

The post-secondary grants and bursaries are as outlined in the previous year, Mr. Chairman. I am proposing to bring legislation forth that, after our deliberations of the Main Estimates, to increasing the grants allocated to the post-secondary students.

We have not reflected it in the Main Estimates, largely because I think it would be presumptuous of us to do that, I think, because it requires legislative change. So that legislation will be tabled at the end of the Session for Members' deliberation, once we have discussed and finished our deliberations of the Main Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, with those remarks, it is, I think it quickly capsulizes the monies expended in this area and I think it accurately reflects the costs accruing to this Government, on the Operation and Maintenance side, as the fuel and energy prices increase.

People sometimes do not realize that when the costs of your light bill goes up three or four or five dollars a month due to increases, it affects various departments similar to the Department of Education, maybe in the area of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It makes it very difficult, trying to set priorities and this kind of a thing, with the ever escalating costs and the inflation that we are experiencing at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Any general discussion on this Vote?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how general a question this is. It is kind of general. I would like to know if I could have the figures as to what charges we have against the Federal Government in terms of wards of the Federal Government, that is for pupil costs, the annual per pupil cost. Are these figures available? Would it be too difficult to get them? I would like to know just what this amounts to to date within this fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member would look to page 69, I think it outlines our recoveries from the Federal Government, which in the area of \$1.5 million.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what it costs the Government of the Yukon on a per pupil basis to provide the education facilities, curriculum and everything to the student. But I do not see it here under Recoveries. I looked at Recoveries before I asked the question. I see student accommodation, I see student transportation, but I do not see anywhere where, for instance, we charge the Federal Government per pupil for wards of the Federal Government and this type of thing. Where do we charge the Government of Canada for educating wards of that Government?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it depends on your definition of wards to the Federal Government, but if one looks through the Recoveries outlined on page 69 as referred to earlier, the various, for an example, the dormitory fees, we collect some monies from the Federal Government. If you look at the rehabilitation services, the use of our facilities, we collect some monies through cost-shared arrangements with the Federal Government. It is inter-related with the various recoveries as outlined on page 69. If the Honourable Member is referring to the differentiations by race or whatever in respect to the students going to our facilities, we have no formal agreement with the Federal Government. At one time there was, I think it was outlined in Motion Number 15, they replied to that very accurately and I think the Superintendent of Education should take a lot of credit for the research that

was done on that particular paper because I think it outlines the background very well.

As far as breaking it out per pupil, we have not done that with the budget. I know that we tabled some documents to that extent, the cost as it relates directly to the education administered by the Yukon Territory to all students per school on a per pupil basis, I believe a couple of years ago. I do not know if it would be worthwhile to go through that exercise again because no questions were raised in respect to that breakdown that was put forth to Members.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, what I am really getting at, is the old burning question that I raise every time a budget comes around and that is that I am distressed, very deeply distressed, at the way the Federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development constantly tell the people of Canada what a great break they are giving the people of Yukon, inasmuch as look at what we are giving them in this great big deficit grant. These people cannot stand on their own financial feet. We have to give them a deficit grant.

What we are trying to arrive at here is just one aspect of the deficit grant, where we do have a direct charge against the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman.

As I say, I do not know what it costs or what it is assumed to cost to educate a child in this Territory. I know that it is a very substantial sum, but I do know that students who are the sons or daughters of Federal Government employees are paid for by the Federal Government. I do know that native people, under the *Indian Act*, as wards of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, are paid for from that Department. I do know that, in other areas of other Federal Government departments, somehow an arrangement is made, we have made a charge to that government for services which we have, as a government, rendered to their government.

Now, what I am getting at is, how much of the deficit grant can be attributed to this legitimate charge in the field of Education? I know there are other fields, and so that perhaps, at some point, going through this budget, we may extract from the total amount of the deficit grant, the amounts of money actually owing by the Federal Government, by Canada and its various departments to this Government, then we will find out what is left and find out what really we are getting for a deficit grant.

That is what I am trying to arrive at.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I do know that the exercises gone through last year in respect to attempting to find out how many status Indians who are eligible under the *Indian Act*, I think we came up with a figure, if my memory serves me correctly, of approximately 660 students between kindergarten and grade twelve, which was rather interesting, because I had the feeling that there could have been more than that, but that was the figure that we came up with.

I guess it would be a case, Mr. Chairman, of, in that respect, is to divide just what the Administration and the costs of running the facilities are and the cost of the teaching staff as well as custodians, and then dividing by a certain percentage of the school population as is presently in the school system now.

Presently, the number of students in the school system number approximately 5,200 students, from kindergarten to grade twelve.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can just clarify what I think Mr. Taylor is looking for.

Some years ago, there used to be a thing called a non-

residential school fee that used to be payable by the Federal Government to provinces, and I suppose, in the Yukon.

That thing does not exist, it has not existed for at least four years that I am aware of, maybe longer.

People in Yukon, who live in Yukon are residents of Yukon and their children's costs are not broken out separately, they are just paid for in the normal manner.

Now, in the case of the natives, maybe we could make some case to the fact that maybe a separate kind of grant could be, you know, could be advanced, but I don't think so.

I think they are just students like anyone else and, as far as per student cost, as Mr. Lang pointed out, it is simply taking the budget and dividing by the number of students we have and we have a per student cost.

But I do not think you could separate it and say that part of that cost is Federal, as opposed to Territorial.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, the people of the Yukon Territory pay and are levied upon them a school tax for this purpose, but this tax is not imposed upon the Federal Government, to my knowledge and it has always been my understanding that a charge was levied against the Federal Government for the education of the students under their control, shall we say, or their responsibility.

Am I to understand then that only the people of the Yukon Territory who are non-federal or non-federal responsibility, they pay the tax and pay the shot for everybody and the Federal Government pays nothing.

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. As I alluded to earlier, it dates back to 1968 I believe when the final agreement with Ottawa, the formal agreement on education came to an end. As the Treasurer has outlined, we feel we have a responsibility to all students in Yukon and have pursued the financial negotiations with IGC along those lines.

As far as the property taxes of Federal Government employees in Federal housing, the Federal Government pays a grant in lieu of taxes, I believe for the land that they are utilizing. Subsequently, the Territorial Government does accrue some taxes or the municipality, I should say, accrues taxes for the land and the assessment of that land.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, Motion 15 very, very explicitly explains the financial arrangements that have been carried on over the years with the Government of the Yukon and the Department of Indian Affairs. It deals specifically because this is a question that Mr. Fleming asked, the Member from Hootalinqua. Since the Government of Canada has a responsibility to provide education for status Indian children in the years past they used to have a formal agreement where they did pay so much and they paid a certain percentage of every school that was built. But that has been eliminated and the Territorial Government agreed to provide education for Indian children and got the funding through the deficit grant.

I think the Honourable Member from Watson Lake has a very good point that education of status Indian people is a Federal Department, and if it were identified, it would also show that it should not be part of a deficit grant, that this is a responsibility of the Federal Government and is not a debt that we should be making on behalf of those children.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on school committees. I am very, very concerned about school committees and I am, not proud, but I thought that the school committee structure was in the *School Ordinance* at the time it was put in, would, to a certain degree, provide a structure whereby parents, members of the community at large, would be able to have

some input and some direction in the operation of the school within their community.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe this would be a forerunner eventually to some day where the control of the operation of schools would go to the people of the community. I have had some not too good a feedback from some school committees. They feel, and I feel in many instances, that they are looked upon completely as advisory bodies. Now before the *School Ordinance* was amended, we did have advisory bodies and that is all they were, advisory bodies.

But under the existing *School Ordinance*, these school committees do have the right to make some very firm recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, in some instances and in quite a number of them, the school committees are being by-passed and the school committees are becoming very, very frustrated. Almost all of the time, if the school committee had some problem with the curriculum, some problem with the way the school is being operated, some problem with the structure itself, they make a recommendation, the principal of the school or the school makes a recommendation, the department invariably supports the school and does not.

I know of instances where they just completely by-passed the school committee and you are getting people who are saying what is the point of serving on the school committee and we are destroying the very thing that we want a school committee there for.

Unfortunately, the political route is the route that some staff are using and some departmental people, mostly staff, and instead of going through the school committee route, some staff are choosing to go through the student route and getting the political support before they go to the school committee.

This is something that people get very, very concerned about. They do not want their children to be asked if they want a course. They do not want their children to be asked if they want a couple of days off school to go on some trip. They do not want their children to be asked. They would like this referred to the school committee. Let the school committee and each individual parent deal with that situation at home.

But to go directly to the students, grade fours and threes and fives, and try to get the support of those people and then say to the school committee, it does not matter what you say anyway, everybody wants it, now what are you going to do.

It is a very dangerous, undermining, and it is deliberate, on the part of some people, quite deliberate. And the Department is falling in line with it.

If you want school committees to remain in the Yukon Territory, and I should not say this because I know that when you say staff, everyone immediately thinks and it is only in a few instances and it always spoils the whole concept, and departmental people and not all again, but that is what will destroy the school committee concept and we need that input, we need parental involvement, because many of the people who are serving on school committees are very conscientious. They feel that, in fact, there is an opportunity to have some input, and, you know, quite often they are being told by staff, you know, you are just advisory and all I have to do is consult with you.

You know, after all, some of them pay the bills and if you want to destroy the concept of school committees, the concept of people having some input, just do this, because there are more and more of them saying, never run for it again, they can have it, they can shove it, this type of thing. It is bitter.

I am drawing it to the attention of the Minister and I am drawing it to the attention of the Members because I am sure that they have had instances of the same type of thing within their own communities. It is the same thing we have heard quite often before. The school committees are there, you have an opportunity to overcome it. For goodness sakes, use them.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the Member has raised some points which I will take under advisement and talk with my officials. I have made commitments in this House as well as public statements in other forms that I am very concerned about the parental involvement in the school system and I think it is vitally important that they do play a large part in respect to the direction of the various schools that their children are attending.

I just want to further add, Mr. Chairman, that, and I realize that it would be inappropriate, in all likelihood, to raise certain instances in the House, but if people do, Members do come across this, please contact me personally, because I am prepared to take the necessary action. I feel very strongly as obviously the Honourable Member from Kluane does, that the parent should be involved in the school system and they should not be getting disillusioned due to the fact that they possibly may be ignored in specific instances. I think it can be corrected, so hopefully we will have a later conversation with the Honourable Member and possibly resolve the problems in her particular area.

Mr. Chairman: Any other general discussion? This got into a particular section. Perhaps if there is no more general discussion, we can get into..

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, generally I would like the information for us for tomorrow, while we go into more detail in education, I would like to have a breakdown of the student enrollment of each school in the Territory and the staffing in each school. I would like a comparison with last year and I know that these sheets are readily available. If a per capita cost has been worked out for 1976, if we could have it, per capita costs per student in the Yukon, that would be most helpful, and the pupil-teacher ratio staffing formula that is used, whether it has been changed or whether it is the same one that has been used in the past.

I have a couple of general questions I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if I might.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if they are general questions.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the department has any policy or it has done any planning for establishing vocational schools or small vocational schools or training centres in any of the areas outside of Whitehorse? In reading over the Shakwak Project and the Lysyk Inquiry, it indicates that there is a need, both of them indicate that there is a need for expanding the vocational training facilities in the Yukon and of course we were told that they could be accommodated in the F.H. Collins. Well, I think here we have an opportunity and I wonder whether the Minister has any remarks to make in this regard and whether the departments have been doing any planning of expansion of the Vocational School?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in reference to the question about the teacher-pupil formula, that I should point out that it is the same one that has been in operation as in the past.

At the same time, I should point out that my officials are reviewing it and, hopefully, there should be something coming up to me in the next couple of months in that particular area.

In respect to the information on the number of students attending a school, I can have that first thing in the morning for Members. In a per capita breakdown, I think that we would have to do some work in that particular area. I do not think we have it right at the fingertips and, possibly I am at fault, Mr. Chairman, but I do recall very vividly tabling that information, I think approximately two years ago and nobody ever raised a question on it so I did not feel that it was that important that the exercise should be done again, but I will do that, take an undertaking to have that cost-breakdown for Members.

In respect to the Vocational School, we are looking at the concept of satellite training units, possibly, in the outlying communities. It is right in a planning stage. I cannot elaborate any further, than what I have said already because with the advent of the pipeline and the, and now with the Canada Pipeline Advisory Council coming to Whitehorse here, I believe, on March 15th, it may give us a better indication of the various programs that they carry or they would maybe cost-share with the Government to see that adequate training programs are available.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, the Vocational School, at the present time, is utilized to the maximum at the present time, and we are making use of some other facilities within Whitehorse as a satellite training program for some of the, I believe it is a diesel mechanic's course, but we are actively pursuing the concept of satellite training for the outlying communities.

I would like to think that we could possibly get something into place, or at least a plan that can be agreed upon, and present it during, not this budget session, the following budget session, to put something into play for the outlying communities, but it is going to depend upon the finances that are available.

Mr. Chairman: Now, I think we can confine our discussion from now on to 300, Administration and the detail of it is on page 38.

Any discussion on Administration, 300? A total of \$1,177,600 dollars.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a few things that should be pointed out in respect to the man years accounted for in Administration 13. I related earlier in my remarks that we have consolidated the various employees in the Government into one area, which would come under the Manpower Co-ordinator's section of the Administration 3 and 300.

I should point out that we are trying to consolidate this whole area into one wing of the Government so that we can monitor the job creation put forth by the Federal Government, we can be involved with the Federal Government in their various programs that they are coming forth, so that they do not distort the priorities as set by the government and in turn by the Legislature here.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that there was an increase of three man years within the Administration, we found that we were weak in the area of accounting. We have increased a man year there and, at the same time, the advent of the recruitment coming to the administration of the Department of Education has forced an increase of a man year in that particular area.

Mrs. Watson: Where?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Under recruitment as specifically pointed out in the Vote 300 as outlined in the budget.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, it was so long ago, I have been thinking about so many other things. It was a question in

the funding by Indian Affairs and I am still not clear of that myself and several of us have been asking a question forever on it and I do not think it really is clear. What bothers me is that every province has an agreement with the Department of Indian Affairs for teaching native children and I cannot understand why the Territory does not have one. If it is not clearly marked, I do not know why it has not been before this because so many people have been trying to get that estimate of funds. If it is not clear, then the deficit, if somebody is just saying oh, it is in the deficit grant, then we are really losing out, because we should be knowing exactly what is in the deficit grant so we can make it smaller if possible. I cannot understand why there is such a vague area there.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a major policy change in respect to the education as delivered by YTG to all students, and the Honourable Member from Kluane referred to the substance that is in response to Motion number 15 put forward by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua. We are attempting to deliver the education programs to all students and not differentiating by race. Now whether it is the request of this House or not is another story altogether. Possibly we should be looking at it. I do know that many of the provinces do that to go to recoveries to the Federal Government for finances in that area.

It is a very complicated area as you well know when you start differentiating the students if one is status, as opposed to non-status, as opposed to white, and as opposed to Chinese. It would be a very difficult exercise, but I personally believe that on the long term, we are probably better off with the format that we are following, but I can understand the Honourable Member's question in view of the Federal Government's present philosophy of divide and conquer. It is putting us in a very difficult position as a Territorial Government and hopefully some day their policy will come clear whatever that policy is.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that education of native children is the responsibility under the *Indian Act* through the Department of Indian Affairs and they cannot just not do it. They have to do it. That is why we have such difficulty accepting the fact that you do not know how much it is. A federal act supersedes anything you are going to do anyway, we have to have that money. It seems to me that it is constitutionally very important if we know what percentage of the deficit grant is for Indian Affairs education. If we could include that under our own department of Education territorially, legally, that is all the better in all ways. I cannot understand, we always seem to get to the end of the line without ever having that answered.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to refer the Honourable Member back to the response that was given to Motion Number 15. It clearly outlined the steps and the procedures that have been followed in years past and I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, it was 1968 when the last formal agreement between Canada and the Yukon Territorial Government came to an end. Then, subsequently, all children were to be treated on the same basis and it would be simply a financial negotiation between IGC, Canada and ourselves, in respect to the necessary funding for the Department of Education.

That is why there is no breakdown at the present time, Mr. Chairman, because we have not, as of today at any rate, pursued the breakdown by per pupil costs to the Federal Government.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in that Motion Number 15, it was asked that the governments get together and formulate a policy, so we all know where we should

stand.

I stand again, and I am not going to hold up this budget or anything, because we are too long talking about it now, we cannot do anything about it, the fact remains that we are being ripped off, as far as I am concerned, by the Federal Government.

I might just go a little farther, if I may, then just in this area of Education, because the same principle is being applied in Health Services, for instance, they are paying some, but they are slipping out of a lot of that. As I mentioned, asked in another question here, that was very poorly answered, in the area of compensation, where the private sector is even being ripped off and I say that again, and we are being ripped off the same way here, because we had a policy and we knew exactly what was to be paid by the Federal Government, which is their responsibility in the *Indian Act*, then that deficit grant would be quite a different picture. Whether we like to go that way or do not like to go that way, it is a fact of life that it is their responsibility and they should pay the bill that way and then the deficit grant should be given to us in whatever way it is necessary. I would like to see the two of them split up so we know where we are at.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman is certainly well aware of how slowly governments react and I can recall and I am sure he can, when Indian children were not, they went to Indian schools, they had separate schools in the Yukon Territory. They did not attend the public schools, they went to residential schools. They were Indian schools.

So then you went to the policy of integration and it gradually took quite a while to get to the integration of our school system and whether the Federal Government did not have to pay thirty per cent of a school, depended on what population of the children attending the school were Indian school and that is the kind of agreement we used to have.

The agreement also used to pay so much per student and we went to integration. We just nicely got into integration, everything, everybody is all the same and the Federal Government does not even consider and, under the *Indian Act*, they can make arrangements with some other agency to carry on the education of Indian children, so they are really not contravening the *Indian Act*, and now the demand is for the other way back again.

So, they will get there, they are just slow.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make one comment to what the Honourable Member has just said, is that we seem to be going in a circle and we are about three-quarters of the way around and we are going to be right back to where we started here twenty years ago when I was going to school.

I can recall what took place in the education system in the Yukon and I saw the improvements, as a student going through this system, with the integration of the Indian people into the classroom, with the rest of the children that were attending the school system, and it seems a tragedy that we are going back the other way, but, obviously, as I said, the lack of policy by the Federal Government puts us in a very difficult position.

Personally, I am not an advocate of that. I have to be very honest, I do not think it to the benefit of the children and that is largely, I would like to think, our main concern. I think that it is fair to say that I would think my children could play with the kids across the street, whether they be black, red, purple or pink and take them as people, not on their ethnic backgrounds, but obviously I may be in a minority as far as the vocal politicians at the present time, but I think that I am a member of the majority as far as the Canadian people across

this nation are concerned.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, just one last word on another item that should be close to the Minister's heart. That is constitutional development. Both of us know that he and I are probably the most aggressive in this area sometimes. If the provincial governments have an agreement with the Federal Government to pay for Indian education, it is not included in anything they call a deficit grant or a provincial equalization grant. Yet we are allowing it to be part of our debt to the Federal Government. It is not the same in the provinces, it is completely treated separately and certainly that is not coming around to the old days and the bad things and treating Indians differently because they are Indian. It is only being realistic and saying this is how much money it is costing us and we do not owe the Federal Government anything for it. They are the ones who want responsibility for Indian education, and I would like to know how much it is and so would a lot of people, but the reasons I would like to know are constitutional.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will take that up with the Treasury Department. I have expressed the same view at various times in looking as the Treasurer well knows, and I am prepared to do the financial, get the financial analysis done in this area to maybe give us an outline of just exactly what the costs are. I do not think it would take that much work in view of the work that was done last year of the number of students attending our education facilities as far as being beneficiaries under the *Indian Act* and maybe give you an idea. All I can say is I cannot have those figures for you tomorrow, it is going to take some time and as the Honourable Member from Kluane alluded to a little earlier, she said the government is slow to react as time goes on. Possibly that policy should be changed, I do not know, but I will get the necessary information in a time frame that hopefully is compatible to all Members, but I cannot get it tomorrow.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, we would be grateful, it has only been three and a half years already that we have been asking this question.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct one thing, and I do not recall in the whole time that I have had this position that I have had the direct question put to me as per the Honourable Member for an outline of the direct costs as it relates to the beneficiaries under the *Indian Act*.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification, I think the Minister answered it earlier. How many students have you got in Yukon and how many are native children? Do you know that figure?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will have to give you the figures from my memory. We have approximately, I believe 5,200 students in the system at the present time from kindergarten to grade twelve. If I recall correctly last year there was a survey done on the request of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and I believe the figure was 660 status Indian children as outlined per the *Indian Act*. So, roughly, you are looking at less than ten per cent, maybe eight per cent.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, until very, very recently, the cost-sharing arrangements that Canada had with some of the provinces were not very generous as far as the provinces were concerned for the amount of money they paid for the education of Indian children, and, in fact, the Province of British Columbia never did collect for Indian children that attended the public schools. They never did collect until 1973.

So, I do not think the formula that Indian Affairs uses for cost-sharing, or used to use, are very, would give us very much money anyway.

Mr. Sherlock: I was just going to add to what Mrs. Watson said. I think she is quite correct. The last agreements that I say in Alberta, in British Columbia, within the last three or four years, were not, definitely were not in favour of the provinces, they were the other way around.

The provinces had to add money to them. There are probably three parts to this. The question raised initially by Mr. Taylor, for, he called them Federal wards, I think. Okay, that probably includes two people, that is the people who are children of Federal employees who are reimbursed by a grant situation. We get a grant through property taxes in lieu of people living in federal buildings, as Mr. Lang pointed out.

In the case of the native children, there used to be an agreement with the provinces, and I think they still have this agreement, a special and separate agreement, for paying so much per student for student costs. We do not have that, it is included in our regular funding with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

If you went back to that system, you would end up having to go to another agreement. You probably would not get the required amount of money, so you would still have to subsidize it and you would end up getting the same money from the same departments that you are now getting.

So, constitutionally, I can see what Ms Millard is getting at. Constitutionally you would probably separate the deficit grant between a recovery and deficit grant, but you would not get any additional money, at least as I see it.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, from what the witness has said and I would probably presume that the way we have it now, even though we do not like it and if it happens to carry on this way, that when the bombshell falls and the land claims are settled and everything drops on us, we would not see much change in the picture at all, because we are paying the bill right now, actually.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 300?

Mrs. Watson: Again, under Administration, the Minister stated that they were, they have the two regional superintendents now. I wonder whether the Department of Education is giving consideration to moving the rural superintendents to the regions that they serve and moving them out of Whitehorse to headquarter them in these regions?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not at the present time, Mr. Chairman. It is felt that they are covering a very large area. This is why we have done it north and south, so that Whitehorse is the point where they can go out of and we feel that it is very important that they have a, at least on a weekly or bi-weekly, depending on their timeframe, time to spend within the Department itself so that the Department knows what the left hand is doing, as opposed to the right hand.

I think it could be a very difficult situation if we were to separate it into other communities, at the present time. I think maybe some thought could be given to that in a couple of years from now, but we did take that into consideration when the decision was made to separate the northern and southern part of the Yukon into two regions.

It was just felt by the officials in my department for continuity and for liaison with the department, it is essential that these people be close to Whitehorse so that they can liaise with the departmental officials and be on a constant basis discussing problems with the department. The problem that they thought could occur is that if an individual was centred in another place of residence, other than Whitehorse, in view of the fact the Department is set up in the manner it is at the present time, as opposed to school boards, we could get problems where the one regional superintendent does not

realize what is going on in the department and could get a conflict if we do not have the necessary consultation going on a relatively daily basis.

Mr. Berger: On the same subject, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why the situation should change in two years down the line. We are going to have the same problems continuously. I think the Honourable Member from Kluane has a valid point and I would say that the regional superintendent would get a much clearer picture of the problems in those areas. Right now they go into the community stay there for a couple of days and they are gone again. They really do not know what goes on. They really personally do not know the feelings of those people in the communities, and I think it would be much, much better if they would live there.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I really do too. Every time we ask this we get some excuse and we are going to be looking at it down the line and we just never seem to get them out of Whitehorse. It is just like pulling teeth. I would like to see it tried with one anyway. I think that there might be advantages there that the departmental and the people involved themselves have never even realized. As Fred says, they are going to get to know the people and they are going to get away from the departmental syndrome. Sometimes you do not see the forest for the trees, and they have policies within the department that stand in the way from them solving their problems within the region. It is just mouth service really that we are getting, and I can understand people have their homes, they have families and they have friends and this type of thing, they do not want to move. That is basically the reason. They do not want to live out in the sticks. That is the basic reason, but somebody has to live out there, we do and we are not that bad. So I would really like to see that something be done about it, try one, just like pushing in the water, it is not so bad once you get in.

Ms Millard: Yes, I just have to add my voice to this because every opportunity we get, I think we have to really stress that Whitehorse is expanding, expanding, they are going to get everything and places like Dawson are closing, are getting smaller. Clinton Creek is closing, it is going to affect Dawson and the Territorial Government is doing nothing about it. These arguments will certainly come out in the decentralization paper, because I think it is absolutely essential that this government start looking at the Yukon as a whole and that means the outlying areas have to be taken seriously. It is not a joke that we want those people there, and it certainly would be much easier on the superintendents. I cannot understand why it has not been thought of before.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on 300?

They are looking at it as a whole, but the hole is Whitehorse.

Mrs. Watson: I have a different one, if Mr. Berger's is about the decentralization, fine, I just have another one.

Mr. Berger: No, Mr. Chairman, my question is on man power. I may be completely misunderstanding this new field we are getting into here, but I would like to know what power and what jurisdiction are we taking over here in manpower. My understanding is man power is a Federal jurisdiction and a Federal responsibility and right now it is a very strong department, as it seems.

What I am curious about is the Minister made a statement a couple of weeks ago, a week ago and said that all hiring for pipeline is going to be done in the South. Now, I can foresee the days where there is local contractors going to be looking for people to work on the possible sub-contracts on the pipeline project. Will those people have to go out to Van-

couver and Edmonton to hire people, which they require on the local level?

I mean these are the questions that are not answered at all and I think this has something to do with this mysterious Department of Manpower.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the decision, the political decision to go further into the area of manpower will have to be made by, after the next election, by the people that sit in the Legislature at that time.

I made it very clear that what we are trying to do is to the people within the Government at the present time, over the last three or four years, to try to put them into one area so that we know what they are doing and this is what we have done, in this particular Vote 300, to attempt to bring into one area the people that have been dealing in the area of manpower and the reason, as I stated earlier, was specifically because, in the Department of Education, we are responsible for the Vocational School, which is under the Adult Occupational Training Agreement, with Ottawa.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is a case where we are attempting to bring all these concerns together within the Department. As I spoke earlier this morning, in a ministerial statement about the Yukon labour council that has been brought together in the past year, it was largely on the initiative of this Government to try to bring the various industry, labour and government together so that we can look at the overall concerns, the long-term concerns for the Yukon, in view of the training programs that we are offering at the present time, and obviously looking at possibly changing, modifying some of them or possibly adding thereto.

It is trying to get industry involved, as well as labour involved and government involved together so that we can do some long-term planning and take the necessary steps that are going to have to be necessary in the future, in view of the economic situation, as it develops, in the next five to ten years.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we realize that we have to get involved in a more direct way than we have in the past. I think it is fair to say, and I think that some of the Honourable Members have come to see me personally, in respect to the various job creation programs that have been put out by the Federal Government, going into a community and then, subsequently, starting a program and leaving it.

I happen to have had the opportunity of meeting Mr. Cullen here not too long ago and he has made the commitment that the various provincial governments and territorial governments, if they want, if they want to get involved, at least on a peripheral manner, with these various programs offered by the Federal Government, that we can give the directions to how that money is spent.

In other words, so it does not distort the priorities of this Government, and the monies that are voted here so that two or three years down the road that we are required to pick up a program that they have initiated without us really being a part of it.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have a responsibility to the people of the Yukon to ensure that the training facilities and programs are adequate to meet the development that is going to be forthcoming. We have taken the initiative as a Government with Canada Manpower, working with Canada Manpower, to do an inventory of the people that are interested in working the pipeline and the skills that they have for working with Manpower and we will be working with the unions at a later date to compile all the information they have and that we have so we can see where

we are going in respect to the training programs.

We are working, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, with Foothills who is going to be starting a program similar to the Nortran Program, which is going to supply the necessary jobs that will be available after the pipeline has been constructed on a permanent basis to get Yukoners involved in this area. So there are a lot of things that are taking place, Mr. Chairman.

We have been working on a pipeline manpower delivery system with the Canada Manpower to ensure that it is a delivery system that will be set up that is not going to be a major bureaucracy. We are trying to keep the numbers of people that will be coming in at the Federal level down to a minimum so that it does not come in, as I explained earlier to Members, in the area of housing, so our requirements are that much more, if we get that many more civil servants.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas that we are looking at to try to see whether or not we could streamline them in consultation with the Canada Manpower. I think one area that was very evident that was tabled in this House here approximately a year ago with a multiplicity of programs that were going to find people work. I believe there were 33 different programs offered by the various government agencies to find people work in the Yukon.

It is totally ridiculous, and I think it is a case where the YTG has to get with Canada Manpower, but we have a very good working relationship with to try to sort these out so that we have a common base and we are not duplicating efforts and this kind of a thing. There is a lot of work in this area, Mr. Chairman. I feel quite strongly that it is an area that we have to be interested in or else we are going to be caught behind the eight ball again and largely attributed to the fact that we are offering the training programs. We are the agent that is responsible, so therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have any choice in view of what is taking place that we must become involved and it is an area that I feel quite strongly that we should be more involved and attempting to direct the priorities for the long term future of the Yukon.

It should be directed by Members that are elected in this House and not by civil servants at a regional basis.

Ms Millard: I have a question on Miscellaneous, 99, \$25,000 under Evaluation of Curriculum I presume.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that applies to the curriculum development that is an ongoing program within the department. This year we published "How to be a Placer Miner", as well we worked on a various flash cards and alphabet cards that are utilized in the schools using pictures of northern animals and this kind of thing in the schools, rather than taking them from southern Canada.

At the same time, we should point out, Mr. Chairman, we have taken a different approach this year in respect to the monies available under this program. We have invited the teaching staff to submit applications for grants to develop teaching materials relevant to the Yukon.

The project has been developed in a response to requests by the school committees and the teaching staff for more relevant, what you term more relative teaching materials in the school and we are making an invitation to the professional teaching staff to take part in this.

The funding, at least this year, is put on a, in a manner of grants and there will be three grants at \$500, two at \$1,500, and one at \$4,000. A selection committee has been appointed, in consultation with the Yukon Teachers' Association. There will be, and the school committees. There will be two representatives from the Yukon Teachers' Association, two representatives by the Executive of School Committees, and two

representatives from the Department of Education.

We are trying to get the parental involvement, the teaching staff involvement, as well as the Department involvement, to look at various research programs that could be taking place and then subsequently brought into the Yukon curriculum, Yukon content into the basically B.C. curriculum within the school.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for his explanation on the man power, but he also made a statement that a decision is going to be made in this Legislature, but unless the Minister is coming forth with an explanation and with a paper explaining all those things and explaining to us those new departments being created, how can we make a decision on anything?

I mean, Mr. Commissioner made a statement, the same statement on land claim, the three people in land claims, that it is up the Legislature and so how can we make a decision if nobody tells us anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is the intention of my department to have two or three policy papers before this House within the next couple of weeks, in the area of manpower and then the Honourable Member can have the opportunity of speaking to them.

Mr. Berger: Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel those papers should have been here now, when we are discussing this thing in budget.

I mean, right now we are going to pass the budget for three man years for manpower co-ordinators.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman---

Mr. Berger: And the thing is we have no information on it. We do not know what we are talking about, really. We do not know the policy of any department, we do not know anything.

Now we are told we are going to get it in the next couple of weeks, so how can we pass those things?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, it is strictly a transfer from within the Department. They are people that have been involved in the area of manpower under one auspices, rather than divided throughout the Government. It is not, there are two man years that were voted last year in this particular area, Mr. Chairman, and all I am trying to do is to highlight them in the budget, rather than having them throughout the Government and I think it is wise that we are doing this to attempt to bring them into one area of the, one department in the Government so that we can have an idea of what is happening and then, subsequently, as the Honourable Member has said, that the necessary policy papers can be drafted and brought before the House.

And, if not, maybe even legislation, depending on the situation.

Mr. Berger: It is really informative what the Minister just said and told us, but, I mean, the thing is I am not blaming the Minister for what is happening. I mean, those things happen all the time in this Government structure.

I mean, now we come up with a budget for \$70 million or \$108 million, but we have not got the necessary information to make a wise decision yes or no.

I mean, we have to pull it, it is just like pulling teeth. I mean, unless we ask questions about those things, this Government never volunteers information and this is what I am angry at.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can see some of the concerns of some of the Members and, if in fact the Minister does have some papers ready to bring forward on the subject, I wish he would, before we get through with this

particular part of the budget.

I think it does a very meaningful bearing on what we are doing. You know, it could well be that what the Government has in mind is a policy and a job for these people is something that we would maybe want to ask that we have more people on staff, that I think the program should be intensified. I do not know but I think Honourable Members do raise a point. It is something to consider, certainly.

Ms Millard: Yes, I have to rise in agreement with the speakers before me that it is a very complex thing that has just been landed in our laps at five to five and I think we could have had the information to discuss more thoroughly before we came to this part of the budget but the thing that I am interested in is the evaluation curriculums section and the committee that apparently has been formed. It is my understanding that the people who are having most problems with the curriculum the way it is are the native people in Yukon because it has no relevance to them whatsoever.

Now, I want to know why there is no native person on that committee?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is quite conceivable that one of the members from the school committee could be native. All I can say is, in an earlier question that the Honourable Member raised in respect to the needs of the native students within the education system that my department is going to be meeting with them in the very near future, as I outlined the other day, just to see exactly what they are talking about in respect to their needs because when we get down to basically asking what is deficient in the school system, when you get down to the nuts and bolts of the situation, it is very hard to find out exactly what they want.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I was accused of nit-picking earlier when I asked for information, when I asked for the organizational chart of the Government, when I said possibly they could come forward with more information. We are looking at a \$70 million budget and that is the background information we have got and all of this pulling the manpower thing, you are using your manpower liaison officer and one other that was in your budget, if you had taken the time and had prepared it and had your sheet ready for us, it would have been there.

I think that it is absolutely ridiculous, we have to pick, pick, pick to try to get the information we want and if you had it ready when you came in with your budget, there would not be a necessity and you would not have to talk so much.

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Could we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege was raised by the Honourable Member for Klondike, concerning the participation of the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Riverdale in a motion on the green paper on Rent Stabilization, which took place during the 1977 Second Session.

The Committee of the Whole has agreed to refer this Question of Privilege to Mr. Speaker for a decision, after he has had an opportunity to review the relevant "Debates and Proceedings".

The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 3, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-'79*, and directed me

to report progress on the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted.

In relation to the question of privilege contained in the report relating to a former Session, I think that I would like to take this matter under advisement and I will be bringing back a decision in this regard in due course.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I move that we do now adjourn.

Ms Millard: I second it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that we do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

Adjourn