



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 5

10th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Thursday, March 9, 1978

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Thursday, March 9, 1978

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

We will proceed at this time with Morning Prayers.

Prayers

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and welcome the Grade 2 class from Selkirk Street School to our fair Chambers, accompanied by Mrs. Robb, their teacher.

Applause

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper. Are there any Documents for Tabling?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling the Science Council Canada Report, Number 26, August, 1977, Northward Looking, A Strategy in Science Policy for Northern Development.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a report by Mr. Jeff Carruthers, entitled "Probe Proposed to Help Settle Yukon Conflicts".

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

Reports of Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills?

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

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, moved by myself and seconded by the Member from Hootalinqua, that the R.M. Hardy and Associates report of the Yukon Territory Water Board, entitled "Requirements for Development of a Rehabilitation Plan, Clinton Creek Mine, Cassiar Asbestos Corporation", be tabled in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion or Resolution? Are there any Notices of Motion or Resolution?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Notice of Motion concerning mill rates for the 1978 taxation year.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Statements by Ministers?

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the Order Paper, I tabled a newspaper report entitled "Probe Proposed to Help Settle Yukon Conflicts" by Mr. Jeff Carruthers. Mr. Speaker, we are attempting to get formal approval by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to release the terms and conditions as were laid out to the Executive Committee. As of yet, we have not had that approval.

I should point out that the Government of the Yukon Territory has never breached a confidence when it was requested, and subsequently we are going to continue in that light. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the document that is tabled for all Members goes further than the terms and conditions that were outlined to the Executive Committee, and in my own personal opinion to the point that the constitutional review process has been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I think all Members should get a copy of this and have the opportunity of studying it because in our experience, at least the experience that the elected Members have had on this Executive Committee, when Mr. Jeff Carruthers

quotes a reliable source, we find that in most cases he is 95 per cent accurate.

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to express my appreciation to all Members of this House who gave me their permission to be absent for two days through your good office, Mr. Speaker, to attend the Federal-Provincial Conference of Ministers of Social Services in Ottawa, Monday and Tuesday. The reason that I felt justified in absents myself from this House during an important Budget Session was that because of our obstinacy in refusing to become part of federal delegations to such federal-provincial conferences, sitting with government officials, rather than the politically elected people at those conferences, sitting as part of an official group advising the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, because we refused to do that over the period of the last two, three, four years, we were finally given a small, but a concession, by the Federal Government to appear not as Members of the official Minister's advisory group, but as advisors to the Federal Minister who was hosting that conference.

There is a subtle difference and we saw it and we took advantage of the opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

My elected colleague from the Northwest Territories and I sat beside the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare at that conference. Now, we did not get to the table, that is the next step. We have always been permitted to sit at tables with provincial ministers at provincial conferences. We are advised, we are allowed to sit as advisors to the Federal Minister at a federal-provincial conference, but we have not yet got to the table at the federal-provincial conference. That is the next step.

I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are getting there and our voice is being heard and we were given every courtesy. We were included in all the private meetings of the Federal and Provincial Ministers, aside from the conference room. We did have an opportunity to make our views known there, where it counts, away from the official panorama of the great big government conference centre in Ottawa.

We also were given very special opportunity, Mr. McCallum and I, to speak privately with the Minister at the close of the conference and bring before her the concerns of the Territories, regarding the block funding proposals which the provinces accepted on Tuesday, with great reluctance and, in their case, they have really not the same grounds that we have.

Because of our very small population, Mr. Speaker, we are being penalized by the new block funding system and it was most urgent and most important that this be brought before the Honourable Monique Begin and we did so. We have obtained from her an assurance that she will go back to Cabinet now and plead our case and try to get a special arrangement for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, in view of our particular needs and in view of our small population.

We are preparing material now, Mr. Speaker, to brief her for that appeal to Cabinet and I am very pleased with the co-operation we have received from the Federal Minister. She appeared to grasp our problems and have sympathy for them.

I certainly hope that we will be able to follow through on this procedure and see some benefits come for the Yukon.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling the answer to an oral question asked by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, concerning Yukon Teacher Education Program.

Question re: Constitutional Development Proposal/Confidentiality

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to any one of the Ministers this morning concerning and arising out of the Question Period yesterday morning and an article in the "Whitehorse Star". I quote from the "Whitehorse Star": "During his visit to the Yukon last week, Faulkner said he made a proposal on constitutional development to ExCom who he said asked that the contents of their discussion be kept confidential so they can have time to study them." Another quote in the "Whitehorse Star" says: "Lang said later he couldn't make the terms of reference public to MLA's because Faulkner had asked them to keep the matter confidential."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning Mr. Lengerke asked the Minister, Mr. Lang, a question concerning the article and the Minister replied, and a portion of that reply is "we were going to be looking into it and giving our remarks to the Minister because he asked us specifically to keep it confidential."

I would like to ask any one of the Ministers just who was trying to keep the article confidential? Was it the Minister that wanted to keep the matter confidential, or was it the Executive Committee that asked the Minister to keep it confidential?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Honourable Member's consternation. It is also the same consternation by the elected Members of the Executive Committee. I would like to reiterate the response I gave to a question, I believe, two or three days ago, that the Executive Committee specifically requested I believe twice during the meeting that this particular issue should be transmitted to the Constitutional Committee for their comments. The Minister asked us specifically that he wanted our comments prior to deciding what steps should be taken after our comments were received.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. The way I understand it, I have been approached by two or three press people who have stated that the Minister, the Honourable Member from Peterborough specifically told them that it was up to the Executive Committee whether or not they wanted to release it.

Now it is my understanding and the understanding of my elected colleagues on the Executive Committee that he requested us to keep it in confidence. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, in referring back to the statement that I made earlier on the Orders of the Day, that this Government has never breached a confidence and there is no real point in doing it now because all of it is public anyway, so it is a formality of tabling the paper. We are making attempts to get to the Minister to get his formal approval to table the document and then it is our intention that the Constitutional Committee should deal with it and we would like to hear their comments.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, once again, the Government of Yukon Territory is put in the middle again, being manipulated by our Great White Fathers in Ottawa, where they seemed to be breaching confidence every day and at the same time we attempt to maintain a profile of trust that I believe every government should have.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it does not appear to be a two-way street, but, at the same time, two wrongs do not make a right.

Secondly, you have all the information because it is in the "Whitehorse Star". Furthermore, in the report that I tabled this morning, by Mr. Carruthers, even goes further than what the Minister said to us in the brief meeting that we had with him.

As I said earlier in my comments, it looks like they have already made the decisions.

Question re: Pipeline Committee/Minister's Statement

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Local Government: I was wondering if the Minister could give us a brief statement on how his presentation was received

in front of the Committee on Pipelines, in Parliament.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, all three parties who were present at the Committee accepted the unanimous brief that was given on the part of all of the elected Members of this Assembly. They were incredulous that the points that were mentioned could have received unanimous support from a House that they know has a lot of battles going on at many times. As such, the brief was extremely well received by the representatives of all parties, including the Liberal Party, who were very sympathetic towards the points that were made on behalf of Yukoners.

I have had that feeling that these points have been accepted over and over and over again, when making presentations on behalf of the people of Yukon Standing Committees. Unfortunately, I never see that attitude reflected from the Committee to changes in the legislation. So, I would be a most surprised man in the world if that receptive attitude was eventually reflected in the Legislation, but one can only live on hope, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Constitutional Development Proposal (Cont.)

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I have another question on the constitutional matter. I will direct it towards the Minister of Education.

I am just wondering, in your discussions with the Minister when he was here and the fact that he left you a piece of paper to consider, and I have not seen it yet, in your discussions about that, did you ask the Minister, really, what his reaction was to the Yukon Government's position on meaningful government? Certainly the report that went through this House and substantiated, in no uncertain terms, that we did not want an inquiry of the Drury type situation?

What was his reaction there? The reason I am asking this, Mr. Minister, is because the paper on meaningful government is our official position and why would he even consider any further anything else that the Minister would give you until you had an answer, one way or the other, what his reaction was?

Obviously, I know what his reaction is, but, I would like to know if you did challenge him on that point.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, would the Honourable Member kindly address his questions through the Chair.

Mr. Lengerke: I did.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a couple of points that should be made. The Meaningful Government paper was a proposal put forth by this Government, approximately two years ago.

Furthermore, it has never been discussed in the Legislature, so, as far as the formal government position, it is a proposal by the Government but it has never been accepted by the Legislature, and things have changed since then.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development dained to give the Executive Committee two hours of his time. We were scheduled to have the meeting at 9:30. The meeting never got under way until ten after ten.

Subsequently, two Members in this House that wanted to meet with him did not get the opportunity to meet with him.

The presentation that was given to the Executive Committee which was read orally by the Minister was given at approximately quarter to twelve, after other issues had been discussed. We were in no position to comment, and in fact he had completed his oral statement and he was putting on his coat to leave so really we had no opportunity to give a reaction.

I just wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, that as I reiterated earlier this morning in my comments that I feel the Executive Committee has been put in a difficult position and furthermore I think, for all intents and purposes, we were lied to.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, it is really not a question at all. I must clarify one remark that the Minister made. There were

two Members that did want to meet with the Minister, the Member from Kluane and myself. I did get the opportunity to meet with the Minister and I just want to make sure because otherwise we will have another—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I am afraid this is Question Period. Are there any further questions? We will then proceed to the Order Paper under Orders of the Day, Motions and Resolutions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Madam Clerk: Item Number 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Mrs. Watson.

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

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS ASSEMBLY THAT the Territorial Government immediately undertake the identification of all requirements, growth, protection and preliminary development plans for all Yukon communities in order to support the demonstrable and immediate needs 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.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to defer the debate on this Motion if the Minister of Local Government wants more time to prepare for this debate.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like that courtesy extended. This is the first time I have seen the Motion and I did not know that it was on the Order Paper. I would certainly like to be able to do some work for remarks on this most important Motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lengerke: I would move that Resolution Number 1 be moved into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Berger: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Resolution Number 1 be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Madam Clerk: Item Number 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member Mrs. Watson.

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

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to defer the debate on the Motion to Monday to accommodate the Members who have been absent.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair takes it, next sitting day?

Mrs. Watson: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

We will now proceed to Public Bills.

PUBLIC BILLS

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 1, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Next day of sitting, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 5, Mr. McKinnon.

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

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 6, Mr. McKinnon.

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

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Bill 7, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: Committee come to order.

This morning we will continue with Vote 14, Renewable Resources, Establishment 1420, Wildlife.

I will now declare a brief recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order. We were about to conclude our discussion on 1420, Wildlife, yesterday and put off finishing it until Mrs. Watson had an opportunity to speak to it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly hope that the Committee does not carry this Vote until we have dealt with the Supplementary Budget because there is an extensive over-expenditure of money for the Game Branch in the Supplementaries and I do not think that we can consider finalizing this until that is finalized.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 1420?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the over-expenditures referred to by the Honourable Member, almost all of them are referred to recoverable items. They are new programs that came up through the year, negotiated with other Federal Government departments. Almost all, are recoverable.

Mrs. Watson: I would still like to have it deferred, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, 1420, Wildlife, we will stand that over.

Establishment 1420 stood over

Mr. Chairman: We will proceed with Bill Number 1, *Third Appropriation Ordinance, 1976-77*.

We will now turn to Schedule A, Department of the Treasury, Page 4.

Establishment 200, Territorial Treasurer and Collector of Taxes. Supplementary Number 2, a decrease of \$2,770.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the whole concept of this Bill. This is rather unusual to have a supplementary for 1976-77 and I wonder if the Treasurer could give us the legal authority for a supplementary of this nature. I have never heard of it before.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to address the Member of the Committee for a moment. Although this was the matter that was put before the House by the Administration, it has been brought to my attention that this morning the Bill should have received second reading and did not, so we cannot discuss it.

We can go to Bill Number 2, *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78*. That one has been referred to the Committee.

Bill Number 2, *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78*. This Ordinance may be cited as the *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78*.

On Clause 2(1)

Mr. Chairman: We will turn to Schedule "A", Administrative Services, Page 3, Administrative Services - \$203,100.

Page 4, Establishment 100, Yukon Legislative Assembly, Supplementary Number 3, \$4,000.00.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, again I would like to ask a general question and it is regarding the *Financial Administration Ordinance*, where there is a requirement that when the Council is not in Session, in respect of which an expenditure not foreseen or duly provided for by an Appropriation Ordinance is urgently required for the public good, the Commissioner may authorize payment of the amount required for such expenditure out of the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund", and then it goes on to cite the requirement to bring in a Supplementary Appropriation Bill.

I would like to know whether, in fact, the approval for this type of expenditure, and we are over-expended in the O & M side by over one million dollars, \$1,403,000, whether, in fact, the approval was given by the Commissioner and the Executive Committee for this type of expenditure, before the expenditure was made or whether, in fact, the departments make the expenditure and then come back and try to get the approval of the Commissioner and the Executive Committee.

I would like to know what is the procedure with an over-expenditure, for a department.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the procedure is that the department requests approval for over-expenditure beforehand. There is a form called a *Budget Adjustment Form*, which they must prepare and it is channeled through the department, through the Member concerned, in through Treasury, the Treasurer must indicate his comments on it. It then goes back to the Member concerned, who tables it with the Executive Committee for approval to the Executive Committee.

Once the Executive Committee has approved it, it goes back to the department, back a copy comes to Treasury for our recording, the department gets its approval or they do not, whichever way the Executive Committee deals with it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, further to that, are there instances occurring, and I am sure they do, where, in fact, the expenditure is made, the department realizes then that they have over-expended a certain primary or a certain establishment, I am sure that that happens quite often within the Government, and then, after the fact, they go to their Executive Committee to get approval for the expenditure, after.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the Member is probably correct. It probably happens towards the end of the fiscal year. We monitor these things through the variance reports every period, that is every four weeks, we have a print-out which indicates the status of each Department and their expenditures, we monitor this very closely. But the Member is quite correct, there are occasions when there might be an over-expenditure which has not been located or found right until the point where it has actually been an over-expenditure and the Department may come back after and that in fact happened in the 1976-77 Estimates which we cannot discuss. That is the case in point there.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should not ask the Treasurer for his opinion, but in good accounting procedures, does this indicate poor management?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I do not think so, I do not think it necessarily means poor management. You will have to remember that the budget, the estimates are in fact estimates. They are an estimate of anticipated expenditures and it is a plan at any given point in time.

If that plan changes through the year and you could then relate very carefully or very directly that the plan was not planned out properly to start with, then you might say that

maybe there is poor management, but just generally speaking, no, I do not think that you could really say that.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, a question for the Treasurer, I am aware that you do use the variance report system. Are there in fact cases though that you will see a trend occurring where there is or looks like there is going to be quite a healthy over-expenditure, do you caution the departments somewhere along the line that this is occurring?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the process provides for direct cautioning of the department by the Treasury Department. It also goes to the Subcommittee on Finance, the variance reports that we report quarterly to the Subcommittee on Finance where we go over the variance reports, and at the direction of the Subcommittee on Finance, I would then be directed to go to the department perhaps again. It really is done twice: it is done during the analysis, the review and it is done again formally, after the Subcommittee has had a chance to look at it as well.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am often quite concerned, and I am sure the other Members are, and I am sure that the Treasurer is aware of it, that in each department there is a little bit of fat and I can understand why they have to have a little bit of fat, but that little bit of fat this year, within the Estimates, becomes the base for the next year and the next year they are going to put a little bit of fat in, and it becomes the base for another year. I think this is the type of accounting that private enterprise always looks at government and says this is bad. This is the type of thing that concerns me very much.

You are using the past expenditures as a base. I wonder if the government took the attitude that there shall be no supplementaries, you have to carefully work out your departmental requirements on the programs that have been approved, whether that would in fact help make the departments be a little more cautious about the money that they do in fact spend?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, we actually operate on a, I might use the word zero-base budgeting, because, although there is a base year, and that is used as a guideline. When we passed the guidelines for calling for Main Estimates and certainly the same thing applies to Program Forecast, long before Main Estimates, the guideline calls for a total substantiation of the budget. Every bit and piece detail must be given to us and in fact that is the detail that we use to inquiries right here.

So, in fact, the entire budget is redone each time that we prepare Main Estimates, notwithstanding the base figures.

Now, the fact that Mrs. Watson alludes to, again, I have to probably admit that maybe some of it does exist in certain areas, but, it is tempered with the plan of the budget. For example, I think salaries is probably a very good case in point. You budget for the positions that you have established. Now, during the year, some of those positions become vacant. Now, the policy of this Government is that they do not allow any additional money just for what might be emergencies of any kind, in connection with casuals or people. So, the departments can use some of these vacancies factors, perhaps, to utilize, say, hire casual people periodically.

So, from that point of view, you could say yes, there is a bit of fat and it is being used, but that is controlled by two ways, again, through the variance reports and it is also controlled by policy.

This last year there was a policy directive issued to departments as to how and when they can utilize salary money.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, during this inflationary period, is there a general inflationary factor built in to each department's budget? Is there a general inflationary factor built into each department's budget?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, not per se. The departments are asked to budget according to the base guidelines. Treasury adds on the price increases and the salary increase factors.

So, there is no general increase given to them, you know, say five per cent, ten per cent, no such thing is actually given to them. The guideline is much more rigid than that.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, do you not think the department should put it in and then Treasury adds it in on top?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, I do not know if I can answer that any better than I have already. The departments stay with the guidelines. They do try to, some of them do try to add other things and, of course, these are weeded out during their screening process that takes place, the analysis that takes place in Treasury and the further analysis takes place in sub-committee and it is always brought back to the base or the guidelines given.

Mrs. Watson: One more question: the supplementaries deal with the organization of the government as it existed before. I have stood up in here several times and asked for an organizational chart of the Territorial Government, and it would assist us so much in getting this organizational chart while we are dealing with the budget.

Now, with the supplementaries, we could certainly use it and we could certainly use it when we go into the Mains. It became so obvious yesterday. I would like to have an answer from someone in the Executive Committee, when are we going to get an organizational chart of the Territorial Government with the re-organization of the departments and the branches that has taken place when the fourth elected Executive Committee Member was taken on?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I thought that information had been tabled, I would have assumed it should have been by now. I will investigate and find out why not.

Mr. Sherlock: May I add further, Mr. Chairman, since the question came up in the last couple of days during the budget discussion, we have actually gone to each department and asked them to give us the organization charts of their departments and they are doing that now. They will be tabled as the Votes come up, if that is satisfactory.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add as further information on this, that I have never seen any such single chart since the day in Executive Committee when we were presented with a great mock up on brown paper which occupied one whole wall and it was temporary display thing which has now been put into departmental organization sheets for each department. Treasury is quite right, Mr. Chairman, there is no one master plan that shows them all in one piece of paper. What you have to see is the departmental organization charts.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, also to accompany that departmental chart, it would certainly help us if we had some definition of the staff complement of each chart. The chart that came with the Consumer and Corporate Affairs was quite helpful. If we could have something like this, education is quite lacking. Had we had that information on the administrative part of the department, we could have saved ourselves a whole half day of debate and we would have had the information that we required.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 100, or general discussion on the Estimates?

Mr. Lengerke: The \$4,000 for the Yukon Legislative Assembly, just miscellaneous items, or is there any one significant item in particular?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that consists of Labour Standards Committee, \$1,900 and increased travel \$2,100.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 100? Establishment 100, Yukon Legislative Assembly, Supplementary Number 3, \$4,000. Revised Votes \$335,700.

Establishment 100 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 120, Administrative Services, Supplementary Number 3, \$14,000.

On Establishment 120

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I see it has been partially off-set by reduced travel. What would the over-expenditure have been as far as the salaries go and then what was the under-expenditure on the travel to arrive at \$14,000?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, there were actually two adjustments in that one. If we had taken just the salaries, there would have been an over-expenditure of \$63,900. After adjusting it or taking out of the base the \$41,400 for "Hansard", which happened through the year and a reduction in travel of \$8,500, well, we came up with \$14,000.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Primary 120, Administrative Services, Supplementary Number 3, \$14,000. Revised Vote \$798,800.

Establishment 120 agreed to

On Establishment 124

Mr. Chairman: Estimate 124, Intergovernmental Affairs, a reduction.

Supplementary Number 3, a reduction of \$1,400 for revised Vote \$117,00. Any discussion?

Establishment 124 agreed to

On Establishment 125

Mr. Chairman: Primary 125, Economic Research and Planning, Supplementary Number 3, \$135,300, revised Vote, \$378,100.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in view of the large amounts, \$135,300, perhaps we could have an explanation, in very general terms, as to how this is broken down.

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the break-out of that is pipeline is contract salaries, \$41,400; pipeline support costs, \$93,900; increased professional costs - that is contract again, at \$10,000; miscellaneous, \$8,000. Then we had an adjustment for manpower transfer from, to J-1 of \$18,000, giving us a net of \$135,300.

I should mention, Mr. Chairman, that we did indicate a recovery there. We have, in fact, asked for a recovery, we have not yet obtained it.

Mr. Berger: I wonder if it is possible to get the total cost of the pipeline office, up to date? I mean, we really do not know how much the cost of the pipeline construction is up to date, to this Government.

Mr. Sherlock: We are indicating that the cost here, the supplementary cost, is going to be the cost of the pipeline office for '77-'78 and I was wrong in saying that we had not recovered any of that. We have, in fact, recovered \$76,000. I am sorry. Of the total.

Mr. Lengerke: Does all of this go to the pipeline coordinators?

Mr. Sherlock: All of the cost attributable to pipeline--

Mr. Lengerke: Are recovered.

Mr. Sherlock: Well, we have recovered \$76,000 of it. We have billed them for the rest of. We bill DIAND for the rest of it.

Mrs. Watson: But, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the general explanation. I would like to have it written down on what actual contracts that were let for the contract salaries for the pipeline office. You know, I think that we have a right to know for what kind of investigative services some of these consultants are providing for us.

We have got staff on hand, we voted a quarter of a million dollars, what is the staff complement of Economic Research and Planning last year, it was 8 or 10 people, something like that, and we still had to spend another \$135,000. Even if it is recoverable, I think we would like to have an idea of what this is actually being used for, some very specific details on the contracts.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I may not be able to answer it

very specifically, but I can indicate to you what the costs are for. The costs include the services of Mr. Al Wright, and primarily during the Lysyk Inquiry compiling of information, it includes the services of Mr. Mel Foster, who did some work for us in connection with pipeline taxation again for the Inquiry, it includes the services of the Secretary to Mr. Wright and includes a Research Assistant in the library, again primarily during the pipeline inquiry research work.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I thought that we had provided for Mr. Wright's salary last year, so that we would not have to go to a supplementary?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, actually there were two parts to that because there was some money in last year and there was some money that DIAND had and transferred to us into 77-78 and that was part of 76 that has been recovered. We got some additional money for 77-78 from DIAND making up that total of 76 and we billed them for the balance of 135.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I thought we had budgeted for the salary of a Pipeline Co-ordinator in last year's Estimates?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, we did not.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some background on the way that we see the Pipeline Co-ordinator's Office working. We had two avenues open to us, and one of them is start a huge new bureaucracy and arm of government under the arm of Pipeline Co-ordinator. Remove those pipeline related responsibilities from all the various department heads and put them into a new department, an arm of government, taking every pipeline related project creating this large governmental department that would deal exclusively with pipeline related projects.

Mr. Chairman, we were so satisfied with the extra work that our department Deputy Head did on our presentation and our behalf to the Lysyk Inquiry that we decided that what we really could use was a small co-ordinating office that would co-ordinate all of the activities related to pipelines that could be given as extra projects to the departments already in place at a great saving of time, effort and efficiency to this Government. To this point in time, that is the area where we have attempted to work and you will see in the Main Estimates a separate Vote for the office of the Pipeline Co-ordinator, keeping in mind that that is the most efficient, most economical and the best method that we think we could find of co-ordinating all of the pipeline related activities.

It is extra work on the department heads, they are meeting weekly on the task force basis at the present time.

All of them have taken on extra duties, because of pipeline related activities, which is taking a large part of time of this Government's office and they were busy enough, the Department heads, prior to pipeline and they are just taking on extra responsibilities.

However, they find it challenging. They find that that is the way that would have like to have the department work, they would like to be involved in the pipeline related activities, as it reflects in their departments and this year will see the creation, for the first time, of the formal separate office of the pipeline co-ordinator.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, response to the permanent pipeline co-ordinator's position, was excellent. There were about 100 applicants and I understand, unfortunately, the first two applicants, for various reasons, that we were willing to offer jobs to, at the present time, neither have accepted. So, we may either have to go down the list a bit or recall the position.

However, we are still negotiating with one of our top prospects and we had hoped that we would be able to make an announcement in the very near future as to who would be heading the office of the pipeline co-ordinator.

But, we really believe that we are doing it in the most efficient manner possible to the Yukon public and I just think the department heads, it is extra work, and they have done one heck of a good job, on behalf of the Yukon so far, in one, doing the material and background they did in this Government's presentation to Lysyk, keeping active, keeping involved and keeping, as an extra workload those matters of pipeline activity which will be related to their departments, co-ordinated by a small, efficient pipeline co-ordinator's office, rather than going the way that was suggested by some people, and by some experts, that we had better get ourselves a brand new, huge, spanking department of pipeline activity, which we would probably need another building this size to contain and be on top of everything.

We chose not to go that way and the people that we were interviewing for the job application, knew that they would be acting as a co-ordinating function for the work already started in the departments on pipeline.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what position was transferred out, and where to.

Mr. Sherlock: That was a Manpower person to Education.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, going back into the '77 Estimates, '77-'78, Economic Research and Planning had a strength of eight man years, five of them for the research group and three for land claims. One of those positions has gone to Education, with the Manpower detail. Where are we going to find those other seven positions in the new Budget?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, those are in Vote 7 and in Vote 2.

Mrs. Watson: Vote 7?

Mr. Sherlock: And 2.

In the back of each of those Votes, you will see a man year summary.

Mr. Chairman, while Mrs. Watson is looking at that, maybe I could clarify a point on last year's pipeline money. I said adamantly that there was not anything in 1977-78 budget. There was some money in the Supplements of 77-78, but it was not in the Main Budget. Again that came to us as extra money from DIAND so it was really a recoverable money. That was the \$35,000.

Mrs. Watson: That is right.

Mr. Sherlock: You have got a good memory.

Mrs. Watson: Just bear with me one minute. What is the function of some of the Economic Research and Planning, four man years have been transferred to Tourism and Economic Development and I believe they make up now the Department of Natural Resources or something like this, Renewable Resources. Where are the other three man years, I guess, in Administrative Services?

Mr. Sherlock: That is in 225?

Mrs. Watson: It is in Vote 2. You are saying that four of those man years were transferred to Tourism and Economic Development, and I believe now they are called the Department of Renewable Resources, are they not?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Renewable Resources, Mr. Chairman, is in Vote 14.

Mr. Lengerke: While we are waiting, maybe Mr. Sherlock could tell me, he did give us some breakdown of the 125 there, the \$135,000, and he mentioned \$10,000 and \$8,000 for the Special Services, I think were outside the Pipeline Co-ordinator's office, were they? Were they contract to the Economic Research and Planning group?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, my detail does not indicate precisely where the money was contracted to, it just simply indicates the additional requirement for the money.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Member from Kluane, the Department of Economic Research

and Planning actually grew by another two additional persons in man years. It is on page 121 of the Main Estimates, and the other three members of the Land Claim Committee are actually in Vote 2 and we already discussed them really.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, none of the Economic Research and Planning people have been transferred to the Department of Renewable Resources. Those are all new man years, without coming back to the House it was all established and everything and now I am asked to approve them?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, there are three new man years in Resource Planning, right.

That has nothing to do with ERPU.

Mrs. Watson: Economic Research and Planning.

Mr. Sherlock: Right.

I do not know, maybe we could pursue this in another way. Mr. Chairman, It seems to me that when we were discussing Mains the other day, in Vote 2, that there was some additional information to come on man years and I just cannot remember precisely what the question was, but it seems to me that the Vote was held up for additional man year information. Maybe the question could be restated and we could bring the answer back.

Mr. Chairman: The only Vote 2 that was stood over was 200, Executive Committee.

Mr. Sherlock: Oh, okay, that is not it then.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a general question which I would like to ask any Members of the Executive Committee because this really has not anything to do with the actual budget, but it does. Economic Research and Planning is one sector of the Government, Renewable Resources is another department of the Government, and, under Renewable Resources, Vote 14, Establishment 1401, we have provision for Research and Planning, and yet we have an Economic Research and Planning Branch of Tourism and Economic Development.

Are we divvying the research and the planning factor of the Government?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I believe that 1401 has been passed, but, for the Member's benefit, no, there is no duplication. The commitment on the part of the Research and Planning in Renewable Resources is to develop a department of Renewable Resources for the management of the Renewable Resources of the Territory. We, as yet, do not have that kind of a department set up. We obviously have it for game, but we do not have it for fish, for forestry, for various other things that would come under the realm of such a department.

The idea, of course, is to develop that to get an inventory of what the needs are and then begin to assume responsibility over those other areas. But we have to have a grasp of what we are dealing with before we can assume that responsibility.

Mr. Berger: Well, Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, what is the Economic Research and Planning Unit doing really?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: (inaudible)

Mr. Berger: Well, that is very enlightening, Mr. Chairman and I am thankful for that, but I mean, what does this comprise of, what is the Economic Research and Planning really doing. I mean, on one hand we are talking about establishing a new department in the near future of Renewable Resources, and here we have one already supposedly doing all that type of research.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that the work that the Economic Unit does is that they are doing on-going research work in spacial index, for example. They did the report of the gambling, when it was requested by this House. They are doing an on-going survey of the rent fee schedules in the Yukon. They have done real estate, they are doing all sorts of research projects. For an example, there has

been some interest expressed in the area of railroads for Yukon, so therefore, we have got to have somebody to assess these various reports that are coming in and whatever and how it relates to this Government.

A lot of the things that the Economic Planning Unit is doing is on the request of this House. I think it is important that we have somebody within the Government that these things can be done on an ongoing basis. I think all Members, when we were discussing the report on Gambling, if I recall correctly, everybody said it was a very good report, they felt it was well done. In fact there were compliments extended to the Department in question.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me I recall saying, and I will say it again this year, that there seems to be a lack of planning in the planning of what is happening. Nobody is planning the planning units, and I think that is where our problem is, not what the Economic Research and Planning Unit does. We know what they do, but why should those services be also duplicated

in other departments? Why do you not have one big Research and Planning Unit, which is getting bigger every time? I notice in the new budget there are two more man years going into Economic Research and Planning. It just seems to me that there is a real duplication of services. If you want to be efficient, why not stick it all into one group and let them do whatever kind of research the Government needs?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, there is no duplication. What I outlined for the renewable resources of this Territory certainly is not the same thing that Mr. Lang was outlining, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Economic Research and Planning Unit. They are not duplicating these other services; quite to the contrary, they are complementing each other where there is a common need done. They are in communication and it is a very useful service that they are doing. For instance, the services that they perform, the Planning Unit performs in terms of the spacial price index, the rent controls and the real estate, as you know, we have insisted in this House that these be monitored on a regular basis and a frequent basis and this is a responsibility that the Planning Unit carries out. They have passed this information on to me in Consumer Affairs so that if action is necessary, then I could bring it forward to the Executive Committee.

That certainly is not a function that you would find when you are trying to develop a land use plan for the Territory for how you are going to take care of your wildlife, or how you are going to take care of your forests and things like this. They are entirely different.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I wish I had before me the paper that was tabled in this House last budget session, because it described those very things that the Economic Research and Planning Unit was supposed to be doing. I have been keeping in touch with that paper because I have been wanting to see what production is going to come out of the Economic Research and Planning Unit and that was one of their things. They were also going to be doing constitutional studies and all kinds of exciting things that have not come out.

The whole purpose of the Economic Research and Planning Unit has changed over this past year then. I think we could have another piece of paper like that. I would sure like it myself, some kind of real description of what that Economic Research and Planning Unit is going to be doing for us now and why is it different from before. We really presumed that this secret little department that was sitting there for a while and we did not even know about it, was going to be doing things for us in a very broad sense. I would like to know why that has been changed and why is the philosophy getting more disintegrated again, instead of concentrated in one Unit?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the whole point is, I think, which requires emphasizing again is that certainly the terms seem to be changing for the Unit, purely and simply

because the load that has been imposed upon them by this House, preoccupies almost their entire time.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I asked the question before. I mean, what is the total cost of the pipeline impact up to now and I would say that we are getting the wrong information, totally wrong information, because part of what the Economic Research and Planning Unit is doing is part of the pipeline impact and this is rent control and all sorts of things. Without the pipeline we would not have to go into all those things.

I think those costs should be charged directly to the pipeline and this is the information I am seeking, but we are spending it in all sorts of different areas and little departments.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments and I do not know if the Honourable Member understands the situation with the Government of Canada and the legislation that is before the House on that point.

You know, if we could have a unit within the Government to do the necessary work that has to be done, that could be related to pipeline to a certain extent, but, at the same time, for natural growth and pay for it from our ordinary financial negotiations with Ottawa, we are better off because if we are going to go about and identify this as a pipeline cost, all you are doing is putting that much more of a return on the taxes to the Federal Government, because we are going to have to pay that money back whenever this line of credit, which everybody talks about is ever established.

So, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to all Members in this House, who should be trying to utilize the resources we have to do necessary surveys, to do the necessary programs, if we are going to see that it is natural growth, rather than placing all the pressure towards the pipeline, that the Honourable Member would not do.

I think that we would be irresponsible in the claim that we are making relative and the Members in this House if we were to take that tack.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister does not understand what I am talking about. I want the information about the pipeline impact costs up to now and, in reality, I do not want him to go out and borrow from the \$200 million fund, the same as most other people do not want to. The other thing is, I want the taxpayers in this Territory, the people in this Territory informed on what the real costs of that funny plumbing job coming down the Alaska Highway will be to the taxpayers, in reality. Not that we are hiding them, that in fact we are paying part of the costs right now, and we have not received a nickel in taxes from the plumbing job.

Mr. Lengerke: I do not know if I understand the Member from Klondike correctly, but I would think that he is asking that there be some kind of accounting done of the activities that the Economic Research Planning Unit and whoever else is involved in pipeline related activities.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Every department.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay, you do have a separate accounting then that someday along the line, if and when we can recover those dollars.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: We cannot, the agreement says we cannot.

Mr. Lengerke: We realize, but we can, at least, account them towards the pipeline. We can say this was because of the pipeline that we had to get into all these activities, regardless of recovery or not, but we can identify, is that correct? Can we do that.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, if we want to get the Economic Research and Planning Unit into a new study and say, go to every department, whether it be local government, whether it be engineering, whether it be education and you relate, as of now, in the future what percentage of your time and extra workload is going to be charged because of the pipeline,

your work on the task force, your meeting every week, reports that you are doing for the pipeline co-ordinator's office, and just identify every cent of that in every department, in every person who is employed in the public service of the Territory, so that we will have a yardstick of actual costs on a continuing basis, can actually be apportioned to pipeline expenditures. Mr. Chairman.

That is a big task as far as this Government is concerned, to have every person who is working on anything considered to do with pipeline to a portion, their time and their costs so that there can be an accounting of this in every department.

Mr. Chairman, we did not think that was necessary because it is in stone in the international agreement that has been signed to this point in time that there is not going to be any of the social, economic, environmental costs of that pipeline paid at the end of the pipe by the American consumer. Now that was what we were first doing before the agreement was signed. Let us take a separate accounting, let's keep a separate set of books so that depending upon what agreement is signed, we will be able to say those are pipeline related costs.

Now the Government of Canada says and probably did, we worked out a better deal for the Yukon because we do not want those pipeline related costs, but through this property tax on the pipeline that the Yukon is going to be better off. Of course, that is the total argument, one, are we better off unless there is a capitalization of the heritage fund to a large extent of money, I think not, and we are not better off. But the fact remains that we could keep this accounting which will mean an awful lot of work for this department and we cannot go anywhere to anybody with that accounting and say look, pay it for us. The only way that we are going to be able to get any advantage in the long run is being able to negotiate a better deal as far as long term benefits through a heritage fund. That is it.

Whether we have got that accounting, the international agreement is signed, we cannot go to the American Government, we cannot go to the Canadian Government. They say all right, oh, that is pipeline related expenditures you have it in, eh, all right boys, now from your deficit grant, now from your operating grant, ha, we do not have to give you this anymore and your normal Treasury Board agreements and decisions and IGC meetings, it is all related to pipeline, here is a \$200 million fund that you can borrow against for these pipeline related projects which you have accounted separately for and you say those are all pipeline related costs, now boys, pay it back against the property taxes on that pipeline.

We are getting ourselves into more problems than it is worth, because we have been told that nobody is going to pay for it but us. We are trying to keep as much of it which is growth. We say look, we were going to need to do a spacial price index, we should have been into the real estate market survey, we should have been into rental surveys as far as the public of Yukon are concerned. Let's use those as normal functions of a government becoming more sophisticated and trying to get into more things for the public and recover those costs from our normal deficit funding, rather than trying to relate everything to pipeline when we know that if we do, that there is only one poor sucker that is going to have to pay that back and that is the taxpayer of the Yukon Territory, Mr. Chairman.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, we are getting away from the purpose of the Economic Research and Planning Unit, and my understanding was that this was set up because of the General Development Agreement. That was the whole purpose of the thing originally. Now we heard yesterday that we do not have any agreements, they have all been turned back and everything else, but still this Research and Planning Unit is expanding. Now the terms of reference, or whatever you want to call it of this Unit, have gone away because we do not have anything under the GDA so we are using that unit for different purposes than we actually passed last year in this House and we are not

even getting an explanation of what they are doing, let alone why and I really insist that we should have some general piece of paper to refer to what has happened in regard to the questions that we have asked and we are not really getting any answers.

Mr. Berger: I want to thank the Minister responsible for pipelines and I hope the media finally is telling the true story of the pipeline. I mean, instead of talking about the \$200 million, some media hides it under Heritage Fund, some media hides it, well, maybe we can borrow some money.

I would challenge the media to finally be responsible and really tell the true story to Yukon, to the people in this Yukon.

This is the only reason I asked the question and I think it is very relevant what is going on right now in Yukon.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, there is just one deficiency in the arguments that were put forth by the Minister of Local Government and that is the fact, have you do in fact have an agreement with Canada on a method whereby, during this period of time, where we have the major construction project, whereby they will fund our deficit grant? That is the question.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, did the Honourable Member say that we do have an agreement?

Mrs. Watson: I asked him if we do.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Do we?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Oh, I thought that was put as clearly as we possibly could, in the Budget Address. I think we call it the most critical and serious problem, to get into that negotiation as quickly as possible, to be able to get that type of an agreement agreed to immediately, because if we do not, Mr. Chairman and if we do not get that capital funding accelerated over the next couple of years, I stand here and tell you that this Government, and this Territory, is going to be in a lot of problems, I am not trying to hide anything.

I am saying that it is so absolutely essential that we relate and have an agreement with the Federal Government of what a pipeline related project is or what percentage of any project can be related to pipeline, so that we know exactly where we stand financially and we are able to start putting out contracts to get that infrastructure in place, on an accelerated capital basis, and do not ever think that I am trying to hide any facts or trying to fool anybody.

I am trying to get it into the Budget Speech just as clearly and as succinctly as possible, how critical and serious this situation is to the people of the Yukon Territory and those of them that are going to be around here for awhile.

The one positive thing that came out from, or, one of the positive things, one of the few positive things is maybe the way I should put it, that came out from our meeting with the Minister at the end of last week, that he saw that point, he agreed with it and said, yes, we have got to get those negotiations started and commenced as quickly as possible. It is essential, I see your point, I see your problem, but recognize something else, that this Federal Government is in a lot of problems financially and money which used to flow, one time I used to always hear it, why do you not go ask more from the Federal Government? You do not get as much as you want.

Well, let me tell you, if that mythical well was ever there at any point in time, and I do not think it ever was, that tap is turned off and she is turned off tight right now, except for certain specific areas and Yukon does not happen to be one of them.

I will just give you an example:

In the field, in the area of land development, all I am going to say on this when it comes up. I have never had a problem of getting assent in expanded land development programs because it was loan money that was going to be paid back. Loan money which will be paid back even over a period of time, is almost impossible to come by from the Federal Government.

Of course, what they are trying to do is say get everything related to pipeline and get your nose into that \$200 million line of credit so that you can suck in the taxpayers of the Yukon Territory in perpetuity in identifying everything as pipeline related projects.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying desperately to stay out of that trap. We have been responsible, we have got letters on record saying from the beginning we have to negotiate what a pipeline related expenditure is and what type of financial deal we are going to create over the next several years so that all of these problems which we tried to relate in the budget speech do not come to pass. At least we are at one point now which we were not before, that at least we are going to be able to enter negotiations with the Federal Government on these agreements on these points, and it is going to be up to the skills and the abilities of the people who will be representing you at those negotiations to see whether we get any kind of a fair and equitable deal, so that our children and our children's children will not be paying for this pipeline way down into the future without even being able to look at a long term benefit fund for them. Boy, do not let me ever underestimate the problems for the moment and not tell you that I am not going to be totally frank and objective and lay those problems out on this table to you. If we get snowed, and things do not come about, then in the long term analysis and way down into the future, probably, people will not be looking at this pipeline as the benediction so many of our people are trying to think that it is to the people of the Yukon. Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the Honourable Member, I agree with one thing. There never was a well there, not for the Yukon Territory. There never have been, well for Indian organizations and there may still be some, well for Indian organizations and there may be some, well for the Northwest Territories, but there never was a well for the Yukon Territory. The Yukon Territory has always had to substantiate any expenditure that they wanted to make. It is a little difficult to make people understand this and I believe the Honourable Member from Riverdale had a little problem the other night at one of his meetings when someone indicated that, you know there is no problem getting money from Ottawa, all you have to do is ask. That is one thing.

But I do disagree, I can see the danger we are in, I think we all realize it, but we should not completely cut off the possibility that we may have to define what a pipeline expenditure is, at negotiations. The thing that has concerned me a great deal is we talk about the \$200 million line of credit. Is it going to be a capital expenditure or is your line of credit supposed to be used for O & M? We hear it thrown around, is it going to be charged to the \$200 million? What we are referring to, what Mr. Berger is talking about would be a drain from the O & M side on the \$200 million.

So, I think that somewhere along the line we certainly have to get this straightened out.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Right, that is exactly what I am saying.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly what my colleague was expressing, was that, first of all, everybody that has heard about the \$200 million and I think that some people are still under the delusion that it is a grant.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, order please. I am going to cut you off because you are a Member of the Government. We are getting far, far away from the purpose of this discussion, which is 125, Economic Research and Planning. Will you please return to the subject at hand so we can get on with this Estimate?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Closure.

Mr. Chairman: Has anyone anything further to say on the Economic Research and Planning?

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All right, now the Government has established Economic Research and Planning and it is in the Tourism. They do not have it as a

separate branch of this, of the administration. They have put it with Tourism. Is it going to be the Government's policy to permit Economic Research and Planning in each department of the Government?

Now, we have heard that the natural resources, wildlife management, are going into research and planning. Are you going to permit research and planning officers in Welfare, in Education, in Health, now Tourism? Do not frown, because I have seen submissions from department heads to the budget committee where each one wanted to have some research and planning officer. Is it going to be your policy to go along with that for each department?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the Economic Research and Planning Unit is the embryo stage of what every Member wants to see, at this table, an economic development branch, under the control of an elected Member of this Government.

We said that is our ultimate, that is what we wanted to see, for goodness' sakes, give, at least when that Member comes in and that branch is set up, to at least have the bones of an organization that can do economic development research. That is what the orientation of that department should be. It should be in things as doing decentralization and what that will mean throughout the Territory and what the cost will be if that takes place. It should be in things like gambling, it should be in things as one of the pros and cons of an economic development in any one of the areas of the Yukon.

It should not be in the area of land use planning, where it is a total and completely different set of circumstances, and the land use planner, who is a director of renewable resources, who has been doing so much work on the expert environmental committees, like Shakway Valley, like Tilisyk, setting up the land use plan in the Whitehorse North and the Whitehorse South areas.

That is not economic development's job and it is not, from the Game Department of doing the Dempster management study. That is not there job. That is in the wildlife area of discipline and the professionalism and the expertise should be found in that department where they know what they are talking about.

That is the crux of what the Economic Research and Planning Branch was originally begun for, for what everybody has stated time and time again by motion in this House, that they want an economic development branch. We think that the things which they are assigned to now, work in the areas of economic research development. That is their orientation and that is the way that it should be defined, and that is the way that it should be given out as to what area and to what department, different areas of research go.

In those areas, I have to say that there are some other reports that are coming to the House in the very near future that they have done. They have done an excellent job. There are jobs that are going to be accepted by the public of the Yukon. There is no editorializing on them, there is no political booms, or bumps on them, it is just the facts as they are and the economic development and research in the spacial price indexes and the studies that they have done and real estate ones, which are coming, and the monitoring of them, they are doing their job in those areas which they were formed for.

I think that as everybody becomes more comfortable with specifically the job that they are and should be doing, that we are going to see there is a very great advantage to having this type of department doing that type of work and keeping on top of it. It is just in the last little while that I think everybody is starting to realize how it should be functioning, the work that they are doing is excellent and I think that we are all starting to feel more comfortable and feel that they are doing the job that they should be doing for the people of Yukon, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is a very relevant ques-

tion and it will be short. D. Munroe is the Chief of the Economic Research and Planning. Who is the Department Head? Who is the Deputy Head of Department of Tourism and Economic Development?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Crosby is functioning as the Deputy Head.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, was Mr. Munroe's status classification changed when they were transferred to Tourism and Economic Development out of Administrative Services?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the difficulties you get into when you are discussing somebody else's budget. I do not know whether there was a reclassification. Possibly the Treasurer could comment on that.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my understanding there was not a reclassification, but based on the organizational information passed to the Executive Committee and approved by the Executive Committee earlier this year, you will see that in the Main Estimates that in fact both people are listed under that Vote. You will see that Mr. Munroe and Karl Crosby are listed as branch heads, two separate branch heads reporting to the Minister separately.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I do not know, and I think there should be some clarification. Who is the actual chief of that Department?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that that really should be answered by the Minister responsible, who is not here.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that both of them report to their Executive Committee Member, as branch heads.

Mrs. Watson: I would like the information from Mr. Bell.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: There is no Deputy Head and the branches are functioning independently, reporting directly to their Minister, Mr. Bell.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, but then Mr. Crosby is a different classification than Mr. Munroe, is that right? I would like more information on that if you could get that from Mr. Bell over noon hour so we could have it after lunch?

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared to go on to vote on 125, Mrs. Watson, or do you want to get that information first?

Mrs. Watson: I would like to get the information. I am not trying to hold up 125, but I certainly would like it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we will recess until 2 o'clock, because I understand that some of the Members are going to the Penn today.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order. We are dealing with Economic Research and Planning, 125, on page 4, and I believe we had concluded that we would wait for some information to come in before we continue with it.

So we will go to 126, Electoral District Boundary Commission, Supplementary Number 3, \$10,900, Revised Vote \$10,900. Any discussion?

Establishment 125 Stood Over

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 126, Electoral District Boundary Commission, \$10,900; Revised Vote \$10,900.

Establishment 126 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 140, Public Inquiries, Supplementary, \$19,300; Revised Vote \$19,400. Any discussion?

Establishment 140 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 150, Plebiscites, Supplementary Number 3, no amount; Revised Vote \$1,000. There is no change there.

Establishment 150 agreed to

On Establishment 160

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 160, Public Service Commission, Supplementary Number 3, \$21,000, revised Vote \$917,200.

Any discussion?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, those are simply adjustments from the initial plan. There were some changes up and down in the expenses on Interviews, Advertising and Removal Costs, and these are simply adjustments between those three aspects.

Establishment 160 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Department of the Treasury, on page 7. Department Supplementary Number 3, \$365,100, revised Vote \$2,889,800.

The first item is Establishment 200 Treasury, Supplementary Vote \$6,500, revised Vote \$1,022,400.

On Establishment 200

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe that Treasury has been re-organized and we can probably get the chart and go into the detail when we go into the Main Estimates, but maybe the Treasurer could just briefly outline just how different their functions are going to be in this next fiscal year? Just briefly

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member is correct. We did reorganize slightly. We broke out two former sections or cells from within Accounting Services Branch, broke them out and made them reporting directly to the Treasurer. One of those cells was Revenue and Taxation, the other one was Data Systems and Computer services.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, what would be the reasoning with the reorganization of the Treasury Branch? Was there a glaring deficiency in the organization as it existed?

Mr. Sherlock: I do not know that I can define it as a glaring deficiency, but there were some difficulties in the previous organization. Under the Accounting Services organization, it seemed that that particular branch there was just too much in it, and there was not sufficient segregation between the functions to be able to manage it properly. For example Data Services was under that particular branch and for the Data Services managers, for example, to get to the Treasurer for a decision had to go through another level. After studying the situation, we decided it would be better to break it out and have them report directly to the Treasurer, one aspect.

The other aspect of that was to make it public to the departments that Data Services provided a function for the Government for all departments and not just for Treasury, a very, very useful bit of visibility that was necessary.

In the case of Revenue, a similar situation really. There were all kinds of things in the revenue and taxation area that must, by legislation, be signed by the Treasurer and no one else. It was difficult and it seemed wrong to have to have the Revenue and Taxation manager go through the Accounting Services Director to get to the Treasurer to get something signed. It just did not make any sense, and I chose to break it out and the Executive Committee agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 200?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the functions of the Treasurer as outlined in page 6, is responsible for the Treasury Department as set out under the *Financial Administration Ordinance*, and then the responsibility for Taxation and so on. The Treasury Department is responsible for the accounts of the Territorial Government. The Internal Auditor, what is his function vis-a-vis the Treasury Department?

Mr. Sherlock: The relationship with internal auditor to Treasury is simply an audit function. He audits activities within Treasury, as he audits activities within other departments, in exactly the same manner and reports directly to the Commissioner on his findings.

So, it is called an internal auditor because it is within the Government, but, in fact, he does an external function to Treasurer.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I always was under the impression that Treasury did the audit for the departments.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, Treasury does audits and verifications and other things, with other departments of data and information that is channeled to Treasury for processing. So, it is a different kind of audit.

For example, we audit invoices. That is a verification function of invoices being processed to Treasury. Prior to payment they must be reviewed and certified or placed for payment by Treasury. That is quite different from the internal auditor's function.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Would it be a function of the internal auditor, then, when he audits various departments, he audits their legal authority to spend money and to tie the primaries and establishment to legal authority and does he also do this with the Treasury Branch?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, he does just that. He audits the legal authorities, he audits the regulations, rules and policies and procedures to make sure that we and other departments abide with or guide them with the rules. He audits agreements, for example, and that is, of course, so do the Auditor General and other auditors, but so does the internal auditor.

He audits agreements within the departments and within Treasury, as well. For example, if we have recoveries which are processed to the departments, verified by Treasury and sent off for recovery, the internal auditor will, some time in the future, review those and make sure that, in fact, the proper claim was made, based on his interpretation of the agreement. It might be different from ours.

Mrs. Watson: He has the final say, though?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not say that he has the final say. I think, you know, it has got to be a consensus thing. It will be a discussion and if he, say, disagrees with the department or, say, and Treasury, then, certainly, there will be a discussion and some decision has to be made on who is right, who is wrong.

But, it could be separate.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that brings me to how does the Internal Auditor's function differ from the Auditor General?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the function of the Internal Auditor is not all that different from the Auditor General insofar as the actual work is concerned. He audits, as I said, policies and procedures and agreements and systems, and so does the Auditor General. But the Auditor General goes on to certify the accounts and he must place a certificate on the public accounts to indicate that they are good or not good, to indicate errors or omissions to indicate the Auditor General also makes recommendations and of course so can the Internal Auditor. The Internal Auditor also makes recommendations on operations on the correctness of the accounts, on the physical correctness of the figures, as well.

There is a relationship, it is a similar function, except the Auditor General, of course, is much more authoritative and certainly goes beyond what the Internal Auditor does.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Because of our political structure, we have the Auditor General certifying our public accounts. The provinces have their own internal auditor that is called an Auditor General, who certifies their accounts. Am I correct in this?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the provinces have, some of them call him the Auditor General, but most of them call him the Provincial Auditor, and he is the person who is just like the Auditor General of Canada for the provinces. He reviews and certifies the accounts of the provinces, right.

Mrs. Watson: This gets me back, the Auditor General under the *Yukon Act*, there is a requirement that the Auditor General's report is tabled in our House. In the provinces, their Provincial Auditor or their Auditor General reports to the House and yet we have a very strange situation in the Territory where we have an Internal Auditor who does not have to report to the House.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the only comment I can make there is that our Internal Auditor was in fact established by the Executive Committee, I believe, and not by legislation. So there is a slight difference. Our Internal Auditor is not legislated as an Internal Auditor of the Government. He has been established by the Executive Committee, so there is a slight difference.

Mrs. Watson: How? Mr. Chairman, how could you establish an Internal Auditor then if we do not have the legislation?

Mr. Chairman: Are you asking me that?

Mrs. Watson: Anybody who can answer it.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, if I just may carry on, I am not an absolute legal expert on this, but I would suggest that if we wanted to establish an Internal Auditor who was of the same type and the same authority as the provincial ones, then we would probably have to amend the *Yukon Act* or have specific legislation brought in.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that would be very interesting, would it not, to have two Auditor Generals' reports tabled in the House, if they ever conflicted?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, I believe that the Internal Auditor was established by the former Commissioner, Mr. Salmon, for a particular purpose.

Mrs. Watson: I know.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 200?

Establishment 200 Treasury, Supplementary Number 3, \$6,500, revised Vote \$1,022,400.

Establishment 200 agreed to

On Establishment 201

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 201, Insurance, there is no change here.

Mr. Lengerke: On the matter of Insurance, I recall last time we discussed this, there was some discussion with respect to or some concern with respect to the placement of insurance of the Territory and I would like to know if we are now tendering that? Is that a bid situation or do we just award the contract to somebody on a nominal basis? How is that done?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, yes, I recall the question raised last year and we did attempt to go out to bid, perhaps not as forcefully as we might have.

Two things happened, first, because we did not seem to have enough or adequate people to simply pursue the matter, but, more important, the response from some of the firms, if we sent in a notice saying that we were going to proceed with, or we would require certain kinds of insurance, the response was not really there so we continued it with the firm that we had the insurance with, because, of course, we had to carry on with the coverage.

Mr. Lengerke: I wonder, do we know, exactly, how much coverage we do have for the Government and the types of insurance, all the classes. Have we got a pretty good idea of what we are buying?

Mr. Sherlock: I am sorry, I missed the question, Mr. Chairman. I just got the last part, do we have an idea of what we are buying.

We certainly do, but there was something—

Mr. Lengerke: Dollar value?

Mr. Sherlock: —prior to that.

Okay, liability, third party liability, \$51,800; some deductibles unrealized, \$8,000, that is about it.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned and the reason for that questioning was that I did hear and have had some discussion with a number of agents who said that they could not really react to the request by the Territory, as far as quoting, because the specifications for the insurance were just not that clear. I think that was somewhat of a problem and I am a little bit concerned with Mr. Sherlock's remarks that maybe they did not go out as forcefully as they should to do this, but, I think they had given us that assurance that they were going to do that last year and I am a bit disappointed that they did not make a better attempt.

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can clarify that. When I said that we were not so forceful, I really meant we did not have a person who would be able to be totally dedicated to that and perhaps as knowledge of the insurance as should be to be able to come up with adequate specifications to be able to come up with a bid. So we had that difficulty which has not yet been resolved. But we will continue looking at it.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, are we going to be able to resolve that situation, or are we going to have to hire a consultant to tell us exactly what our insurance specifications are going to be so that we can go to tender next year? How are we going to resolve it?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, our consideration right now is that we would recommend going to a consultant to give us the specifications we require. We have not pursued that matter yet.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Because there is no change in there, I do not think we need to carry this particular item.

On Establishment 202

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 202, Electric Rate Equalization, Supplementary \$200,000; Revised Vote \$800,000. Discussion?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, just a question as to the reason for not getting back from the Federal Government the tax refund enough to cover this, is it because of the actual cost of increase to the power company? In other words, the increases that they have on the bills now supposedly, and of course if you had the bills it would be under "A", supposedly, a cost increase. Is that a natural cost increase?

I am wondering why we do not get back. They have more business, more people, money and everything is going up and yet we seem to get less back in tax money. Are they making less money than they did before?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, there are probably a couple of parts to that question. First of all, yes, the increase is related to the increased costs of power. It also relates to the decreased revenue earnings of the company, because they do not make as much money, they do not pay as much taxes, this fund was set up as a rebate of the taxes that Yukon Electrical pays. I am not sure, was there another part to that?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, that is the answer. I was just wondering why it had dropped so much.

I would ask, possibly the Minister, the Yukon Government, when they are billed from Yukon Electrical, I do not about NCPC, but on some incidents they get back the rebate and I notice in other instances they do not get back the rebate in such cases as the L.I.D.'s, and I was just wondering this situation does exist?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would have seen some evidence of it. As far as I know the YTG gets back no monies from the rate equalization fund in any way, shape or form. We pay premium price right across the board. We do not get deals with— we do? In what areas?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think this should be looked at. I think the Territorial Government gets a special rate. I know they did in Dawson, and I am sure they do across the Territory, yes. It should be looked at.

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we do not, at the present time. It may have been some time ago, but it is not.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman--

Mr. Sherlock: Two years ago and then it was in effect, but it is not in effect now.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, the NCPC in Dawson City, at one time, Y.T.G. were getting a special rate at Dawson City. NCPC now requested that Y.T.G. go on to the same rate. That is how they were able to lower the rate for the rest of the subscribers in Dawson.

I believe that some of the Government installations in other communities, under Yukon Electric, do get a special rate. Are you sure of that, Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, I am not all that sure. I have been given to understand it is not in effect now.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: We get such a rate from NCPC in Dawson City and that is exactly the reason why we are building a new sewer and water system there, because we cannot afford the power rates for pumping any longer. They just socked it to us.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I might explain there is, or maybe it is a mistake, but if it is a mistake it should be corrected.

the two pumps, Number One Pump and Number Two Pump in the L.I.D. in the district of Teslin, is billed at, I do not know the exact figure last month, but \$217 in one place and \$280 something or other, I think it was, the first month \$400 and some dollars. On that billing is the commercial rebate and this is what I was wondering about because I notice in their street billing, when we were at the meeting, that there was no rebates, but there was rebates on those new pumps that were put in in the sewage area.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I think probably you just let Yukon Electrical not give us back, or us not get some rebate back, where we were getting some to the benefit of the taxpayer of the Yukon. I am sure that if any of them read the "Debates and Proceedings", they certainly will not be giving that rebate any longer.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I am not too interested one way or the other, but I see some bills with it on and some bills with it off and, as far as the rebate is concerned, I am not so sure that the Government does need that rebate, in this sense.

You might think I am talking against the consumer, but I am not, because if that rebate goes back there, I am paying it and I am also paying all of the others, too.

I think that it needs to be looked at. If there is a case where they are giving rebates in one area and not in another, well, we should look at it.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the policy is that no government agencies or whatever receive a rebate.

Now, I think what Mr. Fleming is alluding to is that there may have been some errors made and some people did get them. This area was looked at by the Internal Auditor, at my request I might add, and we did find some and, while looking at the records of Yukon Electrical and in fact Yukon Electrical has undertaken to review all of their records and they are doing that now, and there will be some adjustments made.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I'll find out I was not getting enough.

Mr. Fleming: Just exactly my concern, Mr. Chairman. The Government rebate could be an overall picture all over the Yukon, but private enterprise is paying also, to get that rebate.

In this case, it just did not turn out that way. We pay twice. I have said this before in the House and I am wondering if Government, also, while we are on rate equalization, and in general, I have to refer to a couple of other programs—I see one Minister scowling because he knows what I am talking about, I will just mention the heating fuel equalization and the

Home Owner Grant. I am just wondering if this Government, in figuring out what they need for electrical rate equalization or, possibly, the equalization of rates across this Territory, ever thought of making an overall picture at these types of programs and bringing them together and see where they priorities really lay whether it is needed by all the people that are using electric light or a home owner or whether it is needed by a certain group of taxpayers or whether it is needed by a certain group of people that are burning coal stoves or oil stoves or whatsoever, and maybe coming up with a program where the priorities might be better than they are now, I will not go on with that because this is rate equalization. The Home Owners' Grant is another thing but it fits right in there with the picture of what I would like to see.

I would like to see an overall policy and some priorities in just where we give that money back to the public.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, any time we do that, regardless of what program it is, Home Owner Grant, Electrical Rate Equalization, is not sure which way you slice it, you are talking about a means test, and Mr. Chairman, the work and the administration of going into any one of these programs of not setting up a means test program, but going into a means test just sets up another department, a lot of agencies that you would have inspectors, I think how the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua just loves inspectors getting into the person's personal life and finances, but I ignore it, there is no other way to go, whether it is grants to senior citizens, home owner grants, that you are going to have to, somewhere, if you want to not make it a universal program, come into some methods of means tests.

Now everybody that I know about the universality of a program is better than getting into that kind of an area, Mr. Chairman, and that is the only way you are going to do it. If you think there is a certain group that makes too much money and should not get a Home Owner's Grant and should not get electrical rate equalization, okay, I tell you, be prepared for an awful lot of misdirection, an awful lot of bureaucracy, an awful lot of inspection and an awful lot of hassle. If the Honourable Member wants it, he can have it, I do not particularly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the witness was telling us the reason there is an additional \$200,000 needed in the electricity equalization funding is because the taxation of Yukon Electrical is lower, in other words the profit picture changed. I will not send me to an area which the people of Whitehorse do not like to hear. My feeling on this subject is that the electrical rates charged in Whitehorse are not realistic enough. Otherwise if they would have kept up with the times, the profit picture of Yukon Electrical should never have changed.

In other words, the profit picture should have stayed the same, I would like Mr. Brudoch could comment on that?

Mr. Brudoch: I am sorry, was there a question at the end of that?

Mr. Berger: There was a question.

Mr. McKinnon: I do not think it was a proper question, because it is not a matter with this House, it is a matter of corporation law, up to the Federal Government.

Mr. Berger: That is correct, Mr. Chairman, but by the same token, if a private company only taxes on their profits. When the funding was set up, I believe the taxation refund was roughly about \$1 million, \$800,000 to \$1 million. In other words, when the Yukon utility company charged too much for the rating of the time, so much too much of a profit, or they are not charging it right now and they do not make a profit, this is not a proper question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McKinnon: I think everybody agrees with you, Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: There was an additional \$200,000 needed on the electricity equalization.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think the first assumption he made was absolutely correct, before the Electrical Public Utilities Board came into being, the income tax that they had to pay on profits was quite healthy. Therefore, the money that the Territory got back was fairly substantial and we did not use all of the rebates. Under the scheme that we have now, we did not need them all for one year.

However, the Electrical Public Utilities Board came into operation and they reviewed the rates that the company were allowed to charge and as a result of that, their profits were cut down considerably so their income tax payments were less, so the rebate payments that we get back into the Territory were less.

Meanwhile, electrical rates have gone up and we find ourselves into a beautiful squeeze. Another thing, our equalization scheme, for the first 300 kilowatts, everybody pays two cents a kilowatt and I think we all realize that your distribution companies are going to heavy-load that front 300 kilowatts and they are going to go at things like fourteen, fifteen cents for the first 300 kilowatts and a rebate scheme is paying, if they were charging fourteen, the rebate scheme is paying twelve cents per kilowatt, for that.

That is why our fund is in trouble, but I agree with the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua and I disagree with the Minister of Local Government that you are looking at a means test, I do not agree with that all.

If you look at your electrical rate equalization scheme that you have now, you look at your Home Owner Grants and you look at some of these other things and you have to consider one of the reports that was brought in the other day, the equalization of electrical rates across the Territory. Some of these things have to be looked at in order to make the benefits that the Territorial Government is giving out, equitable across the Territory.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would just as soon debate this further when we get into it in the Mains, when we are looking at, like a million dollars.

Mr. Sherlock: I have one more question, please, Mr. Chairman, if I may, is how much of a percentage, or what percentage of the profit or income tax paid to the Federal Government do we get back? What percentage of the actual.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Ninety-five per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that I know and I have seen the power bills in every one of these areas across the Yukon, but, Mr. Chairman, you try to tell the electrical user in Whitehorse that his rates are not realistic, if you are a politician in Whitehorse, and, honestly, Mr. Chairman, you do not get very far because they feel that they are pretty realistic and I think that mine are.

Mr. Berger: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to counter that because I am quite willing to stand up and say, no, they are not realistic enough, comparing with outlying areas, because the thing is that if I look at my own electricity bill and what I have in electricity used in my home, it is completely unrealistic to what they pay in Whitehorse here.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, can we not say that yours are more realistic than mine?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if you read the study that was prepared by the task force that NCPC set up and one of the statements they made there that Whitehorse had one of the cheapest rates of electricity in all of Canada.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Not any longer, that was about three or four years ago.

Mrs. Watson: No.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 202?

Mr. Lengerke: It depends on who you are comparing it with.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 202, Electrical Rate Equalization, Supplementary is \$200,000, revised Vote is \$800,000. Establishment 202 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 203, Central Purchasing and Stores, a decrease of \$19,900; Revised Vote \$339,100. Any discussion?

Establishment 203 agreed to

Mr. Berger: Just a question on Establishment 203. What are the savings with the new VHF system? I see the savings on communications charges and I presume this is part of the savings in that particular area.

Mr. Sherlock: These are just small adjustments again within the Establishment, within some Primaries. That communications is simply long distance telephone calls within the branch.

On Establishment 204

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 204, Heating Fuel Equalization, it is a decrease of \$6,500; Revised Vote \$8,500. Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, is this a matter of over budgeting, over-estimating, or is it a matter that we actually have a reduction in the number of applicants?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it is a case of over budgeting, our budget figures are generally based on historical information and some forward projections, and in this case there was a small reduction in applicants as well, sorry, there was a small reduction. Why I do not know.

Mrs. Watson: Is there a difference in the differential between the fuel rates in some of the outlying areas and in Whitehorse? For example, last year and the year before, the difference between the fuel rates in Whitehorse and say Dawson City would be 18 or 20 cents. In the next year, is the differential constant, or does it vary?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I think I had better come back with that answer. There are so many difficulties, there are so many complications with this. I have answered it before to Mr. Fleming on a previous occasion and I really do not want to answer that question without looking at it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it would be fine if we could have it for when we go through the fuel equalization and I am quite prepared to carry this.

Mr. Berger: I wonder if somebody could tell me what attempt is made to make this plan known to the people in the Yukon? There are always new people coming in and I wonder if this is part of the reason why there is a reduction?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the plan is advertised both in the paper and on the radio and news media. I do not know what else we can do, short of sending the forms out to individuals.

Mr. Fleming: No, Mr. Chairman, I was not going to, but seeing as you mentioned my name I will say a word. I was just wondering, as I was saying I wondered about the program when it was first brought in and wonder about it now. That is what I was speaking of in priorities a while ago. I am just wondering if this program is really a program that was a necessity. It is small, it does help some of the people in the outlying districts, very few, some of them do not even bother with it, because the paper work amounts to just as much as you get back practically in some places. However, I think in the case of the Member from Kluane, in Dawson or somewhere, where the freight is exorbitant from Whitehorse to there, it would help some of the citizens so I have nothing other to add, but I think that maybe it may not be a priority at all really.

I think, possibly, the people in the outlying districts are not putting in for it because they know that the Government has too much money and they are hoping to make sure that all the people in Whitehorse get their full share of the Home Owner Grant and so forth and so on.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this has been

answered, but how many applicants did we have last year?

Mr. Sherlock: For 1977, Mr. Chairman, 118 applicants.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Establishment 204, Heating Fuel Equalization, \$6,500 reduction, revised Vote \$8,500.

Establishment 204 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: There is no change in the Home Owners' Grant.

On Establishment 210

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 210, Prior Year's Adjustment, Supplementary Number 3, is \$125,000, revised Vote \$125,000.

Discussion?

Mr. Lengerke: What statutory adjustments or accounts?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, those refer primarily to adjustments on recovery, on claims, recovery claims where we may have put in a claim and a portion of it may be disallowed by auditors later on and we have to make an adjustment, which goes into the prior year and some of our claims go back several years. That is why it is Prior Year's.

The figure itself is based on last year's actual.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that would involve an estimate on the revenue that you will be receiving or recovering from the rebate fund for the electrical equalization, this type of thing. You have to estimate, but you do not know until a few years later.

Mr. Sherlock: That is correct, Mrs. Watson.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if the statutory adjustments are not made for expenditures, though, expenditures in there?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I should clarify that last one, because Mrs. Watson used the term electric rate equalization and it really does not have anything to do with electric rate equalization.

These are claims on Canada, adjustments on claims on Canada, which go back to prior years and there are adjustments made. Sometimes we put in things that should not have been in there and we have to make an adjustment. This allows for making the adjustment.

Mr. Lengerke: Well, Mr. Chairman, how long is that reflected in the budget, really, if you cannot make the claim in there, they do not accept it, does that not sort of become a bad debt sometime and do you not eventually have to write it off?

Mr. Sherlock: No, no, Mr. Chairman, that is not really what this is.

Mr. Lengerke: No, but if you are back so many years, you are making adjustments, when, you know, when do you catch up on that?

Mr. Sherlock: What this really refers to is this is a charge, so, in other words, we have overclaimed on a claim on Canada. This is an adjustment of that kind.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay, now I have got you. I recall last year we discussed this.

Mr. Sherlock: Right.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 210, Prior Year's Adjustment, Supplementary Number 300, \$125,000, revised Vote, \$125,000.

Establishment 210 agreed to

On Establishment 211

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 211, Write-off of Bad Debts, Supplementary Number 3, \$60,000; Revised Vote \$60,000. Any discussion?

Mr. Lengerke: Just a common question again: how far back do the debts go, what do you keep on the list?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, we keep them on the list

forever and continually try to collect them, but there does come a point in time when we have to consider that some accounts are not collectible and some of them may be even one or two years old only, but if there is indication that they are not collectible, then we put them up for write-off and we have to write them off.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I just might ask an example. There are bad debts in all departments, or just where do they accumulate?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, they could come from any department and it could concern just about anything. It could be anything from taxes to school bills to water bills to whatever, road maintenance, third party claims, bills and this kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Establishment 211, Write-off of Bad Debts, Supplementary Number 3, \$60,000; Revised Votes \$60,000.

Establishment 211 agreed to

On Establishment 300

Mr. Chairman: We will now turn to Department of Education, Supplementary Number 3, \$23,000; Revised Votes \$14,153,700. Page 10, Establishment 300, Administration - Education, Supplementary Number 3, \$152,200; Revised Votes \$789,800.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, \$144,000 of this is in respect to monies allocated for the various transfers of man years in the area of manpower, as well as the increase of the administration for the Regional Superintendents that we discussed while going through the Main Estimates.

The balance of the remainder of money was approximately \$4,000 for the School Committee Annual General Meeting, and there was a slight increase in stationary supplies which amounted to approximately \$4,000.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Honourable Member we still have not got that staff complement that he was going to give us for the administrative side of the Department of Education. I think that it is necessary when we are looking at \$152,000 of an over-expenditure. I think we would like to see it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, my staff is preparing all that and it was my intention to bring it in when we went back to Vote 300 in the Mains, to give a clear indication.

Mr. Chairman: Anyone else?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is a 25 per cent overrun on this Establishment.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I went through it in the Main Estimates, I can go through it again. The two Regional Superintendents, the splitting of north and southern regions in Yukon, Assistant Regional Superintendent, the reason for this I gave during the last budget session that we were going to increase the staff in view of the fact that we could not perform the necessary duties outlined by the legislation that is presently in force. The Secretariat was transferred from Intergovernmental Affairs, the Manpower Co-ordinator was a transfer from Vote 4, Employment Liaison Officer was a transfer from the Territorial Secretary and there is an additional secretary. I outlined this in the Main Estimates, Mr. Chairman, and I am not trying to hide anything. Possibly Mr. Sherlock could add something further to what I have said.

Mr. Sherlock: The only thing I could add would be that there would be the corresponding reductions in the other departments.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, just one position?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Chairman, three positions.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Establishment 300, Administration Education, Supplementary Number 3, \$152,200, Revised Vote, \$789,800.

Establishment 300 agreed to
On Establishment 302

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 302, Schools-Curriculum, Supplies and Salaries, Supplementary Number 3, a reduction of \$58,400, Revised Vote \$6,934,500.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this Establishment 302 is in reference to the teacher salary adjustments, which, as you know, are governed by the Anti-Inflation Board and we have processed a six per cent increase. At the same time, we are pending the Anti-Inflation Board's decision and there is a slight balance in budgeted salaries.

Materials and supplies required for classroom use, will have a balance of \$12,000, in view of the fact that we had some orders cancelled by various suppliers, for whatever reasons that they were not able to fill the orders that we had made out.

Mr. Sherlock: I was just going to add that in that Establishment 302, in fact, \$42,000 of that \$58,000 represents a reduction of salaries, as a result of conversion of positions from teachers to superintendents. So there is \$42,000 of a reduction that relates to Establishment 300.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Establishment 302, Schools-Curriculum, Supplies and Salaries, a reduction of \$58,400, Revised Vote \$6,934,500.

Establishment 302 agreed to

On Establishment 303

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 303 School Support - Salaries and Supplies, \$68,200, Revised Vote \$2,907,900.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the reason for the increase in this particular area is the cost of heat and light over the year increased over budget by approximately \$89,700. The relocating of portable classrooms cost over-budget by \$17,964, and the increase in these areas have been partially off-set by the reduced cost of transporting school children, which is approximately \$39,000, and that is in reference to the allowance that we pay out in lieu of school transportation.

In other words, it would appear that in many instances where children were going to school and their parents were getting the allowance that we prescribe by Regulation, it has been down as opposed to what it was last year. It is a continuing, fluctuating situation which we are never too sure of until the end of the year comes and we can balance our books accordingly.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 303, School Support, Supplementary Number 3, \$68,200, Revised Vote \$2,907,900.

Establishment 303 agreed to

On Establishment 304

Establishment 304, French Language Program, Supplementary Number 3, \$1,800; Revised Vote \$102,300.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the interesting points in this Establishment is that the salaries have increased over the base by, I believe, \$8,145 due to the expansion in community programs, which we made reference to in the debates in the Main Estimates on this section. The increase is offset by reduced costs of a program evaluation that was going on of \$5,000 and the student grants that the Territory provides to two students through the Federal Government to attend francophone universities, this last year we only had one qualified application so it left a balance of \$1,345.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 304 agreed to

On Establishment 306

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 306, Teacher Training Program, Supplementary Number 3, \$57,700; Revised Vote \$157,700.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this reflects the cost of the program over the duration of the past year over and above what

was voted last year which was \$100,000.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 306 agreed to

On Establishment 309

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 309, Student Accommodation, decrease of \$6,800; Revised Vote \$156,300.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think that is fairly straight forward, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 309 agreed to

On Establishment 313

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 313, Special Education Programs for Exceptional Children, decrease \$18,400; Revised Vote \$537,800.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that is in reference back to 302, that is an adjustment governed by the AIB and that reflects that.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 313 agreed to

On Establishment 314

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 314, Post Secondary Grants & Bursaries decrease \$36,800; Revised Vote \$184,200.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this reflects the number of students receiving grants and bursaries. Last year we estimated 215 and it would appear approximately 190 students will be recipients of the grants and bursaries available through this Government. Also additional savings have been achieved in this area due to the fact that a number of students have not maintained a 65 per cent average and that reflects that as well.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 314 agreed to

On Establishment 319

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 319, Recreation, Supplementary Number 3, \$174,000, Revised Vote \$505,400.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this reflects the increase in the area of recreation, in view of the passage of the *Recreation Development Ordinance*. At the end of this year, there will be \$82,100 spent on the cost-shared programs with the various communities.

The Arctic Winter Games total, at the present time, looks like approximately \$67,900 and at the same time, the Recreation Department, in agreement with the Yukon Sports Federation, who levies the Western Canada Lottery now, the Government still receives, I believe it is twelve and a half per cent of the net profit and it appears that \$24,000 will accrue to this Government, through this.

So, this outlines approximately \$24,000, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Recreation Grants and the Recreation Assistance Program, I know, is new and is just getting started and I am just wondering, when does the Minister plan to have an evaluation of the monies and how they were spent and where they were spent, to see if they are being handled properly and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, basically, they put a budget forward, it through the Recreation Department and subsequently, a budget is agreed upon between the Recreation Department and the community. The monies are sent out to the communities and then they have to account March 31st.

At the same time, we have the ability, under the legislation, to ask for accountings at various times through the year if we feel it should be done. So it will be an on-going basis.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mrs. Watson: I am not quite satisfied with that. We are looking at \$67,900 for the Arctic Winter Games. What was

given in the Main Estimates for that, for the Arctic Winter Games?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it was a case of any being voted other than the monies that are allocated to the Arctic Winter Games Corporation. I think it is in reference to the White Paper that was tabled here last Session, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. Sherlock, do you have any more on that?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, all three of those items are new, in fact. They were not in the Mains for 1977-'78.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think they were discussed, Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing the Paper that was submitted to the House here last Session.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, what is the \$67,000, \$68,000 for? Is it for travel to the Northwest Territories?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the travel to the Northwest Territories, which I believe is in the area of \$40,000 to \$45,000 it is going to cost for transportation, walking out dress and, I believe, it is fifty per cent of the monies needed to organize the contingent that will represent Yukon in the forthcoming Winter Games.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out each athlete participating is putting forth to the Government of Yukon Territory \$65 following along the policy that was outlined with the Canada Summer Games for their walking out dress, as well as a few dollars going towards transportation so that the athlete is putting something forward for the organization. It is up to them how they raise the money.

Mr. Sherlock do you have a better breakdown than that possibly? I do not have that with me.

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, we do not.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like a list of the grants that have been given out to the various recreation organizations and boards within Yukon Territory for that \$82,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that information will be forthcoming when we are discussing it in the Main Estimates. It is just being compiled and I will have it for the Honourable Member.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we have already discussed Recreation in the Main Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Chairman, I could table it as a paper when we are in Vote 3, let's put it that way.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if we could go back to Recreation, fine.

Mr. Chairman: Are you dealing with this item we are discussing now, Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing \$82,000, we are being asked to vote \$82,000 and we are going to get the details of it when we go into the Main Estimates. I am saying we have already discussed the Main Estimates, but if we go back into Vote 3, I am quite happy to wait until then, but I would like the information, the money has been spent so I am going to have to let this go through, but I would like to have the information.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if we can continue with the various Establishments, and then possibly after coffee break because I think I have the information on my desk. I would have to check and see, but I know they have been compiling it and we could refer back after coffee then.

Mr. Chairman: Has this something to do with this particular thing we are voting, Mr. Lang?

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

Mr. Chairman: Well, we will stand this particular item over and break for coffee. We will recess for a short while, fifteen or twenty minutes.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would the Committee come to order, please?

Hon. Mr. Lang: For clarification, Mr. Chairman, in the Recreation Assistance Program, up to now there is a \$58,097.57 been expended and it would appear that, depending on, as of March 31st, when the balancing of the various budgets in the communities, which the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua referred to, there could be an expenditure of a further \$24,000.

I think that clarifies it, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: These are advances, what happens if they cannot justify the advance and you are not able to show that the community has spent 40 per cent of that? Will they then owe the money to the Government?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that with the community organizations, that there is a \$1,000 incorporation grant, initially, that is a once only grant, so it is to their own discretion of how they want to administer that amount of money.

The remainder, I would presume, is that if the 20 per cent has been held back to the various organizations and if they cannot justify the expenditures, then, therefore, I would say, it would reflect on the amount of money that they would get in the on-coming year.

Mr. Sherlock, do you have anything to add?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, I think that is probably what would happen. There would be a hold-back on the following year's grants.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering how good a job the government is doing. It is not that I think that the people are getting too much money or anything, because I think that they are entitled to it and probably are going to use it very well, but we still should make sure that we do have a good accounting system of it.

Just what are you accepting as a fact, when you get it? Just a paper from the community association with we spent so much on this and so much on that? Are you going to ask for some sort of receipts that prove that this money has been spent or, you know, has it been used correctly?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there would have to be a proper procedure in respect to receipts and this kind of thing to justify it. I think the Honourable Member has raised a very good point. I think we have to do that as far as the Government is concerned to ensure that the money is being spent where it is designated through the *Recreation Development Ordinance*. I think we have to give it a full year just to see how the program works and I would like to think that Members could, if they do see things possibly wrong that they should be bringing it to my attention and subsequently, as I said in debate during the Recreation budget in the Main Estimates, that there is going to have to be amendments to the Ordinance and it could be taken into account at that time. I am not precluding any changes that have to be made or anything else. I think everything should be monitored on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Fleming: I agree with the Minister, but obviously he did not realize as we are having an election in the outlying districts this fall too, and we better not bring too much to the attention.

Ms Millard: I am just curious, Mr. Chairman, why is not Dawson on the list?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it would be my assumption that they have not applied for the program. There has been a lot of publicity. I can check into it for the Honourable Member.

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, because I understand the Recreation Board operates under this system.

Mr. Berger: Just for the enlightenment of the Members, I think they just had an election in Dawson and are just in the

process of getting their things together. **Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member feels that any of us are going to say that any of our communities are getting too much money, he might as well forget it, I do not think they are getting enough money. But I do not like the way that they have to get the money. I did not agree with the *Recreation Ordinance* at the time it went through, and I see what is happening now and I am really very, very concerned.

I am quite prepared to let it go for a year, but I think what we are doing is getting some of our people into problems. In order to qualify for some of these recreation grants, they have to set up recreation programs, which they have never had. All of a sudden they are going to have all of this money spent by the end of March. I do not think they were aware of this at all. I think we have got some people into trouble with this, but I am prepared to wait and see. It was the very thing that I spoke about when we were discussing the *Recreation Ordinance*, but I will wait and see.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 319?

Establishment 319, Recreation, \$174,000, Revised Vote \$505,400.

Establishment 319 agreed to

On Establishment 320

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 320, Administration-Vocational Apprenticeship Training, \$5,400. Revised Vote \$59,300.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that is fairly straightforward. The Director travel costs have increased over the base and due to the commitments that we have with the Manpower related matters for the Vocational School of approximately \$4,220, and the salary costs have increased due to staff changes in the clerical support and the increase there is \$1,180.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 320 agreed to

On Establishment 321

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 321, Yukon Vocational and Technical Training Centre, a reduction of \$310,100. Revised Vote, \$1,728,800.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of variables that have affected this particular Establishment. We have had two vacant positions for quite some time, the vice principal and the community basic education supervisor. Some programs began late and the community basic education and the linesmen's course. This has resulted in a net reduction of approximately \$155,100.

In view of the change in the Unemployment Insurance Regulations, that were recently amended by Canada, allowing Territorial students to apply for allowance payments through their benefits under the Unemployment Insurance funds, this has resulted in a net reduction of expenditures in that area of approximately \$95,000.

The heavy equipment operators course has been able to participate in two projects which are cost-shared by another government agency, somewhere to the situation that took place in the municipality of Faro on their airport. This last year it was the heavy equipment operators course was utilized, in agreement with the Department of Transport to upgrade aviation areas around the Whitehorse Airport and the work with Parks Canada to upgrade the area surrounding the S.S. Klondike, for a change of \$60,000. That totals \$310,000, which is reflected in the budget.

I think it speaks very well, Mr. Chairman, of the Vocational staff, in respect to the heavy equipment operators' course, because it is a very expensive course to run and if we can get these various projects on a cost-shared basis with them, it will definitely bring our costs down, because the costs are ever escalating.

I think if anybody is involved in machinery, they all know that at one time a 950 loader was running for about \$30 an hour and now it is running for about \$55 an hour. That just shows you the costs that accrue to this Government for that program.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, are the community programs reflected in here at all, for instance Lifeskills programs?

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

Ms Millard: Well, then, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would be interested in some information that we got this afternoon, about an application from the Whitehorse Correctional Institute to have the Lifeskills course, not particularly in the building, but to allow the inmates to have the access to a Lifeskills program and they were turned down.

I wonder, you may not know anything about that off the top of your head, but if you would like to investigate it, I am sure they would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that has never been brought to my attention.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise me, how long that Vice-Principal job has been vacant? Was there some problem in recruiting one?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The job has been vacant for quite a number of years, Mr. Chairman. We have assessed the situation with the Vocational School and we have just not felt at this time that it is necessary to fill the position. That is where the situation stands at the present time.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, if there is no need to fill it, why do we keep budgeting for it?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, possibly this could be in the discussion for the Main Estimates when we get into—

Mr. Lengerke: I will ask it again.

Mrs. Watson: That is why it is nice to have a list of the administrative people that you have in your department. I mean that. Mr. Chairman, last year we budgeted \$459,000, I believe, for the community courses. We lapsed \$310,000 that we did not require. So we only spent \$158,000 last year on the community courses. This year, however, we are coming back in again and we are asking for \$455,000 again for community courses. If you did not spend \$300,000 of it last year, what indication have we that you are going to spend \$400,000 this year.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the Chairman that that would be questions for the Main Estimates, but in respect to the \$310,000 not expended this last year in this Establishment, I outlined it is not all to community basic education, there are cases of positions not being filled, programs starting late, not only some of the community basic education programs starting late, the linesmen course starting late, and then there were the changes in the *Unemployment Insurance Act* which has affected our balance as of March 31st.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Treasurer could tell us exactly what the cost is of the Heavy Equipment course to this Government? What was the cost last year of that \$100,000 that was spent in total?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry it is not included in our details. But I would make a point though that I raised earlier in my general reply on salaries, this does in fact inflate that kind of situation where there was some additional salary money budgeted for all salary positions. This is a case where there were vacancies and of course the money is being pulled back.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder to what extent Manpower participation was greater. Was it greater in the number of spaces that they picked up last year, or was it greater in the subsistence allowance that they were prepared to pay?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I outlined the fact that the subsistence allowance now with the *Unemployment Insurance*—

Act of Canada, with the amendments that went through last fall, has changed so that if a person is eligible for the benefits for unemployment insurance, that is their allowance so we had a decrease in allowance being paid out by this Government for the various spaces that we purchase in a program to the tune of \$90,000.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Hon. Mr. Lang: \$95,000.

Mrs. Watson: That was left in this year's Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will have to have a look at, when we are, we are going, that Vote has not been, that Establishment has not been cleared, so, possibly it could wait to have those questions answered when we are in the Estimates.

Mrs. Watson: I would like to have my question answered, though. Was there greater Manpower participation in the number of slots that were picked up in the courses? Manpower usually says that they will pick up a certain percentage of the spaces in each course and there has always been some argument with Manpower, they make a commitment that they will pick up so many spaces and then, when it gets time to recover, they sort of renege on it or they have changed their policy. Has there been a more generous commitment by Manpower to pick up spaces, during this year?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, it is the same procedure as last year and I must say that, in respect to Canada Manpower, working with this Government and the Vocational School on the purchasing of spaces, we have found them to be very co-operative.

To my knowledge, the disposition of spaces, as far as the Territorial Government pays for as opposed to Canada Manpower is, I believe, approximately the same. I do not have the numbers with me.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, when the community courses were first brought in by the Territorial Government, they were brought in at the urging of Canada Manpower. Canada Manpower, at that time, were prepared to almost pick up 100 per cent of the spaces for the community course, Lifeskills, B.L.A.D.E., and these types of things.

Then, as the years went by and it was not that popular a thing, Canada Manpower changed their policies, started backing out and they were down quite a bit less than 50 per cent. That meant that the Territorial Government had embarked upon these programs, then Canada Manpower was pulling out.

What per cent of the spaces in the community courses was Canada Manpower picking up in this past year?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I do not have those figures with me, possibly the Treasurer has.

I should point out that the Honourable Member has raised a very good point and this is in reference to the new policies that the Federal Government is putting out in the area of purchasing space and purchasing space in vocational schools and putting monies in areas where there is economic growth so that there is job potential, once an individual has completed training.

In the provinces, they are making it very clear that they are going to be removing money from the area of community basic education programs.

As far as the Territory is concerned, it looks as if they are prepared to carry on for the next two to three years, but, at the same time, in view of the fact that we are having the assessment that I promised this House here last Session, and as I told you, I believe, the day before yesterday, that we should have an initial report in from the individual that had working on it from Alberta, within the next month. At least, I would like to think within the next month.

But, the point is that I am getting at is that the Federal Government, the day of reckoning is coming and it should be within the next two to three years, Mr. Chairman.

Possibly Mr. Wilson has the answer.

Mr. Sherlock: The backup does not indicate the number of positions that were purchased, it indicates a slight reduction but I cannot give you the percentage, I would have to come back with that answer.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, usually it is an agreement between Canada Manpower and the Vocational School. The last time I think it was 30 some per cent and I would like somebody to let us know what it was for 1977-78 and what we can look forward to for 1978-79, specifically on the community courses.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will bring that information in when we go back to Vote 3, 322, when we go back through the Mains, that will help with our debate on the particular Vote.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 321?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, maybe it would be better to take this up with the Mains, but the fact was that we are talking about the basic skills course. Is there an effort made by the Vocational School to work with the Correctional Institute and the Juvenile Detention Home to make available to them some of the courses that they offer or make available to them spaces for some of the courses that they offer?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will bring that information in when we get back to the Main Estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 321?

Establishment 321, Yukon Vocational & Technical Training Centre, decrease \$310,100; Revised Vote \$1,728,800.

Establishment 321 agreed to
On Establishment 322

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 322, Adult Education - Night School and Continuing Education, decrease \$9,100; Revised Vote \$57,800.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this reflects that some of the programs that we were prepared to offer last year in some of the communities, the interest was not there and subsequently we have a free balance left in that particular Establishment.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take exception to that, because I think the interest is shown in every community in the outlying areas, but the minimum requirement of participants and that, this is why a lot of the communities do not even bother any more applying for the night school classes, because I think the minimum requirement is still a minimum of 10 participants in each course. In a lot of communities, there are not that many people available that they can take interest in a thing like this. I think I have been standing up now for four years and asking when are they going to lower this requirement. Now we are turning money back because it was not made available probably.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I have not any comments to make other than similar to what I have done in other budget sessions. I believe if my memory serves me correctly, it is a minimum of 10 participants in a program and I think that that is a minimal number that should be involved in a program if the Government is going to fund it. I think that we have an obligation to ensure that there are enough people taking the program to warrant putting the program on. I think this Government would be laughed out of the country if we were prepared to put a program on where it was a one to one basis.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I will stand up for the fourth time as well and say the same thing. I am beginning to wonder why it is when a politician gets elected to Executive Committee position that they become Civil Servants and not politicians anymore. Politicians are politicians to change policy, that is the whole definition of a politician. Policy is changed from pressure by elected Members on the Government to change those things.

there has been no response to things. Even little things like this, I find it is a useless exercise for the fourth time to stand up and say the same thing that the Member from Klondike has said, that in Dawson there would be five more courses if they were allowed to have seven people or six people. There are people willing to teach courses in Dawson that have only five or six people who are interested and they will teach them for nothing, but you won't even allow that to happen.

Is the policy of the politician who runs the Department of Education one of non-education, of no education of adults in night school? I mean, that is the only conclusion I can come to, because the pressure has been brought, not only from the Member from Klondike and I, but many, many times to the Department that this is something that is needed and it is such a small change and here we are turning back \$9,000.

I find it incredible that a politician does not understand what a politician's job is for and it is to change policy, not to stand there and say what the policy is and I am sorry, I cannot do anything about it, but that is the way the Department runs.

You are there to change those things and I have not seen any change yet.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, if there was a question, have you an answer?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: There was not a question.

Mr. Chairman: There is no answer.

Any further discussion?

What was the question?

Ms Millard: I will ask a question if he needs an question to sit on his feet. When can we expect a policy change in this part, even this minor little part of the budget, or can we expect it there will be no policy change from our politicians?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I feel at the policy that is in effect at the present time is justified in view of the fact that there should be a number of people taking the program.

I have to say to the Honourable Member, about changing policies, I think that it is evident that we have done this in various areas in this Government and I do not think that the accusations by the Honourable Member are correct, but that is my opinion as opposed to hers.

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the policy is correct. If you can bring me evidence to the fact that there are other interests and that there should be, possibly, a change, I would be prepared to look at them.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would have to stand on this one here. We go again to the multitudes and we put up policies for the multitude. The City of Whitehorse has plenty of people, that is fine and dandy. Ten can go to any school, any night, you can get that crowd.

You go to an area such as Carcross, Teslin, I might name a half a dozen of them, Ross River, Haines Junction, although it is getting to be quite a centre, but, you know, and you do not get that type, you cannot get that amount of people that are going to take any single course.

So, therefore, I do not care what it costs or anything else, if the program is going to be here, then it is up to the Government to look and find a way to make a different policy.

Ms Millard: Right on.

Mr. Fleming: And that is your problem and I think it is time you did it on this one.

Applause

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to look at it and I will get back to Members.

Mr. Lengerke: Well, enough has been said, I think. I was just going to say, yes, I think the policy does reflect a Whitehorse standard and I think we have stood many times and heard the Members and I am wondering why we cannot take a

look at something like a one to five or one to six ratio basis.

However, I would say that there is some onus on the Members as well, and people in the outlying areas to identify those courses that they want put on, because I do not think that has been done either.

Well, I would like to have some evidence of that. A Minister has said before there is no interest. Well if there interest for one or two, let's hear about it.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, there is no use identifying the courses anymore, because like I said before the people are sick and tired of applying for those things because the answer comes back just like a broken record you have to have a minimum of ten. So what is the use bothering with the whole thing? Whitehorse is the only area in the Yukon where people think about it. Right now I think again the whole concentration is on Whitehorse. But nothing in the outlying areas. Again I am getting sick and tired of trying to have to emphasize it in this House.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I think we have the right to change that policy, and if a motion wants to come forward, we can do that immediately.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to look at it and I will report back to this House within the next week.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with him looking at it. You look at everything, and we do not have any changes.

Mr. Chairman: Are you inferring that the Minister is a voyeur?

Mrs. Watson: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: Are you inferring that the Minister is a voyeur? Any further discussion on 322?

Ms Millard: Could we hold that over then until we get the reply from the looking into?

Mr. Chairman: You are going to do that in the Mains.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, we have the Main Estimates and I have heard the Honourable Members and I am prepared to look at it and hopefully I will have an answer by the end of next week.

Mrs. Watson: Oh, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Establishment 322, Adult Education - Night School and Continuing Education, down \$9,100; Revised Vote \$57,800.

Establishment 322 agreed to

On Establishment 323

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 323, Apprenticeship Training, Supplementary Number 3, \$3,300; Revised Vote \$31,900.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think Mr. Chairman that is fairly straight forward.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I cannot use that line now at all, you have ruined it.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion on 323?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister could explain to us the "pool car usage".

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think this reflects the Honourable Member from Pelly's interest in this area, and it is obvious that we are doing more work and more responsibility in the area of apprenticeship training. The Co-ordinator's travel has increased because of the requirements of the number of people that are apprenticing and we need to check the verification of their journeyman status.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: At what rate are pool cars charged back to a program?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is ten cents a mile, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if it would not be possible, especially to Faro, there are daily flights into Faro,

would it not be cheaper to fly into Faro?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this could quite conceivably happen.

Mr. Berger: Will the Minister look into this one too?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member wants me to purchase the airline, I will look into that, too.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we had an answer to the charge that is made to every department for pool car usage and whether it is the same for last year or whether it goes up every year.

Mr. Sherlock: The last year's charge, Mr. Chairman, was thirty cents per mile. I understand it has remained the same this year.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion.

Establishment 323, Apprenticeship Training, Supplementary Number 3, \$3,300. Revised Vote \$31,900.

*Establishment 323 agreed to
On Establishment 400*

Mr. Chairman: We will go now to Territorial Secretary and Registrar General, Supplementary Number 3 \$83,000. Revised Vote \$1,335,300, page 14, Establishment 400.

Mr. Hibberd: have you an introductory comment?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the increase in the expenditure merely represents as outlined here. The costs as far as the Electrical Public Utilities Board is concerned, these costs, of course, are incurred by the Board and are independently incurred.

It is due, primarily, to the result to the fact that there were more meetings and they had a good deal of costs due to contracts, when they were evaluating the utility rate increases.

The Credit Union itself also had costs, in terms of the evaluation of their programs, as well. There were more of them than was expected.

Most of the others are fairly minor. No significant increases.

Mr. Lengerke: Can we just have those increases identified for the utilities and the Credit Union?

Mr. Sherlock: The Public Utilities increase is \$45,000. The *Credit Union Ordinance* is \$8,000. Increased mailings - \$14,000, "Hansard" - \$15,000.

There was a decrease in travel - \$6,000. Weigh scale losses - \$38,000.

In addition to that, there were transfers of personnel in and out and there was some cost changes in that. Library and clerk, was a \$26,000 adjustment net decrease in transfers of personnel in and out of the Department.

Mr. Lengerke: Further explanation on the *Credit Union Ordinance* costs of the \$8,000. What exactly was that for and also the weigh scale losses. I think that is pretty common.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that concerns a fee paid to a supervisory examination by the Credit Union of British Columbia.

Mr. Chairman: The weigh scale losses.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that is simply a loss incurred in the operation of the weigh scales minus the permits.

Mr. Lengerke: Is the report available that had to be done on the *Credit Union Ordinance* or the evaluation by the?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, they are undergoing an evaluation right now and we are awaiting the report for that.

Mr. Lengerke: We have already paid \$8,000, I understand, for that.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: That is true, Mr. Chairman, but the audit on which we are waiting as for the performance is what I think you are looking for, and that is what is now being evaluated right at the present time.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, once again, the \$8,000 is an

estimate of what we anticipate the bill to be.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, a question on the Hansard, we do get about \$15,000 back. I think we are possibly losing a lot of money due to the fact that the Government does not have a policy as to who pays and who does not pay for Hansard. I am wondering in the logic of, according to the answer I got a month or so ago here, that the Government employees do not have to pay for Hansard. I could understand this where probably Deputy Heads or departments possibly would be able to get them, but I cannot quite understand the logic in all Government employees being able to get Hansard without paying for it?

Mr. Sherlock: I am not sure I have an answer for what the Member asked, but the \$15,000 that I mentioned earlier really relates to the increased cost in Hansard because of the increased sitting days in the Assembly. The Member asked a different question altogether, which I do not have an answer for.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I am not so concerned about the \$8,000 figure, but I am concerned about the method in which this is done. Why would that not be in this year's budget? If it is going to be that is going to be completed, why do we not pay for it out of this year's budget? It reflects the wrong way and I wonder how many other items we do this for, and then we get a Supplementary?

Mr. Chairman: We are still in this year, Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay, I am sorry, that is fine then.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear. We just passed the *Credit Union Ordinance* last year, I believe, yes. Now this amount of money that is required, is this required in order for the Government to do some of the things they have to under the *Credit Union Ordinance*, they have a responsibility to do an audit or an inspection of the credit union and is this is what this is for?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is exactly what it is for. There is a statutory provision in the Ordinance for the Government to examine certain things within the Credit Union, and we contracted that examination out to the Credit Union of BC or the BC Central and that is what this costing is for.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, is the requirement a legal requirement that that report must be made, it is a confidential report to the Government?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hibberd?

We will just accept the question for Ms Millard in the interim.

Ms Millard: Yes, it was back to what Mr. Fleming was talking about. I think what he was asking for was a policy on who gets Hansard and who does not and I know, in practice, there does not seem to be any real policy, because there are some people who have received it for years and are still receiving it because they have received it for years.

But, new applicants have to pay fifteen dollars a Session and I was questioning this once before.

Also, I have discovered that places, even like the University of British Columbia, were not getting Hansard, so, obviously--

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Why?

Ms Millard: Well, there was somebody there who wanted to do some research on us, believe it or not, and he did not know where to go to find out so he asked me, but, anyway, I had asked before on some kind of general policy on Hansard, because I know of several people who would really make use of it if it were available, and particularly at less of a cost than it is.

Who is the person who would make that choice? Would it be Mr. Hibberd now?

Mrs. Watson: You mean who wants to read about it?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: How much is it worth to you, Mr. Chairman?

Ms Millard: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not get that answer.

How much is it worth to me?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Yes, for you to be sold, across the..

Ms Millard: Well, not very much, but I know that there are people who are interested in the things that are happening here and I am wondering if, perhaps, the Minister could take a look into the Hansard selling policy and see if it could be at least evened out across the Board, because I am sure that this is what Mr. Fleming is trying to get at, that there are people receiving it free and other people having to pay for it and it is not very equitable.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would just kindly look into it he would find out that we have lost \$3,000 or \$4,000 this year and I do not think that is quite sensible government. I do not see why we should be giving it to some people, when others pay for it.

And, due to the giving process, where they have not collected or bothered or something, or just sent the bill out and nobody pays it, and I have checked into it, there is 200 and some, 270? I have a definite figure from the Government already, but there is a large amount of them out.

It amounts to well over \$2,000 that is being just absolutely given away now and I have a friend or two that I know is getting it and we paid for it, at one time. I do not know what is going to happen now, but I would like to see everybody else pay for it, too, including the Government employees.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to check into it for the Members, but they should not be surprised when they receive their bill.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, while we are just on that subject, perhaps, also, they could check the mailing list to see that educational institutions that might be interested in it do have them, because, more and more, the North is getting to be a subject of intellectual discussion, believe it or not, and it should be available to at least universities.

Mrs. Watson: Canada West?

Ms Millard: Oh, even Canada West.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect, it is and they all know that they can subscribe to it, but they are not supposed to get it free in every library of every university across Canada.

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, the policy is that the university has to apply and I do not know how regularly they have to apply, because I was advised that yes, the University of British Columbia gets it automatically in their library and it was not there and they discovered they had not applied for it, so it seems to me that the access is being cut off because UBC just did not happen to think, they may not even know we have a Hansard, for one thing, so I think it is to our own advantage to make sure that places like that, and there are probably other places, too, for instance, provincial governments.

I mean, the whole thing is just kind of messy and maybe if Mr. Hibberd would look into it, we will have another voyeur on the staff here.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I will try and increase the Honourable Member's circulation as much as possible.

In reply to the previous question, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Inspections, the Ordinance merely states: "63.(1) The affairs of every credit union shall be examined at least annually, by or under the direction of the Registrar, and the credit union shall produce all books, documents and other papers required by the person conducting the examination."

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that would be the new one, would it?

Mr. Sherlock: If I recall correct', Mr. Chairman, the new

Ordinance also specifies that the examination is for the examination on behalf of the Government. I do not believe it says anything about tabling the report with Council.

Mr. Lengerke: I do not want to hold it up for that, but we will get the answer from him.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 400, Territorial Secretary and Registrar General, Supplementary Number 3, \$83,000; Revised Vote \$1,335,300.

Establishment 400 agreed to

On Establishment 500

Mr. Chairman: The Department of Health, Human Resources and Rehabilitation, Supplementary is \$348,900; Revised Vote \$14,750,200. The Establishments are on page 17 and the first one is 500, Disease Control, Supplementary Number 3, \$21,000; Revised Vote \$135,700.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I think some of the Honourable Members are familiar with the fact that we had a flare up of TB in that last year and there was an increase in costs for that treatment. It is something, Mr. Chairman, that we still have to watch for. Most of us have gotten pretty casual about TB but it is still with us.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the increase in costs for treatment, would the Honourable Member be saying that it costs more money to provide the medication or just what do you mean? What is the cost that is increasing?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, according to our information there were actually more cases, so this concerned looking after the cases.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member was asking for a breakdown even further to additional costs of treatment and/or, I understood, you wanted more, because I had already said we had additional cases.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, with respect, the increased cost in treatment. So I asked what the treatment was that was being applied. If it was because there are more cases of TB, I can understand that, but we are looking at almost a 20 per cent over-expenditure there, so there must have been quite a significant increase in the number of cases.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, there were three additional cases, the hospitalization costs of which were \$39,000.

Mrs. Watson: So, Mr. Chairman, these were actually people who were hospitalized or put into an institution?

Mr. Sherlock: That is correct.

Mrs. Watson: I see, okay, thank you.

Ms Millard: Well, since the area is called Disease Control, I would also hope that there was some expenditure not just on treatment, but on, I do not know what you would call it, control of it, in investigating the cases and seeing if there is some prevention type of thing coming on or inoculations, that sort of thing. Would that be expended in that area, as well?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: That is the usual approach with the public health nurse involved in each of these areas and she would follow through on members of the family and so on.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Establishment 500, Disease Control, Supplementary Number 3, \$21,000. Revised Vote \$135,700.

Establishment 500 agreed to

On Establishment 501

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 501, Mental Health. Decrease \$156,300. Revised Vote \$135,800.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is fairly self explanatory, as my colleague on the right keeps saying.

There is a differentiation between costs under the Mental Health Vote and under the Rehabilitation Vote and this is

because of the transfer from one to the other.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, with the reduced Hospital Insured Services, does that reflect a reduced number of patients being sent outside for mental treatment?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that some of these people have been brought back and are in our rehabilitation centre, for example, rather than being in institutions outside, which is our objective in establishing that centre.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am not completely satisfied, because, you know, there is quite a change of money there. We are looking at Mental Health and then, of \$156,000, an under-expenditure, and then Rehabilitation Services at an over-expenditure of \$99,000.

I think I would like just a little better explanation than what we have had.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I have additional information that Mrs. Whyard may not have. There are three parts to that reduction: \$100,000 of that relates to the transfer to the Rehabilitation Services, as mentioned by Mrs. Whyard.

\$58,000 relates to the reduction in Hospital Insured Services and the miscellaneous increased cost of \$2,400 for a net of \$156,300.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, under 501, a reduction of \$58,000 of Hospital Insured Services?

Mr. Sherlock: Hospital and Insured Services, Mental Hospital and Insured Services.

Ms Millard: Well, I think what the Member is getting at is what I was trying to get at, too, is why has it reduced. I mean, normally, when you are talking about hospital expenditures there is an increase all the time, but it must be fewer patients involved.

That does not have anything to do with the rehabilitation because that is in the \$100,000, I would think.

So that, certainly, I am sure that mental hospitals are not charging less.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I can answer that very specifically. We simply have information that there was a reduction in reduced hospital and insurance services. We could assume that there was a lesser number of patients out to institutions, but I do not have that information.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Just a comment, Mr. Chairman, that I think indeed there is a trend to less patients going outside to mental institutional care and when these patients are in that situation, their costs are considerable so it would not take that many more patients to run up a large sum of money.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on Mental Health, was it cost-shared with the Federal Government? Rehabilitation services certainly are, so if the amount was transferred is this why the transfer was being done, the amount was being transferred from Mental Health to Rehabilitation Services, then we have the costs cost-shared?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, certainly that was part of the reason. Maybe Mrs. Whyard could have another part. Certainly under 507, the costs there are cost-shared 50-50 and I assume that is one of the reasons that it was moved.

Mrs. Watson: That agreement is for rehabilitation of people who have mental, physical and emotional disabilities. Is that right, Mrs. Whyard, emotional?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard indicated yes.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I am sorry, they cannot hear me nodding my head from over there.

Mr. Chairman: Well I heard something. Any further discussion? Establishment 501, Mental Health, decrease \$156,300; Revised Vote \$135,800.

Establishment 501 agreed to

On Establishment 502 and 503

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 502, General Health Services, no change. Establishment 504, Subsidized Medical Travel, Supplementary Number 3, \$30,000; Revised Vote \$225,100. Any discussion?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I think all Members are aware that we never know until we have to charter in an emergency how many charter trips there will be, and this is the additional costs because of those circumstances.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, not actually on this, but on subsidized travel in the Yukon Territory, I do not see it anywhere in the Vote. I am just wondering if that program is still in existence?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but obviously we did not need a supplementary for that portion. This is air travel.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, these are just for special charters, not for a medical evacuation for instance from Dawson where they could not handle it in the nursing station and it would have to come to Whitehorse and still go on the scheduled flights. This is actually only for real emergency situations and charges, is that correct?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes.

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it is possible to get, then, some statistics on how much was spent going from Dawson to Whitehorse, because I am sure the Minister can see my purpose, because the argument in Dawson is that there is more money spent on flying people to Whitehorse than there would be on increasing the staff in Dawson so that people could be handled there.

Would those statistics be available?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to have that breakdown prepared by the Branch and brought in, because I quite understand and sympathise with her approach.

Ms Millard: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are the number of patients that we are sending out increasing or is just the costs of the travel increasing? I would hope that the number we are sending out are beginning to decrease.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, there is no indication as to numbers in our back-up material.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 502, General Health Services, or 504, Subsidized Medical Travel, Supplementary Number 3, \$30,000. Revised Vote \$225,100.

Establishment 504 agreed to

On Establishment 505

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 505, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Supplementary Number 3, \$35,100. Revised Vote \$233,400.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, \$25,000 of this was an additional amount paid to Crossroads in order that they could bring, at the request of their Board and after considerable discussion with our Branch, the salaries of the staff at Crossroads up to the same level as equivalent staff positions at the Detox Centre. This was a problem because they were doing comparable work.

The salary range at the Detox Centre is between \$11,000 and \$12,000, which I do not think is too high for what they are doing there.

It was agreed that we would make this additional amount available so that they could meet the demands of their staff on the very clear understanding that at no time were we ever increasing at a rate higher than the public service receives in this Government. This has to be watched very closely.

Half of this cost we recover through Federal cost-sharing.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to carry this, but I would like more information on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse program when we go through it in the Mains.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I have it all ready. I am ready to inundate Members with more information on these items.

I have to apologise to Members. I thought we were starting with Mains and I was briefed and ready to go with Mains and I really do not have all the information that I should have for this Supplementary page.

Mr. Berger: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister maybe included it anyway, but I wonder if there is any information available on the community programs.

I realize they just started, but I was wondering if there was any information available?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, do you want it now, or when we get to the Main item? I have a complete report ready to give at that time.

Mrs. Watson: I would not want to discuss it now, but I would certainly, if the Minister has some material available for the Mains discussion, it would be wonderful if we could have it ahead of time.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to distribute one of the reports today.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 505, Alcoholism & Drug Abuse, Supplementary Number 3, \$35,100; Revised Vote \$233,400.

Establishment 505 agreed to

On Establishment 506

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 506, Detoxication Centre, Supplementary Number 3, \$20,200; Revised Vote \$130,100.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have any additional details on that. I think it is fairly straight forward.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I just thought they served juice.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard, the question was from Mrs. Watson that she was under the impression that the only thing served to the people in the Detox Centre was juice.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Oh, Mr. Chairman, they are not necessarily on a liquid diet all the time they are there just because it is a Detox Centre. Mr. Chairman, one of the most valuable things we do at the Detox Centre is to get some good food into people who may or may not have had any for a long time. They do stay you know, the length of stay ranges from six hours to five days while they sober out and get some counseling and are steered toward a treatment program or whatever is the next step.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I thought the object of going to the Detox Centre was to get them off the juice, not on the juice.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can help in the actual costing. There was a man year added there of \$17,000 and \$3,000 for dietary supplies. That man year was brought in during 1977-78 and will appear in the Mains as well.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I believe that was the additional position which was put on because the worker is there alone at night and because that is the busiest time when our clients are being brought, it was felt a very good policy to reinforce that person with additional help. In most cases, it was one of the female staff on alone at night and they are pretty good people, but it is pretty tough looking after up to sixteen clients there at one time at night.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion? Establishment 506, Detoxication Centre, Supplementary \$20,200; Revised Vote \$130,100.

Establishment 506 agreed to

On Establishment 507

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 507, Rehabilitation Services, Supplementary Number 3, \$99,400, Revised Vote, \$428,400.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any support on this one, I am afraid. I have got everything in other areas.

Mr. Sherlock: That relates to the \$100,000 transfer from 501.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to let this go through but I would hope that the Minister has some report on the rehabilitation services for us when we go through the Mains. We are getting into an area where we are expending over \$600,000 and I think that we should have some type of report on the type of program that they are into and the staffing that they have.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to provide that.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 507, Rehabilitation Services, \$99,400. Revised Vote \$428,400.

Establishment 507 Agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, I would entertain a motion.

Mr. Lengerke: I would move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Ms Millard: I second that.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Ms Millard that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion Agreed to

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 3, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79* and Bill Number 2, *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78* and directed me to report progress on same and ask leave to sit again.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted.

May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I move that we do now call it five o'clock.

Ms Millard: I second that, 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 call it five o'clock. *Motion agreed to*

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until ten a.m. Monday next.

Adjourned

The following Sessional Papers were Tabled March 9, 1978

78-1-8

Science Council of Canada Report No. 26 (Northward Looking - A Strategy and a Science Policy for Northern Development)

78-1-9

Report by Jeff Carruthers, Free Press Correspondent "Probe Proposed to Help Settle Yukon conflicts"

The following Legislative Return was Tabled March 9, 1978

78-1-1

Yukon Teacher Education Program
(Oral Question - Page 735 - February 27, 1978 - 1977 (Second) Session)

LEGISLATIVE RETURN

(1977 Second Session)

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On February 27, 1978 Ms. Millard asked the following oral question: re Yukon Teacher Education Program

Could the Hon. Minister bring to us the statistics on how many of those students have less than Grade 12 qualifications and how many of those are native?

The answer to the question is as follows:

In response to the question, the Supervisor of the Yukon Teacher Education Program from the University of British Columbia, contacted the Department of Education to state their office is not in a position to give information of the type requested and that at no time are students required to give information of this sort.

There were 20 names placed before the Senate Admissions Committee seeking admission as mature students. Twelve persons were accepted under the mature entry provisions. In addition, 3 persons were accepted as regular students. Of the 20 eligible people, 14 persons are presently enrolled in the three year programme and no distinction is made between the regular students and those students admitted under the mature entry provision.

March 6, 1978



