



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 6

10th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Monday, March 13, 1978

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
March 13, 1977

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

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: We will at this time proceed to the Order Paper. Are there any documents for tabling?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning The Pipeline Bill C.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further documents for tabling? Are there any Reports of Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills? Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Are there any Notices of Motion or Resolution? Are there any Statements by Ministers?

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, consistent with what this Government has been saying to the House in respect to questions being put by Members in the area of terms and conditions for the constitutional process, I would like to inform all Members that the formal dex has gone to the Minister, requesting him to give us formal approval to formally table the terms and conditions in the House so that it can be transmitted to the Constitutional Committee.

I would like to read the contents of the dex to all Members. It states, Mr. Speaker: "Executive Committee welcomed your invitation to comment on the terms of reference for your process regarding constitutional development for Yukon. Unfortunately resultant press stories indicate that your terms of reference are now available publicly, both nationally and in the Yukon. We feel that it would be advisable due to these events, and in order that the thrust of necessary constitutional reform is not lost, to permit your document to be tabled in our Legislature and available to our Constitutional Committee for their consideration".

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there has been some misunderstanding in respect to what took place during the discussions on this all important matter, consistent with what our understanding of the meeting was that the Government of Canada requested us to keep the document confidential, we are formally asking for approval so that all Members have the opportunity to peruse the document and subsequently comment at a later date.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Statements by Ministers? This then brings us to the Question Period. Have you any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Regional Development Incentive Agreement

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister of Consumer Affairs mentioned, this is during our Committee of the Whole, mentioned that they were looking at the possibility of bringing to Yukon the Regional Development Incentive Agreement, or, at least, trying to provide that type of program in Yukon.

I am wondering of the Minister could tell me have they actually looked at this possibility? Are they looking at it? Who are they talking to? What are the results? When can we expect some announcements, a few more details, Mr. Minister, please.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when we were discussing it earlier in Committee, the Regional Development Incentive Program is designed to help private enterprise and, as I also indicated, there have been representa-

tions made to DREE to develop funding in Yukon to support private enterprise that would move in here in the manufacturing and processing fields.

To my knowledge and as you are well aware, we are not handling this, we are aware of what is going on to a certain extent. There has been no agreements made, but there could be no agreements made until we had reached an understanding with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development first, who, in turn, has to react with DREE before we can have any such programs available to someone in Yukon.

It just has not reached the stage where there is any agreement as yet. We are in the process, as I indicated, of negotiating such agreements with these departments so that such funds will be available to a private entrepreneur, who applies.

Mr. Lengerke: Supplementary to what the Minister has replied: who is negotiating and are you talking to DREE via the Department of Indian Affairs? Is this the way, or is there direct contact between the Department of Regional Expansion and you, as the Minister, or the Commissioner?

This is what I am interested in. I am not really too interested in negotiations that are taking fourth, and fifth, and sixth hands. Could you elaborate, Mr. Minister.

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

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, as the Member well knows, our negotiations are done through the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and we have transmitted to the Department our wish to enter into such an agreement.

Now, it is our intention to aid and assist Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in drawing up such an agreement, but it is up to them to negotiate that with DREE.

Question re: House Leader of YLA

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, a question for any Member of the Government: is it true that the Honourable Minister of Education has been elected House Leader for this Legislative Assembly, and if that is the truth, why was there no public formal presentation?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have not been in election here for about three years, and I do not see any reason to go into another one until this Fall. There is no formal House Leader of any kind, Mr. Speaker.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, then why is the Minister taking on all the duties of a House Leader?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, all the duties of a House Leader, I think it is fair to say that it is quite obvious that one Member of the Executive Committee had to take the responsibility to organize the Executive Committee Members in respect to the daily works in this House, and subsequently I have taken on some responsibility in that area, but I would not call it a House Leader, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Supplementary: what other functions would be necessary for a House Leader if that is not the function of a House Leader?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get in on this one because as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation, I approached my colleague some months ago prior to the opening of this Session because I had been given additional portfolio responsibilities and because I had very little time to devote to legislation and its passage through this House outside of my own portfolio interests. My colleague from the Department of Education being Deputy Chairman of that Committee, I asked if he would undertake for me, the burden of Chairing the Committee from that time on when I was not able to do so and the steering of Legislation through this House, which I did not have time to do.

I have been very appreciative of having that burden taken on my time consuming duties. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister then comment on whether or not it would be a positive constitutional step forward to do something like elect a House Leader and make it a formal announcement, rather than to assign one Member the duties and not make it an actual formal thing? I think it would be a good thing.

Mr. Speaker: To whom is the question directed?

Ms Millard: Well, perhaps the Minister of Education, since he is the one who is involved.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think it is just a case of organization. You will recall last Session, where we had a lot of difficulty in the Legislature and it is a case where an individual from the Government and the Chairman of Committees should be able to get together to discuss the format of business as the Government sees it.

Subsequently, that is why the one Member was designated within the Executive Committee to organize with the Chairman, the format of what should be done with the House, with the consent of the Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Supplementary, Mr. Chairman: is it not a normal procedure, when the Chairman of Committees and the Government sit together to determine what business should be dealt with in the House, is it not normal for a Member of the Opposition to be asked to sit on that Committee?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there is no Committee.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, my first question was not answered. I wanted an opinion from the Minister whether or not he felt that would be a positive step forward in constitutional development, to make a formal announcement?

Or is there some reason why he is operating as a House leader, but not acknowledging it formally? I think this is a very important question and there obviously has been a policy decision on this somewhere in Executive Committee and I feel we deserve an answer on it.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, there has been no policy decision by any group or by the Executive Committee. There has been an arrangement between the Honourable Member of Human Resources and the Honourable Member for Education that part of the work of the Committee, the Sub-committee on Legislation, would be that the Chairman of that Committee would arrange the House business for the expeditious and efficient flow of Government business.

Mr. Speaker, that is totally and all that has happened up to this point in time. Yes, it would be a constitutional development if there were a formal party system and a House Leader is chosen. I think that all Members could see that happening, following the next Territorial election.

Mrs. Watson: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, since both Honourable Members have said that the Minister of Education does confer with the Chairman of Committees to see that the business, the Government's business is dealt with expeditiously, I could not agree with more, would it not be natural and normal to ask someone from the Opposition to sit with these two gentlemen to arrange the expeditious handling of business within our Committee?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, we wanted to sit constantly and consistently on the matters of House business with all of the Members in Caucus because there is not a formal government and opposition. Some Honourable Members, not those on the Executive Committee, have chosen not to sit on that type of a Caucus Committee of the total House to arrange government and to arrange the business of the House.

We have decided that because it should be efficient and try to be as expeditious as possible, that the Honourable Member, the Minister of Education, would fulfill that obligation. We would much rather that all Members of the House, as they did

in the past, meet in Caucus to decide on House business and on the running of the House so it did run efficiently and expeditiously without arranging anything behind doors, just going about the business of the people of the Yukon in as efficient way as possible. Because Honourable Members chose not to do that any longer, which was a tradition, the Honourable Member, the Minister of Education, took over those responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary from the Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, is the Executive Committee of the opinion then that the Caucus of the whole House should sit and decide policy decisions which is what was happening behind closed doors, which is what was happening?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, I never said that and never will.

Question re: Dawson Hospital/Nurse Required

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to get away from the subject, I have a question for the Minister of Human Resources. I would like to seek her advice and assurances that she would continuously press this particular matter. We have another tragic case in Dawson where a Demerol cancer patient was forced to be transferred to Whitehorse because there is a letter presently in the Dawson City Nursing Station where it states that a patient is not supposed to be kept longer than three days. In this particular instance the patient was transferred from the McDonald Lodge to the hospital, was kept there for 36 hours, and one nurse was only on duty for 36 hours and the patient, under protest, was transferred to the Whitehorse General Hospital.

My question is, as I said at the beginning, when can Dawson City expect to have a fourth nurse in the hospital?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I am very distressed to hear of this, and the Honourable Member knows what our position is in the Yukon Department of Health on the subject. We have been giving the City of Dawson and the Board of Health in Dawson and the hospital people there all the support we possibly could in their efforts to obtain sufficient nursing staff to keep that hospital open to patients around the clock. Unfortunately, the administration of that building is still within the control of Medical Services Branch at the Federal Department of Health and Welfare. Our submissions to them have resulted in replies stating that they do not have the funds at this time to add additional nurses, one additional nurse.

We have been informed, Mr. Speaker, in our latest inquiries, that there will be an additional nurse during the summer months when the population increases enough to justify it. Mr. Speaker, I have every sympathy for the point the Honourable Member has brought forward, and I have intervened personally in earlier cases to the Director General of Medical Services in order to keep a patient in Dawson in his own home area to die with his family around him.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is once again, if we had had the turnover of the Health responsibilities to this Government as of the first of April, we would have been staffing that hospital in order to let it do the job it was built for.

Question re: Constitutional Reform/Terms and Conditions

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education stated this morning there was obviously a misunderstanding regarding the process of constitutional reform in the Territory. Is the paper that is going to be tabled, if the Minister gives his permission, a blueprint for constitutional reform in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the paper that I was referring to earlier this morning are the terms and conditions for an individual to look at a constitutional reform for the future Yukon.

It would appear to be a process of public hearing that is being

proposed and it would be subject to the individual, under those terms and conditions of assessing just exactly what should happen to the Yukon.

I think, furthermore, to that, Mr. Speaker, in respect to various other stories that have been printed and have been aired via CBC with Mr. Jeff Carruthers, it appears that the decision in respect to resources and this kind of thing, the bureaucracy in Ottawa has already made the decision of how that would be allocated.

But, I think that we could get into a fuller debate, once we have permission to table the terms and conditions and I would expect, or I would like to think, that the constitutional committee would be reviewing it and bringing their comments to this House so that we could debate it and just see exactly where we want to go.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just one more supplementary: are some of the points that were brought up by Mr. Carruthers in the *Globe and Mail*, included in the terms and conditions of the constitutional process paper?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there is just one or two points that he has brought up. The remainder appears to be information that he has from sources within the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and goes further than any information that was transmitted to the Executive Committee.

Question re: NCPC/Telex Regarding Rate Increase

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, a question for any of the Ministers: a few weeks ago we passed a motion in this House, suggesting that we send a telex to NCPC, with respect to that rate increase matter. I am just wondering, have we had a reply to that telex, to date? If we have not had a reply, I am wondering could one of the Ministers expedite the matter and get a reply or possibly let us get the assistance of the Commissioner and do that so we could have a reply in this House within the next day?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, no reply has been received. We have not been all that successful in expediting matters when we follow such telexes up and we would be more than prepared to try this again.

Question re: ERPU/Tabling of Paper

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have stood up on this, but I did in the last Session, a question to Mr. Commissioner: I have had two questions concerning the Economic Research and Planning Unit sitting on the Order Paper and have now disappeared from the Order Paper, since we are in another Session, for three months. I was told by the Assistant Commissioner that there was a paper prepared in response to that.

Now, when will that be tabled.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member tell me the questions so that I might answer them.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, Question Number 31 and 37, dated December 5th and December 12th.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check the Order Paper of past Sessions and bring an answer back to the Honourable Member.

Question re: Pipeline Property Tax/YTG Position

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for any Member of the Executive Committee. What is the Territorial Government's position in their negotiations with Ottawa, with regard to what percentage or ratio or part of the property tax which will be realized by Yukon from the pipeline, will be offset against deficit grant and what part of that tax revenue is the Government proposing will be revenue to be used at the discretion of Yukon?

Mr. Speaker: This is a written question, is this?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, it could be taken as a written question.

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that it be taken as a written

question in view of the detail that is required.

Question re: Corrections Officers, Matrons/Response Concerning Salaries

Ms Millard: A question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources: a motion was passed in this House some time ago about the Corrections Officers and Corrections Matrons in the Whitehorse Correctional Institute concerning their salaries. Now I understand there is a prepared reply for that. I am wondering when the Minister will table that?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have missed that one. A motion requiring the reply? Is that what the Honourable Member said, Mr. Speaker?

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, the motion I believe requested that the situation be looked into and reported back to the House. I understand that there has been some action taken on it, and a positive action. Actually it came up in our Budget Session while the Minister was away. I would like to know if we are going to have some kind of formal response to that motion?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into it. I know that we have been acting on one of the Honourable Member's suggestions, but I have had no report yet.

Question re: Pipeline Money/Use of

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, a question to Mr. Commissioner. On Thursday last, around 5 o'clock, there was a CBC interview with Mr. Jeff Carruthers and he was quoted as saying that Mr. Commissioner had three different viewpoints and plans on spending the pipeline monies. I was wondering if Mr. Commissioner could elaborate to this House about those plans, maybe right now or maybe in the written form?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I know not about which the Honourable Member speaks. What Mr. Carruthers says is his business. Certainly there are many ways, a lot more than three, that money could be used from the pipeline, and I have in an attempt before the Rotary Club on Friday to just outline some of the possibilities. If the Honourable Member would like a copy of what was said on Friday, he is more than welcome to it, I can get him a copy.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Daycare Centres/Money Allotted For

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Human Resources concerning the block funding that will be received, I presume, in the next fiscal year, at least it is being planned for the future from the Federal Government. Will any amount of that funding be earmarked for daycare centres in the Yukon in the Minister's opinion?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of block funding from the Federal Government to provincial or territorial, was to provide an undesignated amount of funds so that the Provinces and Territories could assign their own priorities to the spending of that money within the total amount.

They have no longer designated certain dollars for each program on a 50-50 basis. Now, there is no restriction on how that province or territory uses the funds. In fact, Mr. Speaker, at the Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa last week, at least two provinces raised the question that there was no guarantee that any of this money would have to be spent on social programs. It would go into the general revenue of that province and each Minister would have to fight for it, as we do now, out of the general pot rather than having it designated under cost-sharing under Canada Assistance Plan. That is one of the objections some provinces had against block funding.

But, to return to the specifics of the Honourable Member's question, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing designated out of that total specifically for daycare programs. We have been put in the unfortunate position of having less money than ever before, under block funding and no hope of asking for new programs on fifty cent dollars anymore. They will all be 100 cent dollars from this Treasury.

That is why I explained to Honourable Members and I am

sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I am taking too long with this answer, but I would like to refer to my remarks earlier in this House, that we have asked the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare to go back to Cabinet and plead for a special arrangement for Yukon and the Northwest Territories, under block funding. Otherwise, we are going to find ourselves in serious financial deficit positions, on social programs.

So, to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, we do not have any specific amount of block funding allocated to daycare. It is a general fund out of which all programs must pass.

Ms Millard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes, but, the actual question was, will the Minister be earmarking some of that funding for daycare.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, we have, in our program forecast, a very healthy amount allocated for daycare in the coming year.

Mrs. Watson: A supplementary question to the Minister of Health, will that block funding include the Federal Government's share of the Yukon Health Care Insurance scheme and the Yukon Hospitalization scheme? Or will they continue to be funded in the way they have in the past?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, we are getting into a complex financial field here, as the Honourable Member knows, because we are already into block funding and established program funding. The whole thrust of the Federal Government now in all departmental areas of financing, is to go into block funding and tax points, rather than shared costs on hospital or medicare or social programs, as they have in the past.

I would really appreciate the Honourable Member giving me an opportunity to bring in a written answer on that.

Question re: Pipeline Impact Expenditure

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a question for any Member of the Executive Committee and if an oral reply is available, fine, and if they want to take it as a written question, fine.

Has the Government developed a position or policy with regard to what types of pipeline impact expenditure should be funded to the Yukon as a loan from the \$200 million line of credit?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, both the questions of the Honourable Member has asked for today, and if she wants more detail I would be prepared to give it to her, but the question is that this Government asked the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, quite some months ago, to be able to get down into negotiations with them to decide exactly those questions which the Honourable Member has put this morning.

With the Minister's visit, we were able to get his agreement, and as I said in the House the other day, that it was one of the areas that we discussed which received, finally, a positive response that we should immediately enter such negotiations which we saw the need for an requested from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs some months ago, that he was now willing and prepared for the Government of Yukon and for the Department of Indian Affairs to enter into such discussions and negotiations which are brought up by the questions the Honourable Member prepares today. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that these discussions, which should have begun some time ago, will in fact begin immediately with the Minister's approval from his visit here last week.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear that the Federal Government is prepared to enter into negotiations with the Territorial Government. My next question then is, what is the position the Territorial Government is going to be taking in their negotiations regarding the Heritage Fund, the offset of the taxation against the Deficit Grant, what expenditures should be charged to the line of credit? Has the Government of the Yukon a position from which they want to negotiate?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, our internal task force is presently preparing those positions. I can tell you one thing and I have said it so many times, that \$15 million, just is not enough, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you are most generous this morning. Would the Minister of Local Government give consideration to tabling or making available to the Members of the House, the position that Yukon is going to be taking at that negotiating table?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the problems with negotiations and these are going to be hard type negotiations with members of either the IGC, the Federal Government has not said who is going to be the negotiators for their Department. Now these negotiations have never been conducted in the public forum before and I think that we would weaken this Government's position if we had a policy that had been accepted where we could not maneuver or have any flexibility on. This has not been the case in negotiations concerning financing with the Federal Government on prior occasions.

That brings me up to the point again that in other areas, whether it be land negotiations, whether it be pipeline negotiations, that I have no problem at all in these areas keeping all Honourable Members informed through some method, whether we call it Caucus or whatever we do. Electrical rate equalization is another one that I agree with all Honourable Members that this information on these so acutely important matters to them and their constituents that they have to be informed of this position. Certainly in the negotiations, the House is not the place to be presenting these positions and negotiating. In these areas it would then, I think, weaken rather than strengthen the Territory's hands in dealing in these negotiations, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I think my question was partially answered. My question was: if there are any agreements or anything after we leave the House this Session, we are going to be out in the boondocks and not right around here, I am wondering if at that time before any final decision and agreements are made, whether all Members of this House would be informed? That was my question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if Honourable Members give me the forum, or give me the process of how it can be done, I would be willing to oblige them. I believe totally that I want to see them involved and knowledgeable of what is happening. I just need some method which Honourable Members will give to us that allows us to do this, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, one more question supplementary to that and I can understand why you would not want to table the specifics of a position, but would it be possible to at least table the philosophical alternative that the Yukon Territorial Government does favour?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member knows that we have no problem at all with philosophical alternatives. I think she might be sorry when she gets involved.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Daycare/Regulations Concerning

Ms Millard: A question to the Minister of Health and Human Resources: has there been any work done on Legislation dealing with daycare, either an Ordinance or Regulations attached to *Health Ordinance* or *Child Welfare Ordinance*?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of work done on regulations for child care, not just day, but overnight and boarding homes and all kinds of child care, over a period of the past three years.

As the Honourable Member knows, we have been unwilling to impose the regulations until there was sufficient financing available for daycare and other centres to upgrade their facilities to meet the regulations.

I think we are getting very close to the circle meeting, Mr. Speaker, and the Branch has regulations ready, as soon as we can come up with a financing plan which will make them practical.

Ms Millard: A question to the Minister: does the Minister feel that, then, there is enough funding in the present budget to meet regulations which should be coming out very soon?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, there has not been, that has been the problem up until now, and as the Honourable Member knows, there is no specific plan in the current budget for additional subsidies to daycare, over the \$35,000 that we are now paying.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health: has the Government considered the consequences, in the Territory, to people who are offering daycare or providing child care for regulating, stringently, by Government regulations, daycares in the Yukon?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I thought I had already said so, that that has been the reason we have been loathe to impose these regulations, until we were convinced and assured that the people operating these centres would be able to comply and not go out of business, because they are required and they are a vital service to many working parents.

The Honourable Member, having occupied the portfolio I am responsible for, knows full well what all the problems are in imposing regulations. We have taken into consideration the requirements and problems of the operators and groups operating these daycare centres, as well as the problems of the parents who require to use them.

Ms Millard: Further on daycare, Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Minister aware then that there are now two daycare centres in Whitehorse who are very close to closing, because of debt, without any further funding or legislation available, forcing them into it? Is she aware of that and are there any plans to do anything about that?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I have not been made aware of any areas, any specific daycare centres who are approaching the point of having to close. No one has informed me, either from the Yukon Child Care Association or the daycare centres involved.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua raised another perplexing problem on the subdivision in Teslin as it is within the pipeline corridor. We have been in correspondence with the Northern Affairs program of Indian and Northern Affairs and I would like to read part of the answer because I think it is extremely important that all Members know that we seem to be getting into more and more difficult problems concerning land and its development rather than any simplification of the issue at the present time.

The Teslin subdivision lies within the area withdrawn by PC 1977-2859 for the purposes of constructing a natural gas pipeline. The lots in the Teslin subdivision were offered for lease prior to the Minister's announcement that lands within the pipeline corridor were being withdrawn from disposition, however, at the time of the announcement not all leases had been executed. The Department officials in Ottawa are presently preparing the necessary documents for submission to Privy Council with a view to amending the pipeline corridor to exclude the Teslin subdivision. Efforts are being made to ensure that the individuals involved have an opportunity to acquire leasehold interests on the lots as originally offered, and we expect a response on these matters in the near future. I would like to give a copy of this letter to the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Teslin Subdivision

Mr. Fleming: A question for the Honourable Minister, Mr.

Speaker. Are you sure they are speaking of the, how do we put it, the ones at Teslin subdivision by the Federal Government, the other one is the Teslin subdivision by the Yukon Territorial Government? Are we sure they are speaking of the right one?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: That, Mr. Speaker, is another good question. Whether both of the subdivisions lie within the right-of-way or only the one does. We know for a fact that our subdivision does lie within the pipeline right-of-way, so presents problems which we hope that we are going to be able to resolve through having the area as the Northern Affairs Program states, having it withdrawn from the pipeline right-of-way through whatever method they are going to be able to use at the Federal level. Mr. Speaker, I will have to find out further whether we are all talking about the same subdivision at this time. The one that we are particularly interested in, of course, is the Territorial acreage holding subdivision which we hope to put up for sale this summer, but we do not know what our stand will be until we have it cleared up in discussions through the Indian Affairs branch, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

We will then proceed at this time to Orders of the Day, under Motions for the Production of Papers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Madam Clerk: Item 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Ms Millard.

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

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Motions and Resolutions.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Madam Clerk: Item Number 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, 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 Klwane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Honourable Hugh Faulkner, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, relieve Dr. Arthur Pearson of his duties as Commissioner of the Yukon Territory and appoint an acting Commissioner who has had experience in, and is familiar with, the administering of the Yukon Territory pursuant to Section 4 of the *Yukon Act*, and

THAT the relief of Dr. Pearson as Commissioner of Yukon continue until the Stratton Inquiry has completed its investigation into the role of the Commissioner and other persons leading to the discontinuance of proceedings in the Supreme Court concerning the alleged professional misconduct of Allen Lueck, a barrister and solicitor of the court; and its decision rendered, and until the investigation by the RCMP regarding possible forgery and falsification of affidavits in which the Commissioner may have been involved is concluded.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I spoke to this Motion at the last Session. Unfortunately, I was the only one who was

permitted the opportunity to speak to the Motion. A motion to adjourn debate was brought in and carried. This was most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, because other Members of the House were quite anxious to speak, whether in support of the motion or in opposition to the motion. But I feel very strongly that there was an injustice done by the House, at that time, not to let Members have the right to speak.

When I spoke, during the last Session, I said then that I did not think that we had the privilege, as elected people, to turn our back on the issue at hand, that we had an obligation on behalf of the Territory, to make a decision whether, in fact, we felt that with this cloud hanging over our Chief Executive Officer, whether the people of the Territory could be expected to have confidence in the man who was holding that position.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be very lengthy this morning, but I am going to say that we are forced to live under the *Yukon Act*. It is something that none of us really appreciate, when you look at the structure of Government that is defined in the *Yukon Act*, and when you look at the position of the Chief Executive Officer, under the *Yukon Act*, and you realize over a period of time, as you deal with the Act and as you deal with the Legislation, and as you live in the Territory, the absolute authority and power that is vested in this position, almost a supreme type of power.

Mr. Speaker, when there is doubt in the minds of the people of the Territory whether that power was exercised by that individual in a judicious and wise manner, the people of the Territory are going to be questioning the whole Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Indian Affairs, no doubt the whole Government of Canada, realize that we are not satisfied with this type of structure and we should be saying to them, as we are saying constantly, look, we have to live under the *Yukon Act* until you change it, we know that. We have to live with the Chief Executive Officer that has supreme power. We have to live with the fact that that Chief Executive Officer is appointed by you, not nominated by the people of the Territory, not responsible to anyone in the Territory, and when the actions, the use of that power by that individual who is in that position is under question, under a *Public Inquiries Ordinance* then we should be saying to the Minister of Indian Affairs enough is enough. Until this is cleared up, we want you to relieve your Commissioner of his duties, and assess the situation at that time and then determine what action should be taken.

For all the bravado that we have regarding constitutional reform and I am particularly surprised at the Executive Committee who have been silent for so long on this issue, and I raised at the last session the questions that are in people's minds regarding the cases that were referred to in the inquiry, the cases under the *Medical Profession Ordinance*, the cases under the *Game Ordinance*, the cases under the *Land Ordinance* and I said then, the Executive Committee have an obligation to make a statement on this. They must and yet they have been sitting quietly by.

They have had their time, the debate has been adjourned, and I think today they certainly have an obligation, not a right, an obligation to speak to this Motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member from Klane expressed her concerns very well and I cannot add very much except that I would like to tackle this thing from another viewpoint. As head of the Territory, the Commissioner is also the head of the Civil Servants in the Territory, and I think this investigation that goes on right now, the Stratton Inquiry, I think all Civil Servants in the Territory ask themselves the question: why is this man still in the position he was appointed as? If anything like this ever happened to a Civil Servant in the Territory, under the *Public Service Commission Ordinance*, Section 10, the person would be suspended pending investigation. In other words, he is found guilty at the beginning of the process, pending investigation if he is guilty or

not guilty, it depends on the outcome then. This, Mr. Speaker, to me is an important factor. Here we have the man, head of the Civil Service, still in the position as the Commissioner. I cannot justify that, regardless that the man is a Federal Government Civil Servant, or Territorial Government Civil Servant, it is a very unique position in Canada. Just the same, he is a Federal Civil Servant.

I would say the sooner we clarify this and the sooner that the Executive Members and the sooner the Minister stands up to this question, as everybody we have are, we would off.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, and it is seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, THAT Resolution Number 2 be amended by deleting everything after "decision rendered", in line 13.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Honourable Member would present the Chair with a copy of the amendment?

It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Klondike, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, THAT Resolution Number 2 be amended by deleting everything after "decision rendered" in line 13.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, now that we have an amendment before us and it alters the situation somewhat, but, in my own case, it does not really alter it enough. That was one of the problems I had with the original motion.

As far as I am concerned, this motion really is, again, a nothing motion, because we do know the answer already. I am also of the opinion that this motion indicates a pre-judgement in a case that is before an inquiry, specifically being inquired to, at the wish of this House. I would like to see the outcome of that first.

I think that if the purpose of the motion is to really illustrate a lack of confidence in the Commissioner, it does not do that, because the issue raised in the motion is separate and apart from a non-confidence situation, as far as I am concerned. I am of the strong opinion that, if in fact, this Assembly feel a non-confidence motion should be brought forward, it should come from the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee's elected Members. After all, they are the people that work with the Commissioner on an everyday basis. They are the people that are supposed to be looking after the interests of this Assembly, at the Executive Committee level.

In the case of either motion, the one before us or a revised one, I would want to know some answers first. I would want to have it demonstrated that the Commissioner is not capable of doing his job. It must be shown that he cannot work with the Executive Committee, or that the Executive Committee cannot work with him. It must be clearly shown that the everyday ability to govern the affairs of this Territory are adversely being affected. It must be shown that the present Commissioner has affected the everyday efforts, politically and administratively, of this Territory. It must be shown that because of the Commissioner that departments, department heads, staff, everything else, are being affected in their everyday duties, that their leaving, you know, that there are real problems.

I would like to know if it has affected our pipeline negotiations, if it has affected the land claims, if it has affected our Shikwak Project, and so on. These are answers that I would like to know.

If a motion of this were to go ahead, I would like to ask the movers of the motion some answers too. What are the alternatives, what are the alternatives? Who would you call for an acting Commissioner? Who would the acting Commissioner be? Have you made arrangements? When would he take over his duties? By the time he took over his duties the Inquiry would be over. Will we better off in a situation like this? If you are thinking in terms of Jim Smith, former Commissioner, I would suggest that the era of Jim Smith as Commissioner of Yukon is over. I might suggest that he might be a political leader or an elected person some day in this House. I would

vote yes to a motion such as this if it could be demonstrated the action called for would result in an immediate improvement to Yukon's situation, and if it eliminated the Commissioner's position completely. In other words let's make it a Lieutenant-Governor's position, then I think I would be quite happy with this.

It is quite ironic, the other day a well known Yukon Senator said to me, if you people think that this Commissioner is bad, wait until you see the next guy. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that, as I say, rather than going to the Minister and saying listen guy, will you let this Commissioner, relieve him of his duties, I would suggest that we just go to the Commissioner and ask him to do that. I would think that the Commissioner in his own wisdom could take that decision if he felt that this is the positive way. But I really suggest that we wait until the Inquiry is completed, and then I would think that I would like to see demonstrated from the Executive Committee, and I would hope they would demonstrate this, because I have been up in this House many times suggesting that somebody has got to show that leadership and I would like to see them come forward with something.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I am standing up in support of the Resolution, and of course I seconded the amendment. First I will speak on the seconding of the amendment, because the first part of this motion definitely states what the Honourable Hugh Faulkner, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development should do, and it is his responsibility. However, when I get down to the investigation by the RCMP and the possible forgery and so forth, I find that this was merely something that was in the paper as far as I am concerned, and I do not regard it as a fact of life until it is proven so. So I do not really care for that part of the whole motion.

As for the remarks from the Member from Riverdale, I am afraid that most of them are very irrelevant. We are not speaking of whether the Commissioner can do his job or whether somebody else is responsible to somebody else in this department or anywhere, we are speaking of what the Minister should do as a Minister. In his position, that high a position, in any other department other than the Government, at this moment such as maybe the Army or any organization, if one of his Executives was in doubt at all at any time, because of any court proceedings that were being brought against him, where there is no possibility maybe of him being guilty, it would not make any difference. If that matter is in the courts then it is up to the Minister to do his job and his job is to relieve that person until such time as it is proven one way or the other.

I would say, if I was a Commissioner, which I will never be, of this Territory, that I would appreciate the Minister doing his job, rather than having the Commissioner in this embarrassing situation.

ii would just say again, it is up to him to do his job. It is up to him to relieve the Commissioner, at this time, until it is proven one way or the other and to do that because he is responsible to the people of the Yukon Territory.

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the amendment and the motion. I think the amendment is a good one and we are bringing in elements that really are not relevant to the case.

I am glad, at this point, that we finally have a chance to discuss this motion. I think it was a disgraceful act to make a motion to adjourn this motion and to let things ferment the way they have.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I should remind the Honourable Member that it is not competent for Members to reflect upon decisions made by the House. It is discourteous and in contempt of the House.

Proceed.

Ms Millard: So be it.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are losing prospective on this whole

thing. We are not discussing Mr. Commissioner as a person. We are discussing Mr. Commissioner as a Federal civil servant, somewhere way down the line, in Indian Affairs and Northern Development. He is not some sort of demi-god, simply because he happens to be our Chief Executive. We have to start seeing things in the national prospective and, in the national prospective, the Commissioner's position is very meaningless, as we found out many, many times.

In that regard, because he is a civil servant, I am fully supporting this motion, because I think it was very bad of Mr. Faulkner not to suspend him right from the beginning. It is a common civil service practice to suspend employees who are suspect of anything. As a matter of fact, many of the Members know that I myself was suspended for three and a half months, without pay, for having to refuse to move from one town to the other in the Yukon. For such a minimal matter, I was suspended and I certainly have not done anything close to the evidence that has come out in the Stratton Inquiry.

I feel it is imperative that we cleanse any suspicions from that position, if we have to have the position at all.

I think that we are losing sight, as well, as a Legislature, that we are supposed to be making political decisions, not administrative decisions. It is a pity that this Administrative motion has to come out of this Legislature. And, because we have to make political decisions, I think the political decision that we should be making today is one of condemnation of the position of Commissioner, not of the person of the Commissioner, but the position.

We have fooled around with all kinds of silly little details, when really what our whole position should be is we move to get rid of the whole position of Commissioner. That is why I am supporting the motion, because it is an attempt to sort of clarify what that position means to Yukon and what should be done about it.

I would be in full support of a motion such as that, but I do not think that we have the courage to even vote for it, let alone discuss it.

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the motion, nor the motion as amended, for reason of which I have stated previously.

But I must point out to the movers of the motion that one of the principle defects in it is that if it were passed and the Minister acted on it, the person who would succeed as the Administrator of the Territory, is a person who is also under investigation in the same inquiry. Therefore, the resolution has absolutely no significance whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the reasons for the motion coming out of the frustrations that all of us are feeling on the months and months that it is taking to complete this inquiry process, I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I know that all of the people from the YTG that are involved in any way shape or form with the Inquiry, are of exactly the same feeling of the Members of this Assembly that they had wished that the Inquiry results had have been in prior to this session sitting.

Mr. Speaker if that had happened, either the people involved in the Inquiry would have know their course, or of course there would have been an obligation, which I agree with the Honourable Member from Kluane on all Members of this House, when the results of that Inquiry are in, to move with the results and the findings and the recommendations of that Inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I feel that acting presently when there are three weeks transpiring between this day and the arguments of the Inquiry, because all of the evidence is now in, and on April 4th comes the arguments, and certainly after arguments are heard, is not going to be that lengthy a process for the inquirer to make up his mind and submit the report.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the motion or that the obligations on

behalf of the Members of this House to their constituents and to the Government, are premature at this time, fully accepting that this Government and this House has to take some action upon the results of the Inquiry if they so show that such action for the benefit and protection of the people of the Yukon are necessary.

mmr. Speaker, I agree also with the Honourable Member from Mayo that it is a prejudgment of this House to support such a motion. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I would not have found it nearly as a prejudgment on a person who handles the office of the Commissioner. If the motion had called for the suspension of all of those people in this Government who are involved in the Stratton Inquiry. Then I would not have had the difficulty in the area of prejudgment that only one of those people involved in the Inquiry should be suspended, but not the other people in Government involved in the Inquiry. Whichever way to slice it, Mr. Speaker, this motion deals with coming out in the prejudgment of one person, the Commissioner, not the senior people of this Government who are involved, Mr. Speaker, with the Stratton Inquiry.

There are some very practical aspects which leads one not to support the motion also, one of them mentioned by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that the person who would fulfill the Administrator's function the day following the suspension of the Commissioner would be the Administrator who is also part of the Stratton Inquiry.

If, then, there was another person come in for that hiatus, minimal hiatus of time of three weeks, until the arguments are heard, it only says that it would be a person who has experience and is familiar with the administering of the Yukon Territory pursuant to Section 4 of the *Yukon Act*.

Mr. Speaker, the halls of Centennial Towers in Ottawa are full of manderins who know, have had experience and are familiar with the administering of the Yukon Territory, pursuant to Section 4 of the *Yukon Act*.

Mr. Speaker, I guarantee you that we will have resident in the Yukon Territory so quickly one of those bureaucrats who has reflected over the years a total disinterest and, indeed, even a dislike for the emergence of responsible government in Yukon, and there will be, Mr. Speaker, an iron hand, once again, over the interests of the people of the Yukon Territory and there is no way, shape or form, that I am going to give the Federal Government the opportunity which they would love, to move in stronger than ever in the Yukon Territory and I am saying publically, on every occasion that I can, that that is exactly what the Federal Government is attempting to do, because of the major issues facing Yukoners at this time, at every opportunity.

For me to be a person who would give them, in any way, shape or form, that ability to do so, would just be totally and utterly distasteful, Mr. Speaker, to me, at this time.

Another practical aspect is that at the end of this month we get back into, probably, the most meaningful, series of negotiations and discussions concerning land claims that we have faced at this time. Whether you like it or not, Mr. Speaker, and I do not happen to like it, and I know Honourable Members do not and we have spoken about it, but the terms of instructions from the Minister to the Commissioner is that he will represent the people of Yukon at the table in land claims discussions.

Now, we wanted a person with the background and experience of the former Commissioner to continue as our representative, on behalf of the people of Yukon at that table, and so indicated to the former Minister by motion. The answer was that the new Commissioner, the present incumbent will represent the people of Yukon at that table. And we made the point that we did not like it, but those are the facts of life and how in Heaven's name, you are going to get anybody in the next period of time, in three weeks, to be able to have the expertise and the knowledge and the background of the last year of negotiations,

where the present Commissioner has sat at the table, is impossible for me to see at this present time, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that the interests of Yukon, through such a maneuver, will be in the best interest of all of the people of Yukon, if such a change were to take place at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, that the motion if premature, it does prejudice, and the timing is so short now, as to when the results of the inquiry will be transmitted, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is the time the representatives of the people of Yukon to stand up and be counted, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of Yukon will not find them wanting, at that proper time and this is not that moment.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the Minister of Local Government and some of his remarks. I am a little surprised, being one of the senior elected representatives of this House that he expresses complete negativity on an issue which is very important. I am not satisfied that the Stratton Inquiry, which this House called for, after failure of everything else, is really going to resolve the issue. The Member from Riverdale, Mr. Speaker, made a remark about a non-confidence motion coming from the Executive, or maybe we should have a non-confidence motion against the Executive, because we, Mr. Speaker, in this House, have given the opportunity to some of the elected representatives of this House to take on a lot more responsibilities from the Government aspect of this Assembly.

I have yet to see anyone of these Members that we have given the privilege and opportunity to stand up and be counted when the need arises. I have yet to see, Mr. Speaker, even though we hear other than in this House, complaints of problems they are having with the Chief Executive's office. I have yet to see any one Member stand up on behalf of the people in the Yukon and say everything is not quite kosher. I have yet to see, Mr. Speaker, any one Member of the Executive Committee on behalf of the rest of us, advise this House of problems he may have with the Chief Executive Officer of the Yukon.

It has been pointed out by the Member from Klondike that any other Civil Servant is suspended pending investigation. It is the same Executive Members, Mr. Speaker, that brought forward the *Public Service Commission Bill*, which allows this opportunity, yet here we are, again wanting to throw hash in our faces, ignore the basic intent behind this Resolution. I suppose at any given time in the future they will probably say there have been no problems at all with the Chief Executive Officer, that is, the Commissioner of the Yukon.

I am not satisfied with their attitude because one could suggest that maybe they are protecting the Commissioner of the Yukon for unknown reasons, which we do not know. I think it leaves a lot of the public in the Yukon many unanswered questions as to the activities of the Executive group as a whole, which includes the Commissioner of the Yukon.

I will be supporting this motion, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason our Executive Committee Members have not brought forward a motion of non-confidence, even prior to the establishment of the Stratton Inquiry.

It does leave a lot of unanswered questions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think most of the points have been covered in the debate, up to now. I think that there are a couple of points that should be made, though.

Number one, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has made his decision, that he is not going to ask the Commissioner to step down during the time of this Inquiry. That statement was made in the House of Commons.

Only time will tell whether or not the Minister's decision was valid, and we have to wait for the result of the Stratton Inquiry for the report to come forward, in respect to whether or not there was major wrong-doings done in respect to the interference of the judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is one major flaw with the resolution. The Member from Mayo has alluded to it, as well as the Member from Riverdale. That is in respect to relieving the Commissioner for the period of time that the Inquiry is in process, or permanently.

I do not know about anybody else here, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want another Commissioner. The position of Commissioner, as far as I am concerned, after the next election, should be the position of Lieutenant-Governor and that is going to depend, Mr. Speaker, on the political people who are running, as well as on the electorate, whether or not party politics will be accepted in Yukon, in the forthcoming election.

I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the day of the Commissioner and the authority of the Commissioner must come to an end, and the only time that is going to come to an end is after the next election. Not during the life of this House. We have approximately six months left.

That decision is going to have to be made by the politicians that run for office and are elected, after the next election.

I think that there is another point, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the position of Commissioner. I think that the Honourable Member from Riverdale has said it very well, in reference to a well-known senator in Yukon who said, well, if you think this one is bad, just wait until you get the next one.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the appointed senator of Yukon was influential, or responsible for the appointment of the present Commissioner. It is common knowledge, and God help us if he is involved again in the selection of a Commissioner. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is this, is that we have the Stratton Inquiry, that all Members called for the Inquiry, you have summations within approximately two weeks, and then you will have a report issued from the Stratton Inquiry, which is supposed to be objective and unbiased and we should not be pre-empting it or pre-judging it.

Once the results of the Inquiry have come down, I think it is time then that Members of this House will have to review it and make a decision, in respect to the results of the Inquiry, as they are outlined to us. That is why I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should not prorogue this House, once we have finished the Main Estimates. We should remain in recess until which time the summation is brought forth to this Legislature.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I believe the resolution is not well-thought out. I do not think it is thought out for the long-term future of the Yukon and, therefore, I cannot support it.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, just as I thought, I did not expect any action from that comfortable pew across the way, do not rock the boat. You can call it the comfortable pew, they are never ever going to rock that boat.

The Resolution was well thought out. It is just that the Minister of Education does not recognize a good resolution when he sees it, it is unfortunate. It was well thought out and I had hoped, and I will be sincerely honest, I had hoped that the Executive Committee would have amended the Resolution and said it is a vote of non-confidence, but I might have known better that comfortable pew finds it a little too comfortable over there and they do not want to rock that boat. They are going to wait until the election and all the rest of it. One excuse is that if we have the Commissioner suspended, then the natural person would be the Deputy Commissioner, not necessarily, not necessarily, he does not have the experience. However, if he is, that is fine, where is the leadership from the elected people if

he does not have the experience and the capability in administering the Territory, where would the leadership of the elected people come in? It would be there, but would you be prepared to take up the challenge?

Mr. Speaker, the Executive Committee knows not what goes on, and they seem to like it that way. I do not think they have even read the testimony of the Stratton Inquiry up to date. They do not seem to know that the Commissioner tells them what he thinks they should be told. This is from the testimony, what he thinks, the Ministerial directive was that he shall consult with, and the previous Commissioner's Sessional Paper was that he shall consult with the Executive Committee on all matters and if you read your testimony, you will see that. The Executive Committee knows not that there was an involvement in these other pieces of legislation. I do not know whether they have even taken the trouble to find out about them or to check them out.

I might have known that they would not be prepared to make a decision on it and to say we do not want a Commissioner, course not, but that is the most stupid excuse for not voting this motion. We do not want the Commissioner, we want a Lieutenant-Governor. We do not want, and as the Honourable Member from Pelly said, the Stratton Inquiry is not going to be able to because of the change in the terms of reference. It is not going to be able to get at some of the things that should be got at. Unfortunately those terms of reference were changed, and that is why it is so important that either you come forward with a vote of non-confidence or we go to the Minister and say look, we in the Territory have fairly high standards and we feel that until the Stratton Inquiry is finished with, a decision is made, and the rest of the things that have come out in the testimony are dealt with, that you should relieve this man of his duties.

I am surprised the Minister did not do it originally and I really am surprised that the present Commissioner did not do that himself.

Actually, this, in my regard, is the action that should have been taken. The Commissioner should have done it. Failing that, the Minister, well, if they are not going to face the issue, the Executive Committee should have done it. They have not, well then maybe the people of the Territory should stand up and start expressing their views and that is why that motion is here today.

I have no problem voting with the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I would have had no problem at all with a revised motion, along this line, if it had been introduced at the time the Inquiry was asked for.

If, when the Inquiry was asked for, and I voted for that, one of the stipulations had been that the people involved should be relieved from their duties while the Inquiry took place, would have been perfectly acceptable to me at that time, Mr. Speaker.

But, to come along at this stage and slide it in, when the Inquiry has been like a black cloud over us for the last two and a half, three months, I cannot accept the timing, Mr. Speaker, and the whole objective of the motion defeats itself now.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

The Honourable Member from Klondike will conclude the debate on the amendment.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I find it really curious, when we seem to have two standards of justice in this country.

When we go to Ottawa, we have an ex-Minister who has been under a cloud of committing a crime. The Attorney-General of Ontario never even laid charges against the person.

Here, we have a Commissioner who is suspected of wrong-doings and, as I pointed out before, Mr. Speaker, if it had been

anybody else in this Territory, any other civil servant, and I would go so far as to say any other civil servant in this country, would be suspended right now, without even asking questions about it.

How can we expect the young people of today to say the law is good, we are making a good law, when we do not even respect the law. The law does not even respect the laws they are making.

I find it ludicrous and ridiculous. We have an increase in the crime rate all across the country. Why? Because the lawmakers do not even respect the law. Why should young people of today respect the law, because it depends who you are, Mr. Speaker, and who you know.

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Some Members: Disagreed.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called.

Mr. Speaker: Madam Clerk, will you kindly poll the House.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Disagree.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Disagree.

Mr. McIntyre: Disagree.

Mr. Berger: Agree.

Mr. Fleming: Agree.

Ms Millard: Agree.

Mr. McCall: Agree.

Mrs. Watson: Agree.

Mr. Lengerke: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results of the division of the Amendment to Resolution Number 2: 5 yea, 6 nay.

Mr. Speaker: I must declare that the Amendment has not carried. Is there any further debate on the motion?

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I have a further amendment if that is allowed. Moved by myself and seconded by the Member from Klondike, that all words after "and" in line four, be eliminated and add the words "not appoint another Commissioner unless he is an elected person".

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, I believe this is supposedly to read that Resolution Number 2 be amended. I am just not sure how to correct these motions that are made in such haste, they are very difficult for the Chair to interpret.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I would like direction of the Chair. I thought that you could have an amendment to an amendment to a motion, but then you did the successive series of votes and as you moved into the voting, then members cannot move further amendments after question has been called on. It would be interminable if that were allowed every time an amendment is defeated, then another member can get up and move another amendment. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that in any way, shape or form that that is allowed.

Mr. Speaker: It is the understanding of the Chair that a motion can be amended countless times, but an amendment to an amendment can only be done three times, and that would be the end of it.

I believe that the Resolution states that Resolution Number 2 be amended to delete all the words after "and" in line four, and adding the words "not appoint another Commissioner unless—I am sorry, I cannot read this, I wonder if the Honourable Member would provide a printed copy."

Is there any further debate on the main motion.

Some Members: Question.

Ms Millard: Point of Order, we cannot go into the debate on the main motion until the amendment has been considered, can we?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the amendment proposed is unintelligible, it cannot be read by the Chair. As I say, this is the difficulty of Members proposing motions in haste.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I can repeat it, I can read my writing.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid it would have to be read from the Chair. Order, please. Would the Honourable Member care to print out her amendment?

Ms Millard: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on the main motion?

Mr. McIntyre: May I suggest to the Honourable Member who is preparing her motion, that, in the event the Stratton Inquiry goes against the Commissioner, that her motion, a motion to the effect that she has, probably would not be in order, if she brings it at this time. We would not be able to reintroduce a motion of that nature, at a later time in this Session.

Mr. Speaker: That is correct. That would preclude any further resolution at this Session, respecting any decision on the Stratton Inquiry.

Since the Chair has not received a further amendment, and I will put the question at this time, on the main motion.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I have seen demonstrated in this House many times before that an Honourable Member has been given a chance and I would ask that she be given the chance to present her motion.

Mr. Speaker: If the Honourable Member is prepared to submit something to the Chair at this time, the Chair would receive it, but I must say to all Honourable Members it is grossly unfair to the Chair and to all the procedures of the House to present amendments in this fashion.

All right, the amendment proposed is proposed by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie and seconded by who?

Ms Millard: The Honourable Member from Klondike.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.—by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Resolution Number 2 be amended by deleting all the words after "and" in line 4, and adding the words "not appoint another Commissioner unless he is an elected person".

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was the gist of the speech I made on the original resolution, was that I feel that it is time that we took a political position on the position of Commissioner, that we are not here to make administrative decisions, although, if that is the only route that we can go, that is the route that we have to go.

I feel that it is time that we made it clear to Ottawa how we feel about the position of Commissioner and to the people of Yukon just where we stand on being told, from Ottawa, by an Ottawa civil servant, where we are and where we are going to go.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intent of the motion, for what it is intended to do, but I would urge the amender to recognize the fact that this precludes any judgment in this House, pending what the results of what that Inquiry might be.

I would suggest it needs further debate. It is quite a departure from what had been considered before this amendment was brought forward.

I would therefore move that the motion, with the proposed amendment, be moved to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Resolution Number 2 and the amendment proposed thereto be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Madam Clerk: Item 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Ms Millard.

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

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, next sitting day.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

We will now proceed to Public Bills.

PUBLIC BILLS

Madam Clerk: Second reading, Mrs. Whyard.

Bill Number 1: Second Reading

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 3, the *Third Appropriation Ordinance, 1976-'77*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources that Bill Number 1 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I would so move.

Mr. Speaker: A simple agreement, I believe, would be necessary. Are we agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Bill Number 5: Second Reading

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill Number 5 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works, that Bill Number 5 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: Bill 6, Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to further process Bill Number 6 next sitting day.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Madam Clerk: Bill 7, Mrs. Whyard.

Bill Number 7: Second Reading

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 7, *Loan Agreement Ordinance (1978) No. 1* be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources that Bill Number 7 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

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

Mr. Fleming: I will 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

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee of the Whole please come to order. Due to the late hour, I think that we will not go into business this morning, but this afternoon we will deal with, after due consultation with the proper Members, we will deal with Mrs. Watson's Resolution Number 1 after a recess until 1:30.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order.

We will go to Resolution Number 1. IT IS THEREFORE THE OPINION OF THIS ASSEMBLY that the Territorial Government immediately undertake the identification of all requirements of all requirements, growth projection and preliminary development plans for all Yukon communities in order to support the demonstrable and immediate need for land in those communities;

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

Discussion.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I brought this motion in right after the Minister announced his new policy and his very generous offer on seven acres to Haines Junction, taking out eight lots, very generous.

Mr. Chairman, the first "whereas" says "WHEREAS a revised northern land policy. I should point out that at one time, I believe we did have a policy whereby Indian Affairs were prepared to transfer blocks of land in and surrounding communities to the administration and control of the Territorial Government. I believe that was accomplished as a result of the Carruthers, was it, report on the Northwest Territories. I am not clear on that. I think that was the background of it.

Then, for awhile, for almost three years, we have had no policy on transfer of Federal land to Territorial responsibility. Since 1975, I think they have blocked and say no, we are not transferring any more land.

So, it is refreshing to know we at least have a revised policy, even if it is a far cry from what we want.

The Territorial Government has requests in for block transfers of land for most of the communities, the communities, and, in some cases, to the areas surrounding communities and a very sensible approach that has to be taken because the Territorial Government is in fact responsible for local government and standards of development of communities. That is one concession that the Feds do not seem to have interfered with yet, at the present time. They do interfere with the development of some of the Indian communities but at least they have not quite got into the local government area. They are making noises, they are making noises, they are looking at getting into the capital expenditure of some local government jurisdictions. However, at least in the outlying communities, they are leaving the control of the pattern of development and zoning to the Territorial Government and the local authorities.

The policy that the Minister announced was really far from satisfactory or adequate, I do not think there is one person in this House, this is one thing I think we can get an unanimous vote on, one of the few. We are going to have to live with his policy, whether we like it or not. I do not like it, but we have to have land, and if there is one way that we can get land and he

says so, there is only one way, then we are going to have to push and get all the requests in that we can.

I do not think that we are going to have too much of a problem proving that there is in fact a need for land in communities. Who we have to convince at the other end is one of the questions, and what they consider as an emergency, or what they consider as a great need. Mr. Chairman, I have got to the point where I have people talking to me, particularly in the three communities that I represent, who the very development of these communities has been delayed by two or three years. The people are extremely frustrated, very frustrated, and they come to me and they say what am I going to do, they want me to move my tank, they want me to do this, and I have not got any place to go. What do I do? The environmental people, the Indian Affairs Forestry people, they do not want my trailer there, they want me to get it out of there, what will I do?

I have all I can say and I have not said it, but one of these days I am going to say it and at that time I am going to feel extremely irresponsible, well, go squat.

They are forcing people to do that and it gets pretty difficult not to say to people, well, challenge them and see what they are going to do. I do not think that is the answer, though, but this is what is going to happen and we have got to convince the Federal people that this is, in fact, what is going to happen.

They can increase the number of forestry or land officers, Federal officers that they have in these areas and they are going to be completely busy, just chasing people from one spot to another. They are going to have a whole army of them in here, when all they can do would be to release land so it could be developed and people can go and actually buy it and develop their home and develop their business, so they can stay within the law. People want to.

So, Mr. Chairman, my motion is asking the Territorial Government to take up the Minister on his procedure and let us just see whether, in fact, there is going to be a lot of other blocks that we do not foresee in the procedure that the Minister has outlined. Let us test it, at least. Maybe we should test it with that great seven acres, that is going to answer all the land needs of Haines Junction.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the motion. I have doubt that any Member of the House will be speaking against the support of such a motion.

I might tell the Honourable Member that that is exactly what we have done and either the requests have already gone to the federal department here or they will be, as of today, in those areas where we have our planning done have not been allowed the transfer of land, namely the mobile home subdivision in Haines Junction, Dawson Acre Subdivision, the Dawson industrial subdivision, and also the Eagle River complex on the Dempster Highway, which we have not been able to get to this point in time.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister said that this is a policy of political compromise which would satisfy nobody, that, without a doubt, is one of the most accurate statements that I have ever heard the Minister make since his appointment. This policy is just totally fraught with problems, extra frustrations, more questions raised than have been answered at this point in time. As the Honourable Member says, we may as well get them into the mill to see where the hell they are going to go from here.

I think it is important to look at the revised northern land transfer policy and recognize some of the real problems inherent in what has happened with the change in policy from the Federal to Territorial Governments.

The first thing that we have to realize is that the previous policy of land transfers from Federal to Territorial administration, in large blocks within and surrounding northern communities, referred to as the block land transfer program is suspended. That is it. It is in suspended animation now. As if

this Government, and particularly the department which I have the portfolio responsibility of, is in enough problems already without being told that there are going to be no more block land transfers. You must realize what that does, without a mass of land surrounding the areas in which you can plan and zone properly, the whole of the development procedure becomes an ad hoc measure with no rhyme or reason for a total overall picture, which was exactly the reason that we were looking at large block land transfers, not large in the context of many square miles of Yukon, but large enough that all of the communities, whether it be Dawson, Haines Junction, Teslin, or Carcross, like Whitehorse, could actually zone that area surrounding it and make plans and programs for what the community was, not only going to look like with the next subdivision or the next development that was going on, but what it was going to look like twenty years from now in making sure that we leave a legacy and heritage of some sensible planning to the people who come after us. That is the whole concept of having land within your control that you are able to do this. That is terminated. We have gone from a block land transfer policy to a spot land transfer policy, whereby if we come up with all the planning and all the reasoning why we think an acreage subdivision, industrial subdivision, a mobile home subdivision, then we can get into the pot and that is not the end of it at that point in time; that is only the beginning of it, Mr. Chairman.

Then, once we identify what we need in any small developed area immediately, and Mr. Chairman, the new policy will remain in effect pending further developments in land claim settlement and constitutional evolution, the block land transfer is going to be replaced by a land transfer policy whereby transfers from Federal to Territorial administration are restricted to built up areas and to vacant lands required to meet immediate, it has to be immediate, community expansion and development needs only. Pretty limited, Mr. Chairman, and then we finally decide well okay, after 1972 when we were - that is the first time that we applied for the block land transfer in the Haines Junction area, 1972, now after all that has gone on and all this file of correspondence and letters and threats and the whole works back and forth between the Feds and the Territorial Government, it appears that we are going to have fifty trailer lots, finally, after that time in the Haines Junction area.

First we have to initiate it by the Territorial Government, and now we have to go, which we did not have to before, at least it was right to the people who made the decision in Ottawa, now all those plans first have to be submitted to the Regional Director of Lands in Yukon. Mr. Chairman, our planning policy and our land use policies are not always compatible with the Regional Director's policies. In fact, Mr. Chairman, often they are diametrically opposed to one another.

I do not have to go any further than telling the Honourable Member that the Bear Creek acreage subdivision. It is my feeling, Mr. Chairman, they do not like this type of subdivision, and particularly they do not want it around an area where there is a National Historic Site.

So, depending upon what happens, and as the Honourable Member says, let us get it into the works and see what happens, we may not even go any further than that now, Mr. Chairman. At least we used to get it down into foggy bottom before we were refused. Now we may go no further than the top of the hill, depending on what happens. These are great advances, Mr. Chairman, in getting land released to the people of the Yukon Territory.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the requests for land transfers of built-up areas are to be supported by site plans and legal descriptions and preliminary development plans. Well, here we are into another grey area where nobody has got any smart answers for. Just what do we mean by site plans, legal descriptions and preliminary development plans.

Now, if the environmental people and the people at the top of the hill want to see the terrain, they want to see the contours,

they want to see the sewer system, they want to see the land system, they want to see the water systems, all complete before they even send it on down, this Government is going to be committed to millions and millions of dollars in taxpayers' funds, doing consulting and engineering work before we even know whether it is even going to get past the hill and down to Ottawa.

Another major question, completely and totally unanswered and never consulted or negotiated with us prior to the announcement being made, at all kinds of levels at the same place, the Territorial Government, the Indian people and the L.I.D., as I understand, the only ones that they did consult with was their own land people here who have not got a clue as to where they stand right now, in any way, shape or form.

Okay, so we go past that and now the initial review of the request for the transfers are in the hands of the Regional Director and then he forwards them to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Northern Programs, recommending the boundaries of the parcels with substantiation in each case.

Regardless of what we put in and say what we need and want, the bureaucrats up the hill can make the decision as to what kind of planning has to be done, what they agree with and disagree with.

More often than not, knowing the people in the Environmental Services and the people in Lands, that they will probably be against the actual subdivision which we have planned, rather than the going along with it and us sending it right to Ottawa, where we used to get automatic approval of it.

Then, we come into another hooker, after we have done all that. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I really cannot be that optimistic of seeing that mobile home subdivision within my lifetime, I do not think, as being a Member, at the rate that we are going. We seem to take ten steps backwards in land policies for every small half step we take forward.

After that, the transfer proposal is subject to the approval of the Claims Policy Committee. Now, is this not a dandy, Mr. Chairman? Now that we are through all of these, if it gets that far, then down it goes to this group called the Claims Policy Committee, which seems to change director generals and people on it everyday, depending on the upward mobility of the senior bureaucrats in Ottawa, and here is where our next hurdle is going to be, with a group of people dealing totally and only and their only existence being to settle native land claims and they are going to get our request in that Committee, and, Mr. Chairman, they do know nothing and I mean, about land needs and criteria in the Yukon Territory.

Then it sits there in an office of government which is set up specifically and that is one thing to settle land claims with the Indian people, and here goes our request for land development for all of the people in Yukon into it. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that every one of these requests is going to be a mini-Indian land claims settlement. There is no way around it. The decision has been made that eight of the lots are going to be reserved in the Haines Junction area for the use of the Champagne-Aishihik Band. That is the criteria, and now it has been set, the tradition and the pattern that any of these requests for block land patterns that there is going to be a mini land claim settled and the Territorial Government is going to get emerged in and involved in which they never should have, when all we are looking for is the development and progress for all of the people in Yukon in and around the communities.

Now who knows where that is going to lead us? Are the eight going to be pre-selected of the prime land in the subdivision? Won't that be nice if that happened in your community? Won't that help the betterment of the races and the settlement of any polarization of the people? The first thing the people can go in and pick out the prime lots for development. Okay do it another way. Say if there are 50 trailer lots in the Haines Junction subdivision and you come up to 42, and all of a sudden you tell

the other people in the line if there is more that they cannot have it on a first come, first served basis because the Minister has decreed that eight of these lots are going to be reserved for the use of the Indian people. Isn't that going to do a great deal to harbour race relations between the people of Yukon in Haines Junction and in Dawson City and all of the other communities?

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister said he was coming up with a policy that was not going to satisfy anybody, I told him directly you have really hit it right on this time. These questions were not even raised, we were not even consulted about the total number of questions that are left unanswered, as far as this policy is concerned when we met with the Minister. Of course nothing could be done because the policy had already been issued in a press release prior to even any of this consultation or negotiations taking place. So we are stuck once again with a *fait accompli*. The Honourable Member says we have got to get some land somehow, but I say, Mr. Chairman, and I say it in all sincerity that this is creating one heck of a lot more problems that it is solving in any way, shape or form.

There was no reason in my mind that it could not have been used through a bi-lateral transfer arrangement of lands, under the pipeline agreement that everything could have been worked out without all of these problems coming to the fore at the present time, not satisfying anybody and just throwing more and more and more road blocks as if we have not got enough problems in the name of sensible and orderly development to Yukon.

I will tell you one thing that will come out of it, for all the problems that we are facing, there is only one person and there is only one group that are going to get blamed for the mish-mash, hodge-podge development of Yukon because of asinine policies like that and that is YTG. If there has ever been a stronger and more obvious reason for the surface rights of lands in Yukon to be turned over to the administration and control of the Government of Yukon, there is nothing more obvious at this time in Yukon's history that have any sensible and coherent land development policies that that should be happening immediately. Instead, Mr. Chairman, we are just getting further and further and further down the road at poor management and bad planning and the unavailability of land for Yukon residents to be able to use and this is going to come to haunt us over and over, because it is an emotional issue which we all know, we are all faced with it on a daily basis and this does nothing to answer all of those questions that have been raised by all of the Members who are dealing with constituents on a daily basis in matters of land which I am also dealing with all of their constituents on a daily basis on matters concerning land.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again, sure we will get the stuff into the hopper and where it goes from there, God only knows but if you think I am optimistic at all in any way, shape or form, I have been bitten so many times on this land policy in this land question, that if it worked smoothly, I would be the most amazed person in all of the Yukon Territory, in fact all of the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I cannot really add too much more. I do disagree with the Minister on one statement he made, when he says the block land transfer has gone from block land transfer to spot land transfer.

I think, really, the situation is that we have gone from a spot land transfer policy to a beg and you might receive policy.

I think it is a ridiculous situation the way it is.

One thing that I would ask, though, with all the remarks that have been made and I would like to have the assurance and I think the Minister has given us that, but I want to see it, is that we do have, in the mill and that we do have that request made on behalf of all the Yukon communities and that land is identified, the specific uses are identified, because I know exactly what will happen. We will have the Feds coming back and giving us all great excuses, telling us, no, we cannot act because

they have not given us all the information.

So, I think with that, certainly there is going to be some support in this motion, but I think it is a ridiculous scene, with respect to the land anyway, but, enough has been said.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will stand in support of the motion. I can wholeheartedly agree with everything the Minister has said and other Members.

I was at an L.I.D. meeting the other night and the representative of the Local Government was asking the L.I.D., at that time, and I think this is probably part of the process that the Minister of Local Government has initiated, to start things moving and asking the Local Improvement District to forward a plan, a five-year plan or projected ahead as to the land that they will need and so forth and so on.

However, I still feel that it is a hopeless cause and I find that the members of the L.I.D.'s, in the same instance, feel it is a hopeless cause to do a bunch of work when you do not know if you can get anything. They have that apathy there, so it is right at the bottom, before it ever gets to the Minister, the problem is there.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say that this motion is not tough enough to do any good with the Federal Government, as it stands now, but I do believe that our representatives in the Executive Committee and the Government of the Yukon Territory, should stand behind the people in this Territory in every way, shape or form, legal or illegal. If they have got to have a piece of land to live on, let them live on it.

That is the only way that they are going to really come to blows with the Federal Government and get it straightened out, then let us get right at it and do it, because I can no way condone any human being in Canada, that is a Canadian citizen, or of immigrant status, being here and not being able to have a place to live.

I say, let us stand behind those people. If they won't give us the land, let us go out and drive a peg in the ground and say take it and sit on it, until such time as they do, instead of fooling around.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem supporting the motion and no problem supporting the Minister in his statement, at all.

The only thing I would like to state is that he is talking about a policy. I think the fact of the matter is that there is no policy on land from the Federal Government. I think the fact of the matter is that the only policy that exists is to divide the people in Yukon on racist basis.

I think this is what the Federal Government is trying to achieve at the present time by saying that, oh, we cannot give you land because of Indian Land Claims, and this goes beyond that. The question I have in mind, what is going to happen in the Dawson area where there is nothing but squatters all over the bush. Who is going to claim what? What land is going to be available for anybody afterwards?

There is no control over anything. The Federal Government does not care. They do not give a darn about anything. I think there is absolutely no policy coming from the Federal Government.

I do not think we can come up with the fanciest motion on the fanciest paper on anything, goldplated or anything, unless we are going to convince southern Canada that there is other people in the Yukon than native people, I do not think we are going to get anywhere at all.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has outlined our predicament very well. I think the outline of the consultation process offered by the Federal Government in this area was very well explained. It was a case of a policy coming to the Government of the Yukon Territory that had already been made public, and he attempted to ask for our advice at that time.

I think there is a very important area here that should possibly be elaborated on, Mr. Chairman, and that is the aspect of the Federal Government who is looking and saying look, we need constitutional steps forward in Yukon. We believe that the people of the Yukon should be taking care of more responsibility on behalf of the people they represent.

This represents, Mr. Chairman, a direct intrusion in the area where we have now constitutional responsibility, and that is planning and developing of land, under the portfolio of local government. Now it means that the Federal Government, through the back door, have come in and are going to dictate the terms and conditions how we are going to develop Haines Junction, Teslin, Dawson City, or any other community. Mr. Chairman, I would submit to Members here that what we are getting from the Federal Government is lip service, if you can call it that. Is it not ironic that to resolve a situation which could have been so easily resolved through the pipeline, legislation to have a swap in land, we have a Minister coming in and dictating how that policy is going to be implemented in Yukon, a member who is not responsible to the people in Yukon, a member who is responsible for the constituency of Peterborough, which most Members have probably never been in before.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I have been there.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just wanted to make one other comment, and I wanted to echo the words of the Honourable Member from Klondike, that if I have ever seen a policy that reeks of apartheid, this is one. I believe that the Honourable Member from Klondike is right, when the bureaucracy using the political arm of Government and the Federal Government is fostering and propagating the concept of racial distinction in Yukon today and for the future.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I am just kind of reminded, listening with some interest, to the debate on this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, that I was with the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works at a meeting in September, the latter part of September in Ottawa when the new Minister, then new Minister gave us the assurances that block land transfers would indeed be considered and perhaps implemented in Yukon. At that time he handed us a press release which both the Honourable Minister and myself received directly from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The press release was a copy of a letter or a message sent to Daniel Johnson, President of the Council for Yukon Indians. I found a couple of things interesting in it: first of all he states "I want to make it clear that the announced agreement in principle for a gas pipeline through Yukon has not altered in any way, the Government's view that the successful resolution of your claim is of paramount importance". I just reiterate that because there is no land claim. There has been an offer by the Federal Government to native people and there is no claim. This is why I have always risen in this House and said this process has got to stop. You have got to stop funding these people.

Certainly they have expended enough funds now to settle this claim or to lay a claim, upon which they can settle, so that we can get land in Yukon and get other things.

All right, the Minister goes on to say, "I am aware that land is the cornerstone of your claim", and I do not know how he can become aware that there is a claim and there is no claim. However, he goes on to say, "With this in mind, I have asked my officials to establish with you a joint process of evaluation of land, directly affected by the pipeline in order to quickly identify areas of particular importance to native people. In the meantime, I am announcing a freeze on all new land dispositions, including mineral rights, within the pipeline corridor, excluding some areas immediately surrounding existing municipalities that may be required to accommodate expansion."

Now, here the Minister makes a commitment to the native people, in which he says, and I repeat, "...excluding some

areas immediately surrounding existing municipalities that may be required to accommodate expansion."

This is what the Minister said in September and this is the commitment he gave me and the Honourable Member who serves as the Minister of Highways and Public Works. "The area affected will be of sufficient width to cover possibly route changes arising out of the joint review process I have just mentioned, or caused by engineering or environmental requirements. This freeze will remain in effect until the final pipeline route has been established, after which I will consider what further measures may be required."

As you have seen in this pipeline legislation, I would suggest to you, and, following the pronouncements as leaked to this Mr. Carruthers, and as reported in the newspapers, I do not think that this Federal Government currently in power in Ottawa are going to release anything. I think that we are back to the old attitude where you put a big fence around the boundary of the Yukon Territory, declare it a national park and move everybody out. That is what I see.

When I came to the Yukon Territory in 1948, people were crying for land. There was no land policy. When I came into these Chambers, not these Chambers, but when I came into this Legislature in 1961, that was the uppermost point in the campaign at that time, of all Members and it was certainly the uppermost point in the Members who were elected. Land, land policy, making land available, at a price people could afford to pay, within the Yukon Territory.

All I can see we have done, Mr. Chairman, is we have retrogressed so badly that the Federal Government have tied everything up so badly that now we are getting into a situation of racial segregation, which is even going to make it worse, and I doubt that we will ever, certainly in immediate times, as long as this Government is permitted by Canadians to serve Canada in Ottawa, ever see land development in Yukon, to the extent we require it and need it.

I also, as some Honourable Members who have spoken, deplore the racist policies of this Government, in bringing to the Yukon Territory, racial segregation in land or in anything else. Up until these people started this land claim process, native and non-native alike got along pretty good in this Territory, certainly as long as I have been here.

We fought wars together. We have done all sorts of things together, to fight for freedom in this Territory, and I think that is a point a lot of people have forgotten. I think that these land claim negotiators ought to consider some day about the importance of who went to war to preserve it for the people of Yukon, to make this Territory strong, to make it self governing within Canada and whenever such proposals and propositions, as have been announced by the Government, come up as we are looking at today, they are deplorable and they ought to be rejected and every effort should be put on by this Government to stop this sort of thing. Therefore, I will also be supporting the resolution but I just thought, Mr. Chairman, that it might be interesting to know how the Minister makes a commitment to you one day and takes it away the next.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to extend a little further the remarks of the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, because he referred to a document that the Honourable Mr. Faulkner had sent to Mr. Johnson of the CYI guaranteeing that their land rights would be respected in any pipeline negotiations. Now we have before us a land proposal for Haines Junction, Mr. Chairman, which provides some guaranteed land for people who are status Indian only in the Band Council, and certainly not for the other members of CYI who are going to have to line up with the other members of the public and buy their lot. The whole thing is so confused and convoluted now, that I do not know how anyone could make sense out of it if there had ever been any hope of it at the beginning.

I think that the present Minister is being very badly advised by people in his senior official levels who have never been Yukoners, who certainly do not want to be Yukoners—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: We do not want them to be Yukoners.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: —and who are not going to be invited to be Yukoners, but who unfortunately have all the power in the world to decree what will happen in Yukon. The sooner we get someone in that Government who has a sympathy for the people of Yukon and some understanding of what goes on in this Territory, it would be even nice if one of them had lived here for a brief period of time, the better for the people of this country. Until that day, this kind of mish-mash land deal will continue to be imposed upon us.

Mr. Chairman, when we were in conversation with the Minister last Friday, it was very clear to us that he had no prior knowledge or information or background or briefing on the reasons for this proposal for Haines Junction. In fact, at one time, he turned to one of his officials and said what was the rationale behind having eight lots for that Band Council. It is incredible that he could have approved such a proposal without having been briefed and having been instructed a little more fully.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that my colleague on the left did a noble job of trying to educate the Minister in a very brief period of time to the dangers of this proposal and he appeared to be alerted to them, and there was still hope then that we might have made some change in the announcement, and then he was informed by one of his senior officials that it was too late, Mr. Chairman, they had already announced it to the Indian organizations and to the people of Haines Junction. The whole thing had been signed, sealed and delivered before it was ever communicated to us.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the people of Haines Junction would have let him retract the press release any time, quite gladly. In fact, they did not get it until that afternoon, after the meeting was held here and I am not going to prolong the debate anymore, but I do not really think that the people in most communities realize the actual desperate situation we are there, we are in Haines Junction. It is a terribly desperate situation, there is not any land available.

I do not think they realize, and the Minister was speaking about a mini-land claim settlement every time you make application for land. We have already had ours, when we went for expansion of boundaries. We had a mini land claim settlement at that time. They sat down, the Champagne-Aishihik Band, it was the YNB speaking on behalf of the Champagne-Aishihik Band and do not they always, I do not think the Indian people of Haines Junction knew what was going on until they lined them up at the meeting that night and told them how to vote. At that time, they objected to the boundaries of the L.I.D., and they sat down and worked out certain tracts of land that should be taken out of the L.I.D. boundaries and set aside as reserve as Indian lands around their village, was understandable, some possible potential commercial land and quite a large segment of the experimental farm fields, so we have already had our mini land claim settlement.

Now, here we go again, only Haines Junction is announced as having eight individual lots. Is it going to be a pattern that is going to go with every community, or does Indian Affairs, for some reason or other does not like Haines Junction, or the Minister? It could possibly be.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Whatever would make you think that?

Mrs. Watson: I have a very, very sneaking suspicion that the community is being discriminated against by our federal department. It could possibly be that they do not like the outspokenness of the Member that represents the area, but they are saying five commercial lots when there are no commercial lots proposed in that subdivision.

Now, where are they going to pick those up? They are going to rezone them for commercial, but, Mr. Chairman, people are saying well, all right, okay, if they have to develop that lot just like everyone else, if they have to pay for it like everyone else, if they have to pay taxes like everyone else, if they have to adhere to zoning like everyone else, area development regulations, pay frontage costs, fine, no problem. Nobody has any problem who owns the land, none at all.

But, it does not say that here, and I think most of us realize that that is not going to be the situation because it is not going to be given. It will be held by the Crown for use by Indian people. If they want to use it as investment of property, then they are contravening our *Lands Ordinance*, the terms of our sales, but that really does not matter, does it. That is just the Yukon's *Lands Ordinance*, and the Federal Government seems above that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I had better sit down before I get too bitter, because I can go on about this to some length. But my motion is here, let us test them and do it fast and find out where the blocks are, because, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to give up on this land thing and I want to hear what the reply the Territorial Government is going to get from the submissions that have been made now.

It is too big a thing. We cannot let ignorant people, in positions of authority, make rulings like this upon Canadian citizens, Canadian taxpayers, who have a right to an opportunity in any part of Canada and the people, the non-Indian people in the Yukon Territory at the present time, in some of these communities, are not being given the right that other Canadians have got.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to continue to fight this. I am not giving up with that little bit of a land policy, but YTG get your application in and see what happens.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Kluane actually brought most of my points up, but I still would like to ask the Minister, how will this policy affect the five commercial lots set aside in Haines Junction? Will this also, like the Honourable Member asked, carry on in Dawson City, in Faro, in any other community in the Territory? Will those lots, who is going to pay for the lot development? Who is going to pay for the taxation on the lots? Has there any agreement been made yet and, if not, how will the Territorial Government go about it?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: All the questions that were raised when we first became aware of the policy, every one of these questions was raised with the Minister, and I think that we got general approval that all of the laws of general application would apply. The reason being, of course, that if there was still a great demand for land in the communities and there was a chunk of land in the middle of a development just sitting there doing nothing, not paying any taxes, not paying any frontage, and everybody in the community knows whose land that is and why it is held up. What once again, would that do to the betterment of, hopefully that we are all working for, of relations between the Indian people and the white people in the communities do? It would be disastrous if there was no more land available and that a chunk of land was left in the middle of a community.

Of course, you would have to take the cost of development on the frontage over all the lots, so people would be paying more for their lots because it is just totally unacceptable. I think, and we will have an exchange of letters going between the Governments as to the problems which are all the problems that people brought out today and we hit every one of them and nobody had done any homework or did not even understand it to begin with, and I think that at least in this area that the laws of general application that a person has not built within a period of time the law reverts back to the Crown for resale was acceptable. But that is just the type of background and thinking and

knowledge and consultation and negotiation that has gone on prior to this thing being announced. A major policy with no thought behind it at all. If I, as a Territorial politician, brought in a policy that had so little background and thinking to it I would be laughed out of this House by all Honourable Members. This is exactly the instance that we find ourselves in in dealing with the major policy decisions with the Federal Government on a unilateral basis just plunked down in front of you and say there it is. Of course you have to accept it because what is the alternative, it is not one lot at all as the alternative. It is just a very disheartening and really an abominable situation. It seems to get worse and worse every day with no light at the end of the tunnel any longer. You just cannot see where we are going and that we are getting anywhere. We are actually making headway in being involved in policy decisions affecting one of the most sensitive areas of Yukon development. It gets awfully frustrating to the extent you wonder if you are getting anywhere at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I think enough has been said, but one thing that concerned the Member from Kluane, raised again is the eight lots in Haines Junction. I am sure the Executive Committee asked the Minister this, I certainly did, I had a discussion with him and that was one of the points I wanted to get clarified. I do not know how well it has been clarified or what you can call a guarantee from a Minister because there is not such a thing, I guess.

I asked, these eight lots, will the people have to develop those under the same terms, will people have to live by the same regulations and rules of the municipality, and I was assured, again, I was told by the Minister yes, yes, this would be the case. But I have been seen it all happen too many times in other communities, Mr. Chairman, where this is not the case, even when the Minister has assured and given this guarantee that then you end up with a special status situation within a community, and believe me, you think you have problems now, wait until that happens. I will wait and see what happens when the people from Haines Junction will really rise in that one.

Mr. Berger: Just to re-emphasize what the Honourable Member from Riverdale said, I would just point out Dawson City, where we do have an Indian community right in the City and the land in question is very nebulous who is the real owner of that land there. They do not fall under any City by-laws, under nothing. It is a community within a community that is the whole fact.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Just one added comment along the line that is now under discussion. That is the fact that I do not think that YTG should offer services, such as sewer or water or anything like that unless there are annual taxes paid on this property. I think that is pretty darned important, and these people are going to hold these lots and develop them, real fine. But I think taxes must be paid, because you cannot provide those services to people who do not pay taxes.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Pay or do not play.

Mr. Chairman: What disposition does the Committee wish to make of the Resolution? Shall the Resolution carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Resolution Number 1 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Supplementary Number 3, 1977-78. We were on Health, Human Resources and Rehabilitation, Vote 5.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, what Bill Number is that?

Mr. Chairman: That is Supplementary Number 3.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be advisable to have the expertise from Treasury available as witnesses.

Mr. Chairman: We will call a brief recess until we get our witnesses here, then we will not have another recess. Get your coffee now because there will be no further recesses.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee come to order. Bill Number 2, and we were at page 17.

On Establishment 510

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 510, Administration, Health, \$418,300. The supplementary number 3 is \$22,000 and the Revised Vote is \$440,300.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this additional amount was two months at \$11,000 each, for February and March, to cover payments to CU&C for our computer costs of Medicare and hospital billing.

As you know, we have been in the process of transferring the computer back to Whitehorse and this money was necessary for the additional time of the takeover.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions?

Establishment 510, Administration-Health, Supplementary Number 3, \$22,000, Revised Vote \$440,300.

*Establishment 510 agreed to**On Establishment 515*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 515, YHIS, no change.

*Establishment 515 agreed to**On Establishment 525*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 525, YHCIP, Supplementary Number 3, \$122,100, Revised Vote \$2,000,500.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this increase is required by the 8.3 increase in doctors' fees agreed to in negotiations with the contract with them last year.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 525, YHCIP, Supplementary Number 3, \$122,100, Revised Vote \$2,000,500.

*Establishment 525 agreed to**On Establishment 526*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 526, *Medical Profession Ordinance*, Supplementary Number 3, \$49,900; Revised Vote \$50,000.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, not all the fees have yet been received for payment for that inquiry. This is an ongoing billing situation.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions?

*Establishment 526 agreed to**On Establishment 530*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 530, Administration Welfare, a decrease of \$34,400; Revised Vote \$952,600.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this is a reduction in dollars in this Establishment because various positions were vacant, and these vacancies were not planned, but rather were the result of our inability to recruit replacement staff immediately.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in how many positions are vacant, and is there any reason why we are unable to encourage, I presume it is social workers, to come to the Yukon?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure of the number of positions, maybe Mr. Wilson can assist us, but it is not difficult to attract qualified professional people, it is the matter of time required to do this through Public Service Commission methods. Advertising across Canada, conducting interviews, bringing them here, and it just seems to take a very long time when you are in a hurry to find someone. Normally, in the normal turnover, you do have a period of two to three months warning, but occasionally you do not have that long and it is very difficult. We have been unable, for example, I do not think this is reflected in this figure, but in more recent months, we are having difficulty getting supervisors when we need them to fill vacancies.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 530, Administration Welfare, decrease Supplementary Number 3, \$34,400; Revised Vote \$952,600.

*Establishment 530 agreed to**On Establishment 531*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 531, Child Welfare Services, no change.

*Establishment 531 agreed to**On Establishment 532*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 532, Social Assistance, Supplementary Number 3, \$17,000; Revised Vote \$662,000.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, these costs were incurred as a result of clients incurring higher costs in their components of social assistance. For example, we pay in the department, actual costs for shelter and utilities as opposed to set rates for food and clothing, and it is not possible accurately to forecast these components always.

Mr. Chairman, I have some background information for all Members regarding our rates for social assistance which may be valuable to them when we get into the Mains, and I will have it circulated when we are through with the Supplementaries, if that meets with your approval.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

*Establishment 532 agreed to**On Establishment 533*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 533, Daycare, Supplementary Number 3, a reduction of \$17,000, Revised Vote \$25,000.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure of the reasons behind this. It is a reflection of the fact that fewer parents who are receiving assistance from our Branch have asked to have subsidies for daycare. I do not know whether it is because we are assisting more families who may have a single parent who does not go out to work, but there is expanded information on that, as well, in our profile of the social branch.

It is just simply because fewer of our subsidized clients have required that money for daycare.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, since it has come to our attention in the last couple of days that there are daycare centres in Whitehorse who are facing extreme circumstances, in fact, one of them has a payroll coming up in two days and they do not know how they are going to meet it, is it at all possible to have this funding go directly to daycare centres, rather than to the program that it is in, which I understand is simply to subsidize parents who are in need. There has to be a level of income low enough to be able to apply for this.

Is it at all possible, under the extreme circumstances that daycare finds itself in today, to use some of this \$17,000 to help them over this emergency period?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this money is, in fact, paid to the daycare centre, not to the parent, on behalf of the parent. The department pays that cost of daycare to the centre and I am afraid that these funds, which were, as you know, at that time, under the Canada Assistance Plan, would be restricted only to those clients. We could not transfer them holus-bolus to another program which we have not brought in before this Government at all.

I do not want to go all over the same ground with which all Honourable Members are familiar. But, you do know that two years ago we did come in with a proposal which would pay to the daycare centre, a sliding scale on behalf of parents depending on their income. This amount here has nothing to do with that kind of a plan. It is only for those clients already receiving social assistance.

I really would need instruction from Mr. Treasurer, but, I do not know how you could change dollars from that program which was under Canada Assistance Plan to an unknown, invisible proposal, as yet. I can sympathize with the need of the

daycare centres, but there is just no machinery here for me to—well, those are mythical dollars anyway. There is no \$17,000 sitting there at this precise moment, as a separate number of dollars in our revenue.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the Canada Assistance Plan is that it is a fifty-fifty proposition, so that fifty per cent of this \$17,000 should be ours to do with as we will. If there was enough enthusiasm on the part of the Territorial Government to support daycare and help them through this extreme period, would not fifty per cent of that money be ours and fifty per cent Federal?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Treasurer to answer that one because all my enthusiasm has never been able to get him to bend on any financial restraints.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I think Mrs. Whyard answered it very well. There is no way of changing this particular Supplementary without bringing in a new program, and which means we would have to go through another Supplementary at a future time. So if the Department came up with a program which would accommodate what Ms Millard is saying, it would then have to go through another Supplementary at a later date.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if there is any possibility of doing that then.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, from a practical point of view, and knowing the need and the support you have for this case, I really think the best bet is to wait until you are into the Mains and get what you can there. I think it is too involved to go back into supplementaries which are a year out of our fiscal period already to try to rearrange something. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we proceed and try to get what the Honourable Member wants and a number of us want in the Mains.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? Establishment 533, Day Care, decrease of \$17,000; Revised Vote \$25,000.

Establishment 533 agreed to

On Establishment 534

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 534, Social Service Agencies, no change.

Establishment 534 agreed to

On Establishment 535

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 535, Children's Group Homes, no change.

Establishment 535 agreed to

On Establishment 536

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 536, Youth Services Centre & Senior Citizens' Facilities, Supplementary Number 3, \$489,800; Revised Vote \$1,052,700.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this is straight transfer which occurred last Fall when the former corrections branch, Juvenile Training Home, was turned over to Human Resources as the Youth Services Centre. That facility represents \$492,800; and from that we are deducting \$3,000 which was an over-estimate in materials and supplies for senior citizens' lodges, so balanced together, you have a net of \$489,800.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe 536 and 560 are inter-related, and we have the Youth Services taking the \$348,900 out of Corrections Branch and transferring it over to Youth Services Centre, but we have also increased that though by \$140,000. We are not just using the funding provided in the Corrections Branch. I would want an explanation of what that \$140,000 was spent on.

Mr. Sherlock: The adjustment in 560, actually there are several adjustments within that, but Mrs. Watson is quite right. There is a relationship between 536 and 560, but only in the adjustments factors. The actual adjustments in 560, okay, there was an adjustment in overtime, additional overtime in Corrections at that time of \$106,000, Training Programs an additional \$6,000, RCMP care for inmates \$15,000; and then the actual

transfer of the Juvenile Training of \$492,800 subtracted. This adjustment in Corrections indicates an increase in dietary supplies of \$10,000 various miscellaneous expenses of \$5,900 for a net reduction of \$349,900 in Establishment 560.

Ms Millard: The question really was, in 536, where it is so much more than \$349,000 it is for \$89,000 and the extra \$140,000 is the question.

Mr. Sherlock: I am sorry, I did not get that last question.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, the question was on 536, in actuality, where \$489,000 is \$140,000 extra than the amount that was transferred from the Corrections Branch.

Mr. Sherlock: Because, in the first instance, Mr. Chairman, there was an over-expenditure in Corrections and I mentioned those in that category, the over-time, the training and the RCMP care of inmates. So, there was an over-expenditure in the first instance, before a transfer took place.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I think what most Members wanted to know is find out how much of 536 the \$489,800 was spent on senior citizen facilities.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, under 536, as I mentioned earlier, only \$3,000 is applicable to senior citizens and that was an over-budgeting, actually. They spent \$3,000 less than they had budgeted for in materials and supplies for senior citizens' lodges.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied. I can understand what Mr. Sherlock is saying, that originally the Corrections Branch, from last year, they were transferring \$489,000, but, because of the fact that there was an over-expenditure for over-time and RCMP and so on, they were not transferring the full \$489,000, they are only transferring \$349,000, to youth services.

What we are saying is where did the \$140,000, what is the difference? Youth Services spent \$489,000.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the actual transfer was \$492,800 from Youth Services in Corrections to Establishment 536, but, in 560, there were over-expenditures which I read out, \$106,000, the \$6,000, the \$15,000, \$10,000 and \$5,900, that appeared in 560, before the transfer took place and they are not necessarily related to the Youth Services transfer. They were other adjustments in 560.

But, considering that there were, in Youth Services within 560, plus all those other things were in 560, the net effect of the adjustments in 560 is a decrease of \$349,000.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it would certainly help a great deal if we had a chart of the structure of these departments of Corrections Branch, Youth Services, Senior Citizens' Facilities, Social Assistance, Child Welfare Services, you know, all of these would be wonderful to have a chart so we could see where they do in fact fall. All we had from last year is Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation and now we are having it really split up into all of these branches, and what we wanted and I have been asking for is organizational charts. I wonder if the government, apparently they do not have them, I certainly would like to get one of this department.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: We have them, Mr. Chairman, I thought we had provided one from my branch at least. They are available and I thought they were being distributed, but if I may say, Mr. Chairman, one of our problems here with 560 is that in the Mains for this coming year, 1978-79, you will find that an entirely different branch. It is only because we are dealing with Supplementaries for 1977-78 during the time of transition when juveniles were removed from Corrections and Corrections are moving to Legal Affairs. That is why you have a sort of composite here of some off, some on resulting in this confusing figure of \$349,900. I quite appreciate the problem that we are all in. Mr. Chairman, but I think probably this is the only way Treasury could present the figures for this Supplementary Vote. You

will see it completely clarified in the Mains because the departments have now been re-organized.

Mr. Lengerke: There is a figure that the Treasurer gave, I think something like \$108,000 for overtime, is that correct?

Mr. Sherlock: It was \$106,000.

Mr. Lengerke: Oh, \$106,000, I am wondering why all the overtime. Is that a reflection of the fact that there is not adequate staff or what reasoning was that?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, as you know, we do not budget separately for overtime, so they have to either find it within their budget or it comes out of the Supplementary. But yes, the answer to your question specifically, there was considerable overtime in Corrections during this period.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, there was considerable overtime because, as you know, we were oversupplied with clients and we had to make emergency arrangements to house the additional people that kept being sent up that hill. So this required overtime on the part of some of our Corrections Matrons to look after the separate establishment we set up for women inmates, it required overtime for people who were going to use the cells in the RCMP Detachment. It was a tremendous additional staff expense, and will continue to be so as long as we have that many customers.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the philosophical change in the Youth Services, moving it from the Corrections Branch to the Welfare Branch. I do not need that right now, but for the Mains I would really like some kind of overview of why that was done and what positive results there will be from that?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, we are bringing that.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion? Establishment 536, Youth Services Centre & Senior Citizens' Facilities, Supplementary Number 3, \$489,800; Revised Vote \$1,052,700.

Establishment 536 agreed to

On Establishment 560

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 560, Corrections Branch, reduction of \$349,900, Revised Vote \$1,584,400.

Any discussion?

Establishment 560 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will go on now with the next—

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are you going to ask to pass this Vote out of the Health and Welfare. I would like to remark on it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we will go back when we do Schedule "A" and every Vote, you will have another opportunity when we go over it the next time, but we will not do the Establishments again.

Mrs. Watson: But you will do the—

Mr. Chairman: But we will do the Schedule which appears in the Bill and we will be voting on each of the items in the Schedule.

Mrs. Watson: With the Bill?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

On Establishment 600

Mr. Chairman: So, we can go on to Department of Local Government, Supplementary Number 3, \$18,100, Revised Vote is \$3,569,600. On page 21, you will find the Establishments.

The first is 600, Administration, Supplementary Vote decrease of \$9,000, Revised Vote \$127,500.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that you anticipate any questions when your main vote is \$3,587,700 and you come in with a revised vote of \$3,569,600, which is \$18,000 less than you estimated. I imagine everybody would be standing up and congratulating you and not asking any questions whatsoever, with tight budgeting like that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions?

Establishment 600 agreed to

On Establishment 601

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 601, Community Planning and Land Disposal, Supplementary Number 3, a decrease of \$4,000, Revised Vote \$226,200.

Any questions.

Establishment 601 agreed to

On Establishment 602

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 602, Protective Services, Supplementary Number 3, \$12,700, Revised Vote \$338,800.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to state in this one that we have a competent boiler inspector on permanent staff and he has been transferred from Territorial Secretary's office to Local Government, where everyone feels that, with the building inspectors, the plumbing inspectors, the electrical inspectors, that it just seems to be more natural to have all the inspectors of that type under a local government service. So that is the increase there, to provide for that salary, which has been transferred over from the Territorial Secretary's office, or now, the Department of Corporate and Consumer Affairs, I should say.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 602 agreed to

On Establishment 603

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 603, Assessment Services, Supplementary Number 3 a decrease of \$700; Revised Vote \$195,900.

Establishment 603 agreed to

On Establishment 605

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 605, Municipal Services, a decrease of \$68,900; Revised Vote \$2,356,700.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is assuming, of course, that none of the L.I.D.'s run into trouble between now and the end of March, because I think this is where they are funded. I know of instances where we are going to have a fairly healthy bill because of over-expenditure of some of the maintenance of some of the water systems. You are assuming here that you have a \$68,900 that did not need to be used but I think in fact that is not going to be a true figure until you get your final reports in from your L.I.D.'s. I think that more than one of them have expended more than their budget, so how will that be handled? Will that be brought in as another Supplementary next year for 77-78?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, these are projections as at period nine, which is third quarter, projected to the end of the year, based on information known in December. Unfortunately, that is the only way we can do it, and it is the departmental projections, not ours. Based on those projections, these are figures that they are working with. If there should be over-expenditures beyond this, then obviously we will have to come with a Supplementary next year and they will appear as over-expenditures in our public accounts and we have one year to clear them with and certainly they will be brought in next Fall, I hope, if there are any.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Establishment 605, Municipal Services, Supplementary Number 3, a decrease of \$68,900; Revised Vote \$2,356,700.

Establishment 605 agreed to

On Establishment 606

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 606, Ambulance Service, Supplementary Number 3, \$51,800; Revised Vote \$324,500. Any discussion?

Establishment 606 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Could we go to Highways and Public Works?

Mr. Sherlock: Could I answer a couple of questions that Mrs. Watson raised last week, as it relates to grants, I thought it might be a good time to answer them.

Mr. Chairman: Sure.

Mr. Sherlock: She raised two questions, if a grant is being made outside of an Ordinance beyond what the terms of the Ordinance are, does the *Appropriation Ordinance* cover that grant? The answer is yes, in such a case the *Appropriation Ordinance* would be considered the senior Ordinance and would carry.

Her second question was: does the *Appropriation Ordinance* cover a grant that goes beyond the terms of an existing Ordinance which defines the grants? Again the answer is yes. In this case, if the grant was not defined in the *First Appropriation Ordinance* it would be necessary to identify it in a subsequent *Appropriation Ordinance*.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the interpretation of the *Financial Administration Ordinance*.

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may, the *Financial Administration Ordinance* provides several, you have to read the complete sections, you cannot just, say, read one paragraph and stick with it, because in the subsequent paragraph there may be a clarification and if you read from one paragraph to another, it does cover all of these points.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I have read it all and I think I have learned.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Inasmuch as we may be getting into the Department of Tourism and Conservation after we do Highways and Public Works, I wonder if we could have Mr. Bell or Mr. Crosby, someone from that Department present while we are going through it.

Page 30, Department of Highways and Public Works, a decrease of \$2,112,400, Revised Vote \$15,157,000. The establishments are on page 31.

On Establishment 900

Mr. Chairman: The first one is 900 Administration.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways and Public Works, I am proud to say, was budgeted very closely also, except for those large projects, under the Engineering Service Agreement, which we get late in the year, permission to go ahead with, things like the paving of the ten miles through Carmacks, the reconstruction of the ten miles north of here, and those funds have to lapse, because we cannot spend them in the year which they are finally get to us to spend, the lateness of the contracts called, so we have to re-vote them the next year to get those projects started which we are not able to finish in a year.

You will see, other than that type of funding, under the Highway Maintenance Establishment Number of \$2,131,000, that we are very, very close on budget, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Establishment 900, Administration, Supplementary Number 3, \$25,100, Revised Vote \$815,800.

Any discussion?

Mr. Berger: I find it puzzling, in Establishment 900, Mr. Chairman. It says to provide funds for higher and anticipated salary costs and maintenance costs on VHF radios.

Now, you go to Establishment 915 and there the funds are available because the cost of operating the system are less than anticipated. I would like to have an explanation on that. In one Establishment, the costs are higher. In the other Establishment, the costs are lower.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the administration, under the Establishments for the actual maintenance contract on the radios themselves, and we are getting more radios and more vehicles, as all Honourable Members know, and there-

fore, the costs of the maintenance of the VHF equipment is going on.

The 915 vote is it meant the cost of operating the system, less than the anticipated pay-outs, would be the pay-outs of things like to CNT, which we have a contract with at a certain amount for the use of their facilities, for the VHF, over the course of the year.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 900, Administration, Supplementary Number 3 \$25,100, Revised Vote \$815,800.

Establishment 900 agreed.

On Establishment 901

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 901, Building Maintenance, decrease \$33,000, Revised Vote \$930,800.

Mr. McCall: May we have a clarification, Mr. Chairman, which building maintenance that particular Vote is making reference to?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would ask for clarification, but I know that it is this building and all other Territorial buildings that are contracted out, either contracted out for cleaning or where the Government of Yukon Territory does its own cleaning and maintenance.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions?

Establishment 901, Building Maintenance, decrease \$33,000, Revised Vote \$930,800.

Mrs. Watson: Why is it subsistence instead of maintenance, in that it says: "Subsistence, reduced materials in subsistence and maintenance requirements." What does subsistence have to do with maintenance?

Mr. Sherlock: That subsistence referred to there is the subsistence or the meal allowance paid to workers on the highways in certain areas.

Mrs. Watson: On building maintenance?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It would be the Territorial employees under Engineering. The plumbing crews and the small construction crews who go out on the highway to do the work in Territorial buildings and are given a per diem subsistence, Mr. Chairman, as they travel through the Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions?

Establishment 901 agreed to

On Establishment 902

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 902, Highway Maintenance, decrease of \$2,131,000; Revised Vote \$12,980,000.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I would like further clarification and breakdown. We have two points of reference here dealing with the less unusual snowfall and the road crusher resurfacing and road reconstruction. I would like clarification and the cost estimate saving as to the two different entities in this particular Vote?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I do not have the material broken down in front of me, I believe Treasury has, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I will have to get that information, I thought it was readily available. It is readily available I just do not happen to have it at the moment.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am glad the information is available, because my question is if we have not completed resurfacing the road properly, we are going to have a worse problem with dust control so there must have been some decision made that it was worthwhile in that regard to turn back that amount of money to not complete resurfacing.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I think you will find that these are major contracts like the paving of the ten miles through Carmacks that was not finished last year because there was not time. We have to re-vote it again in next year's budget,

but it is contracts like that that are included in this \$2,131,000. That is what we mean by road resurfacing. They are major contracts that were not completed last year because of the timing of the funding to the YTG and because of the lateness of the funding and the weather setting in. This is an ordinary type of arrangement that we have been trying to get an answer to over the course of I do not know how many years, but unfortunately still do not seem to have that answer for these major projects to be approved and come in the normal funding early in the year. Every year we end up saying this is going to be a false picture of this budget and we are not going to spend all this money because of the lateness of getting the money and calling the contracts and we are going to have to revote it next year. But I will get a breakdown of this \$2,131,000 as soon as we are through the Vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the wish of the Committee that we stand 902 over until we have the information?

Some Members: Agreed.

Establishment 902 stood over

On Establishment 905

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 905, Third Party Services, no change.

Establishment 905 agreed to

On Establishment 906

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 906, Northern Exploration Facilities, Supplementary Number 3, a decrease of \$37,000, Revised Vote \$88,000.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a new thing on me. I do not remember ever seeing before Northern Exploration Facilities. I would really like to know what they are.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I think it used to be called Roads Resources, Mr. Chairman, and we fool everybody by changing the title every once in awhile.

Mr. Sherlock: They call it tote roads, tote trails.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Tote trails assistance program, northern exploration facilities.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Now this is a federal program, is that not correct? We get the money from the Federal Government and we administer it for them.

Now, is that rolled into our deficit grant? Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, it is.

Mrs. Watson: Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is terrible. Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the taxation from the pipeline, it is such a crucial thing now, these days, when we talk about the taxation from the pipeline, the revenue from that taxation being used to offset the deficit grant, when we have the Indian land claims secretariat, which was supposed to be 100 per cent fully funded by the Federal Government, when we have the Inter-governmental Affairs Department, which was supposed to be cost-shared quite liberally by the Federal Government, when we have the Tote Trail Assistance Program, which is a complete Federal Government, we operate under their regulations, it is part of the deficit grant in our taxation, we will then—, now, I know of a few more goodies that are coming up and I am not going to tell you, we will then be paying for federal programs.

Why are we letting it go into the deficit grant?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: How do you stop it?

Mrs. Watson: Just do not let it happen.

Mr. Chairman, why is it going in the deficit grant? Does Mr. Sherlock, does anyone have an answer?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I do not have an answer, other than to say that it has been in there at least for four years, o, somewhere along the line it got rolled in.

Mrs. Watson: It better get rolled out.

Mr. Sherlock: I do not know on what authority, presumably at IGC.

It is not something new, though, it has been there for at least four years.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think there is an important point here that the Honourable Member has raised and I think that we should be taking note of it for our future discussions with IGC, because these are, as the Honourable Member has pointed out and the Minister of Local Government has outlined very well the consequences of the pipeline and the taxation that will accrue to this Government, we should be trying to delineate these programs so that we are not paying for them. I think it should be taken up at the official level.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, we used to show as recoveries on cost-shared programs and I keep looking for recoveries and they are very, very few these days. They must all be in the deficit grant and I think we are going into a very, very dangerous area and we are going to have to watch this and certainly have to watch it as we go through the Mains.

We just cannot let this happen.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there are always certain advantages and disadvantages of course. As the Honourable Member knows, that before this program was included as deficit grant financing, and as a federal program, that the Federal people ran it completely. The Regional Director was the Chairman of the Board, with the *Highways Ordinance* and with it is part of the deficit financing and included in the program in our Estimates, the Chairman of that road exploration or the tote road program is now the Director of Highways. The people from Game, which was a large consideration before, that Northern Resources was just allowing roads and trails to be built anywhere regardless of the effect that they had on game or two roads would be going into the same general area, when one road would have sufficed. So there has been a corresponding transfer of authority to that committee to the Territorial Government. Now, at least, the Chairman of that Committee is the Director of Highways and the corresponding and various Territorial departments sit and suggest areas of concern to the Chairman of that Committee. So there are distinct advantages to Yukon of having it as part of this type of financing, because with it, we did gain a certain in fact a very large element of control over program that a lot of Members of this Legislature and a lot of departments and the YTG was not all that happy with, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I can agree with the fact that YTG should have some involvement in the decision making and who should be able to build tote trails or whatever they were called, but I do know that it was still shown as a recovery after YTG became quite extensively involved in the Tote Trail Program. Basically, it is still the Federal Government takes all the credit for their Tote Trail Program. That is their Roads to Resources type of Program and we do give these grants, I believe, under the Regulations that are set out by the Federal Government, so they are still dictating the terms and conditions and they are still taking credit for it. I still feel that it should not be part of our deficit grant.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion? Establishment 906, Northern Exploration Facilities decrease \$37,000; Revised Vote \$88,000.

Establishment 906 agreed to

On Establishment 910

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 910, Office Accommodation, no entries there.

Establishment 910 agreed to

On Establishment 915

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 915, VHF System, decrease of \$11,100; Revised Vote \$57,800. Any discussion?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the figure is missing on page 32, but it is the same figure that appears \$11,100 decrease.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Establishment 915 agreed to

On Establishment 916

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 916, Revolving Fund Write-off, Supplementary Number 3, \$74,600; Revised Vote \$74,600. Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, was this not shown in the original estimates?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, this refers to spare parts which were old spare parts, which did not come to sight until sometime through the year and they identified them and presented them to the Board of Survey for write-off and we approved them for write-off and, of course, we have to put it through the Supplementary. It is the old story that we do not budget for contingency matters in the Main Estimates, so if they come up through the year, we have to put them through our supplementaries.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one further question, what have we done with the spare parts, after they went to the Board of Survey?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, they are put up for public auction for sale to whoever wants to bid for them and they are generally bid for in lump sum, for all or nothing kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I think they were Mac truck parts left over from the building of the Alaska Highway.

Mrs. Watson: Do you know how much money we got?

Mr. Sherlock: I do not think that paper gives what we got for them, but I could certainly find out.

Mrs. Watson: Oh, it is all right.

Ms Millard: My question, if we got it, where would it go? Would it come back into this Department or just go into the General Revenue Fund?

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, in fact it does appear on page 52, under Treasury, Sale of Surplus Equipment, on page 52. It is part and parcel of other sales, as well, of course, under Treasury.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Establishment 916, Revolving Fund Write-off, \$74,600, Supplementary Number 3, Revised Vote \$74,600.

Establishment 916 agreed to

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, if we go to Project Capital and I think some of the answers where the Members asked a question on the paving and stockpiling and crushing material, would be on page 45.

Mr. Chairman: We will get to Capital later, Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: You did not get my point. We are holding up Establishment 902. If we would move on to the Project Capital now we could clear Establishment 902, also.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: When I can get a break-down from the Department, I will be able to do it in a few minutes and I think that it has to be in the Operation and Maintenance section, not in the Capital section of that large amount of money was not spent, so it is different from the Capital section. The Capital money was not spent, but this is Operation and Maintenance money we are talking about that was not spent. I do not have a break-down for it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: With Housing? What page is that?

Mr. Chairman: It is page 33.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, I think we can go through it point by point, Mr. Chairman, and answer questions as they come up.

Mr. Chairman: The Yukon Housing Corporation, a reduction of \$52,300, with a Revised Vote of \$2,161,800, page 34, the

Establishments are listed.

On Establishment 1800

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1800, YHC Administration, Supplementary \$2,500, Revised Vote \$471,700.

Any discussion?

Establishment 1800 agreed to

On Establishment 1801

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1801, Operating Subsidy, a decrease of \$43,800; Revised Vote \$1,090,100. Any questions?

Mr. Fleming: I just wonder because of reduction in rental-purchase housing costs, just where does that reduction come in?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there was a decrease in this area for the Whitehorse 24-suite apartment that came on stream late in the year and subsequently we had a balance left over of \$10,200. The Whitehorse Rental-Purchase Project, due to the sale of a number of units, we had \$19,900 left over for the operation and maintenance of those units that we were not subjected to any longer, due to private ownership taking over these responsibilities. New and special projects we had \$57,600 over and above what we had budgeted last year that we did not spend. Some projects were not undertaken as anticipated and the cost for Nisutlin Block was leased to the Crossroads Society and subsequently money was forthcoming to the Government. Then there was approximately \$2,400 for other projects which was left over from the amount of money that we budgeted last year.

These decreases were partially offset by increases in two areas: in the rent supplement area by \$17,500 and that was strictly rising power costs for heating and utilities; in the side of the maintenance we had an increase in the area of maintenance by \$28,800. The reason for this, Mr. Chairman, was an increase of a number of unforeseeable projects that came our way, for an example the Teslin sewer works which we had not budgeted for, but we had to connect to, as we were the property owners of the Yukon Housing Corporation houses, and also there was one apartment in Teslin that we did a lot of work to in the area of foundations. Overall, it turned out we were fairly close to what we budgeted in view of what we had to do last year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions there. Establishment 1801, Operating Subsidy, a decrease of \$43,800; Revised Vote \$1,090,100.

Establishment 1801 agreed to

On Establishment 1802

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1802, Staff Accommodation, Supplementary Number 3, a reduction of \$11,000; Revised Vote \$600,000. Any discussion?

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, obviously we have some empty units in staff accommodation. How many units do we have empty?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is just strictly reflected where we gained approximately in the area of \$97,000 for the fact that we did not have to rent as many units from the Federal Government in the area of Camp Takhini up the hill because more and more of our government employees are purchasing or building their own private homes, which I think is a very positive step for the Yukon because they are making a long term commitment to the Yukon. In turn, I think it is better for them because even if they are here for 5 or 10 years, at least they have an equity in something rather than paying rent.

At the same time, one of the offsetting factors in this Establishment was the fact that over the past year a number of the lots have finally been turned over to the Yukon Housing Corporation in the name of the title, which is the Yukon Housing Corporation, so subsequently they have to pay the taxes which was in the area of \$79,000, so it reflects the decrease which is roughly \$11,000.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?
Establishment 1802, Staff Accommodations, decrease \$11,000 Supplementary Number 3, Revised Vote \$600,000.
Establishment 1802 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bell being present here as the Executive Committee Member in charge of the Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information Services, page 23. Supplementary Number 3 is \$380,700, Revised Vote \$3,771,500. The Establishments are on page 24.

On Establishment 700

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 700, Branch Administration, decrease \$5,000, Revised Vote \$153,700. Any discussion?
Establishment 700 agreed to

On Establishment 701

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 701, Parks and Historic Sites, Supplementary \$28,700, Revised Vote \$479,200. Any discussion?

Establishment 701 agreed to

On Establishment 702

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 702, Tourism, Supplementary Number 3, \$87,000, Revised Vote, \$681,000. Any discussion?

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where the impact on Tourism's study is? Is it finished or, and it seems like a strange name, I thought it might be Tourism Impact.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: The study is not quite completed, but it will be completed approximately mid-April. That is the latest date that we have.

Ms Millard: Perhaps he could explain more on what is, the title just puzzles me, "Impact on Tourism". What is impacting tourism?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: This is a misnomer, Mr. Chairman. It is a tourism development strategy that we are speaking about in here and that is strategy on how tourism will proceed or should proceed within the next few years, what type of approach we should take, what action, what development plans and so on.

Ms Millard: And what amount of that funding is for that study?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the study was \$73,000, of which \$42,000 is recoverable. It is a cost-shared program.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Is it marked as a recovery or is it all part of the deficit grant?

Mr. Sherlock: That does appear as a recovery, Mr. Chairman, on page 54 and it is both D.I.A.N.D. and Canada Tourism.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Ms Millard: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I should not interrupt. I am just curious why this is coming to us in a supplement, instead of in the last year's budget. Surely a study of this size could have been put into our Main Estimates last year.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, they were working on it when we were doing our Main Estimates, prior to the budget of 1977-78, but they simply did not have it ready to put into the Main Estimates, and as a result it had to be put forward through the year and Executive Committee also, obviously, agreed that it should.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, we also had begun with an organization called BC Research, and they pulled out, they simply withdrew their services and that delayed the beginning of the study.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Ms Millard: Are there any findings yet on this study, since it is probably in the printing stage, because if it is coming to us at

mid-April, it must be almost finished. Can Mr. Bell give us some indication of some kind, because in mid-April we probably will not even be able to discuss the results of this. If he can give us some vague idea of where we are headed in tourism development?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I am as anxious as the Member to have this, but I do not have it at this time. I will try to get at least an indication of what direction we are taking before you prorogue.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I presume that we will be getting a copy of this expensive study as well.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Definitely.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further? I hardly dare start.

Establishment 702, Tourism, Supplementary Number 3, \$87,000; Revised Vote \$681,000.

Establishment 702 agreed to

On Establishment 703

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 703, Information Services, reduction of \$44,000; Revised Vote \$212,600.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, is this transferred out position due to pipeline needs?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give you a direct answer on that one, maybe Mr. Sherlock can.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, our backup indicates it was a clerical position transferred to Parks.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 703, Information Services, reduction of \$44,000; Revised Vote \$212,600.

Establishment 703 agreed to

On Establishment 710

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 710, Resource Planning, Supplementary Number 3, \$82,000; Revised Vote \$82,000.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely amazed at how this Government has been operating this past year. We have many years, I think there are 22 many years established before the budget came in without any approval from the elected people. It is just taken for granted that these positions would be accepted and paid for, we do not have much choice really and here it is and they have enough to vote it through, so what the heck. We set up new branches, here we have Resource Planning, not one cent was voted for Resource Planning, yet this branch was established or whatever they are doing, there is \$82,00.

There is Game expands over \$226,000. I know one of them was a study on the Dempster, which we talked about at one time in this House, but, when you think of Departments going ahead, when you look at the over-expenditure of Health and Welfare, almost a million dollars, two supplementals, a million dollars. You know, when Welfare in B.C. goes over a million dollars, that is really something. People are up in arms about it and really, it is in the papers and how many million people do they serve?

And in the Yukon Territory, we have a population increase between two and five per cent and we can over-expend our budget by a million dollars, one sector of it, and yet, we have not had new proposals, new programs come forward at all. I can see that. I know that there has been inflation, but the type of thing that we are being faced with now, re-organization, I know, but this type of expenditure of money and say, well, \$226,000 is a lot of money in my terms, and I know some of it is recoverable, but, nevertheless, there is a lot of arrogance attached to a Government that will embark upon over-expending their budget to that degree and not really worry that much.

I do not think they are really that worried, when they approve that kind of extra many years and, Mr. Chairman, I just do not like the indication of what is happening and the way we are going financially with this Government.

I take money seriously. It is public money and I am just beginning to wonder how seriously some of the other Members in the comfortable pew look at money.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the inception of this Department was not as a result of inflation, was not the result of an arrogant Government, but it was the comfortable pew taking the motions of this Assembly seriously.

Motion Number 9, December 1st, 1976, and I quote in part, "...THAT a Department of Natural Resources be created within the Yukon Government and to be under the control of an elected Member."

Mrs. Watson: We did not give you the Treasury Department, though, with it, did we?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Is there any other department functioning at \$82,000?

Mrs. Watson: Functioning for six weeks, Mr. Chairman, they are functioning for six weeks.

No, Mr. Chairman, the type of over-expenditure we are seeing here is just incredible.

Mr. Chairman: Any other--

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, it is not six weeks. This is December 1st, 1976, that this motion was passed.

Mrs. Watson: I understand it takes three months lead time to hire people, or had you hired them before hand?

Mr. Chairman, I am not getting into an argument back and forth on this, but the point is, that a lot of public funds have been passed without new programs, new development, without coming to this House and getting some agreement in principle, at least, from the House, on some of these things.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I have to take exception to this. This is a direct response to the wishes of this House, that this money was utilized. It was not certainly without ignoring the House, in fact, it was an obligation that this House put on the Government to do something, and that was to put in place a Department of Renewable Resources and they have done that, at the request of this House.

Mrs. Watson: I wonder, Renewable Resources was to be a combination of other departments of other interest departments. These other departments already have money within their budgets. This is the point I am making. There is already money there, you are just combining it. I did not give you a blank cheque.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate her problem when she says that there are some departments still functioning, but nevertheless, did she expect the whole inception of a new department which involves such areas as all our renewable resources, to bring them together, develop a superstructure, develop plans for the future of the whole Yukon. There is no funding for all of that. This is only the start. We have to get this in place. Are we to assume that you just wanted the Game Branch to function under this area, under the same budget without any direction from above? Was it to be part of the department? Was the same thing to apply to Parks as a branch? You wanted to integrate all the renewable resources in the Yukon Territory and develop them in an integrated fashion.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, there was funds for the administration of all of those departments within the budget. That is the point I am making. Just because you are creating a new department, you need more funds, Heaven forbid, maybe we should just stay the way we are because every time we want to turn something around, we have got money, we need more money.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I just cannot let that pass. The whole purpose of the Department of Renewable Resources was to develop a game plan for our resources in the

Yukon, over which we have some jurisdiction and hope to get more in the next little while, and so we do have a responsibility to have some knowledge of those resources, develop plans about those resources. This was what was implied in this motion and this is what we are trying to do.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one more question. If you spent the money, where is your game plan of how you are going to manage your resources?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: The Member well knows that you cannot develop a game plan that quickly. It certainly takes time to develop it, she knows that as well as I do. Are you supposed to have a study done on the behavior of the caribou herd and their whole behavior over a year, and this department has not been in place for a year.

Mr. McCall: Accepting what the Minister has just said, maybe he could provide us with a total breakdown as to what you have done with the \$80,000 that we are still waiting for any plan dealing with Renewable Resources, justify the \$80,000 that you spent. A full explanation.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: I do not have the breakdown, I wonder if Treasury can help us.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the greatest majority of those costs are salary costs of \$45,000 roughly salary costs and fringes; there was some consultant work about \$15,000 worth; some travel \$3,000 worth; communications, long distance, et cetera a total of \$1,200; advertising, freight, miscellaneous office supplies, et cetera a total of about \$5,000; rental of space \$6,000; rental of equipment, internal-external about \$7,000; and that is about it for a total of close to \$87,000.

Mr. McCall: I would say that is a pretty expensive cost overrun when we have got nothing to show for it.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, this is hardly cost overrun. As you note, there is no vote in last year's budget for such a department. This is the total cost of that department, to date.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question, but there was money for the person whose salary you are paying for was in last year's budget.

But, I am rather curious with this Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information Services. The Honourable Member responsible, no, you are not responsible. I do not know what you are defending it for. However, it is a rather interesting thing, it is under the Executive Committee Member Mr. Bell. Then we have three Directors and the Member from Consumer and Corporate Affairs was saying that they had to have a Director, they had to establish a senior person within that Department, but the Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information Services, has one, two, three, four directors. Are they all answerable to which Executive Committee Member, and who is the senior director within that Department?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the estimates for the year that is passing and it does not reflect the formation of the Department of Renewable Resources as an entity unto itself.

So, if we just take out that component--

Mrs. Watson: Which one?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Which is now the Renewable Resources, which includes Resource Planning, includes Parks and Historic Sites, includes Wildlife, there are branches involved. There is no director or deputy head of a Department. There are branch heads that are reporting directly to me and there are two of them at this stage.

There is the branch head in charge of Renewable Resources itself and there is the branch head for Wildlife. There is not a director, they are reporting directly to me, there is no deputy head.

Mrs. Watson: You know, really, this is really quite an exercise in confusion and you have done a really good job

because I am confused, because in the Mains, of course, and then we go to Department of Tourism and Economic Development, and I asked for the chart on that one and I asked who the senior people were on that. I asked the, we have Department of Tourism, who is the director of Tourism, which is Mr. Crosby, and then we have someone with Economic Development. Now, I did not know whether he was the director of Economic Development. Is he at a director level and who is the senior?

You know, these are the types of questions we are not having clarified and I am sure the department heads and departments would like to have them clarified.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: I would just like to point out again, the Member is discussing last year's estimates and, as she well knows, there has been a department formed, which, as she well knows, there has been, the Department of Renewable Resources is functioning independently. It is no longer included in the Department of Tourism.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I will try again when we get into the Mains.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: But is not, Mr. Chairman, page 23, is puzzling, who is the senior director when you have one department with four department heads.

Mr. Sherlock: May I just try to clarify that. There is no senior person in those four people that are shown there. Those are all independent people reporting independently to the Member. As Mr. Hibberd pointed out, one or two of those are now in another department, so that makes it even more confusing. But for purposes of trying to stay with last year's format and stay within last year's concept of the Mains and the Supplementaries sort of relating together, we had to show these this way so that new person that appears in this Supplementary is related to Establishment 710, the establishment of a new branch, which, in Main Estimates, becomes a new department.

Mr. McCall: I would like some further clarification on that. You are talking about getting confusing. I would like the clarification as to the Director of Resource Planning. Just what responsibilities does this gentleman have when you say they are moving around in various departments? I would like some proper clarification. What other responsibilities does he have apart from Resource Planning?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think we went into this in some detail when we were discussing this in the Mains. I am not sure whether the Member was present or not.

Mr. McCall: I am looking for clarification dealing with a Supplementary, Mr. Chairman, and I expect a straight answer.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I attempted to outline before what the Director of that branch, what his responsibilities are, and I described in some detail at that time how were trying to put in place an overall game plan to develop our Renewable Resources Department to see what our resources are. We have taken inventory of those resources as much as possible, I described various projects that the Department had ~~already involved itself with to the present stage, even though it~~ is a very new department. Such things as presentation to the Shakwak for an example of it.

They have involved themselves in the planning for the northern end of Whitehorse, similarly for the plans for the Whitehorse-Carcross area, and for the plans along the potential park along the Yukon River, they have been addressing themselves to the problem of the development in northern Yukon, they have had input, what input there has been, regarding the overall management plan involving the Dempster Highway. As I also described they have involved themselves with trying to develop funding availability, both for industry and for other agencies under the GDA Agreement.

In addition, it is the responsibility of that director, or will be,

he has in line responsibility for Parks and Historic Sites, as well.

Mr. McCall: I am not too happy with what the Minister is saying, wandering away somewhere.

I would like to ask the Minister this question, it is a general question dealing with 710 and other related votes, whether they be in the Mains or otherwise: what are the man years? Has Government considered dealing with this 710, apart from what is in this supplementary, dealing with resource planning? That is, is there any other votes, whether it be in 710, whether it be in Mains, that there are other man years available, in the Budget, dealing with resource planning for the Game Branch?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, as far as Resource Planning itself is concerned, this Establishment 710 concerns itself with three man years in the supplementaries and there are no increases in man years in the main budget.

I went into the details of the Game Branch and their man years at the time that we went through the Mains. There was an increase of two man years in that, for the Main Estimates, not for the Supplementaries. There is an increase of two man years for technicians, regarding studies as far as caribou and sheep and grizzly were concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 710, Resource Planning, Supplementary Number 3, \$82,000, Revised Vote \$82,000.

Establishment 710 agreed to

On Establishment 720

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 720, Game Branch. Supplementary Number 3, \$226,000, Revised Vote \$1,133,000.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, it was a wide variety of things that were involved in this supplementary estimate, which included one problem regarding the helicopter rental, which, because of the man hours, the hours that the quote was for, the quotation that was given was dependent on using the helicopter for a number of hours. If we did not use it that much, we had to pay a higher rate. We did not use it that much and found ourselves paying more for the same number of hours, so to speak. So, in effect, it cost us \$24,000 more.

Other costs that were involved were various surveys, raptor surveys, training co-ordinator, Dempster caribou studies, raptor and sheep studies, the vast majority of these, Mr. Chairman, were recoverable expenses.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, the one item not covered in the Minister's explanation was pipeline studies. How many studies were involved and how much money?

Mr. Sherlock: It is shown in back-up of \$70,000 and the entire amount is shown as recoverable.

Mrs. Watson: Who is that thousand dollars recoverable from?

Mr. Sherlock: From DIAND, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Is that the entire cost of the study or is that just cost-shared?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, that was an arrangement made between the Wildlife people and that is the total cost of that particular study, right. It is a special study that was done last summer.

Ms Millard: So, I find it interesting that we can specify on certain things that they are pipeline related expenditures, but on other things we cannot. What is the difference?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, without getting into great detail on that, I would think that at that point in time, they were not yet asking for a very definite definition of pipeline-related, so the Director of Wildlife was able to negotiate a recovery on this specific study. Since then, of course, other things have come to fore and the thing is much more confused now, and certainly we are going to have to deal with that, but I do not think that we should get into that discussion at this point in time.

Ms Millard: Were these studies done for the National Energy Board or for the Lysyk Inquiry or what?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, as I recall, they were done right after the Lysyk Inquiry and may well have come about as a result of the Lysyk Inquiry, but I would not want to go beyond that.

Mr. McCall: I take it that these particular studies that are being completed are not related in any way to the previous Vote we have just cleared?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCall: Then why did the Minister make reference to them in his remarks to the previous questions?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I was describing a department of Renewable Resources which is being developed by this Government at the request of this House, and part of that Department of Renewable Resources of which the Member had requested me to describe is the Wildlife Branch.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see a training co-ordinator in here, if it is the person I am thinking it is. If it is the person who is taking two or three people and trying to train them into conservation methods and they will eventually be absorbed into the Branch. I wonder if the Minister could give us a few words on that, because I think it is a good program and deserves some applause.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the training co-ordinator is on a one year contract with this Government, and there are four students that he has with him now.

Although the program appears to be going well and progressing favourably, it is only on a one-year basis and we really do not have an evaluation of it at the present time.

I really cannot tell you much more than that, at the present time.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, can we expect that this program will be carrying on over the next fiscal year, then?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: I do not think that we have made allowances for it, at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it would have been rather nice to have been informed about the program.

I am wondering, the two studies that we did have recoveries for, the Game Pipeline Corridor Study and the Raptor and Sheep Study for the Dempster, who conducted the studies? Were the studies done by the Game Branch personnel or did we go to consultants from outside the Territory, again?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I believe they were done by Game Branch personnel.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, supplementary to that, if studies are done by Game Branch personnel, we pay their salaries anyway. How can we charge for those studies, then?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I will check, but I would suspect that there is a considerable amount of casual labour involved in the support staff, et cetera.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, back to the training co-ordinator, I find it disappointing that it may not be a program which is on-going. I think that it is an excellent program and one way that we can allow native people to take part in the Game Branch.

Has the decision actually been made not to carry on that program, or is it just that the Minister actually is unaware of whether or not it is coming into force for the new year?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that it is a one-year program on a trial basis. It has not been evaluated, no further arrangements have been made, so it, would, unless other arrangements are made, it would die a natural death.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, when does the year end? Can we expect that to be next Fall, and, as Minister, you would be

making some investigation into assessing the program and so on? Is that what we can anticipate?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is on-going assessments of the program and that is the whole purpose of it, to evaluate the value of the program as it goes and evaluate those people who have been through it and what they get out of it and what benefit the Game Branch might, in the long run, get out of it.

So, certainly, it is being evaluated and I believe the year-end is sometime this summer.

Mrs. Watson: It is fine, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether to be happy or sad because I do not know anything about the program, so...

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mr. Lengerke: Just further on the training co-ordinator, the \$40,000, how much of that was for his wages or for the contract?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, we indicate here \$10,000 as the personnel cost and \$30,000 other costs, but there is not a breakdown of what the other costs are.

Mr. Sherlock: Well, there would be some casuals included in there, but I do not know.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Mr. Sherlock: We did find a couple of items that would answer Mr. Lengerke. For example flying time was \$15,000; materials was \$14,000, materials probably did include boats and things like that. I have no idea what things.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, \$15,000, did you not already identify some flying time of the total 226 you said, for additional helicopter time, well how many places have you got helicopter time?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, each program has its own identification of the various components, including flying time so this is specific to this program.

Ms Millard: How much is the training co-ordinator getting the paid. The way I figure it out he is going to make \$10,000 for the year which is pretty small for what he is doing. What is his salary?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the indication is that it is \$10,100.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 720, Game Branch \$226,000 in Supplementary Number 3; Revised Vote \$1,133,000.

Establishment 720 agreed to

On Establishment 730

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 730, Library Services Branch, Supplementary Number 3, \$6,000; Revised Vote \$1,030,000. Any discussion?

Ms Millard: I would like to know what the transfer out of the position was for? Was that pipeline related?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, all we have is an indication it was a clerical position transferred to T-1. A clerical position transferred to T-1, to Secretary.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Ms Millard: It was my understanding when we passed the poor excuse for an Information Service on pipeline that we were talking about last session that somebody from the Library Services Branch would be responsible for that. Has nothing been done about that yet, are we waiting for the new budget?

Mr. Chairman: This is Supplementaries.

Ms Millard: Yes, but this would—

Mr. Chairman: You are looking for the Mains.

Ms Millard: Well that is what my question is, Mr. Chairman, nothing has been done yet so that we cannot expect a position on that Pipeline Information Service until April 1st, is that correct?

Mr. Chairman: That is what I would expect.

Ms Millard: I would like an answer to that, because we passed a motion some months ago about an Information Service which was totally inadequate anyway, as far as I was concerned, but at least we could do that much.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this House did ask for a Pipeline Impact Information Centre, the Resolution passed this House.

The Honourable Member is referring to comment made during discussion of that motion that there was pipeline information being accrued in the Archives section of Library Services.

I probably was the person who referred to the body in the Archives area, doing pipeline information, but the pipeline impact information centre is not going to be housed in this building, as a Territorial Government project. What the motion asked for was a Main Street information centre. Yes, Mr. Chairman, with respect, that is why the Honourable Member was so unhappy about it, as I recall. She wanted in-depth research and data collecting.

What the motion, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake proposed, was a simple impact information centre and it is my understanding that that is the motion that passed this House.

Aside from that, Mr. Chairman, the actual establishment of that information centre is now underway, but it has no direct connection with Library Services Branch. Is that the question she wanted answered.

Ms Millard: Yes, that sounds good enough. Where is the direct connection, then, and how far along are we on that, just incidentally, if I may ask that?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the connection would be through the fact that Library Services Branch is now part of Information Resources, under which information is generally collated: libraries, archives, information services, media services, so on and so on.

So, the direction of the information centre will be part of the Information Resources Branch, but since we will not be operating it, it will be operated at a community level and we will be one of the funding bodies only, there would be no figure at all in this budget for the operation of that local information centre.

I think we are getting into an area here, Mr. Chairman, which is certainly not covered under this particular...

Mr. Chairman: No, it would be in the Mains if it would be in anything.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, but the Honourable Member from Ogilvie has a valid question, because the motion was passed and the Government undertook to provide an information centre within the Government on pipeline related material.

Now, was there any expenditure made since we last sat and that motion passed, for such an information service, above and beyond what normally is done by the Government? Was there any money expended for that and where would it be shown in the Supplementary? I believe that is the question that the Honourable Member has.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, all that has been done since that last Session when those questions were asked, has been done in-House, with our present staff, without any additional cost. There is a sub-committee on pipeline, there is pipeline information being disseminated, which you get daily. This kind of this is on-going, but it is in-House.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I believe I asked a question earlier in this Session, and the Member from Ogilvie I think was away, but regardless I know her concerns. I got the answer back from the Minister of Local Government or the Minister of Pipelines, that in fact something would be done again within two or three months. I did not get a very definite answer or a very good answer on it. If there is not going to be any money in

the budget for it, how are you going to do this?

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing the Supplementaries not the Mains. When we get to the Mains perhaps you people could ask these questions. This is not the place to ask them.

Mr. Lengerke: We realize that.

Ms Millard: But, Mr. Chairman, if there is no money, where do you ask the question in the Mains if there is no money in the Mains.

Mr. Chairman: Well, when you are discussing Information Services, and there is no Information Services in this particular Supplementary Estimate.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, without prolonging the agony, could I just draw the attention of all Members to the fact that I have circulated today a memorandum on this subject asking which Members are interested in discussing this weekend the terms of reference of that centre. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 730, Library Services Branch, Supplementary Number 3, \$6,000; Revised Vote \$1,030,000.

*Establishment 730 agreed to
On Establishment 800*

Mr. Chairman: If we could go now to the Department of Legal Affairs, Mr. Bell, the Executive Committee Member is present.

Department of Legal Affairs, \$2,947,200, the decrease of \$19,400; Revised Vote \$2,927,800. The detail of the Establishment is on page 28. The first item is Establishment 800, Legal Services, Supplementary Number 3 a reduction of \$10,300; Revised Vote \$145,000. Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, first of all I wonder if I could draw to the attention of Mr. Bell what I have been asking for organizational charts, and since Legal Affairs', for the Main Estimates, status is certainly changed, it becomes a different picture altogether. I wonder if Mr. Bell could have available for us an organizational chart of the new, I do not know what to call it. Justice Department is it, for when we study the Mains.

My question here with reference to Establishment 800 is what position was transferred out? This is rather unusual for an Establishment to relinquish a position, was it transferred out of the whole Vote, or was it just transferred within the Department?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it was a clerk-typist position transferred from Legal Services to the Legislative Assembly, somebody that is working downstairs right now.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, were they over staffed in Legal Services?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to say that they were over-staffed. It was a matter of, I guess, a greater urgency. They needed somebody down in the Legislative Assembly and they were looking for where they could find a body and it was--

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is part of the Legal draftsman.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: That is right.

Mrs. Watson: That's right, okay, that is fine, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

*Establishment 800 agreed to
On Establishment 801*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 801, Administration of Justice, a reduction of \$4,000, Revised Vote \$733,700.

Any discussion?

*Establishment 801 agreed to
On Establishment 802*

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 802, no change.

Establishment 802 agreed to

On Establishment 803

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 803, Police Services Agreement, a reduction of \$68,400, Revised Vote, \$1,820,600.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, I see that funds are available, because of reduced requirements, under the agreement. I am wondering if Mr. Bell could tell us what those terms are now that have been reduced, or the requirements that have been reduced?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, are you referring to the \$68,400?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, I am.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: It came in under Estimate. The Estimate of Policy Services of agreement costs were, that is the information that I have, unless the Treasurer has anything that would...

Mr. Sherlock: I am not sure that I can answer the question fully, but it is just like Mr. Bell was starting to say, these were adjustments to the original budget, the adjustments that we got from the RCMP, in the second instance, were lower than they originally estimated and there were various adjustments in the costing, not one item.

Ms Millard: So, Mr. Chairman, then it was not really a reduced requirement, under the Agreement. The Agreement was not changed, it just happened to work out that way.

Mr. Sherlock: Revised costing.

Ms Millard: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I think what they mean is a reduced requirement for money.

Mr. Sherlock: Right.

Mr. Chairman: And if you read it that way, it makes sense. If you read it a reduced requirement for policing, it does not make any sense at all.

Any further discussion?

Establishment 803 agreed to

On Establishment 804

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 804, Criminal Injuries Compensation, Supplementary Number 3, \$11,700, Revised Vote \$11,800.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, how many people did we actually compensate for their criminal injuries?

Mr. Sherlock: Two people, Mr. Chairman, and I believe there is another one in process.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Ms Millard: Just while we are on that, that may be more readily talked about under the Mains, as it occurs to me. Is any information given out to the areas and to the people about this program? That was my main concern when it came through, was that people may not be aware that we have this program at all. Is there some pamphlet or something given out to people, readily available?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Stubbins did go out to all the communities and brief the communities on this program. I am not sure that he had literature to hand out, but he did go around and brief the communities.

Mr. Lengerke: I wonder if Mr. Bell could tell us the nature of the claims? It would be interesting to know of the associated crimes that were committed and why the claims were being made?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give you a direct answer at this time, but I can endeavor to see what information I can bring back.

Mr. Lengerke: It would be very interesting to know. We had a great discussion on that before.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I probably should not intercede, but there is maybe a complication in giving that answer, it may complicate the actual claim or it may be prejudice to a claim.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for that information if it will complicate it, but if there is information available, we had great discussion in this House on many occasions as to the nature that compensation would be provided. It would be very interesting to find out if somebody got hit on the head and were looking for a claim on that, that is all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, at least one of the claims was reported very fully in the *Whitehorse Star* and the *Yukon News*.

Mr. Lengerke: Oh, I do not read those.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 804, Criminal Injuries Compensation, \$11,700; Revised Vote \$11,800.

Establishment 804 agreed to

On Establishment 805

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 805, Court Worker Program, reduction of \$3,700; Revised Vote \$26,300.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why under this program any money should be going back to us because it is such an essential program and it should be expanded. Could we have some idea why we have got the \$3,700 back?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the program did not get started until late in the year. I think it was started in July so there were a couple of months that we simply did not have any bills for.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I know every budget I still have this puzzlement with me that that money cannot be used for something else. I am sure that the Court Worker Program can use more funding, especially in travelling to the communities, they have difficulty getting that. I know that is a policy decision. Is there some way that this money could be used other than putting it back?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, it relates back to changing the program, and really again it goes back to the Department. If the Department is prepared to change the program and puts up a new program that the Executive Committee and the Government can buy, and put through the Supplements, it is possible to do that, but it has got to be a changed program.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, it would not change the program to allow the person to travel more and say for instance do things in a educative role or something. It would not need a policy change, because one time I was questioning this, I was told that there just is not enough money for court workers to travel to different places. Now \$3,700 could be a trip to every community in Yukon, which would be very productive, and instead we are ignoring it. Why can it not go into travel or something?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, the detail on this was a second full-time worker came on stream on the First of July instead of the First of April, and therefore there was not enough staff, that is the information that I have.

Ms Millard: So then, just to clarify to myself, because it is set down in salaries and that money cannot be used as six months salary or whatever, that money that is set aside for that person, because it has not been used, cannot be transferred to that same program, under travel?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Treasurer, will you answer that, please?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not a clear-cut answer, because it is possible to transfer money within a vote, between establishments and between primaries. The department must get Government approval to do that and then it subsequently comes up in the Main Estimates as a supplementary, as we are doing now.

Now, if that is your question, yes, it is possible to do that, but, in this case, there may not have been, and I do not really

want to answer fully, because I do not know fully. I think this involves an agreement, so, consequently, I do not know what flexibility there is within that agreement. Again, you would have to go back to the department.

Ms Millard: But, Mr. Chairman, this is a grant. This is a grant that is given to, as far as I know, Skookum Jim Hall. Now, are they not allowed to use that \$3,700 the way that they can, and of course they would have to show you that they had used it in the proper manner, but would a grant not have less cumbersome civil service rules on it and they could use it?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: It is still the taxpayer's money.

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, I think that what the Member is saying is probably correct. If it is a grant, unless the agreement specifies certain limitations, then maybe what she is saying is correct, but again, I do not know the agreements, I cannot answer her fully.

Ms Millard: Well, maybe, Mr. Chairman, I should phone up Skookum Jim Hall and tell them to ask for \$3,700. Somebody should be--

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bell.

Ms Millard: Well, somebody should be on top of those things, because it seems to me it is a very essential program. It is not funded enough, as it is, and if we are really going to be trying to help people in Yukon with their legal problems and all the rest of it, these kinds of things should be up on top of, and it should be known to the people that are receiving the grant that that money is available, one way or another.

Mr. Sherlock: On top of?

Ms Millard: Well... They do, and they have not said.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: I will find out the exact details on this for the Member.

Ms Millard: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 805, Court Worker Program, a reduction of \$3,700, Revised Vote \$26,300.

Establishment 805 agreed to

On Establishment 806

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 806, *Legal Professions Ordinance*, \$15,300, Revised Vote \$15,400.

Perhaps Mr. Bell could tell us what this is about.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the votes where there is a one dollar contingency and this was the cost of one action, that is the cost to date of one action, under the *Legal Professions Ordinance*.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions or any discussion?

Mr. Lengerke: Could Mr. Bell enlarge on that?

Personal? Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Establishment 806, *Legal Professions Ordinance*, \$15,300, Supplementary Number 3, Revised Vote \$15,400.

Establishment 806 agreed to

On Establishment 807

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 807, Native Indian Special Constable Program, Supplementary Number 3, \$40,000, Revised Vote \$40,000.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering why this program is in the Territorial Government's Establishment. If I remember correctly, this was sponsored by the Federal Government, by Indian Affairs. The native people have direct responsibility to Indian Affairs and I was wondering why we are spending \$40,000 on this?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, this is a cost-shared program, and this is our share.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, what is the money spent on, because my understanding of it is they are hired and trained under the RCMP, I thought the RCMP Agreement, and we share the cost of that training, we share part of the cost of that training. Thank you.

Mr. Berger: Are there any other costs of RCMP officer training, for example a citizen of the Yukon decides to become an RCMP officer, do we share the cost also of the training program?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 807, Native Indian Special Constable Program, Supplementary Number 3, \$40,000; Revised Vote \$40,000. Shall the Establishment carry?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it is a training program, how many people are involved and where are they stationed, or what communities are they in, Special Constables?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I have this information in my back-up for the Mains. We have, I believe, at the present, four: Ross River, Teslin, and two other locations. I cannot give them to you now, but I can give them to you during our discussions in the Mains if that is all right.

Mrs. Watson: That is fine, Mr. Chairman.

Establishment 807 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: In the absence of the Deputy Chairman, I will entertain a motion from somebody.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I volunteered to provide the House with some information on Highways and Public Works, there was just one Establishment that we had not cleared, 902, of \$2,131,000 of savings. Mr. Chairman, part of the reason for the reduced cost in maintenance is that it was the first year of our new maintenance management program this year, that the consultant who appeared before the House last year estimated that we would probably do 67,289 pass miles with graders on surface grading, and he estimated the cost to be \$31.49 a mile. That actually turned out to be only \$24.96 per pass mile, and that almost is almost \$700,000 of that cost which is a saving from the estimate of what it would cost per passed mile per grader.

The rest of it, in road maintenance, is snow packed conditions just being that much down. We received, as of March 1st, the latest snow pack conditions and Whitehorse and southern lakes area is reporting 50 to 70 per cent of the average conditions, snow packed water equivalents in Watson Lake, Liard River are also well below last year's records, the Dawson area's snow pack conditions were approximately 60 to 78 per cent of the normal, while the Mayo-Stewart River area reports readings of 40 to 50 per cent of the average for this time last year.

So the combination of both of those amounts, in the Road Maintenance Section, of a saving of almost \$1,300,000.

In Reconstruction, the consultant estimated the number of projects that we were going to do at \$474,000. The actual costs of them worked out to \$367,000. We did not do several of those because the Shakwak Valley Project became a reality and, of course, it would not be efficient or sensible to do those projects which we had estimated that we were going to do in the Shakwak Valley, when they are going to come on stream and be done by the road upgrading in that area.

Other areas that, as I indicated before, is that some contracts were not let early enough to spend the money that was available. One other aspect is that our crusher, the Territorial crusher, was broken down and much of the crushing which had been estimated to be done, was not done also.

So, for those reasons, there is a saving in crushing of \$255,000. In reconstruction and the saving of the estimates and projects that were not done of \$265,000, and of surfacing, of \$250,000, for a total of \$770,000, in those areas, coupled with the total of \$1,300,000, which I mentioned in the other areas, the difference in the passed mile per grader, and also the saving because of the snow conditions this year, being anywhere from 50 to 75 per cent below normal, amounts to the total of \$2,131,000, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions or discussion on that?

We are looking at 902, Highway Maintenance, page 31, a reduction of \$2,131,000, Revised Vote \$12,980,000.

Establishment 902 agreed to

Mr. Fleming: I would move, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Speaker now resume the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I second that.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

dit70 000000

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. May we have a Report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole have adopted Resolution Number 1, respecting land transfers from Federal to Territorial Government Control, and directed me to report the same. The Committee also considered Bill Number 2, *Fourth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78* and directed me to report progress on same, and asked 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 5 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that we do now call it 5 o'clock.

Motion agreed to

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

Adjourned

The following Sessional Paper was Tabled March 13, 1978

78-1-10

Northern Pipeline Bill