



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 7

10th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Tuesday, March 14, 1978

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
March 14, 1978

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

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper. Are there any documents for tabling? Reports of Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills? Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion or Resolution?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by the Member from Hootalinqua, THAT the Federal Pipeline Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Any further Notices of Motion or Resolution? Are there any Statements by Ministers? This then brings us to the Question Period, have you any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: NCPC Power Rates/CBC Broadcast

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I have a question this morning in regard to something I heard on CBC radio last night, with regard to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I did not get the whole picture, it was a tabling of a paper or some such thing in regard to NCPC and the holding down of the power rates or something in the Yukon Territory. I am wondering if any of the Executive Committee or, Mr. Commissioner is not here, Mr. Bell or anyone has a knowledge of this?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything directly with regard to what the Member is asking about. I tried to get the tape of that report, but I was unable to this morning. I have arranged a meeting with the Chairman of NCPC to find out specifically what it is about.

As I indicated previously, there are some negotiations going on with regard to alleviating the high electrical rates in the Yukon, but I am not aware of what those specifics are at this time.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a Legislative Return which contains information in response to the motion made by Ms Millard regarding Corrections Matrons and Corrections Officers.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling Legislative Return in response to written question number 31, asked by Ms Millard on December 5th regarding Economic Research and Planning Unit information.

Question re: Citadel on Wheels

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, my question this morning is to the Minister of Education. It is regarding this correspondence, Mr. Speaker, that I have had and it all expresses an irate point of view from the communities and schools who are not being allowed to have the Citadel on Wheels visit their communities and schools by some apparent bungling on the part of our Government. My question this morning is, would the Minister of Education report to this House of why the Government handled the situation as they did and would the Minister investigate to see whether in fact it would be possible to again open negotiations with Citadel on Wheels to see if we could establish a more realistic schedule?

Mr. Speaker, with your agreement, I will read just one day's schedule that the Government prepared—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order.

Mrs. Watson: It is part of my question, Mr. Speaker, hether—

Mr. Speaker: I think the question, at this point, would be sufficient, as we cannot allow—

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Speaker, could I—

Mr. Speaker: —the Question Period to range into a debate.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Education whether he thinks this is a realistic schedule for one day?

Wednesday morning, travel to Haines Junction from Destruction Bay, put on a school performance that morning. In the afternoon they travel to Carcross, put on a school performance in Carcross that afternoon, and then put on an adult performance in Carcross that night, and then travel to Whitehorse that night? Is that a realistic schedule?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the questions under advisement and report back.

Question re: NCPC Power Rates/CBC Broadcast (Cont.)

Mr. Berger: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on the question asked by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, on the NCPC problem and the question is directed to the Minister of Renewable Resources.

I was wondering if the Minister would consider that somebody get in touch with Mr. Jeff Carruthers, of the *Globe and Mail*, because this is where all their information seems to be coming from?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: The Honourable Member is quite right, I cannot think of a better source of information these days, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Resolution Number 2

Mr. McCall: I have a question, written question, directed to the Minister of Education, being the unofficial leader of the Government.

In view of the fact that I have received information—

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I am glad you said unofficial.

Mr. McCall: In view of the fact that I have received information that the Commissioner has discussed Resolution Number 2 with some Members of this House, other than Executive Members, prior to the Resolution being debated in this House, and further, my information revealed that the Commissioner wanted to know how some Member was going to vote with respect to Resolution Number 2, my question is: what were the reasons, other than mentioned, for discussing the Resolution prior to debate taking place in this House and does the Commissioner feel that this was a wrong thing to do. That by discussing Resolution Number 2 with other than Executive Committee Members, could it be suggested that the Commissioner was trying to influence those Members as to the way their vote would be cast; and further, if this was the case, which Members were approached.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will have to refer that to the Commissioner. I am hardly in a position to speak for the Commissioner's actions.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Pipeline Project/YTG Responsibility

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, during the last session I asked a question of the Minister of Pipelines, I believe, and I am wondering when I can get an answer. The question was: The Government of Yukon recently submitted to the Federal Government a request for research funding dealing with fourteen specific areas that are YTG responsibility in connection with the Alaska Pipeline Project. What fourteen specific areas were identified in this regard and what amount of funding was requested in each specific area? Can I expect an answer to that question very shortly, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I would hope so, Mr. Speaker. I just apologize to the House that I have been extremely busy. I am falling behind in both my administrative and political work unfortunately.

Question re: Riverdale Elementary School Plans

Mr. Lengerke: A question for the Minister of Education this morning. First I will compliment him, I guess, on the speed

in which he has undertaken to do a study for a Riverdale school, the elementary school. My question this morning is are there plans available for that particular elementary school at this time?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, two or three years ago plans were drawn up for an elementary school. Whether or not it would be applicable to the situation in Riverdale remains to be seen. I think it is fair to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared to look at a small elementary school in that area, and I think at the same time, we are going to have to look at Porter Creek as well as the new area in Hillcrest. But as I said at the public meeting that I attended, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of the decisions that would have to be made is going to depend, number one, on the funding that is available, and number two, in respect to the long term decision that will have to be made about the Whitehorse Elementary School.

If a decision is made on the Whitehorse Elementary School, after we do an in-house study of just exactly what we are going to do with that particular facility, whether it is going to continue as a school for the next ten years, or whether the property is going to be sold, then we are going to have to look at possibly a small school in downtown Whitehorse as well.

All these variables have to be looked at and decisions will have to be made later on this year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lengerke: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the plans that in fact were done by, I believe Aubrey, McKinnon and Partners for that school in Riverdale, is it such a plan that it cannot be used or are just going to have a waste of money, an expenditure that is just going to sit there? What type of school was it? Was it a neighbourhood school or was it a large complex?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we would have to review the plans, I have not reviewed them for a couple of years and I would have to report back here, but the point is it is going to depend on the long-term school population in the Riverdale area, and, for that matter, the downtown area, as well as in other areas in Whitehorse.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think that anybody in this House wants to be responsible for making a decision to build a school that possibly, five years down the road, may be a quarter empty or half empty, because this is what has happened in southern Canada in many parts of the communities, that schools have been built and the planning has not been done properly and subsequently, either the schools are half empty or there is a major busing problem.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary from the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: The Minister misunderstands my question. I am not talking about the facts and figures of a Riverdale school, at the moment. I just want to know if we, in fact, are going to be able to utilize the plans that have been prepared already, at great expense to this Government, for some other school, be it Riverdale or where?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to think so.

Question re: YTG House Leader

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Education answered a number of questions dealing with his proposed or so-called leader of the Government and one of his remarks, Mr. Speaker, in answer to one of Ms Millard's questions: "Mr. Speaker, I think it is just a case of organization. You recall at last Session, where we had a lot of difficulty in the Legislature, and it was the case when an individual from the Government and the Chairman of Committees should be able to get together to discuss the format of business as he sees it."

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: has the Minister ever given the courtesy to all the officers of the House when he is discussing the format of business, and when?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as per the responses to the questions pertaining to this particular area yesterday, I have taken the responsibility from the Executive wing of Government to see that we are organized, and business is expeditiously done in this House. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the shambles that the Legislature was in last fall that something had to be done to correct the situation and I think the situation has been corrected by organization and obviously, Mr. Speaker, the main point of business that has to be attended to for the initial portion of this Session is the Main Estimates.

If the Honourable Member wants to come and discuss it with me, I would be more than prepared to discuss it with him.

Mr. McCall: Is the Minister aware that there are three officers of this House and why has he not approached all three officers of this House to discuss the format of business?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, obviously it was an oversight on my part and I would be prepared to discuss ongoing business at a later date if there is a change in format.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Pipeline Bill/Amendment to

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, on CBC this morning it was announced that the Progressive Conservative Member from Alberta, Peter Bawden, suggested to the Committee on pipeline legislation an amendment which would cut down the responsibility of Foothills (Yukon) Limited in their environmental studies to a rough figure of \$16 million. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Pipelines. What extra burden would that put on to Yukon? Would the Yukon have to put up further monies on environmental studies?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The Deputy Prime Minister, who is leading the Bill in the House, I understood, from the same report has already informed Mr. Bawden that his amendments are not going to be accepted, and I think Mr. Bawden also admitted that he knew that his amendments were not going to be accepted. I think it is an academic debate now, because both the leader of the House shepherding the Bill through the House has said no such amendments are going to be included in the Bill and the Member who raised the point also recognizes that these amendments are not going to be accepted. So if we want to have an academic debate on an issue that is not going to be accepted in Legislation, we can do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? We will then proceed to Orders of the Day under Motions and Resolutions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

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

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

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Recreation Branch should do a preliminary study of the costs and benefits of decentralizing the Arctic Winter Games from Whitehorse to the outlying areas with such study to be presented to the House prior to the conclusion of the 1978 (First) Session.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a nickel for every time the word "decentralization" has been said in this House in the last two or three years. This Motion really is based on that concept, and really the purpose that I have in bringing forward the Motion is to really test out the Government and see how serious they are on the whole concept of decentralization.

I suspect they are not, because there has not been any real effort to respond to all the pleas of taking seriously this concept

in the Yukon from many Members. We have been discussing it now for so many years that, to reiterate what was said would just be repetitive.

Dawson City is declining. Clinton Creek is closing down. The capital budget, our capital budget redefines its priorities along the Alcan route. Many capital projects are not being considered, which have already been started and were in the planning stage, for the outlying areas.

I think this is a despicable way to go about things and it is time that we took a look at the real cost to the outlying areas, not only of the pipeline, but of the whole policy of the Territorial Government to centralize things in Whitehorse.

Now, here we have a perfect example of what can be done. It is being done in the Northwest Territories right now and if the Government does not take this seriously, I think I might even give up, I do not know. I am just really looking for the Minister's response.

Mrs. Watson: Do not give up.

Ms Millard: I won't. I am really looking for the Minister's response to this. I am sure that they are going to find all kinds of administrative reasons why they cannot do this and why they cannot do that, but if they believe in a concept and act on that belief, they can find the administrative ways of doing it. This is one of the small areas they could do it in.

I am just really looking for their response to the concept of decentralization.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the Resolution proposed by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie that Resolution Number 3 be amended by deleting all the words following "House" and substituting the following: "the Minister of Education approach the Board of Directors of the Arctic Winter Games Corporation to seriously consider decentralizing some of the preliminary events of the 1980 Arctic Winter Games from Whitehorse to the outlying communities."

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I might have a copy of the amendment.

It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education that Resolution Number 3 be amended by deleting all the words following "House" and substituting the following: "that the Minister of Education approach the Board of Directors of the Arctic Winter Games Corporation to seriously consider decentralizing some of the preliminary events of the 1980 Arctic Winter Games from Whitehorse to the outlying communities."

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons why I am proposing the amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member from Ogilvie. I think that there is some background that should be reiterated in this House that was stated when we were discussing the Supplementaries as well as the Main Estimates. Number one, when the Yukon Territorial Government was approached by the Arctic Winter Games Corporation to host the 1980 Arctic Winter Games, I had my departmental officials phone three of the communities that might possibly consider hosting the Games, Watson Lake, Faro and Dawson.

In each case it was felt that they did not have the facilities to host the Games. Subsequently, Whitehorse was approached and they have agreed that they would host the forthcoming Arctic Winter Games in 1980.

I think there is another major point here, Mr. Speaker, that is reflected in the amendment. That is the fact that I am prepared to approach the Arctic Winter Games Corporation Board of Directors, which we have two, Alaska has two, as well as Northwest Territories, to see what can be done to see whether or not some of the preliminary events could be hosted or held in the outlying communities, some of the preliminary trials during the Arctic Winter Games.

Now I think the accusations that this Government is not

concerned about the outlying communities is not accurate, Mr. Speaker. I think it is fair to say that we made an effort, number one, to see whether or not they were prepared to hold the Games; number two, letters have been sent, contrary to some of the statements made in this House, to Haines Junction, Carmacks and Teslin, and that was approximately a month and a half ago and we have had no response, whether or not they were interested in hosting some of the preliminary trials during the week of the Arctic Winter Games being held in Yukon.

The point that I am prepared to do, Mr. Speaker, is I am prepared to approach the Board of Directors, as I stated earlier, to see whether or not they are prepared to decentralize some of the trials. Now I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time during the evolution of the Arctic Winter Games, the Arctic Winter Games are being held in two communities in the next week, Hay River and Pine Point in the Northwest Territories. The Arctic Winter Games Corporation at that time will be able to assess the pros and cons of separating the Games in that way.

Also I think there is another point, Mr. Speaker. Whitehorse, under the understanding from this Government, and that was the acceptance of the policy that was put here, would host the Games. I think it is fair to say that if you are going to make a major departure now to decentralize the Games to the extent that it was spread all over the Territory, the City of Whitehorse would have to re-assess their position. We do not have the time. I would have thought that the Members would have raised this during debate here last fall. It was not raised, it was raised here at the beginning of this Session, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have done what we can do to see what we can do to accommodate the outlying communities. But I want to point out that the jurisdiction we can propose or can recommend to the Arctic Winter Games Corporation that there may be a change in format, but they make the decision. The Northwest Territories is included, as well as Alaska, not just is Government. You have three jurisdictions involved and I think that is very important, Mr. Speaker, and it has to be recognized.

At the same time, I would expect that I would probably be able to come back to this Legislature with an answer probably in April, after the Arctic Winter Games Corporation has assessed the Pine Point-Hay River Games and then subsequently, can look at the Yukon in the advent of the 1980 Games.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I am a little disturbed by the amendment to the motion, because, to me, the amendment should roll after what the original motion does.

The Minister of Education is looking for loop-holes now. He knows full well that Yukon was given the right to host the 1980 Games. He knows full well that the proposal was made to the City of Whitehorse. He knows full well, at that time, the Territorial Government could have said, all right, what are we going to do. Are there other areas in the Territory. He knows full well that Watson Lake, Faro or Dawson, to host the entire Games, would be a tremendous undertaking for these communities.

But, to host a certain portion of it would have been a different thing altogether.

What is said in this motion is what has to be done before you can do any talking about it. I would have hoped that after it was brought up last Fall, I would like to draw the Honourable Minister's attention to last Fall, when we talked about decentralizing some of the events for the Arctic Winter Games, that the Territorial Government would have sharpened their pencils, Recreation Branch, instead of looking for excuses, would have sat down and looked at it in a realistic way, rather than writing a general letter to these communities, approach them in a very realistic way and done a complete assessment of it.

Before you do that, how can you go to the Board of Directors? You have nothing to go to the Directors with. You are

going to say, I am getting pressure from the Legislature, but do not bother about them. That is exactly, I just know that. I just know that is going to happen.

Instead of being serious and having a good proposal to put forward, we are going to go to the Board of Directors now and the Territorial Government should have been doing this a year ago, unfortunately.

I hope, because I do not think anything is going to materialize, I just know what the Board of Directors are going to say, I just know.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: What?

Mrs. Watson: They are going to turn it down because we do not have a proposal, which is what we want to see.

I would sincerely hope that the next time around, maybe the Territorial Government heeds this and looks at this other communities, because they are beginning to have facilities that could accommodate some of the events, but not all of them.

Mr. Speaker: I am extremely disappointed at the brush-off that we have got with this amendment.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment, I will tell you that right now. There was no need of the amendment in the first place. We have asked the Minister to do something that is, in actuality, good for the Territory, if it can be done. We have just asked him to check to see if it is possible and feasible that it can be done, and it looks to me like he did not want anything to do with any motion, other than if it was made by himself and deleted the whole thing and started over again with his own idea of what he might just do, go and ask them if they could.

I would say he is going the wrong way anyway, because he had better find out if he can do it first, before he goes and asks them to even consider it.

I would also like to ask the Minister, when he says that he has contacted three places he mentioned, just who he contacted in those three places. Was it the L.I.D., or was it the community club, as such, or possibly the Board in the recreation field. Just who did he send the letters to, because I find that the Government, any time they are dealing with themselves, they may have sent it to the L.I.D., must therefore go somewhere else and before they get the letter, it is going to take a lot more than a month to get an answer back. Hopefully, he will get some answers, so Mr. Speaker, I will be just voting against the amendment.

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

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, I also will be voting against the amendment. I think this shows the dilemma this House faces with this Government. As some Members have already pointed out, this Government has absolutely no intention of decentralizing anything. The whole concentration seems to be only on Whitehorse. I stood here before and said we are making the biggest mistake possible creating a monster city in the southern end of Yukon and forgetting about the rest of the Territory. I think this is what it is all about. We are not even talking about the Arctic Winter Games right now. The rest of the Territory faces an economic dilemma. There is absolutely nothing in the rest of the Territory right now which, economically speaking, could support anything. This is why the Motion came out in the first place, to get a little bit of hand on money which is available from the Federal Government through the Arctic Winter Games. Maybe some of the money needed in those communities could be raised that way.

The Minister of Education, I am sure, did not approach Dawson City and say now look, there would be so much money available, could you possibly incorporate this in the new recreation complex. I am sure he did not approach Haines Junction on those things, no community in the Territory. Right now the City of Whitehorse is talking about building a monstrous new recreation complex, and if they are going to go through with it,

Mr. Speaker, then there is never going to be a decentralization of anything. We have seen it already back a number of years ago when they built a pink elephant across the river here which used to be the color of the hospital. The reason for that is there are no services available in the outlying areas, Mr. Speaker, because of this elephant we have sitting across the river right now, because we had to justify the expenses on the thing. Exactly the same thing is going to happen with anything this Government undertakes.

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

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment. It will not come as a surprise, I hope, to the Minister. He mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in his comments that places like Faro do not have the facilities. Well is it any wonder we do not have the facilities when you do not put anything in the budget for those facilities to take care of the Winter Games. Faro was already offered, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate some of those Winter Games, if we had the facilities. We have some, and I think the Honourable Member from Klondike was making reference to the type of attitude that we have representing this Government. They believe in centralization, not decentralization, and it has been very obvious, Mr. Speaker, by some of the Minister's remarks as to the support of his amendment. The Minister really does not find himself too interested about the outlying communities.

I won't be supporting the amendment.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, I cannot really get hung-up on either one of the motions. They both do the same thing, really.

You know, it says: "...the opinion of this House that the Recreation Branch should do a preliminary study..." Well, in order to do a preliminary study, I would expect that the Recreation Branch would have to talk to the Board of Directors of the Games, as well, and they would have to see what the results of the Pine Point-Hay River Games would be. They would have to go through that same exercise, as well.

There is no time limit, really, other than reporting back the results of a preliminary study, or an investigation which preliminary, however you interpret that, could be a couple day's work, one day's work, whatever, and then they will come back with the recommendation that a further study, or whatever, has to be done.

So, really, I just cannot get too excited about it either way. I think that the idea is great. I support the idea that we should be looking at the feasibility of decentralizing the Games. It may not just apply to the 1980 Games, at this point, because plans have proceeded to a degree, where maybe you cannot turn back. But I think that will be quite apparent in the results of the study or of the report that comes back from the Recreation Branch.

I would have no problem supporting the first Resolution the way it stands.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I really find this amendment insulting. I think it is disgraceful that the Territorial Government is throwing the onus on the Arctic Winter Games for a policy decision that should be made by this Government and should have been made a long time ago and there should have been action on it a long time ago.

It is disgraceful that they do not have the courage or the ambition or the interest to really represent the whole of this Territory. I think we are seeing the results of four Executive Committee Members from Whitehorse, that is really the result.

I would like to point out to Members, if they have not noticed, that this amendment says to "seriously consider". They might as well put that in quotation marks, "decentralizing some of the preliminary events of the 1980 Winter Games". "Preliminary events", not even the actual Arctic Winter Games. I do not even know what the preliminary events would

be, up to that point.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, then what the hell are you talking about it for then?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Ms Millard: I think that it is really disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, if anyone votes for this motion, they are voting against the outlying areas.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, you know, really, as the first president of the Arctic Winter Games Corporation and knowing better the Charter of the Arctic Winter Games Corporation, between the three jurisdictions, Alaska, the Yukon and Northwest Territories, it just amazes, disturbs and hurts me to see the Arctic Winter Games being used as the political football on another issue policy of decentralization.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, let us get back on the track to it. The Arctic Winter Games Charter and the Arctic Winter Games Board of Directors makes the decision of where the Games will be held by asking the area who has the next Games, whether it be Alaska, Yukon or the Northwest Territories, for the communities to send in their bids as to whether or not they want to host the Games.

Those are the facts of the matter and that is exactly where it lies. There were probably three areas that could have hosted the Games in Whitehorse, there have been several in Alaska who have bid, several in the Northwest Territories, in Yukon only one community saw fit and thought they could host the Games and sent in their application to host the Games in 1980. To the Minister of Recreation's credit, rather than getting all this flack in the House, he saw that there could be problems and tried at the original instant to get those communities at least within 100 miles of Whitehorse involved in it and find out whether any of them were interested in hosting any of the venues for the Games so he could try to work out an arrangement between the City that got the application in to host the Games, Whitehorse, and those communities as to whether some of them could be decentralized.

Now, because of a political football, the Members are making out of the athletes and the Arctic Winter Games Corporation, he is being condemned in the House for attempting to do that.

Mr. Speaker, it is just so obvious that the Members have not read what the Arctic Winter Games Corporation is, or their duties and responsibilities. They have asked for applications, and the only application that has been received is from the City of Whitehorse and the Arctic Winter Games Board of Directors make the decision, not this Government, and not the Minister of Education, as to who will be the host city and to where the venues will be. The International Board of Directors makes those decisions as they should be, and to the Minister's credit, he tried to get some of those venues for the 1980 Arctic Winter Games moved away from Whitehorse, exactly what Honourable Members are crying about that he did not even attempt to do.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to see the Arctic Winter Games Corporation which at least up to this point in time, has not been used as a political football in this House and the athletes of Yukon being used as political pawns, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is not the time and not the place at this time to debate such a nonsensical issue in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, I just wanted to say in the time I have spent in this House, this is the first time I can honestly say that I have seen real true irresponsibility being demonstrated here by Members. I have never seen some of the politicians attempting to cover what they did not do during the time this House was not in session. They knew that I was approaching some of the outlying communities, and they did not follow it up, Mr. Speaker, they preferred to come to the House and criticize the Government.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, if we do get replies from the communities within 100 mile radius of Whitehorse, I am prepared to sit down with the whole society in Whitehorse for the Arctic Winter Games and see whether or not we can take some of the venues outside of Whitehorse. But I just think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members do not understand, as my colleague has said, the Charter of the Arctic Winter Games, the jurisdiction that they have, and also, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, it has to be understood that they have tried decentralized Games and we are going to have to wait and see just exactly what takes place at the forthcoming Arctic Winter Games in the Northwest Territories to assess whether or not they have been successful or where they are lacking in success.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is I would like to think that the Honourable Member from Klondike and the Honourable Member from Teslin, and the Honourable Member from Kluane who stood up and made their political statements, I hope they are prepared to get on the telephone and just find out what is happening in their particular communities, because they have a responsibility, they ran for office like I did, instead of sitting up and criticizing the Government every day like a bunch of puppets. That is exactly what it looks like, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please.

Mrs. Watson: On a point of order--

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Watson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, did the Honourable Member send copies of letters that he was supposed to have written to communities, to the people who represent those communities?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member has no point of order.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The mover of the amendment has now closed debate on the amendment. 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.

The Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Agreed.

The Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Agreed.

The Hon. Mr. Lang: Agreed.

The Hon. Dr. Hibbard: Agreed.

Mr. McIntyre: Agreed.

Mr. Berger: Disagree.

Mr. Flemming: Disagree.

Ms Millard: Disagree.

Mr. McCall: Disagree.

Mrs. Watson: Disagree.

Mr. Lengerke: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results of division to the amendment to Resolution 3, five yea, six nay.

Amendment defeated

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

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let that pass, I mean, I was accused of playing political football. I am not, I never threw the ball in the first place. It was the Government who did not react to the request of this House to look at the decentralization of anything, seriously.

It is unfortunate that it had to come with this particular instance, where the Arctic Winter Games are played with. This was not really the reason the Arctic Winter Games have to be decentralized. We asked a number of times now, of this Government, to look really seriously at decentralization. We asked for the Tourist Department to be moved to Dawson City. We

asked for other departments, look at the feasibility to move to other communities, to give those communities an economic base, which they are lacking right now.

But this Government, for some unknown reason, decided to bury those questions under some bureaucratic nightmare of an answer that it costs too much money and it is not feasible. On the other hand, we talk about how we have to subsidize those communities.

This is the real reason why this motion ever came on the floor. And I accuse this Government of really playing the political football game, not those Members in this House.

The Members in this House, Mr. Speaker, are showing their frustration of not being listened to by the Government Members of this House.

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

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate what the Honourable Member from Klondike has said, that I abhor the fact that we are being accused of making a political football out of the Arctic Winter Games.

All we were asking in our motion is for the Territorial Government to look at it seriously, what we are proposing, realistically and seriously, and then come back to us to see what, from the Government's point of view, from the Recreation's point of view, their recommendations are. That is all that we asked, Mr. Speaker.

Instead, we get an amendment, which is political.

The amendment does not even address the Arctic Winter Games, it wants to go to the Board of Directors and it wants to see whether we can have preliminary events, not events of the Arctic Winter Games. This, Mr. Speaker, is the thing that really bothered me when the amendment came in. Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for the Board of Directors to be involved at this point, we want the Territorial Government to sharpen their pencils and do their homework.

For the Minister of Local Government to stand up like our elderly statesmen since the other one was not available, he lacks the shiny top on the top of his head, but he will likely gain that fairly soon if we keep at him. Mr. Speaker, to in a very lofty way tell us how the Arctic Winter Games operates and how international and national Board of Directors dotty, dotty, dot type of thing, you know, we are not that impressed, and we are not that naive either. We just want the Territorial Government to sharpen their pencil and do their homework and come forward to this House and see what they have been able to do, and, to give us the courtesy of when they write, like the Department of Education, to a community and suggest they have the Arctic Winter Games in the future, please let's send a copy to the Member who represents that area. It might help a great deal, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that the Honourable Members were going to make such a serious issue out of whether or not some preliminary games could be played outside of Whitehorse. It was my understanding, confirmed again today by the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, that outlying communities were written to and asked if they had any interest at all in hosting these events. To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there has been no reply from any of those communities. I would assume in six weeks without any reply that the answer is in the negative. Now, to have the Honourable Members representing those areas stirring up a storm here as if they knew nothing, were given no opportunity and were being ignored again, is pretty silly, Mr. Speaker. There were offers and they have not been accepted, that is the point that impresses me, because Mr. Speaker, in my areas of responsibility, I am getting requests from communities constantly for things they want to do and be part of with this Government, it is not the other way around.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I know what the offers are. I am not going to tell the Government of what I know all the time either. But I do know what the offer was, it was a very simple thing and it has not had time, there has not been time to get the answer to come back here from my constituents. Sometimes it takes the Government a year or two years to do something and they expect a community 100 miles from Whitehorse to have an answer back here within a few days, they are not going to get it. But they will be getting an answer, and that answer will be favourable to decentralization, that is all I am going to say. You are not fooling me by jumping up and saying you have not got an answer and they are not going to give you an answer, and there is going to be this that and the other thing, and there was no mention in this motion of any certain parts of the Games or preliminaries or otherwise or anything else. The motion merely asked you to do something that you were put in the House to do and that is all, very simple. I am wondering where all the contention comes from. I am just wondering why you just really seem to object to doing something, which is very simple with this motion.

I just cannot understand it.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Speaker, I, too, find it puzzling why there is so much objection on the Government's side to doing a simple little thing which indicates an attitude of the Government in support of the smaller communities which is a very simple little thing. That is why we are arguing on this motion, I think, because it is such an easy way to do things.

I really felt, in putting forward the motion, that I was giving the Government an opportunity to be positive about the small communities and to try to give them some kind of at least moral support and to have all these funny little excuses coming out that they have sent letters out to the communities, I would certainly like to have a list of who it was sent to in Dawson, because it was never brought to my attention that anyone was approached.

Anyway, if they were approached to host the Games, no wonder they are saying no. None of those little communities could host the whole Arctic Winter Games. I do not know what kind of miracles they expect from them, but we are making a reasonable alternative, a reasonable alternative, which is already being done in the Northwest Territories and already we are seeing positive results from it.

I am really discouraged, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a negative attitude towards the outlying communities. I cannot really swallow that and the only reason that I can see is that they all live in Whitehorse and they darn well do not come out and see us at all, let alone give us a phone call between Sessions. I have yet to receive—

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: That is not fair.

Ms Millard: More than about three phone calls in four years on decisions that are being made by this Government between Sessions.

Now, you cannot say that there is any kind of communication between Whitehorse and the outlying Members even, let alone the outlying communities of any sort.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, can I rise on a Point of Privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Ogilvie knows that that is just not fair, that anything affecting the City of Dawson, that the departments which I have portfolio responsibilities for, carbons of those letters to anyone in that constituency go to both Members of Dawson.

Also, I have been in Dawson at least three or four times, within the last few months, on matters which dramatically affect the City of Dawson, which she represents

I find those allegations, Mr. Speaker, on this motion, to come at this time, tremendously unfair and just not truthful, Mr. Speaker:

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not go into the details of it, because it really is a general concept that we, who are supporting this motion, are trying to get across and I am afraid I am very disappointed that it is not coming through from the Government that they even really support the outlying areas. Very disappointed in that and I am just hoping that the new election will prove that there are more people interested in what is happening to the whole of the Yukon, then there is at present.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member having twice spoken to the motion has completed the debate.

Some Members: Agreed.

Some Members: Disagreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare that the motion has carried.

Ms Millard: Division.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Oh, for heaven's sakes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms Millard: I would like to see where the colours are, division.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that the motion has carried. We will continue with Motions.

Madam Clerk: Item Number 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. McKinnon.

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

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works, BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Council approves such different rate or change in the case of the school tax levied within Yukon, including municipalities, from 16 mills to the Canadian dollar to 10 mills, and, in the case of the general purpose tax levied within Yukon, excluding municipalities, from 22 mills to the Canadian dollar to 28 mills for the taxation year 1978.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of very important reasons, some of them mentioned before, why the present mill rate for schools and the general mill rate for the Territory should be changed, especially at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Statutory requirement there be a re-assessment of real property every five years results in a static assessment for five years. The rising mill rate in times of inflation and a new assessment having a gross value of higher than the last one, and for a responsible taxing body, a fall in the mill rate. The cycle is then repeated, Mr. Speaker, over the next five years. Mr. Speaker, the new re-assessment to the City of Whitehorse has added to the overall assessment of Yukon so significantly that the necessary school operational funds can be raised by a mill rate below the 16 mills which has been charged over the past 13 years with no change. This assessment, Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before, is based on 1976 fair market values where the previous assessment was based on 1969 fair market values making the change extremely significant.

Mr. Speaker, this new assessment in Whitehorse puts a great burden on those whose assessed value of land or buildings is increased greatly in 1978. But the same result would occur on all land and buildings elsewhere in Yukon as the five year re-assessment takes place. Not to reduce the school mill rate at this time would mean that an inequitable amount of the school revenue would be taken from those who were working under a new assessment compared to those whose last assessment was some years back.

It is an opportune time, Mr. Speaker, to make an adjustment in mill rates because it is hoped that the re-assessment of

Dawson, Watson Lake Airport area and Faro can be done to become effective in 1979 and we would face the same problems that are now apparent in Whitehorse if this opportunity at this time were not taken. Mr. Speaker, there is no established relationship between the funds collected from school taxes and the operational cost of schools. No formula has been adopted on how the mill rate is to be set. We therefore, in setting an educational mill rate, really have no guide as to percentage figures of what the contribution Yukon taxpayers towards the operation of Yukon schools should be.

It is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that there really are no capital contributions to school costs throughout Yukon. Overall, Mr. Speaker, throughout the Territory, about 10 per cent of the operation and maintenance budget is collected from Yukon taxpayers towards the operation and maintenance of the school system.

Mr. Speaker, we do not think that there is a finer plan or lesser cost upon the taxpayer of Yukon anywhere in this country, or indeed if one looks further, in North America. Mr. Speaker, throughout Canada there is a demand for senior governments to assume more of the burden of the school mill rate so that the vacated property taxes can be absorbed into the municipal share of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, it is common municipal philosophy, at this time, that the municipal taxpayer can see the true results of his property taxes through garbage collection, through sewer and water systems, through paved roads within the municipality, but it is a little different to see the benefits of school taxes to those people who are on fixed incomes as senior citizens or do not have any children in school.

Property taxes for general type municipal services is an equitable taxing formula. Property taxes for education purposes are, for many reasons, an inequitable type of taxation and the modern philosophy is, and most of the provinces are following along this line, that the senior governments should remove themselves as quickly and as efficiently as possible from property tax for education purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a move in this direction. If the Government does not move in this direction, it means, truthfully, Mr. Speaker, that to provide the municipal services, one would have to go to higher per capita grants, but, of course, to get those higher per capita grants, all you would be doing is charging more taxes to be able to distribute them to the municipalities. It would not reflect, once again, the true costs of municipal service on property taxes, so it is best to get out of the field of property taxes and leave that to the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, because of our concern that the reassessment should not result in any major increases in school taxes on any owner of residential property, because we believe that the Territorial Government should set an example for all the taxing authorities at this time to be as responsible as possible, we have suggested that the school mill rate be reduced dramatically from sixteen to ten mills.

Mr. Speaker, because this change is still insufficient, in Whitehorse particularly, to cushion the impact of the new assessments, and because a number of home owners can be identified as senior citizens or Yukoners of many years' residence, we also propose, as we mentioned before, some changes in the Home Owners' Grant policy, which will be debated, I hope, at second reading of the Bill later in the Orders of the day, this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the general mill rate for municipalities in 1977 was between thirty-one and forty-two mills, and, for the remainder of the Yukon, twenty-two mills. We are suggesting, therefore, at this time, Mr. Speaker, that when six mills of school rate is being vacated, that we use six mills to add to the general mill rate. This would give a total mill rate of thirty-eight mills for the Yukon generally, which is no change, Mr. Speaker, over the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there are any jurisdictions in the country, regardless of what the elected Members have said of the budget about fly now and pay later, an election year budget, that can make that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I can imagine if the Government would have gone the other way and increased the taxation upon the people of the Territory, then the results of the reaction would have been much more reactionary, Mr. Speaker, than the ones that the Members have indicated up to this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, for the municipalities, including Whitehorse as they have already indicated, we believe that the councils of each municipality will be able to drop their mill rate totals by at least the same amounts.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to design a system of taxation that is entirely equitable and there will always be exceptions.

The suggestions we are making by the Resolution in the Home Owners' Grant amendments will benefit, Mr. Speaker, throughout Yukon, the great majority of home owners, which is the target group that this Government is most interested in aiding, helping, and make sure that their disposable income remains at this level at least through Government charges, that will allow them to remain in Yukon.

Mr. Speaker, because this adjustment of mill rates means no further taxation upon those who are taxed totally by the Territorial level, because the adjustment in the mill rate helps those municipalities which are not assessed this year, and, Mr. Speaker, because it does not place any inexorable burdens upon the mill rate at least for those people where the reassessment has been handled this year in Whitehorse. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, because I am proud of the fact that we have been able to keep the mill rate the same for the last three years and I think that this Government should take some credit for being responsible we will have to allow that to happen, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for the unanimous support of this House for this very important resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would move this Resolution into Committee for further discussion, Resolution Number 4.

Mr. Fleming: I second that motion.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, THAT Resolution Number 4 be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Public Bills.

PUBLIC BILLS

Bill Number 6: Second Reading

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Minister prepared to proceed?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill Number 6 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works, that Bill Number 6 be now read a second time.

Is there any debate?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal satisfaction that I brought the first *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance* to this House. Mr. Speaker, it is again, with a great amount of personal satisfaction that I bring further amendments to the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*.

Mr. Speaker, we have had several years in which the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance* has been working, working easily, working very well, and I think of a true benefit to many home

owners throughout Yukon. Mr. Speaker, during the debate when we first brought in the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance* there were other suggestions that were made by Honourable Members, particularly those from the outlying areas for amendments to the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*. We said at that time, Mr. Speaker, that we would like to see the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance* function for several years and then, Mr. Speaker, be able to come to the House and look at those areas where we did not believe that perhaps it was functioning in the best interest of an awful lot of taxpayers throughout the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, and outside of the legatees in the Ordinance, an explanation of the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*, would show that in those areas, particularly outside of Whitehorse where many people's taxes were between \$100 and \$200 a year, that, Mr. Speaker, there was only a minimal amount of money received back from the *Home Owner's Grant Ordinance*.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, at second reading, one is allowed the privilege of speaking on the philosophy of the Bill, not to go into details of the Bill. The comments the Honourable Member is making at the present time should be made when we begin the discussion on the Bill, within Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Honourable Minister could restrict himself to the principles of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why I am not using or have not used any dollar figures at all in the Bill, but I think it is the philosophy of the Bill that it is changed from a certain group of people that it helped, hoping that it will aid another group of people, which the Honourable Member from Mayo and the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, and Kluane, mentioned, in particular, on debating the philosophy of the first Ordinance. There is a change in the philosophy and that is the change in that area, Mr. Speaker.

There is a change, also, because it also gets into the area of helping further, Mr. Speaker, those who are under benefits under the Old Age Supplementary Assistance Program, that these people are also helped to a greater extent than other taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the two Bills in conjunction, the resolution, or the resolution setting the mill rates, in conjunction with the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*, show a responsibility and a concern of this Government for the target group that we particularly are attempting to help in these days of high inflation and, Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of the disposable dollar for those who are trying to pay a mortgage on a home and raise a family in the Yukon.

We believe that the combination of the resolution and the Home Owner's Grants, as equitably as possible, looking at all various options and alternatives, does this, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that with the changes in the direction of the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance*, that, as a resolution, and because of the real benefits it has to the majority of home owners in the Yukon, that Honourable Members would give their concurrence in a unanimous way to such an Ordinance, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, may I have the opportunity to speak on the Bill?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while no one opposes a principle of helping a home owner, one may oppose the idea of how it is being done.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of the Home Owners' Grant is a principle which involves a senior government, such as the Territorial Government, setting the taxation load within a jurisdiction.

There are other ways, Mr. Speaker, that home owners could:

be benefitted by senior governments, other than through a home owner grant type of scheme. This is a very interesting and very political type of maneuver, but when the Bill gets into the Committee, I will be able to explain further the principle that I see, the very basic principle that I see, being involved here. That is the fact that the senior government is not getting out of property taxation, is actually becoming more involved in dictating where and who should be paying the costs of property taxation, even though, Mr. Speaker, that is the responsibility of a local government structure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I have a comment or two on the principle of the Bill because, I think the Government, I must commend the Minister on listening to the pleas of his fellow Members in the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and in helping the aged especially, I have to agree with him, on helping the other areas of the, you might say, lower class or whatever. I agree. The philosophy of going further than that, I actually cannot agree, however, I cannot speak on it at this time. As I say, I would commend him on what has been done to a certain extent.

Motion agreed to

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee of the Whole please come to order.

As there is a Members' meeting for the recess period, and it will probably last for upwards of an hour, I will declare a recess until 1:30 and at that time we will continue with the Supplementary where we left off yesterday.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee come to order. It was agreed that this afternoon we would deal with the motion that was moved into Committee of the Whole this morning, Resolution Number 4.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have very little to add from the general debate which has been conducted both from a ministerial statement and from views that I expressed this morning. I have asked Mr. Sherlock and Mr. Wilson to be here to be able to answer specific questions dealing with the changes in the mill rate and what actuarial changes that those will, indeed, affect, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am very, very interested in some of the results of the resolution. I would like to know, with the reduction of the six mills within the municipalities, first of all, what revenue did we receive for school taxes in past years and what revenue will we be expecting for 1978-9 and what revenue would we have expected if the mill rate had not been lowered?

Then, also, looking in the areas outside of the municipalities, what effect, the revenue that exists right now from the 16 mills, what effect the reduction will have on the mill rate, on the total revenue that is derived from property taxation?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, we have half of the answer only. We have the answer as to what was paid in 1977-'78, and what will be received in, or is projected to be received in 1978-'79, based on the new mill rate.

Now, the comparison to the old mill rate, we would have to calculate and we can bring those figures back.

Whitehorse, for example, taxes for 1978-'79, 1977-'78, \$922,343. Projected for 1978-'79, \$1,200,647.

Mrs. Watson: Excuse me, one million?

Mr. Sherlock: \$1,200,347.

That is an increase of \$278,000. Faro, 1977-78, \$104,822 projected for 1978-79, \$65,514, a decrease of \$39,000. Dawson, 1977-78 \$26,906, projected 1978-79 \$16,816, a decrease of \$10,000.

Now outside the municipalities property tax \$836,092 for 1977-78 and 1978-79 is \$1,063,180, an increase of \$227,000. School 1977-78 \$465,372; 1978-79 \$307,394, a decrease of \$158,000. The overall projections for taxation for 1977-78 \$2,355,535; projected for 1978-79 \$2,653,251, an increase of \$297,000.

Mr. Chairman: I do not have the 16 mill calculation. We can bring that back if the Member wants that.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it. I do not think it is that much to calculate is it to bring back if it remained at the 16 mill?

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Mrs. Watson: On the motion, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am going to vote against the motion for the simple reason that I think that it is a manipulation of property taxation, both school and property taxation, in the Yukon Territory and it is so manipulated to get the vote of the municipalities and it sort of turns its back on the rest of the areas outside of the municipalities because you do not have that many in this House.

I am really concerned about that area, the area outside of municipalities. I am concerned about municipalities also for the simple reason, by lowering the school mill rate, and I am not saying that it should not have been lowered because it would have been quite a burden for the taxpayers, we also are going to have to show that we are going to continue to fund a certain portion of our educational costs in Yukon, whether you like it or I like it.

We have \$17 million in our budget for education. The revenue that we have given to us today, I do not think that we are even paying ten per cent. At one time we were twelve. We are not even paying ten per cent and five years ago the Federal Government was putting on pressure and after the Territorial Government to increase the mill rate in school taxes, before they would entertain providing more money within the deficit grant for education costs in the Yukon Territory. Whether you like or I like it, it is an issue that we have to face.

By cutting the mill rate, it is just distorting the picture and, Mr. Chairman, I think that it sets us up for some other form of taxation, and the Minister of Local Government said it today. He did not feel that it was fair that school taxes should be based on property taxation, but he did not come out and give us an alternative.

Everyone of us knows that we cannot continue to have our education funded the way we are, and to pay the percentage, when it is dropping, of the total cost and we are going to be asked to look at some other form of taxation.

Mr. Chairman, if it is not next year, it certainly is going to be the year after. There are not too many alternatives that we have in the Territory. We cannot tax natural resources. We are looking at \$30 million in the property taxes from the pipeline, but everyone has got that spent a long time ago.

So, the only other alternative that I see would be sales tax. I think, by the manipulation of the taxation that is being done in this resolution, together with a Home Owners' Grant, is setting us up beautifully for a sales tax.

Now, that might be a more equitable way of distributing the costs of education, but, let us not kid the people. Let us be honest and say we are not going to fund school costs through property taxes, but you must rest assured that you cannot continue this way. Some other form of revenue is going to have to be found to cover the costs of our schools.

Mr. Chairman, I look at the outlying areas where the 16 mills for the school taxes was lowered to 10. But the general purposes then was increased by 6. Now in the municipalities, Dawson and Faro, they are going to get a bit of a tax holiday and nobody minds anyone ever getting a tax holiday, however, why was not everyone given the tax holiday? They are going to be getting a new assessment next year, incidentally. We may have other communities that are not within the municipalities that get a re-assessment next year and they are going to then be the ones that are really going to be discriminated against under this Resolution.

If you look at Dawson and Faro, and Whitehorse has had their new assessment, they have had the mill rate lowered, and they have had the school tax rate lowered, Dawson and Faro have not had the new assessment, but they have had their school mill rate lowered, and no doubt when the assessment comes in next year, the new assessment to these two municipalities, the taxes are going to go up and maybe the municipality themselves. They still have the right to lower it, but what if one of the communities that is not a municipality is re-assessed next year, or the year after, or the year after, and their assessment comes in at three or four times what it is at the present time, their school mill rate is 10 mills, but their other one is 28 mills, and that mill rate cannot be lowered by the local community. It has to come into this House and have a majority in this House to lower the mill rate.

I think I should point out something here, the Minister of Local Government is always saying that people in the outlying areas are not paying their fair share of property taxation or that they are getting a break on property taxation. Look at 22 mills. That is the base, Mr. Chairman. If you have water, you pay an extra mill, and for the operation of your system you pay another mill, if you have sewer you pay an extra mill, if you have paved streets you pay a couple of more mills, if you have the recreation under your L.I.D. you pay two mills for every recreational facility that is operated and maintained. So you could easily add, in order to even begin to have the same services that you have say in Whitehorse, you would automatically be adding another 10 mills to the 28 mills, and you would be at 38 mills.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order, if you would please.

Mr. Chairman: Yes?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do take offence to one of the comments that was made, Mr. Chairman, and I think there should be a retraction made that my colleague has said that the people in the outlying communities are not paying enough. I have never heard my colleague say that and I think that an apology is due. I do not think an innuendo like that should be let to go by.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, he knows what he can do with his apology. Mr. Chairman, that is ridiculous, if he had said a Point of Privilege, I could have understood it, but a Point of Order.

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a Point of Privilege, I would not have suggested that the Honourable Member reconsider her words, because innuendos like that I do not think are called for. I have never heard my colleague say that so I think there should be an apology forthcoming, or a retraction.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Oh, she can get away with it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, may I proceed?

Mr. Chairman: Go ahead, Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, so you could easily, or you would have with your base of 28 mills and the services that you

enjoy in the municipality of Whitehorse, not the complete services, the municipal services would bring you up to at least 38 to 40 mills.

What I am saying, these areas have to have their mill rate changed here. They cannot be changed in the local jurisdictions.

I think that it was a big mistake, Mr. Chairman, at going for the exorbitant type of assessing that we did. I would have hoped—

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: We had no choice.

Mrs. Watson: —that we would have amended the *Taxation Ordinance*, as I asked in here, and I have asked time and time again. The *Taxation Ordinance* says "land assessed at fair value". It does not say fair market value. Something more specific than fair value could have been brought in and brought into this House to use as a basis for assessment. Then we would not have to do all the finangling and wiggling around in order to keep the taxes down so that people would be able, could afford to pay them.

We are bringing in the Home Owner Grant because the home owner cannot afford to pay, but we are still leaving the business community, who is going to be carrying a fair portion of the taxation in the outlying areas and in our municipalities. Maybe that is right, or maybe it is wrong, but what the Territorial Government has done with this Resolution and the Home Owner Grant, they have distributed the weight of the taxation within the municipalities and within the outlying areas and I submit, as I said when I spoke on the principle of the Bill, the right to manipulate who should bear the greatest portion of property taxation in a municipality should not be this Government, it should be the local government of that municipality.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am glad for Faro and for Dawson, that they have got a bit of a tax break, fine. But I am concerned with the untenable position the outlying areas are being put in by that resolution.

They are certainly being brought up to any rate of taxation that any municipality is paying and I am sure that if we worked it out, they would probably be paying more. They will not be able to necessarily, automatically know that they can put pressure on their municipality when the new assessment comes through to see that the mill rate is lowered. It will have to be done here.

Rather than take the situation, we are in a mess with our assessment, then I think they should have gone with a variable tax rate. There is provision for it in the *Taxation Ordinance* and I think that everyone would have understood the necessity for varying the tax rate from one area to another, until it could become, more or less, standardized across the Territory, until the assessments were completed.

So, I will not be supporting the motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear that the Honourable Member will not be supporting a Resolution which does nothing else but leave the Territorial taxing amounts for 1978 exactly as it was in the year, 1976. Nothing else happens to every constituency that she represents and every constituent on the north Alaska Highway.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that rather than getting up and not supporting a Resolution, which would be doing exactly that, she would be saying how pleased she was that in those areas which she represents, there will not be one penny more taxation upon the people that she represents, over a three year period, while she was in this House and also that there will be breaks to many of her constituents that there was not before, because of the increased benefits to the Home Owners' Grant.

Mr. Chairman, what we looked at with the re-assessment and all of the taxing information that came in, was that in 1977-'78, through all of the Territorial taxing authorities, we

received the grand total of some \$2,355,535.

We said, Mr. Chairman, that we do not feel that the re-assessment, particularly in Whitehorse, should allow for a gross inequity in taxation throughout the Territory mainly affected by the people in Whitehorse, but should look to all avenues and approaches to making sure that there was not inordinate tax increases on anybody in the Territory as far as the Territorial taxing authority was concerned this year, because we felt and we were getting the message over and over and over from the public of Yukon that the one thing they could not stand along with their increased electrical bills, fuel bills and grocery bills was an increase by this Government in Territorial taxes, where we were the Territorial taxing authority at this time. We could have used the assessment in Whitehorse for a bonanza of taxes. We said no, that is what we are always being accused of that we would use a re-assessment to get a bonanza in taxes through the back door and we did not want this to happen.

Mr. Chairman, we looked at alternative after alternative after alternative. Mr. Chairman, I organized a task force immediately when we saw what the City of Whitehorse assessment was going to do to the taxing picture in Whitehorse. Mr. Chairman, it was composed of the Territorial Treasurer, the Director of Local Government, our Special Advisor, Mr. Bilawich, who has long history in municipal taxation, and taxation formulas and we brought in Mr. Joe Oliver who is one of the most respected municipal advisors that we know of in western Canada.

Mr. Chairman, we also took a look at how we could approach this and be able to say to the intergovernmental committee that we are being responsible people, that we are not lowering taxes because of things that have happened. We are keeping at the same level of taxation although, because there are certain additions to the assessment roll throughout the Territory, we will, in essence, bring in a total of \$297,700 through the Territorial Government. So it was the play of all of these issues and all of the formulas and all of the things that could have happened that resulted in the most equitable basis immediate, or of all of the avenues of approach in the Resolution, Mr. Chairman, that you find before you that will change the school tax from 16 to 10, and the general purpose tax from 20 to 28, in effect leaving the taxing exactly as it was as far as the Territorial taxing authority is for the year 1978.

Mr. Chairman, if we had not done that, I do not want to use examples of anybody else, other than my own, to give you some example of what would have happened to taxes if that formula had not been done at least within the City of Whitehorse. Mr. Chairman, my property because it is downtown and because it is zoned as multiple residential, which used to be single family residential, my property value, by re-assessment, escalated from \$2,000 to roughly \$12,000. The \$2,000 was fair market value at the 1969 level. Mr. Chairman, that is a huge increase, but that is a fair value in 1978 on my land zoned multiple residential. But Mr. Chairman, if there had been no change in either the City or the Territorial taxing formula, my taxes would have gone following a Home Owners' Grant of this Government in 1977 from \$238 to \$615, triple an increase. Mr. Chairman, I was affected more than many other areas because there is not a corresponding increase in property values in Riverdale, in Porter Creek. The only other area that even comes close to the re-assessment on property in the downtown area is the Crestview area.

Reducing the mill rate just to reflect what we received in school taxes from the year prior, would not have been equitable because, in different areas, the assessment went up so dramatically, as in the downtown area.

So, if we had have done that, said, well, look it, this is what we received in school taxes last year. Let us just say that we want to receive exactly the same amount this year and drop the

mill rate down to maybe about six mills or so to recover that, then the beneficiaries totally would have been the people whose assessment did not sky-rocket, primarily the Riverdale sub-division.

So, we had to use a mix and match formula to provide an overall equity because of the re-assessment. The one that we arrived at, which I think is by far the most equitable formula that we could have come up to through all of the experts and all of the trials and tribulations and formulas we went through, is the one that is presented, Mr. Chairman, to the committee at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think that all of the people involved deserve kudos for bringing some equitability out of a really difficult issue to try and come up with an answer.

When it gets right down to the nitty-gritty, Mr. Chairman, after all the assessments and all of the formulas and all of the mill rates are set and done, really, it comes down to what is it going to cost the guy out of his pocket in tax dollars. Mr. Chairman, it is going to cost exactly the same to all Territorial taxpayers, as it did last year, with extra benefits if the *Home Owners' Grant Ordinance* is passed.

So, they are better off, out of their pocket, than they were in years prior. In those municipalities such as Faro and such as Dawson, which had the highest mill rates of anywhere in Yukon, because of the lowering in the mill rate they are going to be more equitable with the other jurisdictions, but they are looking forward to an assessment in the next year, so any small tax break is not going to be significant and for a year only.

So, the question is, what could it do in the Whitehorse area? Mr. Chairman, because of the dramatic increase in property values over the last years, there has been a dramatic switch in the value of commercial vis-a-vis residential property.

Mr. Chairman, the assessment, up to 1969, was really an unhealthy figure for a vital municipality to be working with and to be growing with.

Mr. Chairman, everybody knows, who has done anything in municipal government at all, that there should be approximately a 60-40 split in the assessment and the value of the assessment, to have a vital and a growing and a progressive community. Approximately 60 per cent of the property values to business, and about 40 per cent on the residential properties.

Because of the total outmoded mill rate and assessment that was in the City of Whitehorse, this was reversed and the residential home owner tax payer was picking up about 60 per cent of the costs in the municipal government and industry and commercial properties were bringing about 40 per cent.

It is not mill rates and a change in mill rates that affects us, it is having a modern assessment that truly reflects the property values within the municipality that makes this split equitable if the assessment is done and that is what this assessment has done. It has changed the prime contributor to the municipal role from the residential taxpayer to the commercial industrial taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what I may be called by the business interests, I will not apologize for having an assessment that makes that split, which is healthy and will help this City be a vital and growing community and taking some of the load off the backs of the residential taxpayers. Mr. Chairman, I am just going to close this set of remarks by saying that there is no area which got dinged more in the assessment than the area in which I happen to live, and the constituents which I happen to represent in Whitehorse North Centre. But let's look at what the total analysis does to my disposable income out of my pocket.

In 1975, Mr. Chairman, there was no such thing as a Home Owners' Grant. My municipal general mill rate was about \$225, my school mill rate was about \$125, and my total taxes were something like \$350. There was no Home Owners' Grants in those days. Mr. Chairman, considering that the City,

as a responsible taxing authority, is lowering their mill rate to 21 mills and we lower our mill rate to 10, that brings from \$350 my tax bill in 1978 to \$550. Mr. Chairman, by the new formula of the Home Owners' Grant, I will receive a Home Owners' Grant on that amount of \$275, bringing my total tax bill, out-of-pocket, in 1978 to \$275. Mr. Chairman, I paid in 1975 \$350, in 1978 in that area which has jumped in assessment more than any other area, my out-of-pocket tax dollars will be \$275 and that is a \$75 betterment in my financial position within three years.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any one of us has to be ashamed of the policies and the Resolution and the amendments to the Home Owners' Grant that really, as far as the residential home owner, throughout the Yukon Territory, will benefit him more in 1978 than in any other year since 1975, since this membership in this Assembly was elected by the people of Yukon.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can all be proud of the work that has been done and Mr. Chairman, I think that we can say that we have listened to the requests of the people of Yukon who have told us over and over and over again in no uncertain terms that enough is enough, that we cannot bear any other taxes on them at the present time by the Territorial Government authority.

Mr. Chairman, if the Resolution, which I have forwarded to this House and the changes in the Home Owners' Grant had not come into being tabled at this Session, and if this Government had gone to increase the tax burden on the people of the Territory, I am positive, Mr. Chairman, that you would have heard the yell and the screams against this Government forever and a day. I think all Honourable Members who want to act responsibly know full well that their constituents would not have let this Government or they, as elected representatives, get away with a tax increase on the general public of the Yukon Territory at this time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have done our work. We have done our work well and we have done it as equitably as we possibly could have. Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies and am rather proud of the method and the ways that we have used to make sure that if any break is forthcoming, then that break is to the residential home owner tax-paying citizen, regardless of where he happens to reside, throughout the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I must agree, in many cases, with what the Honourable Minister has said. In fact, I quoted the very same words, almost, to many of his constituents, that if they did not vote for him in the next election, they would be a fool, in this City of Whitehorse, because exactly what he has been speaking of is exactly what has happened.

I will agree that the home owners' program has helped the citizens and I will include all of the residential taxpayers in the Yukon. Under the new program that is coming out, it is much better than it was before, because it was not equal to all people, I did not feel, before.

However, I am worried, and very, very worried about the small business in this Territory, in the next few years and I have not had the answers I wanted. This motion actually deals with them. I wanted to know when we were going to have a re-assessment in the outlying districts, because, Mr. Chairman, when that re-assessment is done, and we, at that time, will possibly be paying up to 42 mills, we could get hit very hard with taxes in the area of small business and I am not speaking of a residential person. I am talking of small business in the outlying areas.

There is, in my opinion, no possibility of them ever lowering something, once it is set. Maybe there is, maybe we can coax the Government, somebody can. Maybe the Government will get good-hearted and do these things, but I am a little worried that this will not happen.

Another reason I will not be going along with the Resolution, is because it is fine for the Government to play around with taxes and school taxes and so forth, give the municipalities a break, but do not forget the municipalities have that break. They can adjust their general mill rate themselves.

I take this motion as a double-barrelled one, as the Member from Kluane has said before, in different words, but that is exactly what it is, and it is brought to us the same as the Home Owner's Grant and the ten mills. I take to objection to the Minister when he stood up and said that there was no rise in taxes since we have been in this House in the last three years. I think there was a ten mill tacked on.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: That was in the first year.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, well, I am reminding the Minister that we have been here four years and there was a tax rise when we were here and possibly the next government will have a tax rise, too.

If the Minister wants to play around with taxes like that, okay. That is fine, but I am not interested in playing around with our taxes, in the outlying areas, when we do not have the opportunity to sit down and change our general mill rate.

If he wants to bring this motion in as a separate identity because the municipalities should be a separate identity due to the fact that they have that opportunity then fine and dandy, but I will not go along with a double barrelled situation like this one here.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member from Hootalinqua and I are both really upset at the maneuvering with the wording of the motion. It is clearly, as he says, a double barrelled thing, and it is a maneuver. When you look that it refers to the obligation under the *Taxation Ordinance* under two sections or two resolutions to set the rate for school taxes and to set the mill rate for general purpose taxes. They were combined into one, which is something that people in this House could have supported one area and could not support the other. I am not going to support the whole motion because of the structure that was set up for the areas outside of the municipalities.

Certainly nobody wants to see property taxation, certainly nobody wants to see any home owner in the Territory to have to dig into his pocket any more for tax dollars. It is fine to say home owner, Home Owner Grant, fine, nobody wants to pay any more taxes, period. But when you look at the budget that we have this year that was brought down with the give-away ~~Santa Cruz type of approach we have taken to the budget~~ because it is an election year, it is a deficit budget, what better way to bring in an election year budget is to bring in a reduction in school taxes and an increase in the Home Owners' Grants. That is fine, I am very pleased for the people of Whitehorse, but I know that the people of the Territory, I am saying the people of the Territory and the people of Whitehorse are going to have to pick up the tab, not this year, but they certainly are next year and every year after. I hope that every Member here, that we can have the choking speeches by the Minister of Local Government, that is fine, but do not forget you are going to have to pay the people and because he does not make you take it out of this pocket, next year he is going to make you take it out of that pocket. So it is not going to make that much difference.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that he said the assessment distributed the responsibility for the taxation burden to be split on a 60-40 basis, the business community is picking up 60, and the residential home owner picking up 40. There are a lot of merits to this type of thing, it depends on the size of your business community compared—. Every municipality almost has to take this into consideration. When the Territorial Government does it for the municipalities, it is a little amusing. You have to look at the assessment of your business community and industrial community, as compared to the size of the assessment, compared to your residential com-

munity. You also have to put into it a factor of what is the cost of providing services? What percentage of the total cost of services have to be paid in order to serve the business community, and what per cent of that total services package has to be used for the residential community? So the Minister is just unilaterally standing up and saying 60-40 is the way it should go is an assumption I do not think he had any right to make on behalf of Whitehorse or any other municipality. This is exactly what he did.

Mr. Chairman, when the general mill rate in the City of Whitehorse was 21 mills, and into that is built the cost of their services, they have to pay frontages, this is true, to provide the service to the individual lot, if they did not pay for it in the price of their lot. But their sewer and their water and their recreation are all in those 21 mills. Mr. Chairman, I am saying in the outlying areas, we pay 28 mills and on top of that we pay, if we have sewer we pay a mill; if we have water we pay a mill and so on and so on and so on. We could easily add 12 mills to bring it up to the standard that they have in Whitehorse.

Right now, the general property mill rate in the areas outside of Whitehorse, where they do have services that are even faintly comparable to those in Whitehorse, are paying 38 mills to Whitehorse's 21.

This is a very true situation. Mind you the home owner will be benefiting from the Home Owner Grant and I am certainly very pleased with that, but, the small businessman, too, we have to remember, in the outlying areas, who is trying to compete, really is competing with the business community in Whitehorse.

Right now he has overhead above and beyond that that the businessman has in Whitehorse. His light bill is a different light bill, based on a different rate and his fuel bill and so on are very different than those in Whitehorse.

It is very nice to see the Members across the way sitting there and smiling and jeering and it just really makes my rural blood boil.

So, Mr. Chairman, I did not like the maneuvering, I do not like the maneuvering in the assessment, I do not like the maneuvering in the mill rate. I just do not like the maneuvering and, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to support it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments and I will have to agree that the Honourable Member does not like anything, that is quite obvious.

But, I think it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister in charge of the portfolio of Local Government has done a lot of work in the last couple of months and I think he should be commended for the work that is done.

I would like to make a few points to the Honourable Member from Kluane, who insinuates that the people with the municipality of Whitehorse do not pay any taxation. I think that is inaccurate and I think the Honourable Member should reconsider her comments.

In reviewing the areas within Whitehorse, it is quite obvious that the Riverdale area is going to be remaining the same, the Porter Creek area is going to remain the same, and there will be a slight increase in the Crestview area, because their land has not been assessed for six or seven years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the mill rate that is being put forth before all Honourable Members, I think that it reflects a very responsible position of this Government, that we recognize the cost of living as it relates to the individual who is pursuing work and attempting to pay his bills.

I think it is fair to say, also, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand any Member in this House inferring that we should be raising, possibly revising the equalization plan that we have now in effect, that we are prepared to carry over, raising medicare fees, we should be raising this this Session, rather than carrying it over.

I just, Mr. Chairman, it is beyond my comprehension how any Member could be inferring that these things should be done.

I think it is fair to say that in the next year we are going to be going into a new era with the Federal Government, with our financial negotiations, and a lot is going to depend on what happens in the next couple of months of how our finances are going to be for the 1979 budget year.

I think that, if things go well, I think that, for the next couple of years, I think that we can come up with a program which is going to adequately serve the people of the Yukon, yet, at the same time, hopefully does not necessitate an increase in taxation.

At the same time, I think it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of the decisions that will be made in this area are going to be made by people that are going to be running for re-election or running for election, and are going to be serving in this Legislature. I think that there is going to be, probably down the road, some hard and fast decisions are going to have to be made.

The decisions are going to be made whether or not we are going to continue adding programs or whether or not we are going to review programs and possibly delete some. These are all hard, fast political decisions that will have to be made. Fortunately, this year we were able to cope with the sound financial management that was exhibited here in the last couple of years with our working capital and in our financial negotiations with the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think the formula that we have presented as a Government here, I think it speaks well for the Government. I think it reflects the fact that we are attempting to keep the financial situation at a level comparative to last year, at the same time, in an attempt to prevent any undue financial hardships on the taxpayers that we have in Yukon. I think that with the Resolution that is before us, I think that answers the question and I think that in time it will prove that we have done the proper thing.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Treasurer would correct me if I am wrong. This is going back to the statistics and I may have copied them incorrectly. The total increase in taxation revenue for school taxes to the Territorial Government, because of the re-assessment in Whitehorse, even with the lowering of the mill rate, there still is an increase of \$297,000 in school taxes. Then the increase from the outlying areas, outside of the City of Whitehorse, not outside of municipalities, where Yukon Government is the taxing authority, what is the revenue from school taxes there?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, there is a net decrease of \$69,000. The actual school tax is a decrease of \$158,000. The overall property tax was an increase of \$227,000, with a net of 69.1 increase.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, \$61,000. But there is an increase of overall property taxes of \$227,000, and a decrease of how much for school taxes, \$158,000. So that leaves an increase in taxation of \$69,100. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Members wonder why we are saying there is an increase in the property taxes in the City of Whitehorse of 278 and most of that is borne, I believe, well it is borne I suppose equally because of the various areas where the property assessments were higher, but some of that is going to be given back in a Home Owner Grant of 270. Faro has a decrease, the revenue from Faro, and there is a decrease in the revenue from Dawson, and there is an increase from the outlying areas in the revenue of some \$69,000. Is that correct?

Mr. Sherlock: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I think the thing we should point out, though, the increase is primarily due to additional properties brought on stream. Now I do not have the numbers for additional properties, but we could certainly obtain those through Local Government, if Mr. McKinnon, I am sure, would get those if possible.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the opportunity slip by where the Honourable Member from Kluane feels that we are interfering in the setting of the general mill levy in the City of Whitehorse.

Mr. Chairman, with the lowering of 16 to 10 mills, in most instances, the Territorial taxing authority, whether it is on residential or commercial property, is less than the previous tax year. So, we have left the field open, in many instances, for the general mill rate to accurately reflect the goods and services that are being given on a general mill rate, through the city.

The increase that will come, primarily, on a business establishment, will not be by the lowering of the mill rate from 16 to 10 mills by the Territorial taxing authority, but generally through the mill rate of what every mill rate is set, by the municipal taxing authority.

So, the assumption that we are entering into a field where we should not be, Mr. Chairman, is just incorrect.

Mr. Chairman, I just have to go back, once again, to the comparison between a taxpayer in the City of Whitehorse and in the outside area. I have used the comparison before, because the Honourable Member's house at Haines Junction and mine in downtown Whitehorse are assessed for improvements at exactly the same rate.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if we wanted to trade our houses, they would be almost even up, as far as an assessment goes. I have been in the Honourable Member's house and I think that that assessment is fairly accurate. We do not live lavishly, we both have simple bungalow type houses, but both of them are assessed at the same level.

Mr. Chairman, we were paying about the same level of taxation, too, just a few years ago. But, Mr. Chairman, with the dramatic increase in the property values in the area of mine, in the City, which went from two to \$12,000, the Honourable Member had remained the same, the amenities and the goods and services are the same. You have sewer and water, I have sewer and water. You, I do not have pavement, Mr. Chairman, whatever the Honourable Member wants to think, on 8th Avenue, going by my house, and I certainly do not have a view of the St. Elias Mountains out my window, as the Honourable Member from Kluane has.

But, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, that my taxes this year, after the Home Owners' Grant, with the same services, without the view, will be in the area of \$280 and the Honourable Member from Kluane's, with the Home Owner Grant, with the same house, with the application of the hamlet allowance and everything, will be \$142.

Now, Mr. Chairman, come on, let us get down to brass tacks. You know, it is nice to do all the screaming and the hollering against the municipal members and how we are taking the people from the outside areas to the cleaners. Mr. Chairman, I have stood up here and strongly defended this Government's policy that amenities and tax breaks should be given to the outlying areas and, Mr. Chairman, this Government has come through with different programs, whether it be the television reception to the smaller areas, the hamlet allowance, or the assessment on those areas that there are breaks and there are advantages, tax-wise, because this Government believes in the stay option policy and the people in the outlying communities are the backbone of this Yukon and we should not exclude them to the interest of Yukon and this Government is not, will not and has not done this in the term of office of this Government, Mr. Chairman.

What you are going to have to pay out of your pocket and what I am going to have to pay out of mine this year in taxes, accurately reflects that philosophy, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that is the most unfair comparison. He takes a comparison on the taxation of his house after a re-assessment. Mr. Chairman, he talks about the in-

crease in property values. I do not think that any property in the whole Yukon Territory, the market value is going to be higher than in Haines Junction by the time they get around for the assessment, because there just is not any available. So any piece of land there is going to be almost like gold, so you can just imagine the value, the assessed value on some of that property. This is what concerns me.

The fact that we are now at 28 mills on the general mill rate, I would not be standing up in here if we had left the school mill rate at 16 mills, the other mill rate at, what was it, at 18 mills.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: And screw the Whitehorse people.

Mrs. Watson: No, no, leave it at that, and brought in an amendment to the *Taxation Ordinance* when the assessment is done. Then you have your reduction in mill rate, and then you have to set your general property taxation to accommodate that new assessment and to accommodate the reduction in the school mill rate. This is what I am complaining about. You have tried to equalize it all when one group has been reassessed and the other area has not. Well what you are doing is you are setting up the outlying areas. That is what concerns me. If there had been an amendment to the *Taxation Ordinance* clearly defined with a new assessment, the mill rate will be adjusted or something like this.

I was absolutely surprised when the Honourable Member stood up in the House and said we are lowering the school mill rate in the Municipality of Whitehorse, in all of the municipalities, and then set the outlying areas. I did not expect that mill rate to be lowered at this time until the assessment was done. Then you would be reflecting truly what you have endeavored to do in Whitehorse. I am so concerned that the advantages of the lowered mill rate, school mill rate are going to the municipalities, but the outlying areas, they have got, as I said, a general property mill rate that is going up to 28 mills. It will be 38 mills with some of the services that people in Whitehorse now enjoy under their base of 21.

Mr. Chairman, I have made up my mind so all the arguing—

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on the difference. I just cannot see it, \$227,000 was mentioned in the outlying districts and then \$69,000, of course a balance of \$158,000. Is somebody really saying that the taxes are being raised by that amount, because I know they are not being raised at all? There is no such thing in the way they are going to do it this year. Then somebody said it might be because of additions to the roll. Now I have just got to wonder just where the additions came to the roll when we have not been able to get any land or anything out there in that territory. I would like an explanation or chart or something to show me just where that came from. There is no way.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, throughout the Territory, the 1976 assessment was \$29,085,739. This year it has gone up to \$30,739,375. In Whitehorse, the assessment has gone from \$57,646,470 to \$120,034,777. In Faro it is almost static, it is from \$6,550,440 to \$6,551,390.

In Dawson it has gone up some \$400,000, from \$1,224,155 to \$1,681,615. The total taxes on all of those improvements or all of that assessment throughout the Territory in 1977-78, was \$2,355,535 up to \$2,653,251 in 1978-79, for a change an additional taxes to the Territory from the additions to the assessment roles in all of these areas, of \$297,700, but \$278,000 of that \$297,000 comes from additional monies from 10 mills on an approval basis of \$120,340,777 in Whitehorse, from \$57,646,470 in the 1976 assessment.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to equitably distribute that increase in taxes through the Home Owner Grant formula of increases in all of the areas of Yukon and, of course, to senior citizens. So that what we are trying to say, is that in 1978-79, that this Government did not feel it was opportune and the time to hit you over the head with increased taxes, where, because of such of a dramatic increase in assessment that we were to

make it more equitable, we had to do it through another program, namely the Home Owners' Grant program and I do not see how we could have come about with any formula that would have been fair and would have been more equitable and, goodness' sakes, Mr. Chairman, we tried and tried and tried and went around and around and around on this program with the best expertise that I could find, to defend the interests of the Yukon Territorial taxpayer.

Mr. Fleming: It did come from re-assessment, actually, then?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Everywhere, but primarily Whitehorse, but there was no re-assessment done in other areas, except adding on new properties, new businesses that came on-stream over the last year. There was no assessors, like they did in Whitehorse, going into every house and saying, you know, your property used to be \$2,000, it is \$12,000. That was not done.

What was done was just the new homes, just the new businesses, the new commercial endeavors that are picked up every year, as a normal assessment, were picked up in the normal way, through every Yukon community, as is done every year.

Mr. Fleming: I have a question, Mr. Chairman: We know which way we are going to vote, there is no use arguing over it all day.

I did ask the other day, when there was going to be a re-assessment and I will just ask specifically this one question now, for myself and the constituents in my area, when will there be a re-assessment in the Teslin and Carcross area?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I have an answer to the Honourable Member's question coming in tomorrow morning to be tabled and I believe, Mr. Chairman, and I will check it because it is on my desk for signature now, that it will be 1979.

Mr. Fleming: We won't have it.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, you will

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, we won't be on the easy road for very long, I can see that.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, this one really floors me, because everybody is presuming what the next government is going to do.

For goodness' sakes, do they not recognize that if they happen to be returned by the electorate, that they can be every bit as responsible and that they can be every bit as compassionate towards the home owner tax-paying citizen throughout the Yukon Territory, as this Government is?

What makes them think that because there is a new Legislative Assembly going to be elected in September, that all of a sudden that Assembly is going to be so irresponsible towards the taxpayers of Yukon, that taxes are going to sky-rocket, there is going to be all kinds of new taxes?

Mr. Chairman, I would still defend the interests of the Yukon taxpayers, next election if I ran and were elected back. It would not change at all. You should be happy, you should be thankful that the Government is showing this responsible attitude towards the taxpayers of the Yukon Territory and not presume that if you are re-elected that you are not going to be exactly the same way towards the Yukon taxpayer. I would hope to goodness you would be, if I happen to be in the position you are in, and you happen to be in the position I am in, and I would be watching you to make sure that you were defending my interests as well and as responsibly that I am defending yours.

Mr. Chairman: Question. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Council approve such different rate or change in the case of the school tax levied within Yukon, including municipalities, from 16 mills to the Canadian dollar to 10 mills, and, in the case of the general purpose tax levied within Yukon, excluding municipalities, from 22 mills to the

Canadian dollar to 28 mills for the taxation year 1978.

Motion agreed to

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on one basic point that it was not a fair structuring. We had to vote on two aspects of the *Taxation Ordinance* and we have to vote both ways for both sections so because of that and because of other reasons I have given, I would have to vote against the whole thing.

Mr. Chairman: We will go to Supplementary Number 3. *On Establishment 125*

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, Establishment 125, I believe was not cleared. I have some backup information if you want to go at it.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. That is on page 4.

Mr. Sherlock: Pages 4 and 5, right.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 125, Economic Research and Planning was the one we did not clear there.

Mr. Sherlock: In part of the make-up of that \$135,000, there was \$59,800 for professional services and those are primarily related to pipeline. The Pipeline Co-ordinator was \$39,000; the financial consultant in connection with pipeline is \$2,200; some support services in connection with Welfare presentations to the Lysyk Inquiry \$6,900; preparation of final report cost us \$9,000; and miscellaneous costs of \$1,007, for a total of \$59,800.

Then there were other salary contracts totalling \$41,400. These were made up of typing assistants, casual employee assistants, for \$27,400, for a total of \$41,400. The typing was \$14,000.

Mrs. Watson: Did I understand correctly that we spent \$6,000 for a consultant or some expert to help us prepare the Health and Welfare submission for the Lysyk Inquiry?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There was some consultant services done. I believe there was a lady that worked in the Welfare Department who was transferred out of it for a term period to work on the Lysyk Inquiry report. Is that not correct, Mrs. Whyard. That was Nancy McPherson.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I was not aware of the amount involved. I know that a former employee of that branch was available to assist the pipeline co-ordinator in the preparation of various reports. I certainly had no idea there was that much money involved.

Because, at the same time, I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the same individual was also preparing briefs for other groups, which appeared before the Lysyk Inquiry.

Mrs. Watson: I understand that we have departmental heads that can do this type of thing, but the fact that we paid this person to help the Government prepare presentations to the Lysyk Inquiry, and she was preparing briefs for other lobby groups or individuals who were taking position contrary to the position of the Territorial Government. That, to me, is quite shocking.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I cannot understand that figure, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister to look into it for us?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, it is not my vote.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, it is.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It is the Economic Research and Planning. I understood that is being transferred.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, is it fair to say, then, that the total amount of the \$135,000 is due to increases because of pipeline activity?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, basically that is correct.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have somebody undertake to get us more details on that \$6,000?

Mr. Chairman: We will just stand this over, then, for the time being, until we can get more information on that.

Establishment 125 stood over

Mr. Chairman: We promised Mr. Hibberd that we would get into his—

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I have one question on this. Maybe we could get the information also. Is it possible to get the cost figure on the socio-economic impact of the closure of Clinton Creek Mines. I presume that is hidden also in this \$135,000. What was the share of the cost of the report of the Territorial Government on that?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I understand that question. Is he asking is there a relationship between the closing of Clinton Creek and the pipeline?

Mr. Berger: No, no relationship on that, but we received the report on the socio-economic impact of the Clinton Creek Mine closing in Dawson City and we received a paper today and it says it was a joint effort between the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and Economic Research and Planning Unit of the YTG.

Now, my question is how much was the shared of the cost to the YTG in this study?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I have no information on that all. I would have to ask the Member concerned.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with the Main Estimates, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, on page 73.

The increase is \$155,700 and a total of \$571,900.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, a few of the questions that were asked: Mrs. Watson asked regarding the reclassification of personnel in the Department as a result of reorganization. There was no reclassification of personnel.

Mr. Chairman, there were considerable questions asked regarding the role of the liquor vendors by the Member from Watson Lake. Their function in Watson Lake, there is a possibility of splitting their functions as Territorial Agent and as the Liquor Vendor.

Mr. Chairman, these people that we are discussing are actually the liquor vendors and are not under the responsibility of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs at all. As far as matters that do involve this Department, there are very, very few inquiries that do go to these people. The only area that there seems to be a source of inquiry is that to do with the motor vehicles, and it appears it is fairly well known in these outside communities that they do communicate with Mr. Brackenbury directly in the Department. That seems to be a fairly well formed line of communication.

As far as the Member from Klwane's concerns with regard to the northern portion of her riding, there has not been a re-examination of the situation with regard to having an agent in that area. All I can say is that we will look at it again. It has been looked at for two or three years. As I say, it is not really in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, but we will undertake to have a look at the situation with the problem as she outlined it to us.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Fleming was asking questions with regard to *Hansard*. I will read a reply, if I may. In reply to Mr. Fleming's question, and the answer to him during the last session, Government employees does not refer to persons requesting them for their own personal use. To the best of our knowledge, all copies going to Government departments are being used for reference material relating to departmental activities.

With regard to Ms Millard's subsequent question, our policy on who gets *Hansard* and who does not is simply that those who request a subscription are put on the mailing lists. It is impossible for us to take the initiative to contact organizations or individuals throughout the country who might possibly have an interest in this publication. As we stated in our written

answer to these questions asked on December 13th, no firm policy exists regarding payment. As a general rule, private citizens or non-government businesses are invoiced while government agencies, educational institutions, et cetera are not. This is an informal policy only, but we are reluctant to change it until a comprehensive policy can be developed covering all government publications.

We would have no reservations about charging all subscribers if that is the recommendation of the Council. But it should be pointed out that with our present subscription list, the cost to each subscriber would be approximately \$300 per year, if we were to break even on production costs. As this is about ten times the present price, we could expect a significant decrease in the number of subscribers. In addition, we do not invoice other governments as they also provide free subscriptions to us. Invoicing other YTG departments would not result in an increase in revenue, as it would only be a paper transaction.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion on 400?

Establishment 400, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, \$155,700, total \$571,900.

Establishment agreed to

After a brief recess, we will go on to the balance of Mr. Hibberd's responsibilities, Vote 14, Department of Renewable Resources.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order.

On Establishment 1420

Mr. Chairman: Vote 14, page 217, Establishment 1420, Wildlife, \$650,500, \$1,236,200.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, some of the Establishments under Vote 14, although they might have been passed, I said I would bring back some information.

Regarding 1401, Parks, Mr. McCall had asked for more information regarding the break-down of this Establishment. I should mention, in general, Mr. Chairman, that the activity break-down into the three branches of Administration, Research and Planning and Development and Maintenance have been changed to more accurately reflect the functions of the division.

For example, at the present time, Research and Planning funds, and it is identified as \$19,100, is totally for this upcoming budget, directed to Historic Sites.

There is no additional funding for Research and Planning funds for campground and parks, in this budget, for this year.

So far as the Development and Maintenance is concerned, the \$444,000, these funds will be used exclusively for campgrounds and there have been no similar O & M funds identified for Historic Sites and Parks, et cetera.

The break-down, as far as \$444,000, I believe the Treasurer has this, if any Members want it, but it is a fairly routine break-down and it is increased over the previous year, which was \$388,000, is reflected as inflationary increases only.

The question was asked, Mr. Chairman, regarding the Historic Sites and Monuments Board and if any of their provisions had been acted on. I should state that as of their meeting of September 10th, Mr. Chairman, yes, there were some provision that have been acted on, but what the Member was inquiring about was their last meeting and there were no resolutions passed by the Board at that last meeting.

With regard to the cost of the wilderness campsites, we do not maintain separate records regarding these sites, \$25,000 was voted in 1976-77 for capital to construct the sites, but there has been no O & M funding specifically designated for them since that time. The maintenance costs are drawn from several of the Primaries in 1401. The major site involved is that of Fort Selkirk and in Primary 72 of 1401 there is a caretaker maintenance contract for \$1,000. The other have in them, such as Primary 50 such things as firewood, garbage bags, et cetera.

Primary 30, travel costs for maintenance men and Primaries 10 and 15 are salaries and fringe benefits for maintenance men.

The work that was done in construction of these campsites and they are the four smaller ones on the Pelly. I believe, breaks down as follows: The boat, motor and trailer \$3,700; boat rental \$225; Yukon River clean up \$3,400; charter aircraft \$2,250; wilderness campsite planning contract \$1,000; material for construction of sites \$2,500; and I should mention, Mr. Chairman, the work was done in co-operation with the Selkirk Indian Band who supplied all the labour for the construction of these wilderness sites. The monies that were saved were used to pay for the outdoor recreational survey or at least our share of it, which was somewhat less than half, and that amounted to \$10,500.

Mr. Chairman, some questions were asked in the wildlife estimate regarding habitat studies. These studies were carried out as a responsibility. We are a member of the International Commission which consists of ourselves and such other groups as Canada Wildlife Service, and the Alaska people and they meet two times a year and decide what kind of studies that they require to be done in their joint interests. It so happened that the Yukon was designated to do some studies regarding such things as the fire effects in the winter ranging of the caribou, and also further studies in the calving areas.

A question was also asked regarding special studies in the same area, and this went to various minor investigations including monitoring of sheep around Whitehorse where there is considerable pressure on the species and in monitoring other sheep in other areas where there seems to be problems in maintaining the population. Monitoring of goats, and there was some work done on the elk that were introduced some twenty years ago, and there is some work that was done with regard to the moose in the Nisutlin Bay area.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just a question of a general nature, it could have been asked, possibly, when I was not in the House, but, with respect to 1401, Campground Maintenance, I wonder if the Minister could tell me is there a minimum standard set for the maintenance, for the facilities that do now exist? Are there different classes of campgrounds?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, we are dealing with 1420. If you have any questions on 1401, you can bring them up when we do Schedule A.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if we are dealing with 1420, I have a couple of questions I would like to ask.

In 1420, one of the largest items, of course, is salaries, and I see where we have an increase of two man years. Three of them for game management and a reduction of one with the administration.

Then, the largest item is the rental of equipment and that is in the appendix, which is attached, that is broken down into the various studies and the various projects. I would assume that the greatest costs for carrying out these studies would be the rental of aircraft time, helicopter and this type of thing. Am I correct?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we spent some time going over this when you were at your meeting at the Junction, and therefore were not available when we first went over it.

There is an error in your Estimates, as far as the man years are concerned.

Mrs. Watson: Not mine, yours.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: There are two technicians are the two that are an increase. I explained their functions before. One technician is with regard to caribou research and the other is a technician that is working in the area of sheep and Grizzlies.

We also got into the business of the costs of rental of aircraft and there was, indeed, I believe, a considerable increase in the

number of hours that were used. It was not merely due to inflationary costs as we originally considered.

Perhaps I should mention a couple of other things, Mr. Chairman. The question was asked by Ms Millard regarding enforcement versus the management, a question of the personnel.

It should be stated that enforcement is a part of the game management with surveys, inventories and population analysis are all parts of game management.

The establishment of seasons, bag limits, hours of hunting, et cetera are part of game management, insuring that seasons, limits, et cetera are obeyed, as this is all part of game management.

Regarding the policy of what roles of conservation officer will play in game management, the following points apply, I think this will answer your question:

- a) the job of conservation officer is outlined in a position description which he has or can have;
- b) the conservation officer must respond to public complaints about offenses;
- c) he must patrol regularly enough to keep offense levels down;
- d) he must do certain seasonal enforcement checks, such as outfitter camps and traplines, but many conservation officer districts lack enough staff to do all of these things.

Conservation officers must assist technical staff in certain surveys and field trips, such as participation and assistance. It is usually worked out by a conservation officer, chief conservation officer and a biologist.

Conservation officers must exercise their own judgment in many cases, with regard to where they go and what work they do.

Mr. Taylor asked questions regarding the hiring of Conservation Officers. These conservation officers are hired through the YTG Public Service Commission as are all other YTG staff. The job descriptions of qualifications required exist and are on record with YTG PSC. To be hired as a conservation officer, a person should have a technical institute degree in law enforcement or resource management or equivalent training and experience combination. Some people with a background of "ex-police work" and technical institute training make excellent conservation officers. Our hiring policy seeks to obtain the best people we can to look after our wildlife and fisheries resource. The policy follows that of most other progressive management agencies. Policy does not discriminate against people from any particular geographical area and I would suspect that the Yukon Public Service Commission has not established duration of domicile in any particular area as an overriding hiring criteria.

Mr. Berger was inquiring regarding the trainee program. As mentioned previously, there are four native trainees involved. The program is under a trainee co-ordinator. The co-ordinator sets up work and the training schedules, he assembles material for work and learning, the actual program has the following in it: practical field experience and such projects as the Dempster caribou work, big game agent studies, fur harvest data analysis, wildlife food habit studies, there are regular lectures from the Game Branch permanent staff, there are lectures and facilities tours from Federal Government agencies, and also as part of the job, there is the day to day interaction work of the permanent Game Branch staff. The trainee programs could be for anyone, however, at present the funding we get is Federal funding aimed primarily at natives. It is funded through Northern Careers and Northern Roads and Airstrips division of DIAND.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, further to 1420. Presently within the Yukon Territory we have a very large national park. That national park also has game wardens, people who are involved in enforcement of the law and protection of the game and also are very interested and involved in game management,

some very technically trained professional people. My question is, what steps does the Territorial Government take to co-operate with the staff within the national park and to co-ordinate some of the activities that the Game Branch is responsible for with the activities that the people in the national park are responsible for?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how specifically I can answer Mrs. Watson's question. There is continuing interaction between the two agencies. The staff of the Game Branch of this Government are responsible for the enforcement of the Legislation of this Government, no matter where it occurs in Yukon. As such, if there are offences committed under the *Game Ordinance* or other ordinances for which they are responsible, whether it involves the park or not, they are responsible for carrying out the procedures to bring that to court no matter who it is or where it is.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I found the remark of the Minister rather enlightening. There is an inter-action. I hope it is a positive inter-action, because we can only benefit if it is a positive inter-action and even just the way the Minister answered the question, that this Government is the agency that must enforce the game laws, within the National Park, I agree, but this Government should be utilizing any assistance that they can have.

I would also like to point out to the Honourable Member that game wardens within the National Park are also defined as peace officers, under the *Game Ordinance*, the Yukon Territorial *Game Ordinance*.

What I am looking to is the spirit of co-operation, because the Territory is a huge territory. Game management and game enforcement, with the amount of staff that we have to do it properly and positively, requires a concerted effort and staff beyond what we are actually able to afford.

So, if we have available staff that is willing to co-operate, even though they are from a different agency, I think that the Territorial Government's attitude should be of co-operation, not of inter-action or reaction.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I can differentiate between the terms, although I appreciate what the Member is trying to get at.

I would also like to point out to the Member a matter that she did bring up herself, is that we are obviously on the brink of considerable increase in pressure on this resource, as a result of, well, two major projects in the area to which the Member refers.

She points out our major is having enough personnel to adequately enforce this Ordinance, and other Ordinances, so that we can keep the offenses to a minimum. This will require, certainly, a good deal more personnel than we now have operating in that field.

I would hope that when I come back and ask for man years so that we can have adequate enforcement to cope with this pressure, that I will get support from the Members.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, no one questions with the need. I am the one that stated it. I know that we can only afford so many and no one was questioning your extra man years. I just questioned how many you had and what positions.

I agree it is a huge area, but I am reluctant to look at hiring more personnel, if we are not going to co-operate with the extra services and the extra structures that are there. It seems so foolish to sort of guard your own kingdom, because that area is going to be under tremendous pressure, with the Shawkwak Project and the Alcan pipeline.

I would sincerely hope that this attitude, it is our *Game Ordinance*, it is our authority to enforce it, is not the attitude that is carried out in the field.

I would stress very much, I would like to see more co-operation and I agree that we do require more personnel than

we can afford to enforce and to protect the natural resource that we have, if the Member agrees that we should use the structures and the people who are ready and willing to co-operate.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: I have already agreed, Mr. Chairman, and I will remember what the Member said.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mr. Berger: I am quite curious, how is the game management administrated in the provinces? Is it the responsibility of the provincial government or is it the Parks Branch of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility of the provincial governments. The national parks, of course, are primarily interested in the role of that of national parks, and their primary concern is not that of the management of the wildlife that exists in the area.

Mr. Berger: Again, I am curious. The national park, the primary interest is to preserve the area in its original habitat and its original conditions as much as possible. Is not wildlife included in that?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, we can go on on this for a long time, but I am sure we all recognize the fact that a development of a national park is synonymous with development period. It means building paths, building cabins, there are a lot of people involved, in other words, there is a massive intrusion in an area that is designated as a national park. It is a massive intrusion of people, and this in itself is working against the preservation of the wildlife species. So, by the very definition of a national park, it poses a good deal of problems in the management of wildlife.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, what I am really getting at is should not Parks Canada contribute some fundings or a contract for management of the game to the provincial jurisdiction or the territorial jurisdiction in return? What fundings would be available?

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member has got at this point before, and there are certainly various schemes and various areas whereby there is co-operation and joint funding between the wildlife branch and national parks in the area of renewable resources. I have given you instances that, for instance, the Yukon River development is a good one and it is coming up this year.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I should also point out that we have the game preserve. It is 1,500 square miles just north of and adjacent to Kluane National Park. The Parks people are responsible for enforcing the *National Park Act* within the boundaries of the Park. They also assist the Territorial Government in the area between the highway and the national park and in the patrolling of the game preserve, because it is so adjacent. But the management of game within the national park is completely the responsibility of the national park and must be funded by them. But there is an overlapping of functions and this is why I am saying there should be co-operation so that we could all benefit and get more for the dollars that both government agencies are spending.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Establishment 1420, Wildlife, \$1,236,200.

Establishment 1420 agreed to

Mr. Berger: Just on one point that the Minister mentioned before that part of the fundings were for study on the impact of forest fires on the caribou. I was wondering if this report could be made available to the House.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: I do not believe it is completed yet, Mr. Chairman, but I will attempt to communicate it to the Member when it does become available.

Mr. Chairman: Page 220, General Development Agreement.

Is that passed?

Back to the Supplementary Number 3, the Treasurer has-

some more information on 125 which may enable us to carry this particular Establishment, or may not.

On Establishment 125

Mr. Sherlock: We were able to determine that there was an agreement signed between the pipeline co-ordinator and Ms McPherson and the main duties of the agreement indicate that she was to serve as liaison with other groups involved in a socio-economic research related to pipeline development, to facilitate the completion of impact study to YTG on social services currently being undertaken by the Association of Social Workers, facilitate the development of recommendations of cost-shared alleviation of social impact due to pipeline development, and, I am aware, also, from being involved in meetings during the Lysyk Inquiry, that she did a lot of travelling and a lot of research on the Alyeska Pipeline impact situation and reported these back and, of course, included them in her reports.

So, it appears from the contract that she did have a dual role in some areas. She was working primarily for YTG pipeline co-ordinator's office to bring information together and help combine a report for the Lysyk Inquiry, but she was also doing some work on the side for other groups, as mentioned.

Mrs. Watson: Well, did we pay her for the work that she was doing for the Association of Social Workers?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, she was paid for the entire contract. There is no indication of what portion of the job might have been for the Association. I have no way of knowing that.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that is most unusual. I do not think the Government funded a study presentation that the YTA were going to make to the Lysyk Inquiry, neither did they fund a presentation that was being prepared by the Public Service to the Lysyk Inquiry. Why should the Government be funding a presentation to be made by the Association of Social Workers?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could clarify the way this thing is worded. It appears that maybe she was not, maybe I should say she was not in fact paid for work that she did on behalf of the Association, she was paid on the work that she did for YTG related to the Association.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I just need to know what period of time was covered by that cost?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the contract was in the period of the 24th of May to the 31st of July, roughly two months.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very interesting if the Treasurer would have a look at that bill and we could have some of it itemized because I am a little concerned about this. When a person is hired to prepare a presentation on behalf of our Government to the Lysyk Inquiry and on the side, is preparing another presentation for a private organization, when the statistics in the research that the use of the Government, it can be put over and used over there with the private association, and I think there was quite a conflict in the function she was performing for us. She was using us to sort of do something at our expense, and I would wish the Treasurer would look at the billing to see just how it is broken down.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, we can certainly undertake that, but I would guess the billing was probably simply number of days worked at a contract price, giving us a total. However, we will look at the billings and perhaps come back to the House.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion. I do not think the information to be brought forward would interrupt the passing of this.

Mrs. Watson: Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 125, Economic Research and Planning, Supplementary Number 3, \$135,300 increase;

Revised Vote \$378,100.

Establishment 125 agreed to

On Establishment 2005

Mr. Chairman: We will now go to page 39 in the same book and deal with Project Capital. The Establishment 2005, Territorial Administration Building, increase \$113,200. Any discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it would certainly help us if we were going through these. Certainly the Executive Committee Members must have just a bit of information, a short explanation so that we do not have to stand up and ask questions, just to facilitate getting through it a little bit faster, surely we should not have to dig for everything.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps Mr. Sherlock can help us.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, yes, there was additional work that was required to be done to the building, for example there were partitions to be added to accommodate some of the minor office changes. There was some additional work required for electrical and mechanical work that had to be done in connection with setting up the computer room. I have figures for these if you like.

Mrs. Watson: No, no, no, we do not need it, just general.

Mr. Sherlock: Generally that was it. The computer one was the biggest one, \$113,000, I am sorry, \$59,000.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Establishment 2005 agreed to

On Establishment 2020

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2020, Hansard Equipment, increase of \$10,000. Any questions? Discussion?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just on that, do we lease any equipment beside that?

Mr. Chairman: Pardon me?

Mr. Lengerke: Do we lease any other equipment to accommodate the Hansard situation, beside that equipment we purchased?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, not specifically, no.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay, that is good.

Establishment 2020 agreed to

On Establishment 2180

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2180, Staff Accommodation, decrease of \$7,500. Any discussion?

Establishment 2180 agreed to

On Establishment 2182

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2182, Public Housing, decrease of \$248,400.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will have to refer to the Treasurer on that item.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, all we have is just what is stated there, that there was just part of the program that did not go.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, what part?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, Mr. Chairman, the background information indicates that were parts of the programs in all areas. I am not sure how to answer that question, because it is not—, there is no simple answer. It is a whole page of detail.

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, what was the anticipated program, was it building a lot more houses in one specific place, that did not come about, or was it, for instance, low cost housing or rental purchase housing? Staff housing?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, these are adjustments within the program. As so often happens, there is a program developed at the beginning of the year during a program forecast and then there are adjustments made through the year to the program and I am saying that these were adjustments to the initial program and it covers a whole page of adjustments. Certainly I can make this available to the Members, if they

want to, but, the net result of it is a reduction of \$248,000.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, was there any money set aside for rural and remote housing that was not in this?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it is the next item Ms Millard.

Ms Millard: Sorry.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on Public Housing? Establishment 2182, Public Housing, decrease \$248,400.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just on that, I am sorry, I was just looking up—. Is there some problem with forecasting the types of expenditures in public housing in the program, because I believe in the last Supplementary we turned back I think it was a figure something like \$219,000 and here we are again. Is there really a problem in the forecasting of that? Maybe we should figure out a different way to budget.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will have to, I do not have all my notes here, but I do know this, that a lot of cases, as the years go on, is that we are not able to, in our program forecasting, sometimes you refer back a year earlier to the final completion of a project and subsequently it may be reflected a year later rather than that particular year, and that could be one of the reasons for the decrease in this particular area.

Ms Millard: It is all very clear, isn't it? On the rural and remote housing, I understand no action was taken on that program?

Mr. Chairman: We are not on Rural and Remote Housing, Ms Millard, that is the next one.

Ms Millard: Oh, I thought we had passed that one, I am really sorry.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sherlock, perhaps you could baffle everybody by just reading that page of figures you have there and then everybody would be happy that they do not understand it.

Mr. Sherlock: Okay, Mr. Chairman, here goes: Carmacks rental purchasing - \$7,500;

Carmacks rental purchase again - \$19,500;

Haines Junction - \$1,000;

Ross River rental purchasing \$4,100;

Dawson City public housing - \$12,400;

Watson Lake public housing - nothing;

Mayo public housing - \$1,500;

Haines Junction rental purchasing - \$54,500;

Mayo rental purchase - \$39,800;

Ross River rental purchase - \$21,900;

Teslin rental purchase \$9,900;

Watson Lake rental purchase - \$30,000;

Whitehorse rental purchases - \$25,500;

Whitehorse, 24 suites, and I do not know what that means - \$29,000.

That is basically it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, prior to leaving this item, it also reflects the fact that there has been a number of rental purchase housing sold and subsequently the cost to this Government are less for the operation and maintenance because it is borne by the individual purchasing that home. That accounts for a substantial amount of the number decrease.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, we are dealing with Capital.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am trying.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion, which will only cause more confusion?

Establishment 2182, Public Housing, decrease \$248,400.

Establishment 2182 agreed to

On Establishment 2183

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2183, Rural and Remote Housing, decrease \$225,000

Ms Millard: I am almost afraid, Mr. Chairman. Rural and Remote Housing, is that the total turn-back of the budget that was set aside for Rural and Remote, because I understand nothing was started in the program.

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is incorrect, Mr. Chairman. There were four homes on a pilot project, constructed in the Carcross area. Two of them by one contractor, two by another, and these projects have been completed.

Subsequently, I think that we have learned a lot from the construction of these homes. The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua has come to see me privately on it, pointing out what he feels are deficiencies and the Housing Corporation is taking this into account, if we are going to proceed any further in this particular area.

But we have, finally after, I believe, it is two to three years voting monies in this area, finally expended some in that area and I think we have learned a lot from the experience that we have gone through in the past year.

Mr. Berger: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is quite simple. Maybe the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua could give us a report on what that program was all about and how he liked it.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will give a report. I stood up in the House, I think and I said very distinctly what was wrong at that time.

However, how much has been spent, up to date, if I could have that amount, on those four homes?

Mr. Sherlock: \$175,000, Mr. Chairman, on four homes.

Ms Millard: What is the basic difference between rural and remote housing then, and public housing? There must be some criteria in differentiating.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the delineation here in front of me. I know we discussed here approximately a year or two years ago.

But the concept of the rural and remote is for people with low incomes and looking at their lifestyle and attempting to bring in a structure that is compatible to the way they want to live. This is what took place in the construction of the housing that was built in the Carcross area this past year. It is a joint decision-making, public participation. There are four or five different interest groups involved as a committee and then, subsequently, designs are put forth and approved and then put out to tender.

So, it is attempting to try to come up with the program that is acceptable to the community and that is all I can say about it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sherlock: The only thing I could add to that, Mr. Chairman, is that the terminology is CMHC terminology and CMHC has different programs, housing programs and these are two of them. The specifications for each program are different and I certainly cannot go into that, I do not know what they are. But it is CMHC terminology that we are using there. I do not know if that is an answer, but that is what it is.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I think that everybody treats that program too lightly. This program was introduced to this House last Session, last budget year, with a big fanfare and it was supposed to be a real good program that CMHC came up with, which is because they have lowered the standards, especially for some outlying communities.

My understanding was that those four homes were supposed to be built out of square logs and I would like to see a report on it. How successful was the program, how was it accepted by the communities, how was it accepted by the people and so forth?

I think we should have all those figures and some answers.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think this could go on further when we discuss the Main Estimates. There is a section in that particular area.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Establishment 2183, Rural and Remote Housing?

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am going to pull a Mrs. Watson here and request that that information be ready for us by the time we get to the Mains on the Rural and Remote Housing.

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

Mr. Chairman: I wish the Members would address their questions before I start reading the item for the question. You are continually interrupting me when I looked around, I have waited for a considerable time, waiting for somebody to put their hand up, then I go to read the question and immediately somebody puts their hand up to ask another question on the same thing. I have already given you time to do that.

Establishment 2183, Rural and Remote Housing, decrease of \$225,000.

Establishment 2183 agreed to

On Establishment 2184

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2184, Replacement Equipment/Staff & Social Housing, \$15,000. Any Questions?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I was sitting around waiting for someone to just give us a little - that nonsensical phrase, surely they could give us an idea of what it is all about. Surely the Government has some responsibilities. When they put a nonsensical phrase like that in there, they expect us to vote \$50,000, we have got to be idiots or they are.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, are we questioning the title or the vote wording?

Mrs. Watson: What is it for?

Mr. Chairman: They just want to know where it goes? What is social housing?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I assume that refers to public housing. The wording is not ours, it comes from the department and it has been here longer than I have and I certainly cannot answer that.

Mr. Lengerke: Does somebody know in the Government?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that the same vote wording was used last budget, and it is my understanding it is in the area where we have to take responsibility for public housing, which I guess you could call social housing, and where equipment has worn out, for an example washing machines and this kind of thing and replacing them.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions. Establishment 2184, Replacement Equipment/Staff & Social Housing.

Establishment 2184 agreed to

On Establishment 2201

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2201, Office Furniture and Equipment, \$50,000.

Mr. Berger: It is probably useless anyway, could we have a breakdown on those figures?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I know what the money is for. That was primarily related to some of the additional positions that came on staff during 1977-78. There was some under-budgeting as a result of a cut back that was arbitrarily made during program forecast time in the Fall of 1976, just at the time we were doing the Mains, I recall for various reasons we had to cut back in the budget and this was one of the areas that was cut back. When we went into the fiscal year we found that there was not sufficient money and we had to put some additional money in, back to what was originally forecasted, and provide for the new positions.

That is primarily what it is for.

Mr. Chairman: Anyone else?

Establishment 2201 agreed to

On Establishment 2202

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2202, Liquor Control Equipment, decrease \$4,500.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why there could be anticipated under expenditures. If they anticipated an under-expenditure, why did they put it in the budget?

Mr. Chairman: I think, Ms Millard, what they mean there is that they anticipate that by the end of this fiscal year they will not have spent that \$4,500 that was budgeted for.

Mr. Berger: Just a question of interest here, 2202 is Liquor Control Equipment, there is an under-expenditure of \$4,500, yet when we go on page 40, 2204, Liquor Control Keg Cooler, we have an over-expenditure of \$3,200. Why could that not be off-set in the same Establishment.

Mr. Chairman: It is, it is off-set right here.

Mr. Berger: It is not, Mr. Chairman, it is two different items here.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but this is where it is off-set, Mr. Berger, in this document.

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could clarify that. It will be done that way in the succeeding fiscal year. Unfortunately, we had to stick with the old Establishment numbers in this book and make the adjustments within those numbers, but Mr. Berger is quite right.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 2202 agreed to

On Establishment 2203

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2203, Central Purchasing Equipment, \$400, a reduction of \$400.

Establishment 2203 agreed to

On Establishment 2204

Mr. Chairman: Now we get to Mr. Berger. Establishment 2204, Liquor Control Keg Cooler, \$3,200. Any question, Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: No, Mr. Chairman. This still should be only an under-expenditure of \$1,300.

Establishment 2204 agreed to

On Establishment 2205

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2205, Sign Paint Shop, decrease of \$800.

Establishment 2205 agreed to

On Establishment 2206

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2206, Central Purchasing Warehouse Renovations, \$100,000.

Mr. Berger: I was just wondering, is this renovation also including the enlargement of the Central Purchasing Department, or, could we have additional information on that?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that expenditure refers to two parts, really.

About two years ago, the Liquor Corporation and Central Purchasing operate out of the same warehouse. About two years ago, Liquor Corporation was using more and more space and was gradually pushing Central Purchasing out of the warehouse and was talking in terms of building, perhaps, a new warehouse for liquor.

After a review of the situation and presentations sent up to Executive Committee, it was decided that there was another building available in the compound, a metal building, and all that was required was insulation and fixing up inside and perhaps Central Purchasing and Stores could work out of there and still maintain some of the space in the old warehouse. That in fact is what happened. This expenditure of \$100,000 was to insulate and renovate the building 277 for Central Purchasing.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to point out that there had been no money voted for the project at all, so it was a project that came up and was approved in the middle of the year.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there was money voted, I believe, last year, was there not, Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, monies were considered in program forecasts but were deferred pending review of the situation, and unfortunately it was not reviewed until after the year had started, the fiscal year had started and it had to come through as a supplementary.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2206, Central Purchasing Warehouse Renovations, \$100,000.

Establishment 2206 agreed to

On Establishment 2207

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2207, Sign Paint Shop Projection Equipment, \$800.

Mr. Berger: Again, Mr. Chairman, there is a non-existent item again, because on one hand we have a decrease of \$800 and here we have an increase of \$800 for the same equipment.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, 2205 and 2207 are related, but it is a matter of clearing the Establishment numbers.

Establishment 2207 agreed to

On Establishment 2302

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2302, Public Address and Bell System Replacement, \$17,500.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, all Members will recall last year I believe, we voted \$30,000 for this expenditure. As it turns out, the lowest bid came in at \$47,500 and we had no choice but to go with it due to the fact that from just a safety standpoint the Christ the King Elementary and High Schools, as well as the Whitehorse Elementary School had P.A. systems that were about twenty years old and there was no way that we could get any new parts for them, so we had to replace them.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 2302 agreed to

On Establishment 2303

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2303, Selkirk Street School Gymnasium, a decrease of \$150,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this just reflects the amount of money that has been spent during this year for this project which is in the neighbourhood of \$350,000. There was some problems with the timing of letting the contract. At the same time, they had some problems getting the necessary materials that had to go along with the building of the gymnasium, so therefore the amount of money that is decreased in the area for this year will be reflected in the Main Estimates for the oncoming year.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion. Establishment 2303, Selkirk Street School Gymnasium.

Establishment 2303 agreed to

On Establishment 2304

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2304, Old Crow Gymnasium, decrease \$75,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, some initial work in this area, this past year, as the Members know, we voted monies in the area of \$100,000 to start the project. We expended \$25,000 with plans and pre-engineering for the project, but unfortunately, as all Members know, the monies for this project are not reflected in the Main Estimates for the forthcoming year due to the fact that our capital monies that we needed for projects just was not forthcoming and we had to realign our priorities in respect to what is going to be happening in various other communities in the next ensuing years as far as economic development is concerned.

In the Mains, you will notice that it is reflected in Watson Lake, as well as Haines Junction, which do need additions. We had no choice.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is I feel badly that we had to defer this particular project and all I can hope is that, for the '79-'80 year, there will be monies available to continue it.

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, the people in Old Crow are very unhappy about this. For one thing, they were counting on the employment that would come from the work that would be done on getting the logs, and the interior work and everything else.

I am afraid that I have to reiterate what I said this morning, that I feel that, because this does not come back into the budget this year, of course it probably will not again until the pipeline is over, because the emphasis, in the new budget, in the Mains, is on Watson Lake, Haines Junction, Whitehorse, Teslin and the interior communities are getting nothing.

The interior communities here also have reductions, the Mayo Administration Building, a reduction of \$700,000. In Faro, there is also a gymnasium, I believe, a renovation to the gymnasium that is not going forward.

Who made the decision, the deliberate policy decision in capital, to take the funding away from the interior communities and put it along the Alcan route?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it was quite obvious that a policy that had to be made by the sub-committee on finance. It was a very difficult decision to be made, but, at the same time, you have to understand, from our viewpoint, the monies that were made available. We had x-amount of dollars and we had to look and see exactly where the monies had to be expended for the forthcoming year.

We had no choice. I do not think that anybody will disagree that Watson Lake and Haines Junction are the two communities that needed renovations to their existing classrooms. There is no other possible way that we could do it.

At the same time, the Honourable Member knows that I have been working with the Federal Government, getting monies available for a revised TEST program for the Old Crow people, so I think, possibly, that can overcome some of the disappointment in this particular area.

But, all I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that we were disappointed that a decision of this nature had to be made, but, at the same time, I am keeping it in mind for the '79-'80 year, depending if money is available.

Because I do agree with the Honourable Member that the people in Old Crow, as far as their school facilities are concerned, should be upgraded to the standards as in other areas in Yukon.

All I can say is that it is going to be taken into serious consideration, just like it was this year.

All I can say to the Honourable Member is that we are disappointed that we could not go ahead with this program.

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, the T.E.S.T. program certainly does not substitute for a gymnasium, which has been a glaring need in Old Crow, where the winter is longer, where there are no facilities for any kind of sports except in the classroom, where you have to throw out the desks before you can do anything, even wrestling or anything that goes on there now.

They want indoor equipment and what I started pursuing in the first place, was some kind of facility, some minor facility, not a full gymnasium, even, because I had my suspicions that this might be the first item that might go.

Is any amount of that initial work going to have to be paid for again? We obviously have done the work. We are going to have to redesign it in the next ten or twenty years, when the Government decides that they are going to take another look at Old Crow again. It has taken years to get the work done that is already done and we are going to lose that.

There is a petition going around Old Crow right now and I am going to be tabling it, because they feel very strongly about this that they have not only lost, they did not want television. They did not want television. Twice they voted against having television in the community.

The CRTC turned down their proposition of having one receiver and so we went ahead and we gave them television at \$20,000 a year, a cost to us. Yet, when they really want something, this Government is not coming out and even making an effort to do it. Somebody has made the decision and input from this Government is obvious.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the point is, there is only X amount of dollars, and we have got to work within those amount of dollars. As I said, we are aware of the fact that Old Crow does not have a gymnasium. Obviously, we put it in the budget last year thinking that we could go ahead with the program and we did some preliminary work, but the point is the monies were not available from the Federal Government on the Capital side of our Budget to continue for this forthcoming year. It was very much a conscious decision, we have Watson Lake and Haines Junction which are the two major areas in the Yukon where the school population is growing and escalating, one of the two major points in Yukon where there are an increase of students, and all I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that we have to supply those kids with classrooms. The point is we have X amount of dollars and we have to distribute it accordingly. This is what we have done.

All I can reiterate, once again, Mr. Chairman, is that on our side it was a difficult decision to be made, but it had to be made, there was no other way. Does the Honourable Member from Ogilvie suggest that in Watson Lake we should not supply classrooms to the children that are there in Watson Lake and there are going to be more to come? These are the decisions we had to look at. I would like to think, Mr. Chairman, that monies will be made available next year. If they are made available, all I can do is assure the Honourable Member that it is in program forecasts and we are proceeding to pressure to see whether or not the money is available. We are doing everything from our end, Mr. Chairman. If the Honourable Member wants to go out and raise taxes or whatever, she should bring her suggestions to this House. The point is, the monies are not available right now.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to see the Minister at least volunteer to take a trip up there which he has not done in all his elected years—

Hon. Mr. Lang: On a Point of Privilege, Mr. Chairman, that is incorrect. I have been up there twice in the last two years.

Ms Millard: Okay, maybe the—

Mr. Chairman: Will one of you sit down?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The Honourable Member well knows that it is difficult to get away at this time of year to begin with.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, before his term of office is over, perhaps if he could write a letter to the school committee explaining why there is going to be no gymnasium, or to the teachers who are finding it very difficult to teach people physical education when it is 60 below in their indoors and they already have a full classroom, and why they got television instead of a gymnasium, because I am really getting tired of carrying back the policies of this government which do not seem to reflect the fact that these people are very much in need, and decisions are made in Whitehorse and I have to go back there and say well I do not know. I fought for that, but somebody made the decision along the way and I do not even understand the reasons myself behind it. I find it very difficult.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I am curious, here on the next item we are turning back another \$46,000. It only would have taken another \$29,000 and going through the programming committee, I am sure it would have been possible to continue that program. I also find it quite curious, especially with the situation like you face in this Government, actually all Members are facing right now in the native community of not listening to their wishes.

Here we go and turn back a lousy \$75,000, just to create a

gymnasium of some sort. It would have been the minimum structure for \$75,000. You cannot build very much with that.

I cannot understand the Government for that.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Members have a misunderstanding. The \$100,000 was just to get the project underway. The total project for a school gymnasium, if it were to go out to contract, I believe was \$1.2 million. If we were able to do it with the labour at Old Crow, which is the intention of this Government and if we can go ahead with the gymnasium in the next couple of years, would be in the area of, I believe, \$800,000.

So, it is a lot of money and the point is that the money is not available. I would ask my colleague in Local Government, in respect to the television at Old Crow, I hear one thing from the Honourable Member and I hear other things from Old Crow that I speak to that come to town.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on 2304?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we have never put in a ground receiving station, unless the people of the community have requested it, and I think that any correspondence on the subject will show that there was a request from the people of Old Crow for television.

In fact, there is a commitment from them that they give a contribution to this Government of \$1,000 a year for such a service.

Mr. Chairman, I get a little perturbed to think that this Government did not elucidate the problems in capital fundings that we were facing just as clearly as possible. It was not included in the budget address, until the elected Members had a chance to look at that address.

We included the section on capital funding, saying that it was a difficult and a critical situation to this Government, that, with the certainty of such a major construction project as the pipeline in Yukon, in the years '81-'83, it is out position and it is our position and will continue to be our position, that we should review our capital expenditure forecast for that period and decide which programs should be accelerated to take place before and which should be post-poned until after the pipeline construction period.

The capital projects considered were all normal departmental projections, resulting from normal growth and development of services in the Yukon Territory. It was recognized that, for the Government to undertake major capital projects, during the period of pipeline construction, would aggravate the situation wherein the construction industry will be fully extended in coping with the pipeline project itself.

This would increase inflationary projects, which is the very issue that Government is trying to defend against, when pipeline construction begins in Yukon.

It should be emphasized that such capital requirements would displace their occurrence in the budget for the period of pipeline construction, unless the high level of Government expenditure would decline during the pipeline construction period.

In other words, accelerated capital expenditures that this Government is seeking funding for, are not new projects created by the pipeline, but, rather, it is new timing for undertaking the construction in order to avoid conflicting with the pipeline project.

Representation has been made to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for additional capital and land development funds of some \$22.7 million to accelerate capital and land development projects, for the above mentioned reason.

To date, our requests have not been successful, as the Federal Government is currently experiencing severe pressure on available financial resources. I offer any one of the Honourable Members to come with our representations to the powers that be presently, and if you think that things were tight in capital

funding as far as Yukon was concerned before, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen it as tight, and even loan money, as it is presently. We said, Mr. Chairman, and we committed ourselves to continue to seek approval of Treasury Board for funds to accelerate our capital on land development programs, and will include these programs and supplementary estimates if and when we obtain approval.

Mr. Chairman, my programs have been dissipated by a lack of capital and loan money that I am trying to get into the economy of Yukon before the pipeline, and I kid you not, it is a critical and a difficult and a desperate situation. We were trying to do all of the capital projects: the Old Crow School, the Mayo Administration Building, accelerated land development programs and we are just told point out-blank-a-jail, that money was not available, this is the amount of money you had, now what are you going to do with it. We made the conscious decision that if there was one or two areas that we could not go beyond the scope of the next year or two without additional classroom space, because we knew of the growth areas that was coming with schools, and he got part of the stuff that I was crying for, my colleague was; because we could not depend on the pipeline corridor itself not having schools in Haines Junction and Watson Lake.

You do not think that places me in a tremendously difficult situation as far as capital is concerned and all of the elected Members on Executive Committee, well you are just fooling yourselves, because you can stand up and berate us too when you come to our programs. He got the cream because we could not defend not having the schools being built in those areas. We have not tried to avoid the issue, we have met it head on by letting all the Honourable Members know of what we are trying to do, what our philosophy is and where we are trying to go. Mr. Chairman, I just say that we will continue our negotiations with Treasury Board. We know that we are right in our policy and our philosophy, and we hope that the rightness of our argument will prevail and we will see supplementary estimates that will include those projects that we know are essential and necessary and one of those projects which was included in that extra capital funding is, Mr. Chairman, the Old Crow gymnasium, along with all kinds of other projects which are critical at this point in time.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to that, to the Honourable Member's statement, that you should not be blaming this Government in respect to the monies that we have available. We have tried every avenue that is available to us to get monies for the ongoing capital projects and the projects that are necessary along the pipeline corridor. I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I commend my colleagues on the Executive Committee, because as the Honourable Minister for Local Government said, he had to give up something in order to go with these school extensions in these outlying communities along the Alaska Highway so that we could be ready, and could cope with the situation as it develops. So I think, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the Honourable Member, that I am prepared to write a letter to the school committee, on her request, and at the same time I think the message that has to go back to the people of Old Crow is that we tried to get the money and the money was not available. It is fair to say, and the Treasurer can back us up, it was right to the last minute until we knew exactly how much money we had available. We had a meeting here last fall, late last fall, starting from some of the top mandarins in Ottawa, update your five year program, get it all together and try to escalate it within the next couple of years so that you are ready for the pipeline, which we did. Subsequently we find out the Treasury Board gave it the axe.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: They are \$11 billion in debt.

Hon. Mr. Lang: So, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more that I can add to this, I will write a letter to the Old Crow School Committee, and at the same time, I can assure the Honourable

Member we will continue pursuing trying to get the monies that are necessary for this particular project.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, it is just really a very sad day, because I think it was by sheer intuition that I was the one Member who sat in front of the Lysyk Inquiry and said we do not want this pipeline. It is going to bring really bad things.

Now, we are seeing the beginning of the bad things and we still have years to go. The outside communities are going to be paying for that pipeline. The people along the pipeline route are going to be paying for that pipeline, and we cannot even keep track of how much is in this budget, that we have already paid, for a pipeline that, we are being told, may not even go, and it is a tragic day in the Yukon, I think, when we start going along with those kinds of policies, where the Yukon gets raped because of some big business and some big Government that happened to get together and wants to take Alaska gas to American customers through our backyard.

It is just dreadful.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 2304 agreed to

On Establishment 2305

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2305, School Ground Improvements, decrease of \$46,100.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, you will recall last budget session we voted \$100,000 in this area. There were two projects at two of the schools that were listed for school ground improvements that were completed.

We had a problem in the Carmacks area that was in line for some paving and ground improvement to their facility. As it turned out, over the summer months we thought we were going to have it done in August, the contractor that had been awarded the contract to do the paving in that area found that his time ran out and he could not get a paving crew together, so, subsequently, it is going to be done early this year, in Carmacks.

The problem with the Robert Service School was that the initial stage necessitated clearing the school grounds and, unfortunately, it was late this Fall, I understand, when the final building was taken off the ground--

Mr. McCall: It is still there.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Or, it is still there, it is being taken off, I understand. That ground improvement will be completed this year.

At the same time, at the Mayo school, the J.B. Clarke School, some work was done on the grounds of the school, but it was not completed and it should be completed this year.

To complete these three programs and, at the same time, the new schedule projected for this forthcoming year, are Teslin School, for ground improvement; the Christ the King Elementary and Christ the King High School, to be completed this year.

So, these were the problems that we went under in respect to this program.

I have instructed my officer for this forthcoming year to have alternatives, where they feel that a school ground cannot be done in a particular school, that the money be transferred to another area so that we can get the ground improvements done in another area, if we are unable to, due to factors that we have no control over, to complete the projects.

dit57.000000

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, that is all well and good, the Minister has given detailed explanation about ground improvements but I would like to know where the many requests have got to in the shuffle dealing with the extreme need for ground improvements for the Van Gorder School in Faro. We have been waiting for about seven or eight years for ground improvements and the explanations we have been getting from the Department of Education, and I was at one of the Advisory

Committees at the time, that we were forever waiting for expansions to be completed.

The last expansion took place, I believe in 1973 and we are still waiting for those ground improvements even though there was estimates budgeted every time in the budget. I would like an explanation from the Minister just when are we going to be considered in the shuffle for proper ground improvements that have never taken place since 1969, 1971, when the school was completed in the first run around.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the obvious answer to the question is that Faro was a school that we were seriously looking at for expansion over this last year depending on the results of the feasibility study that was being undertaken for the Grum claims. That was not completed. We have no further information of whether or not there is going to be major increases in the population in Faro as of yet until decisions are made as to whether or not that piece of mining property is feasible.

I am hopeful that it will be coming in this coming year. I should point out that the way we determine which schools should have their ground improvements done in any given year, is that the regional superintendents consult with their school committees and then the regional superintendent assesses just which areas need the improvements the most. Subsequently, then they are listed as a priority item.

I think that it is fair to say that the Faro school is one that, depending on what happens to the Grum property, the Honourable Member can understand our predicament here, we do not know what is going to take place and just exactly what is going to have to be done in the area of education facilities. Until a decision is made, and I understand that the feasibility reports should be completed this spring sometime, then we will have a better idea of where we are going and obviously, if there is no expansion to that particular facility, I would suggest that it would be in line in very short order for major ground improvements being undertaken. So this is the situation the way it exists at the present time, Mr. Chairman. At the same time, I should point out that the Canada Works Program is being offered by the Federal Government within the Department in the school committees, we are trying to coordinate this Federal program so that we can utilize some of the monies that are available under that program so that we can further extend the school grounds improvement program throughout Yukon.

Apparently the monies available in this area will be made known here in the next month or two months and subsequently, I should be able to report back to the House just exactly what has taken place in that area but I think it is a logical position of this Government to try to coordinate the Federal monies that are available through the Canada Works Program and what we have available and we will be able to give that much more of a service to the schools that need the necessary ground improvements.

Mr. McCall: I would like to put forward a proposal to the Minister and hope he will take it under very serious consideration. If the community of Faro was prepared to put in the ground improvements, would this Government offset approximately 50 per cent of that cost if the community is willing to put up the other 50 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to seriously discuss the offer with the Honourable Member.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I will put that in writing for him.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me if the paving that is going to be done in Carmacks, under that program, is that going to be done this year, at last year's prices?

The reason I am asking that is because, I do not know whose

fault it was that they could not get there, but I think it would probably be the contractor's, and we did have a deal. I would hope that the Government sees to it that we do get that at a good price.

My other question is, is there a policy or has the Government got a policy with respect to ground improvements, school ground improvements, when they build a new school? For instance, you are going to build one at Haines Junction and Watson Lake, and I am wondering, is the school ground improvement part of that contract, because it well should be. I think that this is a problem that you have got, that you are giving excuses to the Honourable Member from Faro, who has been told that when additions are put on that you have got to wait until the additions are done and there are more additions to come before you do any improvement to the grounds.

Well, surely to God, you should be able to figure this out and get it as part of the total contract.

Also, the Selkirk Steet School gymnasium, does the addition there include improvement to the school grounds, because it well should?

Is there a policy or are you working on a policy to cover that?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that monies are available in the contracts now that are let, for ground improvement. So, subsequently, that is taken care of.

I should point out that I am not making excuses here, Mr. Chairman. I am pointing out the facts of life, as they were presented over the last year. We have been trying to deal within those parameters.

The only thing that I do believe we made a mistake in was not having an alternative to go to if we could not complete a project that we had on-stream and we are going to rectify that this coming year.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just in answer to the Minister's statement about the school ground in Dawson City.

I think the building he is referring to is removed, but there is still the matter of a garage sitting on that site and I think there are two departments, the Department of Human Resources and the Department of Renewable Resources should get together and find a lot to put that thing on, because I think that is the reason it has not been removed yet.

I think the Department of Human Resources is the owner and the Department of Renewable Resources is the user of the building.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, any comment?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I could check with my colleague on this. I was under the understanding it had been moved, but I will check it out, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister if he has had an opportunity to investigate the possibility of giving summer work programs to the school kids in the areas where those grounds are to be maintained or improved, because it seems to me that a great deal of it is within their capabilities, with someone directing their activities, and that it would be a means of them raising money during their summer vacation.

The main point, of course, Mr. Chairman, being that if you work hard to plant a lawn or trees around grounds or clean them up or build a backstop for a baseball field, you are not going to go and wreck it.

It just seems to me it is a good investment in young people's time to use them for those programs and I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has had an opportunity to look at that?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, earlier in my statements I referred to the Canada Works Program and this is the area that I would think this could be utilized to hire some of the students that are attending the schools.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the students need direction from the Government. I think it has already taken place. I stand to be corrected, but I believe at Jeckyl students undertook a program there and did some improvement under the directorship of some of the adults in the area and did a very good job. They do not need a bunch of prompting from this Government.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, just dealing very briefly along the same lines we are talking about with school grounds, I just want to put something through the records which I failed to mention a moment ago. The Minister made reference to the Grumm Venture, and he very well knows the Advisory School Committee and members of his department have worked very hard in preparation with the Engineering Department for proposed plans which would not in any way interrupt any school ground improvements, or even just straight maintaining, if there was any such grounds in existence. The engineering cost estimate that came back to the School Advisory, which put it beyond the reach of this Government was \$2,800,000 and there has been a revised plan put forward and we have not had any straight answers on it yet, which I would like to discuss with the Minister when he does have the time. It is now reduced to \$1.5 million. We do not want to wait for the Grumm Venture to complete school grounds, we do not want to wait for Grumm Venture for more classes, we need them now, we need them badly.

Mr. Chairman: Anyone else?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in what the Minister was saying about his priorities in moving possibly from one area to another, the monies, because of the fact they could not finish one project somewhere. I am just wondering, such things as school grounds that a project cannot be finished in a year and if we voted that money once for it, I would like to see the project finished that year and there is no need to having a supplementary left over. No need of it at all, because there is no need of anything taking that long in a small project such as school grounds.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with the Honourable Member, but as I outlined the situations as they developed, for example in the Carmacks area the paving, I have no control over the private contractor, whether or not he got his paving equipment into Carmacks at a time when we could do the project. It was estimated that they would be there, but these are factors that I have no control over. Possibly the Honourable Member could give me some advice?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, as the Member from Riverdale just spoke a moment ago on the very subject. If there is a contract let to have the job done, let this Government see that job is done and if it is not done, then of course we will have the money to be able to use again. But I think it can be, there have been contracts. I know of some right around the Whitehorse area where things have not gone too well and we have inspectors coming out our ears and yet we still cannot seem to get things under control sometimes.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion. Establishment 2305, School Ground Improvements, decrease \$46,100.

Establishment 2305 agreed to

On Establishment 2307

Mr. Chairman: Oh, dear! Establishment 2307, Mayo Gym Relocation, \$136,900.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would just like to point out to all Members that it was a decision that was made after the budget, and after we had had the school up and the move of the gymnasium was very successful, which some of us doubted, but it did, apparently it went very well and it fits well in the school that is now in Mayo.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, it was all done to free some land for the new Administration Building, which now we

have not got the money to build.

It was a good idea, a really good idea.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: It was just the execution was rotten.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Just the money.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion?

Establishment 2307 agreed to

On Establishment 2308

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2308, Teacher Training Program Equipment, \$19,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, possibly the Treasurer has a breakdown. This was to get some of the desks and whatever was necessary for the program.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the funds were to renovate portable classrooms and to purchase new materials, classroom equipment, furniture, students' seating desks and office provisions for the Teacher Training Program.

We do not have an individual breakdown, it is just a total.

Establishment 2308 agreed to

On Establishment 2309

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2309, Dental Services and Renovations, \$2,500.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this was for renovations to a couple of the schools so that the dental therapist could have a room for delivering the program it is done at the elementary level.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the school identified was Jack Hulland School and it was primarily the placing of a second chair, dental chair, in Jack Hulland.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Establishment 2309 agreed to

On Establishment 2315

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2315, Mayo School, to provide funds for final charges against this project, \$100.

Mr. McCall: What was that, Mr. Chairman, a postage stamp?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: A good question.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, elucidate.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will have to refer to Treasury for this. It is my understanding that the Department has a financial obligation to pay the accounts that, even though they relate to a previous year, when the transaction actually takes place, and possibly the Treasurer could elaborate.

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was indicated to us that there would be charges accrued, or incurred in that Establishment, so the \$100 simply is to set up to make provision for the actual charges that are yet to come. We do not have them yet.

Establishment 2315 agreed to

On Establishment 2345

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2345, Ross River School, \$1,800.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, is that the same situation as at the Mayo situation.

Mr. Sherlock: It is, Mr. Chairman.

Establishment 2345 agreed to

On Establishment 2506

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2506, Detoxication Centre - Washing Machine, \$1,100.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know the brand, I just know that there is a considerable amount of bedding to be washed in the Detox Centre because our customers come overnight and there are 16 people sleeping there normally each night and the bedding has to be changed and washed. I do not know any other justification except that.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that is basically "

Establishment 2506 agreed to

On Establishment 2553

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2553, Remand Centre, \$62,000.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, as most Members are aware, we tried to utilize to the best advantage the space in the Correctional Institute last year by moving the women inmates out of a section in which there was normally only one or two or perhaps no inmates, and providing other accommodation for them. Because of the lengthy delay in getting this proposition off the ground and available for those inmates, we had to seek even other alternatives during the temporary arrangement and we have obtained a house for them which is working out very well, Mr. Chairman.

In the meantime, funds were allocated to the renovation of two government owned work trailers, bunk trailers, which were moved up from the storage area of this Government to be renovated to be used for the use of inmates who I am happy to say will be in them in the next few days and we can get into more of that in the Mains, but I think the Honourable Members who were up there the other day will agree that it has been a good investment because we are going now to have a special area for the non-maximum security types and we are going to make very good use of those buildings.

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Fleming that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Resolution Number 4 respecting the school tax and the general purpose tax and directed me to report the same. The Committee also considered Bills 2 and 3 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.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will second that motion.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, 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 Legislative Returns were Tabled March 14, 1978

78-1-2

Corrections Matrons and Officers
(Resolution No.9 - 1977 - 2nd)

78-1-3

Impact on Dawson City and Yukon of closure of Clinton Creek Mine
(Written Question No.31 - 1977 - 2nd)

LEGISLATIVE RETURN #2

1977 (Second) Session

Mr. Speaker
Members of the Assembly

On December 1977, Ms. Millard asked the following question:
THAT whereas section 3 (1) of the Fair Practices Ordinance reads:
"No employer shall refuse to employ or to continue to employ a person or adversely discriminate in any term or condition of employment of such person, because of the race, religion, religious creed, colour, ancestry, sex, marital status or ethnic or national origin of such person;"

And whereas the Corrections Matrons and Corrections Officers employed in the Department of Human Resources are one pay range apart, and are expected to perform similar duties;

And whereas the assurance was given this House several months ago that this situation would be rectified;

Be it resolved that this House urges the Government to immediately act upon its own Ordinance and investigate the circumstances of the Government continuing to employ women in positions which adversely discriminate in their terms of employment, and that this House further requests a written report on this situation by the next sitting of this House.

The answer to the above question is as follows:

The Public Service Commission Ordinance and pursuant Regulations and the Collective Agreement with the Public Service Alliance of Canada govern the terms and conditions of employment for employees occupying positions allocated to the class of Corrections Matron and Corrections Officer I in the Public Service of the Yukon Government.

The Public Service Commission has conducted job audits to examine the duties and responsibilities performed by Corrections Matrons and Corrections Officers employed in the Corrections Branch.

The job audits confirmed that there is a distinction in the duties and responsibilities performed which is accurately reflected in the respective Correction Matron and Correction Officer I class specification.

The major distinguishing allocation factors between the two class specifications are:

1. The greater risk of violent disturbances due to the increased male inmate population vs. the female inmate population and the indirect environmental consequences, for example, the greater difficulty in controlling inmate work groups, security risks and the higher potential for inmate unrest and the difficulty of performing inmate checks and security procedures.
2. The requirement to conduct work parties independently of close supervision outside the main institution and the preponderance of escort duties in relation to similar duties performed by Correction Matrons.
3. Difference in assigned domestic responsibilities between the two classes of employment.

In summary, the ratio of female inmates to Correction Matrons vs. the ratio of male inmates to Corrections Officers reflects the degree of difference in the work environment. The chance of violent disturbances is less acute within the female inmate population whereas the risk to Corrections Officers with respect to male inmate population is greater. Similarly, the volume of male inmates necessitates additional patrol duties, additional escort duties and the requirement to conduct work parties. These aspects are reflected in the class specification and are similarly reflected in the duties and responsibilities performed by employees allocated to the Corrections Matron class and the Corrections Officer I class of employment.

Pay Range Assignment:

Corrections Matrons are paid pay range 16.
Corrections Officer I's are paid pay range 17.

Negotiable Salary Assignments:

The salary ranges assigned to the above classes of employment are negotiable and as such are subject to the collective bargaining process.

Collective bargaining negotiations for the renewal of the current Collective Agreement will be commencing shortly. The current agreement, which incorporates the above classes of employment, expires March 31st, 1978.

Future Considerations:

Mr. Mounsey, the newly appointed Director of Corrections, has indicated that he wishes to conduct an experiment in the near future in an attempt to utilize Corrections Matrons as Corrections Officers. It is Mr. Mounsey's intention to place Corrections Matrons on an acting pay basis as Corrections Officers. If this experiment proves successful, the assigned duties and responsibilities can be integrated and the Public Service Commission has indicated that at that time, they would conduct a classification review in which all positions will be allocated to one class of employment.

A similar process was undertaken on the transition of the Juvenile Training Home to a Youth Service Centre, where all Correction Officers and Correction Matrons were given identical duties and responsibilities and consequently, their positions were allocated to either the Youth Service Worker I or the Youth Service Worker II class of employment.

Conclusion:

It is the conclusion of the Public Service Commission that the class specifications accurately reflect the kind and level of work performed by Corrections Matrons and Corrections Officers based on job audits and that employees occupying positions allocated to the class of Corrections Matron have not been discriminated against because of their race, religion, religious creed, colour, ancestry, sex, marital status or ethnic or national origin.

Furthermore, the Director of Corrections is in agreement with the analysis of the Public Service Commission with respect to the degree of difference between the kind and level of work currently performed by Corrections Matrons and Corrections Officers.

LEGISLATIVE RETURN # 3

Mr. Speaker

Members of the Assembly

On December 5, 1977, the Honourable Member from Ogilvie directed the following written question to the Commissioner:

Some time ago we were advised that the Economic Research and Planning Unit was involved in the examination of the impact on Dawson City and the Yukon of the closure of the Clinton Creek Mine.

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

The answer to the above question is as follows:

- 1) A study to determine the socio-economic impact of the closure of the Clinton Creek Mine was initiated during the spring of 1977. The study was a joint effort of the Economic Research and Planning Unit of Y.T.G. and the Northern Social Research Division of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Y.T.G.'s role in this study was to set the terms of reference and to manage the project. Our main objective was to determine the impact of the mine closure, which would form the basis for government policy towards mining in the future. DIAND's role was to actually conduct the study and to write the report.
- 2) The Lerchs report was tabled in the House on February 28, 1978.
- 3) Upon the request of Y.T.G., DIAND was requested to include within the terms of reference of the Clinton Creek study, an assessment of government's role in the mining industry. While not included as a part of the Clinton Creek study, DIAND decided to develop a Mining Strategy for the North (N.W.T. and Yukon). This comprehensive study will cover topics such as
 - 1) Mineral Legislation
 - 2) Corporate and Personal Income Taxes
 - 3) Mineral Exploration
 - 4) Mineral Production
 - 5) Infrastructure for Mineral Development
 - 6) Employment and Training in the Mining Industry
 - 7) Benefit/Cost of Further Mineral Processing
 - 8) Canadian Content in Mining Industry
 - 9) Environmental Legislation and Concerns
 - 10) Social Concerns
 - 11) Economic Impact
 - 12) Associated Business Opportunities
 - 13) Regional Development Implications
 - 14) Incentives for Mining Industry
 - 15) Land Use Planning and Priorities
 - 16) Native Land Claims and Their Effects
 - 17) Technological Benefits from Mining
 - 18) Labour Health and Safety

This study is now underway, and the Y.T.G. has been assured it will be consulted as the project progresses.

Date

Signature