



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 9

10th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Thursday, March 16, 1978

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Thursday, March 16, 1978

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

We will proceed at this time with Morning Prayers.

Prayers

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Privilege, this morning, which is very rare.

On Tuesday, March 14th, in the Committee of the Whole, there were a number of statements made by the Ministers in respect to Arctic Winter Games. I would like to quote, for a moment, if you would bear with me, Mr. Speaker, to what the Honourable Minister for Human Resources, in a statement in reply to comments by Mrs. Watson. This is in reference to the Arctic Winter Games:

"Mr. Speaker, I have no idea that the Honourable Members were going to make such a serious issue out of whether or not some preliminary games would 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 these communities. I would assume, in six weeks, without any reply, that the answer is in the negative. There were offers and they have not been accepted. That is the point that impresses me, because, Mr. Speaker, in my responsibility I am getting requests from communities constantly for things they want to do and be part of this Government. It is not the other way around."

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned. This is why I rose on a Point of Privilege. I received a telex copy, Mr. Speaker, of a letter that was sent to the Honourable Minister of Education, February 21st, 1977, from Father Rigaud, the Chairman of the Faro School Advisory Committee, who requested, on behalf of the school committee, that they would be definitely interested in hosting a portion of the Arctic Winter Games.

What has been implied in the recent debate, Mr. Speaker, in the Tuesday's Committee of the Whole was completely the opposite. I feel that is a gross injustice not only on myself, but also of the community of Faro.

Mr. Speaker: I will have to take under advisement the Question of Privilege raised by the Honourable Member from Pelly River.

We will now proceed to the Order Paper. Are there any documents for tabling?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning a Band Council Resolution and a Petition from the people of Old Crow concerning the lack of a gymnasium there this year.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further 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?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that subsection (5) of 4 of the *Recreation Development Ordinance Regulations*, Commissioner's Order 1977/90, be amended by deleting the words "after within" on line 5, and substituting the words "a hundred and fifty mile radius of the Yukon Territory boundary".

Mr. Speaker: I will also have to give consideration of the

acceptability of that Motion, however, I shall speak with the Honourable Member at a later time when we have had a chance to review it. Are there any further Notices of Motion?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Notice of Motion, seconded by Mr. McCall, that the letter to Dr. W.J. McCall, Father Judge Memorial Hospital in Dawson and other doctors around the Territory, be referred to Committee of the Whole for further discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Are there 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: Arctic Winter Games Decentralization

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, on an interview, I think I just heard it and I think it was on CBC, and many times in this House we have voted on the Arctic Winter Games and, of course, we have been prodding the Government to try to decentralize this somewhat. Many of these incidents that he has spoken of possibly going along with our wishes and trying, probably, to have some games outside this City of Whitehorse.

However, he has always spoken of a 100 mile radius of Whitehorse and I would ask the Minister this morning if, after all their consultation and all the things they do and the cost to do it and everything was finished and done with and they decided that this was the case, I would ask the Minister where anybody could hold anything outside of Whitehorse, in any community, other than Carcross?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand the question. I was interviewed this morning by CBC, on the Arctic Winter Games, and raised the various points that were brought up during debate the other day in this House.

At that time, I said I was prepared to discuss with the Arctic Winter Games Host Society, as well as the Arctic Winter Games Corporation, the possibility of having some of the preliminary events or venues held within a hundred mile radius of Whitehorse.

I do have to say this, Mr. Speaker, and I think that people should be aware of this, is that disbursing the games will take a lot away from the Arctic Winter Games Corporation, to the extent, probably, that it would not have the value that it has had in the past. I draw from the experience that was in the City of Anchorage, which is a very large populated city in Alaska, where the events were held all over the city, and subsequently people did not have the—

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, we are not getting an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order please.

Hon. Mr. Lang: ...the ability to get to the various other athletic events—

Mrs. Watson: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Lang: —or the spectators.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Honourable Minister take his seat.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, we are not getting an answer to the question. We are getting a political statement.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member has no Point of Order. Would the Honourable Minister of Education continue.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, further to that, I would point out that the decision just does not entirely lie with this Government. The jurisdiction lies with the Arctic Winter Games Corporation, as a body constituted to decide where the Games are to be held firstly, and secondly to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the Minister kindly take his seat. May I have the Point of Order raised by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I asked a direct question. If the Minister and the Corporation decided to hold Games outside of Whitehorse within a 100 mile radius, just where would he hold those Games, other than Carcross?

Mrs. Watson: Good question.

Mr. Fleming: If he cannot figure that out, Mr. Speaker, that is his problem.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member would refer back to the "Debates & Proceedings", I said that Carmacks, Haines Junction, and Teslin were the communities that have been written to and there had been Notice of Motion in the House requesting that those letters be tabled, which they will be on Monday. I did make a commitment to this House during the debate on the White Paper that was tabled in this House during the last Session to undertake to see whether or not some of the communities were interested in hosting a portion of the Games.

At the same time, it has to be understood, Mr. Speaker, that a host community that has—

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, he has not answered the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that a host—

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no Point of Order, as I have already ruled. The Ministers need not answer any question if they do not choose to, and that is part of the Parliamentary process. Perhaps the Honourable Members could give some consideration to this fact.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the only other point that I would like to make, that I was attempting to put across, was the fact that the Arctic Winter Games Corporation—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Would the Honourable Minister kindly take his seat.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, we have a time in the Orders of the Day plotted for Statements by Ministers, and if the Minister had to have his statement he wanted to make about the Arctic Winter Games, I would suggest he made it then. We have had a question, if he does not want to answer the question, fine, but he does not have to go into a statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I will deal with one Point of Order at a time. The Honourable Member from Kluane has not raised a Point of Order. I would suggest that Honourable Members give consideration to the rules and procedures of this House and perhaps Honourable Members could get together in a little more amicable manner in order to resolve the questions. Questions raised by any Honourable Member of any of the Ministers need not be answered at all and that is part of the procedures. If the Minister wishes to give a reply that would be the Minister's prerogative. However, I would also ask the Minister if he would, and all Ministers, whenever possible, make their replies as brief as possible.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question. If the Honourable Members refer back to the "Debates & Proceedings", I said we were prepared to look at possibly hosting some of the preliminary venues of the Games, in Haines Junction, Teslin, and Carmacks.

Letters have been sent out, no replies have been received. We are prepared to follow that up, but I must say, also, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, it depends on the Arctic Winter Games Corporation, as well as the Host Society.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education, in view of the fact that you received a letter February 21st, 1977, and in view of the fact that you made a comment on Tuesday, to a Member who had asked a number of points that you stated that I had made: "My department officials phoned three of the communities that might

possibly consider hosting the Games, Watson Lake, Faro and Dawson", I would like to know from the Minister, Mr. Speaker, just why we are being, shall we say, given half-truths to explanations in questions in "Debates & Proceedings", when, in fact, you did have documentation and you did not reply in the proper manner, only with the exception of a phone call.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I did not have documentation, contrary to what the Honourable Member says. If the Honourable Member takes some time out and refers back to the "Debates & Proceedings", as of the date, Wednesday, December 14th, 1977, which the Honourable Member, if I recall correctly, did not even enter into the debate, I stated to the effect, Mr. Speaker: "At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that we have written a letter to the City of Whitehorse, asking them if they are prepared to host the forthcoming Arctic Winter Games in 1980."

"We did have communications with Faro that could quite conceivably, it was an off chance, could possibly host the games. We spoke to people in Dawson City and Watson Lake to hear what their thoughts were and, through my officials, there seemed to be a consensus that, at that time at any rate, they would not be able to house and feed that many athletes."

Mr. Speaker, this has to be taken into account, the logistics and the ability to house the athletes that are going to be in the numbers of 700 to 800 people, plus spectators which could number in the area of 400 or 500 people. So, it is a lot of people and it is a lot of work to try to organize and attempt to house these people in one area.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the question I asked before. However, this time it will be very, very simple so that the Minister can answer it without giving us a dialogue.

Does the Minister know how far, over a hundred miles, these three places he mentioned, Carmacks, Haines Junction and Teslin, is from Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, letters have gone to Carmacks, Haines Junction, and Teslin, within the roughly approximate 100 mile radius of Whitehorse. I do not think we have to carry on any longer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Is the Minister prepared to provide all the documentation that he wrote to the outlying communities dealing with Arctic Winter Games? Are you prepared to table that documentation in this House so that everybody know what he is saying?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been answered, but I will permit the Minister to answer it one more time.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will bring in a comic book that the question has been answered. The information will be tabled in this House.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification of one point because the Honourable Minister of Education keeps contradicting himself, both in the House and on the radio this morning. Who does actually determine who hosts the Arctic Winter Games? You stated on the radio this morning, you stated in your debate that it is the decision of the Corporation, yet you now read from the "Debates & Proceedings" that the Territorial Government approached the City of Whitehorse to see if, in fact, they wanted to host the Arctic Winter Games. So your statements are really conflicting and very unclear and seem to use—

Mr. Speaker: Order please, would the Honourable Member kindly address her remarks through the Chair?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member in her preamble forgot to ask me the question.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister will get the question in the morning when he reads the "Debates & Proceedings". I am saying who makes the decision of where the

Arctic Winter Games will be held when the Minister says that it is the decision of the Corporation and then in the next instance he says that the Territorial Government approaches the City of Whitehorse to see if in fact they want to host the Games in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction that is in line to host the Arctic Winter Games for the 1980 Games or 1982 Games was approached to request information and to look at what communities could be capable of hosting the Games. Those communities are approached and subsequently the proposals are put forth by the host community to the Arctic Winter Games Corporation.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, well why did the Minister on the radio this morning say that it was the Corporation that made the decision of where the Games would be?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the Corporation will make the final decision where the Games are going to be hosted, in respect to the community; and at the same time, they will make the decision on how they are going to be run.

Ms Millard: Mr. Speaker, further on the Arctic Winter Games, I would like to know from the Minister who was approached in Dawson City on this subject, and was that person represented on the Recreation Board which represents the whole of Dawson City?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, as I stated in this House, my departmental officials contacted the City Manager in Dawson, the City Manager in Faro, as well as one of the members of the L.I.D. in Watson Lake. It was close to Christmastime at that time. There were elections going on and we wanted to find out just exactly whether or not they felt they could host the Games. As I said, the consensus was that they felt they did not have the infrastructure to host the Games. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we subsequently approached the City of Whitehorse.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Ms Millard: I would like to know, in the Minister's opinion, if he feels that that was a very serious attempt to get a consensus from all groups in Dawson City and whether or not they were also approached to host just part of the Games, not the whole Games?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it was as serious as we could make it, because at that time the timing was such that we had to approach these various communities and attempt to get a White Paper so that we could have it discussed in this House, which was discussed in December.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think this whole Question Period is ranging into the area of debate and I would ask all Members if they would give consideration to terminating this particular subject at this time and if it requires debate, perhaps give consideration to doing it in another manner.

Question re: Blind Creek Road

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Minister for Local Government.

Yesterday, in the "Debates & Proceedings", the Minister, said the following, and, Mr. Speaker, this is primarily because, this is dealing with the \$6,400, Establishment 2911. He goes on to say: "This is primarily because we did not do all the work that we anticipated in the year on the new Blind Creek Road in Faro".

My question is: the amount of work of putting in culverts, grading, bringing in a cat and completely finishing the Blind Creek Road, I would like to know from the Minister just where did the funds from if they did not come out of the \$6,000 that was budgeted in the previous year?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, it was over-budgeted and we did not use as much of the monies as we had allocated for that project.

Question re: Sunset Home in Dawson

Ms Millard: A question for the Minister of Health and

Human Resources: sometime ago we all received a copy of a letter from Klondike Senior Citizens' Society, concerning the use of the Sunset Home in Dawson, and one question has been asked on that. I would like to know if there has been any progress on the use of that home by this senior citizens group?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Human Resources has had a submission prepared for some time, asking for the turn-over of that former Sunset Home to the use of the senior citizens' group in Dawson, but we have been waiting for a favourable climate to try to process it, in view of the difficulties we had in our previous effort to provide the Golden Age Society with a building of their own.

I would certainly solicit the support of all Honourable Members to that project, before I try it on again.

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker, will that be presented to us before the end of this current Session?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, there is a process whereby such submissions have to be viewed by a permanent advisory committee of the Public Service, here in this Government, prior to its recommendations being received by Executive Committee.

I will activate that process and trust that it will get in before the end of this Session.

Question re: Alaska Highway Roadbed and Right-of-way

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways.

Has Canada transferred to the Yukon Government the ownership of the land used for the Alaska Highway roadbed and the Alaska Highway right-of-way?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, any one of these transfer searches takes a lot of time and background and work and I will certainly get the legal people on it immediately, if the Honourable Member wants the answer to the question.

Question re: Constitutional Development Paper

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education this morning: I am wondering, could he tell me if he has heard anything from the Minister of Northern Affairs, with respect to the constitutional process that the Minister announced here lately? Has there been any further word on that? When are you going to table the paper?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, no reply has come back to the dex that I quoted to all Members in the House. Once we have received word I will report back.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Executive Committee considering tabling the paper regardless of whether the Minister replies or not?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, consideration could be given to that during the Executive Committee meeting tomorrow.

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to that matter. I wonder if the Minister has considered sending a telex to the Federal Department in question saying that unless an answer is received by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, that the paper will be tabled?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will take the comments of the Honourable Member under advisement.

Question re: Arctic Winter Games Decentralization (Cont.)

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to go back once more to the Arctic Winter Games. I would like to ask the Minister of Education to make up his mind and please tell us when did he really contact the City Managers in Dawson, Faro and so forth, because in one statement the Minister said to us it was shortly before Christmas and the other statement he said he contacted them because we had to prepare a White Paper. The White Paper was handed to this House when we were in session and it was long before Christmas. When actually did the Minister contact the City Managers?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, I will not permit the Minister to

answer. I have already stated that the House has ranged into the latitude of debate on this question this morning, and perhaps some other method could be found by which to encourage debates that Honourable Members seem to indicate are required.

Question re: Pipeline Corridor/Expropriation of Land

Mr. McCall: I have a question directed to the Commissioner, Mr. Speaker. As we all know, the Commissioner is the representative of all Yukoners at the land claims bargaining table. I would like to know were the recent publications dealing with the proposed or suggested proposal expropriating the land down the pipeline corridor by Federal Legislation? I would like to know if the Commissioner, on behalf of Yukon, shares the same view as the Federal Government when it comes to the displacement of land down the pipeline corridor?

Mr. Speaker: To whom is that question addressed?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the question at the moment, I think you will have to be more specific, land claims expropriation of land, I do not understand his question, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling Legislative Returns in answer to the following questions: written question number 41 from the 1977 (Second) Session regarding research funding for the Alaska Pipeline Project; written question number 42 from the 1977 (Second) Session regarding the \$200 Million Line of Credit; written question number 43 from the 1977 (Second) Session regarding the formal Impact Management Agreement between Foothills and YTG; written question number 47 from the 1977 (Second) Session regarding community lands; question asked by Mr. McCall on February 20th regarding the Stratton Inquiry; question asked by Mr. McCall on March 1st regarding impost fees for lots in Faro; question asked by Mr. Fleming on March 1st regarding assessment in the Teslin area; and a question asked by Mr. McCall on March 8th regarding a Heavy Equipment Operator Class series review.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Just for the information of Honourable Members, who I am sure would wish to know that some of the difficulties encountered perhaps this morning in the Question Period could be resolved in future Question Periods by Members consulting Beauchesne at page 150 and 151, which points out for instance on 177 that reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers and so forth as an opening to a question when the Orders of the Day are called is an abuse of the rules of the House. Also a Member in putting a question cannot state an opinion, he must confine his observations to those which are absolutely necessary. Perhaps this might assist the Honourable Members in putting their questions in the future.

There being no further questions we will now proceed to Orders of the Day under Motions for the Production of Papers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

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

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

Ms Millard: Very much so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, THAT copies of all letter pertaining to the Arctic Winter Games which were sent to communities outside of Whitehorse be tabled in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Mrs. Watson: Can we not speak to the motion?

Mr. Speaker: No, this motion, as all Members know, is non-debatable.

Motion agreed to

PUBLIC BILLS

Bill Number 1: Third Reading

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 1, *Third Appropriation Ordinance, 1976-1977*, be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt a title to the Bill?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill Number 1 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources that Bill Number 1 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Bill Number 1 has passed this House.

Madam Clerk: Third reading, Bill 2, Mr. Hibberd.

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

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The business for this morning will be the completion of the Estimates, as we were reviewing them yesterday, and at 1:30, we will do the child care part of Health and Welfare and, subsequent to that, we will be looking into the Housing Corporation estimates for this year.

On the completion of those things, we will go back into carrying on with the Main Estimates, Health and Welfare.

In order for the witnesses to appear, I will now declare a brief recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order.

We are on Vote 8, Department of Justice, page 127, and we had stood over 800, Legal Services. We stood it over because there was some discussion about the concept of the new Department of Justice with a Director and then three reporting groups: Corrections, Administration and Legal Services. There was some discussion regarding that, as I recall, so we stood it over.

On Establishment 800

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I asked to have it stood over, and with respect, Mr. Chairman, I know this is quite a request to make, but I have not completed the research on the *Public*

Service Commission Ordinance that I was doing and hoped to complete and I wonder, with your consent, whether we could just consider it on Monday first thing when we go into Committee?

Mr. Chairman: Is that agreeable to the Committee?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I will stand this over again.

Establishment 800 stood over

Mr. Chairman: Ms Millard was about to ask some questions regarding expenditure recoveries and we do not have to pass these, but what is the question Ms Millard?

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, my question is on the expenditure recoveries on Transfer of Prisoners Agreement. I notice there is nothing in the Estimates for 1978-79 from a projected estimate of 1977-78 of \$26,000.

Mr. Chairman: That is on page 144 of the Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, the reason there is none in there is that we do not have any space. It is that simple. This transfer is an agreement between B.C. and Yukon for long-term sentences. For example, over a two year sentence in the penitentiary, there is provision in the agreement to spend the last part of the sentence here in the Territory, if the person is a resident before leaving.

There is no space available here to handle the people that might come under that agreement.

Ms Millard: But we are still transferring prisoners outside?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Yes. Any requiring, over a two year sentence, as I mentioned earlier.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, just to reconfirm that policy, does the prisoner have to have over two years of a sentence? Are some prisoners sent outside with two years less a day, or even less of a sentence?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, two years less a day normally remain in Yukon, over outside.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, just to confirm, normally does not mean always, correct?

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to get at is that we do have prisoners, Whitehorse prisoners, or Yukon prisoners, who are in institutions outside, mostly in British Columbia, and that is what this agreement was about, was the transfer of prisoners from here to there.

I just want some confirmation that we do still do that and we do have some prisoners outside and some who have actually less than two year sentences.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, not to our knowledge. There is no one with less than two years has been sent outside.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if the person involved in known to be from another jurisdiction, do we try to transfer them out and are we successful in doing that, if there is sentence is two years less a day, or less than two years?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it is the same situation as if the person were from Yukon and outside. They would be transferred in here. The reverse would be applied to an individual from another jurisdiction and if the province agreed to accept them for the latter part of their term, then they would be transferred to that jurisdiction.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, if I could add to that, that during the past few months when we have been under considerable strain in trying to accommodate the number of inmates sent to our Correctional Institute, the authorities have been reviewing each of these sentences to see whether or not there were people from outside Yukon who would be available to serve that sentence outside in their home jurisdictions. Unfortunately we are not getting very many from outside.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we are still on Justice are we?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we are.

Mrs. Watson: Can we discuss the revenue side of the budget at this time or will we deal with it—

Mr. Chairman: We were dealing with expenditure recoveries and revenue.

Mrs. Watson: Okay, fine.

Mr. Chairman: If you have any questions, that is on page 144 and 145. Anything further?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, under Expenditure Recoveries, National Parole Board, of course Members will realize that there is no recovery forecast for 1978-79 because the Parole Board has now established its office in Yukon, therefore, they will be undertaking that on their own.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on the Revenue, I see that we are \$20,000 less than last year. Was it just an overestimation of the revenue last year?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, there was an overestimation and we believe that people were more law abiding.

Mrs. Watson: They were what?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: More law abiding.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that seems rather contradictory though when we have a decline in the revenue, that we have an increase in the number in the Correctional Institution.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: That is a situation of hard core, as opposed to soft core, I am told, the difference in the crimes or the misdemeanors, I guess you could say.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further? We will then go the Department of Tourism and Economic Development, page 117, \$92,600; 1978-79 Main Estimate \$891,900. On page 118 are the Establishments. We will just pause a moment for Mr. Crosby to come down.

On Establishment 702

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 702, Tourism for a total of \$707,800.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman was there a question?

Mr. Chairman: Well usually the person responsible will indicate the reasons for any increase or decrease in the total amounts and then we can go into questions.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: There is an increase, Mr. Chairman, of one man year and that is for the Information Centres throughout Yukon. The increase in Operation and Maintenance is mainly due to salary changes and some increased costs of travel, there is transportation and rooms, printing, advertising costs have increased.

We have money in there to upgrade the information centre, that is maintenance, which was not in the previous year.

That is generally it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Bell. Any questions?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, we have an increase of one man year for the information centres, I wonder where that man year will be posted? Or where is the increase in staff? Is it for Whitehorse or is it one of the other centres?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it is outside of Whitehorse. We suspect that it will be Destruction Bay, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, my comment and question will probably be of a general nature, but everytime I look at this one and I see the Department of Tourism, certainly the Department of Tourism, still under an appointed person, it just makes me furious, because we have stood up in this House I do not know how many times and suggested that this portfolio should have been under an elected person.

I am really wondering why the heck that decision again was not made? What was the matter, when are we going to see that happen, because certainly the tourism industry, is one that produces revenue and we are always saying we should be controlling those areas that, you know, we have revenue-producing capability.

To me, as I say, I just cannot quite fathom this. It should have been done. When are we going to see that happen?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say when it will be done.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, it was a straight request of whether the new Executive Committee Member, on top of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, which there was a strong lobby for an elected Member to be in charge of, also by Resolution of this House, that Members wanted, as the elected Member in charge of Renewable Resources. Once again, a strong lobby from the public, from this House, for it to be under the control of an elected Member, whether, with those two departments, a Department of Economic Development and Tourism could also be handled by that new Executive Committee Member.

There is just not enough hours in the day or enough ability in one Member to be able to handle those three separate portfolio responsibilities, and two out of the three was all that would be acceptable and could even be thought of bringing under a new Member.

The decision was made that Renewable Resources and Consumer and Corporate Affairs were two areas every bit as valid as the Department of Tourism and Economic Development. That is just simply the decision that was made amongst the four elected Executive Committee Members.

The direct question was asked to handle Tourism and Economic Development, on top of the two and no, it was not possible.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I must express my difference with the Honourable Member. Mr. Chairman, when I heard the re-organization and the formation of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Corporate Affairs portion of it is a purely administrative department and the Territorial Secretary was one of the last ones, I think, that should have been taken over by an elected person. The consumer aspect of it, yes, I could see where that should be with an elected person, but when you look at all the rest of it, Motor Vehicles, Workers' Compensation, Safety Inspections, Labour Standards, all of those, those are purely administrative things defined in legislation and regulations. Whereas Tourism certainly is one area where you need political input into the guidance, and I am saying guidance, of promotion of tourism and in the delivery of tourism within Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I wonder if I could ask another question of the witness?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: We have an increase of one man year, yet we have a decrease in the total budget for Tourism from 1977 to 1978, and I do not believe there has been an overexpenditure in the Supplementary. How do we explain a \$30,000 decrease and yet have an extra man year?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, that resulted from the transfer of Information Services to the new Information Resources Department. That is part of the reasoning.

Mrs. Watson: So Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witness has an exact amount of what the actual Tourism budget then has been increased this year? If Information Services have been taken out of \$741,000, and Tourism alone now is \$707,000. What is the increase from last year?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just add that there was some difficulty in making the comparisons in actually interpolating the exact figures. So it may not be easy or correct

to compare those figures. If you want us to come back with some other kinds of figures, we could try and juggle them, but we had some difficulty with those because there were so many changes within the Department; people coming in and people going out, studies done and studies left out. There were some studies done last year that were not carried forward this year. So there is a difficulty in those figures, Mrs. Watson, and I apologize for that, but we could try again if you would like us to.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, no I would not ask the Treasurer to go to that extent. I can word the question is the Tourism Branch then in 1978-79, are they budgeting for normal increase such as salary increases and increases because of inflation, or are you planning on any new programs or any new studies?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, we have no new programs and we have budgeted for a standard inflationary increase and exactly the way that the Member stated it is the way it was done.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions?

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my question is on the grants part, which I think is a very important part of Tourism. The contribution that is made by the organizations in smaller communities and people trying to do things for Tourism is very important and I see there has not been an increase in there.

I am wondering if there is some kind of policy for this and also what kind of grant applications have we been getting? Are we using up the whole \$20,000 and do you have to turn some applications back because there is not enough money?

Really, what I think might be happening is that people are discouraged from applying because there is not enough money for the kinds of things that need to be done in Tourism.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, one moment, we will see if we have a breakdown on how they were granted.

Mr. Chairman, the money was distributed broadly to museums and to the Chamber of Commerce, for their visitor centre, and the demands always exceed the amount, that is, the requests for grants always exceed the amount that we have.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, then that brings up my original question. That was: why is that the policy? Why are we not responding to the requests that we have and the applications that we have with a greater increase in the grant section here?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, we are, at the present time, looking at a change in policy.

Ms Millard: While we are on grants, where is the grant to the YVA, in this?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, that is under Development, Primary 20, \$45,000.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have some comments with respect to the program that was carried out by the Department and the Yukon Visitors' Association. It was a joint program the Department did fund. Was that successful in the opinion of, maybe Mr. Crosby could answer that, I do not know. A little rundown on if you are planning on doing that again.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Tourism and Yukon Visitors' Association entered into a co-operative program last year, to carry out certain marketing activities in Canada and the United States.

The program was segmented into a cross-Canada tour, using the Yukon Frantic Follies as the showpiece, into the Alaska Travel Show, in co-operation with the State of Alaska, which involved taking the travel show to forty American cities, the production of a "Discover Canada's Yukon" tour booklet, product listing that was produced by the industry in the Yukon Territory, and some other portions of the marketing program, which we did co-operatively through a marketing council which was established to expend these funds.

In our estimation and from the return that we have received

to date, the program was most successful.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, do they plan on doing it jointly with the Yukon Visitor's Association again this year, the same type of thing in promotion of market?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are. Mr. Chairman, an example of the success of the joint venture, that struck me as a beginner in this business, was they had one visit to Australia, a joint visit, and they had one client call with the Ansett Airlines, and the result of that one visit was three tours, 200 people came to the Yukon. Our joint investment was approximately \$1,500, and the estimated revenue from those 200 people was \$12,000. It is significant in that it was a first and one call that you could see the results that can be obtained.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, just a question I wanted to ask before. Are there any plans under way to expand this joint program to Europe and other countries. There are a significant amount of people coming over from Europe. Since the financial situation in Europe is much, much better than North America, are there any plans under way to expand this thing?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, yes, Mr. Crosby and I were discussing that in the past week, and the West German market apparently appears to be a very lucrative one and we are going to try to reach it.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, the Treasurer mentioned there were some studies done and some studies left out. I wonder if we could have an identification of those and the dollars that would be concerned with each?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, we did in fact identify some of those during discussion on Supplementaries, so we do not have that information now, but we could bring it forward if it is required.

Mr. Lengerke: I would like to know.

Mr. Chairman: Any further on 702?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the witnesses have any idea whether the tours that normally are quite a part of our tourism, that come up in the summer to Whitehorse and Dawson, whether they have had any problems booking accommodation for this year, and possibly for next year, because of the extra pressures that are being placed on our hotel accommodation?

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Chairman, I assume the Member is referring to possible pressures as a result of economic development and construction. The problem is that finding accommodation for the number of tours that want to come to Yukon each year is always difficult, because we compress the season into a relatively short period of time. I do not expect this situation to improve until we have more accommodation in the Territory.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, then actually some of the tours may be turned aside because of the even greater inability within the next few summers to accommodate them.

Mr. Crosby: That is correct, but we also must keep in mind that there are several hotel projects on paper at the present time, which we hope will alleviate the situation somewhat.

Mrs. Watson: One more question, Mr. Chairman, and that is regarding some of the statements that were made on the news this morning, regarding the Honda company advertising using the roads of the Yukon Territory as a model to be used as the worst roads in North America, and how well the Honda stood up to these roads.

I wonder what the Government of the Yukon Territory is planning to counteract the type of advertising that Honda has carried out on our behalf?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I just got a copy of the ad this morning, so we really have not started. We have started discussion on it, that is all.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, you will be taking some sort of action, even if it is just a strong letter.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer Mr. Lengerke's question.

One of the studies that was discussed in the 1977-'78 supplementaries was the Tourism Development Strategy Study, which was, again, for '77-'78, is not in for '78-'79. Strategy study?

Mr. Lengerke: Why not?

Mr. Sherlock: Well, perhaps you can ask Mr. Crosby.

Mr. Lengerke: You are going to bring that forward?

Mr. Chairman, were there others, because you mentioned others. You said that there was a number of them.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make, just that there was no easy way of arriving at comparative figures, because there were so many adjustments and I threw in the fact that there were some studies that were done in '78 and not carried forward into '79. I do not have a list of those studies.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I notice that there are no recoveries from the Department of Tourism, the Federal Government. Did we not carry on any activities, or are we not proposing to carry on any activities that can be cost-shared with this Department?

Mr. Sherlock: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, we do have some recoveries in the studies that we have had underway. The Tourism Development Strategy costs, we did get \$30,000 from the two levels of government and the Pipeline Impact Study, that is the impact of the pipeline on Tourism, was almost totally funded by Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and the Canadian Government Office of Tourism.

So, we did get some recoveries.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that relates to '77-'78 year, though.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Mr. Berger: Just a question, Mr. Chairman, either one of the witnesses maybe could answer. With the increase of traffic that the Tourist department expects over the 60-Mile Road, either way, going east or west, during the next three or four years, does the Department think that the road facility, at the present time, is adequate enough to handle this type of increase in traffic, if there is an increasing factor expected?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the projects planned for on the road are, and Mr. McKinnon would have to speak to that.

I think one of our problems would be the Alaska road, leading to our road, I guess they are about equal in width and we would have difficulty there.

Where it would affect the flow of traffic, I could not say.

Mr. Berger: Especially, Mr. Chairman, in the view that Alaska is upgrading their particular section from Tok Junction or from Forty Mile Roadhouse to the boundary, they are replacing bridges and upgrading the highway. My question was does your Department think that the present road facility on the Canadian side alone, never mind Alaska, adequate, especially from Mile 39 on this Highway to Mile 68, the boundary?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am qualified to speak on the conditions of the highways. I could only speak personally, and I would probably agree with his thinking.

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I think a really important point has been brought up. I know the Member from the Klondike's discussions and my discussions with the Klondike Visitors' Association, the immediate point is always highways and what is happening with them. Of course we know that is not your

responsibility, but do you take it upon yourself to use your position as an advisor on Tourism to the Department of Highways to suggest changes which may accommodate tourism in Yukon? I would hope that you would be doing that and you cannot just say it is not your problem because it is, because it is part of the Tourism problem.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: The answer to the question Mr. Chairman, would be definitely yes.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, now that the Information Services has been taken out of Tourism, we still have Information Centres within the communities of the Yukon Territory and I gather that their responsibility is going to be disperse information regarding tourism. However, whether we like it or not, I can foresee the next few years when travellers come into the Yukon Territory, they are in fact going to go to those information centres and they are going to want information different from information that tourism provides as the normal procedure at the present time.

Have Tourism given this consideration and are you going to try to make some accommodation for this demand, this normal demand that is going to be placed upon the centres?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it has been considered, and we would hope that we will be able to have the centres, have the information on hand where to direct the people, rather than attempt to answer the questions in the immediate future, at least be able to tell them where and how to get the information they need.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that might be a bit of a problem if you are in Beaver Creek or if somebody is there, where do you get information, they will say, "Go to Whitehorse." I would hope that the Government would be looking at something a little different than that, and probably the area I should be questioning is when we get to Information Services.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Watson. Anyone else?

Establishment 702 agreed to

On Establishment 705

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 705, Economic Research and Planning, \$184,100.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is an increase of two man years, one of them being a clerk for Library and Data Processing and Public Liaison and one a Research Planning Officer 1, the cost for this gentleman will be fifty per cent recoverable from Statistics Canada.

His function will be to liaise with the Statistics Canada to assist the public and territorial government departments who are dealing with Statistics Canada and assisting us in generating statistics with them. In other words, it makes the Statistics Canada expertise available to us, through this individual and opens the door to us.

The amount recoverable is \$20,000.

That is pretty well it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, what do they do?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I have a list of the various projects here, that takes several pages, that they have engaged in in the—

Mr. Chairman: We would like to hear. I think all the Members are vitally concerned that this particular unit is probably not doing much of anything because we do not hear what they are doing. This would be a good opportunity for you to tell them just what they do.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Okay, Mr. Chairman.

Spacial Price Survey for the Communities of Whitehorse, Dawson City and Watson Lake; wage and price control, they are studying that now to determine the feasibility of retaining the AIB program in the Yukon during pipeline construction.

They were involved in the General Development Agreement strategy and in developing the contents. They developed the Government Decentralization paper, Gambling in the Yukon. They did a study on health care records to examine the adequacy of the records as a data base for social research.

They did a labour force survey for Yukon, or, they are doing, I should say. It is 30 per cent complete. It is a project to determine the feasibility and run a pilot study of labour force survey in Yukon, in conjunction with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

They have completed a study on prefabricated housing, to determine the possibility of developing the industry in the Yukon.

They have just begun looking into, it is partially complete, a Yukon Government owned insurance company, to determine the possibility of that.

They have partially completed a study on the feasibility of the cost of constructing a gas distribution system in various communities in Yukon.

They have assisted in preparing data for speeches for the Commissioner.

They were involved in preparing the green paper for the Pipeline Information and Impact Centre. They spent some time negotiating an agreement with Statistics Canada to cost share the representative in Yukon. I just mentioned that earlier.

They have done rent surveys, another spacial price survey, which is undergoing right now.

A group of interested social scientists to promote Yukon research capabilities, they took part in a study with them.

They have just about completed an examination of the Electrical Franchise Agreement.

One of the major projects they are looking at soon will be an economic model for the Yukon. That is, the development of a model to identify the impact and where Yukon should be going in the next number of years.

They have studied utility companies to examine the structure of utility companies in the rest of Canada and the laws governing them. That one is 30 per cent complete.

A statistics inventory to identify and organize how and what information is available and put it into the data system. They are proposing a study of the supply of gas to Yukon communities, electrification of the pipeline, a benefit cost analysis of that particular project.

Then they have a number of proposed programs. They were involved in Yukon Outdoor Recreation Survey Study, a review of social services programs for the aging to determine the costs and benefits of various programs, they are involved in a review of freight rate increase announced by White Pass & Yukon Route, and a review of rate increases by NCP, and they have spacial price survey using the reference date February 1st, and they are doing that at this minute.

That is a number of them, Mr. Chairman. I could provide a detailed list for each Member if you would like, at a later date.

Mr. Chairman: That would be appreciated, Mr. Bell.

Mr. Lengerke: Just further to that, Mr. Chairman, do they keep track of the time that was spent on each? Is there an allocation so we can sort of figure out costs that are involved?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: I am sure they have, Mr. Chairman, they are very statistically minded, and I am sure they keep track.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, that was what I was wondering. Maybe when you are supplying that list they could maybe tell us too that the time, how many people on each had to be used, and the dollars involved.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one of the most interesting studies that I noted that they are working on right now, appar-

ently it is not completed, is the feasibility of retaining the AIB restrictions or guidelines during the pipeline construction in the Yukon Territory. My question would be, if the decision was made to do this, how would they implement this type of a decision, under what legislation would they do this in Yukon?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot give a direct answer. We just finished speaking with AIB, and we are just really in the preliminary stages of this, so we have not reached that stage at all. I would be difficult to give a direct answer.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am interpreting it incorrectly. Are they at the present time negotiating with the AIB so that they could be the monitoring agency for the AIB for the next while we go off controls, as they are with other provinces? Or is the study being done to determine the feasibility of continuing the AIB guidelines during the pipeline construction?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it is the second half of the Member's remarks, to determine the feasibility.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, sometime ago, about three months ago to be exact, I asked a question about Economic Research and Planning Unit, concerning constitutional positions in the Territorial Government. I do not see any mention in the lists that Mr. Bell gave us of this.

I just presume, then, they are not working on it, although I do not have an answer from my question from December 12th, whether or not they are.

Another thing that I understood they were working on, in fact, there is a study produced, is on the land prices in Whitehorse, land property to be bought to build a house on. I did not notice any mention of that either.

I wonder if he could comment on those two items?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, the list, as I said, was not complete. I was simply giving you examples of what they had. As I said, I can promise to bring you a complete list, and they would be included in that list, I am sure.

Ms Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps he could take the opportunity, then, since it has been three months since my question originally in December, on the constitutional question. Just what are they doing in that and what can we expect in the way of a study or a plan?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to do that.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just further to the list of the projects completed, can Mr. Bell tell me if outside consultants were used in doing any of the papers, and reinforcing some of the conclusions?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, there is no indication on my report that there were outside consultants used, but I cannot confirm it. I cannot see any indication where they were.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the witness could indicate whether the Economic Research and Planning Unit did a study, an in-depth study, on property taxation, assessments and mill rates, uniform and variable mill rates, in the Territory?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I just received an up-date early this morning and it is not on that list, and I cannot find it on this one, so that is another question I will have to take up and reply at a later date.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I will take his word. It does not appear as though there has been one done, and the policy did not look as though there had been a study done either.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Ms Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, also in the answer to one question that I had about the Closure of Clinton Creek Mines

Study, there was to be a study done, in conjunction with Indian Affairs and Northern Development, on government's involvement in mining in Yukon, and I understand that is under-way at this time.

I wonder if Mr. Bell could give us an idea of how long that may take and when we may anticipate that study finished?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I have asked the same question of the Research Unit and I have not received a reply. When I do, I will give a copy to the Member.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

Anyone else?

I wonder if the Economic Research and Planning Unit has undertaken an investigation into the possibilities of the cloning of bureaucrats?

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Not at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Establishment 705 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Any questions dealing with Recoveries on page 123? Well, we will require you again on Monday. Will you be here Monday to deal with that one item in Justice?

You can be excused now.

Mr. Deputy Commissioner: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The next Vote to consider is Vote 5, Department of Human Resources, Main Estimate \$4,216,000. On page 83 are the Establishments and we will go to 530, Administration.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, you wish to begin now before the noon recess?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I think we could go through it, unless there is some problem, do you need other witnesses?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: No, but I have a great deal of material to present, Mr. Chairman, and we are expected at the Youth Centre for lunch at noon, and I wondered if we could have the agreement of Committee to let us go now so that we will not be too late getting back.

Mr. Chairman: I did not realize you were due there at noon. We will recess then until 2 o'clock to give everybody a chance to see what is going on at the Youth Centre and the preparation or leaving the papers around.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Until 2 then.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order.

A request was made for some witnesses to attend during the discussion of the day care and these witnesses are now present, Mrs. Cummins and Mrs. Lynn Garner.

On Establishment 533

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 533, Day Care, \$35,000.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to take a moment just to do a general introduction to the subject of day care, since we have not yet mentioned it this year during the Estimates.

I do not think that any Members need me to re-enforce again the importance we are placing on day care in our Human Resources Branch.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am being inundated by paper from another Department.

Some three and a half years ago, when I was given the responsibility for the portfolios of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation, one of the most imminent problems on the doorstep was that of a requirement for support from this Government for day care centres being operated in Yukon.

At that time, there was no capital grant or operating grant, or any other form of subsidy to day care, except the one which still exists and that is subsidization for day care for children of parents who are clients in our social assistance program.

This is still in effect, Mr. Chairman, and we budget annually

something like \$35,000 toward that particular subsidy, for that particular group of parents.

But there was not in place at that time, and there is not in place at this time, Mr. Chairman, any kind of subsidy for day care for the working parents of children who are not receiving social assistance. It is almost the same pattern we see in any government program, Mr. Chairman, because it is always those in need who require our priorities and for whom the dollars are spent.

The people who are above that needy level of income in our modern day world, are the people who are expected to pay their own way.

Mr. Chairman, we went through a great deal of time and consideration and debate two years ago on this subject. I just want to remind all Members what happened at that time. The Department of Welfare had spent considerable amount of time and energy in discussions and planning with the Executive of the Yukon Child Care Association. I know this to be true because I took part in some of those meetings myself.

There were two main requirements of the Association in facing Government with their requests: one was that there must be some kind of regulations in effect to determine what standards applied in any place taking care of children. Since that time and during that time, our Branch has worked on the preparation of regulations and these are ready in draft now. They have not been imposed, Mr. Chairman, because if they are, there will be a number of day care centres required to upgrade certain standards in their establishments and this costs money. So that brought us to the second request of the Child Care Association. First for regulations and standards to be imposed, second for funding in order to make those standards financially possible to all day care centres.

All of this discussion had taken place before the Budget Session of two years ago, and, at that Session, Mr. Chairman, in our Vote, we brought in an estimate, additional of \$50,000, and a proposal for a subsidized scale, a sliding scale subsidy to day care, for parents using those day care centres whose total family income was \$17,500 a year or less.

I would like to say just a word about that ceiling, Mr. Chairman, because this Branch really went to bat to get one even that high, through the Canada Assistance Plan officials in Ottawa and particularly through Mr. Howard Clifford, who is the day care senior official in the National Health & Welfare Department.

The cut-off point for any such subsidy program to be cost-shared, under Canada Assistance Plan, up until that time had been considerably less than \$17,500 and we argued with the Federal officials that we had a special case here in Yukon, because of the higher costs of living here and because working parents faced higher bills and higher mortgages and, therefore, it was not a fair scale to apply to Yukon residents. After some discussions, Mr. Chairman, we did get the ceiling raised to \$17,500.

Our proposal, which was made at that time, to utilize the \$50,000 that I had obtained in the Estimates for day care subsidies, would have been paid to the day care centres, not to the parents, based on the income of the parent using the centre, so much per child, per parent, per income, in order that the day care centre would have funds to upgrade the facilities, and, I hope, increase the "salaries" paid to their workers, because they are not salaries.

At the same time, because of the sliding scale subsidy, there would not be the necessity to increase the fee to the parent using the day care centre. This had taken a considerable amount of work and we were pretty proud of our plan when we brought it in.

Unfortunately, the plan was turned down. It was turned down by the Yukon Child Care Association, on the advice of certain researchers who looked at the program and advised

them not to accept it.

It was also turned down by some Members of this House, if you recall, Mr. Chairman, who challenged me on the program, saying that if we were going to subsidize working parents in day care, we should also come up with a program to give the same benefits to parents who stayed home with their children. Well, I still never found the answer to that one, Mr. Chairman.

In the meantime, we continued our discussions with the Child Care Association and day care sponsors and the understanding was that we would try to come up with some kind of acceptable proposal. At the same time, the Federal Government was changing the rules of the game in the Federal Department of Health and Welfare. They had introduced a new *Social Services Act* which never got passed in last year's Parliament, and is still on the books now. They had also proposed a new means of funding such services, not under the Canada Assistance Plan any longer where we pay 50 per cent and the Federal Government pays 50 per cent of the legitimate costs under very strict guidelines imposed by the Federal Government, but the new system of block funding for social services.

I spoke briefly on this subject in the House, Mr. Chairman, last week after returning from the Federal-Provincial meeting of Ministers of Social Services to discuss block funding. We have, through the months, here in Whitehorse, through the Director of Social Welfare, Human Resources Branch, and the President of the Yukon Child Care Association, come to a realization and an understanding and an agreement that until the details of this new funding system were known and clearly understood, there was little point in reworking another subsidy finance program.

We now know, as of last week, Mr. Chairman, that this Government, its Department of Human Resources, will receive only block funding for such items as day care, and that to institute any new program under the new block funding, we will receive \$5 per capita for new programs, which is fine if you are in Ontario or BC, but not terribly helpful in Yukon. Furthermore, that money will not be available until the *Social Services Act* has been passed and the new program is in place.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is, and I suppose it is a case of crying over spilled milk, and I am sorry to do this, but I want my branch to get credit for what they did try to do. If we had imposed the sliding scale subsidy system two years ago with our \$50,000 as a beginning, there would now be a program on the books in this Government, and in this Government method of funding, a program which is already in place is in the "A" level of budget and we could have increased gradually the amounts given annually to that subsidy program. But any new program to be introduced in this Government, Mr. Chairman, as you probably well know is put in the "B" level of the budget and only if there are funds available does anything in the "B" level get to see the light of day.

The only amounts, at present, in the Main Estimates before you, is the \$35,000 item which is there for day care subsidy and that is only for parents in need. It was almost fully subscribed, as you saw in the Supplementary votes. I do not anticipate there will be any decrease in demand by parents in need for that service.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that because of the delays in federal legislation and because of delays in the imposition of their new financing system, which Treasury will tell you has been most complex and most frustrating, because no governments across Canada have known what they were going to get, under what headings, for cost-sharing in social services, we have no other item in this year's budget for outright grants to working parents for day care subsidies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, within the last few days, one of the Honourable Members has informed us in this House that the financial state of at least day care centre is at the sad point where they are looking at having to close and this I had not been informed of until she brought it to our attention.

I cannot allow day care centres in Yukon to close. This Government should not allow day care centres in Yukon close. The people who are using them must have those facilities continued and have them available, not only for the people we have here now, Mr. Chairman, who are working hard to pay mortgages and pay their taxes and raise their children in the North, but, if you want the long-range view, you have got to have enriched day care facilities in place, long before there is any impact from a pipeline construction project.

This Government made a commitment, Mr. Chairman, to the Lysyk Inquiry last summer, that this type of service must be provided for the benefit of Yukoners before they get hit.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that it has not been this Department's policy to discourage support to day care. It has been this Department's policy to try to encourage it and try to find funds for the most acceptable means of providing that support.

I know that the Yukon Child Care Association have been recently awarded a Manpower grant to do an update survey on the requirements of facilities available and every bit of information they are able to obtain in that way is very valuable to us as justification for providing this kind of subsidy.

I would like, now, Mr. Chairman, if we may, to hear from the witnesses and I will be very interested in what the various Members have to say on this subject.

Ms Garner: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on behalf of Lillian McGuire who is President of the YCCA organization who unfortunately had to be out of town today. The presentation I have to make is not in written form to be distributed at the moment, but I could certainly have it available, if it would be of help to the Members by the first of the week.

First I think that I should direct myself to the income subsidy. We would certainly like to see this retained and a recent poll that was taken of day care users, we found that there was 60 per cent of our parents taking home an income of \$1,600, that is a \$1,600 net income. In essence this means that they are barely able to pay day care costs for one child, much less if there are two and I have a breakdown of expenses for a family of four as an example if it is requested.

The YCCA would certainly be prepared to present a sliding scale subsidy program at a later date if it was required. I should mention that I believe the reason the original program was rejected, or the main reason it was rejected was because along with the program there was a requirement that we raise our fees to \$185 a month which meant that we had to raise fees for all those parents above the subsidy level, which was most of our parents by 35 per cent nearly overnight.

In addition to that, we would like to propose that our grant be considered to come directly to the day care centres in Yukon, based on spaces available. The figures that we are considering at the moment are in the first year \$1.25 per day per space, which makes a cost of \$1.25 times 233 spaces times 260 days or \$75,725. On this amount we cannot meet all of the standards that we have presently proposed, we would make our first priority support staff. It would be a part-time position and this would be staff to help with the cleaning and cooking and general maintenance in order to pretrain workers to spend more time with the children.

If it was possible our second priority would be further program development. This is in the area of education and social awareness programs for the children.

In the second year, our proposal that we receive \$2.50 per day per space, which amounts to \$151,450. At this point we would still be unable to meet all of the standards that we have presented, but our first priority in this year would be program development.

The second priority would be a 20 per cent increase in salaries. Our salaries at the moment for our directors are approximately 20 per cent above the minimum wage, but our

general workers are making in the area of \$600 per month. If we could raise this to approximately \$720, we may be able to attract additional trained staff and retain them.

In the third year we are proposing \$3.75 per day per space to make a total of \$227,175. At this point we feel that we should be able to implement all of the standards we have now proposed. The undetermined factors that we do not have information on at the moment are general population growth, and of course, the impact of the pipeline on additional spaces required and increased rents.

When this information is known, we would have to reassess our position and look at alternate terms of funding.

I want to note that we do expect all parents to participate in day care costs and those who are in high income brackets should pay the total fee. We do not expect the Government to assume all funding responsibility. We have had and will continue to have fund raising projects.

However, these are not guaranteed funds and they do not allow us enough operating capital to provide quality care for the children. We really must have some Government assistance, at this time, to provide quality care for the children.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

Is there any discussion on day care?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could be told what the fee is now in the day care centres, per month, per child.

Mrs. Cummins: Mr. Chairman, at present, there are five day care centres in Whitehorse. The Child Care Centre is \$140 per month; Happy Hours is \$140 per month; Northern Lights \$150 per month; Them Mah \$150 per month; Jack Horner \$135 per month.

If you would like the figures on children, I have them as well. I believe there is a total of 233 children, at present, in day care centres throughout the Territory, approximately 140.

There are presently two day care centres that are in the red and are in danger of closing.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, just out of curiosity, have these been raised in the last year, the cost per child per month, in the last year, or, what was the last year and the year before for costs?

Mrs. Garner: It seems that there has been a substantial increase. I think Mrs. McGuire would have to address herself to this. I have not been here for that long.

But, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no substantial increase. We have tried very hard to hold our fees at a minimum.

Mrs. Cummins: At present, at the Them Mah Day Care, we have just gone through a fee increase. We increased our fees in December from \$110 a month to \$120 a month.

We are in bad financial trouble and, as of the first of March, have had to increase our fees again from \$120 a month to \$150 a month, in order to break even.

We are, in an attempt to keep costs down, using federal government training programs to keep staff.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could be told what happens when a family has more than one child. Do they get a reduced rate or is it straight across the board?

Mrs. Cummins: I speak for my centre. The fees for one child are, as I say, \$150, and there is a sliding scale. I believe it is \$235 for two and roughly \$300, for three children or more.

So there is a decrease per child per family.

Ms Millard: I would like the witnesses to tell us if they are having to limit the number of children in the day care centres. Do you have more people asking for day care than you are accommodating at this point?

Mrs. Garner: There are two centres in the downtown area, Mr. Chairman, that do have a waiting list. This is not so for the centres who are further out from the downtown area.

Ms Cummins: However, most of the centres are extremely limited in space and the number of children that they can take care of. Also, they are all in rented space and are unsure of how much longer they are going to be able to retain that.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witnesses could tell me, or the Minister probably, that the \$17,000 she was speaking of, that is more or less the limit of the possibility of using the day care centres other than maybe paying their own way I would say, I hope, because I really believe that under that, possibly this use is fine, however is that considered by using the person that is bringing the child there or is that considered as the family income?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, that was the joint family income, now that was gross. But as our Director at the time explained, the Child Care Association there are a number of things that could be deducted from that which I do not think was really clearly understood at the time. The reason we chose 17.5 as the cut-off date for government subsidies, the government cut-off rate for government subsidy was that was the figure which we had negotiated for special mortgages through CMHC and I felt that if one Federal department could approve that for one reason, they could let us have it for another. So we won that battle.

But now that requirement under the Canada Assistance Plan is simply gone, Mr. Chairman, because there is no cost-sharing now. It is straight block funding. The Federal Government gives us the number of dollars that we got for all our social services cost-shared in a base year, and they say there is the money use it.

Now the problem that I tried to explain to Honourable Members the other day was that the base they have chosen for this funding, this new system is 77-8, which is a very bad year to base our costs on in Yukon because we have about six new programs waiting in the wings that this department has been trying implement day care, home maker, senior citizens, Meals on Wheels, all kinds of things that Mr. Treasurer will tell you, I have been in there battling for. We have not had them because there was no money. Now, a Federal Department is basing what we are going to get in the next ten years on what they gave us in 77-78 with a small increase annually, which does not take into consideration any new programs or any growth in population requiring additional services. In the first year, Mr. Chairman, the Yukon Territory's dollar difference in this one department of Social Services under block funding is \$160,400 less than we got in 77-78, and it goes on correspondingly until, in the tenth year of that plan, unless something radical changes, we will be down \$1,536,800 in our social welfare.

That, Mr. Chairman, is why I went to Ottawa and that, Mr. Chairman, is what I brought to the personal attention of the Minister of Health and Welfare, and that is what Madame Begin has promised to go back to Cabinet on, and try to get us a better deal, because, in the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories, block funding is a disaster. We do not have the population to make it work.

Now, I am sorry to detract from the time of the Child Care Association, but those are the facts of life as far as financing this year goes. That is what I have been up against.

Mr. Lengerke: So, Mr. Chairman, just am I correct and the Minister will answer I am sure, in assuming then that the block type financing is the situation now, so, in other words, the standards or the income test that we used to have to meet, under the Canada Assistance Program, is no longer in effect then—

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: No longer.

Mr. Lengerke: So, we would have to set out own income type of criteria if we were going to have a program such as this?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: That is correct. If this Government wanted to, it could give a deficit grant to every day care centre. It could give a capital grant. It could give so much per unit per child, whatever. And it can impose its own guidelines, if it had the money.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the normal ratio of the number of children to child care worker is and what is it in Yukon?

Mrs. Garner: I do not have that information, Mr. Chairman, at the moment. This was the ratio of workers to children?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Ms Millard: If, even, Mr. Chairman, they have a general idea. I certainly do not need the specifics to it.

Mrs. Cummins: I speak for our Centre, Mr. Chairman. There are presently, I believe, twenty-seven full-time children and it varies between six to eight part-time children, and, because we are open from 7:30 in the morning until 6:00 in the evening, we have to stagger our staff and we have a total of four full-time staff and one part-time staff. So that would give you our ratio.

We are considered to be the best staffed centre in the Territory, at the present time.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, are all four child care workers there at one time, or it is staggered throughout the day or throughout the week?

Mrs. Cummins: It is staggered throughout the day. We have to have at least two people in attendance at all times. We have two starting at 7:30 and then two, or one may come in at nine and then another at, say, ten, to work through until six o'clock in the evening, so that we can keep two staff members there at all times, in case of emergency.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, in talking about the day cares in Yukon, just what is the rate charged in Watson Lake for the day care that is down there?

Ms Garner: Mr. Chairman, it is \$7.50 a day.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a little more information from our own side. We had hoped, as the Yukon Child Care Association did, that the new *Social Services Act* would be passed because under it, there were going to be higher acceptable ceilings for income for subsidy for day care.

I think we have to admit here that the figures we worked on for a plan we proposed two years ago are now three to four years old in actual fact. The inflation factor was not considered since that time. You have got to face the facts of life and that is that although some salaries have increased, so has the cost of living and so has everything else in the overhead of a day care centre. So I would be the first to admit that the figures we proposed two years ago are not valid now in subsidies and I would be the first to support something higher than a 17.5 all family income annually for some form of subsidy in day care.

We had been waiting for proposals from the Child Care Association regarding what kind of subsidy they felt would best suit their needs and as I said earlier, they in turn have been waiting to see what block funding was going to bring. None of this had jelled up until this point. But the sliding scale proposal, based on net income to allow subsidization to lower income families, is still the desired direction as far as my branch is concerned, over and beyond the people who are in actual need, who will always get the help they require. There is still an area which we feel is justifiable for a subsidy.

If Honourable Members do not wish to go that way, one of the alternatives the Child Care Association has said, and I think you are all in possession of documents from them on this proposal, their first one, alternative "A" is now really out of the picture because the Canada Assistance Plan will no longer apply and they based it on that. The second one is funding under the *Social Service Act* which has yet not been finalized. The third one under block funding proposes that under this

scheme, actual costs of day care would be established and a realistic fee set. The difference between the actual costs and the set fee would be the amount of the subsidy per child given to the Centre for their costs. I have no problem with that kind of proposal because that is direct financing of the Centre for their upgrading and staff improvement, and that is what we are all trying to achieve.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I have another question for the witnesses: \$185 per month per child, or the first child initially here in the day care, is that correct?

Ms Cummins: That is what we would have had to raise our fees to, no.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Oh, I see, okay. What is the going rate for day cares say in British Columbia or Alberta? Do you have any information on that?

Ms Garner: Pardon me, I did not hear the last.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The amount that would be charged to a family with one child to utilize the day care centre say in Vancouver or in Edmonton?

Ms Garner: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the Vancouver figures in particular, but in the areas in which I was working in BC, the rate as of the end of December was in the vicinity of \$7.50 a day.

There are a lot of cost factors that are different for B.C. Rents are lower, in farming areas it is often easier to supplement food costs with donations, and a great many other factors.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair, also, to point out that in British Columbia, the Provincial Government provides not only capital grants to day care for construction, but also subsidy grants for operating costs.

Hon. Mr. Lang: So, Mr. Chairman, that would work out to about \$157.50 a month on 21 days?

Mrs. Garner: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Any other discussion or any questions you would like to ask the witnesses?

Mr. Fleming: I am not quite clear on the whole situation and I never have been.

In the case of the day care centres, are you accepting children from people who are, say, a job of a wife receiving maybe \$15,000 and also a husband receiving \$15,000? Do the day care centres accept children from these people at a certain rate, or do they accept them at all? Not subsidized.

Mr. Garner: I am not sure that I understand the question, but fees are standard for everybody who comes to the day care centre. There is no change.

Perhaps I am not understanding the question.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, if I could assist, I think all Members have been provided with this sheet.

Mr. Fleming: I do not even know what that is all about.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Could I, please, Mr. Chairman, assist with it?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: This is a very quick work-up of some figures we were able to get only yesterday. This is a very brief breakdown of incomes of the people who use day care in Whitehorse.

On the left hand column, Mr. Chairman, monthly net income is exactly that. That is the monthly income of the parents who use that day care centre. That is combined family income, both parents working or single parent. That is their total money per month, take home pay.

Now, the centre column, Mr. Chairman, shows you the number of parents in that income bracket who are using the day care centres. So, you have two parents in the \$500, three in the \$600, two in the \$700 and so on, down to a total of 62, in this particular cross section we are looking at.

The right hand column, Mr. Chairman, gives us a percentage of the number of parents using day care in those particular income brackets. So that you see 3.23 per cent of the parents are in the \$500 per month bracket and you work through to 11.29 per cent in the \$800, and another 11.29 in the \$1200, and roughly 60 per cent of the parents using day care in Whitehorse, are earning \$1600 or less, per month, all family income, total family income.

You could say, then, on the other side of the picture, Mr. Chairman, that about 40 per cent of the parents who use day care, have a total family income of more than \$600 a month.

So you begin to see where the main number of users actually lies and I think you could say quite fairly that it is between \$800 and \$1,600 a month here. The people who are less than that are going to be subsidized under our Social Assistance Plan in any case. You have one user making \$2,900 or more, one at \$2,600, and one at \$2,500, two at \$2,300, four at \$2,100, and so on. That is a pretty good breakdown. I think that is a pretty fair picture.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I agree the picture is fine. That is all right. My problem is not really with the picture now that it has been explained, but my problem is with the income of these people and who pays what and how much. Does the 40 per cent that are over the \$17,000 pay the same rate, or subsidized at the same rate as a person being at \$500, that is actually my question?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, at present, all day care users pay the same fee per child, and we have just heard that they are from \$140 to \$150 per month per child. So it would matter if you were making a million dollars a month, you would be paying that amount and it would still be that amount if you were making \$100 a month.

Mr. Lengerke: It is interesting. Just another question with respect to the users. Of the 233 children that are in day care, how many of those children are from families that are over an income of \$20,000? Have you got that figure?

Ms Garner: We cannot give a figure at the moment as to how many children are involved in those families that are high income, but one can assume from the statistics that we have had that it would probably be one or two, not more.

Mr. Lengerke: So generally then a family usually has just one or not more than two children in day care?

Ms Garner: That is right, yes.

Mr. Fleming: My whole argument is being the same then with some of the other programs as you well know which ones I always stand up for. I do not really believe in not treating everybody equal, but I do believe that when a person is making enough that should pay their way and I do not believe they should be subsidized in any way, shape or form, if they want to use it. Maybe we would not have so many children to take care of in day care centres, because I can see here, I do not have a child myself, but I think I have been through the mill once or twice, you know, if you are getting this type of money per month that I see here at the bottom of the page from \$2,000 and up there, for a family even. Maybe I could be wrong in the City of Whitehorse due to the high taxes and so forth and so on. I could be wrong, I am not trying to say I am not particularly wrong. But I feel that there are many people who do not need to be subsidized in these areas that we are subsidizing and not really subsidizing the people that need it. That is my problem.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard, I do not believe anybody is being subsidized right now, except welfare cases.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: That is quite correct, Mr. Chairman, and I was about to remind all Honourable Members that the plan that we brought in before would have subsidized only those people below a certain income ceiling and I have not heard the final word from the Child Care Association, but I am sure that a number of their proposals have—, well, we have the

papers before us and the Honourable Member has one as well, which says, you know, a family of four with a net annual income of \$12,500 would get 100 per cent subsidy.

With \$14,500, a 70 per cent; \$16,500, 40 per cent, and so on. That was what they had proposed under the Social Service Act and the Child Care Association had agreed that that was the way to go.

So, I think there would be no great difficulty in finding a meeting ground here on what a cut-off point would in, and that they would accept. My problem two years ago was that they felt that cut-off point was too low.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, a question of the witnesses: if the situation was handled a little differently and the cut-off point was different, would that maybe, due to the fact that you might not get so many children to look after and you would still, possibly, have the same costs, would you not, in each day care centre? And possibly this might, in some way, go just the opposite to what I was feeling a moment ago, you know. Would it maybe do that?

Mr. Garner: A day care subsidy, as a personal answer, it certainly assists those families who are eligible for it, but, at the present time, the situation that we are in is that the fees that are coming in, and this is the way the income subsidy comes to us, is a per child fee. The fees are not, in themselves, high enough to cover our operating costs, if we endeavor to meet the standards we have proposed.

So, in addition to an income subsidy, we are asking for the basic grant, as I have presented it, to try and relieve that situation. If our fees are set at \$8.50 and our actual operating costs is \$9.26, say, we still have that difference to deal with, because the income subsidy gives us a fee of \$8.50, not more than that.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Are we referring to the income subsidy for families in need?

Mrs. Garner: Yes, definitely.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, I think that is where we are confusing some Honourable Members. I think the impression is getting abroad here that there is a subsidy in place now for all users of day care and we do not have such a thing. The only subsidy in place now is for families who are on our social assistance list and there is a subsidy paid to day care for those children.

Mrs. Garner is telling us, Mr. Chairman, that it is up to—

Mrs. Garner: Pardon me?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: How much per day?

Mrs. Garner: The fees for those people on social assistance are paid 100 per cent, to my understanding.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the witnesses, then, have you had consultations with parents and so forth that are not on any subsidy whatsoever and feel that your price for the services that you are giving are high enough at this time?

Mrs. Garner: Yes, parents very definitely feel that they are high enough.

Mr. Fleming: Maybe not, business is business.

Mrs. Cummins: Unfortunately, our costs are not decreasing at all. We still have to have, you know, the same amount of space, really, the same number of children.

We are proposing that the people who are presently getting subsidy, that it continue, but our concern is primarily the centres and keeping the staff and looking after the children who, you know, eventually go to school and be our future.

We are looking at five of the eight most important years in their life in their development, and we have no funds to pay qualified staff, that is providing we can get qualified staff.

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it then, the people who get a full subsidy are not really paying the full cost of what it costs to have that child in the day care centre, the per

dium cost of the day care centre is not met by the full subsidy, is that correct?

Ms Garner: Correct.

Ms Millard: So that in effect you almost have to feel you want to turn away the full subsidy because it is actually costing you money. If you did not have those clients in the day care centre it would not be costing you that money.

Ms Garner: That is correct.

Ms Millard: Correct. Also, I would like to have more idea of what the standards are that we keep discussing. If we could have just a brief idea of what kind of standards are trying to be met and are not being met at this point.

Ms Garner: I am sorry, could I hear the last part of the question again please?

Ms Millard: Mr. Chairman, just a brief expose of what kind of standards, we keep talking about these standards that we are trying to meet and are not meeting, and I am just wondering what they are. Is it a per child floor space or food or what?

Ms Garner: Mr. Chairman, there are basic standards to be considered in relation to staff-child ratios, in the amount of space that you have, physical space for each child, their nutritional needs have to be considered, safety needs, and they go on from there. Program needs of course follow that, the specific programs that we need for the child's development.

Ms Millard: Perhaps the witness could give us a general idea how far away we are from meeting standards that are now being met say outside Yukon?

Ms Garner: The basic safety and health needs are being met as far as Yukon is concerned. Space needs vary, some centres are very short of space, in fact I believe there is only one centre that would comply with BC standards which require 45 square feet per child to meet their standards. Program requirements, that falls in direct relation to the number of trained staff that you have in Yukon and at the moment I am of the understanding that there are only two or a maximum of three people who have actually had some post-secondary school education in relation to day care in Yukon.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, now the Member to my left mentioned the subsidy there, but when the children that you are getting subsidy for, and the children you are also not getting a subsidy for, in the total analysis, you receive the same amount for each one of those children per month, do you not?

Ms Garner: Yes.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may, then there are three things actually I think we must do then. The first one, if we raise the subsidy, that is only giving the person that is coming more money. That might be all right, but you in the business also must raise the price for each child through the total analysis too, or otherwise you must get a grant to operate your place, in other words, so those three things, you must raise your price, I would say to—

Ms Garner: Yes, if we raise our price we are going to force a number of parents in middle income brackets to seek other care for their children and that is a very difficult situation to find adequate home care for the children and it is the children that we are concerned with.

That is what has prevented us from raising our fees to date, is because it takes a great number of our parents out of the possibility of day care.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just one more comment. I am saying, you know, in my case, I would be willing to see the subsidy raised to the families that need it, but I will also say that the price must be raised to the families that do not need it quite so badly. That is to make the operation successful.

I cannot go along with a complete give-away to everyone. That is my last comment.

Mr. Chairman: Anyone else?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, in our general approach to this problem, we have always agreed that day care in private homes, which submit to regulations when they are imposed, should receive the same kind of financial subsidy as a professional, if you like, and I wonder if the Child Care Association has any information they can give us.

We have been looking only at the five or six organized day care centres. How much more would be required to supplement the income of people who are looking after a number of children in their home? Or do you feel that this is necessary.

Mrs. Garner: The way I can address that question, Mr. Chairman, is to say that how it has been dealt with in B.C. is that home day care centres, although they have been licenced, have been in a different category. Once you got above five children, I believe you are classified as a day care centre and then you come under the regulations and financial assistance for day cares.

Under that the circumstances are so different. You do not require the same space. You do not require a lot of other things.

I cannot deal with that question on any other terms. I believe the assessment and update program will have information on what the situation is in Yukon, but I do not have it today.

Mrs. Cummins: The Canada Works Project has been attempting to do some investigating in private day homes and this is part of the reason for proposing some standards, because we are finding some cases that are not very pleasant.

Unfortunately, a lot of the centres cannot take children under the age of one year, because it is just too demanding for the staff. It takes one staff member for four children, under the age of two. There are a lot of people who are, presently, using private day homes who are as well receiving subsidy, and these day homes are not meeting any form of standard. They are not subject to any kind of inspection.

We have uncovered some cases where there have been seven, eight and up to twelve children in one home, with one person looking after them.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I asked that question specifically because it is a matter of grave concern to the Director of Child Welfare, who has a statutory responsibility for the protection of children and until we do impose some kind of standards on these places, the horror stories will continue.

The problem is that some of these places will, of course, look after your child for less than the organized day care. A parent takes their child there and is then trapped because they are never able to obtain, in most cases, I am told, Mr. Chairman, they are never to obtain a receipt for income tax deduction because the person who is running this business is not reporting income.

They cannot complain about conditions or they are threatened with the loss of that resource, if you like, for their children.

It is a pretty horrible situation to get into. What kind of centre is that, that is the kind of centre where a person will take children into their own home and charge you less than the organized day care, but it is not a good situation and the department is well aware of this.

I am only asking for some kind of information from the Child Care Association as to how a subsidy plan would affect those places and how it would be carried through because I am not sure how you do it.

Ms Garner: We will certainly endeavor to get the information for you.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment very briefly on the remarks that were made regarding some of the conditions in some of the homes, private homes that are being used as day care centres, and the horror stories that the Minister was talking about and that we must have regulations. I cannot agree with this at all. I think a parent who takes a child to

a place like this has the first obligation, very specifically. Whether you get a receipt or not should be the second consideration and surely any parent should not leave a child under a situation like that.

Why should a government agency accept the responsibility? I think parents in our society also have some responsibility. I know that some day care centres are small and I know that some of the homes where women take children are quite small. But I also know homes where people have quite a small home and they have four or five children themselves, they are well taken care of, they are safe, they are loved, the nutrition is good, and they certainly do not meet the standards that would be set down in the regulations for the square footage requirement. So I think we get carried away on some of this and I feel very badly when I hear about crowding four or five children in a home, because I know some wonderful families who have four or five children in less than 900 or 800 square feet.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, with respect, nobody said anything about crowding four or five children into a home. What we are talking about are situations where parents come and inspect the place and it looks good, and they leave their child there, and then one day they arrive early unexpectedly and they find children tied to a fence and no one in charge, they have gone downtown. I know exactly what the Honourable Member is saying that you can have eight or nine children well taken care of in their own home, sure fine, but I would challenge the Honourable Member to sit in this desk and accept what happens if one of those places has a fire and children die and this government is asked why there were not regulations and inspections and permits being issued to that place. Try it on, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of situation I am talking about.

You know, it is not always obvious the first time you arrive to look at a home to see if you can leave your kid there while you are at work. It looks lovely and the lady is charming and their homemade cookies in the oven, but, if you arrive unexpectedly the scene may be entirely different, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make one comment. We seem to be ranging into debate amongst Members and the idea of having witnesses is to address your questions to the witnesses and then subsequently after that deal with the issue.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to let the witnesses see what I am up against.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, order please, Mr. Chairman. I have to agree with the Honourable Minister of Human Resources what she stated, but I would take it one step further and say we have to make legislation right here in this House, not regulations. First we have to have legislation on day care centres. I would also like to address a question to the witnesses and ask them what is the City of Whitehorse providing them? Does the City of Whitehorse assist you in any way?

Ms Garner: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger: And then, Mr. Chairman, I would say maybe that the day care centre program should go under the recreation program, because we seem to spend a lot of money for curling clubs, for all sorts of things, maybe the day care program should go under the recreation program and ask for assistance that way because the City of Whitehorse and other communities have lots of money for that.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I would like information on if I may. That is what was mentioned briefly, is there any kind of assurity that the day care centres who are now leasing space are not going to be forced out of those premises by inflationary factors because of the pipeline? Have any of the centres approached this Government, asking whether, for example, they could use space in the former YWCA building for day care?

Are there any possibilities being pursued for safer, more sheltered, if you like, leased conditions?

Mrs. Cummins: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there are no centres that have any form of long-term lease. Most of us are operating on a month to month basis.

There has been a submission made, I believe, to the City of Whitehorse and CMHC, with regard to use of the YWCA for possibly a larger, more central centre, in order to amalgamate and integrate some of these different facilities.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else?

Mr. Berger: Another question, Mr. Chairman, to the witness: is the Government providing any day care centre facilities in the new housing projects? I am sure that they are building housing units around the City of Whitehorse, too. Are they building in day care facilities into those things?

Mrs. Cummins: No, they are not and all of the centres are formed primarily through parent participation. There are a great many of them that depend on volunteer help and most of the staff, as we said before, are paid minimum or next to minimum wage.

But there are no day care centres being set up by anyone, really, other than concerned parents and parents who require that type of service in order to exist. You know, rather than stay home and be subsidized to the extent of \$800 or \$900 a month, they can go to work and perhaps be subsidized to the tune of \$100 a month or \$150 a month, whatever the case may be.

Mr. Berger: A further question, Mr. Chairman: are you aware of any bylaws that the City of Whitehorse has at the present, in their books or in the making, when these new housing units are being built, the plans of private contractors, that they would provide day care facilities in those things?

Mrs. Cummins: We are not aware of any at the moment, but about the only assistance, really, that we get through the City is that we have regular fire inspections and health inspections. That is, of course, done primarily by the Federal Government, but that is about all of the assistance that we get.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else? The witnesses may be excused then, thank you very, very much Ms Cummins and Ms Garner for your assistance.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Is it the intention of the Chair to go into the Housing Corporation now? My witnesses are available and as I stated earlier, the Chairman of the Housing Corporation will only be available today.

Mr. Chairman: Are they here now?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, they are.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think we are ready to ask the question on 533, Daycare, unless there are some arguments? Establishment 533, Daycare: \$35,000.

Establishment 533 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We will declare a brief recess and when we resume we will go on to Yukon Housing Corporation.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Would Committee please come to order. Yukon Housing Corporation, Vote 18, pages 257 and 258. *On Establishment 1800*

Mr. Chairman: There is only one Establishment, 1800, Yukon Housing Corporation, \$1,185,300.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few preliminary comments, if I may. The Honourable Members will note the change in the presentation of the budget. The Corporation's budget has been net voted, and the summary of expenditures and related recoveries indicate the funding required for the 1978-79 budget year. This is shown as a net operating grant to the Corporation.

You will also note that the past two financial years have been converted to the same basis for comparative purposes. Change in format reflects the requirement under Section 17 of the *Housing Corporation Ordinance*. This Section requires the Government to make available funds out of an annual appropriation to meet the operation costs and finance capital projects of the Corporation. At the end of the fiscal year, a grant is to be made equal to the deficit shown in the audited financial statement from the same appropriation.

The Yukon Housing Corporation is, of course, still bound by the same budget review process and budget guidelines which will continue to be set by the Government. The Corporation also remains responsible to this House through the Minister in charge of the Corporation.

The new format, Mr. Chairman, highlights the financial responsibility of the Board of Directors for the expenditure of operation and maintenance and capital monies. For some time the Board has been looking to take on this responsibility as set out by its legislation. It is the feeling of this Government that the Corporation now has the financial capability to operate in this matter, and in effect, move from an operational status of a Government department to a true Territorial Crown agency. This view has also been shared by the Auditor General and at the same time, was recommended by the previous Executive Committee Member who was in charge of the department.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, net voting brings expending and recoveries together in such a fashion, to give a better picture of Operation and Maintenance expenditures in the cost-sharing arrangements, as well as the various sources of revenue available to Yukon Housing Corporation.

In terms of Federal cost-sharing programs, an interesting comparison was drawn by the B.C. Department of Housing in its proposal for a tax point transfer of federal housing subsidies. On the 1976 census, and the federal subsidy budget, Yukon received \$9.41 per capita, which is the second lowest in Canada. Alberta was the lowest at \$8.60, and the Northwest Territories the highest at \$54.25 per capita.

Now, the reason I mention this, Mr. Chairman, is a lot of people seem to think that the taxpayer of the Yukon is subsidizing the various programs that we have to a great extent and this is not accurate and I think it reflects the fact that the independence of the people of Yukon towards housing and their ability to go and build their own home and pay for their own home.

Mr. Chairman, to change the subject a little bit, I would like to point out, on January 31st and February 1st, I had the opportunity to attend a federal-provincial housing ministers conference in Edmonton, which is one of several sectoral conferences leading up to the First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to briefly comment on some of the agreements reached at the conference, which will likely affect the future budgets of the Yukon Housing Corporation and, in the end, the Territorial Government finances.

While it might be somewhat presumptuous on my part when I refer to provinces, I am including Yukon, which I hope would receive the same considerations as the provinces. This has been the case in the past and I hope it will continue in the future.

It was agreed, Mr. Chairman, unanimously by the provinces and the territories, that the Federal Government implement what they term "global funding" in 1979. The following principles would apply:

- 1) Federal funding would be provided for three years towards budget commitments. This would allow the provinces to effectively plan, develop and budget for housing programs;
- 2) the commitment of funds to specific projects would be the prerogative of the provincial government. In other words, the provincial and territorial governments would set the priorities

- 3) Federal fundings could not be reduced or altered without provincial review or concurrence.
- 4) the province would be able to transfer budgeted federal funds between programs.

In addition, the provinces and territories agree that the principle of a federal-provincial master agreement are to be worked out by federal-provincial official task forces by May 1st, 1978 and individual federal-provincial master agreements will be negotiated in a bi-lateral basis by September 1st, 1978.

These are tentative targets, Mr. Chairman and whether or not they will be reached remains to be seen.

I have a suspicion, Mr. Chairman, it will probably be carrying on within the next year.

Consensus was reached that capital costs allowance should be extended. This is of particular importance to Yukon because investment in rental projects is encouraged by the tax benefit of capital costs allowance.

With respect to the reduction of property tax from personal income tax, consensus was reached that the Federal Government should study the feasibility of this tax credit approach and apparently this study is underway.

Provinces and territories reach consensus on the Canadian Home Insulation Program. I am pleased to say in my conversations with the Federal Minister, Mr. Andre Ouellet, he assured me the age criteria for the program as it relates to the Yukon would be removed in order that more people could take advantage of the Program. In response to my recent letter, he confirmed that housing constructed before September 1st, 1977 now qualifies for full financial assistance under the Canadian Home Insulation Program.

In addition, future meetings will be held with the CMHC regional office to discuss delivery of the program in the Territory. I expect these meetings to take place within the next couple of months so that the people that would be able to be eligible under this program could apply. You must understand it is a Federal program and it would be delivered by the Federal Government.

In another area, consensus was reached that an inter-provincial task force on senior citizen's shelter allowance and rental scale be struck to study the British Columbia safer program, that is shelter aid for elderly renters and that a safer rent to income formula and the 30 per cent rent scale recently introduced in Alberta would be studied to determine short and long term implications on Provincial and Federal Government subsidy levels.

Mr. Chairman, I can advise this House now that an official from the Yukon Housing Corporation will be attending and participating in this task force which will have its first meeting in Victoria early in April.

Mr. Chairman, you will be interested to note that the Government is prepared to take a more flexible cost-sharing formula to housing subsidies between levels of government. The Federal Government is suggesting a more generous and unilateral subsidy contribution with no specific or fixed provincial share required as a condition. Also, the Federal Government is looking to reduce its lending obligations that is providing the capital financing and thereby allowing the Federal Government to increase its direct role in providing subsidies in areas of greater need.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government favours the rent supplement technique which would save capital expenditures on the Government's behalf, make more housing available, and reduce the stigma associated with the Government housing projects.

These agreements reached by the provinces and territories in the position now being taken by the Federal Government clearly have financial implications for the Yukon, particularly during a period of rapid economic expansion. Their importance

lies in the effect on this Government's future financial planning. There is going to have to be a lot of work done, Mr. Chairman, within the next year to determine how it is going to affect us financially and as you can see the way the rules have changed in the area of Social Welfare, we have to ensure that we get our fair share.

With these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call on the Chairman of the Yukon Housing Corporation Board to briefly elaborate on the financial details of the budget.

Mr. Chairman: I should mention that the two witnesses that we have with us today are Keith Schneider, and John Owens.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, with reference to Vote 18 has netted on page 259 and to the breakdown of that, or the expenditure summary on page 261, I would like to address the first item, that of Administration, \$563,400. An increase in the area of Administration of approximately \$70,200 over the 1977-78 Main Estimates is indicated. The bulk of this, roughly \$45,000 is made up of increases to previous salaries, as well the net of \$12,000 was incurred by reducing the home management field workers by one half man year and increasing the maintenance supervisor's position by one man year.

Therefore, in total salaries, produced \$57,000 of the total increase, with fringe benefits increased by another \$8,700.

Special and professional services have been increased by \$7,000, in order to continue to make use of special expertise in the area of financial engineering, architectural services and research and planning.

The requirement for these services has increased, due to an increased demand for greater administrative efficiency, as well as for greater planning in relation to future housing demands.

Travel has increased by \$7,000, as well, due to forced price increases as well as increased requirements relating to new maintenance supervisors' positions.

Non-government travel, which relates particularly to the Board of Directors, has increased mainly due to price increases.

Office supplies and furniture shows a reduction, due to the fact that janitorial services are now shown in Primary 57.

A minor increase in office rent is budgeted, due to the tax escalator clause in the lease.

Primary 81, now shows \$500 as being available to purchase miscellaneous equipment for the home management program. The miscellaneous category shows a substantial increase due to the fact that workshops for all association chairmen and managers is now anticipated to be an annual occurrence. Prior to this it has been done on an ad hoc basis.

In addition to the \$12,000 for salaries charged back to the Capital Projects, it is also anticipated that 50 per cent of each of the maintenance supervisor's salaries will be charged back to the projects. Therefore, a portion of the overall increases outlined are recovered through these charge-backs.

That is our summary on the administration portion of our budget, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions or discussion. That is page 261, Expenditure Summary, Administration.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, what percentage did he say of the Administration was being charged back to a project?

Mr. Owens: The charge-backs, Mr. Chairman, I will give that to you again. There is \$12,000 of salaries charged back to Capital Projects, and also 50 per cent of each of the Maintenance Supervisors' salaries will be charged back to the project.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, is then the full maintenance supervisor's salary shown in the Administration?

Mr. Owens: Yes, there is, one is shown in there, one man year.

Mrs. Watson: We have two maintenance supervisors?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, in the forthcoming fiscal year, we have been given approval to increase our staff complement by half a man year and that would permit us then to take on full-time in other maintenance format.

The charge-back arrangement is that 50 per cent of each salary will be charged back because the Territory is going to be divided into two areas and the charge-back of 50 per cent on each one of those salaries is, in part, cost sharable under our arrangement with CMHC.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else? Perhaps then we could go to Operating Subsidy.

Mr. Owens: In the area of Operating Subsidy, Mr. Chairman, Operating Subsidy has increase by \$209,600 over the 1977-78 Main Estimates. The largest single contributing factor to this increase is in the area of special maintenance wherein \$95,000 has been requested to do major foundation repairs in Dawson City, Mayo, and Ross River. The projects in Dawson and Mayo come under Section 40 of the *National Housing Act*, which is cost-shared with CMHC 75-25. Forced price increases in the area of utilities caused an additional \$24,400 increase. Miscellaneous expenses have risen by \$81,800 due mainly to the fact that amortization and taxes are now payable on the 24 suite apartment completed last year in Whitehorse. As well, amortization payments for the public housing projects in Mayo, Dawson City and Watson Lake were miscalculated in the 1977-78 Main Estimates, contributing \$20,000 to the \$81,800 difference. Finally, ordinary maintenance has increased by \$9,000 over last year.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, under Operating Subsidy, could I ask just how many units in total that the Housing Corporation is speaking of?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, our breakdown is something in this order: our total public housing stock is roughly 324 units, that includes all the outlying communities as well as the City of Whitehorse. Under the Rental Purchase Program, which is one of our major programs, we have 127 units; under the Rural & Remote Program - 4 units; and the other units come under Public Housing, Section 40 in Whitehorse - 43 units and the outlying communities - 41 units, and in addition we have 72 units under Section 43, and under the rent supplement, we are responsible for 36 units.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on the Operating Subsidy?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, in public housing, are there any strides to making the individual tenant be responsible for his own utility bill, particularly electricity and fuel?

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, in the public housing section of the *National Housing Act*, we are under an agreement with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for a rent geared to income scale and naturally this scale includes heat, light, and water.

Mr. Fleming: Supplementary to that, Mr. Chairman, is there any set amount that they cannot go over. In other words, do you have a cut-off area in either electricity or fuel or whatever?

Mr. Owens: There is a quota system established under the Rental Purchase Housing Program, and we do follow those quotas.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I have to stand, the witnesses expect me to stand. I was just wondering, it is a harmless question, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering is there any money set aside in the budget this year to plant grass and maintain the appearance of the houses in Dawson City?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, in our budget for Dawson City rental purchase, and, I believe public housing, our tentative maintenance schedule indicates some site work to be done on those two projects.

One of the things that should be noted, however, our budget

goes through another process besides the scrutiny of the House. We have to submit individual project budgets to CMHC and get their concurrence as to the expenditure of monies, as well. Site work of that nature sometimes receives a lower priority, even though we make loud demands for the necessity of that work.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under the Operating Subsidy, again on the repair of and maintenance of buildings, and I will give you an example of it so you will know what my question is: in the area of Teslin, for instance, last summer, I noticed that contracts there were given, there were one or two contracts, or otherwise, I am not sure just how they were given out, for the maintenance of the majority of the houses that were there last summer. Was that contracted on a contract basis to a couple of individuals or so forth and so on, or were they hired actually, day by day or just how did you work that?

Mr. Owens: The work that was done in that particular community and the work that is normally done in most of our communities is on a service contract basis. We do have service contracts in many of the communities for on-going maintenance and we have established relationships with some individuals in a community to provide specific emergency maintenance, if required.

Mr. Fleming: Supplementary, then, in other words, you are actually hiring these people, they are under contract, but there is no specified contract for each specified job, is there? You say, for instance, Teslin, you hire two people for the summer and this is for the major repairs, for instance, the Department of Public Works, where they remove the whole area of the outside of a building and they replace that completely or partially complete, to date, so you will know which one I am talking about, of these people. Were they hired as contractors or were they hired per day?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, in that particular case, which is indicative of some of the other work we did in other communities, we let service contracts to local contractors in the community or within Yukon, to do certain work.

What we did prior to that, however, we advertised in the papers, requesting people who might be interested in this type of work to make themselves known to us. So, through that list, we had an idea of those people who might be interested in doing this type of work.

Once we got underway and had time to judge the capability and competence of the contractor, then, in certain cases, we gave them other contracts if his work was satisfactory and so forth.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the repair and maintenance of buildings is over a quarter of a million dollars when you are looking at 324 units. It works out to me at \$848 per unit. Is this high compared to the national average for public housing or do you have a national average?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, we do not have a national average, but what I can tell you, and this just took place fairly recently, we were advised by Federal DPW from whom we rent houses in Takhini, they have increased their rent by, I believe, \$119 a month to take care of maintenance, and that is the rent that we will now have to pay in order to lease 25 houses from the Federal DPW. So there is a yardstick, I suppose, on that particular figure.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Schneider, does he have a breakdown comparison costs between trailer type homes as to the stick-built type homes, as far as maintaining them?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, I can give you the costs of the 1977 capital project staff housing in Faro which consisted of two new houses, stick-built. The original contract was \$116,000, with various change orders, that was increased by \$5,100 and reduced by another change order in the magnitude of \$208, for a final construction cost of \$121,000. Appliances,

landscaping, administration fees and land increased the total cost to \$147,478. The year prior to 1977, we built, or had erected, in the community of Faro, five Atco modular units and the total capital cost of that project, including landscaping, fencing and land comes to \$285,750 for an average cost per unit of \$57,000.

Mr. McCall: That is nice, Mr. Chairman, but those are not the figures I asked for. What I was asking for is the comparison costs of maintaining a stick-built home as compared to a mobile home over a period of shall we say the last fiscal year. What have been the costs in comparison to both anywhere in Yukon?

Mr. Schneider: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I had this information so readily available I just wanted to read it out.

I do not have that particular comparison or that information with me right at this moment, but it can be provided. I think I can say though that the operating costs of a stick-built house will be less than a modular or trailer.

The actual magnitude of that difference, I am afraid I am not in the position to give you right at this time.

Mr. McCall: Well, I am just hoping, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Schneider can provide us with that comparison cost, because it may be cheaper to buy a mobile home, when it is a hell of a lot more expensive to maintain it. So we would lose in the end, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: Another item I am very interested in is taxes for the amount of homes that were given to me and the amount of units and so forth, I wonder if I could get any clarification as to just how much tax Yukon Housing Corporation does pay to the Government in this sense? I see \$51,000 and I am wondering, that is, you know, I have a little league business and I hit pretty close to that myself.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I do not have the total cost. I can say, however, on all the properties that we do hold, whether it is rental-purchase or staff housing, we do, in fact, pay taxes and we of course do not get the Home Owner Grant.

Mr. Fleming: Are the taxes the same for Yukon Housing Corporation as they are for everybody else?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, our taxes are the same and there have been cases when we thought of going to the Court of Revision, along with some other people.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Owens mentioned before the repair costs in Dawson City. My question is directed to one particular unit and it is a duplex unit. Is that repair work completed by now? How much was the cost of it now and, if it is not completed yet, how much more money will be expected to be spent on it?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, I believe the work has been completed by now. Recalling the original figures, the foundation contract, I think was in the neighbourhood of \$20,000. Then, the interior work I believe was in the neighbourhood of another \$10,000.

I could have those figures confirmed, if it is wished.

Mr. Berger: Well, Mr. Chairman, another question now is, out of the \$30,000, what is the cost to Yukon Housing Corporation and how much is CMHC or the Department of Indian Affairs going to contribute to the cost?

Mr. Owens: That project is under our agreement with the *National Housing Act*, or with the Central Mortgage and Housing and the cost of repair will be shared 75-25, by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no further discussion on Operating Subsidy, perhaps now we could look at Staff Accommodation.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, this is the same one that confused me last year and it is not really, I should not say confusing me, it is just the fact that, as far as I am concerned, and these are exactly the words that I said last year, that if that is a true

statement and those figures are exactly what they should be, and I can believe them, there is something wrong in this Territory, entirely, all over, because there is such a discrepancy, you know, they come up with. Watson Lake can be 23 units and their electricity bill can be \$7,900 and you go up to Teslin and it is \$9,600, I think it is, for 11 units and you keep looking.

I am just wondering why there is such a discrepancy. Some people must just burn nothing but electricity and others must burn none at all. It just does not look realistic to me, the whole picture.

I would ask what the total is for on the right hand side?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be a good idea to have Mr. Owens explain that particular area prior to any questions being asked. He think he has a fairly good run down of just exactly how the monies are expended.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, I think to really answer the question that the Honourable Member has put forward, we should look also at the recovery factor because in the staff housing units, although the figures illustrate an increase in expenditure in this area, there is actually a reduction as fuel is presently being paid for by Yukon Housing Corporation and then billed back to the tenant. Therefore this shows as an expenditure which is not the case in 1977-78. This accounts for approximately \$70,000 of the expenditure and therefore this year's budget is in effect less than last year's budget for staff housing.

The overall decrease is due mainly to the reduction in the number of staff units leased in Whitehorse, more tenants converting to the comparative market rents has also contributed to the overall decrease. In the area of recoveries, staff accommodation revenues are shown as having increased mainly to the inclusion of fuel recovery for those on comparative market rent. Actual rental revenue makes up approximately \$374,700. These are down from previous years due to the reduced number of units in Whitehorse, plus some anticipated sales.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, dealing with those 18 units in the Town of Faro, how many Government employees does the Yukon Housing Corporation cater to as opposed to those that own their own residence in the Town of Faro? I see you have 18 units, but there are more than 18 Government employees in the Town of Faro. I thought that would get you.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think that has any connection with what we are discussing. What I am getting at, I do not think there is any way of knowing in the City of Whitehorse how many Government employees are living in their own houses as compared with the number of employees that are living in staff housing. These figures have nothing to do with Yukon Housing Corporation.

Mr. McCall: What I am trying to say, Mr. Chairman, you have 18 units here. You have 18 Government employees in that accommodation. We have more than that, and I would like to know.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall, that is a different matter altogether. Mr. Lang why are you not supplying housing to the other 18 people that work there?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, they are all married.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else on Staff Accommodation?

Mr. Owens: May I approach an answer to that?

The Yukon Housing Corporation is a Crown corporation and as such is administering staff accommodation. We have no input into the hiring, or other government policy, other than that of the Yukon Housing Corporation, under its Ordinance.

What we do in staff accommodation is provide the accommodation as is requested by the departments of the Government. Therefore, I have no concept at all of how many employees of the Yukon Territorial Government that there are in Faro. I only am responsible to provide the units that the Government departments indicate that they require.

Mr. McCall: Well, let me put another twist in it then, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the witnesses this question. Has any Government department put forward a request to Yukon Housing to provide more accommodation for government employees in the coming fiscal year?

Mr. Schneider: No, they have not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, NCPC, in their proposal on their rate increases on commercial properties, are talking about going on the demand meter system in Dawson City. Would this affect the Yukon Housing Corporation?

Mr. Owens: Yes, the same rate as any resident in any of the communities. If the demand meters are going into commercial operation, then, no, they would not, except possibly in the apartment units.

Mr. Berger: It is just for interest, Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if NCPC considers it as a private home owner, as a dwelling, or does NCPC consider you as a commercial operation?

Mr. Owens: NCPC, or Yukon Electric, in the communities, consider us a private owner, and only in some cases in apartment units, or multiple dwellings, where commercially rated electricity is put in, would we be on a demand meter.

Mr. Berger: In other words then, Mr. Chairman, the Hobah Apartment block could possibly go on the demand meter system?

Mr. Owens: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hold this up at all, because, you can go on, but I still have a little problem, and I would like to get it a little clearer than Mr. Owen has explained it to me, in just the facts, right here.

Under electrical and staff accommodation, Beaver Creek, Carcross, so on, down the line, are those people now, I think I understood you to say, they are now paying their own utility costs. Are they paying the electrical, are they paying the fuel costs?

Mr. Owens: Yes, they are, except for some persons who are not yet, and it is getting to be a very low number who are not yet on the comparative market rent, because they were under the previous staff agreements of the Territorial Government.

Anyone who is on comparative market rents is paying his own electricity. The fuel is being handled by the Housing Corporation buying it and providing the bulk rate to the occupant. Therefore, we purchase it and charge them for the actual cost of fuel.

Mr. Fleming: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further? Then perhaps we could go into Recovery Summary, Staff Housing: \$445,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, in the discussion, I think the Chairman already explained that particular section.

Mr. Chairman: Yes he did, but somebody might want to ask a question about it.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, if I could just cover, with your permission, the Recovery Summary in total.

Mr. Chairman: That would be all right, yes.

Mr. Owens: I did touch on the staff housing revenues and the fact that there is fuel recovery included in the staff housing figures, and therefore indicates an increase. The Department of Indian Affairs does provide us with a contribution with respect to the Rental Purchase Project. This contribution goes towards the operating deficit of this program. While not shown in the 1977-78 Mains, \$165,000 were actually received, as indicated in the 1977 projected budget.

The CMHC Operating Subsidy is the item that has contributed most to the difference in the revised projections of overall net deficit for 1977-78. Mainly this is due to the additional recoveries made during 1977-78 for the previous year's operation compared to the Main Estimates of 1977-78, the 1978-79

projection has increased, mainly due to the increased expenditures in the operating subsidies.

There is also in this category, 1978-79 the City of Whitehorse's contribution to the operating deficit of the Section 40, Public Housing Project in Whitehorse. The larger recovery indicated in the revised 1977-78 figures also includes operating surplus from the Whitehorse Housing Authority, however, Yukon Housing Corporation pays the amortization on this, as well as the taxes, so although there was a surplus, in the end, there was a net deficit because we had to pay the amortization.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else? We will go back to Establishment 1800, Yukon Housing Corporation. Any further questions arising out of what we have discussed on Recovery and Expenditure?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, we will be going over it after the witnesses leave I presume. I have a question to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Shoot.

Mr. Fleming: Okay, but it is not with the last item, it is back to Staff Accommodation.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it is what we are doing, Yukon Housing Corporation, the Main Estimate, so you can ask any questions you like.

Mr. Fleming: On the Staff Accommodation, whereas the individual is now getting his fuel and possibly I think maybe in all cases or some cases, the Yukon Housing Corporation is supplying that to them and they buy it on a bulk basis, and I do not know how it is billed or anything, but is this individual allowed to also collect the rebate on the fuel?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang, that is equalization.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the fuel equalization for private ownership of a home? Staff accommodation is rental?

This is a question that would have to be directed to the Treasurer. As far as I know, they do not.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, as long as they are paying their own fuel bill, they qualify if they rent or own their home. They qualify. There is nothing that says it cannot be government employees in a government house.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, the Housing Corporation does bill them separately for the fuel that they purchased, so that therefore they would have sufficient receipts to apply for it and indications are that they would then qualify for the rebate.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, they would qualify for the rebate, but I believe they also get the fuel, under the contract price that the Territorial Government has with the company who supplies the fuel to the Territorial Government. So, certainly, they are getting fuel, in some instances, less than the retail sale value within the prime base area, which is Whitehorse.

But there is one question I would like to ask, since you are with Staff Accommodation. This saving, and in some instances it is seven cents a gallon, which is being given to YTG employees who are living in staff housing, is not being handed to YTG employees who are living in their own housing. They are not able to buy the fuel under the same terms that the people who are in staff housing are able to buy the fuel, at seven cents a gallon less.

Mr. Fleming: Just a comment, that is my reason for asking and the reason that I think that the Territorial Government should look into it. I think that all people should be treated equal in this case, where they are working for even the same government.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, when we implemented comparative market rent, it was our intention at that time to have the individuals pay their own fuel.

Administratively, this was not, well, I suppose it was possible, but it would have been very difficult. We met with the fuel suppliers and they expressed some concern on that arrangement.

We also have some reservations in terms of if the individual leaves and does not have the tank filled up, and the house freezes, then we would be in the difficult situation of going after that tenant for the cost of repairs, and so forth.

I must agree, though, ideally and administratively, it would save us a great deal of headache if we could, in fact, have the employees supply their own fuel locally. We still can move in that direction. It is going to be a different price, of course, and we would have to convince the fuel suppliers that they should still provide as they would to anybody else.

Those are really our reasons for providing it to the tenants and then charging it back.

Mrs. Watson: Was this stride in making the tenants able to take advantage of buying in the bulk for fuel, a part of the Public Service Agreement, or was it just a policy of the Housing Corporation, who are providing the administration for the staff accommodation?

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, it was just an administrative decision of the Housing Corporation, primarily dictated by convenience, more than by any intent to pass on a special benefit.

Mrs. Watson: You are though.

Mr. Chairman, they are though, in fact, passing on a special benefit to a certain sector.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the benefit would not be diminished by the amount of fuel equalization?

Mr. Fleming: No, Mr. Chairman, the freight equalization plan is now set up as it was supposed to be in the first place, but they have it set up and it is the freight. For instance, in Teslin the freight is .06 cents and they turn in their bill they get .06 cents for each gallon they buy and that is a very simple situation. Whereas the Yukon Housing Corporation buys the fuel and they get a discount naturally for buying bulk, they get another maybe .03, .04, .05 or .06 cents, whereas a person living in that home then gets two areas where he can collect. The other fellow, possibly living downtown in his own home, working for the Government does not get the subsidy.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that the Board of Directors did not see this discrepancy occurring and I can only say you have brought it to our mind and I will look into the administrative problems of sorting it out and equalizing it. Possibly we can charge an administration fee from the Housing Corporation and even everybody out.

Mrs. Watson: No, Mr. Chairman, no, I do not think we are bringing it up to take away a benefit from some staff. When you bring in this type of policy, the adjustment would have been better in the rent that it would in this kind of special benefit, because you are giving a special benefit, but we certainly would not want you to take the benefit away, and I am sure you would not endeavor to.

Mr. Lengerke: A question that I should have asked when we were dealing with 1800 under Administration, which is a good old standby question: the classification of the various people, are they changed very much from last year, I think your man years are the same, but I am just wondering if you have those changes?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, there are no classification changes in the forthcoming fiscal year. There was only one change that I recall last year, and that was an upgrading of the Assistant Manager's position.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, have they got an organizational chart that they could hand out. I do not want to hold this thing up for that, but I would be very interested to have it.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, we do have an organizational chart. Copies could be made available to the Members.

Mr. Lengerke: They might not all want it, maybe just me.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the same information was handed out last year. I think we handed out a chart if I recall correctly and there have really been no changes.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Mr. Fleming: One more question, Mr. Chairman, on the electrical issue, which now, of course, they are paying their own way, but on the ones who are not paying their own way, does the Yukon Housing Corporation, or could the witnesses tell me if the electrical rate that they were paying was the regular residential rate for that area?

Mr. Owens: Yes, it was, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Establishment 1800, Yukon Housing Corporation, \$1,185,300.

Establishment 1800 agreed to

Hon. Mr. Lang: Could possibly we refer to the capital side of the budget while we are on Housing, at page 267?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Page 267, in the Capital side, Vote 20, Yukon Housing Housing Corporation.

On Establishment 2182

Mr. Chairman: The first item is 2182, Low Rental and Senior Citizens' Housing, Main Estimate \$492,000.

Mr. Owens: The low rental and senior citizens' housing, I just want to draw the Members' attention, that under Section 43 of the *National Housing Act*, funds extended for the construction of accommodation of single and or elderly persons projects will not be put into communities without local municipal, L.I.D., or community concurrence as outlined in the green paper on Housing Strategy. Communities that would be possible recipients of these projects include Dawson City, Mayo, Watson Lake, Teslin, and a possible start on a large project in Whitehorse.

In the outlying communities, these projects are seen to be basic four-plex units which are suitable for occupation by single persons, single parents, or the elderly.

Funds are provided through a loan of up to 90 per cent of the capital costs from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, under Section 3 of the *National Housing Act*.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under this particular section, Mr. Chairman, could the witness tell us if there are possible fundings available as we debated before for day care centres.

Also, are there any plans in the making from the Yukon Housing Corporation, on their own, to go ahead and plan day care centres, especially in low cost housing projects, and if there are any amounts of housing projects being built in the future?

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, Central Mortgage and Housing has, from time to time, allowed for such facilities in large multiple dwelling units or projects. It is not foreseen by the Board of Directors that large projects would be the thing that we would be getting into and, therefore, I can only indicate that presently we have not discussed it and we do not foresee ourselves getting into the day care question, at this time.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, it is not the question of getting into day care, it is just the facilities, to provide the facilities, because I am sure there are other organizations more qualified to run a day care centre than Yukon Housing Corporation.

But, the question is would Yukon Housing Corporation, the Board of Directors, consider this type of thing? I mean, we are talking about CMHC probably has something in mind with 1,000 to 10,000 tenants or something like this, but it is not

necessary up here. We can scale that down to a possible, maybe 100 tenants or something like this or maybe even 50 tenants, because usually in those housing units, there is a large amount of children and it is usual that both parents have to work.

In this particular instance it is a single parent dwelling. In other words the parent has to work in order to make a living. It is much more important to look into this thing.

Mr. Owens: I would not consider it the role of the Housing Corporation unless I am directed to do so by this Government, to get into the question of day care.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, could we put it another way, when you build apartment blocks there is a requirement to have a laundry room. Is there any requirement to have an activity room in an apartment block? Some of them do when they have children living in them.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, there is no requirement to have recreation or play facilities. The possibility of having that included in a complex is there, the cost of it would have to be borne by the residents as a whole, and in the question of apartment accommodation, we have been operating with the practice, particularly in apartments and smaller units, where we are hoping that we can encourage the private market to supply these for us, rather than Housing Corporation going in and expanding its hold on the housing market in the Territory.

Therefore, if we continue this, and continue encouraging free enterprise to supply these units, and if we also encouraged them to supply extra facilities, we just have to consider it is going to increase the cost of everybody who lives in that dwelling.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I would like to carry this a little further. We are talking about private housing, building and housing markets and so, somebody has to come up with a plan, somebody has to come up with a policy to say to the builder, regardless of whether it is Government or the private builder, this is what we want and this is what we would like to have. I think the Yukon Housing Corporation in return could be part of this plan and could be part of the senior member in the planning committee like this and say now look, this is what we want, the senior citizens mixed up in the housing development, instead of setting them aside in one particular area and saying here are the senior citizens, here are the single dwellings, and here multiple dwellings. I think that if we have an overall plan and it says we are going to mix up everybody, and the senior citizens are going to be right in the middle and going to be on the side, so in other words you do not have to get those like we have right now in the Yukon.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, yes, if we are encouraging and assisting in financing a project, we can make special requirements for it. Again, as I said in my opening remarks on this Section of the Estimates, the communities that receive special projects or new projects from us are going to have to come forward with the request. Certainly if that request contains some indication that further facilities are required, then we can consider that and can consider the cost of doing it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the Housing Corporation has been involved in building housing and if you were looking at a 12 apartment block, and you must know how much it would cost per square foot, how much extra would it approximately add to the price of that complex to put in a recreation room?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, that is somewhat difficult to answer depending on the size and obviously, it would not be the same cost because I would assume it would be just open area. At the same hand, you provide that facility within a normal 12 suite walk-up apartment, you are going to reduce part of the revenue space so that is a consideration. The end, of course, in terms of operating costs, are going to be greater as well as your capital costs are going to be greater.

Things like this have been done and could be approached in the future.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, what are the square foot-age costs of building nowadays? Is it not running about \$50 a square foot?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it really depends which builder you talk to but I have heard prices anywhere from \$45, \$50 a square foot.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, to go back to private contracting, how many private contractors in the Territory, especially in the City of Whitehorse right now are using the facility of CMHC to finance the building of housing units and apartment blocks?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, I do not have hard figures on that. I can tell you that last year, a fairly large apartment building, project was built, using CMHC assisted money under the Assisted Rental Program. The year before that, there was a fairly substantial project built in Riverdale.

There really is not that much activity in terms of builders using direct CMHC money. There seems to be a shift now to using private money from the chartered banks.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, does the CMHC have any stipulation on the plans for contractors to say, "Now, look, you are putting in large rental accommodation units here, maybe 200 apartments or something like this you have to have certain requirements in there."

Do they have something like this? Do they enforce it also?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, I believe when one is talking about very large projects, there are requirements for amenity space. In terms of smaller projects, there are also requirements for amenity space but they are quite a bit less. If you are looking at concentrated development, then amenity space has to be provided and that normally takes the form of a games room, swimming pools and things of that nature. But on a smaller scale, it is really in terms of outdoor space that the lot is sufficiently large for the number of people that may occupy the project.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, many times in planning projects like that, it is the planning authority that sometimes gives some direction like in the case of a municipality, the City of Whitehorse, if they are looking at an application of a large housing complex, they can stipulate right in the terms to whoever the developer be, it could be the Yukon Housing Corporation or a private developer, they could say, "Well, listen, we want to have certain facilities provided in that." That would be part of the terms and this is quite common. These are the ways you can do that and I think that kind of thing should be encouraged.

Mr. Berger: I fully agree with the Honourable Member from Riverdale on this and I wish they would get off their seat and do something about it, but I think they are too chicken to take on the responsibility. It is much easier to come crying to the Territorial Government and say you did this wrong.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on 2182?

Establishment 2182 agreed to

On Establishment 2183

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2183, Rural and Remote Housing: \$400,000.

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, can I draw to the attention of the Members that this Rural and Remote Housing Program is sponsored under Section 40 of the *National Housing Act*. The capital funds are shared 75-25 between CMHC and the Yukon Housing Corporation respectively, and also the operating costs are shared in the same manner.

No communities have been specifically targeted for the building under this program, and it is intended, where possible, to provide this housing through non-profit or co-operative basis with direct capital funding from CMHC, using Section 15 of the *National Housing Act*. However, should this mechanism not be implemented, the Rural and Remote Program would be able

to be utilized. YANSI would not like to see the program discontinued in order to keep all possible options open at this time. There is also consideration being given to providing some of the single persons accommodation mentioned earlier through this program, this overall approach is being supported by the Management Committee for this program, which includes CMHC, YANSI, and the Yukon Housing Corporation.

Allow me just a few seconds further on that. This program is under a Federal-Provincial Agreement and it is managed or run by this Management Committee which has on it, the native organizations as well as ourselves and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Programs under it are approved or recommended by the Management Committee and at that point comes the Housing Corporation.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I realize this is a cost-shared program, and I know that we have had \$400,000 in this before, and I think \$175,000 or something of it was used. My question is: by virtue of putting the \$400,000 in, does this in any way have an effect on the total amount of money that you might pick up from CMHC? What I am trying to get at is here you have \$400,000, you probably will not use it and is this going to have an effect on cutting some shortages on some other programs that you are utilizing today?

Mr. Owens: No, Mr. Chairman, we cannot see that it would.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, are you confident this time that you are going to have a little bit more activity in this program?

Mr. Owens: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: In one area here I would like to compliment the Minister and the Housing Corporation for taking a look at the situation anyhow as to the single residency occupation in some areas all over the Yukon because I think this is one area where we have, in the past, made a bad mistake. Maybe not a mistake but we have not done anything to rectify what is there, the fact that there is many single school teachers living in three bedroom homes all over the Territory and this type of thing. I think that program, if it was looked at, would maybe work well especially in the outlying communities.

Mr. Berger: I think I asked the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua the other day to give us a report on this thing, because there are four housing units, I believe have been built in Carcross, and maybe Mr. Owens could give us a short report on how successful those housing units are.

Mr. Owens: I do not want to give the indication that we were anticipating this question or anything.

The Carcross story, as I guess it could be referred to is, began in July, 1975 and the Management Committee, which I just mentioned, was established to meet the program and to develop a mechanism for delivery of rural and remote housing.

After one year of discussion, the agreement designating Yukon as being part of the program was executed. Later, in December, 1976, an agreement was reached to use the same concept as the rental purchase program, since the program, as explained or put forward by Central Mortgage and Housing, could not work in the Yukon.

It was further agreed that Carcross had an obvious need for additional housing and since Yukon Housing Corporation had four lots available, it was decided to construct four log units, the log units being based on the preference of the client group.

As initial plans were being formulated in early 1977, Yukon Housing Corporation proposed that this project be utilized as a demonstration project. By demonstration, we simply meant that you do it once and if successful, the idea can be applied to other areas.

On the basis of the demonstration project, the initial blueprints were developed and several formal meetings were held with both local log builders and prospective occupants of the

units. As a result of these consultations, working drawings were developed and tenders or proposals were called in April or May of 1977.

Contracts were awarded to the two lowest bidders in order to have two different housing types. Two units were built to the Corporation plans and the other two were built under an accepted proposal plan.

In February of 1978, a local housing association was formed in Carcross and a meeting held to allocate the houses.

At the first meeting, five applications were considered and two units were allocated.

Meeting the building standards for conventional construction lead to changes in cost increases. The Corporation's design, which initially met with approval from the client group, however, a number of inadequacies are now apparent in terms of functional layout.

Also, the workmanship of the two contractors differed greatly. One contractor did excellent work and went beyond the specifications. The other contractor was removed from the job and the Corporation completed the work, with our own forces.

In the end result, four families can be housed in reasonably adequate, sound accommodation. However, the house may not necessarily be what an individual would chose if he were to build his own.

In terms of cost, one and two unit project cost a total of \$85,920, the other \$87,032. This is including land, Yukon Housing Corporation supervision of the project, and the appliances. The actual building costs are closed at \$46,000 per unit.

Mr. Lengerke: That was a question I wanted to ask, if the planning and administration was charged to that, too. Did that come out of that Remote Housing Program?

Mr. Owens: Yes, it would come under that, it was charged in the project.

Mr. Lengerke: Do you know what costs were incurred for the actual administration and planning of those units, so we can sort of break that away from the actual?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, just one correction I should make, Mr. Owens has indicated that the actual building costs were close to \$46,000 per unit. Actually the figure was \$40,000 per unit.

Mr. Lengerke: I have \$43,750.

Mr. Schneider: That included land going to actual construction costs. The breakdown definitely includes architectural and supervision. On one contract it was \$2,000, and the other contract was almost double that amount, \$4,500 on the second.

Mr. Fleming: I will not belabour this subject either, I have already. I might just ask the witnesses though, I think that the plan was not very good and you are not going to carry that particular plan on in the future, is that right?

Mr. Owens: We called it a pilot project when it was approved by the Board of Directors, and the pilot got shot down.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, I might comment too because last year I commented on when they were going to build log homes, that they would have to do certain things and find certain people to do it. Possibly they went the right way about it, I still will not maintain you cannot build a wonderful log home there are just a few more things the Yukon Housing Corporation, and I do not care who made the plans or anything else, it has not found about log homes yet. I might stress that in case they decide to build another log home somewhere, there is no way you put additions and so forth on log homes. You build a big square home and that is it. No fancy things in any log building that you are building because it would cost you a pile of money, and I think you found that out.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Establishment 2183, Rural and Remote Housing: \$400,000.
Establishment 2183 agreed to
On Establishment 2184

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2184, Replacement Equipment - Staff and Social Housing: \$15,000.

Mr. Owens: This capital fund was established part way through 77-78 in order that equipment, mainly appliances, would be replaced with capital monies rather than from operating and maintenance funds. As equipment is utilized in a certain project, it is charged against that project in order that for most of the social housing programs, sharing can be obtained from CMHC.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?
Establishment 2184 agreed to

On Establishment 2185

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2185, Assisted Home Ownership Program, \$1 million.

Mr. Owens: These funds are 100 per cent recoverable monies, as any unit built would be sold with CMHC financing.

When the budget was prepared, it was intended that Yukon Housing Corporation would enter into a small speculative building program in some outlying communities, with the intent of satisfying a need, as well as demonstrating the demand for this type of housing to the private sector.

Since that time, additional information has come to light. For example, we now find that there is some private speculative building presently occurring in Watson Lake, therefore, there have been some revisions to the plans originally conceived and it is possibly not all of these monies will be spent.

Plans are now subject to a final analysis; land being available, et cetera, include the possibility of a number of present staff housing tenants at Destruction Bay, who wish to build their own houses, and the possibility of a small speculative project in Haines Junction.

Mr. Chairman: Any discussion?

Mr. Fleming: A question, Mr. Chairman, yes, a question of Mr. Owens, this is an actual mortgage from the company and a person could apply individually to build a home?

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, what we use this sort of budgeting for, number one, in order for the Board of Directors to decide to go ahead and build, we have to budget for it, even though we can go and borrow the same monies from CMHC.

What we are suggesting we would do with these monies, is that in a community such as Haines Junction, we would go in because, having analyzed the market, we feel that some speculative building should take place and we would use this program to do it.

We did the same thing a few years ago in Whitehorse, when we developed 28 single detached units. Up until that time, this program had never been used in Yukon.

Once we had done that and we had sold all the units within a matter of a few days, the private market then started using the Assistant Home Ownership Plan themselves.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, I gather from the comments that you had a project planned for Watson Lake, is that right? Just exactly how many units, what were you planning?

Mr. Owens: Mr. Chairman, the Watson Lake and, again, the question of Haines Junction, and also the Destruction Bay staff members, are all programs that we are looking at. They were not to the point where we could say that we had determined that "x" number of units were viable or were needed.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions or discussion?
Establishment 2185 agreed to

Mr. Berger: I would just like to make one comment to the witnesses. They came in expecting a lot of flack and this was

not that bad, no?

Mr. Owens: Not bad at all.
Mr. Chairman: That concludes Yukon Housing Corporation.

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

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Witnesses are excused.

Speaker resumes the Chair

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

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

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted, may I have your further pleasure.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I move that we do now call it 5 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I second that, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to

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

Adjourned

The following Legislative Returns were tabled March 16, 1978.

78-1-4

Pipeline Project Yukon Territorial Government Responsibility
(Written Question No. 41-1977-2nd)

78-1-5

Yukon Heritage Fund
(Written Question No. 42-1977-2nd)

78-1-6

Pipeline Impact Management Agreement
(Written Question No. 43-1977-2nd)

78-1-7

Planning Council Selection of Lands
(Written Question No. 47-1977-2nd)

78-1-8

Stratton Inquiry Cost
(Oral Question - February 20, 1978 - Page 622 - 1977-2nd)

78-1-9

Faro/Impost Fee
(Written Question No. 48-1977-2nd)

78-1-10

Taxation Reassessments in Outlying Districts
(Oral Question - March 1, 1978 - Page 780 - 1977-2nd)

78-1-11

Heavy Equipment Operators Class Series Review
(Oral Question in Committee - March 8, 1978 - Page 77)

The following Sessional Paper was tabled March 16, 1978

78-1-12

Old Crow Band Council Resolution

LEGISLATIVE RETURN #1
1978 (First Session)

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On February 20, 1978, Mr. Lengerke, the Member for Whitehorse-Riverdale asked the following question:

The Government of Yukon recently submitted to the Federal Government requests for research funding dealing with 14 specific areas that are Y.T.G. responsibility in connection with the Alaska Pipeline Project.

What 14 specific areas were identified in this request? What amount of funding was requested in each specific area?

The answer to the question is as follows:

The specific areas, and the amounts requested by fiscal year, are as follows:

| PROJECT TITLE | Year | |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| | 1977-78 | 1978-79 |
| 1. Supply of gas to Yukon communities | 15,000 | 30,000 |
| 2. Pipeline electrification | 15,000 | 30,000 |
| 3. Immigration - Impact measure and mitigative measures | 15,000 | 45,000 |
| 4. Employment and training initiatives | 15,000 | 45,000 |
| 5. Programs for control of speculation | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 6. Spatial price surveys | 5,000 | 10,000 |
| 7. Pipeline as a catalyst for economic opportunities | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 8. Capacity of Yukon road system | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 9. Pipeline traffic | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 10. Impact on campgrounds and recreation areas | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 11. Alyeska impact and expertise | 15,000 | 5,000 |
| 12. Options for protection of people on fixed incomes | 5,000 | 10,000 |
| 13. Real estate transaction surveys | 2,000 | 6,000 |
| 14. Rent surveys | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| Community profiles | 30,000 | |
| TOTALS | 153,000 | 216,000 |

March 9, 1978

J.K. McKinnon
Minister, Local Government
and Highways and Public Works

LEGISLATIVE RETURN #5
1978 (First Session)

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On February 20, 1978, Mr. MacCall, the Member for Selkirk River asked the following question:

In view of the fact that what seems to be a line of credit with respect to the so-called Yukon Heritage Fund, can the Minister advise this House of the following:

Will the 200 million line of credit interfere with the budget estimate for the '78-'79 period and is the Government of Canada trying to force the Government of the Yukon to tap into the Heritage Fund for reasons which would reduce the direct funding available from the Government of Canada for budget purposes.

The answer to the question is as follows:

The 200 million line of credit will interfere with the budget estimate for '78-'79 to the extent outlined by the Commissioner in his budget address on page 2 and 3.

The Government of Canada is not trying to force the Government of Yukon to tap into the Heritage Fund, as monies paid into this fund are not subject to the deficit grant. However, it would obviously be to their advantage to minimize the capitalization of this fund so that a maximum dollar amount accruing to the Yukon in pipeline property taxes can go to reducing our deficit funding from Ottawa. The Government of Canada has accepted the Heritage Fund in principle, but the amount available for the fund and the purposes for which it can be used are to be negotiated.

March 16, 1978

J.K. McKinnon
Minister, Local Government
and Highways and Public Works

LEGISLATIVE RETURN #6

1978 (First) Session

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On February 20, 1978, Mr. Langerhans, the Member for Whitehorse-Riverdale, asked the following questions:

Does the Yukon Government envision or has it identified the need now or in the near future, the necessity to enter into a formal impact management agreement between the pipeline company and the Government of Yukon and conceivably the Federal Government and possibly CWT which would provide for:

- 1) the negotiation of responsibility during the life of the project for impact related measures and compensation,
- 2) responsibility for specific impact terms which would be identified at the outset and possibly some limits on compensation for other items not yet identified,
- 3) provision for binding arbitration should the negotiations fail on any item,
- 4) provision for a necessary permit and enabling legislation from the Yukon Territorial Government,
- 5) provision for the control of funds, payments, pursuant to the agreement,
- 6) provision for financing the information gathering program development and negotiation structure, and

if no agreement is envisioned or planned, how is the final legal responsibility to be determined in terms of Yukon requirements and impacts?

The answer to the question is as follows:

The Government of the Yukon has not yet identified the need for a formal "Impact Management Agreement" with Foothills. The Agreement to build the line will be between Foothills and the Northern Pipeline Agency, and the responsibilities of the company will be defined in the terms and conditions that will be attached to the agreement. Those are now being formulated by a committee on which this government is represented, and will be made available for public discussion and input before they are finalized and passed on to the company.

March 15, 1978

J.M. McKinnon
Minister, Local Government
and Highways and Public Works

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On February 24, 1978, the Honourable Member for Whitehorse-Riverdale, asked the following written question:

Would the Minister provide this House with a list of lands which the Planning Council has identified as potential community lands which may require protection and which the Planning Council has recommended to the Minister be withdrawn for possible selection by the beneficiaries of the claim?

The answer to the above question is as follows:

No such lands have been identified at this time.

Date

Signature

LEGISLATIVE RETURN #8

Mr. Speaker,
Members of the Assembly

On February 20, 1978, Mr. McCall asked the following questions:

Re: Stratton Inquiry
What is the cost to date of this inquiry?
Will a supplemental to the budget be required in order to pay for the costs?

The answers to these questions are as follows:

The expenditure to date is \$9,674.19

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Disbursement Account - J.J. Stratton | |
| Nov. 25, 1977 to Jan. 31, 1978 | \$1,762.80 |
| All West Reporting Ltd. | |
| Jan. 25/78 to Jan 31/78 | \$7,848.74 |
| Miscellaneous supplies | \$55.65 |
| | <u>\$9,674.19</u> |

A Supplementary in the amount of \$10,300 has been requested in order to pay for the costs.

No legal fees are included in the above costs submitted to date.

Feb. 21, 1978

A.M. Pearson
Commissioner

March 1st, 1978, Mr. McCall

In view of the fact that an impost fee of \$1,000, a lot was paid by Cyprus Anvil Mining Corp to the Govt of Yukon, with respect to the last completed sub-division in Faro:

1. How much was the total impost fee collected?
2. What percentage of the impost fee was returned to the Town of Faro?
3. What other communities in the Yukon have paid impost fees?

The answer to the above question is as follows:

In answer to the above question it would be beneficial to the members to be familiar with the background of the situation.

In 1975, Y.T.G., pursuant to the C.A.P., paid to the Town of Faro approximately \$265,000, or 90% of the cost of constructing a secondary water supply line and an auxiliary power unit. This project while a desirable feature of the Towns water supply system was essential with the concurrent development of an additional residential subdivision by Cyprus Anvil. As a contribution toward the cost of these off-site services, financed by Y.T.G. and the Town to the tune of \$300,000, a \$1,000. per lot, impost fee was levied.

The specific answer to the Honourable Members questions are:

1. The Government of Yukon has collected \$48,000. from Cyprus Anvil Mining Corp. being the total impost fee imposed.
2. No portion of the \$48,000. has been returned to the Town as yet, however, Y.T.G. has agreed to return 10% or \$4800. since the Town, at large, financed 10% of the project cost.
3. To date no community has been assessed impost fees, however, in other cases private developers of Government land, have paid 100% of the cost of off-site services. One example is the North Land Mobile Home Park in Whitehorse. In this case the proponent also paid appraised value for the land.

Date

Signature

Mr. Speaker,

Members of the Assembly

March 1st 1978 Mr. Fleming

When does the Minister expect a reassessment to be done in the Teslin area?

The answer to the above question is as follows:

PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF YUKON GENERAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM:

| | |
|--------------------------------|------|
| Whitehorse | 1978 |
| Dawson | 1978 |
| Watson Lake | |
| Periphery | 1978 |
| *Faro | 1979 |
| **L.I.D.'s & Unorganized Areas | 1981 |

* Possibly 1978

** L.I.D. & unorganized areas may be segregated into two categories thus L.I.D.'s would be reassessed in 1980 and the balance of the Territory in 1981.

March 14 1978 *[Signature]*
Date Signature

Mr. Speaker

Members of the Assembly

March 8th, 1978 Mr. McCall

Heavy Equipment Operators Class Period Review:

"I was wondering would the witness be prepared to provide this Committee with the documentation dealing with where, and when, the assessments were conducted, or audits were conducted through the Territory in order to come up with a firm audited assessment or classification review purposes."

The answer to the above question is as follows:

| | |
|--|--|
| Watson Lake - November 23, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Five Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Dawson City - November 29, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Five Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Boundary Camp - November 30, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Two Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Destruction Bay - December 5, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Three Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Haines 75 Mile Camp - December 6, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Seven Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Haines Jct. - December 7, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Six Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Whitehorse - December 14, 1977 | - One Road Foreman |
| | - Six Heavy Equipment Operators II |
| Total | - Seven Road Foremen |
| | - Thirty-four Heavy Equipment Operators II |

In addition to the foregoing, audit discussions were held with the three Highway Maintenance Area Superintendents and the Chief Highway Maintenance Superintendent.

March 13, 1978
Date

[Signature]
Signature

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

