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

We will proceed, at this time, with Prayers.

(PRAYERS)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed, at this time, with the Order Paper under Routine Proceedings. Are there any Returns and Documents for Tabling?

Reports of Standing or Special Committees?

Petitions?

There being no Petitions received, are there any Introduction of Bills?

Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Highways and Public Works has introduced two measures to protect the Department and contractors who obtain government projects.

The Yukon Government Contract Regulations were recently amended so that contractors bidding on water and sewer projects with a total cost in excess of $250,000 must be bondable.

This change comes as a result of problems experienced in the past where underfinanced contractors have taken on water and sewer projects and have run into difficulties during the course of the project.

It is hoped that the new system will alleviate this problem.

The second change is in policy, which calls for meetings to be held between departmental officials and representatives of companies who successfully bid on contracts. The meetings will be held with the bidder prior to awarding of a contract.

The meeting would also provide an opportunity for the contractor to point out how the contract might be better handled from a practical point of view and also to raise points about contract specifications so that any misunderstandings can be prevented before the job is in progress.

The pre-award meeting will also help to prevent any financial problems which might arise at the end of the project.

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

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I believe it is in Order, Mr. Speaker, to make a reply to the Ministerial statement.

Mr. Speaker: A brief reply would be quite in order. Proceed.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am somewhat appalled by the statement that the Minister has just made. He has, in fact, again, contradicted the statement just made by his leader, the other day, that provision of contracts to small businesses would be a priority of his Government and it now appears to have upped the ante and made is somewhat more difficult, Mr. Speaker, for small contractors to bid, go through the arduous process of obtaining bonding; whereas, in the past, I believe, deposits of cash were involved in this matter may wish to find other ways of raising the question in debate perhaps during the Main Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that, with the advent of the new Rules, the Opposition does have the opportunity of replying to the Minister's statement. The same day, the Minister has the opportunity to speak the last time to the comments that were made and also to the principle that we are discussing, with the change in the new Rules.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not the understanding of the Chair; however, I will certainly look into it and if I should be considered to be at fault then I will certainly allow the question to be raised again.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs and I wish to announce a tax rebate plan aimed at assisting community clubs throughout Yukon. This plan was worked out in co-operation between officials within the Recreation Branch of my Department and officials within the Community Affairs department.

The plan is retro-active to 1975 and will result in the writing-off of property taxes paid by the community clubs. All monies paid by the community clubs for general and school taxation and local improvement charges will be returned, in full, under our proposed rebate plan. The total amounts include the taxes paid on the properties and facilities owned by community clubs.

The interim measure is being put into effect until the proposed review of the Taxation Ordinance is undertaken by this House later this year.

Our intention in introducing this rebate program is to assist the community clubs by decreasing their costs in running their recreation facilities. This Government finds merit in the role played by the community clubs in providing recreational facilities in the rural communities and our proposal comes as a direct result of requests for assistance from the various community clubs. Provision for introducing the plan comes under Recreation Development Ordinance and the applicable Commissioner's Order giving effect to our proposal.

The Commissioner's Order allows the community club to apply for a grant to reimburse the club for taxes paid for taxation years 1975 through 1978. The community clubs will have until December 31 of this year to apply for the grant.

This rebate grant will be in addition to other recreation assistance grants provided by this government and will include the following community clubs: Carcross Community Club, Shakkaw Valley Community Club, Klune Lake Athletic Association, Watson Lake Community Club, Keno Community Club, Teslin Community Association, Beaver Creek Community Club, and the Carmacks Community Club.

Our review of taxation payment shows that the total expenditure under this rebate program will amount to $52,500, during its initial implementation. The annual actual cost is expected to be $15,000 per year until the Taxation Ordinance is amended.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, roughly $8,000 will actually be rebated to the various community clubs. The Recreation Branch will be notifying the community clubs involved about details of the program over the next few weeks.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to commend the Minister for his statement, I think that is a very practical kind of action by this government and will include the various community clubs in providing recreational facilities in the rural communities and our proposal comes as a direct result of requests for assistance from the various community clubs. Provision for introducing the plan comes under Recreation Development Ordinance and the applicable Commissioner’s Order giving effect to our proposal.

The Commissioner’s Order allows the community club to apply for a grant to reimburse the club for taxes paid for taxation years 1975 through 1978. The community clubs will have until December 31 of this year to apply for the grant.

This rebate grant will be in addition to other recreation assistance grants provided by this government and will include the following community clubs: Carcross Community Club, Shakkaw Valley Community Club, Klune Lake Athletic Association, Watson Lake Community Club, Keno Community Club, Teslin Community Association, Beaver Creek Community Club, and the Carmacks Community Club.

Our review of taxation payment shows that the total expenditure under this rebate program will amount to $52,500, during its initial implementation. The annual actual cost is expected to be $15,000 per year until the Taxation Ordinance is amended.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, roughly $8,000 will actually be rebated to the various community clubs. The Recreation Branch will be notifying the community clubs involved about details of the program over the next few weeks.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to commend the Minister for his statement, I think that is a very practical kind of action by this government and will include the various community clubs in providing recreational facilities in the rural communities and our proposal comes as a direct result of requests for assistance from the various community clubs. Provision for introducing the plan comes under Recreation Development Ordinance and the applicable Commissioner’s Order giving effect to our proposal.

The Commissioner’s Order allows the community club to apply for a grant to reimburse the club for taxes paid for taxation years 1975 through 1978. The community clubs will have until December 31 of this year to apply for the grant.

This rebate grant will be in addition to other recreation assistance grants provided by this government and will include the following community clubs: Carcross Community Club, Shakkaw Valley Community Club, Klune Lake Athletic Association, Watson Lake Community Club, Keno Community Club, Teslin Community Association, Beaver Creek Community Club, and the Carmacks Community Club.

Our review of taxation payment shows that the total expenditure under this rebate program will amount to $52,500, during its initial implementation. The annual actual cost is expected to be $15,000 per year until the Taxation Ordinance is amended.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, roughly $8,000 will actually be rebated to the various community clubs. The Recreation Branch will be notifying the community clubs involved about details of the program over the next few weeks.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
the actual benefits may not be readily apparent to these community clubs.

The principle involved I would endorse strongly and commend the Minister for that.

Mr. Paukett: Yes, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to thank the Minister for his statement. I have two small concerns which I would like to draw to his attention and, perhaps, he might like to comment further on them at some future date.

I am concerned, somewhat, that some of the clubs in question may have large land holdings which they are not presently using and I am concerned if the Minister has considered the possibility that giving tax rebates on all the property that a club may hold, including land holdings which are not being used, may, in fact, be a disincentive for them to get rid of that land or to sell it or to give it to somebody who may be able to put it to better use.

The second concern that I have, and I did not hear the list completely, but I think I heard the absence of a couple of community clubs from that list that perhaps ought to be on the list and I would like to pursue that at some further date, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, I am afraid the only replies can come from the party leaders.

Mr. Fleming: That is what I thought was going to happen in this House.

Mr. Speaker: In relation to the question raised by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, on his Point of Order, he had quite correctly pointed out that the Government spokesman, following the brief statement by Party Leaders, may give a five minute reply and, at this time, I would ask if the Honourable Minister might wish to continue with his reply?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very important that there be clarification in respect to the statement that I made earlier. The Leader of the Opposition, I do not think fully understood what I was trying to say. The point that we are trying to make is in respect to the water and sewer, and this is strictly in the water and sewer contracts where we are requesting a bonding be required. It is because of the past experience here that the Territorial Government has had in respect to that area of construction.

It is not only for the Governments point of view, but it is protection for the contractor. We will be monitoring it over the next year, or two years to see how it works out.

At the same time, there is not thought from this side of the floor that we are attempting to cut people out of the business, there are other smaller jobs that are available from the Territorial Government, and for that matter, Mr. Speaker, from the private sector for water and sewer, where people can get the necessary experience and, perhaps, get into jobs that are greater than a quarter of a million dollars.

It is a two-way street, Mr. Speaker. We are just as worried about the contractor so that they are not putting everything they own on the line when they go for a contract and find out that they are not capable of providing the service. Subsequently, they suffer and they suffer directly.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a misconception that was also put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the pre-award meeting. Basically, the idea is not to change the bid, but to get the contractor, the Territorial Government officials, as well as, perhaps, engineering consultants, depending upon the job, to outline the expectations of all parties, so that everything is put down clearly. The contractor understands what the Government stands and the Engineering Department understands where they stand.

So, in other words, Mr. Speaker, it allows the contractor, at a pre-award meeting, to put practical ideas, they may not be engineers, but at the same time, they have experience in the field that they are bidding in. Then, that allows them, Mr. Speaker, to put forward practical ideas that were, perhaps, from a theoretical point and engineering point of view, it seems feasible, but once you get down to the actual reality and practicality of doing a particular job, it can be done in a simpler method.

There is no thought that you are going to have a lower bid and then allow you fluctuating the cost of the bid or whatever. Basicallly, I want to try to correct the misconceptions prior to the award of the contract and not after, and not in the middle of the season, or whatever.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this will work. I understand that in some other areas, in the provinces, they have implemented this process and it has been fairly successful.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a couple of questions from the Opposition side, of the total $25,500 expected to be rebated, $44,500 is currently owed in back taxes. Those community clubs which have, in fact, kept up tax payments to this government, will be rebated in cash.

In answer to the Honourable Member from Campbell's unanswered question, Ross River is missing from this list simply because they do not appear on the present tax roll and they have not been taxed.

Mayo does not appear on this list because they were taken over by the L.I.D. some time ago and are presently being assisted under the Canada Recreational Assistance Program.

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

We will then proceed at this time to the Question Period.
Hon. Mr. Tracey: It will be a green paper, a discussion paper, Mr. Speaker, and, hopefully, it will be in the very near future.

**Question re: Vocational Training**

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education with respect to vocational training. In the Department’s 1977-78 Annual Report, an outline of pre-employment courses was explained but without any data assessing the success of the courses in terms of occupational or industry acceptability of students for hire. The Report, in reference to each program, states that the student can only be accepted into apprenticeship programs if the student can receive certificates of course completion, that students are expected to be offered employments. My question to the Minister is whether he has any knowledge of the placement of students into appropriate employment following vocational course completion?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, I do not, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Could the Minister provide this House with follow-up data on placement statistics of students completing vocational training?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: In the Minister’s presentation of this data, could the Minister also detail the courses offered, their length and frequency, and the numbers of students entering and completing the courses?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could ask the Honourable Member to make his question in the form of a written question and in that manner, I would be able to answer his question more fully. I believe that is the case.

Mr. Speaker: Would this be agreeable to the Honourable Member?

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Yes.

**Question re: Contractors’ Unpaid Bills**

Hon. Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a written question to the Government House Leader: Due to the many unpaid accounts by contractors in the Yukon to business places supplying them with such things as food, lodging, et cetera; if, after some contractors have signed, unlawfully, their final payment by stating that all bills are paid, will the Government accept said bills and apply them against satisfactory job deposits made by the contractor and held by the Government for a period of time after completion of a job if, in fact, the Government is holding some percentage for this reason?

Mr. Speaker: I should caution the Member that the question would appear, at first hearing, to be somewhat hypothetical in nature; however, we will consider it.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I can prove every word of it.

**Question re: Pipeline Right-of-ways**

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I have another question. On the pipeline right-of-ways, a question that I do not think has arisen so far, although, it possibly may have and I may have forgotten. After the pipeline is built and the right-of-way has been established and is presumably owned by Foothills, has this government, to date, negotiated, or do they intend to negotiate, what will be paid, or how it will be paid if you have to cross that line at any time or build access to different areas back and forth across that line?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, no, we have not done anything yet, primarily because we are in no legal position to do anything in relation to this until the legislation that we presently have before this House is dealt with.

**Question re: Liquor Legislation**

Mr. Fleming: This is a liquor question and I would direct it to the House Leader. Due to the problems that have been encountered with liquor and due to the fact that the last Legislature brought in the Liquor Ordinance and more or less left public drinking wide open, only giving the action to little towns and they have now done so and proven in some respects that it helps. In my view, I should not give my view, but; in my opinion, a program that students in college before because you now cannot drink in Teslin or you cannot have open liquor in your car, you cannot have open liquor. You cannot in Whitehorse, but you can in the highway directly outside of Whitehorse. It is a mess, in other words, a total mess.

Would this government now, or are they considering, and have they got the guts to bring that legislation back in here and do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not considered it yet. It seems that the Legislation is, in fact, working, for the edification of the Honourable Member, it is now, or it will be, illegal to drink in your car in Whitehorse quite soon.

**Question re: Hillcrest Sewer and Water Contract**

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is to the Government, yesterday, at question period. The Minister for Municipal and Community Affairs, informed the House that it was in the process of letting an extremely large contract, between four and five million dollars, for the construction of sewer and water facilities in Hillcrest, and that was in flat contradiction to an assurance given to this House on Thursday, March 8th, by the Government Leader, that contracts would be broken up into manageable pieces.

I would like now, for the Government Leader to tell this House, which policy will prevail, his or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to. They have been bothering me, the implications made by the Leader of the Opposition, that there is a contradiction. There is not.

Mr. Speaker, I said, and I meant that this Government, will, wherever it is possible, feasible, and economical, break up contracts to make them available to local contractors: I sited an instance where we had already done so. As it turned out, in that case, the local contractors were not successful on the options that were submitted. That policy has not changed.

In the case of the Hillcrest water and sewer job, it is a big job and it is far more economical to be done by one contractor. It is beyond comprehension that we would be asked to break up contracts where it does become uneconomical.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Before pursuing the economics of that one, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could have a brief outline from the Government Leader, which contracts he considers to be more economical broken down and which contracts he will expect to be issuing in large amounts.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, such things as clearing contracts, even the clearing section of a large contract could be broken out as a separate contract, as a subcontract and awarded to the local contractor.

When you come to a job like water and sewer where there are really two constraints, one being the areas to work in and the other being time, it becomes very difficult to break them up.

We are faced with time constraints in the Territory and we must ensure that the contractor is capable of doing the sewer and water job, of being able to open it up in the spring and, hopefully, get it closed by the fall. It also, inhibits our capability of getting lots available if, in fact, a sewer and water job were broken up into too small sections at a time.

There is no magic formula, but, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at this and, hopefully, we will be able to call contracts so that we do not have to break them up, but, actually, call contracts in sizes and magnitudes that can be looked at, realistically, by local contractors.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to make the observation that speed being of the essence in these things to be able to work in, perhaps, four different areas at one time, and even to work in one area at once. Going along; however, I would like to ask the Government Leader how more economical it was, are they expected to be, to issue this in one lump sum or to break it into three or four pieces?

What is the basis for the statement that it is more economical to do it in one?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is very difficult to break it down. I think, it is fair to say in respect to the water and sewer contracts in Dawson, at one time, it was considered that it be done over six years and then a two year program and now it is down to a year program. I could bring down a breakdown in respect to the cost of that?

What you get into, Mr. Speaker, is people purchasing equipment, having to bring it in, transportation, freight, everything else compounds itself and, subsequently, goes into the economy of a particular job.

I think it is fair to say also, Mr. Speaker, in the experience in the past in this particular area, and all we are confining ourselves to is the water and sewer area, is that we have experienced where a contractor, on one particular job that was split into two, who has done the job well, completed it, but, at the same time, in another area, there were financial problems and other problems that entered into the picture, the job is not complete and, subsequently, that contractor is inhibited from finishing his job because of connections, water, being able to do the necessary checks through tests, through this.

The Member opposite, Mr. Speaker, would be the first one to be on his feet if we did not have the necessary lots for the public, so these are the two things that we have to try to balance. I think, we
are doing it in a responsible manner and I am sure that the Honourable Member will be on his feet sometime next year giving the Government credit that is necessary in respect to getting lots on the market.

Question re: Electrical Rate Equalization
Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Government House Leader. In answer to my question of last week, the Government Leader said his Government will not get involved in electrical rates in the Territory. I would like to ask him then, is it the Governments view that the subsidization of rural consumers of electricity, by Whitehorse, should be done through the involuntary billing practices of Yukon Electrical, rather than by Government policy?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Honourable Member has deliberately misinterpreted what I said. We were talking about the setting of electrical rates, we were not talking about electrical rate equalization. Any equalization scheme should be, and, hopefully, will be, as a result of a policy of this House. There is no way, I submit, that we should be involved, as a Legislature, in the setting of electrical rates. This is done by a board which is established, in fact, by this House.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, if the effect of the rate structure in this community is such that it does provide subsidies to other communities, I would ask the Government Leader, is it not his view that the rates then that effect those subsidies ought not to be a matter of some interest to this House?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, should such a idiosyncracy occur, then nothing stopping this Government from being an intervenor before that board. I would suggest that that is the only way that it can be effective in relation to setting electrical rates.

If there is an obvious disparity between rates charged, within, say, Whitehorse and the outlying areas, causing some real inequities to any scheme that we have, we would have every right to intervene. It would still be a decision of the board, as to whether or not they would consider our intervention.

Question re: Yukon Electrical
Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Yukon Electrical, in the Territorial Accounts for 1977-78, there is a write-off of $4,872 on a bill owed by that company. Can the government explain its policy on write-offs of this kind?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry, I do not have an answer for that right now, but I will get one.

Question re: Statutory Instruments Standing Committee Reports
Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Government House Leader in regards to the Statutory Instruments Committee of the last government: the Seventh Report on Regulations to the Public Service Commission Ordinance, which constitutes quite a leaflet, and the Eight Report from the Committee, and that is on Labour Relations, and was tabled in the House, and asked for response in, but there was no time in the last Session to do this. The Ninth Report was a Sessional Paper that was tabled in the House. What is the status of these reports, now, with this Government?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I imagine, they are government documents at the present time. If the Honourable Member wishes to bring them to my attention, I would be more than happy to see what they are all about.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because they were tabled in the House here, they are public knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Vocational Apprenticeship Training Centre/ERFU Study
Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Education, or possibly, the Minister of Economic Development, depending on the area of jurisdiction.

On June 26th of last year, this House passed a resolution directing the Economic Research and Planning Unit to commence an in-depth study and a detailed cost analysis, as soon as possible, for the purposes of establishing a vocational apprenticeship training centre in a community other than Whitehorse.

Could either Minister update this House, respecting progress of that study?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, yes, in fact, I received that report on my desk today. I have not had a chance to look at it yet, but as soon as my colleagues and I do have a chance to look at it, I will table it in the House on behalf of Members.

Question re: Justice Department/Press Relations
Mr. Hanson: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Is the Minister aware of a directive going around the Department of Justice that prohibits the employees from talking to politicians and the press?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I am not aware of it at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I am investigating.

Question re: Corrections' Officer Suspension Appeal
Mr. Hanson: Is he aware that the Director of Corrections is appealing his two day suspension and no appeal is being heard by the man that suspended him? That is the same as being heard by the Magistrate that sentences you, too. I do not think it should be allowed.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, this is a policy matter and it is clearly outlined in the Policy Manual respecting Government of Yukon employees and, at this time, it is not something that I should get involved in, or any politician should get involved in.

Question re: DREE and ARDA Program Applications
Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Government House Leader. Sometime ago the DREE and ARDA programs were brought into the Yukon Territory. I wonder if we could have available, for us, how many applications there have been to date, how many have been approved and who they are, in these programs?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Economic Development would be happy to table that information.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Food Prices in Yukon
Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The price of frozen orange juice in Ottawa today, for the twelve and a half ounce can, is sixty cents and at the local supermarket today, the price for that same can is $1.31. That is over one hundred per cent difference for those who are not as quick as I am in calculation.

I would like the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to request, in an effort, I think, to make government concerns known on this issue, will he request an explanation from the local wholesale firm in Whitehorse who supplies this product and, perhaps, give this House some notice of the answer he receives.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that you could find a can of apple juice that is going to cost twice as much here, too. There have been countless investigations done by the government and by the Consumer Affairs Department. I do not know if we can do any good to have another one, but I will take it under advisement.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will consider commissioning a study by his Economic Research and Planning Unit, not into, simply, the levels of prices in the Territory, but the reasons why such increases persist, particularly, such as the increase in the last year, 16.5 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Economic and Research Unit is looking into some of this right now and if they are not, I will certainly make sure that they are keeping an updated record of it.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When the Minister is instructing his officials in preparation for this study, will he ask them to review the 1975 Food Prices Review Report and the 1976 Transportation Study into northern prices?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to do it but, I would, also, remind the Member in the Opposition that we are constantly hearing from the Opposition as to why we are spending too much money in one area or another and everytime I hear a question from the Member opposite. It is going to cost us more money to investigate. I wonder where he thinks the bottomless pit of money is.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Tax Credit to Community Clubs
Hon. Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one more question. It is regarding the tax credit to be given to the community clubs on the sale of liquor. Is he aware that the income from the liquor sales is a major source of revenue for many community clubs, and that the tax credit would be a significant benefit to these clubs?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would like to introduce this topic into the question period.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to do it but, I would, also, remind the Member in the Opposition that we are constantly hearing from the Opposition as to why we are spending too much money in one area or another and everytime I hear a question from the Member opposite. It is going to cost us more money to investigate. I wonder where he thinks the bottomless pit of money is.
There must be a specific instance that the Honourable Member is speaking of, Mr. Speaker, and I would be only too happy to hear from him at some later time and investigate his specific instance.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I submit, in written form, the question posed earlier.

Question re: Electricity/Future needs of Yukon

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Government House Leader: considering the possibility that Kaiser Aluminum or another major purchaser of hydro-electricity may invest in the Yukon in the near future, what negotiations has this Government had with the Federal Government and Northern Canada Power Commission to discuss future plans in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: None yet, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: On the same subject of energy: as outlined in the Throne Speech, what specific steps are being taken to investigate coal and wood as sources of fuel for the Territory either in the short term or the long term?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we have requested financial assistance from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who, in fact, owns the resources of the Territory, the non-renewable resource survey. We have solicited that substantive studies be done on the availability of such things as coal and wood.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the Government Leader say if this government has done an estimate or has on hand estimates as to the quantity of fire-killed cord wood in the vicinity of Whitehorse and, how long that material may last at current rates of reduction?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, no, we do not, but it may be that the federal government does. As I say, they are the owners of the product.

Question re: Hillcrest Land Survey Contract Overrun

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, as he seems to enjoy answering my questions.

Reference has been made, twice now, in this House, to a contract which was taken back and broken down into smaller places without any reference to the original subjects of it and this contract was, in fact, as I understand it, a survey contract for lots in Hillcrest.

It has come to my attention that the final cost to the government of these surveyed lots will be in the region of $300 per lot. This contract is in the process of being done by outside contractors, somebody operating out of Edmonton. At the same time, we have six local surveyors, I understand, who are tendering current rates for a survey of a lot seem to be around $225 to $240 a lot.

I would like some explanation then from the Minister as to why these local surveyors were not asked to bid on this contract last September and why we now have the cost overrun, it appears, or an excess cost of some $20,000 to $25,000 on the contract as a result.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the contract that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to, it should be noted that I was not a part of the administration approximately in September and, therefore, I would find it difficult to answer his question.

All I can do is assume that the reason it was given was the fact that the project had been given out for planning and design to the engineering company and; subsequently, as an extension to that, the legal survey work was given to them in order to try to accommodate the legal surveying over the winter time and; therefore, I would find it difficult to answer his question.

When it came to my attention from local engineering firms, I reviewed the situation and discussed it with my colleagues. We, subsequently, took the contract back and put it out for proposal. We felt that everybody should have the opportunity of putting in a proposal for that amount of work. It was in the area of 570 odd lots, so it was a major contract.

As it turns out, the contract is going to cost approximately $300 per lot. If we had taken the local contractor's bids, it would have turned out to be approximately in the neighbourhood of $400 per lot.

The cost that the Honourable Member is referring to, and I will have to double check this, but I am confident in saying that I think it is in reference to the fact that a lot of the monies that he is referring to is in the actual planning and design cost that is incorporated into the whole project and; subsequently, divided into the number of lots that are going to be issued to the public.

Therefore, I feel that the government had no alternative but to put the proposal back in with the individual that was originally going to do the work, in view of the cost to the consumer who would have to purchase the lot at an extra $100.

I would further, like to expand, Mr. Speaker, that the calls about local contractor, the engineering company that does have a contract does have an office here. They may not be as well set up as other engineering firms, but they are getting set up and they do apparently have intentions of bringing in their own Dominion land surveyors and setting up a full engineering company in the Whitehorse vicinity to serve Yukon.

So subsequently, it is going to be good for competition and I am sure we all welcome it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am not sure that I followed all of that explanation, Mr. Speaker. I will look forward to reading it in Hansard tomorrow. Perhaps, we could ask him to repeat it, but I think it would be difficult.

Just one further point I would like to ask the Minister to check into when he is checking into it, as I understand it, the ultimate cost of $300 per lot did include some planning costs, but, because the contract was cancelled in the middle and then re-tendered to other people, the cost, to date, incurred by the original contractor were, in fact, an advantage to that original contractor in pursuing it.

My question really is, why, in the first place, that contract was let without competitive bids? I would like to have an answer to that at some future point.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question. There are a lot of things I can do and I am glad the Honourable Member recognizes it, but I cannot turn back the clock and I was not here, so, subsequently, I cannot respond to the question that the Honourable Member is asking.

I was not involved with the government at that time and it came to my attention shortly after taking office. I reviewed the situation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that I can report to the House that I did get a call from one of the local engineering firms who had put in a proposal. He called me to congratulate me on the fact that we were prepared to look at this contract, bring it back and resubmit it out to proposals. He fully understood the reasons for the steps that we took after the resubmissions were put in.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do appreciate the efforts that the Minister did go to try and correct the situation. I think the employees who were present in that department in September are probably still present, so some explanation might be forthcoming to him, if not to the House, and I would suggest that that should be looked into.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should caution Members because I have exercised a great deal of latitude from the Chair in respect to the rules respecting Question Period. Perhaps, Question Period is no proper place for statements, nor is it a place for debate. Questions should be of a very urgent nature and should be phrased.

I would draw the attention of all Members to the guidelines established in Beauchesne, on both sides of the House, to handling these questions.

Question re: Agricultural Development in Yukon

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, you make me reconsider my question.

I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development or the Government House Leader. In light of these rising food costs, the need for greater self-sufficiency in Yukon and the encouragement of secondary industries, as well as the demonstrated viability of agriculture in some areas of Yukon, my question is: does this government plan to institute policy that will, accordingly, offer incentive towards greater agricultural development in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, my Department of Renewable Resources has been and is, in fact, right now, looking into the agricultural possibilities of Yukon. I must caution the Member that in a lot of areas he might think that agriculture is a viable alternative, but it might be for one year or two years and then you get frozen out, or you do not allow agriculture to develop, we might run into the situation where we have to support the people that are in the business.

However, we are looking at things like small agricultural plots and possibly developing a garden plot area for people in Whitehorse who want to have a garden plot. Perhaps, out by Lake Laberge, somewhere along the river on one of the flats, but as far as a distinct agriculture policy, we are still working on that.

Mr. Byblow: Will the Minister, in his Department's deliberations on this matter, consider the rather well informed and thoroughly researched recommendations of the Peak Report, a commission study done in 1976 and tabled in this House?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, this agricultural policy is, actu-
ally, one of our Resolutions of our Party and we certainly are looking at it and we certainly will be looking at the Peak Report. The Member across the floor mentioned, too, that we do not own the land in the Yukon Territory. That would have to be turned over to us and we would have to fight for that too.

**Question re: Day Care Legislation**

*Mr. Penikett*: I have a question to the Minister of Human Resources. Recently, the Minister said he will be presenting Day Care Legislation to this House in the near future. He said the Legislation will establish regulations but not funding. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if, following representations from those interested parties, he will reconsider the emphasis on standards in this proposed measure?

*Hon. Mr. Njoott*: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West that I did not indicate in any way, shape, or form that I would pull the Ordinance out as soon as possible. I said at sometime during the year, probably, later on during the year. With regards to funding, subsidization of day care centres, I still maintain that the Government is not prepared to subsidize day care centres, but we are prepared to act upon the request of the Yukon Women’s Association in implementing the Child Care Ordinance.

*Mr. Speaker*: Supplementary.

*Mr. Penikett*: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the cost of implementing new government regulation would have to be borne by the day care centres in question, will the Minister, when he is drafting this Legislation, at least consider providing these centres with the necessary funds to meet the costs of implementing his regulations?

*Hon. Mr. Njoott*: The Department of Human Resources, Mr. Speaker, has voted described as day care, which is, in actual fact, not a day care subsidization. It is moneys allotted for people who qualify for it under the Social Assistance Plan and, other than that, Mr. Speaker, the Government is not prepared to provide any other source of funding.

*Hon. Mr. Mackay*: In the process of preparation of your Child Care Ordinance, I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will make sure that the limit below or, shall we say, that the Regulations will apply not to just private homes, that the current situation where some lady takes in two or three babies or small children to look after, would not fall under the scrutiny of Government at that level, but would be directed more at larger child care centres? Could you give us that undertaking?

*Hon. Mr. Njoott*: Mr. Speaker, the Ordinance will set a limit with regards to the number of children that would be inside the day care centres and the regulations will not affect in any way, shape or form, people who are doing favours for their next door neighbour and who take a limited number of children across the floor, that the children would be set standards or a limited number of people will fall into the category of the Regulation.

**Question re: Agricultural Policy**

*Hon. Mr. Fleming*: Just a supplementary to the Honourable Member from Faro’s question to the Minister of Economic Development on agricultural policy: did I understand correctly when I heard the Minister say that the Government just does not want people to take a chance with their God given right to go out and try to grow potatoes if they wish to on any land that is here? Is it the policy of this Government to regulate people as to how they live because, that is exactly what the Minister said. I would like him to answer that.

*Hon. Mr. Tracey*: Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not say that and I do not mean that. I do not have any problem with people who want to grow potatoes or have a garden or raise horses or whatever else in the Yukon Territory. We are talking about an agricultural policy for a large agricultural business. A hobby farm or whatever, is one thing; whereas, an agricultural business is another.

*Mr. Speaker*: I must advise the House at this time that the time for Question Period has now expired and we will return to the Order Paper. Under Orders of the Day: Government Motions.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**MOTIONS**

*Mr. Clerk*: Item Number 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Graham.

*Mr. Speaker*: Is the Honourable Minister prepared to proceed with Item One.

*Hon. Mr. Graham*: I am, Mr. Speaker.

*Mr. Speaker*: I should advise the House that due to an error in compiling the Order Paper, the entire text of “Motion Number Eight” as submitted by the Honourable Minister of Education does not in fact appear. I will read from the Chair the entire Motion.

It having been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua that the Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly be amended by adding the following Sub-Orders:

Thirteen (a): On the first Wednesday of the Session and every second Wednesday thereafter, that private members’ business is taken up, the Clerk shall place first on the Order Paper those motions other than Government Motions and those Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders standing in the name of the Opposition Private Members.

Thirteen (b): On the second Wednesday of a Session and every second Wednesday thereafter, the Private Members’ Business is taken up, the Clerk shall place first on the Order Paper those motions other than Government Motions and those Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders standing in the name of Government Private Members.

And further, that these sub-orders shall remain in force until such time as the Second Session of the 24th Legislative Assembly is prorogued.

Since this entire motion does not appear on the Order Paper, the Chair will require unanimous consent of the House to proceed with it at this time.

Do we have unanimous consent?

**Some Members**: Agreed.

*Hon. Mr. Graham*: This Sessional order, Mr. Speaker, comes about as a result of the House adopting our new Standing Orders and should this amendment be passed by this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, we, on this side, the reasonable people that we are, are willing to consider Wednesday, March 14th as the first Wednesday of the Session and, in doing so, allow the Opposition Members to take preference on the Order Paper tomorrow.

*Hon. Mr. Mackay*: We, on this side of the House, being also reasonable people, accept this proposal and I think unanimously, I hope unanimously, and look forward to hearing a week from Wednesday, from the backbenchers of the other side as to their proposals.

*Mr. Penikett*: Mr. Speaker, this reasonable member too, supports this motion and looks forward with anticipation to tomorrow’s debates.

*Hon. Mr. Lang*: Mr. Speaker, I think this clearly demonstrates from this side of the floor, and obviously from the other side of the floor, that the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee has done very well and obviously that the government is going to be a lot more open than what was first alluded to in the debate of the Rules.

So I am sure, with us all being reasonable people, things will work out, Mr. Speaker.

*Mr. Fleming*: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to some things and one exception I take is to the wording of this motion. I will be voting, along with the rest, on this motion, I think. I am very happy to see that we have a day for what they call us, Opposition Members.

But I would like to remind this House once again, as I have in the past, the wording of this motion, it does say “other than Government Bills and Orders standing in the names of Opposition and Private Members”. After what happened here this morning and due to the very wording and things that we are thinking we are government and we are thinking that we have an opposition and we are thinking that there is an Official Leader of the Opposition when, in fact, there is not much thing in the Yukon Act, but the rights of two members were taken away from them in this House this morning, by the same type of wording that is on here.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I will be asking for a ruling on that later, because I do not intend to be a first, second, third, fourth class citizen and have my constituents be that, too.

However, the text of the motion is in good faith and I will be voting for it. I am happy to turn that out that we do have that opportunity on those Wednesdays.

(Motion agreed to)

**PUBLIC BILLS**

*Bill Number 2: Third Reading*

*Mr. Clerk*: Third reading. Item Number 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

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

*Hon. Mr. Pearson*: Yes, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, that Bill Number One be now read a second time.

I am sorry, I have erred from the Chair. Bill Number Two, I would correct, be now read for the Second time and this has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, might I rise and make the Motion, it might clear it up.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number Two, Fifth Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78, be now read a Third time.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It has been moved by the Honourable Member, it became rather confusing.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved the Honourable Leader of the Government, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number Two do now pass and that the Title be as on the Order Paper.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Bill Number Two has passed this House. May I have your further pleasure?

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number Two do now pass and that the Title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved the Honourable Leader of the Government, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number Two do now pass and that the Title be as on the Order Paper.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Are you prepared to adopt the Title to the Bill?

Mr. Speaker: Bill Number Two has passed this House. May I have your further pleasure?

Mrs. McColl: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Mayo, Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number Two do now pass and that the Title be as on the Order Paper.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Are you prepared to adopt the Title to the Bill?

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole to order. At this time, I think we will proclaim a short recess.

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee of the Whole to order.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, our witnesses are not here yet; however, they should be very, very shortly.

In the meantime, I would like to, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, reply to a question that was asked of me in Committee, yesterday, in respect to Establishment 225.

The question was: what was the cost of publishing "Yukon the Eleventh?" The cost was $2,844 for the 3,000 phamplets. The printing was done by Jasper Printing of Edmonton and it was printed under the authority of the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development, the Standing Committee of the 23rd Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, might I also suggest that we go back to page 14 in Establishment 319, and once again seek clearance for the expenditure of $44,500.

Mr. Graham: I am sure, explained the expenditure adequately in the Ministerial Statements today.


Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I was bothered by the Clerk over something he was afraid I might have said wrong in the question or something, which I did not. I am not worried about it.

Now, I was going to ask a question on the pool program and I think, maybe, it has been supplied to me now. Yes, it is okay, it is all right.

(Establishment 319 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I refer Members to page 48, Vote 13, Establishment 1300, Administration, an increase of $3,900.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this increase came about as a result of the reorganization of the total Information Resources Department and in this reorganization of the department, the department head and administrative officer were reclassified.

Also, we do not believe that accounted for the whole increase. There was some increase in casual hire to clear up the backlog of paperwork.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask, that reorganization that you refer to, does that reorganization still stand or has that now been reorganized, in December?

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is the one we were talking about when the Archives, Information Resources, Library were all combined into one department: Information Resources and then we got a department head.

(Establishment 1300 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1310, Libraries, an increase of $15,300.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this increase comes as a result of a large increase over the last year, a twenty-five per cent increase, in fact, in the cost of library materials. It also came about as a result of a $1,400 donation to the Faro School Library and a new pay schedule came into effect during the year which resulted in a seven per cent increase in pay in all locations and also pool cars in some locations were unavailable and commercial rentals were necessary.

Mr. Chairman: At this time, I would welcome our two witnesses back, Mr. Sherlock and Mr. Wilson and inform the Members that they are here to answer questions.

Mr. MacKay: you had a question.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: A general question, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the purchase of materials for the Library, has this Department determined if there is any great cost-saving by purchasing outside the territory or purchasing through wholesalers in the Territory and is there a policy being formulated in the Department?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure of all the policy in this regard. In many cases, I am informed by the library services people that we have a great deal of difficulty obtaining books of certain makes outside. We go, both through the wholesalers in town and, if impossible, we sometimes do directly to the manufacturer.

I asked the Department officials to explain to me exactly why a twenty-five per cent increase should be incurred over a one-year period and they informed me that in many instances that from the day they actually order a book to the day that book is catalogued and put on the shelves, it is sometimes as long as eight to ten months.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Perhaps this question could be as notice for the Mains but I would be interested in the cost to the library system of our membership in the inter-library loan system and the number of volumes sent and received from Yukon to other participants in that system?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I do not have the answer and I do not believe Mr. Wilson has but I will take this under advisement.

(Establishment 1310 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 320, Yukon Archives and Record Services, an increase of $89,700.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this comes as a result of a new man year created within the department over the year, an archives librarian, also as a result as indicated in the previous Establishment of a new pay schedule, which resulted in a seven per cent in all locations.

The Court collection acquisition, which was a total expenditure of $62,000, and I believe that that is recoverable. It is recoverable at one hundred per cent. An addition, salary requirement, that was to do with the new pay schedule and also to compensate overtime. A certain amount of overtime was necessary in the department, to compensate for illness, vacation, and short staff, which is a chronic problem.

Mr. Penikett: Just a general question which, again, could serve as notice. I do not necessarily expect an answer now. The Archives Service, of course, is extremely valuable, but an expensive program. I would be interested in what recoveries, if any, we have from this service, particularly, we are always interested in how much we recover and also interest and information to a number of people, academics and outside research interests that may be availing themselves to this service. I understand that this may be in the interests of Yukon, but I would also like to know if we are able to charge any kind of professional fees or anything to people obtaining these services?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Are there recoveries in the Budget, Mr. Sher-
Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask, the price of the Coutts Collection was $62,500 and the recovery appears to be $63,500, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, yes, they are available on page 76, about $5,000 under sundry.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I wonder if the government would be prepared to entertain some bids for some of my old letters?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Byblow: Does the Minister know whether or not the microfilming falls into this category?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, that will appear in the Main Estimates and, perhaps, it will be clarified when they look at the Main Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, the microfilming is not done right now. That microfilming is under the 1979-80 budget. (Establishment 1320 agreed to.)

Hon. Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1330, Information Services, an increase of $3,800.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if Hansard is under Information Services by any chance? What does it come under, just in case I get to it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, Hansard is under Vote 1, the Legislature.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, if I am not mistaken, is due to the hiring of casuals and this is necessary because, I understand, that there is a great backlog of information in the Information Resources Department and every time they get a chance, they hire casual in an attempt to clear the backlog.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Is this a backlog of press releases you are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, this is altogether different. You are talking about two different departments. This is Information Resources, not Information Services.

Mr. Penikett: While we are talking about Information Services, may I ask, you know, is some of that recoverable?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will get that information.

(Mr. Chairman) I now refer the Members to page 51, Department of Renewable Resources, Vote 14, Renewable Resources, Establishment 1491, Parks, an increase of $102,600.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: That Yukon River project, albeit it may not be an expense to this jurisdiction, it is, nevertheless, an expense to the

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, this $102,600 was to provide funds for new man years in the Parks and Historic Resources Branch. There was an increase in this budget of $229,000 during the course of the year, in June, 1978, in fact. There was only $102,000 of this spent, $58,000 of this is recoverable directly from Parks Canada. It is for surveying the historical sites on the Yukon River.

The other $46,000 is directly recoverable from ARDA, so this is, in fact, not costing us anything.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, one brief question: the Minister will not doubt recall that there was some controversy surrounding the Yukon River project and I just cannot recall if there was any report tabled in this House or not on that project? If there has not, I wonder if there will be one forthcoming?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not know if there has or not, Mr. Chairman, but I will take that under advisement.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just to follow-up on my previous cautionary note to the Minister this afternoon, I would not want him to go to the trouble to prepare a special one, but if there has been one prepared and not delivered to this House, I would appreciate getting it.

Mr. Fleming: I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, ‘to provide funds for new man years’, Mr. Chairman, was this $102,600 involved by any chance by the River Patrol, or is that in this vote?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, it was under this Department that this river patrol was there and contrary to what the Member thinks, there are quite a lot more than just a few people going down the river but most of this river patrol was all casual man years. They were just casual employees.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: To ask a supplementary question on that: was this river patrol budgeted for in the Main last year? I will get the answer to that first, I guess.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, perhaps Mr. Sherlock could answer that.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, no, it was not budgeted in the Main Estimates; it appears in this Supplementary and is in fact included in the $102,000.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask how much?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, $55,000 is a recoverable figure on that side that was the cost of the program.

Hon. Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister says, there is extensive travel on this river, no doubt, from Whitehorse, for instance, or from as far away as Carcross and Tagish, all through there and on the Teslin River joining the Yukon River. I realize that still I realize too, it is the taxpayers’ money and I just wonder if you need that big a patrol on that type of river where there is not really a heavy traffic?

I wonder if the Minister could just tell me, what do these people that are patrolling actually do other than patrol the river and just check visitors and take care of them and see if they are all right?
travel down the river in the wilderness surroundings, they are taxpayers of Canada and the whole thing has met significant criticism.

It appears that, far from limiting the amount of garbage on the river, it may have even enhanced it. Far from allowing people to travel down the river in the wilderness surroundings, they are going around following them for surveys and things like that. It seems to me the whole thing is another bureaucratic institution that has been foisted on the Yukon and is spoiling this place for the kind of tourists who want to come here.

I would, therefore, ask that this program be severely reviewed, or restricted or even cancelled, for the coming year.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I heard the Leader of the Opposition correctly, but I think that in his reply to the Throne Speech two days ago, he was saying that we should be looking for more money, as long as it is free, we should be getting all we can, and here he is saying that we should not be doing it.

To get back to the main thrust of the question, this program is still inventorying our resources and getting the information that we need under the General Development Agreement and we signed that agreement and certainly we should be using all that money to get a record of our resources.

Contrary to what the Honourable Member says, I do not think they did increase the garbage. They did a lot. They cleaned up a lot of the sites along the river and I think it was totally beneficial.

(establishment 1401 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1402, General Development Agreement. It is for information only. I will pass that on to Establishment 1410, Resource Planning, an increase of $22,100.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, at the same time that the money was put into Parks and Historic Resources, there was money added to the Resource Planning Branch of $149,000 and we spent $22,000 of that and this is totally recoverable.

I am sorry, I should not say it is totally recoverable, it is covered by wages that were not spent in that department.

Mr. Penikett: Mention is made here of the CBC Oral History. I know something about Oral History, and I am just curious as to why CBC were carrying out that work rather than our Archives people?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I am not exactly sure what CBC stands for. I do not think it is Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but I would take that under advisement.

(establishment 1410 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1420, Wildlife, an increase of $354,000.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, this $354,000 was to do studies for such things as the Alaska Highway Raptor Study and the Caribou Study in the Donjek area and quite a few others. The sum total of it is completely recoverable from DIAND and Foothills and a few other various areas.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just to follow up on that statement, it appears on the back page, page 80 the total of $361,000 is recoverable in this vote. Of which $349,000 has been got under GDA in the previous two, so a total of $270,000 is then left for this wildlife section, so that means that $80,000 is not recovered. Can we have an explanation of that?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: All I can tell you about it is this $354,000 here, is totally recoverable. I would have to ask Mr. Sherlock to answer the other.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it is not quite that simple. The actual amount that has been agreed to recovery is as is shown on page 80, $361,000.

The items that appear on page 52 includes some other things that are not recoverable. You know, they are salary adjustments or whatever, so that all of what you see on page 52 is not necessarily recoverable. Some of it is funded by the $400,000 that we got under GDA and some of it by other grants that we received.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am not referring to page 52 in total. I am referring to this one item of 1420, $354,000. The Minister told us that it was totally recoverable. I do not see the mathematics of that in the figures here, so could you just address yourself to the 1420?

Mr. Sherlock: Okay, I think, how I should answer that is, that $274,200 is totally recoverable. The balance comes out of the $400,000 additional funding that we received from DIAND under the umbrella of GDA, to set up these programs and to set up the planning capability in the Renewable Resources Branch.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Since this has been the first mention of the additional $400,000 that we got from DIAND, perhaps the witness will give us a full explanation of how the whole $400,000 has been spent, or has it been spent, what were the purposes for which we received that money?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Maybe I could give a general background. The $400,000 under the GDA was used to set up the Department of Renewable Resources and this is where the $102,000 in the Parks Branch and the money that was in the Resource Planning came from. That is where that money came from.

This $354,000 here, as Mr. Sherlock says, part of that money came out of that $400,000, but by far the greatest portion of it is recoverable from DIAND or recoverable from Foothills or recoverable from DIAND and DIAND or recoverable from Foothills or recoverable from Public Works. And also recoverable from Aquitaine.

Thirty thousand dollars of that $400,000 was used for the Department of Economic Development for the regional model.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I do not think so, really, the $400,000 was divided up between Economic Development Department and Renewable Resources, that was just mentioned.

I do not have an item by item list as to where it was spent and I believe it was not totally spent in the current fiscal year. There was some, in fact, left over which went into the General Revenues.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just for my education then, when that kind of special funding comes through, $400,000, in order that this Assembly can understand how the elaborate accounting system of this government works, where would I find, in these supplementary, a record of that $400,000?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I may muddy the water a bit more. The $400,000 is just like the money for the Department of Economic Resources of it has to be accounted for here. If the federal government, in mid-year, decides, beyond my comprehension, but they decide that they are going to give us a Christmas present of $400,000, this government has actually no way of spending that money other than getting it voted, by appropriation in this House.

It just goes out and out and out and out and out and out.

It might spend it on the assumption that they are going to get it voted in Supplementary Estimates and I think, in respect to this $400,000, that is probably what has happened.

You know, we did not just get a gift of $400,000 in cash. That is not accounted for anywhere else. It is voted money.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am obviously new here and I want to ask a question which will reveal my profound innocence to the Government House Leader, but I would like to deal with the hypothetical case, which I do not think is entirely hypothetical, that he just gave us, of $400,000 Christmas gift, which we could not spend until it had been voted on by this House, but might be spent in anticipation of a vote by this House.

Could he tell me what would happen if the money was spent and then we did not vote for it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, I am not absolutely sure, Mr. Chairman. Possibly Mr. Sherlock could enlighten us on that.

The point was, Mr. Chairman, what would happen if we voted it down?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the question correctly, it is just not possible. An expenditure must be voted by this House at some point in time. Whether it is in the Main Estimates or whether it is a Supplementary or whether it is a Supplementary after the fact, as you just voted yesterday in 1977-78, it must still come to this House for voting purposes.

Mr. Penikett: The point was, Mr. Chairman, what would happen if we voted it down?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I can recall one instance where this House did vote down, in the Main Estimates, a proposed expenditure. It was to be the Territory's share of the police agreement. This was a number of years ago.

All that happened, at that point, was the deficit grant from the Department was reduced by a like amount of money and the police cost-shared agreement was paid by some other department of the federal government in Ottawa. I am not sure which one, whether it was DIAND or whether it was Justice or who it was. In fact, that money did not show up for a couple of years in our Budget. We never ever had it and then, subsequently, a new police agreement was signed between the Territory and the RCMP.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be picky, but I do want to understand this. The example, just given by the Government Leader, referred to the Main Estimates. His previous example referred to perhaps something in the Supplementary?

To use the similar example again, $400,000 was received and then in the Supplementary, and expended, what would then be the situation if we then voted down that expenditure in the Supplementary Estimates?
Mr. Chairman: On a point of order, I believe we are straying away from the Establishment we are talking about.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, we are dealing with a case, an example of some expenditure of money. The Minister involved was trying to explain to us how that worked its way through the system. I think it is very important, at this point when we are dealing with it, that we come to some kind of clear understanding of this side of the House, and perhaps the on-going item of the House, of exactly the implications of making some decision at this point, on that kind of money.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not absolutely sure, Mr. Chairman. I would hate to suggest that it would demonstrate some degree of irresponsibility on the part of the House, because I do not think that it is, I am just not sure what would happen.

Mr. Penikett: I do not want to be precipitating any kind of irresponsible actions from either side of the House, but I do want to understand from the Government House Leader, and I do hope he will give me an undertaking that, at some point, we will have an explanation of what would happen if we, for example, found, anywhere in here, an extremely offensive item that we could not, in conscience, support, but had been expended by the Government?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I can add to it, I think that if it is a serious question and not a hypothetical question, we should refer it to the Legal Advisor. My off the top answer, would be that it is just not possible, if it was possible, then what you are doing is defeating the government of the day. I am not sure if that is possible. I am sure whether that is legally possible.

Mr. Fleming: I would like to get up and give a little speech on this, because I think I know some of the answers.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I think the short answer is that the Government would fall if we defeated it. It is a money measure so it would be of a serious nature.

Further to this, I would like to, perhaps, put a hold on this one particular item so that we can, perhaps, come back to this discussion, whether or not we have a little more time to consider it.

The proposition of the $400,000 is disturbing to me, because what happens, as I understand it, is that the $400,000 comes as a “Christmas present” during the year. Now, normally any money that is going to be spent at the beginning of the year is budgeted and, therefore, this Assembly has the authority to say we want to spend $100,000, here, $300,000 there.

Here we have the instance of money coming into the General Revenue, unanticipated, which was then at the discretion of the Executive Committee to spend in areas which they deemed to be proper and there is a slight difference there, I think, between an over expenditure of a budgeted amount and the expenditure of new money. It is, therefore, something that is concerned about on this side of the House. I am not sure if this is a precedent, if new money comes in, can this Government spend as they see fit, without having to come back for Budgetary approval from this Assembly?

Dr. Hilbert: Mr. Chairman, as a background to where the $400,000 came from, it indeed, did emanate from a decision of this House to sign an agreement to spend $400,000. This was the Executive Agreement that the General Development Agreement was signed. Flowing from that, indeed, there was an Agreement to introduce Special ARDA into the Territory, which was again agreed to by this House, or its predecessor. It was following the signing of that Special ARDA Agreement that the powers that be in Ottawa decided that they would indeed put some money into the General Development Agreement to support our ability to develop subagreements under that General Development Agreement. We did not have the capability, in particular, in the Department of Renewable Resources, to carry out the research of whatever a subagreement might involve. $400,000 was put into the fund in developing that capability so that we could, indeed, go forward with a subagreement and that is what has been in the works for some time now.

When we refer to inventories, or parks development in the Yukon today, which is, indeed, the subject of the subagreement but we could understand it being put aside, the House, and probably on both sides. We would be controlling these studies but they do not have the personnel or the ability to carry out our end of it, indeed, there could not be a subagreement.

So the $400,000 was designed to develop our capability and it did indeed, go to that purpose, to the majority extent.

Hon. Mr. Lang: To reiterate what my colleague outlined, for example, the Renewable Resources Department that was the direction of the last previous Legislature to the Executive Committee to do in-depth studies in that particular area so there was direction given by the Legislature.

At the same time, I do not think the Honourable Member should be under the illusions that the concept of the Executive Committee is that you vote money and they just authorize money directly through these Establishments. During the year, I am sure the Member is aware, political decisions have to be made in respect to financing and if there are changes then they; subsequently, have to come back to the Legislature.

At one time, the way the Executive Committee was formed, at that time, we had twelve members; you served your time in the Executive Committee upon the direction of the Legislature and were appointed by the Legislature. Now it is a different situation where you have party politics with a leader who appoints people to the Executive Committee with a Government and Opposition side.

There has to be some flexibility in the system. For an example, you may, in the course of the year, negotiate extra funding; for example, the Department of Public Works works, if we are going through the Main Estimates, we are looking at, perhaps later on, not due to our fault but the fact that our Engineering Agreement is such that it comes on later on in the year, is that we may be negotiating some moneys for upgrading of one of our highways.

This will come into a Supplementary in the following budget year because, unfortunately, due to the negotiations with the Government of Canada, we have not been able to present it in the Main Estimates. So all this is always an on-going procedure, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I thank the Member for his elucidation of the history of the Executive Committee. My concern was about the $400,000, if it were not spent by the following year, I will ask the Government Leader’s “Christmas present”, and there seemed to be a fair degree of latitude as to what the purpose of this money was.

The example just quoted was a very specific thing, issue money for the specific purpose of upgrading a highway.

Now this is a slightly different case. We are talking about a sum that was to enable us to develop a capability of developing sub-agreements. It seems to me that very little has come out of that. A question out of all of this would be: what sub-agreements have we, in fact, come up with as a result of spending this $400,000, or almost all of it?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in the House just a day or two ago, we have a sub-agreement for Renewable Resources ready and I told the House at that time that I would be tabling it in the House.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Is that the only sub-agreement that we have been able to come up with out of our $400,000?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That is the only one that we have developed to this time, Mr. Chairman. We are working on a Tourism sub-agreement at the present time.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: This goes back, again, to the whole principle of what Mr. Sherlock mentioned in the process of his explanation, in fact, it is not even certain that $400,000 had not been spent all of that. My question would be: how much of it is unexpended and is it still being used for the purpose of developing sub-agreements?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Sherlock will have to answer that.

Mr. Sherlock: Maybe I should ask for a repeat of the last part of that question.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I was asking how much of the $400,000 is unexpendited and is that unexpended portion being reserved for the purpose of developing sub-agreements?

Mr. Sherlock: Perhaps I will ask Mr. Wilson. He has got some reservations here, so I will ask him to speak, if you do not mind, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the $400,000, as was mentioned, was brought forward to assist in the development of the Renewable Resources Department. The full $400,000 was allocated to the Resources Department by means of increased man years and increased studies.

This current year, when we look at the supplements, the full amount of $400,000 is not obvious, it is mainly because, while the government came through with approvals of additional man years, not all of those man years were filled. Now, what that means is that in the 1979-80 Budget, the full $400,000 is allocated throughout the Department of Renewable Resources and will remain as an on-going item.

In this current year it would be rather difficult to tell how much of the $400,000 was spent, but as a close approximation, we would use the $102,000 for Parks, the $22,000 for Resource Planning, and approximately $85,000 for Wildlife. That would indicate that whatever was left over was unexpended mainly because of vacancies.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: My mathematics say that is about $200,000 that
has been expended then, out of the $400,000.

So my question then is, I presume, to the other side of the House, the remaining $200,000, will it be used exclusively for the generation of subagreements, tourism and game?

Hon. Mr. Tracy: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wilson did not reiterate the fact that some of that money was already used in the Economic Development Department, but; hopefully, yes, we are going to use it all to develop subagreements.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I just want to return for one moment to the question I raised earlier. I want to make sure the Government House Leader does not think it is a frivolous question.

I am not entirely happy with the suggestion that has been made that if we voted a supplementary estimate, especially in this year, one of a previous government, that this government would be defeated. That does not seem to me to make much sense.

I do want to understand exactly the circumstances we would find ourselves in though, if we did vote down money that had been expended by a previous government.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I, too, would very much like to know the answer to the question. I do not consider it frivolous at all.

(Establishment 1420 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I now refer the Members to page 54, Vote 15, Department of Health, Establishment 1500, Disease Control, an increase of $17,700.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, the money was used to provide funds for increased hospitalization and drug medication.

The Department, first of all, did not put together this supplementary; however, I can follow up on that. It was due to an increase in TB cases. There were five last year.

Of course, the five patients were hospitalized in the year that this Supplementary was put in order, which was 1978-79.

It also refers to Primary 50 of Establishment 1500. I can break this down. There was $15,000 that was used for the five patients in that year and that was under Primary 20, under Hospital, Establishment 1500.

You go down to Primary 50, which is an increase in the cost of drugs for cancer, TB, and VD, et cetera, that is $2,700.

(Establishment 1500 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1501, Mental Health, a decrease of $58,000.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, the funds are available because of a transfer to another, Establishment 1507.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I could have an explanation of the difference between 1501 and 1507, what each amount is attempting to achieve.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, the reason why the establishment was transferred to 1507 was because, under 1501, we could not recover any of the money; whereas, on the other hand, in 1507, we can recover fifty per cent of the expenditures.

The Honourable Member, the House Leader, I do not know whether I should call him House Leader, I am not sure whether there is an official house leader over there or not, but anyway, the Rehabilitation, there is $75,000 that is expended there, but out of that $58,000 is included in this $75,000.

The difference between the two is, that under Rehabilitation Services you have clients switching from Mental Health to Rehab Services. You have a number of assessments up to 50 per cent, many ailments, and you go to different primaries under 1507, where you have more clients assessed on the inside programs, and you are meeting immediate concerns regarding clients outside. Then you have clients who move to Whitehorse from training, and under Primary 35, and then under Primary 50, you have special equipment for these particular clients. All these add up to $75,000, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, perhaps for further clarification, and I reply upon the witness to see whether I am accurate or not, if my memory serves me correctly, with the advent of the Rehabilitation Services, it allowed some Yukoners who were outside in various institutions to come back to Yukon; and therefore, it would reflect in the changeover from 1501 to 1507, in respect to the recoveries of the money and the monies that we expended. Is that not correct, Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That is correct, and the main reason was that, in fact, items were recoverable under 1507, where they were not under 1501.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you for that explanation. I am pleased to hear that the Department is trying to repatriate a number of unfortunate people who may now receive treatment here. Just a technical question, now, Mr. Sherlock, if there is a recovery under that 1507, one would expect to see it on page 80, as a recovery, and I do not see any increase in recovery under that heading.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it does appear on page 80, the recoveries do appear there, they are just lump sum recoveries, because these are fifty cent dollars, subject to submission of claims.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I could ask Mr. Sherlock to repeat that answer.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, the entire cost of the program is not recoverable. Only certain portions of the program are recoverable, and you would have to read a ten page Agreement to determine precisely what is a recoverable, because there is a schedule. Specific items are recoverable under the program. I do not know if I can answer any further than that.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: My problem is that I am seeing a transfer of $58,000 from one establishment to another for the purpose stated of being able to recover fifty cent on the dollar on that amount. So I am looking for $29,000, I guess, in the back here, and I do not see it.

Mr. Sherlock: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the point I was trying to make. The entire cost that was transferred is not necessarily recoverable. What they tried to do was move the program into a recoverable area. Some portions of that program are recoverable, and those portions that are recoverable are included in the $338,000 on page 80.

Hon. Mr. Lang: In further clarification in respect to the actual recoveries, would it not be fair to say from Establishment 1501 that $8,000 of that $58,000 is actually recoverable, because of the revised Vote? I think that that would be a fair assumption to make.

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is quite that simple.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am prepared to accept the Honourable Member's explanation.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1501, shall it carry?

(Establishment 1501 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1502 is for information only. We shall go on to 1504, Subsidized Medical Travel, an increase of $30,000.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Again, here, it is generally stated that, to provide funds for the hospital evacuation, I would like to go further into it and define to the House what evacuation is and what we are actually providing the funds for. Under Establishment 1504, the nurses went on strike in July and all of the hospitals had to evacuate, causing a shortage of $50,000. An increase in charters has helped to cause this shortage.

The average cost of a medical evacuation, with an escort, is about $405 outside of the Territory and about $97 within the Territory. If and when a medical evacuation takes place, with a chartered aircraft, we estimate it to be $150,000.

To define "medical evacuation", it is just medical treatment. In fact, it is the Medical Treatment Ordinance that requires the Department to transport patients, and if there are no on the spot services available to that particular place, the patient can be carried out either by scheduled bus, chartered bus, aircraft or chartered aircraft.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, this is a general question. I do not know if you have the answer just now, but I would give notice, I guess, for the Mains. I would be interested in knowing if there is any study carried out with respect to the quarter of a million dollars that we are spending on this, as to what kind of treatment is being sought outside the Territory?

The purpose of my question is, of course, if there is a particular lack of any service here that is causing a high travel cost to Yukon and, thereby finding out whether or not we should be encouraging the location of some kind of medical specialties, more medical specialists here and saving the taxpayer some dollars and, at the same time, giving us more service.
If you can give us that kind of information, if it is available, I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this would be urgent. Would it be fair for me to ask the Honourable Member to write that question out so that I can get that information for him.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will photocopy the Hansard tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Member that the quarter of a million dollars is taxpayers’ money for sure but, I would like to remind him again, that there was a strike in June, and when there is a strike in the hospital, you have got to have professional people looking after sick people, not chartered accountants.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Not wishing to attach the Honourable Member from Old Crow at all, as he might appear deftlesses, I would ask him to look at the Main Estimates for a brief moment, and you will see that this expenditure has not varied within 10 per cent of this amount for the last 3 years. So hospital strikes, great, but we are still spending a quarter of a million dollars a year.

Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I know that from the outlying areas, when people are sent in to Whitehorse it is because more sophisticated equipment is needed. I am sure that Dr. Hibberd can tell you more about this than I can.

(Establishment 1505 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1505, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, an increase of $3,300.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, here we have these funds for the Whitehorse Crossroads Programs, partially offset by salary vacancy and community program reduction.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, may I ask why there was a community program reduction?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take that under advisement.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, again this is another question that I will be asking later on with respect to Crossroads. I would like to know the totality of that facility and how many bed days, if that is the proper term, how many residents on the average that facility is housing during the year, if that information is available?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring that up when the time comes in the Mains. There will be extensive materials coming out when we are discussing that in the Mains.

Mr. Byblow: Just an observation, that perhaps, the Minister could reply to. In the Mains the $3,300 is reflected directly in Administration, and it says program. I wonder if there is any explanation that you could offer?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, this particular Establishment, the $3,300 is as per Public Service Commissions Agreement, salary increase.

(Establishment 1505 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1506, Detoxation Center, $20,500 increase.

Hon. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, the $20,500 is there to provide for the new man years and other salary requirements. In addition to that, it was created by an agreement between the union and the Public Service Commission to have two people on duty at all times. These two new man years might be identified as recovery unit attendants, and it is, obviously required to have these people.

(Establishment 1506 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1507, Rehabilitation Centre, an increase of $75,000.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I think we have already discussed that. It is connected to 1901.

(Establishment 1507 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1510, Administration, a decrease of $45,000.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, funds are available because of salary vacancies. Vacant positions are the one of speech therapist, and the other is the director of Health Insurance, and these two produced a surplus of approximately $42,000.

In addition to that, $8,000 instead of $10,000 was spent on the Health Ministers Conference, leaving a surplus of $2,000, and these funds are being returned to general revenue.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask, is there only one speech therapist on the payroll of the Government or does this lack of a speech therapist mean that there was no program at all in that area?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Yes, there is only one speech therapist in the Department.

(Establishment 1510 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 1511, Ambulance Services, an increase of $77,000.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: The money is there to provide funds for the ambulance salary services. The ambulance services was only taken over by my department last year, and we have no past experiences to refer to and, as a result, our estimates were entirely inadequate.

Salaries, overtime, relief and holidays, have caused a shortage of $30,000. No money was allotted to travel, and the inspector has to travel to the outlying communities. Therefore, an extra $3,000 is required. Charges for the radio equipment were increased from $334 to $514 per month, making another $2,200 required.

The new Public Service contracts provide for parkas and uniforms. To provide this, an addition of $5,000 will be needed.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, some of the ambulances are old and the maintenance is high. These ambulances are in the outlying communities and contracts have been set up for cleaning the equipment in ambulance services on the ambulances themselves. As we have not experienced this before, the $5,000 was an estimate, and could be slightly over or under.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask Mr. Njootli, from whom we received the transfer of these ambulance services? Who was doing it before we did?

Hon. Mr. Lang: At one time it was administered through the Department of Local Government.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I hope Mr. Njootli will have more success in his budgets of the transfer of health, if we ever get that from Ottawa.

I am somewhat surprised that the amount of the increases is over 20 per cent. Was there any increased service rendered at all for that increased amount?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, no, the only answer I can give to the Honourable Member is that the ambulances have been expanded to the communities. Previously, it has been restricted only to the central area, where all the booze is served.

It has been expanded and requires more people to drive the ambulances. As far as I know now, it is even volunteers in these outlying areas who are doing the work.

Hon. Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get the answer as to if that program, when it was changed at that time to the Volunteer Service, is probably the cause of some of the over-run here. I wonder if the Minister would be willing to see if he cannot get the answer. The inspection he was speaking of, $3,000, is it all charged to this Vote? I thought inspection was all in one area. I thought that inspection services would be one area. Is each inspector put in a different spot?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the inspection of all the government vehicles, but as far as I can gather, these vehicles were in pretty bad shape when they were transferred to my Department and $3,000 of the taxpayers’ money is peanuts if a person was broke and travelling from fifty miles outside to the General Hospital. I was going to say something that was drastic, but I better not, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Falle: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister how many ambulances are involved in this three hundred and some thousand dollars?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: I wonder if the former Minister of the former Department could answer that question for me.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am going on memory and I may have to refer to the witnesses for more clarification. It was under the Department of Local Government approximately one year ago, and then the transfer took effect; very easily, between the departments, not like the Health Transfer between Governments. At any rate, the amount of money that is outlined there, Mr. Chairman, is basically for wages. You are looking at a situation where, for example, in the City of Whitehorse, where you have three shifts, seven days a week, one, two, three people on shift. At the same time, in the outlying communities you are looking at, in the Kluane area, and I believe you have an ambulance in the Destruction Bay area, and basically, you have people at times who are put on call, and I do not think the normal amount of money to stay around the community, etc., subsequently, if the ambulance is needed they are available and they go out and do the work. I would not suggest that it is totally volunteer work, but they do it for much less than if we had to hire somebody on a full-time basis. As far as the number of ambulances, I do not know the number off the top of my head, Mr. Chairman, but I would suggest that the number is relatively minimal as far as the Territory. You have one based in
Watson Lake, the north highway, the Dawson area, as well as in Whitehorse, Carmacks and Faro, so the number of units is really not that great. The amount of money you are expending is actually in wages.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I just cannot resist this. I am fascinated by the observation of the previous speaker about the terrible condition the equipment was in when it was transferred from the Department of Highways and Public Works running the ambulances, that it would be put out to bid and they would get volunteers if possible to do this. That change in the program, whether they were going to save the money, whether we could just add to it, that the health transfer will not change this particular program at all. Nothing changes, but the funding is already in our budget, except that we will have control of the particular program at all. Nothing changes, but the funding is presently coming as part of our overall deficit grant. The assumption is that, on us taking over the administration, that they would not reduce that budget, or increase it, as the case may be, because it is being administered by Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Sherlock: That is right, Mr. Chairman. The other thing, if I could just add to it, that the health transfer will not change this particular program at all. Nothing changes, but the funding is already in our budget, except that we will have control of the program.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just clarify in my own mind, the funding is presently coming as part of our overall deficit grant. The assumption is that, on us taking over the administration, that they would not reduce our deficit grant by any amount as a result of that. It is an assumption, though.

Hon. Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it is not really an assumption. That is the negotiation.

(Establishment 1515 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I will proceed on with 1525, YHCIP, an increase of $133,900.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. How many doctors are operating under the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I believe, out of six hospitals, there was one at Clinton Creek, but that was shut down, there are nine health centres and five health stations in Yukon, and there are twenty-seven doctors in the Yukon Territory. I believe they are all affected by the plan.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The written explanation is to provide for increased doctors' fees. Were these increased doctors' fees in terms of patients seen or in terms of fees charged?

Hon. Mr. Njoottì: I believe, with the full funding being provided through means of deficit grant, so are paying for the full cost of the hospitals.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am certainly learning something from this and I hope I can continue this for a little while.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just add to it, that the health transfer will not change this particular program at all. Nothing changes, but the funding is already in our budget, except that we will have control of the program.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just clarify in my own mind, the funding is presently coming as part of our overall deficit grant. The assumption is that, on us taking over the administration, that they would not reduce our deficit grant by any amount as a result of that. It is an assumption, though.

Hon. Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it is not really an assumption. That is the negotiation.

(ESTABLISHMENT 1515 AGREED TO)

Mr. Chairman: I will proceed on with 1525, YHCIP, an increase of $133,900.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. How many doctors are operating under the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I believe, out of six hospitals, there was one at Clinton Creek, but that was shut down, there are nine health centres and five health stations in Yukon, and there are twenty-seven doctors in the Yukon Territory. I believe they are all affected by the plan.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The written explanation is to provide for increased doctors' fees. Were these increased doctors' fees in terms of patients seen or in terms of fees charged?

Hon. Mr. Njoottì: I believe, with the full funding being provided through means of deficit grant, so are paying for the full cost of the hospitals.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am certainly learning something from this and I hope I can continue this for a little while.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just add to it, that the health transfer will not change this particular program at all. Nothing changes, but the funding is already in our budget, except that we will have control of the program.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am certainly learning something from this and I hope I can continue this for a little while.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just clarify in my own mind, the funding is presently coming as part of our overall deficit grant. The assumption is that, on us taking over the administration, that they would not reduce our deficit grant by any amount as a result of that. It is an assumption, though.

Hon. Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it is not really an assumption. That is the negotiation.

(ESTABLISHMENT 1515 AGREED TO)

Mr. Chairman: I will proceed on with 1525, YHCIP, an increase of $133,900.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. How many doctors are operating under the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I believe, out of six hospitals, there was one at Clinton Creek, but that was shut down, there are nine health centres and five health stations in Yukon, and there are twenty-seven doctors in the Yukon Territory. I believe they are all affected by the plan.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The written explanation is to provide for increased doctors' fees. Were these increased doctors' fees in terms of patients seen or in terms of fees charged?

Hon. Mr. Njoottì: I believe, with the full funding being provided through means of deficit grant, so are paying for the full cost of the hospitals.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am certainly learning something from this and I hope I can continue this for a little while.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just add to it, that the health transfer will not change this particular program at all. Nothing changes, but the funding is already in our budget, except that we will have control of the program.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am certainly learning something from this and I hope I can continue this for a little while.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: If I could just clarify in my own mind, the funding is presently coming as part of our overall deficit grant. The assumption is that, on us taking over the administration, that they would not reduce our deficit grant by any amount as a result of that. It is an assumption, though.

Hon. Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, it is not really an assumption. That is the negotiation.
collected it all yet. I am wondering if, possibly, some of that was collected, we would not have a need of a supplement, such as we have here, but as I say I will get to it later.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Wilson, did you have something to say?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Fleming referred to an item on page 80, YHIS, that would refer to 1515, not the premiums charged under 1525. $500,000 is for recovery from Indian Affairs, not the premium charged.

(establishment 1525 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I now refer the Member to page 58. Vote 18, Yukon Housing Corporation, Establishment 1800, a decrease of $217,100.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not have specific delineation of the various sums that are lower in the various Establishments that were voted last year, but to give a rough idea, there was increased revenue in community housing, as a result in the change of rent assessment policy, which led to a reduced net expenditure. There was a reduction in the number of rental units, both staff and rental-purchase, as results of sales and turn back of units to the DPW and private landlords, mainly in the Whitehorse area, which resulted in a reduction of operating and maintenance expenditures.

There were vacancies in the department over the course of the year in the positions of Maintenance Supervisor, two Program Administrators and one Home Management Co-ordinator, as well as General Manager. This accounted for a significant amount in respect to salary costs. At the same time, it should be noted when this type of thing happens over the course of the year, there is of course an increase in overtime payment, which partially offsets that decrease.

There was a minor reduction in the area of travel, and at the same time the increased operation recoveries will be substantially less than shown, because the final claims have not come through in respect to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We just went through the exercise of signing an Agreement with the DIAND in respect to their contribution towards using Yukon Housing, in respect to Status Indians, in their responsibility under the Federal Statute, and until the claims are actually processed, it is going to be very difficult to tell exactly what our recovery is going to be.

Also, at the same time, under expenditures, they are partially offset by additional expenditure in the area of maintenance and staff housing due mainly to an unanticipated sewer line problem in a number of units in Ross River. Taxes on staff housing are slightly higher than anticipated and the increased activity in the Home Management Program led to a minor increase in the overall budget, but I do not have the clear breakdown in respect to actual dollars, but that gives you an outline of exactly what took place over the course of the year.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Perhaps, Mr. Sherlock, if you have any figures you could put them forward.

Mr. Chairman: Have you any figures, Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: I am afraid I cannot elaborate any further on that, Mr. Chairman, as the Member will probably see the relationship in this Vote. It is covered a little bit more in the Main Estimates for 1979-80.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in how many housing units the Housing Corporation is operating.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I believe the housing staff has approximately 570, between 560 to 600, I believe, 570, between staff housing, rental purchase, social housing, all that kind of thing.

Mr. Byblow: Would the Minister explain why there would be reductions in amortization payments?

Hon. Lang: Mr. Chairman, as I reiterated earlier, there was an increase in sales and a turn back of units to DPW, so subsequently that took less responsibility off us, which flows into Amortization and Operation Maintenance, plus the responsibility no longer belongs to this Government.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, is it the policy of the Yukon Housing Corporation to try and sell off its housing stock, or does it have a particular direction in which it is going?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, in respect to staff housing, with the Government employees, if you look through the Legislative books, you will see that there is a Territorial buy-back scheme on the books, which allows employees to purchase or build their own home and, if it reaches a certain standard, they are guaranteed that the Government will buy it back if they leave the employment of the Government, or the leave area.

In other words, the overall policy of this Government is to encourage private ownership, for two reasons, not only from the Government’s point of view, on the operation and maintenance side, costs to the Government, and indirectly, the overall taxpayers base in the Yukon. At the same time, with all deference to the individual involved, because it is advantageous for them build up an equity in a home over the long range, because for example, in my experience, talking to some people who have been in the Federal Government employ, they have lived in homes subsidized by the Federal Government, and when they are sixty-five they do not have an equity in a home, they have nothing when they are finished their working year and looking for retirement. There are advantages to both sides, but in answer to the question from the Honourable Member, yes, we would like to see people go into private ownership. We believe it is a responsibility of the individual, wherever possible, and some areas it is just not possible, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask of the Minister, as you say, the buy-back plan in the staff housing is not in the low cost housing program, is it?

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

Mr. Fleming: I wonder if the Minister could tell me as to whether there have been any sales in the low cost housing program, to individuals who have been living in the homes?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if you are referring to rental-purchase, I believe there have been some sales in the rental-purchase. Yes, I do not know the exact number, but I believe there have been a number of units sold.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister obtain that answer, please?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will bring that information, Mr. Chairman, for debate in the Mains.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just to perhaps serve notice for the Mains, the cost per house appears to have been about $1,700 per unit, and it seems to have been about $1,700 last year. It seems very low. I would like to perhaps, a) have that figure confirmed, and b) have the figure anticipated for this coming year.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, is he looking over the overall budget in respect to the number of housing units we have? Is this what he is inferring to?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am taking the net grant to the Yukon Housing Corporation and dividing it by the number of houses you told us you had.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am not an accountant, but I do not think that would be an appropriate way to approach it, because you have different categories of housing. You have staff housing, you have rental-purchase, you have about three or four different classifications of housing in the Main Estimates; and, subsequently, if you look at your Mains here, just take a minute.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Chairman, is it the policy of the Yukon Housing Corporation and dividing it by the number of houses you told us you had.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem doing that.

(establishment 1800 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I shall now refer you to page 60, Vote 20, Project Capital, Administration Services, Establishment 2110, a supplementary of $11,000.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. Was it worth it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not absolutely sure, Mr. Chairman. Quite frankly, we are trying to assess that at the moment.

Another question, of course, that must be asked is, should we spend additional funds now to update it, in respect to the latest information available. We may get some more information at our meeting, which I remind all Members is at 5:30 tonight, as well, from the Foothills people.

It is a viewpoint, Mr. Chairman. I cannot answer that question.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I will be happy to answer the question.

I would like to go on record as saying that it probably is not a worthwhile exercise. It should be taken down right now because it is not particularly useful at the moment, and to replace it with something different, we may run into the same problem next year, with a further delay in the pipeline.

I think at this stage that the people of Yukon are satisfied in their own minds that the pipeline is happening sometime, and the purpose of that thing was just to try allay the fears of the people, or to try and show them that, in fact, the government was doing something, and I think this purpose has been served.

(establishment 2110 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2130 is for information only. We
shall move on to 2131, Film Inspection Machine, an increase of $1,000.

(establishment 2131 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Renewable Resources, Establishment 2140, Wildlife Equipment, an increase of $8,200.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to be told what wildlife equipment that was that was purchased in addition to that budget?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, if I may. This is equipment that is required in order to get the studies on bears that are proposed for this forthcoming year. It is going to take an awful long time for this equipment to arrive in the Territory and the Department involved asked if they could please order this equipment prior to the end of the fiscal year and hopefully have it arrive here prior to the end of the fiscal year, so that they would have it for their studies, rather than have to wait for the equipment to be brought in.

So, what in fact has happened is the capital funds have really been taken out of next year's budget and put into the supplementary estimates. Not really, but in theory this is what has happened.

(establishment 2140 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2141, VHF Communications Equipment, an increase of $11,700.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, this is for purchase of some communication equipment, so when the officers are out in the bush they have communication with the Territorial Government radio system.

(establishment 2141 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2145 and Establishment 2146 are for information only, as are 2150, 2151 and 2152.

We shall continue on to Establishment 2153, Ambulance Equipment, an increase of $100.

(establishment 2153 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Yukon Housing Corporation, Establishment 2181, Staff Housing, an increase of $54,500.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that is basically for renovations of the older units and the staff housing complement to upgrade them for conservation purposes, et cetera, et cetera. There is a necessity for purchasing a mobile unit over the course of the last year.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I could have a clarification of what the policy is with respect to the difference between the renovation and repair, and maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, each one complements the other, when they move in to upgrade a particular staff house, I guess.

Mr. Chairman, I will have for the leader of the Opposition a photosat answer tomorrow.

Basically, what happens is that they go into an older staff house and they renovate it, but if there are other areas that need to be repaired at the same time, they do that as well. But basically, it is for conservation purposes as well as upgrading the units.

Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, if we continue to let it go, we are going to wind up having to build brand new units and I am sure the leader of the Opposition would not want to see that happen.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I was not suggesting that the Yukon Housing Authority should not repair its houses. What I was trying to find out was a piece of information: does the Yukon Housing Corporation have a policy whereby they will capitalize certain items as renovations and other items as repairs?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would refer that to the Department of Finance.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, there is a definition that they go by. Off the top of my head, I do not even know if I can recite it, but basically, if you were adding a room, obviously that would be a renovation. If you were just simply fixing the drain pipes, that is a repair. It is not quite that simple, but there is a definition that they go by and it is basically an accounting-engineering definition.

(establishment 2181 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2182, Low Rental and Senior Citizens' Housing, a decrease of $779,500.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would refer that to the Department of Finance.

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should just answer that in a general term because it simply means that they did not spend the amount of money that they had previously budgeted in a whole series of primaries.

I could recite them all but I will leave it at that.

(establishment 2182 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2183, Rural and Remote Housing, a decrease of $399,100.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there was very little activity under this particular program last year. Two years ago there were, I believe, four units built in the Carcross area. There were some homes in the Old Crow area, which I believe is an offshoot of the Rural and Remote Housing Program.

There is a committee that has a representation from the Yukon Association of Non-Status Indians, as well as the Yukon Housing Corporation and that was the only activity in this particular area over the course of last year.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, I am concerned about this whole Corporation. They have the most significant under-expenditures of all arising out of a capital nature, too, which is useful to the Yukon economy.

Was there a problem with respect to this Corporation in getting their programs underway overall? They obviously intended to do these things, but why did they not do them?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that we could probably get into a fuller debate with respect to the Main Estimates, my intention being during the Main Estimates, to have the Chairman of the Housing Corporation as a witness, who is there to oversee the management of the Corporation.

But, yes, I could say from my experience, there were problems getting the program going and areas of whether or not they wanted the particular program.

At the same time, there was some problem in respect to consultation and this kind of thing between the Government of Canada and the Association of Non-Status Indians and the Yukon Housing Corporation.

I must say the Yukon Housing Corporation has tried everything they can to provide the leadership in this area trying to get various people together so that they can get on with the program, but, at the same time, you have to understand that the concept of rural and remote housing also is under the rent supplement program, which I believe is geared to income. Is that not correct, Mr. Sherlock?

So, subsequently, some people may not take advantage of the program and perhaps build their own home and not have to come to the government for a subsidy, which I am sure that all Members would agree would be advantageous if that were possible.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When we deal with this item on the Main Estimates, I wonder if Mr. Lang could bring us some details about how the Corporation is supplying the demand for housing in various parts of the Territory.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there could be a lot of debate on this in respect to the Housing Corporation. I think it is fair to say that I have expounded the philosophy, at least on this side of the floor, and I would like to think that it is shared by all Members in this House. With respect to the fact that we are trying to encourage private ownership.

At one time, there was a great social need in the Yukon for housing, dating back to approximately 1970-71. At that time you will recall, there was a great deal of building through the Housing Corporation, and I think it is fair to say from the Housing Corporation's viewpoint that we pretty well have fulfilled that need, as far as the social need is concerned.

At the same time, we are trying to build in some responsibility and accountability of the tenants of these particular facilities that they are renting from the Housing Corporation. I would suggest that through the Housing Corporation, previous administrations and the present one, this Government will continue to try to come up with programs to encourage private ownership. I think from the taxpayers' point of view and from the individual's point of view, it is very advantageous, and gets the Government, in a lot of areas, out of the housing business.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I cannot promise Mr. Lang that he will get a unanimous endorsement of his views from this side of the House. I think he must of course, be aware of the reality that private home ownership is fast becoming a myth for a great number of people in many income levels in the Territory, as prices continue to go up in some parts, but do I want to debate that with him. I want to re-emphasize that while it may be an arguable point, I would be interested in seeing how well the Corporation is supplying needs, as they may have been expressed by various communities.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how I can provide that information with respect to the communities. As far as I know, overall, we are supplying a need that is necessary in the
Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could suggest just a simple question. If there have been ten requests for housing units in, say, Dawson City and they have been able to meet only one of those requests now, that would answer the kind of question I am asking. It is not very complicated.

Hon. Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I have some of the same reservations as the Honourable Member in front of me. I do not want a debate, either, however, I would like to say that I feel that somewhere along the line, Yukon Housing program has not panned out just like it should, or otherwise you would not see this type of figures here. There would be more participation in the program by the people who are poor in this Territory and need housing.

We are not to 2185 yet but I see the same thing in that figure. There is absolutely nothing used there and I am wondering why? Rural and remote housing, and I might say that if the figures there have anything to do with buying a home or building a home or anything other than if the Yukon Housing Corporation had it already built and you were to buy, it would be an impossibility in the last four or five years anyway because there was no land to put it on. It is understandable to say that there could not be any money spent there.

Establishment 2183 carried

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2184 is for information only. We will proceed on to Establishment 2185, Assisted Home Ownership Programme, a decrease of one million dollars.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Again, here I am curious as to the reasons why we have not had greater participation in the AHOP program. I can guess at some of the reasons in the rural and remote but I am particularly interested—I seem to remember that under AHOP there were some average housing prices or something for which people qualified and some income levels—I would be interested in knowing if they were totally inapplicable here and that is the reason why there was not greater participation or what.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is basically a Federal program. It is offered nationally and the problem with the program is that, I think the Honourable Member has hit on it, is the fact that there is, I believe, a limit for the amount of money that one can expend on a house. I think it is in the area of $45,000 or $50,000, which, really, in this day and age, applicable to the Yukon Territory. It was approximately three years ago.

You will recall there were quite a number of units built under this particular program but it is not applicable to the situation anymore and therefore, as you can see, nobody is taking advantage of the program.

As I say, we do not make the rules in this area, the Government of Canada does and we have asked them to raise the limit as far as the cost of the unit is concerned; this time, to no avail. It is my understanding that they are totally phasing out the AHOP program across Canada so obviously this will not be a line item next year if that is the case. Is that not correct, Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

(Establishment 2185 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Page 61, Vote 30, Establishment 2301 Furniture and Office Equipment, 2283, 05, 06, 07 are all for information only. Yukon liquor Corporation, again, 2232 and 2233.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, these funds were approved in the 1977-78 school year, but due to a shortage of materials encountered by the contractor, the project was carried forward to 1978-79.

(Establishment 2302 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Continuing down to 2303, Selkirk Street School Extension, a decrease of $15,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I believe this was just a shortfall in the total contract price for the extension on the Selkirk Street School.

(Establishment 2303 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Continuing on down to 2305, School Ground Improvements, an increase of $18,700.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this was dual programming between Engineering and Education. Education was providing funds and the Engineering Department were doing the work and an over-expenditure occurred in this year, but the total program of $500,000, at $100,000 a year for the total 5 year program will not be exceeded.

Mr. Dyblow: If my memory serves me correctly, it appears there was a school ground improvement money granted in the amount of $100,000 a couple of years ago. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, it is a five year program at $100,000 a year.

Mr. Dyblow: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister know which grounds received improvement this past year?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Sherlock, do you have that information, perhaps?

Mr. Sherlock: No, Mr. Chairman, we do not have that information.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I will be happy to get it for the Member.

(Establishment 2305 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2306, is information. Establishment 2307, Watson Lake Secondary School, an increase of $58,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this is simply in overage in this year. The total budget, I am assured, will still be within target.

Mr. Dyblow: Is it appropriate to ask when that completion is slated?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I believe it is slated for completion in the coming year.

Mr. Sherlock: The information that we have is that it will be finished in 1980-81.

(Establishment 2307 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2310, Haines Junction School Addition, a decrease of $650,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this is just a lapse in balance due to late construction start and the major contractor will begin construction in the fiscal year 1979.

Mr. Dyblow: Mr. Chairman, $2,583,000 is the projected figure at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Perhaps, I could ask what the total cost of that project will be?

Mr. Sherlock: Mr. Chairman, $2,583,000 is the projected figure at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this is simply where a contract came in below the anticipated price. Local Government is the contracting agent and they simply bill the Department of Education.

Mr. MacKay: Could I ask if that was a local contractor who succeeded in bringing in $14,000 less?

Hon. Mr. Graham: At that price it must have been.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2312 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2313.

Mr. Penikett: If I may be permitted first, I am fascinated to know what that is and who does it?

Mr. Chairman: Security and Surveillance. Mr. Graham, can you supply that answer?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Establishment 2313? There is no supplement there.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is just for security of schools and at the same time there is a certain amount of electronic equipment involved as well, as basically surveillance of our schools due to some of the vandalism that has been experienced over the years. It is added security over and above the RCMP.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Who conducts it.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2316 is for information only; 2341 is for information only; 2351 is for information only; 2352 is for information only; 2353 is for information only; 2354 is for information only; 2356 is for information only; 2357 is for information only; 2358 for information only.

Mr. Chairman: Human Resources, Establishment 2338 is for information only. Establishment 2359 for Human Resources Office renovations, an increase of $400.

(Establishment 2359 agreed to).
Mr. Chairman: Going on to Local Government, Fire Equipment is for information only. Establishment 2601, Roads, streets and Sidewalks, a decrease of $21,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the $2,600 was spent in Carmacks, Haines Junction - $7,693. In Teslin, there was $55,797 and in Watson Lake - $33,881.

(establishment 2601 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 2602 is for information only. Continue on to 2608. Land Development, an increase of $1,020.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I could go through a list here if everybody wants to hear exactly where the money was spent. I leave it to the Opposition whether or not they want to hear a very grand dissertation from this side of the floor.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member would care to do it during his lunch hour.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Well, I think I would like to hear what this is about, but before you do that, Mr. Lang, I would like to know if we can determine what the average cost per lot was on this land development.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, last year, in the Main Estimates, in respect to the land development area here--

Some Member: Great dissertation.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is spread out a long way. I could go through the list. I do not know if you want to hear it all. You have, for example in the Carmacks area, $65,000. I do not have the breakdown acreage by lot size. It is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, from this side of the floor, we manage land development for residential purposes, all we charge is the servicing for the property.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we would be happy with a copy of the list.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am not too sure, Mr. Chairman, if he would understand it.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Honourable Member if he can understand it, I can.

Mr. Chairman: Order, gentlemen.

If you got a copy, would that be okay, Mr. MacKay?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: But does it give us that piece of information with respect to the number of lots that were developed during the year, by area?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Chairman, I can provide that during the Main Estimates, getting on a more serious note here, for the areas, how much land will be available this year, because obviously it has been developed the year before. So, that will directly reflect to the supplemnaries, if that would be appropriate.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would also like to get some kind of understanding of how the costs of development are allocated to land development.

In other words, I would be concerned about the method in which overhead administration is charged to the costs of land development. I would be concerned about how the cost of interest or funds borrowed is charged to land development.

I would be concerned about the initial cost of acquiring the land, if there is an initial cost, from whatever source is account for.

What I would be interested in looking at is, there has been very serious cost escalations over the last eight, nine years now, probably mostly due to inflation, but I would like to get some kind of feel as to what components of the costs there are. How much of it is just digging the ground, how much of it is overhead.

The purpose of my question, and this is for the Mains I guess, will be to try and determine whether or not this kind of work could not be more properly done by private enterprise.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, while the Member is digging out that information for the Mains, I wonder if he might also indicate to us whether they will be proceeding with the recreational lot levy which has been discussed at one time or another to be added to the purchase of residential lot prices?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is something I will have to take notice on, the last question by the Honourable Member.

I should point out, for the information of Members, the price of lots has gone up because the cost of servicing has. If you relate the costs of water and sewer installation to 1978 prices as opposed to 1970, you will see that there is a major difference, not only from the contractors' point of view, but also from the fact that the supplies are costing that much more for sewer and water pipes, so it flows throughout the system.

So, I do not think it is a case of the government making any money on the development of land. It is a case of where escalating costs are catching up to us.

I think for the information of the Honourable Member, and perhaps if he does go outside on some occasion, perhaps he should check into the costs of residential lots in some of these areas. For example, I was at Fort Langley not too long ago. In an ordinary residential area, pavement, overhead lighting, a lot I would say about fifty feet frontage was going for about $30,000.

At the same time, the same lot is going here for approximately twelve to fifteen thousand, so there is a dramatic difference. The major difference is, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the land is not owned privately; there is a lot of public management money or whatever. Outside, it is generally in private land ownership and, subsequently, that cost is compiled on to the development costs.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I appreciate the dissertation. Mr. Lang waxes eloquent when it comes to sewer problems.

Again, the concern I would be addressing myself to is cost of development appears to be, in the Whitehorse area, running around twelve, thirteen, fifteen thousand dollars a lot and I am concerned about that cost because the government is doing that work, as opposed to it being handled entirely by private enterprise. I am concerned whether or not that is a reasonable charge for development.

Again swapping stories, I guess, but the Calgary development that was on national television not too long ago was discussing house prices and, as I recall, the basic cost of development fell about $60,000. That is the kind of thing I would be concerned about.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment clear here, from this side of the House is that I am not opposed to anybody in private enterprise coming with a proposal to putting a development in an area of Whitehorse. We do have a member of the City Council here so I am sure we can get the necessary approval if they were to come to the government.

From this side of the floor, in all sincerity, we are not opposed to anybody in the water and sewer business coming forward and giving us a proposal for a major development.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: That is a very significant statement the Minister has just made.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is why I said it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Yes, I think that is a very significant statement and it is not only water and sewer we are talking about, but roads, planning, the whole gamit of what a real estate development is and I am sure that if there are any - there is nobody left in the press - if the Minister was to make such a statement in the House tomorrow or some time, I am sure it would be well received.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I was not as ready to welcome Cadillac, Fairview and Trizec and some of these other people here as quickly as Mr. MacKay might, but I would be interested in finding out, when we are detailing the unit cost for lot development, if there is any indication from the Minister's officials that, with the increasing supply and the greater productivity in his department in terms of generating land, if some economies of scale are now coming evident and as they get more and more into the land business, if some of the administration costs and so forth which might have been added to the lot might, in fact, be coming down?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will have to take that under advisement, Mr. Chairman. I think we are getting off the subject and perhaps, in view of the comments that have been made, and I take them as very serious questions, perhaps we could get through 2603 on land development.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to get through that.

(establishment 2603 agreed to)

Mr. Hanson: Due to the lateness of the hour, I move, Mr. Chairman, that you report progress on Bill Number 3, Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79, and ask leave to sit again.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Falle: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

(Motion agreed to)

(Mr. Speaker resumes Chair)

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

Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 3, Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79, and have directed me to report progress on same and begs 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. Falle: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek West, that we do now call it 5:30 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member for Porter Creek West, that we do now call it 5:30.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

(Adjourned)