



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 7

2nd Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, March 14, 1979 — 7:30 p.m.

Thursday, March 15, 1976 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon

Wednesday, March 14, 1979 — 7:30 p.m.

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

We have finished all the Establishments on page 64. That completes all the Establishments we have to consider. There is Loan Capital and Loan Amortization here. They are for information only, unless somebody wants to question them. We do not have to vote them. If anybody has a question I will take it now. If not, we will proceed on.

These are on pages 73 and 74. If I have no questions on those now, we will—

Mr. Byblow: You are referring to page 73, the Loan Amortization?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps, we could have an idea of what the additional loan amortization payment is.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think a question of that nature should be directed towards the witness.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. I forgot to say that we have a witness with us. Mr. Wilson, are you prepared to answer the question?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The additional funding under Loan Amortization is the result of borrowing in 1977-78 an additional amount of funds for land development. This was borrowed in March and was unanticipated when the Main Estimates were prepared. Repayment was scheduled for 1978-79 and 1979-80.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps, this is an appropriate time to ask this question, do you have a figure on the amount of developed land that is sitting available, or did I ask that question before?

Hon. Mr. Lang: You have already asked that question and during the Main Estimates, I am sure that we will get into full debate in respect to what is needed for land and what is required in the future.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no other questions at this time we will go on to the First Appropriation Ordinance, 1979-78. This Ordinance may be cited as the First Appropriation Ordinance, 1979-80. I refer, you to the Appendix A, continuing onto Appendix A, we are going to go to Vote Number 3, Education.

Dr. Hibberd: Is it not your intention to deal with revenue of the Government of the Yukon Territory?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, revenue items are indicated in the supplementals, for information, they are not a voted item. If you have any questions, leave it to the floor.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think the incumbent responsibility on this Assembly is to deal with the budget of the Yukon Territory, and that also, involves the revenue that is accruing to this Territory. If there is substantial alteration in what revenue might be accruing, I think it might be worthy of comment from Members of the Assembly, and I think the items should be reviewed or at least given the opportunity to have that reviewed.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, I will entertain that. The revenues are on pages 75 and 76.

Are there any questions? We can start with 04, if you wish. I think probably, we should just review the whole thing. Are there any question at this time?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I think I recall the reason, but I would like a reminder of the reasons why the school tax declined while the property tax increased. Are we just going from department to department?

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think that would be the better way, I guess, I did not realize that there was going to be any discussion on it. So let us go to 04, first then.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Okay, 04.

Mr. Chairman: Have I any questions.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I guess I would have a question then, Mr.

Chairman.

Business and professional licences showed a decline in revenue, yet I think, in the Throne Speech that we heard that the number of businesses operating in the Yukon have increased.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, you must understand that when the Budget is put together, you look at the budget the year before, or two or three years before, trying to average it out, and you try to project into the future what will be received by this government.

As it appears in the supplementaries, we are \$3,000 less than what we had projected. Is that not correct, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The amounts that we indicate in the Main Estimates are estimates rounded off to the closest \$5,000. The fact that we are within \$3,000 is pretty insignificant.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The fact that we are within \$3,000 is good. Hopefully, part of the reason is not any laxity in collecting the business licences.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, on this side of the floor, and I am glad to hear the Honourable Member being concerned about that, because we do make every attempt to collect where the payment is necessary.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am certainly glad to hear that, as one of those who do pay a business licence in the Territory.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Budget is calculated perhaps two years in advance, and at the beginning of the year involved, it might make it very difficult to estimate fairly accurately, but a five per cent range hardly applies to \$142,000 for motor vehicle licences, and I would assume that there is some explanation more than that, that would apply to the difference of that magnitude. Is there anything available to explain that?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the motor vehicle licences is a very difficult area to arrive at. It has gone drastically, up and down over the past couple of years, because such items as over weight permits, freight vehicle permits, freight through permits, and so on, are placed under these motor vehicle licences.

As you may recall, back in 1976-77, the amount of revenue projected in that area was extremely high, mainly due to the Alyeska Pipeline finalization and the large amount of traffic over the Highway.

So, without having good information in the past to what to expect in the future, it was difficult to forecast. However, in that particular area, \$62,000 was mainly because of, I believe, the freight-through permits, but I would have to check on it.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, it just occurs to me, at the moment, that there has been some reorganization of this department since the last Budget was presented, and it occurs to me that the weight scales, which were originally a component of this department, are now with the Department of Highways and Public Works. So, would the revenue from that area no longer be expressed in the terms of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, thereby reducing the revenue that might be expected from Motor Vehicles.

Mr. Wilson: In that particular case, Mr. Chairman, the amount of revenue that would be recorded under the Department of Highways would normally be overweight permits. However, because at the time that the weigh scales were transferred to the Department of Highways, we did not transfer the revenue functions over to the Department of Highways at that time.

You will notice in the 1979-80 Main Estimates that the revenues are showing up under the Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask the witness what registrations are?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are a number of items on which I do not have specific details. No, I would just as soon not indicate right now. I would have to get back on that.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I could suggest that some of it may, in fact, be corporate registrations, and again, if there is such a large increase in that area, it could give rise again, to my earlier question as to why the business licences have not increase proportionately?

Could I ask if there is any co-relation, or any control function, in the issuing of either extra-territorial licencing to companies, or the incorporation of companies, in Yukon to the follow-up for business licences?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, the main reason for the increase in the registrations is because of the new Insurance Ordinance requiring registration of all companies under the Insurance Ordinance.

This has resulted in that increase. I do not know about the co-relation.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, these are insurance companies who are selling insurance in this Territory. I assume, and would they; therefore, be paying business licences?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, I think we are getting into debate with the witness, in respect to the supplementaries. Unfortunately, the Minister responsible for this area is not here, but I think it is fair to say that it is because, as the witness stated, of the insurance companies.

At the same time, I must reiterate once again, in respect to this kind of thing, it is just a forecast. It is a case of looking back and trying to project what is going to happen in the future. As you can see overall, it has been a conservative forecast, because we are over roughly, by \$1 million from what was originally forecasted.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I am being cut off a very reasonable line of questioning. Just a forecast, looking back, I am not quite sure what it is you said.

The point is that these figures bear some relation as between themselves and that, if business and professional licences are estimated at "x" dollars, there is a relationship, presumably, to the lower of the next thing, which accounts, obviously, I think, on the registration of such business to comply with the Ordinances.

So, I think it is a reasonable line of questioning for me to follow, why there should be such a great inconsistency between the actual and the forecasted numbers?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if we could just take the questions that the Honourable Member is raising under advisement, we can provide the information during the actual debate on the recoveries and the revenues in the Main Estimates. Would that be acceptable to the Honourable Member?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: As I understand it, in any event, we are just discussing this from the point of view of information. I do not think we have to wait for the Mains to get into that. I think that the witness could perhaps, provide us with this information as soon as possible, because it relates only to this year, and we cannot talk about next year.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, if I could have some explanation of why business and professional licences declined, while registration of businesses are on the increase, I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, nowhere, in here, does it say that the business and professional licences declined over last year. It says they suffered a decline over expectations. We do not even have the numbers of what was actually received last year, so how can you say that it declined over last year? It just does not make sense.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be forced to give a speech. I am afraid.

When you are preparing projections, and I am sure the witness will bear me out, you do not pick them out of the air, nor do you just look at last year's numbers. You look at last year's numbers to start with, then you look future and say, what is going to happen next year? In our case we have the Alyeska Pipeline, Mr. Chairman, so these things will be built into the forecast. We expect an increase in traffic and revenue from this particular area because of a certain circumstance. It seems to me that when forecasting, in an area where business licences and registration of business indicate the same amount of activity, there should be some correlation between the two, and; therefore, I would have expected, had business licences stayed the same, and if they had made the estimate correctly on the business licences, then, following through, that registration would have been about the same, too. We are talking about the skill that goes into forecasting. It may very well be that our Treasury Department goofed.

That can happen, I think it happened twice today, once to me. I am not after a goof, what I am after is the possibility of lost revenue to this Territory, so that is the question. If these estimates were done in a consistent, professional way, they would have had an internal consistency, which would have followed through to the final amount of revenue. In other words, we would not have expected to have such a variety between these two categories, because they are inter-related. Now, that does not appear to be the

case. I think I have asked a legitimate question. I do not want to get everyone up on their hind legs protesting about it, I just want an answer to the question.

Hon. Mr. Lang: We will see that the information is provided for the Member in the next day or two.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Sir, it was not actually a question, Mr. Chairman, but due to the argument that has gone forth, and my own predicament trying to figure it out, I think it could have been simpler if this was written out a little differently, as what it was this year compared to last year, and then you would have a clear picture as to how it has changed. I can give you an example. For instance, campground fees last year were \$27,000, or so. Now, if that had been beside this year's figure, it would be very simple for a person to know exactly what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I hate to take people away people away from the discussion, but I am sure that all Members in the house will be happy to hear that in the fine Province of Alberta, it is my understanding that the Progressive Conservatives elected 72 out of 79, and I look forward tomorrow for the Member of Whitehorse West passing a resolution to send congratulatory notes to Premier Lougheed.

Mr. Penikett: It is obviously a sad day for Alberta and I am sure condolences will be forthcoming from this side of the house, although the Member neglected to say what was happening in the other seats.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I have to admit to having full knowledge of this disaster and I was trying to spare the house such news.

Mr. Chairman: Now gentlemen, shall we get back to Vote 4, please.

As there are no more questions on Vote 4, I shall go along to Vote number 6, Department of Local, are there any comments on that?

Seeing that there are no questions on that, we will go along to Vote 8, the Department of Justice.

Again, I do not see any discussion, I shall continue onto Vote 12.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, as I was half forming a question before I realized I was in the wrong department; however, my question was, why has the Territorial school tax declined and the Municipal school tax increased; and the Territorial property tax increased?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will have to direct that question to the witness.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Wilson, can you supply us with that answer?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure that I can, but I will try.

During 1977-78, the method of accounting for taxes was changed. At one time we accounted for school taxes, municipal on a different basis than we did school and property tax for Territorial. It did cause us problems in making the estimates for the following year, mainly because when we were looking at it before, we had to guess what the tax roll was. Now that we are accounting for the taxes on a different method, we have to have the tax roll in hand before the estimates are prepared. So 1979-80 should be much more accurate than 1978-79.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am just trying to recall the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, but was it not true that the school tax rate was decreased last year to 6 mills; however, that presumably would have been built into the budget at the time that was done. Would that have any effect on the reduction of the school mill rate?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not think so, directly, I think it was more that we did not have an estimate of what the assessments would be and, as a result, we were on pretty shaky ground when the estimates were prepared.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, yes, the reason I am pursuing it, I suppose when we get into the Mains we will also see a decline in that revenue for this year, and I will be putting you on notice, I guess, pursuing that one to see why that is the case. I suspect, that it is because the assessment has not been completed. We will get into that later.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no more discussion on Vote 12, I refer the members to page 76, continuing on with the Votes, Vote 13.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I know we are not passing these things, but before you turn the page, Liquor profits, Mr. Chairman, is that a result of the increased consumption of liquor by people in the Territory or is it a result of the pricing policy change?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, other than beers, and wine, there was a slight increase, I believe, last year. Other than that, there was no movement in respect to the hard liquor. So it would be increased volume, Mr. Wilson, would it not?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, a portion of that increase is a result of the beer strike. Because there was a lack of beer, there was more consumption of hard liquor, more volume consumed there with a higher mark-up within the liquor area.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, perhaps just to clarify it, there indeed, was an increase in price of the beer and the wines for the latter part of last year, which would account for this increase.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, another item, the interest in investments interests me, so to speak.

I do not think the witness can answer this question right away, but I would be interested in knowing how much cash the territorial government keeps on hand, on the average each month, and what the average rate of return on that cash is, and presumably, that is not available right now, but if it could be made available in the Mains, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, at March, 1978, we had \$24,265,000 in cash, the average rate of return, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, perhaps I could let that question stand then, because, obviously, if you keep \$24 million, and you have only got \$1,300,000 in interest, we are making less than five per cent. If I could be told the average monthly balance, and the rate of return, it would be useful just to check on the efficiency of our investing policy.

Hon. Mr. Lang: We will take that under advisement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other questions on any of the items on page 75?

We shall go on to page 76. I would like to start off with Vote 13.

Mr. Penikett: Could I briefly, get an explanation of the item, Fines, under the Department of Information Resources, amounting to \$5,000?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, these are library fines. They average approximately \$3,000 a year. We just keep the estimate around \$5,000.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Are there any more questions on Vote 13? If not, I will go on to Vote 14, under Renewable Resources.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that our revenue from Campground Fees is not very high and, as it is a fact that our campground fees are considerably lower than most of the southern jurisdictions, would like to give notice of a question about whether the government has, in fact, reviewed this revenue item recently?

Dr. Hibberd: Perhaps it would be worthwhile to know precisely, who does pay these campground fees. Is it the resident or the non-resident? Who is actually contributing this, and in what way and, indeed, what are the reasons we have \$16,000 less than we had previously, or less than is indicated we would have. I agree, it has to be under advisement. We would certainly like to have the answers.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just so I do get this very clear, the Vote in the first place is \$45,000. Am I right? That is the estimated revenue you are going to get in the coming year. I think I am right there. If I am not right, I would like to be corrected so I could have this exactly right.

The actual intake was \$28,900. Now, I know that last year it was approximately \$27,000 that was taken in, so I do look at it as poor estimating, and it appears that the government somehow, thought that tourism was going to jump that high. It seems incredible that they would think along those terms, unless something really boomed in this Territory in tourism.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, perhaps, in answer to Mr. Fleming's problem, we might consider two things. One of them is that the Estimates might very well have been on the basis that residents might have been considered eligible to pay some sort of fee to use the campgrounds in the Yukon. The other consideration might be, the ability to collect those fees from the users, might, indeed, be a very expensive proposition. In other words, to have someone in every campground throughout the Territory in order to collect the fees would make it a very expensive way to collect a very limited amount of money.

So maybe, it has been an accepted principle that we cannot collect from everyone using those campgrounds because of our inability to collect that fee.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think a couple of points have to be raised here. The witness, if I am inaccurate in what I am saying, will correct me. I believe, a year ago, the format of paying for campground fees was changed. At one time, it was three dollars

per night camp fee and it was on an ad hoc basis. Subsequently, from that, there was a change made that you could pay a ten dollar fee and use the campground for as long as you wanted while you were in the Yukon Territory.

At the same time, it has always been the principle of the previous administration, and it is the principle of this Government that we do not believe that Yukoners should have to pay for the use of their own campgrounds, so it is not the intention of this Government to bring in a campground fee for residents.

Subsequently, in view of the fact of the change in format, I would suggest that the projections are probably off, due to the fact, there was a difference in the application of the fee. In other words, there was kind of a group deal as opposed to the way it was. At one time, it was strictly on a daily basis. Is that not correct, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I believe so. I do not have any other figures.

Dr. Hibberd: Just one more question, Mr. Chairman, the third item here, refers to the fur export tax and there is no change in it, which I find rather perplexing in the view of the fact, we are aware that the prices for furs have increased considerably, and the trappers really can benefit from those increased prices that they have gained for the furs. I am wondering why, and because this has been such a healthy climate, indeed, it appears that trapping has been a much more profitable industry, and it has attracted a lot of people who are only very passively involved in the last few years. It does seem to be a much more active and profitable area to get into, so I am a little bit concerned that this is not reflected in the fur export tax. Does this reflect that this is, indeed, not the case, that there is not the interest or the activity going on in the fur industry that we might have assumed that there was?

Obviously, the question is under advisement in view of the attendance tonight.

Mr. Chairman: We shall go down to Vote 15, the Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I just would like to ask the Minister, and I think you will probably have to refer this to the witness, but, involved in the accounting system, do you set up the premiums that are due as receivables and, if so, are they reflected in the accounts of the Yukon Territorial Government?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Is the Honourable Member referring to the \$65,000 here?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: No.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: It was a question relating to the Yukon Health Care Insurance Premiums, and I think it refers back to some earlier questions from my colleague here. All the the premiums that are owed to the government, are they set up in the accounts of the government and brought into revenue as earned by the government, rather than as collected?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, yes, they are.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask then, of the witness how much, approximately, was owing on these premiums at the end of, say, March 31st, 1978, for example?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not have that answer.

Mr. Chairman: We could take that under advisement, yes. Would that be okay, Mr. MacKay?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I take it the witness can supply the answer at some future time, then?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no more questions on 15, what is your pleasure on the Recoveries?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think we will get the same opportunity to go through the Recoveries in the Main Estimates, in detail, so I would recommend that we go to Vote 3 and get into the Main Estimates, because then, in each Vote we can look at the Recoveries, et cetera.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would not want to spend a lot of time on it, but I find you extremely useful in an education process, which I hope the member opposite will allow us, just to talk about some of these things as we go through, because they allow us then, to deal with the Main Estimates probably, much more expeditiously than we otherwise might.

Mr. Chairman: I will entertain a few questions on them. We will go to, that being the case, Vote 1?

Have you any questions on Vote 1? If not, we will go along to Vote 3.

Mr. Penikett: I think it was yesterday afternoon that we had a

number of inquiries about the probability of costs of the French language program, and I wonder if this item here, Secretary of State Bilingualism, \$95,000, and the supplementary of \$7,500, relates to that item?

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

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, from whom do we recover the Teacher Training Program, \$15,000?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, that is from the students.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, from whom do we recover the \$55,000 for student accomodation?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, as I explained earlier in debate the other day, on the fact that we do have dormitories, and also, at the same time, we charge parents for the utilization of those dormitories, and it is in the regulations, so much for the first child, so much for the second child, so much for the third. Subsequently, that is reflected in the budget.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just supplementary, I did of course understand that we had dormitories and I did know that there were parent fees, but what I was interested in was the breakdown of that figure of \$55,000. Is some of it federal money or is this \$55,000 entirely recovered from the parents? I would find that difficult to believe, in view of the small number of children involved.

Mr. Byblow: I would like to question why the item under Student Transportation is so much less in the Supplementals than in the Estimates?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the department no longer charges a fee for students who ride the bus.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, I wonder if I could have a little explanation on where you get a recovery on recreation leadership development? What area do you get that in?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not have an answer.

Mr. Fleming: Would you try to get an answer, Mr. Chairman, please?

Mr. Wilson: I am sorry, I do have an answer, Mr. Chairman. Leadership Development Program has derived revenue from the sale of material purchased through the Recreation Branch.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I believe some of it is the money received back for things like sweat suits and that type of material.

Mr. Byblow: I am curious about what facilities are rented, for that recovery?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Gymnasiums, Mr. Chairman, basically.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I guess, the most significant item of all, is the Occupational Training Recovery. I wonder if we could have an explanation of where that million-odd dollars comes from?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Most of it would come from Canada Manpower, in the courses filled at the Vocational School.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any more discussion on Vote 3? We will go on to Vote 4, then. Is there any discussion on Vote 4?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Workers' Compensation, I am confused about this one, Mr. Chairman, I thought workmen's compensation was a separate fund altogether. Could we perhaps have some explanation of this recovery.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has, over the past few years, maintained on their personnel, inspectors, and also at one time, prior to the move of workers' compensation out of this building, provided accomodation that they charged to workers' compensation board.

Mr. Penikett: I wonder if I could be just reminded, Mr. Chairman, as to how long the metric conversion program will be continuing?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe it is a three year agreement that we have with the Government of Canada on the metrication subject to annual renewal. Is it three years, or five years, Mr. Wilson?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Lang, there were about three years left to run in it, it was about four years a year ago, so it is about three years, presumeably, before it is fully implemented.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty in a matter raised by Mr. Penikett, with regard to workers' compensation, I do not understand why the figure here is a \$35,000 figure, reduced by \$5,000, when it is an independent corporation of this government.

Certainly, the rents, or inspectors, indeed, the inspectors do not overlap between the two, YTG has their inspectors so does the compensation board, so there is no overlap between the two of

them, and certainly, the rent is not going to account for a figure this high.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we can provide a further breakdown, but I think that the witness is trying to answer questions with the information that he has in front him. I do not think he was expecting to be interrogated on the revenues or the recoveries, and; subsequently, we will provide more information if the Members want further breakdown.

Mr. Chairman: Will that be acceptable?

We shall go on to vote 5. Are there any questions on vote 5?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, I am interested in the source of all of the recoveries of this Department of Human Resources. Is there a general explanation for it?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I believe, there is 50 per cent recovery in all of the areas in vote 5, with an exception for Child Welfare, where you have 100 per cent recovery for Child-in-Care who is Status-Indian, and with regard to senior citizens lodges, we try to charge the occupants on a basis of their ability to pay. That would be \$10.00, maximum, with \$20.00 personalized care, but they do get some, what they call comforts assistance. Under that, they would get \$64.00, I think, a month for that comforts allowance.

They are all recoverable but fifty per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I take it that that is from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the recoverable fifty per cent from the Canada Assistance Plan, Department of National Health and Welfare, there is one hundred per cent recovery from Indian Affairs for Status Indians.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions on Vote 5?

We will consider Vote 6, Department of Local Government. Have I any questions on Vote 6?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I see under this is listed insect control and I presume by that, it is control of our insects that make their way in the summertime and I am wondering precisely, Mr. Chairman, what that program consists of, and I would like to know how effective that program was, if there is any assessment available on it?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, all I can do is safely say that it was a very good program, because I have no calls from any distraught mothers here, in the last year or so, so I am assuming it went well.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, that is not an answer, I want to know what the program was. What was used, what was done, and how effective it was. I cannot hear a nice statement that my baby is going to go to sleep to say that it solves the problem. I would like to know if it was an effective program. What was the effect on the insects that were involved, what was the effect on the wildlife and the trees and whatnot in the area? Was it a good program? Is it worth spending another \$40,000 on? Can we do better? Should we have it at all?

There has to be some answers when you spend \$40,000. We want to know if there is some effective program here.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I understand it was fairly successful and I am sure we will get into a much deeper debate when we are in the Main Estimates. I have more information and I can probably go into a pretty technical -- in fact, maybe, I can even set up a seminar on insect control if I can find enough time to prepare a statement.

I am sure that I will be able to respond to it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in knowing from the Minister, on this subject, which is dear to his heart, as to why only half of the revenue projected for sewage charges was collected?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, obviously, Mr. Chairman, we have installed more water and sewer installations. I do not know, you will have to ask the witness.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could pursue that a little further. Obviously, we will have to check that further.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Does the witness have an explanation for that?

Mr. Wilson: No, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Lang: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, under the Department of Municipal Affairs, in some areas we do provide some water delivery and, further, in some areas we provide the services of a sewage eductor, and obviously, these projections were not accurate in the last budget for what we collected.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I might add that in the 1979-80 Main Estimates, the estimate remains at \$15,000. It has been brought down permanently, from \$30,000.

Hon. MacKay: Perhaps we could have some explanation of municipal tax assessments. This is not property tax. Could you give us something?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, under the Taxation Ordinance, we are required to assess municipalities, and charge the municipalities, one mill, I believe. So, if they increase their mill rate, and the assessment increases in a particular area, are going to accrue more for the amount of work that was done.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister will take note of the fact that some people have questioned the present value of that service, especially at the current charge. I wonder if, when we come to the Main Estimates, he would be prepared to answer some questions, and to defend that charge as a portion of the assessment for doing this work.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will just make one comment. If it is not charged through that area, then obviously, we are going to have to collect it some other way, whether it be sales tax or whether it be through other methods such as fuel taxes. I mean, these are the facts of life, Mr. Chairman. You provide a service and somebody has to pay for it, whether it be directly to the particular area, or whether it be a universal tax across the Territory. So, I am willing to debate that for hours.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to precipitate a debate on that subject, the method of collecting money. I wanted to raise some questions about the quality of service for which the municipalities are now being charged. That is the question I hope the Minister will address when it comes back in the Main Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I misinterpreted the question.

Mr. Falle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, what is this \$10,000 TV Service?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, under the Capital Assistance Program, it provides TV for all the outlying communities. It is on a cost-shared basis and this reflects the recoveries that we receive. I believe, it is roughly \$13,000 per annum, at the present time, for running a Tel-Stat. We collect roughly, \$1,000 from a community and pay \$12,000. So that reflects the recoveries.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering what it is for?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, we have an agreement with Statistics Canada to provide cost-sharing for a statistician, under the Economic Research and Planning Unit. The reason that the amount is lower than the \$20,000 is, we did not spend the total amount that we had budgeted in that area for materials, mainly.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, if I could perhaps, ask Mr. Wilson a supplementary to that, does that agreement specify what work should be done by that cost-shared statistician?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, I think you are getting into an area of policy.

Mr. Penikett: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, I am asking a question of fact, not policy.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not have a copy of the agreement, but I do not believe that it has any specifics in it. It is a very general contract.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister responsible for the Department returns, I am sure that he can provide the necessary information. We will take that under notice so that it is available once we go through the Mains.

Mr. Chairman: Would that be acceptable, Mr. Penikett?

Mr. Penikett: Yes, thank you, and I would like to thank Mr. Wilson for his answer.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 8, Department of Justice. Have I any questions on that?

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to put the hard pressed public servants of this Territory to a great deal of work, but if the Minister responsible for the Justice Department can, at the time we are dealing with the Main Estimates, provide some breakdown on the number of lawyers participating in the legal aid program, I would be interested in having that information.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I believe, Mr. Chairman, he has already asked that question. We have an answer on the way.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would be interested in some explanation of the \$18,000 recovery for transfer of prisoners.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is from the Federal Department of Justice, whereby we transfer prisoners, under the Federal Prisoner Transfer Arrangement. If we accommodate prisoners who would normally be under the federal jail, in other words a penitentiary, the transportation to that penitentiary, or back from it, will be paid by the Federal Department of Justice.

Mr. Byblow: I am curious about where the money comes from under the item, Compensation for Criminal Injury.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, that, too, is from the Department of Justice.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: And also, \$1,100, Inmate Recoveries. Are we taking out gold fillings, or what?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is a project that was started during the year, as inmates proceed on work release and they receive a pay cheque. On that work release, a per diem is recovered from the inmate.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no other questions on Vote 8, we will go to Vote 9, Department of Highways and Public Works. Are there any questions on Vote 9?

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, here is our old friend, VHF Radio, back again. I would just be interested in receiving from the Minister, a brief explanation of how these recoveries occur.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member recalls, during the debate today, I informed the House that we do provide this service with the various other Federal departments outside of this Government and that is where the recoveries come from.

Mr. Penikett: Does that mean that we contract, we make the arrangements, we, in fact, purchase the service and the facilities and then, subcontract to the Federal Government and recover that way?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that is roughly the way it works, yes.

Mr. Byblow: The item covering airports and airstrips, it would appear to me that the recoverable amount is easily determinable, because you are working under contract. Why the \$24,000 shortfall?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If you will recall, earlier in debate, we were discussing DPW in the Supplementaries. Some of the money did not come forward and that is the reason for that in that area.

Mr. Byblow: Are you saying that some of the money did not come forward under an existing contract or an agreement?

Where will it show up?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, can I hear that question again, please?

Mr. Byblow: Do I understand correctly, that some of the money did not come, because you did not receive it under the existing agreement or contract?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We estimated incorrectly on some of the work that had to be done. I will rely on the witness here. We are talking about the operation and maintenance of the airstrips, B and C. In other words, in some cases, we charged on an hourly basis, and the projection is down less than what it was. Am I not correct, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: It did not necessitate that much maintenance as was projected.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The seven and half million dollar Alaska Highway Agreement recovery, for our education, could the Minister explain the conditions under which we receive this, and whether all the work we do on the Alaska Highway is totally recoverable, including paving and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We are talking about the operation and maintenance, not from the capital side, and the Alaska Highway is one hundred per cent recoverable for the operation and maintenance.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Chairman, is there any lifetime in the Alaska Highway agreement, there is no sunset clause or anything like that?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, there is no sunset clause.

Mr. Chairman: If you have no other questions, on vote 9, Vote 10, Public Service Commission, are there any questions on that Vote?

Mr. Byblow: Yes, I am curious as to where the EMO money comes from?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an agreement with the Government of Canada, is there not, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is from the Department of National Defense.

Mr. Penikett: I am probably displaying my impossible ignorance, Mr. Chairman, but what is a Brex III?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, it was an exercise under the Emergency Measures Organization. It was just separated because it was not originally set out in the Main Estimates.

Mr. Byblow: Referring to that exercise, where did it take place?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think that refers to the exercise in reference to a possible oil spill in the Beaufort Sea.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no other questions on Vote 10, we will proceed on Vote 11.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Oh, a subject dear to my heart, the office of the pipeline co-ordinator. I realize the Minister in charge of that is not here. I am distressed to see that there is only \$4,000 recovered of all these expenditures. Is there any arrangement that has been discussed that anyone knows of here with respect to recovery of the costs that we are now incurring to anticipate the pipeline?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, I think the enabling legislation that you have before you is the first step forward for recoveries. I think it is fair to say on that subject, Mr. Chairman, all Departments and the Treasury are keeping close track of just what money could be directly related to that area.

Mr. Chairman: There are no more questions on Vote 11.

Vote 12, Department of Finance, are there any questions on Vote 12?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in that amount of \$10,000 in the small business loans program, where that recovery is. The Workmen's Compensation, Department of Finance, and Workmen's Compensation and Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that one too.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not have information on the Small Business Loan Program, but Workers' Compensation is an administration charge for the work that the Department of Finance does on behalf of the Workers' Compensation Board, financial computer related.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could the witness confirm that the electrical rate equalization decrease, reflects a decrease in the amount of money that we recover from Ottawa in corporate taxes from Yukon Electrical?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, it was decreases from the Federal Government in the amount of rebate of income tax by Yukon Electrical, which was decreased from ninety-five per cent to fifty per cent.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no other question on Vote 12, we will proceed with Vote 13, Department of Information and Resources.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The sublease of the Yukon Information Center, I did not know we had a Yukon Information Centre, is this the Vancouver office that this government maintains?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is the Vancouver office, the office that was being used in Vancouver was vacated, however, we did have a lease on it, and this \$8,000 is a sublease. We moved to a different location.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Is this going to be a continuing recovery and expense for some years? I notice they spent about \$11,000. Have we got this to look forward to for some years?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I believe it ends this year, 1979.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no further questions on Vote 13, we will turn over the page, page 80, Vote 20, Department of Renewable Resources.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, we had some discussion about this, was it yesterday or the day before, I cannot remember, Mr. Chairman, however, I am still a bit puzzled about this \$400,000 recovery, and I would like possibly to have this opportunity to clarify it in my own mind, so that I know that when we get into the Mains where I am. I appreciate that the Minister is not here, so I will probably have to direct my questions to the witness, if that is agreeable to you?

The \$55,000, for the Yukon River Project, Mr. Wilson, was that part of the additional \$400,000 that was granted to this Government during the last fiscal period?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, in Vote 14, of the full \$361,800, none of it refers to the \$400,000. These are all recovery agreements with various departments or companies that were specifically related to specific programs. In other words, the Foothills Study were studies commissioned by Foothills that were agreed to be paid for by Foothills. We incurred the expenditure and we billed Foothills.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, could I then ask from whom we recovered the \$55,000 for the Yukon River Project?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the amount is actually \$58,000 and it is recoverable from Parks Canada. It is yet forthcoming because that was half of the total project. The project itself was fifty per cent recoverable from Parks Canada. We paid fifty, they paid fifty.

Yes, that is the report you have before you know. That is the Parks Canada Project and that has nothing to do with the \$400,000.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Dr. Hibberd could explain this, the fact that he just told us it is \$58,000, not \$55,000 that we are shown in this documentation.

Dr. Hibberd: I am sorry, I did not hear.

Mr. Penikett: I wonder if Dr. Hibberd could explain this fact that he just gave us that we are talking about \$58,000, not \$55,000, as it is shown in these supplementaries.

Dr. Hibberd: Obviously I cannot, Mr. Chairman. I just know that the actual recoverable sum, after the project was completed, to my mind, was \$58,000. I have no idea.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, is it possible then that we have a mistake in this document that should be checked out before we finish with it?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, when the Supplementary Estimates are prepared, it is in December or January. In other words, December, 1978, these Supplementaries were prepared.

The timing of some of the receipts is in doubt some times and, as the Members of the Assembly would realize, we have to go by the estimates of what the expenditures are at that particular time.

I have, in my books, that the estimates for the Yukon River Project were at \$55,000, so we showed a \$55,000 recovery. If it ends up to be \$58,000, then we will receive \$58,000. It is a matter of trying to match those recoveries as best we can against the estimates at the time.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, in the event that we do receive \$58,000 instead of \$55,000, could Mr. Wilson explain how we will then account for the \$3,000.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, they will show up on the Territorial Accounts.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: To return to our \$400,000 problem, my notes that I have indicate that a little less than \$200,000 of this \$400,000 amount was unspent. Perhaps the witness can refresh my memory as to where that money, the original \$200,000 was spent here, because I got the impression that some of these recoveries came through in this Vote 14 here.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, when we went over the expenditure side of Vote 14, this \$400,000 was raised. Now, on one hand, the expenditures amounted to approximately \$200,000, meaning that we had \$200,000 left over.

We did, in fact, receive \$400,000, but they do not show up as a recovery item. They are included in the grants. It was not a recovery. It was an unconditional grant, in essence. Because of that, we do not tie any of the expenditures against a recovery. The only time we show a recovery is when we have some sort of an agreement, or whenever there is a direct expenditure related to a direct receipt.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Wilson has brought up a very good point. It is hard to reflect the item \$400,000 in this budget because, indeed, it was part way through the year and salaries obviously did involve a full year and the expenditures fell considerably short of the \$400,000. But the expenditures, as envisioned, would have come very close to doing that.

He does raise a brand new point, because, to my mind, this money was forthcoming to the Yukon Territorial Government on the basis of a commitment which we undertook to staff the Department of Renewable Resources to develop a capability to do certain things. That was indeed a commitment. It was not an unconditional fund.

So I think the Members opposite have a very good point. When they try and pinpoint what did happen to the \$400,000, because the \$400,000 is not reflected in the Supplementaries, or in the Mains, of the budget for this Government. \$400,000 was committed from the Federal Government to the Department of Renewable Resources to develop their capabilities. They, because it was part way through the year, were unable to spend those moneys and so the moneys that were as yet unspent reverted to the Treasurer and are lost to the general morass of general revenue.

It is my submission, Mr. Chairman, that those moneys were a commitment taken on by us to expend those moneys in the area of Renewable Resources, and we have failed to do so.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clarify some items respecting the \$400,000. The \$400,000 was received as a grant, as opposed to a contribution. A contribution meaning that the particular receipt of a fund from the Federal Government would be conditional. The grant is, in fact, non-conditional, as all grants to the Yukon Government are non-conditional.

However, the \$400,000 does, in fact, show up in the supplementary estimates. It shows up on page 1, although it is not obvious. On page 1 of the supplementary estimates, it shows up and, in addition, it is part of the operating grant in 1979-80.

Now, if I could, I could go to page 1 of the supplementary estimates and, as you will notice under the Grant, Other, we show an item of \$82,000. \$400,000 is included in there. In addition, there is a reduction of \$318,000, resulting in an \$82,000 increase in the grant situation to the Government of Yukon.

The \$318,000 reduction was a reduction that took place at a request from the Department of Indian Affairs to reduce the grant given to YTG for this current year, because of the restraint program.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, that does not answer the thing at all. Here we are, we were granted \$400,000. It was conditional on developing that ability within Renewable Resources, and we failed to acknowledge that responsibility, and absorbed the remainder of the funds back into our general revenue. That problem has not been solved as far as the year 1977-78 is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a point that the witness is trying to make is that a certain number of dollars was spent. Any money granted to this government under the Yukon Act, and then flows to the Financial Administration Act, goes into general revenue. That is law.

So, subsequently, it is fine to say that you have a certain number of dollars for a certain program, but if it is not spent in that area, then it reverts to the general revenue. It is similar to saying we are going to put a fuel tax out for kindergartens. In the final analysis, it goes to general revenue and then it is delineated into programs, a certain number of dollars for kindergartens, a certain number of dollars for other programs.

So, this is the fact that the Treasurer has to work with. I think it is fair to say that the Minister will be back here next week and he will be discussing the renewable resource side of it.

My understanding of the GDA was that we had to put up a certain number of dollars of our money that we had had in staff, and everything else, to apply for the \$400,000 outward grant. So, in other words, it was more or less fifty-fifty cost-sharing, but they allowed some areas where we were spending money to apply towards it.

I think that was reflected in the Main Estimates.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to participate in this confusion for a moment if I may.

I am referring to the Hansard, Tuesday, yesterday, and I am puzzled by several statements here. In answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Sherlock said at one point, "The balance comes out of the \$400,000 additional funding that we received from DIAND under the umbrella GDA agreement to set up these programs and to set up a planning capacity capability of renewable resources branch."

Then we went into some considerable discussion under Establishment 1420 about this money, and it came close to a conclusion, in fact it did. In the middle, the Government Leader spoke and said, "I may muddy the water a bit more here. The \$400,000 is just like the money for a deficit grant. Every penny of it has to be voted. It is all here. If the Federal Government, in mid-year, decides, beyond my comprehension, but they decide they are going to give us a Christmas present of \$400,000..."

Now, I am clearly getting the impression from what we are doing here, Mr. Chairman, that we are not talking about a Christmas present, we are talking about purchase for some services, and it seems to me, if not consciously, we certainly seem to have been mislead somewhat yesterday, and I think we need to get this very clear about what moneys we are talking about, and which pot they are going into, and who is taking them out.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Member and I will be undertaking on behalf of this government to get it clearly delineated in writing, because I think there is confusion in all our minds as to just exactly how this does apply.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I am not completely happy with that explanation, because before we finish with these supplementary estimates, I think I owe it to myself and my constituents, and I think probably other members share this view, that I would like to have some kind of proper understanding of exactly what we are doing here, because I think that with less than complete understanding on this point, I think we will not be properly able to deal with the same subject in the Main Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, in reference to this, it is not the intention of the government to move this out of Committee. So therefore, when we move the Bill out of Committee for appropriation for 1978-79, we will supply the necessary information prior to third reading. Is that acceptable to the Member?

In other words, we will not have a vote on the Supplementaries Bill, and we can proceed with the Main Estimates and refer back.

Mr. Penikett: That sounds just hunky-dory, Mr. Chairman, but I really would like tonight, if we can get it, is some kind of, if necessary, a review of the recovery side of this \$400,000, in the context of the answers we were given yesterday about the source and the expenditure of this money, before we leave tonight, because I do not see any reason why we cannot get it, and I am sure the members here are competent to give us these explanations.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the \$400,000 was available under the GDA, with the arrangement that there was a certain number of dollars spent on behalf of this government. The \$400,000 came to the government due to the fact that it was the middle of the year. I believe that there was \$200,000 spent. That left \$200,000 underspent. So, subsequently, it goes back into general revenue to see how the books balance.

Now that is my understanding of how it works. Now, Mr. Wilson, correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. Wilson: What, in fact happened is that the \$200,000 went back into General Revenues. If you take a look at 1979-80 Main Estimates, the full \$400,000, plus probably more, is showing up as an increase in Vote 14, under Renewable Resources, under Resource Planning, the administration and the Parks Branch.

The \$400,000 is not lost. It has been spent in the areas that, in fact, we negotiated the funds for.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, there is indeed a lot of confusion going over this and I agree to a certain extent with what Mr. Lang has said as far as the origin of it, under the GDA, and indeed it did flow from that area, but certainly it is not a part of the General Development Agreement into which we entered.

The Agreement there was a 60-40 split and, presumably, if we came out with \$400,000, DIAND came out with \$600,000, and we had a million dollars to do with whatever was agreed on in that Agreement.

That never happened. It went on for over a year and nothing happened, and now we are in a different space. Now, I agree it involved the same people, DIAND, DREE and ourselves, but it had nothing to do with the General Development Agreement. We were in the area of trying to develop capabilities in certain areas in our government to be able to co-ordinate all our activities with DIAND and with the resources that DREE had to offer. We did not have the capability, so DIAND came forward and gave us that money as an item in that budget for that year, and as a continuing item in that budget, on a continuing basis. That item was \$400,000. That is what we are talking about now.

But, it was specifically given to us to develop the capability to develop sub-agreements in areas that we felt required that development.

Now, it had been a decision of the previous Executive Committee that the main thrust of where those sub-agreements would at least start from, they might go elsewhere in the future, was in the Department of Renewable Resources. The Department of Renewable Resources at that time had a chief and had a secretary, and had a parks branch. It needed a good deal more development, and so it was with this kind of funding that this development has grown mature, developed a capability, and is now going to be able to take on the responsibility for resource inventories. It is now going to take on the responsibility for developing campgrounds to meet our needs, as well as the possibility of getting into parks. Certainly in the areas of resource planning in general and the whole area of the Yukon, the whole thing, this is what renewable resources is all about. It is probably the most important area that we are developing into.

This, I think, is the most important direction we can take as a government now, and that is looking at what our resources are, developing the capability to meet them, and going out and doing so. There is no sense just going out and being a rooster on a vane and crowing away when you do not have any capability to follow through with what your demands are. We indeed have to have that capability. We have to show that we have expertise, that we can do things, that we can manage cottage lot developments, that we can look at our resources, that we can make use of our water, make use of our land, make use of our forests. This is our responsibility to do so and this is what we should be involved with at the present time.

This is indeed what these subagreements are aimed at doing. Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned, of course, that we are presented with this opportunity, with specific instructions from the federal government that we would develop this, and then enter into these agreements where we would be able to do these things, and it has not happened.

This is a considerable concern to me, Mr. Chairman. We have, indeed, gone to the extent of developing some of these capabilities

but there we stop. Nothing has happened. There are no plans to develop this resource capability. What is happening in the area of Parks, what is happening in all of these areas?

We are not doing these things, we are not advancing into the areas of subagreements and I am suggesting that we stopped some time ago and we did not even develop our full capability. The funds were there but they reverted and we did not live up to our responsibility when we received that \$400,000.

Mr. Penikett: Some of us, perhaps I would characterize it as the more innocent Members on this side of the House, innocent, inexperienced, whatever word, certainly left yesterday's sitting with the impression that the \$400,000 which the Government Leader characterized as a Christmas gift, I think, had something to do with the expenditures under Vote 14.

I would like to ask, if I may, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Hibberd, if his impression is that that is the case?

Dr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was the decision of the previous Executive Committee that this was the primary area in which we would initially involve those \$400,000 and, indeed, in the area of Parks and particularly, Resource Planning, is where the funds were intended to go as a first step in developing a capability in renewable resources.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, may I pursue that for a minute? I think we have now been given to understand from the recoveries that most of the money that is being recovered under Vote 14, in fact, does not come from this resource at all, it comes from a number of other sources and a number of other recoveries, pipeline and other Federal Government Departments. Am I getting totally confused here or am I somehow finding a hole somewhere between the two sources?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Wilson outlined it earlier in respect to this money, as well as it relates to, I believe he referred to page one, in respect to recoveries.

I think we are getting hung up here on a financial accounting basis here, Mr. Chairman. I think the basic principle of \$400,000 was that the previous government had made a commitment that they were going to do certain things. Now, they were well on their way of doing it and I understand my colleague, Mr. Tracey, as he said in the House the other day, they are just working on a subsidiary agreement with the Government of Canada and subsequently, when it is going to be signed, I expect it to be in the near future and then we can continue on in the renewable resources field.

Mr. Penikett: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to take this back to the Minister but it seems to me that we were clearly left with the impression yesterday that the \$400,000 had something to do with funding some of the items under Vote 14. I now seem to be confused because I seem to have either lost \$400,000 or \$361,000. We have got \$361,000 recoveries under the Recoveries on page 80. We have expenditures on page 52 of \$478,000.

Now, I know that the discussion got thoroughly confused yesterday. It got further muddled by descriptions of Christmas gifts and so forth, which I think is a very different kind of a thing from service agreements and General Development Agreements with the Federal Government but I seem to be missing -- Either there is some revenue that is not accounted for here or there are some expenditures that have been made against some moneys which we do not seem to find in these Supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, earlier, on behalf of the Government, I was prepared to make a commitment that we get this all clearly delineated in writing, from the Treasury Department, in respect to the recoveries and how the \$400,000 related to this total budget.

Now, obviously, from what I have been saying, you wanted more technical definition of exactly where this money is. It is clear in my mind. My understanding is that some of it is at the beginning of the budget in the recovery side in Vote 14, in the Department of Renewable Resources.

I will see that we get a proper description of exactly where that money is, and how it is distributed throughout this.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to put the Minister to a lot of work. I do not want to get into financial technicalities, nor do I need lots of sheets and charts. The Minister has just explained that it is very clear to him. I think that if it is clear to him, then it ought to be easy enough for me to understand. I would, therefore, ask him, since it is clear to him, to explain it, quite briefly, very precisely, and they maybe I can understand it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I rely on my witness again. It is my understanding that \$400,000 was allocated to this government in the middle of last year. The GDA was not signed until the middle of summer, or quite

late in the year. Now there was a certain number of dollars spent by this government in the renewable resources area, in the area, I believe of \$200,000 of that amount. There was \$200,000 that was not spent, that therefore was underexpended, which went into general revenue, due to circumstances that I cannot detail.

Under Vote 14, Department of Renewable Resources, these are a separate and distinct programs, which have really nothing to do with the actual GDA. Is that not correct, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the items shown on page 80, the recoverable items, are not related at all to the General Development Agreement, nor to the \$400,000. The \$400,000 does show up on page 1, as I indicated before, so there is in no way a withholding of information on the availability, or the indication that we have received funds. It is on page 1. In the additional agreements that were arranged between our government and various other government agencies, that whereby other agencies would pay us for specific work that was done, it shows up as a recovery item.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, to pursue that for a minute, if the items on page 80 do not relate to the GDA, can Mr. Wilson tell me if the items on page 52 relate to the GDA.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, some of the items on page 52 do relate to the GDA, for example, during the year, and we could get into this in the 1979-80 Main Estimates, there was a creation of ten new man years, all of which were related to the addition of funding that was received under the GDA. Items such as a director of renewable resources, a resource economist, resource planners, parks planners, district park supervisors, all these man years were the GDA funded man years. All of those man years have continued on through and the reason that the total money was not spent is those man years were not all hired during this current year, so of the total funding you would expect on page 51 of the expenditures, if all the funding had come through, you would have expected at least another \$200,000 to \$250,000 as a supplementary, and that would have happened if we did not have the vacancies.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am going to make one final effort to sum up this thing in my mind and hope that somebody is going to agree with me.

The \$400,000 was received by the previous government in mid-1978. The express purpose of that \$400,000, as we have gathered, was that the Executive Committee of that government decided to use that \$400,000 to strengthen the Renewable Resources Department so they could then in return develop subagreements for the various programs that they wanted to undertake under the General Development Agreement, am I right so far?

I am right so far.

Then, at some point, this is where I am getting confused, it was decided that the contract for \$400,000 was not fully expended by the end of the fiscal year, that the balance would go into general revenue.

Hon. Mr. Lang: If I could just correct the Member, the decision is already made for you because moneys that are not spent automatically go in to the consolidated general revenue fund. There is no decision to be made.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, so automatically the balance of these funds go into general revenue. The point at issue seems to be whether or not the commitment to continue that work is being fulfilled. Whether or not that \$200,000 is being retrieved, if that is the right word. I know you cannot do it directly. It is whether or not that amount is being put to work in the ensuing fiscal year 1979-80, which we are about to examine, for the purposes for which it was originally received, and whether or not this Government is, in fact, fulfilling the obligations which were undertaken by the previous government.

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. MacKay is correct in his assessment pretty well right down the line. The money had a destination, by a previous Executive Committee. It was unable, because of timing, to utilize the funds that were available, they did revert to general revenue, and they have been diverted, but it is a continuing "A" level item in the budget so that that \$400,000 will be present forevermore, hopefully, certainly at present on a continuing basis.

That is the money that is necessary for the continuing viability of the Department of Renewable Resources for what the funds were originally made available for.

Indeed, I think that Mr. Wilson, mentioned is worth accentuating. The \$360,000, in that range, it went to the formation, to the ten year new man years that were created with that money and, with modifications, went to the buildup of that department. That is what happened to that money.

I think that one of the misleading things is indeed, what is men-

tioned in revenues in the last page of the Supplementary has nothing to do with that \$400,000. They are revenues that are occurring every year, for one reason or another to what is now the Department of Renewable Resources, from one source or another, but you can entirely forget about the Christmas present that we were presented with last year, it was not presented it was fought over, believe me.

One of our areas of confusion, might be some of the phraseology that is used on page 52 of our Supplementary.

Such things described in 1401 as Yukon River Project, and in 1410 as CBC Oral History and Carcross/Marsh Lake Regional Plan, such things as this had nothing to do with it either. I think they are merely misleading because it was mentioned yesterday that these had something to do with \$400,000 and they indeed did not. They were well underway before there ever was a \$400,000. They were plans that that Department got into before that \$400,000 was forthcoming.

The CBC Oral History, the Yukon River Project, all of this was well on its way before this \$400,000 was forthcoming. They were normal projects that might be cost shared in the normal course of events with another are in the Federal Government as it happens in every province and has happened here. They were cost shared and it should not be reflected as being part of that \$400,000. They were our expenses that were cost shared.

Mr. Penikett: I think I smell something cooking. From what Dr. Hibberd has just told us, is that what we are dealing with is not an accounting or bookkeeping problem but perhaps some kind of literary error and that is an area where I begin to feel some kind of competence.

We have just been told by Dr. Hibberd that all \$479,000 supplementary expenditure represented on page 52, I want to be understanding him correctly here, that in the neighbourhood of \$360,000 of that, was involved in the new man years being created to firm up and establish the newly strengthened Department of Renewable Resources.

What I then am puzzled by is exactly the question that I think Dr. Hibberd is addressing, is that all of these items on page 80, the Yukon River Project, also appear on page 52 as the first item, salary reclassifications, legal surveys, fur bearing studies which is also mentioned on page 52, Gyrfalcon harvest which is also mentioned on page 52. I do not see anything about hunter safety studies but perhaps it is in there somewhere.

Foothills Pipeline funded studies and Foothills Pipelines funded studies which are found on both pages, so I think, if Mr. Chairman will agree, I think I would like to perhaps return to the original offer made by the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs and look forward with eager anticipation for a more detailed explanation of this.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the offer was made.

Mr. Chairman: I think, gentlemen, too, that we are referring back to something that was already voted on. I believe the Chair has given a lot of latitude on it.

Mr. Falle: Mr. Chairman, I think that maybe it is time to shut it down and get our guns together. It looks like the Opposition is getting ready to go so I would like call the Speaker back to the Chair.

Mr. Hanson: I move, Mr. Chairman, that you report progress on Bill Number 3 and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Hanson that I report progress and ask leave to sit again.

(Motion agreed to)

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

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

(Motion agreed to)

(Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: I do now 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 directed me to report progress on same and beg 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 at this time?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would move that we call it 9:30 o'clock.

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that we do now call it 9:30 o'clock.

(Motion agreed to)

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

(Adjourned)

Whitehorse, Yukon

Thursday, March 15, 1979, 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: At this time I will call the House to order.
We will proceed with afternoon prayers.
(Prayers)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

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

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today the 1977-78 Annual Report of the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Reports of Standing or Special Committees?

Petitions?

As there are no Petitions for reading, 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. Graham: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe at this time I should correct a statement that I made yesterday that I made in good faith, but which I have since been corrected on.

It was a statement concerning the joint use of facilities, I believe asked by Mr. Penikett. During the Question Period I answered his question that, I believe that that agreement for the joint use of facilities will continue and I do not really see any problem with the Department of Education utilizing the pool in this facility and paying for the use that the Department of Education actually does utilize.

I have been informed, Mr. Speaker, since making that statement that in the Joint Use of Facilities Agreement, no actual cash changes hands between the City and the Department of Education. The only time money is paid out is when the Department of Education pays for instruction or life guard instructors, in an areas such as this.

I did not want to leave the idea in the minds of any Members present that the Department of Education intends to repeal the Joint Use of Facilities Agreement and, in fact, take up the policy of paying for these facilities.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Minister for his statement and the clarification of the Government's position.

I would, at the same time, though, like to ask the Minister if he would undertake to continue to review the prospect of Territorial Government assistance for this facility in the event that it is approved by the taxpayers of the City, for the reasons that I made yesterday, that it could arguably be to the benefit of the whole Territory.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, I think that both the Honourable Members perhaps could have better dealt with this matter in Question Period. It is a matter that ought not to be debated under Statements of Ministers. Perhaps I will permit, at this time, a reply from the Minister that will close that matter under Ministerial Statements, but perhaps Honourable Members might assist the Chair in dealing with such questions as this under the Question Period.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the mistake.

All I can say at this time, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Education does intend to continue with the Joint Use of Facilities Agreement, under the present terms and conditions.

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

We will then proceed to the Question Period.

Have you any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify my answer given to the question raised by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West in connection with the Joint Federal-Territorial Sub-regional Planning Exercise.

Mr. Speaker, the final draft of the Whitehorse North Report is presently being printed. In the next week the document will be mailed to every resident within the study area, as has been the case with other previous draft reports.

Further public meetings will be held during the month of April, after which time the final report will be submitted to the Government for consideration.

The Carcross Valley Report is progressing well, terrain maps have now been completed, a series of public meetings have been held with additional meetings to be convened after release of initial draft to the residents. At this time it is anticipated that the planning exercise will be completed by mid or late summer.

Question re: Continuing Education/University of Alberta

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Last Thursday I raised a question to the Minister respecting a commissioned study by the University of Alberta on continuing education. The Minister stated that he would respond at his earliest possible convenience and I now have a further inquiry into this study. My question is: Is the Minister aware that, as part of the study presumably being paid for by his Department, classroom teachers are being asked to deliver addressed questionnaires to solicit their completion, and pick up and return them to his Department; all on a volunteer basis and on their own time?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of such practice.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Does the Minister feel that it is fair to ask classroom teachers to voluntarily do the work that his Department has paid or is paying a research team over \$50,000 to do?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement and check further into the situation.

Question re: Takhini School/Additional Teacher

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have a question for the Minister of Education. The Minister is no doubt aware of the severe overcrowding in the Takhini School where the largest class is thirty-seven students and the smallest is twenty-five in violation of the student-teacher ratio of twenty-five to one. The school qualifies for an extra teacher and I would like to ask the Minister when the school will be getting this extra staff.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Again, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this question under advisement.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Speaker take note and confirm for me that when he is checking this that technically the school qualified for an extra teacher when they had 238 students. The school now has apparently between 236 and 239 and I would be interested in having that confirmed.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the Honourable Member did ask the Speaker to undertake this and I believe he did in fact intend that that comment be directed to the Honourable Minister of Education.

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

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I have a final supplementary on this question and I do apologize for my error. The school in question is also one of the few without a Special Education Instructor and I would like to ask

the Minister at this time if he could check and see if this situation will be rectified.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is correct in stating that this school is one of the ones that does not have a special education staff and I will check into the situation.

Question re: Health Services Transfer

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In view of the Minister's statement in the House yesterday that the overall reaction from the Indian sector of our community was negative towards the transfer of the health delivery services in the Territory, in the face of these rejections, is he prepared now to withdraw his support from the transfer of this health?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief summation with regards to the history of the health transfer.

It does not only apply to the Status Indian people. There are approximately sixty-six per cent white people in the Yukon Territory and this health transfer affects the sixty-six per cent white population as well as it affects the native people.

Based on those facts, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to withdraw my support for the health transfer.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since this whole issue has become rather a contentious issue and it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Minister of Indian Affairs to be able to proceed with this transfer in the face of the objections from the status Indian people, would the Minister of Health consider referring the whole problem to the Yukon Territorial Government's land claims negotiator?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to put the health transfer into the hands of the Territorial Government's land claims negotiator. The health is not described as land. If we are sitting at the table, I believe that we would have some say in regards to areas such as the jurisdiction we have, but not in health.

If the transfer takes place, and I believe that I, as the Minister, would have some say into it, there will be, at no cost, the food, drugs and linen, et cetera, would be transferred to the Government and this is why I support that, the salaries, operation, maintenance, purchase of vehicles, et cetera are going to go to this Government, transferred at no cost to the Yukon Territorial Government.

So, I do not see why I should withdraw my support.

Question re: Indian People/Aboriginal Rights

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a related subject, I would like to put a question to the acting Government House Leader, if I could. Could he tell this House if his government accepts the concept of aboriginal rights of Yukon Indian people?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say from the Party resolutions of last September that we believe that the Indian people of Yukon have a certain aboriginal right and we believe that this is the concept of the land claims negotiations that are presently going on.

I think, perhaps, the Honourable Member, and all Members in this House, could get into a very good debate on exactly what the definition is, but we feel that the land claims should be settled and it should be settled to the satisfaction of all Yukoners.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, I wonder if the acting Government House Leader can tell me if it is the Government's view that certain rights which are normally described within the definition of aboriginal rights, including the protection of native languages and cultures, should be enshrined in a new Canadian constitution?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I should make a comment in this particular area. As you know, the Government Leader is the Member responsible for the land claims, and I feel that he would be the more appropriate one to answer a question of that nature.

Mr. Penikett: Perhaps he would take one question on notice in the same subject area. I would be interested in this Government's view on the question of aboriginal rights as to whether they see the land claims process as a means to extinguish or enshrine these rights.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I can take that under notice.

I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the question that the Member is asking is actually a question that should be directed to the Government of Canada, because they are the ones who are going to decide whether or not it is going to be enshrined or it is going to be the extinguishment of aboriginal rights.

But, I am sure that we will have an answer for the Honourable Member in the near future.

Question re: Health Services Transfer (Continued)

Mrs. McGuire: I have a supplementary to the health transfer question. I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, are the community meetings completed and are you quite satisfied with them?

The reason I am asking you this is because the only meeting that I know of that took place in Haines Junction consisted of two people from your department, I believe and two Federal health nurses, one status Indian, and one other person.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: In response to the Honourable Member's question, there has been very extensive consultation taking place. There is no more that we can do with regards to each community in the Yukon Territory with regards to consultation on the health transfer.

I have been looking back on the history of the transfer itself this morning and it dates as far back as 1971. There is nobody in this House can tell me that they did not have any contact with regards to the contract.

Question re: Special Education Programs

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. It is my understanding that an in-house document known as the Fleming Report on Special Education is presently being examined by his department in preparation for eventual policy, in terms of dealing with the problems of that area.

It has also come to my attention that no consultation is taking place between his Department and those who are responsible for implementing the programs.

My question is will the Minister assure this House that prior to finalization of his Department's plans to upgrade and improve the Special Education Programs in the Territory, consultation will take place between his department, the Yukon Teachers' Association, Principals and Vice-principals Association and the Special Education teachers?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, yes, I will assure the Member that such consultation will take place. The Department of Education, through a series of meetings will be preparing a response to Fleming Report formally by March 28th, 1979.

After I have been briefed as to the contents of the reaction to the proposed report, we were then intending to invite principals to discuss the report, on March 29th. We are also inviting the Yukon Teachers' Association to discuss this report and further, we are also going to consult with the YNB and CYI education people before a finalized report is presented to me within Executive Committee with a request for a decision.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Byblow: Could I ask the Minister if the original report will be used in those consultations?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the contents of the original report will be discussed at these meetings.

Mr. Speaker: Final Supplementary?

Mr. Byblow: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Minister answered by question.

Will the original copy of the report be used and made available to the interested parties in those consultations and discussions?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I fail to see any difference between the original report and the contents of the original report, but if it will please the Member opposite, yes, the original report will be discussed by the principals, the YTA, and the YNB.

Question re: Yukon Government Boards and Committees

Mr. Penikett: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, to the acting Government House Leader.

Will the Government shortly be making the appointments to the various boards and committees of the Yukon Government in which there are vacancies?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when a vacancy occurs, immediate consideration is given to replacing those particular positions.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise the House, if it is the Government's intention, in the near future to appoint any persons other than card carrying Conservatives to these boards and committees?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say if you review the membership on the various boards that there is a combination of many people of political persuasion. I will agree with the Honourable Member, sometimes it is difficult to find Members other

than card carrying PCs to fill positions, but we take every position under advisement and appoint them accordingly.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker. If the Member wishes I am quite prepared to provide him with a long list people other than Conservatives who would be willing to serve.

At the same time, on a serious note, would the Minister be prepared, at some point in the near future, to advise the House as to how many women, Indian people and rural residents are presently members government boards and committees?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I could find out that information and I will proceed to get the information for the Honourable Member.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were some questions in relation to the Ambulance Services here in the Yukon Territory. One of the questions put to me was, how many ambulances are being operated by Y.T.G. and where they are located. The answer to that Mr. Speaker, is that there are eleven ambulances in the Territory: two in the vicinity of Whitehorse; to be more specific, there is one at Beaver Creek-Destruction Bay, Haines Junction, Teslin, Watson Lake, Faro, Carmacks, Mayo, Dawson City and two in Whitehorse. None in Old Crow yet, Mr. Speaker.

Another question that was put to me, I believe it was from the Honourable Member from Faro with regards to specialists versus money that we spend on patients that require ...

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I must perhaps point out to the Honourable Member if these questions were asked in the House in the Question Period, it would be proper to answer them here but any questions that might have been asked in any Committee of the House ought to be answered in that Committee.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: I understand that; I take that back.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Honourable Member. Are there any further questions.

Question re: Employee Grievance Appeal Procedure

Hon. Mr. MacKay: This is to the Deputy Acting Leader of the Government: With respect to and in view of the requirement that a Deputy Head of a Department must hear any appeal from an employee with a grievance and since, in some cases, that Department Deputy Head may be the person against whom that employee has the grievance, will the Minister consider introducing amending the legislation to eliminate this unfair situation?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we are getting into the area of the Public Service Commissioner. It is my understanding that when a review of a situation is made that the Public Service Commissioner is present during any review of a decision and then the next step is, as my colleague pointed out the other day at Adjudication, we could take the question of the Member under advisement and perhaps discuss it with the Public Service Commissioner.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I wonder if I could ask the Minister to give us an answer as to whether he thinks this situation is fair?

Mr. Speaker: I would have to rule that question out of order. I think that the Honourable Member is asking an opinion and that is quite out of order in the Question Period.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I could ask another question then, Mr. Speaker. In view of the type of appeal process that is required to settle this kind of matter, would the Government be willing to undertake to pay any legal expenses entailed by an employee having to go to the second stage of appeal?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, he is asking me some pretty technical questions. I will take the question under advisement and see what the practice is. Now, I agree with the Honourable Member, I think that that area should be reviewed that he is referring to.

Question re: Education Department Staff

Hon. Mr. Byblow: I have another question for the Minister of Education. It is my understanding that for well over a year now at least four senior officials in his Department are engaged in an acting capacity basis. This is having a chain effect to at least several other positions. My question is whether the Minister is actively recruiting in order to stabilize the permanency of his Department staff?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are actively recruiting and, in fact, we expect that in the next very short while we will have filled any vacant positions in my Department or any positions which are currently in an acting capacity.

Mr. Byblow: Could the Minister indicate the process of recruitment being used?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, we put advertisements in the paper. We actively recruit these applicants. These people apply to the Department of Education for the job. We screen the applicants and we pick the person that we consider is the most suitable for the job.

Mr. Byblow: Could the Minister indicate the method by which the final selection is made?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member seems to be talking in generalities. The selection process for each person in a department is quite different. I imagine the selection of a person serving as a custodian will be quite different than a person serving as an department head; therefore, I find it very difficult at this time to answer his question.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Justice Department/MLA and Press Relations

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is to the Minister of Justice. There have been questions raised in the House over the last couple of days about the existence or non-existence of a letter or a written order by one of the employees of his department to that employee requiring him not to speak to the press or MLA's.

Will the Minister now confirm the existence of such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, we are actively investigating this case and, at this time, I think it would be better that I take the question under advisement and provide the Honourable Member with an answer at a later date.

Question re: Dempster Highway/Impact on Old Crow

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources. Yesterday I asked a question about the measures to protect Old Crow about the possible negative social impacts of the Dempster Highway pipeline.

The answer was vague, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to ask now, specifically what steps is the Minister taking, in view of his government's support of year-round operation of the Dempster?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I have been a long time resident of the community that is in question now, and have been making policy on behalf of the people and for the best interests of those people.

With regards to the Dempster Highway, I have been involved in the development of the interim management plan, which has been set up for those purposes. Under that plan, the Old Crow people had participated, with me on the Old Crow side. It was agreed that there would be an area development ordinance under which the Commissioner would have the power to make certain regulations with regard to the use of the Highway.

I do, in fact, agree with that specific part of the Ordinance itself, and I do believe that under that Ordinance it provides for people of Old Crow, through me, as their representative, to advise the Commissioner on those certain regulations that she can impose on the Dempster Highway.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on the same subject, to the acting Government House Leader in his capacity as Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs.

Could he tell the house what reports and recommendations were considered in making the decision on year around operation of the Dempster Highway?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there is an interim management committee that have been set up for the balance of 1978-79 year. Obviously a decision had to be made, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we were going to carry on with the year around maintenance of the highway. Subsequently the decision was made to open the highway for year around traffic. From that point, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Health Department, as well as other Members of the Executive Committee, will be reviewing the situation and perhaps a little stricter restrictions will have to be put on that highway as opposed to other highways in the Yukon.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to, Mr. Speaker, ask the Minister, did the Dempster Highway management committee recommend that the highway be opened on a year around basis?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker. The committee was set up for 1978-79. This is prior to my time but I understand there was some discussion in respect to the 1979-80 year. I will have to bring back a

direct answer to that question, because it is very direct. I do not believe there was one way or the other, whether or not it should be opened year around or otherwise. I think there were some comments, if my memory serves me correctly, in respect to the fact that perhaps certain times of the year it should be closed.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Special Instruction for students absent due to illness

Mr. Byblow: I have one additional question, for the Minister of Education.

Could the Minister indicate or check for me whether his department has any policy, or plans to have any policy, regarding services to school students who, due to reason of illness or accident are incapable of attending school, but are fully capable and want to receive instruction?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will check into the situation and report back.

Question re: Health/Preventative Medicine

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources.

Can you advise the house, if his Department has any plans to develop health programs to meet the special needs of women in the field of preventative medicine?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I am not a doctor, I will have to take that question, under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister at that time report back to the House on specifically what programs may be under development for breast cancer patients, pre-natal and post-natal care?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to do that for the Honourable Member.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further questions, we will now proceed then to Orders of the Day.

May I have your further pleasure at this time?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the house resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole.

(Motion agreed to)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

At this time, we will have a very short recess.

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: This afternoon we shall go to the First Appropriation Ordinance, 1979 -80. The first clause reads, "This Ordinance may be cited as the First Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-80. I refer you to Schedule A. We will go from Schedule A to Vote Number 3, Education, which you will find in your blue book on Page 37.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that last evening I believe I mislead the House. As you will recall I stood up and said that 72 Conservatives were elected out of 79 and just for the record I would like to say that it was 74.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am certainly glad to see the Minister showing his true colours and his commitment to one party states developing in Canada.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 3, Department of Education. When I call the first Establishment out we will have general debate on Education. After that we will take establishment by establishment and treat that establishment only. I will not permit debate on something before or after. Establishment 300, Administration.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, as a point of clarification, could I just seek some understanding from the Chair as to how or when in Committee we will finally, if you like, settle the unanswered questions from last evening.

Mr. Chairman: We will go back to that at a future date, I will continue where we left off last night.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, any questions that anyone had in relation to the Department of Education I now have answers for and as we get to that establishment I will read out the question and the answer that we have prepared in relation to that question if that is acceptable.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 300, Administration.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, Education is responsible, the Department of Education is responsible for providing primary, elementary and secondary schooling for all school age children in Yukon.

During 1978-79, an Education Council was established by this office to give parents, through their school committees, greater understanding and responsibility in representing the views and concerns of parents directly to the Minister.

The Department, in meeting its responsibility for public education from kindergarten to Grade twelve, is responsible for the provision of facilities, to meet planned and existing requirements, to ensure adequate staffing, to develop programs to meet local needs and to provide educational resources and materials to support the school curriculum.

In 1979-80, the program emphasis will be towards strengthening existing programs, adapting a new British Columbia curriculum to reflect local needs and increasing and improving staff training and continuing to implement native language and cultural programs.

The Education Budget also includes funding for school and adult French language programs, a Yukon based teacher training program, a native language program, dormitory accommodation for students who require part of their schooling away from their homes, special education services, post-educational grants to Yukon students pursuing post secondary education outside of Yukon, a remedial tutor training program and provisions for assisting Yukon communities in developing recreational programs for all citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify exactly what we are dealing with, could you refer to the specific text references?

Hon. Mr. Graham: We are in the blue book, Education, page 37. I read the first establishment and it is general debate on anything connected with Education. Is that the information you wish?

Mr. Byblow: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Perhaps, to initiate some discussion, I notice that the general increase in Administration is, according to my calculations, twenty-three per cent, effectively amounting to, budget-wise, \$147,000.

I am wondering, with the addition of only one administrative person, how we can justify that?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand where Mr. Byblow is quoting these figures from.

You are on page 38, are you on page 37 or 38?

Mr. Chairman: We are on page 37. The remaining page are informational data.

Hon. Mr. Graham: It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that the administration part of the Department of Education has not only dropped by some \$26,000 in the past year, we have also dropped four man years from the total administrative staff in 1979-80 from 1978-79.

We have dropped four people from the staff and reduced the total administration budget by 26.1 thousand dollars.

Mr. Byblow: My question then is, to the Minister, if that is in fact what he is leading us to believe, there is creation of Section 325, Manpower, which is a new department.

I will repeat that. There is creation of Section 325, Manpower and four new administrative positions, and reflected throughout the entire categories, we can find as many as seven and ten additional man years as it were, under administration in the various different categories. I am not sure that in fact there is a reduction in the administrative staff.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Byblow is proceeding to get involved in the various establishments. When we do get to those establishments, I have an explanation for that, it is just basically a wording problem that we have there. I think right now the total budget, is what we are discussing on page 37 in the general manner.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that we are having a discussion of general education policy. I have a problem now and I would ask you indulgence. I would like to ask a question about a matter under the Minister's responsibility, yet I cannot find where it is in the Budget.

So, perhaps if I could give the question now, if he wished to take that as notice until such time as it did appear in the Budget, I would be quite happy to wait for my answer.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Penikett: The subject of my question is the Clinton Creek

School. I would like to know what was the selling price of that facility, when it was sold at auction recently, whether the rumours to the effect that there were several thousand gallons of fuel left in the tank at the time of sale are true, who bought the school, who owns it now, where is it located and what was the purchase price of the owner who now has it?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I will attempt to provide the information when we get to that part of the Budget.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you.

I have another question which is under the general category. The Minister mentioned, when he was describing the priorities of his department, curriculum development.

I wonder if he could tell me, because I am not sure that I do see it here, or how it is broken out, what the specific funding has been allocated for curriculum development?

In dealing with that question, perhaps he could also explain to me, elaborate a little bit on this process of adapting B.C. curriculum rather than perhaps having a separate Yukon curriculum.

I will explain my question briefly, Mr. Chairman, if I may. It seems to me there is a continuum and that at some point, if you keep adapting the B.C. curriculum, you are going to end up with one of our own and I would like to know how far we are away from that point.

Hon. Mr. Graham: We will attempt, Mr. Chairman, to get that information also for the Honourable Member.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: While we are in a general policy discussion, respecting the Native Language Program, I believe we established that that is a direct Federal Grant. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Graham: If he asking a question, it was, yes. And the same is true for the French Program.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Could you indicate to what degree the Department is contributing to these programs in their implementation in the classroom.

Hon. Mr. Graham: When we get to those programs, I will more than happy to get Mr. Byblow that information.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address the general policy issues involved here today with respect to approving of budgets, of some \$20,000,000 for the education of our children in this Territory.

I think that this Department is probably the most sensitive portfolio for any minister to have over the next few years. Already we have some problems which have been discussed in this House with relation to overcrowding in the schools from my riding. We are having indications that Takhini is having growth pains; we have elements of Faro's, they are in a crisis stage, being looked after. There are a lot of problems that this Department seems to be having.

I would like to perhaps address a few of these problems in a general way, without appearing to be negative, I hope, in the process. I think one of the problems we are suffering from is the lack of long-range planning. The problem we have of quite an empty school downtown and an overcrowded one in the suburbs is not unique in North America. It is something that has happened before and is probably still happening in many places. Therefore, my concern is that if this is such a common occurrence that somebody has not foreseen it, sometime ago. With the expansion of Riverdale as an evergrowing suburb, complementary to the expansion of the downtown industrial and commercial core, that there would be a shift of populations.

The quality of education is, to some extent, part of the physical surroundings the children find themselves in and I think that is the major part of the problem this Department has to face over the next few years. I do not honestly think that the personnel in the schools can be criticized for their professional duties. I think they do an excellent job and in the face of quite difficult problems in some areas, very difficult problems in some areas. So I am addressing myself to the physical problems that exist in the school system.

Whitehorse is transforming itself into an urban sprawl and we are having growth in Porter Creek, far more rapidly in the future than any future growth in Riverdale. We have a report, the Stanley Report, which predicts this quite accurately.

I am hoping that in the process of this debate we will see, Mr. Chairman, some positive all-encompassing, long-range plans for the provision of facilities in the Whitehorse area. I am not talking about a short-term solution of busing or pulling in portable classrooms. I am talking about somebody somewhere has to stop and say this is what Whitehorse is like today, this is what it is going to be

like five years from now, ten years, twenty years from now. This is where the people are going to live. Are we providing schools for them?

I have not really seen a lot of evidence of that. I see the Stanley Report has been criticized as being too optimistic on its projections of population. When you question a professional report, I hope that you have got some reason to doubt it. I have just heard the doubts expressed. I have not heard the contrary and the backing of these doubts.

So, for now I am tending to believe this report that we are having to look forward, in the very near future, to two new schools in Porter Creek, let alone the development of all the masses of lots that we can expect in Hillcrest.

So, I think that the school department has fallen behind in its planning. It is not keeping up with the Department of Local Government. We are trying to bring on as many lots as we can and I do not think that adequate planning has gone into the provision of schools, firstly in our oldest development, and that is Riverdale. The problem will reappear, very shortly, in the same form in Porter Creek, a problem that I suggest will probably raise its head in Hillcrest, as time goes by.

I think that that is a very serious criticism of the Department, not of today's Department, but of probably yesteryears' department, five, eight, ten years ago, whenever Riverdale started.

I am suggesting that I think that within the existing facilities that we do have now, there are some changes that could be made to help alleviate today's problems. One of the problems that we do have is busing. The busing of children back and forth is not a good thing and I sympathize very much with the Members from Porter Creek, who have lived with this problem for quite some years, raised with the problem.

Porter Creek is coming into its own now. It has some very eminent citizens that do not seem to be too badly educated.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: But surely, with the facilities that we have now today, and perhaps I am just a simple layman who does not know anything about these things, but we have a situation where Jeckell High School is very crowded. It provides the junior secondary education to all of the kids in the Whitehorse area.

I think there are sixteen grade eight classes all in the one school, Mr. Chairman. Many of these children go to Jeckell for one year only, and then proceed to F.H. Collins. That is not a healthy school situation, not a good environment, because they do not have to identify with any of the school traditions, without any loyalty towards their own school. Difficult disciplinary situations arise because of that. There is no commitment.

So you are busing all these children from all over Whitehorse to this one school. Surely it is not beyond the capability of the Department of Education to find some classrooms, in the area of Porter Creek, for junior secondary students, or even use the empty classrooms in Whitehorse Elementary.

One of the problems with Whitehorse Elementary is the fact that it has a declining enrolment, that it really services the "poorer end of town", and that there seems to be a declining morale in that school. That is probably the softest way to put it.

The parents of children who go to that school are extremely concerned about conditions within that school.

One of the suggestions that has been made to support the busing of children from Riverdale is a leveling of that situation. Level it out, bring in some kids from a ritzier area and have them go to school with the poor kids, and hopefully through that process, improve the moral of the whole school. I do not think I necessarily agree with that, because the situation that exists there today may, in terms of percentages overall enrolment of that school, decline. If we suddenly had 500 to 600 students, only half of them having any difficulty, suddenly it is only fifty per cent of the population of that school having difficulty.

It is still exactly the same number of students who are having difficulty today. All we have done is a statistical leap so, I am wandering a bit, Mr. Chairman, but I would appreciate all the latitude I could get, because I think this is a very difficult problem, and I am trying to throw out ideas and suggestions to the other side to think about.

I would ask them to consider the Stanley Report recommendations, seriously, of tearing that school down. Making it into two smaller community schools, or one. It is also a fact that the government's other suggestions have been to tear it down and convert it to an office building, which is probably worth looking at, and building another school anyway. An other one is making it act as a

junior secondary. I do not know what the professional objections to that are, there may well be some professional objections, Mr. Chairman, to the mixing of junior secondary children with primary grades children, elementary grade children.

I want to examine it carefully, because it seems to me it happens all over the country. In the smaller towns, they only have one school, and in fact all the kids go to one school, from grade one to grade twelve.

So how horrendous a problem would that be, putting junior secondary students in there.

I guess that the final problem that I want to tackle is the question, and it is a difficult one to tackle, is the question of the aspirations of the Indian people with respect to the education system of this Territory.

I think it is, as I have said before, an absolute necessity that if we are going to take responsibility for the education of the people of this Territory that we try and respond to the needs of the people of this Territory.

If a third of these people in this Territory are saying we want to have an increased input into the development of the curriculum, we want to be taught our own languages, we want to learn about our own culture, we want to go into a great deal more depth in these areas, because we think it is important for the pride and continuing development and existence of our culture, then I think this Department has to respond to that. I am glad to see, looking down the expenditure summaries, and so forth, that money is being spent here.

I hope that the Territorial Treasury will not just say that this is entirely an Ottawa program. I think we have to change our attitude there. It is a Yukon problem. It is a Yukon program. If we are going to settle land claims and develop a cohesive society, we are going to have to recognize that it is a Yukon problem and that we should be devoting quite a bit of effort to developing the necessary parts of the curriculum that are called for in the school system, by the native people.

What you wind up with then is a question of how do you deliver these programs to the Indian children at the schools, and at the same time deliver the programs that the rest of the population want?

First of all we have to determine whether there is a conflict in delivering these programs, and I suspect that there is, indeed, a conflict, particularly in the smaller areas where the provision of these additional programs might be at the expense of what has been traditionally the education program to date.

So what we are talking about, there is probably a dollar problem. Okay, that is an additional cost. How are we going to pay for that? Is it worth paying for? This is a political decision, and I truly believe, as I have stated before, that we have to go a long, long way to meet these aspirations. It is going to cost.

It is a bit like the bilingual program. Really, nobody cares for it too much, but you know that we have to do that kind of thing in order to maintain one Canada. Well, it is the same analogy. We have to, in Yukon, be prepared to spend more money in order to keep one Yukon.

This is the key department where these decisions have to be made.

The question now arises, are we now getting into segregation? A pretty hot word. Another one like apartheid, an even hotter word. I suggest we stay away from these words, because in the general public's mind, they suggest some pretty bad things.

If what we are trying to do, and I can liken it to something else: say ten per cent of our school population is especially brilliant, and that we want to give them special opportunity to be able to utilize their full talents so that they can go ahead and improve their education and go as fast as they can. We do not call that segregation, Mr. Chairman. It is exactly the principle we are talking about when we are talking about giving incentives and special assistance to children who have different needs from others. It is selective improvement that we are doing, and I think that we should not be afraid of seeing schools develop where perhaps a predominant number of children in that school are native, because we do not see anything particularly wrong with having a school that is predominantly white, so let us not get hung up if there is a school that is predominantly native, and that school becomes known for offering courses and curriculum that is of special interest to Indian parents. This is the way I would hope to see it develop. It is allowing for differences of the population with respect to what they expect of the education system, and I think we have to be prepared to do that, and we should not get hung up on this hot word, segregation. It is a means of delivering programs that are asked for in an economical

way, without having to build two schools to do it, or hire twice the number of teachers to do it. It is a sensible solution.

I am again being very general. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am not taking up too much of your time. So, in summary, I am concerned about the physical characteristics of our school system and whether they are being planned adequately, and I am concerned about the very sensitive area of native education and whether or not we have a government that is prepared to make some sacrifices in order to satisfy, or appear to be trying to satisfy, what are now known as native aspirations.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I completely understand the format we were going to engage in, but I would like to offer some observations in the same vein, but perhaps with more of a thrust in recognition of the outlying areas, respecting education. It seems that what has happened over the last number of years is that education has fallen behind in the attempt to cater exactly to the needs of the community and, specifically, the Yukon community. I think that a fair amount of attention will have to be directed to this new thrust in society where the demand is of a more vocational nature, while at the same time not forgetting the academic side. That is distinctly a problem, because you are almost delivering, in a sense, two types of programs. Presently, what is happening is that in the smaller schools, it is really a catering to a mediocre middle that goes on the school systems. Attention is devoted to the student who is having difficulty. The student who is capable of making it in the system could make it with or without the system.

This is a real serious problem to attend to.

Physically, in the outlying communities, I think something that could be looked at in the next four years is the nature that the school takes in its structure, with consideration for the rest of the community services.

Now, there are a lot of schools out there that are vacant and empty, and being duplicated in space by other buildings. If you look at the Operation and Maintenance costs in this budget, they are astronomical. If we are going to be energy conscious, at the same time, I think there is a fair amount of discipline that can be exerted within the entire profession and the department.

As the Honourable Member who just spoke, indicated, that allocations have been made in various program areas, and this is good. The delivery of these programs is going to have to be in very close consultation with the people delivering them and to whom they are delivered. In a small community, that is, again, difficult to work out, but it has to be addressed.

I think, particularly in the outlying areas, much more attention has to be directed to the native education aspect. I believe the department now is investigating a special report that looks at what is happening to students who are coming from the outlying areas into Whitehorse.

What is the answer? Do you build high schools in the outlying areas? It is physically expensive. It is another problem that is going to have to be addressed if you look at the results of that report.

We talk about the native language program and, recognizing that it is direct federal aid, and so is the French language program, you compare the two. Compare the two in terms of the money we are spending. Where is the priority?

These are some of the things that are going to have to be addressed, and I would also hope that the department will recognize, in the outlying areas, a consideration for the people you have got in the classroom giving the instruction.

Too often, you have teachers who are leaving simply because of the conditions imposed on them, with no special consideration for living in that community. Sure you have the mechanics in negotiation to set those conditions, but if you take a close check of your statistics, of what is happening in the outlying areas, you are getting less qualified, less experienced teachers there.

You have to ask yourself why?

So, in a general philosophical sense, I would hope that the government will take a close look at Establishment 321, look at the vocational aspect. There is a real demand coming from industry and business for training in this area. They are prepared to help education, and perhaps this is my message, that not only do you have to tie your buildings in with what goes on in the community, you have to tie in what your students are training for with the people for whom they are training.

In recognition of rising costs, there have to be methods by which you can cut those costs, but yet produce and deliver better programs.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Penikett: The Minister may not think so, but I think this kind of discussion and, perhaps, general debate that has gone on so far in the long run may prove to be very useful, because I think it does us all good to think for a moment about some of the concerns expressed by my colleagues in Opposition.

It is an attempt to clarify in each of our minds, and in the government's case, their collective mind, some definite ideas about the purposes and objects of an education system.

I was once a consumer of education, and I suppose since those days I have asked myself a few times, what is the purpose of the education system. I have asked especially because I think I am not too cynical in reflection. I think I would come to the same conclusion as many other people, and that is, I did not really start learning until I left the school system.

I share the view, or concerns, at least, expressed by the Honourable Member from Faro, in connection with the kind of training that is going on in our school system. I tend to be perhaps a little more old fashioned than some, in that I value the antique notion that one of the skills that one ought to acquire in the process of being schooled, is that those fundamental things such as learning how to think logically, and speak in sentences, and, perhaps, discuss things in a rational way, know where to find information, so forth and so on.

I am also aware that, in most cases, that is not the expectations of parents when they send their children to school. I think many parents send their kids to school in the hope that they will be given in the system some specific skills which then they can employ for the rest of their life. Of course, it is a continuing disappointment to parents that children, in the process of being trained, are often changed, and that is, I know, particularly to mothers, often a source of deep sadness.

I think Mr. Byblow touched on a very essential point in terms of the future of our education system. It is a matter to which I referred in my reply to the Throne Speech.

At the present moment in our country as a whole, we have a surplus of university graduates in a number of areas. I think there are literally thousands of Art graduates wondering around without, I think I may say in fairness, marketable skills. At the same time, there is a shortage of the kind of white collar jobs for those people to apply for.

When I was in university, if you were not industrious or intelligent enough to get into law school or medical school, you decided if all else failed, you would become a teacher. You finished your BA, got your C- and then went to the summer course and became a teacher.

I sometimes cringe at the thought of some my university colleagues now being responsible for the education of my children. The reason they were in university, in fact, had very little to do with their intellectual aptitude and had more to do with the financial position of their parents.

I think, without passing dispersions on any of our teachers in our system, I think obviously parents are going to have serious concerns about in whose hands their children are placed in their tender mercy.

So, at the same time as we have this surplus of, I think, liberally educated children, I mean that in the sense of the liberal arts, the people who are not trained for any specific trade or profession in society.

We have a shortage of skilled trades people. In fact, just the other day I was reading a publication, a national publication, which said, and I think it was in Ontario, the average age of the tradesman in that province is over fifty. That is the journeymen. That is a very serious matter.

Given the economic circumstances that I have just described, it is, I think, realistic for many skilled blue collar workers to have income expectations, certainly not up to the level of chartered accountants or physicians and certainly on a par with teachers or many other white collar workers, or Executive Committee members, of course. I think the Member from Whitehorse South Centre for pointing that out to me.

I think that is as it should be. I think there are perfectly honourable professions, electricians, plumbers and all the other trades, they are skills much in demand by society. They are in need by society. I think it is honourable work and I think the rewards for performing those kinds of jobs in society ought be commensurate with their skills.

It is also a fact that, certainly in my day, it required as many years to acquire those skills as teachers did theirs, for example.

The point is that at least in part, I think the goals of the Education system have to be geared to this community's needs in the years to come.

The other day, I think I put some questions to the Minister which he was going to check out since he is also responsible for manpower, but I think it is very important, in a long term planning sense, the kind of perspective the Leader of the Opposition was talking about, that we develop some kind of idea of the kind of skills we need in this community in the years to come; and I suspect we are going to need many more skilled tradesmen than we are white-collar workers and certainly the relationship, the balance now, would have to be shifted. We are going to have to re-orient or change the emphasis of our education system perhaps much more on the vocational side than it has been in recent years.

I think that following the Second World War, people who grew up in the Depression had great ambitions for their children and saw economic security in the white-collar jobs, government jobs, clerical jobs, teaching jobs and so forth. In some cases, no doubt, young people who would have been happier as plumbers or electricians were sent into those office-type jobs and were encouraged to go to university when perhaps they would have been much happier learning a skill which would have enabled them to work with their hands.

So I think that is a general emphasis and a general kind of question of direction that I think has to be addressed very carefully by the Education Department but it cannot be done in isolation, as the Leader of the Opposition points out; it has to be done in the context of the kind of manpower skills and the community needs in the coming years and you will probably have to do some educated guessing as to the kind of economic development that is going to take place here.

I would like to, as I say, throw that out to the Minister and hope that he would respond to that concern in some way during this debate.

There were a couple of other things that I would like to raise and they were addressed at some length by the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale South and that is this question of Indian education. I must admit that I am as curious as the Member from Faro about the commitment of this Government to that program, when one hundred per cent of the money for that program is coming from the Federal Government and yet we are prepared to subsidize French Language programming here, which, I am sure there are people who would find the idea of teaching French as unpalatable as they would teaching Indian languages.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give what I hope is a hypothetical case. I will describe the situation which could happen here in the coming years and ask the Minister how, in terms of policy, he might deal with it. We have in recent years, seen the development of these school committees or advisory committees, so forth. I think, on the whole, that is a positive development. But I am concerned that there may be communities in the Territory where the Indian people are in the minority; there may be only one school locally; the Indian people in that community might have a very clearly stated desire to have some large part of the curriculum devoted to native language training or traditional skills, or whatever, they might, in that community, have a school committee which is dominated by residents of the other half of the community. I would be very interested in hearing how the Minister would handle a situation where the school committee might be violently opposed to the introduction of such native language training or cultural programs.

I want the Minister to understand that I am not putting this question in a provocative way. It is a serious and delicate problem and I would like to have, from the Minister, some statement of policy as to how he would proceed in a case like that, should such a circumstance arise.

I will stop there, Mr. Chairman, I will have other specific questions, but I think those are general concerns of mine.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I was not really going to speak again, before we got into the specific items in the budget, but I feel that at this point maybe I should make a few general comments.

One, is the question of long range planning in Yukon. I emphasize the fact that this long range planning must take place in Yukon as a total, not only in Whitehorse, but Whitehorse-Riverdale or Faro or Whitehorse West. The Education Department does have a long range planning program and it is for the Yukon in total.

It possibly is being very educational to me to listen to the concerns of the various areas throughout the Yukon, I hope that they will continue to express the concerns of their communities or their areas. Again I must emphasize that our long range planning is for the Yukon in total.

I listened with some enjoyment to the Members opposite stating that the Government of Yukon does not have any commitment to the Native Languages Program, because of the fact that we receive one hundred per cent funding from Ottawa. I think that when we get down to Establishment 307 and they see that in the budget this year there is \$125,000 for Native Languages Program and they learn, at some point, in the specific budget debate that the full \$125,000 is being put up by this Government, the Department of Education.

I think they will realize, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Yukon does, in fact, have a commitment to the Indian population in the Yukon. It is through programs such as the Native Languages Program that we hope to show that this is an ongoing commitment and it is a commitment that I personally feel very deeply about.

I will continue to work with both the Yukon Native Brotherhood and the Council for Yukon Indians in attempting to expand the number of programs related to native culture, native language, native traditional pursuits in our schools. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we have had just a few recent meetings with the people from both the YNB and CYI to this end.

I am also interested to notice that the Members opposite seem to believe that these programs should be directed to Indian children only and I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I must disagree violently with that point of view. I believe very strongly that the Native Languages Program and the native cultural programs that we do currently have in our school, are not only applicable to the Indians in our school system, they are applicable to all of the children in our school system. I hope that in the future, we find more and more children from every race taking these programs and learning languages, cultural, the background of our natives here and maybe something of the native history, because I feel that this will bring us a little bit closer together as a society and hopefully integrate our society a little bit more, perhaps than it is at the current time.

It is only by understanding a few of the problems that both parts that our society has, we can hope to reach a better understanding.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I am also very glad to see that Mr. MacKay agrees that we have to spend more money and when I heard him say that, I was particularly happy because we should not have any problem at all with this Budget. In fact, I think Mr. MacKay, most of his problems are going to be with the lack of money being spent here. That is very nice to know.

In the area of basic skills in Vocational Technical Training, I think that as we go through the Budget again, you will find that the Department of Education has a strong commitment to these areas and that, in the upcoming years, you will find that the Department is attempting to take vocational courses to the communities in various methods which I am sure will become apparent to you.

We also hope to take, in the next while, a basic skills program to the various communities. Hopefully, we will teach the people in the communities basic skills, business skills, just skills that will help them get jobs in both the white communities, if you will, and with the developers that are coming into these communities.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I will leave the Members with one thought before we get into the specific debate, that the education system is set up for the children. The people we are educating are the children. I hope that the Members opposite always keep this fact in mind as we go through the Budget. Education is for the children. It is not for the parents.

In some cases, the vocational training and the night school courses, they are for parents; but, basically, we are trying to educate our children and I think that our department is making an honest, true effort to follow that policy.

I hope that all the Members in the House will realize this as we go through and debate in more specific terms.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Falle: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Honourable Members on the other side, our own Minister and the rest of the people in here, concerning education.

I do not pretend to be an educator. I am a small business man and I emphasize small, short, but I also realize that there is something very, very seriously wrong with our education system.

The kids coming out of school today, they lack respect for their elders, they lack respect for their teachers, they lack respect for society as a whole. They no longer ask what they can do for society. It is what they can do to it.

They lack the work ethic. I do not know where it went. When I went to school I had to work for a living, after school. I think a lot of people here did, too.

People coming up through our education system and going into

small business, where I would say maybe fifty or sixty per cent of the population and our income is created from, you make it very hard on the business person when you have a kid, supposedly a high school graduate, a couple of years of education, that actually does nothing for you, what you want him to do, will not think for himself, will not use common sense. It makes it a very hard burden on the small business man.

There is something wrong with our education system. It is completely throughout the country, I believe. It is not pertaining to us, but I wish that some educator could put their finger on it. I know that I cannot.

As a small businessman, I try to hire older people now, forty, fifty years old.

I do not know their problem. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Minister, Merci, et Szunee, nodlay Graham. Gah theh schlaa een kail.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks offered by various members this afternoon and I must say there has been a good deal of interesting information coming forward and it is refreshing to realize that if we are not professional educators, we at least, hopefully, have a intelligent interest in what education is.

I would like to take the Leader of the Opposition to task on one particular point, albeit not a major one, but when he calls my constituency the poorer area of town, I sincerely do have to object to such an intimation.

Remarks have been brought forward regarding the Stanley Report and what it involves as far as the educational system is concerned. I would sincerely hope that that report, per se, is not accepted without very critical evaluation of what the recommendations are.

I find it very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to accept some of those recommendations in view of what might be the effects of some of their recommendations.

It has been suggested, for instance, there is the phasing out of the Whitehorse Elementary School, which I have just had a good deal of encounter with parents in that area as we have just been through an election campaign and they expressed considerable concern about what was happening to their school and what should be done to remedy it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the solution to the problem is as easy as just closing a school. I think most of the problems that are visualized as coming forth in the setting in that school go considerably farther than what could be ascribed to a school.

We all know that there are a lot of single parent families whose children are attending that school and there is a major native component that is using that school, approximately half, and these are a lot of the programs that are involved.

It has been suggested that if that school is closed, these children could be bused to other schools, but I would submit that one of our prime responsibilities is to encourage the time with which the native children in particular are in contact with the educational system, which is, indeed, theirs as much as ours.

We should encourage it, but we will not encourage it by dropping a school that they feel at home with, that they are familiar with, they feel is their home base. They are comfortable with it as much as they can be in what, at the present time, is our educational system.

I would hope that this is going to change as we do honour a commitment to the natives in the area of education, but in recognizing that commitment, one of the things that we must do is accommodate them as well as we can and make them feel that they want to participate in the educational system.

We will not accomplish this by busing them to an area which they feel quite alien in, which they are a small minority in and they will no longer have the opportunity to feel a part of that system.

I think it is very important that we try and maintain that. So, in doing so, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly making a plea that that Whitehorse Elementary School be maintained where it is and cater to the type of people that are now being fed into it.

As I referred to earlier, there are indeed a lot of major social problems that are in that setting. I am also aware of the fact that there are no more dedicated professional staff than the principal and teachers of that school. They are very concerned, they are overworked, they are discouraged, and they need help.

I would very much like to see a perspective of trying to help these

children from a more basic point of view than just trying to put on a cosmetic touch of getting them to behave in school, and be there at the right time, obey the rules, et cetera. Their problems go, as we all know, considerably farther than that and they require a good deal more than just a talking to, or whatever punitive measures that might be considered appropriate.

Mr. Chairman: There is a great deal of work that needs to be done here, and we need a whole team of people who can go into that school, who can attack these problems; people who are professional in the area of where these problems lie. A lot of them are social problems, and we should really be paying attention to it from that point of view. There is no easy solution to this, but if there is going to be some benefit to those children in the long run, so that they, indeed, in the long run can participate responsibly in a full society, they need the help now. We are in a position to help them, and it is our responsibility to do so.

Mr. Chairman: At this time, if there is no more general debate on education, I will call a recess. When we come back we will start on Establishment 300. I now declare a recess.

(Recess)

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

On Vote 3, Education, Establishment 300, Administration, \$1,136,400. At this time, I might mention that, for information only, on administration, you will find the information on Pages 38 to 40, 41 to 43, 44 to 46, 47 to 48, and right on until Page 71.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I believe, starting at Page 42, the title that we have on those, Administration, is inappropriate naming. I have talked among my department officials and we would like to call them, instead, General School Program.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I will just explain briefly why this has been decided, so that we do not later get in a long debate about it. We have broken this down, as you can see from Establishment 302, into urban, rural north, and rural south. It is more or less an area breakdown. These general school programs, which is now titled, Administration, are programs for which we cannot break down to the actual base amount. They include things like repairs to furnaces, where you cannot break it down into various districts. Materials and supplies, which are bought as a group, and used in the administration of all the schools in the various areas. Consequently, we would like to change, both on page 42, again on page 45, those are the two main ones, the title to School Programs, and when we get into those Establishments, perhaps I can give you a further explanation, if that is acceptable.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just before we leave that point, in order for comparison to prior years, can you explain what these things were called in prior years.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, in prior years these were all lumped together. We did not break down urban, rural north, and rural south. What we are attempting to do here is, wherever possible, break the budget down this urban, rural north, and rural south. We have done this in order to put some of the responsibility and accountability where the money is being spent. So, the urban superintendent of schools, who, in effect, has control over those funds, or has a great deal of control over them, is now accountable for those funds for the programs in the schools under his control.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I appreciate the fact that we are dividing it into areas, but that was not the thrust of my question. What I was getting at was, for example, and I know we are jumping ahead of it, but I have to understand this so I can discuss properly, on page 41, the administration budget, which is sitting at \$116,000, last year there were no man years showing and it was only \$20,000. Now I presume we are not talking about a \$96,000 increase, in one year. I presume that the funds that are now reflected in \$116,000 were in fact allocated somewhere else last year. Were they allocated previously under 300?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I can not really answer the question right now, so, if it is totally necessary in order to go through Establishment 300, perhaps when we get to 302, I will have that explanation. Is that acceptable?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do not see that that will be acceptable, Mr. Chairman, because I think in order to properly evaluate Administration in Establishment 300, if in fact there have been reallocations out of that category, any comparison with previous years would not be valid. My concern is that we are looking at a decrease of \$26,000 in Establishment 300, over the previous year. Is that a real decrease, or were there some things in Establishment 300 last year that are now reallocated to other programs.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, you are getting into the finer details of the budget here. I think it is fair to say that if you compare

last year's budget to this coming year in the form presented to you, you have two man years from the Administration in 302, as opposed to not being show in 302 the year before. That represents the salaries and the other costs incurred by having two rural superintendents. So, subsequently, there is an interchange between the departments. I do not think there is a major increase other than the costs of money for inflation and the salaries. I think that is accurately reflected.

Mr. Byblow: I am wondering if it would be advisable for the Minister to provide a witness.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman. I just am looking back upon some of my own notes here, and the reduction in man years in Administration, which can be seen on page 27, from twenty-nine in 1978-79, to twenty-five in the present 1979-80 year, reflects a reduction of four, and these four people, I believe, represent the people transferred away from the Administration Budget, in order to reflect the areas in which they are actually now working.

One person must transfer into the Recreation Department, because of the fact that this was a secretary that was doing the Recreation Department's work, anyway. I believe that is where the two man years will be coming from.

Can we have a moment, please, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, would you permit a short recess, and I will bring in a witness.

Mr. Chairman: I will declare a very short recess at this time.

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: We have two witnesses, Terry Weninger and Sam Cawley.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps, just to clear up the matter on the end of Establishment 302, as to the two man years and the increase in budget, is it all right that we clear up that matter before going back to proceed through Establishment 300?

Mr. Chairman: Well, it was not the way that I wanted to do it, in this particular case, I will allow it.

Mr. Weninger: It is an increase for two man years that we are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Graham: In Establishment 302, yes.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not think the members have their mikes adjusted properly, and there will be problems to have them transcribed.

Mr. Chairman: May we now proceed?

Mr. Weninger: The two man years that are being referred to, Mr. Chairman, are utilized in the area of home economics instructors, and this type of thing, the people who are a casual type of employment in the on-going programs within the schools.

We realize, over the course of any number of years, that we need a reserve of a couple of man years in order to supply certain programs in certain communities, where an expertise might exist, but would not, ordinarily, be on the teaching staff, in order to accommodate, as I said, home economics, or sometimes, a French program, or whatever other talents that might be in the community that are necessary in the school.

Mr. Byblow: Just for further clarification, would those two man years that you are allocating to that establishment previously have been covered under General Administration?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, I do not believe they would have, no. These people are resource people in the communities, so they would not have been taken out of the general Administration budget, Establishment 300, in order to be put into Establishment 302.

Mr. Byblow: Then that is creation of two new man years, because, in fact then, the service was not provided as such.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I believe Mr. Weninger will help you.

Mr. Weninger: No, those two man years were in the general overall man years for the Department. As Mr. Graham has suggested earlier, what we have tried to do is have a cost-centre responsibility and a responsibility centre coinciding, so that the regional superintendents who are in charge of schools are in charge of that amount of staff assigned to them, and the salary funds funds for them.

In doing this, we found that we can not break everything out completely, so when we looked back over the budget for about five years, we knew that it was necessary to have a couple of man years available to perform the functions that we have suggested before.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest now that we get back to Establishment 300, Administration and perhaps clear that

one.

Mr. Chairman: We shall consider Establishment 300, Administration, and only that now.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: I have a general problem understanding something with respect to 300. In referring to Page 38, under that category, 300, Administration, it is my interpretation that this year's budget reflects 759.2 against 617.0, an increase in the area of \$140,000 and a percentage breakdown of twenty-three per cent. Now if, in fact, Establishment 300 says a decrease of four staff that have been moved out, I cannot quite understand this increase.

Hon. Mr. Graham: So what you are asking is why the increase in funds over 1978-79 Administration Budget. Mr. Weninger, go ahead.

Mr. Weninger: The basic increase there is in terms of salaries, fringe benefits, costs of materials and supplies, general increases in the cost of long distance phone calls, the basic increase is in the area of salaries and fringe benefits.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Correct me if I am wrong. On Page 38, we are reflecting in 1978-79 a man year of 19.0. In 1979-80, we are reflecting twenty man years or plus one. But in fact, we are reflecting a \$140,000 increase. I need some understanding for that.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Byblow, the 759.2 thousand dollars is not salaries alone. This is general administrative costs as well such as long distance telephone calls.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before we get into the other part of this Administration Budget we could deal with the question of salaries. I would like to ask the Minister, if I could, for a brief description of the function and work of the Superintendent of Education and the salary range for that position.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the salary range is public information, I believe. Is that information readily available?

Mr. Weninger: The salary range of the Superintendent of Education effective April 1st is in the neighbourhood of approximately \$40-48,000 per annum. I think I may be out a hundred dollars, I am not sure.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, could perhaps Mr. Graham or the witness perhaps explain to me the function and give me a brief description of the work of the Superintendent of Education.

Mr. Weninger: It deals with overall coordination of the department of education: supervising the five branches, the four that serve the public, the Recreation Department, Manpower Department Branch, Adult Training and Continuing Education, and Recreation Branches. The position is responsible for long and short term planning of all branches of the department, and is in charge of setting up the budgets and monitoring the budgets to ensure that the budgets are being followed accurately and correctly.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Weninger. Perhaps I could ask an identical question in the case of the Assistant Superintendent of Education. What is the salary range of the Assistant Superintendent of Education, and what does that person do for a living?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, if we go through every job description of every one of the twenty-five people with a position in the administrative department, and then we run through another job description of the 261 other people that we have involved in the department, we are going to be here for a long, long time. I just wondered if Mr. Penikett wishes to have the job descriptions. I am sure we can get them to him at a later date.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to wait awhile to get job descriptions, but the Minister may have perceived, already, some concern on this side of the House, about the increase in the administration budget for the Department of Education, and in fact, the very size of that department within the context to the school system in this Territory, and compared to other jurisdictions, the relatively small number of students.

It is my intention, whether now, or later, to ask for a job description of each of the personnel in the administration department, and to establish their salary ranges, and perhaps to explore some further questions on this part of the budget. My own view, Mr. Chairman, is that I am not prepared to clear that item until I have that information.

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is perfectly acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman. We will hand the information to Mr. Penikett, and if he has any other questions involving the establishment, let us get on with them.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Some days ago, in this committee, I put notice of a question to Mr. Graham on this very subject of administration, and I understood he was going to bring

forward these things as we hit each topic, so perhaps he could produce the answer to my question now.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I thought I had the answer with me regarding the percentage of the budget that was involved with education, but I have been searching for it, and I have not to now been able to find it.

Immediately I find it I will present it.

Mr. Byblow: Okay, in an attempt to completely understand this, I refer to page 38 again. The item under Administration, in the first category of total, reading \$759,200.

If I turn the page, I find that figure accounted for. If I further read the breakdown on page 39, I see Item 10 as \$576,700, salaries and wages, as part of that breakdown.

Could I find out whose salaries and wages that \$576,700 pays for?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, he can. It pays the salaries of the Superintendent of Education, a Clerk Typist III, one Administration Officer II, a Clerk Typist II, an Accounts Clerk I, a Clerk Typist III, Superintendent of Curriculum, Regional Superintendent Urban, Clerk Typist III, Special Services Inspector, School Services Inspector, Superintendent of Primary Education, Stores Clerk, a Superintendent of Special Education, an Assistant Superintendent of Education, an Accounts Clerk II, an Accounts Clerk II, an Accounts Clerk III, a Clerk Typist II, Regional Superintendent Rural, Assistant Regional Superintendent, Regional Superintendent Rural, one is North and one is South, Accounts Clerk IV, Clerk Typist II, and do you have the next one, Mr. Weninger?

Mr. Weninger: The Supervisor of Primary Instruction.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I notice that in that comprehensive list that you gave us, that there are five accounts clerks. I notice then in the next column along, under Accounting, we have another \$89,100. Could it be that these five are included in that?

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, for information, what does that total, in terms of people. Is that, in fact, 20.0 man years.

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, it is 45.

Mr. Byblow: How many teachers do we have presently in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Graham: We must, I believe, go to another Establishment. I believe we have 261.5 man years in teaching. That does not indicate the total amount of teachers, but that is how many man years there are in teaching.

Mr. Penikett: Off the top of his head, I have not had a chance to read the report from his Department that we received today, could the Minister remember approximately how many kids there are in the school system.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Five thousand, one hundred, roughly.

Mr. Penikett: Five thousand, one hundred, roughly? Taking the problem of doing the multiplication, it works out roughly to 200 students per administrative staff.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps you had better look a little further into your budget if you want to know exactly the number of man years. You have Special Education, which has twenty-two man years under it. You have Kindergarten, which I believe has 14.5, and you have your Native Instructor and the others, for the edification of members who are trying to break it down as clearly and succinctly as they possibly can, under the concept of programming.

I think, Mr. Chairman, before we go further into this, I think it relates back to the question put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in respect to comparing the administrative size of the Department of Education to a comparable area in, say, British Columbia or Alberta.

I recognize the fact that the Department of Education serves two functions: that of a quasi-school board, and that of a provincial jurisdiction. So it is doing two-fold the work that is done in a province. In a province, you have your school board, your administrative structure, and you have your umbrella administration in Victoria and expanding out of Victoria for the provincial jurisdiction. If you compare this administrative structure here and the number of man years we have here, I can assure you from my experience that it compares very favourably with any of the other jurisdictions in view of the responsibility from the officials, from the Superintendent down, in the Department.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I thank the former Minister of Education for his eloquence on the subject, but I also hope and pray that he will understand if we are not prepared to just accept his explanation, after that, and that we will probably not be eager to clear this matter until we have the figures that were promised to us, of the

comparisons, because if you will forgive me for observing this is the single most interesting budgetary item in the Department's estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I find it amazing that the Honourable Member would question the statements I made earlier, and he needs some paperwork done to justify it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: It is probably no surprise to the Members opposite that this particularly is of some interest, because it is not the first time that this area has been questioned, and indications given in debates in this House, previously, that because of concern expressed by the Members of the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, previous to us, that some kind of full review was scheduled for 1978 with respect to the administration of the Education Department, and this was stated in March 1977, I guess, that they were looking forward to doing this full review. I wonder if that full review was done, and if there are any results or changes that have been effected thereby.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I am afraid that I cannot answer for what happened two years ago. I have been here for a month, and I am willing to answer any questions that you may have on this Budget, but what happened two years ago, and the previous Legislature wanted to do to the Department of Education, correct me if I am wrong, but there are no reports that I know of in the Education Department suggesting that we should do a full review.

Mr. Weninger: There was a full report written, but the various job functions within the Department, particularly the school section, was reviewed. It was reviewed in light of the fact that there are certain obligations that the Department of Education administrative staff have to perform in the schools, such as doing so many school visits, so many evaluations for probationary teachers, so many follow-up visits with permanent teachers, and at that point in time it was determined that there would be a Regional Superintendent and an Assistant Regional Superintendent for Whitehorse, there would be a Regional Superintendent for the rural north and a Regional Superintendent for rural south, and a Superintendent in Charge of Curriculum and Instructional Program.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I have found the information that was requested previously. The total administration costs, this is in answer to a question asked by the Opposition, amount to \$859,900, representing 3.5 per cent of the total budget. The comparison of the total administration costs against student enrolment of 5,000 students, which is low, pro-rates the per-pupil cost at \$151.84.

A review of all the branches of the Department of Education, which have identified cost to the heading Administration, shows a total proposed expenditure of \$2,464,800. Now this also includes the Recreation Branch, Adult and Continuing Education, and Man Power.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I thank the Minister for that information. I believe the question that I did pose went on to ask for some comparative data with respect to Alberta and B.C. in these figures. Does he have that?

Hon. Mr. Graham: As the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated, and I am going on what he said, it would be low, but you must realize that it is extremely difficult to arrive at this data because of the fact that you have an administration, such as in the Province of British Columbia, for example, of that total province in Victoria, and then in each individual school district, you also have an administration for that school district.

Consequently, I we are working on some figures, but we do not have anything yet, because you can appreciate the difficulty.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, again, just in terms of the breakdown, on page 38, referring back to that \$759,200 figure for administration, there is an item listed as Other, being \$131,500. What is that item?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I think it is broken down fairly reasonably on page 39. We have: travel, non-government; travel, government; we have communications, long distance removal, cartage, advertising, office, supplies and services, materials and supplies, rental of land and building, equipment rental, and rental of office equipment. It is broken down totally on page 39.

Under Administration, the first two costs are salaries and wages and fringe benefits, and that adds up to a total \$627,700, which you will notice under Administration on page 38, is the dollar amount. Then you will move down to Other, \$131,500, which is broken down under Primaries 30 through 99.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier today, the Minister gave a description of the priorities of his Department and, under that heading, he mentioned curriculum, and I think curriculum development, I do not remember the exact words. At that

time I asked him if he could find for me, when we were dealing with this item today, the amount of money that has been committed for curriculum development.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We are discussing Administration. You are dealing with the next one down.

Mr. Penikett: I am dealing with it under Item 300, Administration, Evaluation and Curriculum.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, at this time the curriculum development under 99, we have committed \$25,000 to research and development for curriculum specific to the Yukon and investigate new methods, \$25,000 has been committed to that.

Mr. Penikett: Is that \$25,000 under this amount here, this is 31.2 on page 38?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, it is. The other \$6.2 thousand is the evaluation, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could make a suggestion to Committee, we seem to be wandering all over from Administration to over to School Committees over to curriculum. If you look on page 39 and page 40, and going vertically down the page you can see the breakout of each particular program, the administration, the accounting, the in-service, and it would be my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, if you, as the Chairman, were to go through and say, "Are there any questions on administration? Are there any questions on accounting, in-service?"

If you look on page 39, it is all broken down vertically and that way we can confine questions to one area and then we can go onto another in a sequence. It appears to me we are going from one subject and going back and whatever. I think that would be a more reasonable way to approach the budget.

Mr. Penikett: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to concede that the Minister is always reasonable, though he seems so in this case.

The item we are talking about here is under Establishment 300, or the item I just raised, under Administration. Now, what he has suggested would make sense, if we had the answers to questions we made previously in the supplementaries.

I think, Mr. Chairman, if I maybe permitted for a second, the kind of detailed scrutiny that we want to make of some of these numbers is not possible without some of the information that we have asked for. If you will permit me, I think what we need is some context for some of this. You know it is all very well to go through it item by item, but I do not want to pass by a detail here and then not be able to pick it up later because we have not got the answers to questions we previously raised.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I am not inferring that we should clear Administration and then go onto accounting. All I am saying is that we should be trying to confine our questions to the administrative side, then go to the accounting, you can refer back to that particular program in reference and even ask a question.

All I am saying is let us try to confine ourselves to a certain area and go into a sequence so that our witnesses, as well as everybody else, can follow what is exactly taking place in the debate.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I will run through the total Administration Establishment, then if you have any questions, we will go ahead. It is on page 39 reading down the page.

It does not seem like everybody understands exactly what the thing is here. Reading across page 38, there are twenty man years in administration. The total salaries and fringe benefits is 627.7 thousand dollars, other - \$131.5 is also clearly outlined on page 39 for a total. Then you have comparison for 1978-79.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to seem obtuse, but we are dealing with a total budget, if you like of \$759,000, the vast majority of which is under the items salaries and wages. We have asked a number of questions on that which we do not yet have answers and we may have a number of detailed questions.

I am quite prepared, for myself, to go skimming through the minority side of this budget if you like, the minor items, that is fine. The Minister will understand that we will want to get back to the big bucks.

Hon. Mr. Graham: As I understand, before we continue on any further in Administration, you want a job description of all twenty people involved in the administrative side and the five people involved in the accounting?

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to go ahead with the other items on that page, but I do want the Minister to understand that we want to come back to Primary 10.

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is reasonable, I am all for it as long as we can make some headway somewhere.

Mr. Byblow: Okay, I will refer to page 39, I still want my question answered.

Respecting the column, Administration, we have 576.7 at the top and we have 759.2 at the bottom.

Last year we had at that bottom 632.1 in the Main Estimate and something slightly less on the actual. That, to me, reflects a twenty-three per cent increase. I want to know where that twenty-three per cent is, \$142,000 when there is only a one man year increase in actual administration.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the 1978-79 projections of nineteen man years and \$617,000 reflects the salary, I believe. So the actual increase in salaries is 10.7 thousand dollars.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I think that Mr. Graham should reconsider that last answer; 617 is the total administration budget last year, not just the salaries.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, if you look at your administrative structure here, on your salaries, last year, \$464,000 was voted under that particular program, for salaries and wages under Primary 10, program administration. This year you are being asked to vote under Primary 10, \$576,700 for the administration. That reflects an increase of one man year, and the increases in the salaries reflected through the negotiations between the Public Service Alliance and the Territorial Government. So that reflects the increase, is that not correct, Mr. Weniger?

Mr. Weniger: The figures that should be compared if I may, are under 1979-80, under Personnel you will see man years, twenty and for those man years, the salaries are \$627,700, right? If you want to do a comparison with 1978-79, on the projected it is \$617,000 for salaries for nineteen man years.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The comparison, \$617,000 last year is purely for salary, is that what you are saying?

Mr. Weniger: \$617,000.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Was the actual salaries paid.

Mr. Weniger: For nineteen man years, that is what it would have been.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Salaries and fringe benefits.

Hon. Mr. Weniger: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Why, in Heaven's name was this budget laid out so that we are looking at a comparative figure next to it of \$759,200 which includes travel, long distance calls, all these things?

For my information, why are we comparing apples and oranges?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Weniger: Other than that, Mr. Chairman, the budget is redesigned this year, and the substantiation that can be provided, I think, as we go through it item by item, should not cause a problem, I would not think.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to accuse false motives to anybody, but it would be an absolutely delightful way of keeping us totally confused, if the budget were redesigned every year. I certainly hope that will not be a continuing practice.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I have 1979-80 budgets here. I have a 1978-79 budget. If you break this down, and I assume members have last year's budget to compare. Am I not correct, Mr. Weniger, in saying this, that you have in Salaries and Wages, from last year, \$464,000 voted. This year we are asking to be voted \$576,000. Take away the fringe benefits that are included in the other figure on page 38. That is the difference. One man year, plus the cost, as I said earlier, of the agreement between the Public Service Alliance and the Territorial Government.

Go down to the next figure, in Fringe Benefits, it has gone up \$10,000 as opposed to last year. It was \$41,800 and this year it is \$10,000 higher, which in turn reflects the negotiated settlement with the union.

So therefore you have a difference of roughly \$624,000 to some \$500,000 difference in the areas of Salaries and Fringe Benefits, which is subjected to the negotiations with the Public Service Alliance.

Going further, then, you go to the Travel, and through your other primaries down vertically, and you can add up both columns to see what the difference is. Is that not correct, Mr. Weniger?

Mr. Weniger: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Now we know exactly what we are doing, right? To go by Primary 10, salaries have increased then from \$464,000 to \$576,000, as a result of two things: one, a new man year and two, salary increases.

So, my question then is what is the salary of the new many year

that has been added?

Mr. Chairman: Will you address the Chair, please. Order, please, will you address the Chair.

Mr. Weniger: The new man year within the Department is a Clerk Typist IV, or a Clerk IV, with a salary range of probably a maximum of about \$18,000.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: My Lloyds Cardet machine tells me that that is about a twenty-five percent increase, then, in salary costs over the remaining members of the department.

Can this be confirmed?

Mr. Weniger: I am sorry, but I missed that.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: For comparison purposes, if deduct the additional staff member that has been added to this Establishment, we come out with an increase of \$114,000 over last year on the same number of many years. My question is therefore, does that mean everyone in the Department got a twenty-five per cent increase last year, or what has happened to cause that great increase?

Mr. Weniger: Salary increases within the Public Service Commission and the managerial exclusion category I think, I did not follow this very closely, I think it is around eight per cent.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I am a little confused, because my addition was similar to Mr. MacKay's. I think in the nineteen positions we are talking about, not the extra one, the nineteen positions we are talking about, under Administration, there is a twenty-five per cent increase in salaries over last year. That is what the arithmetic shows.

Mr. Weniger: Because this item has caused such a great deal of questioning, I would be more than happy if I could have some time to bring in a fuller written explanation of it.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Definitely some explanation is required because in my calculations, not only is there a twenty-five per cent increase in salary, but the entire Administration section has increased by twenty-three per cent. The breakdown, which, when you go further, just for information's sake, works out to about to about \$2,300 per pupil of administrative salary costs. That is pretty high.

Hon. Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, we have been going around on this item for a considerably length of time and no doubt we are going to have the opportunity to do it again. I would suspect that we would be more informed if we waited until we had more information. It would be a more informed and worthwhile debate. So, perhaps we could leave that item as of now and go on to the Establishment 302 instead of wasting more time on it.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 300, will it stand?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, prior to standing over Establishment 300, I am sure there are going to be questions on the in-service, extension programs, as we go down. Let us get through each column there and just see whether or not we have the necessary information for Members. If we do not, we can bring that back in before leaving Establishment 300.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, The Minister is demonstrating the wisdom of Solomon again. I do not have any questions on accounting, in-service training or extension programs, and I am quite prepared to let the rest of it stand.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I have some questions, in these areas. I am curious on this accounting aspect of it. One of the criticisms levelled at the whole Territorial Government by the Auditor General's Report was that there was a duplication of the accounting function as between the operating departments and the Treasury Department. I see further increase is budgeted here. Perhaps I could get a general explanation of what these people on the accounting area do before I ask any further questions.

Mr. Weniger: The accounting man years within the Department are where we have established a one-way accounting system, if you want, to keep us up to date with our expenditures, because what we have to do is process the accounts to go to Treasury, the payments have to go to Treasury, and I think we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of several million dollars of accounts payable that we have to run through, and basically it is that function that these people perform, in addition to keeping us up to date with information on school budgets and various department establishments and primaries.

As an additional item, we have to provide our own salary inputs to the Public Service Commission and to Treasury, because the Department runs its own recruitment and salary functions of personnel.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I understand from previous statements in the House that the Department of Education is the department which is at this moment undergoing changes within its accounting area in

order to be able to either dovetail the operation to what is happening in Treasury, or to replace the operation with a more efficient one, directed by Treasury. Could we expect this accounting, sometime during this year, to disappear from this budget, and actually appear in somewhat less number in the Treasury's Budget.

Mr. Weninger: The new coding and classification account system that is being introduced does not have as its prime objective, although it may follow through, but it does not have as a prime objective, reducing the number of people within the accounting section of the Department of Education, but it does have, as a prime objective, to supply more accurate and up to date information to Treasury, to the Legislative Assembly, on expenditures within the Department.

So it is to keep us more up to date, or Treasury more up to date. However, I think a comment from the Treasury personnel would be appropriate also here.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I could ask then, do these estimates, in the formation in which they are, and I know that we were told that they were being broken down into areas of responsibilities, are these reflecting the new accounting codes?

Mr. Weninger: To a degree they do. It is part of the new classification and coding system that the Regional Superintendent's structure that we described is included in here, because that is part of the new system, whereby the Regional Superintendents will have a budget to administer, to streamline things that are not being properly done now.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The Auditor General's Report also noted that there was some duplication in the area of approval of accounts payable. Insofar as the witness has stated that some of these people are involved in that, can he tell us, or can the Minister tell us, if the problems mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, with respect to duplication in this area, have been reduced?

Mr. Weninger: Our function there is receiving the bills and providing the first check on payment of them. Does this answer your question? The bill is subsequently transferred to Treasury for actual issuance of the cheque.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: So, it is not fair, I guess, to ask the witness if he has any knowledge of what happens to an account payable after it leaves your department. I suspect it is still a problem in duplication.

Okay, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on then to the next item, In-service Training, which is showing an increase of 100 per cent over last year. Could we have some explanation of this?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this reflects an increase of \$25,000 in the professional development fund, which is covered by the Collective Agreement, I believe.

Mr. Byblow: At the same time, I note that Item 99, under Miscellaneous, in the same category, is \$35,000, as against \$15,500 last year. What accounts for that 100 per cent-plus increase?

Mr. Weninger: The first \$25,000, under Primary 20, is the \$25,000 that is identified under the Collective Agreement that the teachers have. The Miscellaneous reflects a \$25,000 item for professional development that the Department of Education administers.

The new contract has two accounts for professional development. One, administered by the Yukon Teachers Association, who make recommendations to the Department for expenditures, and the other \$25,000 is under the sole jurisdiction of the Department of Education, but it is for the professional development of teachers, and it is spent in harmony or consultation with the Yukon Teachers Association.

I think there is another \$10,000 item there and that is for the principals' meetings and in-services that we hold with the school administrators.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to say that I am pleased to see that a little more emphasis has been given professional development. It is in line with the idea of upgrading people resident in the Territory with their education.

However, I would like to ask is there any particular emphasis given to the kind of training that the budget for the Department certainly is given? Is there any particular direction policy which you are following?

Mr. Weninger: As of April 1st, this year is the first year that this \$25,000 is entering into the Budget, of course. We have got planned, various activities, such as credit courses through the University of British Columbia in the area of cross-cultural education, teaching English as a second language.

Other courses, I think, are Primary Remedial Reading, Primary Education, and there is another one, but I am afraid it has escaped

me at the moment.

That is going to make up the bulk of the costs for this in-service.

In addition, there is our orientation session that we put on for new teachers. It is going to gain a different emphasis this year and it is going to cost more money, but it is to acquaint our new teachers with conditions in rural communities particularly.

Mr. Byblow: You refer to an extension program as part of the item under in-service training.

Mr. Weninger: The courses that I mentioned are coming out of the in-service fund, yes.

Mr. Byblow: I just have a question. What is the reference to the extension program for \$26,400, on page 38?

Hon. Mr. Graham: \$16,000 of this is for evening credit courses off campus, credit courses and the first community outside of Whitehorse, I am reading from our explanation, to receive the benefits of this program will be Watson Lake. Five full credit courses will be offered at a total unit cost of \$3,200. Five courses is \$16,000.

The \$10,400 is for correspondence courses for children living in remote areas and to provide courses not generally available in the schools.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Moving right along, the school committee budget of \$6,900, I am wondering if, in view of the council that has been formed, I think it is a council of school committees, if any funds have been budgeted this year to allow these people to come in and meet on a regular basis, or what is the formal structure which this council will follow?

Mr. Chairman: For your information we are on page 40.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I believe that we are having the first meeting on April 7th, with the newly created board and we have only \$700 in this budget, but I do not know how many trips a year we have planned at this time. We may be coming back for a supplement, if we have more trips than anticipated.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The Minister did mention with some emphasis this new council. I believe it was formed last Fall or the idea was put forward last fall. Will this be the first meeting in April, and if it is perhaps you could give us some idea of the function this is going to perform. Perhaps we could have some indication of the agenda this meeting would have.

Hon. Mr. Graham: At this point, we do not have a set agenda, in fact, I believe the meeting was just set up yesterday due to the fact that we had to find out if all of the members on this board could make it to Whitehorse at this time. When we do have the agenda or after this meeting, I will be very pleased to offer a report to the House.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: Just perhaps a clarification of policy. It was stated in the Throne Speech that there would be the promotion of community involvement in education yet the budget reflects a drop in the School Committee moneys. How do those two inter-relate?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments. The Executive of School Committees is becoming more and more formalized but the actual idea originated approximately two years ago, if my memory serves me correctly.

There are two provisions for this under this particular section is that once a year under the legislation you have to have a annual superintendents' meeting where people from all school committees from across the Territory get together and also, at the same time, it is my understanding that there is enough money in here for relatively regular meetings for the executive of school meetings. At least, it was found out in the last couple of years, I think, and perhaps Mr. Weninger could pursue that further.

Mr. Weninger: My only comment is that I feel there is sufficient money in the budget for the anticipated plans this year, involving the Superintendents Annual Meeting and the proposed four meetings for the Education Council.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do not want to show any undue haste, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to get on to the next item, which has an interesting decrease here from \$84,000 to \$31,000. Is there a special reason in 1978-79 that the devaluation in curriculum should have been so high?

Mr. Weninger: The \$84,000 under the projected was to include the \$50,000 for the Continuing Education Study, so it was a one-time expenditure.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps we could have a progress report on this study. I believe it was mentioned in the House the other day that the report would be due this year, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is correct; the report is due this year. I

believe I made a commitment in the House today to follow up on some questions asked by the Honourable Member from Faro.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: This might be a suitable time to raise the question of the financing of our education system. It is my understanding that under the established programs funding agreement with the Federal Government, that quite a considerable amount of our budget comes in the form of money in this fashion, and that some of that is in fact ear-marked for continuing education; that is the kind of program that is anticipated. I was wondering if we could have an indication from the Minister today how much of our education funding from Ottawa comes in that form and is ear-marked for continuing education. The reason for my question is so that if the report recommends an expansion of our continuing education system, we would have some idea of where the funds might come from.

Mr. Weninger: The program you are referring to, Established Program Financing, I think brings the Territory somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1,000,000 for post-secondary education. That amount goes into General Revenue. The expenditures for post-secondary education in the Territory, two major items that come in are the Student Financial Assistance Ordinance that roughly pays out around \$400,000 a year plus the other major post-secondary program is the Yukon Teacher Education Program which I think is \$270,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I should point out in respect to that particular type of funding, I think we are getting caught into saying there is a million dollars coming out of this area, there is \$400,000 coming out of this area, National Health and Welfare has got \$300,000.

What happens in the budgeting process is you have A level and B level. A level is on-going programs, B level is programs that may be introduced. This is subjected to negotiations with the Government of Canada through the course of the year relating to what our finances are and what finances are available from the Government of Canada.

I do not think we should be starting to get into the area of saying there is a million dollars and there is \$400,000 over here because it all comes into the General Consolidated Revenue other than specific cost-shared agreement and that still has to go into the General Revenue. For example, you have the Skookum Jim, the Friendship Centre, that is a specific agreement signed "X" amount of dollars from the Government of Canada for that; "X" amount of dollars from ourselves. But it is all reflected in the general revenue of the Government.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we seem to get over and say there is a million dollars here and \$400,000 here. It all has to come to the General Revenue and from there the programs are delineated.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps, when the Minister is giving us some idea of the budget reports, the established program funding gives us money based on certain formulas developed in Ottawa and they are common through all the provinces, so we get this money and you are saying that we could take that money that is given to us, they calculate that we need \$1,000,000 for post-secondary education, under their formula, so they give us \$1,000,000. So you are saying that we have no obligation to spend that money for post-secondary education?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it depends on the program. If you take the one we are talking about now, this is an agreement, I understand, that was worked out between the provinces and the Government of Canada on the transfer of payments. In this particular case I would suggest we got a favoured deal over and above some of the other areas in Canada due to the way they calculate it. If I had an accountant, he could explain how they calculate it. We spend approximately \$800,000 in the post-secondary, the two areas that the witness referred to.

There is \$200,000 over and above that that goes into the general revenue. Next year we may well have to increase that area if we make the decision to, say increase the financial assistance, like was made a year and a half ago. These things continuously are monitored. All I am saying is that it goes into the general revenue, the excess.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would appreciate again, the explanation, but I would just like to pose the question again, perhaps in a different light. What is our obligation when we do receive these funds for that purpose. You said, okay, it was \$200,000 and we just put it back into general revenue. What if it was \$800,000 we were putting back into general revenue? Is there a finite amount where we can fiddle with it and do what we like, put it into general revenue, or do we have to follow, to some extent, the purpose for which these funds are given?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, we have to follow, to some extent, the provisions of the negotiations. If we said we needed X amount of dollars to pay the public services, say, and we turned around at the last minute and put the money someplace else, well, the next IGC meeting, there would be definitely be some questions asked to what you said you negotiated this money for these particular terms and conditions and you transferred it.

Subsequently, there are commitments that are made over the course of the year in the negotiations in the Territorial-Federal level, and yes, I would suggest you are correct in saying that we have, to a certain extent, a fair amount of commitment in most areas.

Mr. Byblow: To make a point respecting devaluation in curriculum it is my opinion that that category should not be reduced, I think there is a distinct need for development of curriculum and programs which would enhance the total system and I am disappointed to see it reduced.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Does that represent just one man year? There are no man years attached to that, I am wondering, does nobody have the responsibility for developing curriculum in the Yukon other than the superintendent himself?

Mr. Weninger: There is a superintendent of instructional curriculum and instructional program who basically has responsibility for this area of the budget.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, is this \$25,000 that is under miscellaneous, what is it being spent on?

Mr. Weninger: The department has plans that will be completed this year in the area of film strips, two film strips, I believe. One is called "Women in Yukon" and the other one is dealing with early cultures in the Yukon. They have put out a book, some of it came out of last year's budget, called "Early Yukon Cultures".

This year's plans include specifically the research and development of curriculum for Yukon and investigate new methods of instruction. We are looking at, for example, increasing the grade levels in various rural communities.

We cannot go into this without doing some planning. Part of that money will come out of here.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment on this area. I hope people realize when they talk about curriculum development that they realize the full implications of what they are requesting.

When you talk about doing the research for a book or something, but when you go to get that book printed or whatever, you are talking costs of a fair magnitude. You look at a textbook and you say it is only worth six dollars, but when you take a look at the Department of Education and the cost to the Department to actually get a book on, say, "Early Yukon Cultures", you are looking in the area of about \$30,000 or \$50,000, depending on the size of the book and the print you want.

So, it is just not this area that you have to look at. It is the on-going after and the cost, too. So, it is a very expensive area, this area.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was going to raise this later, but I might as well raise it now. Mentioned in connection with this curriculum expenditure of \$25,000, some examination of grade level expansion, I think that was the expression that was used. I am curious as to what that means in rural schools. I think I know what it means, but what does it mean in the context of declining school enrolments, particularly in some areas outside of Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Basically, we hope that by expanding or by enabling students to go to the schools in their home communities for a longer period of time, like instead of going to Grade five in a school, for example, in Pelly, and sending everyone from Grade six to twelve to Whitehorse to go to school, we hope that by expanding the school in Pelly or by expanding the program in Pelly, to six, seven and eight, we will keep students in school that much longer.

I should say also, at this time, too, that some of this money is going to, hopefully, improve the co-ordination between the high schools' curriculum, as far as industrial type arts programs go in the high schools, improving the co-ordination between those programs and the programs in the Vocational School.

So if a student is not interested in the academic world, if you will, and decides to take courses in high school such as electronics and wood-working and this kind of stuff, the courses that he takes in his high school programming will enable him to move into the Vocational School at a later time and proceed along in his education.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, that sounds terrific.

I have two questions. One, does the Minister foresee then the possibility of, at some point in some community, a nostalgic return to the little red school house and kids going from Grade one to

twelve all in one room with one teacher? If so, I hope not.

But, I am really fascinated. The number of things that this \$25,000 is now supposed to do is simply flabbergasting. I would really like to know how much is going to be spent on this grade level expansion, the realigning of the curriculum in some schools so that it will allow entry into trades training, and the evolution of a Yukon curriculum from the B.C. one, and, as well, these very interesting materials, film strips on early Yukon cultures and Women in Yukon and so forth.

The Department is getting a lot from \$25,000, I am just impressed with the efficiency of it.

Hon. Mr. Graham: You must consider that we have one man year in total committed to curriculum development. Is that not true?

Mr. Weniger: If I may, the budget in 1979-80 total included things that you are mentioning. Grade level expansion is not going to be implemented in the 1979-80 school year. It is a year of investigation.

There are numerous implications for expanding grade levels in rural communities in terms of just program, not man years, but in terms of what kind of program would be acceptable to that group of students.

This is a material section. It would be for the purchase of materials. Our main focus this year will be in terms of investigating these things, however, there might be some expenditures where we might have to buy some sample materials in order to look at them.

Mr. Penikett: If I might, Mr. Chairman, it sounds like the one man year is going to be chronically busy.

Mr. Byblow: I think the point has been made. It is certainly an area of the budget that could be re-examined.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the evaluation and curriculum has come down only \$2,000 since last year. When you take out of that total amount the \$50,000 for the study which is being done, which was a one shot affair.

If you will check on page 40 of your last year's Budget, which I am sure you have, you will see that evaluation curriculum is \$33,250 and this year it is \$31,200. In fact, the full \$2,000 has been dropped from Professional and Special Services.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I could just perhaps re-emphasize the point Mr. Byblow was making. I think that he was saying was that the \$31,000 was fine, that is about the same it was, but in terms of responding to the needs as we were elaborating in our earlier, lengthy speeches, this is probably not an adequate amount.

I might point out that as far as I know, in the Northwest Territories, there is a department for this area. I think it employs about six people full time, developing curriculum for people in the Northwest Territories. In that connection, perhaps we could have a comment from the Minister as to whether that is correct, or if there is any use to which that information could be put.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, we will definitely look into expanding the program. Hopefully, if there is a supplement that comes up sometime in the coming year, the Honourable Member opposite will support that supplement for curriculum development.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Absolutely.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Penikett: In the interest of continuing good relationships with both the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition with the taxpayers who vote in their constituencies, perhaps they ought to know that in recent years the budget of the Northwest Territories Department of Education is equal to our entire budget. I am sure they would not want to inflict that on the people here.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make my own personal opinion known on this. I do not really agree with the across the board comparison with the Northwest Territories. I think it is like comparing apples and oranges.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: We all have to defend our positions, I guess. I was suggesting that there may be some valuable material being developed for northern school curriculae in the Northwest Territories, at their expense, which this government could perhaps take use of.

Hon. Mr. Graham: That is a worthwhile suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and we will actively pursue it.

Mrs. McCall: There is some valuable material being developed in B.C., in native education, which I think Mr. Graham might find interesting.

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

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would think, prior to that, if we

could go through Recruitment, then we are finished with Establishment 300.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to do that. Can we get onto the next one.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Recruitment, I think mention was made that this was due to taking advantage of the graduates of the training facility that we have here. I am wondering though, about the overall expenditure of \$153,000. There is a surplus of teachers across Canada. I am wondering how much we have to spend in order to recruit and bring them here? Is this something that can be reduced in terms of making use of the surplus of teachers that we actually have in the Territory right now?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, we do have a turnover of roughly twenty per cent of the total teacher staff each year, and I believe that the vast majority of these funds are expended in the cost of travel for teachers, along with their personal effects, after these teachers are hired, to bring them into the Yukon.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, just one brief question on the recruitment program, in the context of teacher education program. Are the graduates of our teacher education program certified to teach in other jurisdictions?

Mr. Weniger: That is one of the agreements that we had with the University of British Columbia when they adopt the program in, but they would have to be certifiable teachers. Now there are certifiable teachers wherever a province will accept three years of training, for those that have the minimum of three years of training. They still do recommend a standard certificate in British Columbia.

Mr. Penikett: I would just like to make a comment on that, Mr. Chairman. I do recall that the Northwest Territories was entering into some kind of teacher training program, not exactly like ours, but they went through various experiments, initially sending kids out to university, and so forth.

I remember some comment by a senior official of their Department to the effect that their first experience had been to send local kids out to university, train them, they would get certified and they would come back and then get hired by someone else, usually not in the teaching field.

They finally reached the conclusion, and I would be interested in hearing a comment from Mr. Minister, they did not want their teachers certified. They wanted them trained. They wanted them to be able to go in their school system but they thought it was a real disadvantage to have them certified by other jurisdictions because it gave them the kind of mobility that really was not in the interest of the Northwest Territories.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I believe that roughly fifteen of seventeen graduates, so far, from the Teacher Training Program are currently being employed within the Department of Education and hopefully, this will continue. Hopefully, these teachers will stay with us for a number of years and the teachers that are currently being trained in the program will also become employees of the Department of Education and help us a great deal.

Mr. Penikett: Just to follow up on that, I am not proposing entrapment of the graduates. I just wondered if the Department had considered that they might get better cost effectiveness from the program if they are not pursuing the certification of the teachers, or was there some reason, with the body that was educating them, that required this?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Perhaps I can give some background on this. If you will recall, a few years ago, we went into a kindergarten program. There were courses offered for the kindergarten teachers who were laymen. They took the course. There was no credit available to them for those courses, and subsequently, they wanted to get into the kindergarten teaching field and they found that they lost a couple or three months time spent on a course. At least from our perspective, in the teacher training program and in view of the results, it is obvious to us that we should be giving the teaching skills to these people so they can teach anywhere in Canada if their certificate is accepted.

I do not agree with the government saying well, we are going to train somebody just to the extent that they can work - here comes our comparison with the Northwest Territories again - I think that we have an obligation to that individual to give him the training so that he does have the necessary skills to make a living that we were discussing earlier in the principle of the Department of Education.

Mr. Penikett: I just wondered if the Department had considered that possibility.

Hon. Mr. Byblow: I think there will probably be considerable debate when that item comes under discussion in the budget, but just for notice that the Minister can perhaps consider, there is a reduction

of something like \$33,000 in the recruitment costs attributed to the program, and there is a \$282,000 cost of the program, and it is some thought to bear in mind when you continue the program, and for whom you are continuing it, if you look at your statistics. So, just a thought, no debate.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps, one final question. It is not something we are about to vote. It is something that was called "secretariat" last year. I am wondering what has happened to that this year, or where we might find it in the other department.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Weninger, the secretariat were the secretarial pool that were utilized by the various departments, such as Manpower and Recreation and Vocational Institute. The secretaries have now been formally assigned to the administrative costs of the Recreation Department, the Manpower Department and, I believe, one to the Vocational School. I could be wrong, but these people have been put into the administrative staffs of the various departments.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just a procedural question that I would like to put to the Minister. I suppose it is always possible that we may not finish with these estimates until sometime in the middle of April, but I want to ask him if, in view of the difficulty we have had, having given notice of some questions during the Supplementaries, and there is always a problem of time getting the answers before we go into here, and realizing that we were asking the questions at that time because we wanted to pursue the matter here, I wonder if it would advantage him any, and perhaps other Members of the front bench opposite, if we were to give him some kind of written questions in advance, not on the Order Paper, but by way of some background information in addition to what is provided here.

That would help us ask some intelligent questions.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, we would appreciate it very much if the members have the time this evening or over the weekend to go through, especially this particular vote, and indicate to us in which areas they would like some background information. I am sure that we will attempt to put something together as quickly as possible and present it to you.

In fact, I have some answers here, and I will get the answers for various questions asked in the Committee previous to this time photocopied and distributed to you sometime in the very near future.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, if I could just suggest to the Minister, in terms of the use of his weekend, I think you probably received some general expression of concern over here about the size of the Administration increase and the size of that budget within the overall budget of the Department of Education. I do not want anybody to think that we have been particularly malicious to the officials here and have happened to select that item for scrutiny, but I think, if I could sum up the concern, it is that. It is the size of the budget in the overall budget, and we are particularly interested in other jurisdictions' experience, and the increases that are being proposed for this year over last year.

I think, underlying that, there is a concern that there seem to be, from our point of view, a lot of people in the Administration of the Department, and we are not sure what all of them are doing. I think that probably sums up our concern.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the overall budget and I think that, as my colleague has outlined, we would appreciate questions being put in written form and maybe not even through the House, just directly to the Minister, so that everyone is aware of what is going to come up during the course of debate.

I think we are running into two problems, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with the first budget. For all members this is a new format, this was a new form introduced last year, and there was a great deal of debate on the way it was presented, and the different style, but this equates very closely to the provinces.

The second problem is the fact that members have only been in their portfolios for two months and so, therefore, I think you will find, a year from now, that they will be very conversant with their portfolio responsibilities and they will be dealt with fairly smoothly.

Mr. Penikett: I am sure the Member will agree that we have been very courteous, and easy and polite and sympathetic for all those reasons.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Hanson: I move, Mr. Chairman, that Bill Number 3, an Ordinance entitled Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79, without amendment, be reported to the Assembly.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I believe that that refers to the item that we

were leaving open, with respect to the \$400,000. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We did report progress on that last night.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I think Mr. Hanson was trying to move it out of Committee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hanson: Oh, it is not to be moved out of Committee.

Oh, well, then it is very simple. I move, Mr. Chairman, that you report progress on Bill Number 4 and ask leave to sit again.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Hanson: I move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I would like to say at this time I will excuse these two witnesses and thank them for being with us.

(Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to Order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number Four, First Appropriations Ordinance - 1979-80, and have directed me to report progress on the same, and beg 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.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek East, that we now call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Education, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that do now call it 5:30.

(Motion agreed to)

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

(Adjourned)

The following Sessional Paper was tabled:

79-2-16

Annual Report, Department of Education, 1977-78