



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 9

2nd Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Monday, March 19, 1979 — 7:30 p.m.

Tuesday, March 20, 1979 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon

Monday, March 19, 1979 - 7:30 p.m.

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

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, perhaps, at this time we can go back now, and give the Members opposite some information that they requested previous to the adjournment.

Mr. Chairman: On Establishment 360.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Starting at 351, I believe there was some question there.

Whitehorse Elementary, is in fact, receiving the majority of funds, they are receiving \$40,000, but \$30,000 will be going to Pelly and to finish Carmacks, between those two schools there will be a \$30,000 school ground improvement and, also, to Carcross and Ross River, there will be \$30,000 to improve school grounds in that area.

Examples of previous funds were Carmacks, \$28,000, just to give you an idea of the costs involved, \$28,000 to concrete the area for volleyball, basketball, tennis and skating; in Teslin \$26,000 for fencing, sidewalks and playground equipment. Also, after the construction is done in Faro, Mr. Chairman, for the Member, there will be funds for school ground improvement.

What was the next one that was not passed?

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 360.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Well perhaps we will just go through the ones we have not already been voted on and accepted.

Are there any more questions that you people have on 351?

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 351, we stood over previously, 351 now, have your questions been answered?

(Establishment 351 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: We will carry on to Establishment 360, Watson Lake Elementary School.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The rest were all right?

Mr. Chairman: \$1,670,000?

Have your questions been answered on that?

Mr. Penikett: I have a question about the number of classrooms that were going to be involved in that school addition and, I think, Mr. Byblow has some questions about the enrolment.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The Watson Lake Elementary School addition when completed will accommodate kindergarten to Grade 7 and, approximately, 400 students. The addition will contain ten regular classrooms, four kindergarten/grade 1 classrooms, one music room, one science classroom, general administration office, staff room, medical and dental rooms, standard size gymnasium with stage, storage and change rooms. The facility is being designed for that areas of the building and playground that can serve the separate needs of primary and intermediate children.

The enrolment figures as of March, 1978 in the Watson Lake Elementary School was 314. We have projected a total enrolment in this school in 1981 of 366. That is the elementary school addition.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, while we are just briefly dealing with unanswered questions, I would remind the Minister that I had one question about the Clinton Creek School sale price, new owner and purchase price and I wonder if the Minister has that answer yet.

Hon. Mr. Graham: We were getting the information and I am sorry, I should have got it to you before. I think I already have it.

Mr. Penikett: As long as I get it before we finish with the Education budget.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: First of all I would like to compliment the Department of Education for planning so far ahead for Watson Lake, and that is good. Just to clarify, the number of classrooms you quoted were the addition plus the existing school, was that correct?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, it is in addition to that.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: In addition to the existing school, the numbers you quoted, or is that the whole school now?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, the ten classrooms are in the addition. The addition will contain the list I gave you.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Do you know how many classrooms are existing there already?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, I am sorry, I do not.

(Establishment 360 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 365, Watson Lake Secondary School, \$669,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the addition on this site will upgrade substandard industrial education and gymnasium change room facilities. The addition will include industrial education, facility for wood work, metal work and welding instruction, a gymnasium change room and storage facilities, music room, infirmary, and renovations will be carried out on the old structure as follows: the old change rooms will become counseling, conference and storage rooms, old industrial education shop to become a facility for art education.

This school will house grades eight to twelve and should accommodate an enrolment increase for several years.

The projected enrolments for the Watson Lake Secondary School are, at March 1978 - 106 students, and in 1979 - 113, 1980 - 127, and in 1981 - 139.

This school was built for the projected enrolment in 1983, but it appears that the projections will be optimistic. Because of this, the regional superintendent and the director of adult training and continuing education went to Watson Lake and, in conjunction with the principal there, are working on a scheme where courses that are put on by the Vocational School Branch will be offered in the high school. They estimate that this will require three to five classrooms.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do not think I caught what the actual capacity of the school is after all this.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The projected enrolment is, as I said, for 1981 is 139. What you are wondering is what the total school is capable of accommodating? Roughly 160.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Are there any thoughts in the Department's mind, if I can use that collectively, with respect to students who may be coming from other rural areas to Whitehorse to, in fact, be able to attend school in a rural area such as Watson Lake?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, we have considered that, and when we get through the Haines Junction school addition, I think that we will point that out and what we hope to do in the Haines Junction school situation, we will also hope to do in the Watson Lake school system.

(Establishment 365 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 370, Haines Junction School Addition, \$1,500,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, work is expected to start this spring, on a 2.5 million total dollar addition to the Haines Junction school. The completion of the new complex, is expected to allow for grades 11 and 12 to be offered sometime, in the future for north highway as well as Haines Junction students who have to attend school presently in Whitehorse.

In other words, what we hope to do in the future is all students from Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay, Burwash area, who are presently attending highschool in Whitehorse will in the future, when this school is completed, be able to attend school that much closer to their home community in Haines Junction.

The new space will allow for five classrooms, a gymnasium, science lab, art and drafting rooms, vocational shop and a home economics room. The new building will also provide teaching and administrative working areas, and the present multi-purpose room in the existing building will be remodeled into a library.

The projected enrolment figures for the future, presently, there

are 105 students attending the Haines Junction school, and the projected figures are 128 for 1979-80 and 140 in 1980-81 and 145 in 1981-82.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, what will be the capacity of the school when it is completed?

Hon. Mr. Graham: The total capacity of the school will be sufficient to accommodate the 145 student expected enrolment in 1981-82. This is including the anticipated grade 11 and 12 combined enrolments serving the northern highway, which is forty students.

I do not have a number or an exact figure as to what the school will hold beyond that. Roughly 150, I am sorry, I do.

(Establishment 370 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 375, Faro School addition, \$900,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: The first year of a two-year project will be carried out in 1979-80. The total new construction will be one library, which will not only serve the school, but it will also serve the community of Faro. It is being made slightly, I understand, larger and the Education Department is working in conjunction with Information Resources to make this a community, as well as a school library.

Also, we will have four additional classrooms. We are going to renovate the present library to two classrooms. The estimated costs, including everything, should run around the \$2.4 million mark.

The enrolment projections, in January 1979, total student population was 353. The total population expected in 1979-80 are 389, and in 1980-81, 440, and in 1981-82, 480.

The two classrooms, which we are going to renovate from the present library, will replace the portables and the four new classrooms should accommodate another 100 students.

I think that answers just about everything.

Mr. Byblow: Does the Minister expect to be using the portables after 1980?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Once the new construction has taken place, no. We hope to replace the portables with the renovations to the present library.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, if I could be allowed some latitude at this time, I would like to compliment the government for their very perceptive consideration of Faro's educational needs. I would express the hope that when the facility is due for an expansion again, that Faro citizens will not have to go to Ottawa and the Treasury Board to help get the money.

Mr. Hanson: You did pretty good in ten years. Mayo has been there for sixty and we are just getting our gym fixed up now, fifteen years after it was built.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I have the figure for the capacity of the school when all this is done?

Hon. Mr. Graham: When the new construction has been completed, approximately five hundred students.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like the Minister to start writing these things down for future years.

Does the population projection of 480 for this school include any new development with respect to the Grum deposit?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, these enrolments, we have attempted to include the future growth in our figures. How precise our figures will be, we will find out sometime in the future.

(Establishment 375 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 380, Vocational Centre Equipment, \$55,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, these funds are an on-going requirement to replace worn and outdated equipment in all courses, but particularly, the commercial and trade courses.

(Establishment 380 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 381, Vocational Centre House Project, \$60,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this is a yearly project carried out by the Vocational Centre Housing Construction people. It is built as a training aide in the following courses: the drafting course, building construction course and electrical, heavy equipment operator course, plumbing and welding courses.

You will probably notice later on in the recoveries that this full amount, or close to that full amount, will be covered by selling the house.

(Establishment 381 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 382, Vocational Centre Renovations, \$30,000.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, this money has been allocated to install a fire sprinkler system in some areas of the training centre. Also a fire extinguisher system is to be installed in the cafeteria stores, a fire alarm annunciator to be installed in the training centre to direct firemen to the source of the alarm, and the mechanics shop also, needs an extension. The shop was built for one course and currently, there are two courses, heavy duty and gas mechanics being operated out of the same building.

The building construction course will utilize this project as a training aid. That is a total of \$15,000 all in materials. Excuse me, they are going have to have a battery charger room required to bring the building up to safety regulations.

Also, there are a couple of other areas that are considered health hazards. Airborne metal produced from grinding and being breathed in by students and instructors and excessive noise level, which students and instructors endure for ten months, subject to year after year and it constitutes a serious hearing deficiency.

They estimate that a total of \$10,000 is required to correct these health hazards.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, perhaps before we leave the area, because I am sure that once we pass this we will immediately leave this area of capital expenditures for Education.

Mr. Chairman: We would like to pick up the two we had not passed and there is some information yet, we have to go through.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: We have not passed two in the capital expenditures?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, that is right, 300 and 314.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member is correct, though, in respect to once we do get through the capital, we will not be returning here. We will go back to the two establishments in the operation and maintenance budget.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if that was the question, yes, I have mislead you, Mr. MacKay.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask a general question in respect to the assets owned by this Department? Does the Department insure these assets through a commercial insurers or are they self-insured?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, we do self-insure our assets.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I suppose there is a reason for that. Is there any financial justification, on the basis of our experience that some southern school boards are now suffering and, perhaps, this policy here, could be looked at again.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just share my recollections of government insurance and fire insurance with the House. It might help clear it up a little bit.

At one time, schools were insured for fire, along with other buildings, commercial buildings in town, residences and so on and so forth, and the way the fire underwriters treat the Yukon Territory, it is one loss zone, the whole Territory.

In the course of something less than a year, we, in fact, had two major fires in the Territory, one in Whitehorse Elementary and the other at Old Crow. The claims drove fire insurance rates up in the Territory. Frankly, that is what happened.

At the time, we were trying to negotiate with the Federal Government, because we thought it would be cheaper, a scheme for self-insurance. We come under an umbrella of the Federal Government in respect to this self-insurance, but we are self-insurers.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I also believe that my friend to the far left here had a question with respect to capital expenditures revolving around the Pelly School, but I do not know if he will need that open now or not.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I had already asked it because it concerned the origin of that school, the new facility there, and the purchase price of it. I have now mentioned it twice. I do not know how long it will take to get the information?

Hon. Mr. Graham: The school at Pelly?

Mr. Penikett: Let me explain, Mr. Chairman. It is my understanding that the school that once was at Clinton Creek has now ended up at Pelly Crossing. I do not know if that is correct. No? Okay.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Education did a study on moving the Clinton Creek School to Pelly Crossing and it was found to be unfeasible. It would cost more to move it than it would to build a new school.

Mr. Penikett: Well, my previous question concerning the Clinton

Creek School, was based on the assumption that the Department had repurchased it. That is not the case?

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, that is not the case, in fact, I do not know who owns it now, but I understand what you are getting at because I had a note here that we are not under any obligation to provide any information on the sale of the Clinton Creek School past the original seller.

Mr. Penikett: Let me briefly explain my concern, there had been an allegation in some quarters that the government had sold the school at a cheap price and then purchased it back at an exorbitant price and that was the line of my question. If they have not purchased it back, there is no need for the information.

Hon. Mr. Graham: No, we have not purchased it back.

(Establishment 382 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: At this time I would refer you to page 78, Expenditure recoveries, it is for information only.

Are there any questions?

Page 78 expenditure recoveries, if there are no questions on there, these are for information only. I neglected when I started to go back to page 74, information only again, Expenditure Recoveries.

Are there any questions there?

That is on page 74, Expenditure Recoveries, these are for information only, but you have a right to ask a question on it if you wish.

Mr. Byblow: How is the money recovered under the occupational training?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Wilson do you have the numbers available, perhaps you can.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of sources of recoveries, the main source of course, is the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, when, formerly Manpower, purchases spaces under the vocational school. I would say approximately, ninety per cent of the recoveries are from CEIC.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister just briefly explain the item Friendship Centre \$25,000 recovery, how that works?

Hon. Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is an annual grant to the Skookum Jim Friendship Centre in Whitehorse.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there is cost-sharing with the Government of Canada in respect to that particular centre, I think it fifty cent dollars.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the recovery is from the Secretary of State, it is \$25,000. The actual expenditure is \$39,000 so we recover more than fifty per cent.

Mr. Fleming: Well, one question was answered there, the other was on the cafeteria, is that a different format now? Do you rent this cafeteria or something?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, you will have to ask Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, we used to put this under sale of material, Supplies and Services. This is a cafeteria recovery at the Vocational School. We separated it this year.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, earlier, we were told that the French language program had a recovery of \$110,000. I see the Secretary of State bilingualism is giving us a \$130, I am curious about the other \$20.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman we receive from Government employees \$16,300. That, added to the \$110, is \$126, with minor changes, otherwise the estimate I gave of \$110 is probably closer to \$114.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman. This is a general inquiry. The government employees pay \$16,300, is this in tuition fees or how is it recovered.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is a Civil Servant program, \$500 per student. It is paid for by YTG, but it shows up within the education recovery.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification I think it does raise some question regarding the program as far as French language program is concerned for employees of this government. Am I to understand that this program now applies to one, all employees and two, that this government is contributing \$500 for an employee to take that program.

Mr. Wilson: It is my understanding that it does apply to all employees. I do not know exactly what the prerequisites are; however, for an employee to get on to the program.

Mr. Penikett: Does it, at the same time, also give employees time off with pay to take the course.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, it does.

Dr. Hibberd: I only heard one part of my question answered. I am wondering where the \$500 comes from for each employee who is involved in this scheme.

Mr. Wilson: I am only going by memory, so I am not exactly sure, but I believe it comes from the departments. I could not guarantee that is correct.

Dr. Hibberd: Am I to understand that each department contributes this for their own employees so that they can be involved in this program? Is it each department that you are suggesting?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, that is what I believe, but I could be wrong.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman. I will not beleaguer the government with the question this year, but next year I shall be fascinated to know what the cost in lost time is for having employees take this course?

Mr. Fleming: I would be interested in knowing the dormitory fees - \$50,000, \$50,000 now \$35. Are you estimating there are going to be fewer children in the dormitories this year that there was last?

A third fewer?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the answer. I do have some information; however, that there is about \$35,000 as a government subsidy, I believe, from Indian Affairs for forty-eight beds at \$80 for nine months for dormitory accommodation.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, if that was from the Department of Indian Affairs, would there not be some from other sources, too?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, it could be. It is possible and I am not exactly sure of this, that I have, in my figures, other fees, \$24,000, which we rounded up to \$25,000 for forty-eight beds at \$55, which would show up under rental of facilities.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is also a small amount in there. Each summer we rent the dormitories to the army and air cadets and, I believe, that there is roughly a \$10,000 recovery from there.

Correct me if I am wrong. There is a recovery.

Mr. Byblow: I am curious about the Rehab Services, as to the origin of that recovery.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is a charge to the Department of Health Branch Rehabilitation, whereby clients under the rehab centre will take courses at the Vocational School and be charged the per diem rate.

Mr. Chairman: At this time, we have two Establishments stood over. I will refer you back to Establishment 300 on page 37. Have you any more queries on Establishment 300?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just a couple of comments in respect to the material we were handed this afternoon. I understood from some Members opposite that they, too, would like to see that material, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether they want to hold up proceedings in order to do that, but I was fortunate enough to have one copy.

I did notice in going through the copy that the mail clerk has a salary of somewhere around \$14,000 or \$15,000 and as I looked through this, all of the salaries, this is a general comment, I would like to draw to the government's attention a problem in the private sector, which I am finding with respect to people I deal with in that area, that when it comes to hiring clerical staff of a junior or intermediate nature, that the government is extremely tough competition, with respect to the level of salaries paid.

I am wondering if, indeed, it is in the marketplace to pay the going rate, if, in fact, they are not raising that market rate up above what it has to be. I pass that comment with respect to the administration staff, in general, but not pointing any particular fingers at anybody.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say anything other than the salaries are negotiated. It is a collective agreement.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the first remarks by the Leader of the Opposition, I think it is incumbent that if there are documents that are being circulated in this House or in this Committee, they should indeed, go to all Members so we all have the opportunity to review them and react accordingly. That from one mail clerk to another.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Do you wish to have a recess while we circulate those documents then?

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could suggest a solution to the problem, a time saving one, one that may not be entirely happy. Is there any way that such information could be appending to the proceedings of this sitting?

Mr. Chairman: I do not think so.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, after all the discussions that have gone on in the assessment of this Vote, I do not think that there are any serious concerns here on this bench about holding up this Vote for approval. We would like the information, we are just bringing it to the information of the House that we would like to see it not happen again, that we would like the information fully circulated, but we certainly would not want to hold up the proceedings on our behalf.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Dr. Hibberd.

(Establishment 300 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: The other one that we stood over was Establishment 314, Post Secondary Grants and Bursaries for \$400,000.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I believe there were some unanswered questions on this one, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Would you state your unanswered questions please.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, as the Government Leader suggested, I did find the answers to some of my questions in the Ordinance. The other questions that are remaining, concern personal cases, and I have had the Government Leader's undertaking that he will look into them, so I am prepared to let that pass.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, I think I had an outstanding question with respect to whether or not it would be even speculative, the budget increase here to whether more students would be helped out of this fund or less than last year.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I only have one answer. I am sorry I did not get the information that you requested in total. The only thing that I do have is that we expect roughly 200 students to apply this year. I do not have the exact figures for last year at this time.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, for more clarification, for the last couple of years, if my memory serves me correctly, it is running approximately 200 ever year. It seems to be an almost constant figure.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps, we can pass this on, but I would appreciate receiving the actual figures for last year.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I will undertake to get you those figures immediately and I can also assure the Member that no students are being left out for lack of funds, as the House Leader has pointed out. If students meet the requirements set down in the Ordinance, they will receive the grants and scholarships.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do feel bound to say that some of us have drawn attention to the fact that new rules may be catching some people who perhaps, they did not intend to catch. Some people may be disqualified for reasons that this House perhaps, never intended and, I think, perhaps, that it is an undertaking that the government will look into this, and that is satisfactory, but I do not want to let it pass and say that everything is fine, because it may not be.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they do have our undertaking that we will look into it. If it is affecting some people adversely, we will change the regulations.

(Establishment 314 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Vote number 1, page 14, Yukon Legislative Assembly, Establishment 100. Yukon Legislative Assembly \$538,300.

With the reading of Establishment 100, I will anticipate general discussion on that Vote.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition would be prepared to answer a question for me.

It is a specific question, but perhaps, it could be cleared up now, so when we get to the actual Primary, we will have the answer.

Primary 90, in 1978-79 there was an item for grants which shows no figure for this year. In Primary 99, there is a figure in the Main Estimate, but there was no for the last year.

I am just curious about that.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that was actually a coding error last year, it was listed as 90 and this year it should have been 99, so in reading across perhaps, you should drop that \$500 down to the bottom line.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for the answer, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member is doing very well defending the budget.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 100, Yukon Legislative Assembly \$538,300 does it carry?

(Establishment 100 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 110, Clerk of Assembly a total of \$309,600. The information is on 17 and 18 I would like to add.

(Establishment 110 agreed to)

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to say that I appreciate the co-operation of the Members of this house.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2, Administrative Services, Establishment 200, Executive Committee \$398,400. I will anticipate general discussion.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the cooperative effort will continue.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, I can assure the Member that the cooperation will continue and at the rate we have been going, one Vote for two days, we should be through sometime in May, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am curious as to why salaries in the Executive Committee would decrease in the very time when they have gone from four to five?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, once again, we are into this business of the mix and the mix being changed. The Vote one and two were originally one vote and then they were split off, and subsequent to that, when the Department of Justice was set up, the legal draftsman and his support staff were transferred to Justice, and special advisor was transferred to the pipeline vote as a consequence, special advisor to the Commissioner, yes, that was in there too.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: To which advisor are we referring to?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We are referring to Mr. Bilawich.

Mr. Penikett: Just a procedural question, Mr. Chairman, we have not had occasion to think about this, but it is always possible. Should it occur to anybody, would it be procedurally correct for the Opposition to be able to introduce a motion on such an item, say the Executive Committee, that the salaries be reduced? Is that procedurally possible, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think it is.

Mr. Lattin: I cannot accept an increase.

Mr. Penikett: You could vote on the total number.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Professional and special services, what is contemplated under that for this year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, about all I can do is give you a list of what items were paid under professional and special services in the previous year: the Taxation Review, the work that was done on the electrical franchise, professional fees for legal audit assistance, some work on the Elections Ordinance, some work on constitutional studies and the indemnities to the land claims negotiator.

In the most part, these things, in fact, are unforeseen at this time. It is a case of things that come up during the year. This is money that is used to react to crises that come up.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I may as well ask this question now, because it is bound to come up sooner or later. I am interested in knowing the policy and the problem that we have come across just recently here with regard to office equipment, where we hear of a case where a great amount of money was spent in paying out renting a filing cabinet than it would have cost to purchase it. That obviously, seems wasteful and I am sure that the Members across will agree.

Could perhaps, the Government Leader explain to us what the problem with that is and if, in fact, it will be a continuing problem, or is it just a temporary aberration?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, hopefully, it is just a temporary thing. Part of the problem is there is not capital money to purchase. There is O&M money to function so, if you rent, it is O&M money. There is not enough capital money to purchase at the present time.

Hopefully, we can alleviate that, because, I think that is an uneconomical way to do it. Certainly, if we need office furniture and equipment, we should be purchasing or, at the worst, leasing it on long-term leases, but paying monthly rentals becomes very, very expensive. It is a problem that has become obvious to us in putting this budget together and it is one that we are looking for an answer for now.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I am a little intrigued by the wording here, which states, to explain this Vote, "To provide for the Territorial share of the expenses of the Executive Committee".

I am wondering if the Government Leader, or Mr. Wilson, could provide us with the information as to what the Territorial share of Executive Committee actually constitutes? Does this mean the salaries of the elected people versus the appointed people on the

Executive Committee? Does it refer to whose secretaries are paid by whom? And who, indeed, does pay the expenses of the functioning of the Executive Committee and what is the share that we are involved with and what is the share that the Federal Government is contributing to this?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, we pay the salaries for all of the people in the building and in that particular office, except for the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, and the special assistant to the Commissioner.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I have a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman. There was recently some talk, indeed, more than some talk, it was in the newspapers with respect to the hiring of special assistants for Members of Executive Committee. In fact, I think the job application forms will be received on the front page of the local newspaper.

Can we have some indication now, as to whether this budget here, includes any provision for such people?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, just a question, Mr. Chairman, on the Legislative Committees. I am wondering, the Committee on Statutory Instruments and I know it costs money to have lawyers and I am just wondering about that figure. I am wondering, does the government intend to carry on with that committee in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, that would be paid for out of Vote 1.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I was wondering, in view of the unlikely event of us requiring an inquiry into any particular subject in the coming term, under which vote that would come out of? Would it come out of the Executive Committee one or would it come out of the previous vote?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not absolutely certain, Mr. Chairman, but I am sure, when we come to the appropriate vote, there is one dollar voted for the Public Inquiries Ordinance. We will vote that dollar, or \$100, and in the unlikely event that we should have a public inquiry in the next year, then we would have to pay for it and it would be brought to this House in the form of supplementary estimates.

(Establishment 200 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 210, Office of the Commissioner, \$191,400.

Shall Establishment 210 carry?

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I realize I was a little slow. It is my old age. I just wanted to ask what the salaries and wages are in the office of Commissioner.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we pay for the two secretaries, the two internal auditor positions that are presently vacant and the Native Advisor. Those are Territorial jobs.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, if I could just question the Government Leader for a moment, I understand the role and function of those people, particularly in the case of the secretaries, obviously they would be attached to the Commissioner. Why is it though that they are not included in the Executive Committee budget rather than specifically, the Commissioner's.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Well they are included in the same vote. The establishment, I think it is good for us to be able to break out and identify the costs attributable directly to the Commissioner's office.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I hope I have the right item here to be asking this question, but under the Office of the Commissioner it has always been the policy of this Government, until recently, to be involved in the subsidiary to help support the residence of the Commissioner in the style that he would like to have been accustomed, and I am wondering if this item is in this budget or has it been deleted and what has happened to that residence in the meantime?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: In previous years the Government of the Yukon Territory contributed to the living expenses of the Commissioner and it was, I think, alluded to as a grant toward the Commissioner's residence. As you are aware, our current Commissioner lives in her own house and the money now shows up, it has been transferred in the primaries, I wonder if Mr. Wilson can help me, to Primary 99, Miscellaneous, and it is still there. It is \$3,500.

Mr. Penikett: Am I to understand Mr. Chairman that the Commissioner, where appropriate, could still draw on these funds for expenses incurred in carrying out her role?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We actually pay it to her on a monthly basis during the course of the year.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Penikett asked one of my questions but I am still

not aware of, in view of what the Government Leader said with regard to the present Commissioner, what has been the disposition of what had, until now, been the residence of the Commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry, I overlooked that part of the question, Mr. Chairman. That is a Federal house. It is owned by the Federal Government, it was built by the Federal Government and, I assume, they are using it in whatever manner they wish.

Dr. Hibberd: My only query, Mr. Chairman, is that if this was a Federal house in the first place, why were we contributing \$3,000 a year to maintain it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I really cannot answer that, Mr. Chairman. I have no way of knowing.

As I say, we have identified this money as expense money that we, as a Government, feel we should be paying to the Commissioner when she is on business for us.

(Establishment 210 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 224, Intergovernmental Affairs, \$139,300. The information is on pages 27 and 28.

Mr. Penikett: At the risk of sounding hopelessly ignorant, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Government Leader would care, in a couple of sentences, to explain what this office does?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this office consists primarily of two intergovernmental affairs officers, a deputy head and his assistant. These gentlemen perform a service of liaison, primarily, between this Government and all other governments, be they provincial, all other Federal Government departments, the State of Alaska, et cetera.

This branch just sort of acts as a liaison, has all of the contacts with all the various governments.

Mr. Penikett: May I just pursue this a moment, Mr. Chairman? Is it the case that, for example, the Department of Municipal Affairs wanted to contact their counterparts in other provinces, that they would go through this office?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, they may well wish to go through that office in order to make our initial contacts. They are not required to go through that office.

The primary function of the office is as a liaison with the Federal Government and, specifically, with the Federal Inter-Departmental Coordinating Committee.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Does this government have an Inter-Departmental Co-ordinating Committee also?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Not as such, Mr. Chairman, it has a number of management committees at the deputy head level that function along the same lines.

Mr. Chairman, I should mention that we are also a member of the Federal Inter-Departmental Coordinating Committee.

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Chairman, reference was made to the two officers. Is the other 1.25 clerical?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

(Establishment 224 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 225, Land Claims, \$95,400, information on page 29 and 30.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would have expected to see a large increase in this budget, Mr. Chairman, if we are about to proceed into the intensive phase of negotiations in land claims. As parties to the agreement, surely this would have shown some considerable increase with respect to professional and special services.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the use of a professional negotiator is a new concept that has just arisen and, in fact, arose first after the preparation of this budget. We may well, and of course negotiations, whether they go on or not, are somewhat, not dependent upon us nor any decisions we make here, but rather upon others. I am hopeful that they will go on and the Leader of the Opposition is correct, we might well be faced with a substantial supplementary estimate in order to cover unforeseen costs at the present time.

There is no way we can estimate what those costs might be.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I understand you have a Land Claims Secretariat. I think it was referred to previously.

Could we have a brief description of what they have done, to this point, without getting into the policy aspect of it. I just want to know physically where they have been in the process of negotiations over the last couple of years and whether there is any information available to the Members of the Assembly that is not of a classified or confidential nature at this point?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I would invite and also encour-

age all of the Members of the Legislature to go and visit Mr. Gordon Steele. He is on the main floor of the building.

The Land Claims Secretariat consists of himself, one other researcher and a secretary. I am positive that every Member of this House will be absolutely flabbergasted at the amount of research, the number of reports and the number of position papers that have been put together by this group. It is tremendous, the amount of work that they have done.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I should learn to only put one question at a time. I got the answer to the second question.

The first question was, where, physically, have they been with respect to the negotiations over the last couple of years? Have they been sitting at the table or who has been sitting at the table?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, they have been physically at the table, along with the Territorial negotiators all the way down the line.

(Establishment 225 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 240, Public Inquiries, \$100.

(Establishment 240 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 250, Plebiscites, \$100.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: For the same reason, Mr. Chairman.

(Establishment 250 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Page 33, Grants and Contributions, \$2,500. Executive Committee, Establishment 200.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I would like a brief explanation of the reason for this grant and, for the life of me, I do not know why belong to this organization or why we contribute this money.

It seems to me that, if I am correct, we got into it without any instructions from this House. It seems to me, from my own point of view, it takes this organization from time to time, at least if the press report is correct, it has taken positions on questions of public policy that I, for one, would take issue with from time to time. I must question generally, the advisability of public funds going into an organization such as this. It may be impartial according to their charter, but when they are involved in some very hot questions, if I may use the Leader of the Opposition's words, I think they are inevitably bound to become controversial.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, you know it is not so. Funds for this grant have been approved by this House in previous years and that is why it is here. They have to be approved by the House.

Now, the Canada West Foundation is a non-partisan organization and the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and Yukon make contributions, a contribution in our case of \$2,500 a year. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that, in my opinion, it is worthwhile. They have just produced a study, quite an extensive study, on constitutional development in Canada, a question that is quite close to our hearts. Our input has been acknowledged in that report.

I think it is a good investment and I would encourage the rest of the Members to back up this grant at this particular time.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to differ with the Honourable Government Leader's assessment of this foundation. This is a western Canadian separatist foundation, is what it is all about.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think you had better do some research.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I have done some research and my opinion is that it is a western Canadian separatist foundation, and that I would as soon as contribute to the Parti Quebecois as I would contribute to this. I shall not be voting for this at all.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to point out that this is for information only, we do not vote on this particular item.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, we vote.

Mr. Chairman: It is for information only, I am sorry.

Are there any more questions?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further comment on that subject. I would just like to say that this particular organization commissioned a lot of thorough research in the area of resources. It is my understanding that it quite conceivably could happen that they may be doing work in the Yukon in the not too distant future. So I do not think that we should be turning our back on such an organization that is prepared to look, if they look at the west in respect to all of Canada, but they look at it in the context of Canada as a whole, it is not a case of a separatist organization.

I think, in all fairness to these people who are in that particular organization, the credibility of the people, a comment like that, Mr. Chairman, is very, very unnecessary.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just to deal with Mr. Lang's comments he just spoke, there are a lot of organizations that do very useful research and the National Citizens Coalition, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, all of which research is available to us from time to time, I, for one, certainly would not propose that we spend any public funds acquiring memberships in such organizations.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, if we dealt with both one and two now, may I request that we go back to the Supplementary Estimates and try and clear up the one outstanding point that we have there, so that we can get that off the order paper.

Mr. Penikett: Is the Government Leader referring to the \$400,000 understanding?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Whatever the question is.

Mr. Chairman, there is some considerable debate in respect to the \$400,000 from the Federal Government and the GDA Agreement. With your permission, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development if he feels he now has the necessary information to make it all clear to everyone?

Mr. Chairman: We are on page 79, Establishment 12.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, first of all I do not have my Supplementary Estimates with me here. The second point was that in the last debate we had on this, we were promised a written explanation of this phenomena and I am wondering if that is what we are going to get tonight.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I will read it out to you.

Would you like me to read it and I will make a copy available to you?

Mr. Penikett: That would be agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: During the current fiscal year 1978-79 the Government of the Yukon received funds in the order of \$400,000 from the Federal Government as a grant to assist in preparatory requirements towards developmental implementation of subsidiary agreements under the General Development Agreement.

With the advent of this funding, the Department of Renewable Resources prepared an Executive Committee submission and received Executive Committee approval for the addition of ten new man years and support funds. These consisted of an administrative component and resource planning and parks planning expansion.

In addition, with the approval in 1979-80 budget another 3.59 years will be added to the Department. The allocation of the \$400,000 includes additional man years, salaries in the order of \$331,200, an increase support cost of up to \$121,500 which were added to the original 1978-79 budget. These amounts are reflected in the 1979-80 Main Estimates.

Actual expenditures to date directly attributable to the GDA are difficult to estimate as there is not and will not be a separate accounting for this. Instead, these man years and support costs have been allocated to various activities or programs under the Department.

Each budgeted item will, of course, be controlled. For example, the Director of Renewable Resources was the position created as a result of the expansion of the Department, and subsequent to the receipt of the \$400,000.

This position is shown in Establishment 1400 and an accounting will be made for this position.

In the case of sub-agreement under the GDA, funds will be monitored as Yukon's share of the sub-agreement.

In relation to the 1978-79 Supplementary Estimates, under Vote 14, expenditures in excess of the original Main Estimates amount to \$478,900. Amounts approved during the year directly relating to the \$400,000 grant amounted to approximately \$338,000.

However, due to vacancies and the lateness of the receipt of the funds, only an estimated \$103,500 was related to this area. The full \$400,000, plus additional funds, have been built into the base of the 1979-80 budget and, contrary to some suggestions, there has been no attempt to spend this money in other areas.

The estimates for the 1979-80 budget for Administration Parks and Resource Planning alone, show increases of over \$452,000 from the 1978-79 original Estimates. If Wildlife is included, an additional \$167,000 will be spent.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I appreciate that statement. I am wondering if it would be possible to get a copy of it and have a brief recess so that I could digest it. There seem to be a number of questions I would like to raise on it, but I would not want to waste the House's time. In fact, I did not quite understand it the first time around. So, I would appreciate the opportunity to read it over.

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

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee to order.

At recess, we were on Establishment 12.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the opportunity to perhaps, clarify some of the wording in this statement by the Minister and, in paragraph two, towards the end of it, it says "The allocation of \$400,000 includes additional man years, salaries in the order of \$331,200" and so forth, "which were added to the 1978-79 budget". The \$400,000, at this point, I just want to make sure, is referring to the original \$400,000.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That is right.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: In the next paragraph, Mr. Chairman, the statement is made that the actual expenditures to date directly attributable to the GDA are difficult to estimate as there is not, and will not be a separate accounting for this.

My question, why not?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Perhaps I can have Mr. Wilson answer this.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the \$400,000 ends up as part of ongoing programs. The \$400,000 distinct, as a dollar amount, will not be kept separate. What will be kept account of are those items that the \$400,000 went to support; for example, salaries and other expenditures.

The mention made with the Director of Renewable Resources, this could be considered as part of the \$400,000 receipt of funds. That particular item, the salary for that item will be kept track of, but the \$400,000 as a unit will not be, once the dollars are allocated within the budget.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I ask, he is talking about last year's \$400,000, the current year, or the 1978-79 \$400,000?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I am referring to both years.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, it is the same \$400,000 dollars. The money is just put in our regular budget.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: It is not the same \$400,000 we are talking about. We are talking about \$800,000 suddenly.

It is not the same \$400,000.

The \$400,000 that we are referring to, I think that we are referring, we are talking about the amount of money -- we are talking about supplementaries. The \$400,000 was received during 1978-79, I am not interested in 1979-80 at this point, I keep getting explanation of the 1979-80 and I do not want to hear about that right now, Mr. Chairman.

What I want to hear about is what happened to the original \$400,000. Now, if there is no accounting for that original \$400,000, if that is what you are saying there will not be. What is the \$103,500 referred to in the bottom paragraph, if that is not an accounting, what is it?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the \$103,000 is a residual amount based on the fact that in the supplementals there was a requirement of \$478,900 and out of that \$478,900, there was approximately \$361,000 received from other sources. It was the difference between those amounts that we indicated would have been required from the \$400,000. It comes out to \$103,000 but in order for us to say that that particular dollar was from the \$400,000 area is not possible. In other words, it is a residual amount, what is left over from the difference between what we have spent and what we have recovered from other sources.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, the difference between 478.9 and 361.8 is 117.1. You can account then for the difference between 117.1 and the 103.5, is that what you are saying.

Mr. Wilson: I am sorry could you repeat that?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, the total over-expenditure in this budget was 478.9. The total recoveries were 361.8. The difference between these two figures is 117.1. My question then to the Minister, presumably then, to the witness, is: the 117.1 was additional funds expended. I am given to understand from your previous answer that the residue, which is the 117.1, was spent out of the \$400,000. I expect we can now come up with a figure of \$103,500 instead of 117.1. Can the witness explain what the difference between these two figures are?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the \$15,000 difference is because of the CBC Oral History. It was not directly related either the \$400,000 nor was it related to any other recovery.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: So I take it then, that any over-expenditure of this budget, without relating to the preparation of any sub-agreement, has now been allocated to this \$400,000, against this additional funding received?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, there has been a sub-agreement drafted. It is presently for the Executive Committee at this time. So, there has been money spent on the sub-agreement.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman, I was not suggesting that there had not been money spent in the sub-agreement. I was suggesting that the way that it is being explained by the witness is that \$103,500 has been allocated to this \$400,000, attributable to that source of funding. Therefore, I am suggesting that out of that has come one sub-agreement so far.

Do you want to say it for the record or just nod your head?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. So far, there is in progress, one sub-agreement near finalization. There is potential for other sub-agreements.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I do need clarification myself, because from what I understand, this \$400,000 was allocated in areas by the previous Executive Committee to expenditures to develop a capability to enter the sub-agreements with the Government of Canada. But it was only moneys to be spent in this area to develop the capability. There was nothing said and, indeed, there was no money committed in any way to enter into a sub-agreement.

So, to my knowledge, there has been no money spent on a sub-agreement. The \$400,000 was not in any way related to a sub-agreement or to a number of sub-agreements. It was merely developing the capabilities so that that might happen.

So the \$400,000 should not be reflected in a sub-agreement. So, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that whatever was spent in the \$400,000 in the area of which we are concerned, it did not go into the formation of any sub-agreement.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to report that the explanation by Dr. Hibberd just now, which sounded very clear and straight-forward in language, has, I must admit to my amazement, made my understanding even more imperfect.

This statement here, says, and I ask the Minister to clarify for me the following point, this statement says: "Actual expenditures to date directly attributable to the GDA are difficult to estimate and there is not and will not be a separate accounting for this."

The next paragraph says, "In case of a sub-agreement under the GDA, the funds will be monitored as Yukon's share of the sub-agreements."

Now, I would take that to understand that somewhere in the Mains, in future, there will be some description of the sub-agreements and Yukon's expenditures under them, because they will be required by the Federal Government to keep track of the expenditures under each of the sub-agreements, because they will be sharing the costs with the Federal Government. At least, that, to me, is what monitoring Yukon's share of the sub-agreements means.

Am I on track here, Mr. Chairman, or am I hopelessly still off course?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, the sub-agreements, under the GDA, the money that the Territorial Government will put into these sub-agreements, our share, is actually going to be our budget. That is going to be our share that will be used for the sub-agreement. The Federal Government will put in the other sixty per cent or whatever it happens to be.

Mr. Penikett: Okay, Mr. Chairman, let me understand this then. Perhaps, I am understanding Dr. Hibberd now.

The money that we put into the sub-agreements then has got nothing to do with the \$400,000. The \$400,000 has to do with the General Development Agreement, which precedes the development of each of the sub-agreements. Is that the case?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, the \$400,000 is to set up the capability of entering into these sub-agreements and, consequently, once we have the capability, we are at the same time developing sub-agreements. That money, that \$400,000 is for the development of this potential that we would have and the actual money that we would use in the sub-agreements, it is not extra money, it is just our budget. We will use our budget to pay our share of the agreement.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just to make sure that I am perfectly clear. The Minister will have to be patient with me, because this is not as easy for me as it might be for him. The \$400,000 then is tied, if you like, to the General Development Agreement. The sub-agreements are another generation of funding. They have to do with money which the Territory will put into them. The Federal Government will then provide another source of funding, funding to match.

So, in fact, all the words in here about the sub-agreements are, in fact, largely irrelevant because they do not really have any bearing on the clarification of the \$400,000 amount.

Hon. Mr. Tracey Mr. Chairman, it does not say anything in here, unless I am mistaken, this \$400,000 is our share of any money in the sub-agreement. It says that we are developing the capability and also the manpower to bring these sub-agreements into force. It does not say anything in there, anywhere in here, that the money, that \$400,000 is going to be used as our share of any subsequent allocation of money that comes out of the sub-agreement.

Mr. Penikett: I am sorry, I will have to apologize to the Minister for my confusion, but the problem arose because of two successive paragraphs, in one of which it said that it would be difficult to estimate what funds would be attributable to the GDA and the next paragraph it explained that the cases of the sub-agreement GDA funds will be monitored.

That was the source of my confusion, I should just explain that to him.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a statement that I take exception to at the end of the first page. That is that there has been some attempt to suggest that the 1979-80 budget, the second \$400,000, we have never suggested that that second \$400,000 is not going to its proper use.

What we have suggested is that the original \$400,000 has not been entirely expended according to its proper use. So my question goes back to the original \$400,000. We have now established, I think, to some satisfaction, that \$103,500 of the original \$400,000 has been expended in this area.

It says, "However, due to vacancies and lateness of receipt of funds, only an estimated \$103,500 was related to this area".

So, that leaves us the figure of \$286,500 being the difference between \$103,500 and \$400,000. My question to the Minister on that is that that money is no longer being spent in the Department of Renewable Resources.

Hon. Mr. Tracey Mr. Chairman, I am not exactly sure where all the money was allocated. I will let Mr. Wilson answer most of that. There was also some money spent in the Department of Economic Development to develop the ERPU program, the economic model. As far as the rest of the program goes, I will let Mr. Wilson answer that.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just state that we received one cheque for \$400,000. We have not and will not be receiving any additional \$400,000. There is not two \$400,000. We received one, now the difference between the \$103,000 and the \$400,000 has been put forward into 1979-80, and that is why the reference to where the funds are being used in 1979-80.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, that really raised another question in my mind. My understanding was that this was awarded to the government to develop that capability so that we could have sub-agreements, et cetera. So you hire staff, what do you do, hire them for the remainder of that year and fire them again?

I think my understanding was that it was an A Level item and that it would be on a continuing basis, that admittedly, we lose the primary direction of, but because it has already been committed in the area of renewable resources, to the majority extend, indeed, it would have to be continued to be spent in that area.

Hon. Mr. Tracey Mr. Chairman, at the risk of disagreeing with my colleague, the \$400,000 was to develop the capability of entering into these agreements and the capability was developed in the Department of Renewable Resources and there has not been anybody laid off, or fired or whatever. Those positions were only for a short period of time. As Mr. Wilson said, the money has been carried over into the 1979-80. Those positions are ongoing positions. There is no reason and no intention of not carrying them on.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: So, I think we are reaching the penultimate chapter in this saga. The \$286,500 less the \$30,000 that went to ERPU, or wherever it was, the residual anyway, has been carried forward, brought forward, I cannot remember the exact terminology. In which department has it been brought forward?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, in Vote 14, Department of Renewable Resources.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am very pleased to hear that. We are told that Vote 14 in 1978-79 shows an increase of \$478,900 over the original Mains. I am sorry, I take that back. We were told that the 1979-80 budget for this department shows \$452,000 over the previous year. Further back we are told that if we do have this A Level item of \$400,000, I guess, attributed to this department so we have \$400,000 funding, that \$452, we also now have \$250,000 funding this \$452. Can we have an explanation of how that funding is being spent? We have a total of \$650,000 to spend in 1979-80.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I honestly think that now the Opposition Leader is blocking. He is asking the same question over and over and over again and will not accept the answer.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: You know, we have been issued a statement which I think is a little unclear, because it seems to mix up two years together, and it seems to leave everything a little unclear. I am trying to understand it, that is all. I have never had such problem understanding such figures before in my life. I can only think that perhaps, it is not me that is blocking, it is the other people who are blocking.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Government planning, Mr. Chairman. It is all on the table.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, could I sneak in one brief question. I am frankly, still a little confused. I defer to those people of greater intelligence and greater experience, but I do have this problem.

Mr. Wilson said that this \$400,000 was a one time item. Is that correct? As I understood Dr. Hibberd's remark, it is an A-level budget item, and that that funding continues year to year.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not an A-level budget item. It is a one time identifiable item that has been dealt into our fiscal framework, or will be on the first of April, and now forms part of our on-going budget, our on-going deficit grant.

Mr. Penikett: The \$400,000 does continue, but part of a global figure. Just let me clarify this part of it, Mr. Chairman. Also, we have the money left over from last year, that was not spent?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, that is a very questionable plus, because, in fact, we are deficit financing. Our budgets are based on deficit financing. The government of Canada says that they will give us a certain number of dollars.

Now, they require that we revoke any money that we do not spend.

It is carried over, but it becomes part of that total package. It is not added on.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, I have not had a question yet, Mr. Chairman. I am just as confused as when I started, however, there is only one thing that I realize, that when you get some money, you break half of it or part of it and put it in a pocket here and the other over there.

So, I have a couple of questions. In the first place, am I right, we got \$400,000 from the federal government. How much of the \$400,000 was spent the year that you received it, and what on?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, we have estimated \$103,500 as being spent. This was in the area of administration, parks and resource planning, from 10 new man years and support costs.

Mr. Fleming: That was estimated, you say. That has already been spent, has it not. It would not be an estimation.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I say estimated because, as I have told Mr. MacKay, it is a residual figure. It is difficult to say whether that, in fact, is from \$400,000, or whether it is from some other source.

We take it that because we received the \$400,000, and that goes into the full government pot, that if we spent \$103,000, we are allocating that \$103,000 against the \$400,000. It cannot be specifically identifiable.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I see that we are fast approaching the hour of adjournment and, in view of the debate, I think that we should get over this item. I think we have spent a lot of time in the last three days, so I would move that we stop the clock and continue the debate until such time as we complete this particular item.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am quite agreeable. I am desperately keen to understand this, I really am.

Mr. Fleming: So, as I understand it, the money goes in a pot. You did spend it. You are not just short because you had some other money mixed up with it, but if you spent the \$103,500, then the remainder of that money is actually still with the government somewhere. You could have brought it forward as a recovery. You could not really do that, but it is still there.

So, you are bringing it forward and putting it into your estimates for the coming year.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. Fleming: That is simple enough. What are we arguing about?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I think what we are arguing about, and perhaps, this is where I should back up a little bit here, is perhaps, the Government Leader could explain to me the procedure by which the \$400,000 was received, under what conditions it is to be spent, and whether or not that original \$400,000 has some strings attached to it that would make it identifiable for the purpose of developing the capability to develop sub-agreements?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I was not part of the government at the time, but I think I know the story and I can go along, on

the basis that Mr. Wilson will interrupt and correct me should I go wrong.

The possibility of entering into a General Development Agreement, or sub-agreements in respect to a General Development Agreement, was discussed with the Federal government, with DREE, and so on, and it was the position of this government that they did not have the funds to enter into sub-agreements. They did not even have the funds to determine whether they wanted to enter into sub-agreements.

The federal government said we will give you \$400,000 to investigate, to determine what sub-agreements you want to enter into, to determine the capability that you would need to enter into sub-agreements.

They write a cheque, and they mail it up here and, as Mr. Fleming said, it goes into the pot. As a result of that, there were a number of new man years established during the course of the year. They are reflected in the supplementary estimates. The Executive Committee of the day determined that they would go on the renewable resources thing as a first item, as a priority item, and have done so.

We have carried on with that. We have carried on with it to the point now where we are just about ready to enter into a sub-agreement. New man years in this year's budget are reflected in the same establishment, so that we can, in fact, enter into the sub-agreement.

Mr. Fleming: I understand that there are no strings attached by the federal government to the monies that are left over.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, we keep getting caught in this business of money left over and, in fact, it is not left over. If we would have had the capability of spending that \$400,000 last year, then our deficit grant for this year would have been, and all other things recall, our deficit grant for this year would have been exactly the same.

We did not spend all of that \$400,000, but our deficit grant is exactly the same. Does that make any sense?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Is the deficit grant that we receive from Ottawa this year some \$280,000 less than it would have been had we spent the full \$400,000 last year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Then I understand that then that the \$280,000 was surplus and it has been carried forward to this year and we are going to re-vote it, and what we are given to understand, and this is where I have difficulty, we are going to re-vote it in the renewable area, I think that that is probably a question for the 1979-80 Estimates, because I do not think that we are voting \$400,000, plus \$280,000 in that, but I will be happy to debate with you on that when we get to it.

One last point, in the explanations we received previously on this item, if I can refer you to page 1 of the Supplementary Estimates, a figure of a grant, Other, \$82,000, Supplementary Number One, was said to have been the amount of the \$400,000 which was taken into the revenue of the Territory last year. Is that correct?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the \$400,000 is reflected in the \$82,000.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that it is \$82,000, and I explained it before, was that we had a reduction in our total grant by \$318,000, resulting in an \$82,000 net grant increase.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: So, in fact, the Federal Government took away \$318,000 from us last year and it would not happen to be in the Renewable Resources area that this \$318,000 was taken away, was it. It would be nice if it was.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, as with all funds and grants or lack of, it all is in the pot, and that is why it is difficult when you talk about the \$400,000 in the first place, to determine whether it is still in Renewable Resources or not. The \$318,000 was a reduction in our total grant. From what source? The pot.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: To conclude, I now can summarize the situation by saying that due to perhaps a difference in perspective on this side of the floor, we feel that the full amount of the funds have been granted from Ottawa, whether in the form of lump sum for \$400,000 or an A level budget item. The full amount of these funds has not been attributed to the Renewable Resource area, which subject we will debate when we get to that area.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to the Members I am going to take Hansard to bed with me tonight, and try to find out how we got in this problem in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Seeing as how the Honourable Members across the floor finally agree that we are not going to disagree, or agree, I will answer some of the other questions that were asked.

There was the question on CBC Oral History, and I gave that answer this morning. There was another question on the Revenue Section, Campground fees. MLAs would like more information regarding who pays, residents and/or non-residents, and how much. The residents did not pay, non-residents for a season pay \$10, for a night \$2.50.

And they want to know how there was such a difference between what was estimated and what was collected. The reason for that was they analyzed the collection of the previous year and came to the conclusion that it was costing more to go out and collect campground fees than we were getting out of them so, actually, by not collecting the campground fees we took in less money but we ended up making more.

In 1977-78, we made a total of \$23,800, and in 1978-79, in which we took in much less money, we made a total of \$24,100.

Mr. Chairman, if the Member has a question on this I can wait, because the next thing I was going to do was answer another question.

Mr. Fleming: The figures you mentioned there, are they profit, or is that just the total figure which you took in.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: They were the figures we took in. That was our revenue.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, if I remember rightly, someone on this side also asked why the campground fee for visitors on a per nightly basis were so low, as compared with some of the provinces, where I believe the general range is \$5.00 a night.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I have on my desk right now an Executive Committee submission to change the whole fee structure for campgrounds, which possibly might include fees for residents.

Mr. Fleming: Just for clarification, I was here myself when we voted campground fees, and it was voted that we charge more than what is there. I will have to look up the figure, but it went through this House and passed unanimously and it was not after the time they dropped the fee. Not in your time, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, there was another question in regard to the GDA, and that was in regard to a sub-agreement, and Mr. Penikett even had his researcher bring me the news release. It said that we were ready to go into an eleven million dollar sub-agreement under the GDA, and at that time I said I did not know anything about this sub-agreement, and I would check it out.

This sub-agreement was proposed to go ahead, however, there was so much trouble with the Federal Government, with DIAND, and whatnot, that it never did get off the ground, so this sub-agreement has never been entered into and we have cut this sub-agreement back down to the one that we have before us now, which only deals with Renewable Resources.

This is the one that we are expecting to sign, hopefully within a couple of weeks, and then, following that, we will be developing a tourism sub-agreement. They all have a manpower factor, which was what you were questioning about.

Mr. Chairman: On number 13, Department of Information Resources, are there any questions on that?

I shall turn over the page and go onto 14, Department of Renewable Resources. Are there any more questions on that?

Number 15, Department of Health. Are there any questions there?

These are for information only. As for questions, there appears to be no questions at this time.

If there are no further questions at this time, we will go back to the Second Appropriation Ordinance.

(On Clause 1)

Mr. Chairman: This Ordinance may be cited as the Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

(On Clause 2)

Mr. Chairman: I now refer you to Schedule A, Yukon Legislative Assembly, \$937,700.?

(Clause 2 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Administrative Services, \$893,900. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Administrative Services carried. Department of Education, \$16,227,300. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Education carried.
Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, \$627,800. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs carried.

Department of Human Resources, \$12,336,500. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Human Resources carried.

Department of Local Government, \$3,590,400. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Local Government carried.

Department of Tourism and Economic Development, \$1,010,300. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Tourism and Economic Development carried.

Department of Justice, \$5,495,700. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Justice carried.

Department of Highways and Public Works, \$18,064,600. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Department of Highways and Public Works carried.

Public Service Commission, \$1,032,600. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Public Service Commission carried.

Office of the Pipeline Coordinator, \$105,800. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Office of Pipeline Coordinator carried.

Department of Finance, \$4,050,200. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Finance carried.

Department of Information Resources, \$1,582,900. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Information Resources carried.

Department of Renewable Resources, \$2,373,100. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Renewable Resources carried.

Department of Health, \$11,171,700. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Department of Health carried.

Yukon Housing Corporation, \$968,200. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Yukon Housing Corporation carried.

Project Capital, \$26,300,100. Shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Project Capital carried.

Loan Capital - \$5,000,000, shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Loan Capital carried.

Loan Amortization for \$4,200,000, shall this carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I shall go all the way back to Clause 2.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

(Clause 3 agreed to)

(Clause 4 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Therefore, the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, by and with the advice and consent of the Council of the said Territory, enacts as follows:

Second Appropriation Ordinance 1978-79. Does the Title and Preamble carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Title and Preamble carried.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development that Bill Number 3, the Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79 be reported out of Committee without amendment.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Hanson: I move, Mr. Chairman, that you report Bill Number 3, an Ordinance entitled Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79 without amendment to the Assembly. 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, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: At this time I would like to thank Mr. Wilson, for being with us tonight. He may be excused now.

(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. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 3, Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79 and have directed me to report the same without amendment.

And further, Mr. Speaker, it has considered Bill Number 4, First Appropriation Ordinance, 1979-80 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: When shall Bill Number 3 be read a third time?

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

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Hanson: I move that we call it 9:30.

Hon. Mr. Graham: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that we do now call it 9:30.

(Motion agreed to)

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

(Adjourned)

Whitehorse, Yukon

Tuesday, March 20, 1979 - 1:30 p.m.

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

We will proceed with Prayers.

(Prayers)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper. Are there any Documents or Returns for Tabling?

Tabling of Documents

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today, pursuant to the Interpretation Ordinance, Section 13.1, the Report on Regulations.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Reports of Standing or Special Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills? Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period.

Question Period

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, last week there were a number of questions that were asked during the Question Period. I would like to respond to them.

On March 12, 1979, Mr. Fleming asked an oral question about the withdrawal of cottage lots in the Downey Lake area. I would like to point out to the House that it is not this government's practise to speak on behalf of the federal government and, for clarification to all members, this is a response that we received from the federal government officials on the Downey Lake situation.

The federal government surveyed a number of cottage lots in the area in 1975, but prior to the lots being released the Indian organization requested that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development not dispose of the lots until after the land claims were settled since Downey Lake was considered "a sensitive area".

Subsequently, the Minister instructed his officials to refrain from releasing the lots.

Also, on the same day, Mr. Speaker, an oral question about an individual being refused a gravel quarry permit in Teslin was raised by the Honourable Member from Campbell. Last summer, the government received an application from a private contractor for a gravel pit in the Teslin area. As the Member knows, gravel is a scarce commodity in the Teslin area and the federal government attempted to determine if there were any other parties who would also require gravel from the same source.

The Teslin L.I.D. expressed concern about the need for a community pit where private individuals could obtain gravel for their own personal use. Since this would appear to benefit more people, the L.I.D. was offered the pit to administer.

It was proposed that the pit would also be operated so that the L.I.D. could provide gravel for contractors.

On March the 14th, Mr. Speaker, there was another question by the Honourable Member from Campbell in respect to gravel sources in the Teslin area.

It is my understanding that the Federal government is attempting to ascertain what gravel sources are available in the Teslin area, and the drilling program last fall was part of the study. The pit which has been offered to the L.I.D. is thought to contain sufficient gravel for the Teslin needs. The L.I.D. has not yet accepted the pit, because they want to see additional development of the pit prior to it being transferred.

As the Honourable Member is aware, the traditional source at 10 Mile Creek is not being used because of our environmental concerns.

Mr. Speaker, there was a further question in respect to the Teslin sewer system. The L.I.D. receives an operating grant from the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs which is de-

signed to provide for the operation and maintenance of local improvements, such as the sewer system. Teslin's operating grant is being increased to provide funds for maintenance of the sewer system and the repairs the Member refers to will be covered in this manner.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, last week, Mr. Fleming asked if I could give him the answer to how many applications had been applied for under the DREE.

To date, there have been fifty-six applications, six have been withdrawn, three have been rejected, sixteen offers were made by the DREE, thirteen were accepted, three are outstanding, applications in process are thirty-one. He also asked for how many had been approved. There have been eight approved, Kodiak Transport, Mountainview Lodge, Yukon Indian Arts and Craft Society, Yukon Auto Rentals Limited, Ernie's Sawmill, Yukon Opportunities Society, Construction North and T & D Enterprises.

Question re: Kaiser Aluminium Meeting/Tax Exemptions

Hon. Mr. MacKay: My question today, is to the Government Leader concerning some statements made yesterday with respect to Kaiser Aluminum meeting. In the statement from the Government Leader, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that one of the decisions the Federal Government would have to face is the requests for exemption or lowering of certain taxes which the Federal Government raises. My question is: was any such request for a lowering or exemption of taxes received in this meeting by this government, such as property tax or fuel tax?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, no mention at all. The topic as discussed between the Federal Government and Kaiser at the meeting was, you know, a foreign company coming into Canada, and obviously, there are going to be a number of regulations and prohibitions that we are not too sure of at this time. What we would like to be able to do is sit down with somebody from the Federal Government, and discuss them and see exactly what the parameters are, and that was where it was left.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Would the Government be prepared to take a position, at this time, on this issue with respect to property taxes and fuel taxes should such a request be received?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: White Pass Closure/CTC Approval

Mr. Penikett: Yesterday the Government Leader reminded the House that the Canadian Transport Committee approval would be required before White Pass will be allowed to abandon its railroad. Will the Minister assure this House that the Government will, in this event, prepare a brief, strenuously opposing this rail line abandonment before CTC?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I would anticipate that I would have the support, or we would have the support of the Members opposite in such a brief.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Government House Leader for that assurance, and would ask him, since he has also been good enough to compliment the Opposition for its work on this issue, will the Government invite Members on this side of the House to participate in drafting such a brief?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I can see no problem with that at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Penikett: I have a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker, can the Government Leader advise the House if, in his meetings with White Pass in Vancouver, he had any indication if such an application to CTC was imminent and how soon CTC might convene, following such a request?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, they did not give any specific date. They just stated that this was an option that was open to them and they asked us whether we saw that as being one of their options. I said, yes, as a government we saw that as being one of their options.

Question re: White Pass/YTG Commitment to Cyprus Anvil

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Government House Leader,

respecting the White Pass Railroad discussions and the concern over transportation to tidewater. Is the Government aware that a commitment exists by the Government for a tidewater route from Faro that will support ore transport adequately?

The commitment is spelled out in a 1967 Agreement between DIAND and Anvil Mines.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I might also point out for clarification, that that agreement does specify to tidewater, at either Skagway or Haines, Alaska.

Question re: Livestock Assistance Act

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the House Leader, who may answer, I think it was in Ottawa this morning, I heard on the news that Bill C-45, an Act to Amend the Livestock Assistance Act is in the second reading. I am wondering if the Minister was aware of that amendment and if he had any input into it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fleming: Am I to understand then, that the Government, even after all the money we have spent in our budget and everything, does not have some communication with Ottawa to know that an amendment or a bill of this type is being put through?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of it.

Question re: Carcross-Skagway Road Closure

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. Last year, White Pass wanted the Government to keep the Carcross-Skagway Road closed. This year it wants it open.

For the record, can the Minister now say if the Government is considering changing its position on this question?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, no, just in case they change their minds next year.

Mr. Penikett: Has the Minister any estimates on year around maintenance of the highway in question? I am particularly interested in how this amount compares with the subsidies requested by White Pass.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, do not have the figures in front of me here, but I do know that, in order to keep the Carcross-Skagway Road open on a year around basis, it would first require approximately half a million dollars to purchase equipment for the snow removal in that area. As far as the operating costs I could provide the Member with some figures that would be tentative if that were to happen.

Mr. Penikett: Could the Minister advise the House which Government was responsible for the estimate of sixteen million dollars to up grade the Carcross Road to a standard sufficient for truck traffic?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that number, sixteen million dollars, is reflected in the Task Force Report that was done by the Federal Government.

I might elaborate just a little bit on it. What that includes is the bringing up to standard of the Carcross-Skagway Road in its entirety, widen it, paving it so that it would be able to carry gross vehicle weights of 134,000 pounds.

Question re: Day Care Legislation

Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Health and Human Resources.

In view of the fact that all day care centres with the exception of one are in financial difficulty, and as the concerns of the Yukon Child Care Association, that are having in regard to day care standards and regulations. My question, Mr. Speaker, is will the Minister give an approximate date as to when the standard day care legislation and the legislation on day care financial assistance will be tabled in this House?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, the Ordinances now, and the legislative programming, the Ordinance will be coming out, not this Session, but sometime during the fiscal year. With regards to the funding, I have no knowledge of any ordinances regarding funding, except for my Department under the social assistance, where it provides for financial assistance to people who qualify under that social assistance regulations in the Department.

Mrs. McGuire: Will this Government give some consideration to separate legislation on financial assistance?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to investigate the financial situations of the day care centres in the Yukon Territory.

Question re: Land/Private Enterprise Project Feasibility

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I was astonished at an answer I heard yesterday given by the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs,

and I wish to get some clarification of it, in view of his traditionally strong support of private enterprise. I would like to question him on a statement he made yesterday, in which he said, in answer to a question respecting land that may be transferred to YTG along the Dempster Highway, that this would not be sold to private enterprise unless they were satisfied with the merits of each proposal. Now, my question is: is it now the policy of this Government to evaluate, for private enterprise, the feasibility of their projects prior to selling them land?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the area that the Honourable Member is speaking, I think the Government has to take an active role. As one well knows, that particular area in Yukon has some environmental concerns. I believe, on behalf of all Yukoners, and at the same time, when it comes to land and if the land is transferred to this Government, we have a responsibility to see whether or not land is being disposed in such manner that it is going to be used for a useful purpose, and at the same time, we are not setting up small communities all along the highway.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I could get some clarification, perhaps, is this a policy that will permeate any other highways or are we talking only of the Dempster, with respect to this new policy?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, the Dempster Highway will be under the management plan that is going to be developed for the Dempster Highway and, likely, the highway corridor will be a corridor that is separated and will be managed under that management plan. So there could be many things that could happen under that management plan.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, if I could just redirect to the original Minister, my question was whether this policy would apply to any other part of Yukon, other than just this one area. We are just talking of this one area, the Dempster, where the Government will see fit to determine whether or not private enterprise should get into business.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a relatively hypothetical question. Number one, we have to have the land transferred, but I would go further to say that if the land is transferred, or when the land is transferred, yes, we would look at disposal of land in such a manner that it was serving the public interest.

Question re: Dempster Highway Open Year Round

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It's my day.

Mr. Penikett: Last Thursday, I asked the Minister what reports and recommendations were considered in the Government's decision to open the Dempster Highway year round. In his answer, he referred only to the Dempster Highway Management Committee.

I would now, like to ask the Minister exactly what did this Committee recommend regarding the opening of the highway for 1978-79?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, they recommended that it should stay closed. I would remind the Honourable Member, in respect to the opening of the Dempster Highway, if my memory serves me correctly, during the election, the Party Leader at that time was asked whether or not the Dempster was going to open and, I believe, the answer was that yes, we would be opening the Dempster once it was completed.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister for the answer because I am now, beginning to clarify the source of the decisions. Did this Committee make any recommendations regarding year round maintenance of the highway in 1979-80 and what were those recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the report in front of me. As you know, there is a cross-over of responsibility between my colleague in charge of economic development as well as myself and we have made the commitment to table, at a later date, in the House this particular document and I am sure we can get into an active discussion at that time.

Mr. Penikett: If this Committee has made no recommendations, at least none that the Minister can recall, and since according to the Minister's previous answer, this is the only body consulted on this question, whose recommendations, apart from the Conservative Party convention, were taken into account when the decision was made to open the highway year round?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the intermanagement plan that the Honourable Member is referring to is for 1978-79, and for the Honourable Member's edification, we are going into 1979-80.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, it is the habit of the Progressive

Conservatives, when they run for office and they put up a party platform, that they attempt to comply to the commitments they made during the election, and I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing our best in that particular area.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, on the Management Plan, we analyzed the situation and we felt very strongly that for our transportation network, you must have transportation corridors in place if we are going to look to the future of the Yukon Territory, and we felt that the Dempster should be opened with perhaps, more stringent stipulations than there are on other highways.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: I had a question put to me from the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West on Thursday, March 15th and I decided that I should give him the answer this Session.

The question is: are there any plans to develop health programs for special needs of women in the field of preventive medicine and, supplementary to that, specifically with programs for breast cancer, prenatal and postnatal.

My answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that specifically to the programs identified by the Member, those three programs are already in place and have been for many years now, mainly through the Canadian Cancer Society. Women are exhorted to carry out breast examinations and instructed what to do and how to do it and what to look for, et cetera.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, there have been frequent announcements on the radio for Well Baby Clinics. This refers to the prenatal and postnatal clinics held by our Public Health nurses in the various Health Centres and Stations throughout the Territory.

Question re: Livestock Assistance Act

Mr. Fleming: A final supplementary to my other question, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Government, if I may. I will make it a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Fleming: Seeing as how the government had no knowledge of Bill C-45 and no input therefore, into it and it could be very important to the game guides, farmers, outfitters and so forth who own animals in the Yukon Territory, would the Leader of the Party make an attempt to obtain the Bill so that we can have a look at it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before there is an answer to the question, it would normally be ruled out of order, the matter having been pursued at some length at the Question Period, but, perhaps, on this one occasion I will permit an answer. I would ask Members to kindly review their procedures in asking questions and I would call upon the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I was not quite aware of the direction of the question previously, during the Question Period. I am quite happy to see that the Government of Canada is amending that Legislation. It is my understanding that they are amending it to allow the Yukon and Northwest Territories to become involved in the subsidy for feed for our local farmers involved in agriculture.

I should point out to the Members that this was an area that I was pursuing as a member a couple of years ago. It is nice to see that the Government of Canada expedites things as quickly as they do.

But I will ensure that we do get a copy of the Bill for the Member and, at the same time, will ensure that the necessary publicity goes out to the people concerned so that they can take advantage of it.

Question re: Native Oriented Content in School System

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Education. Yesterday, the Minister reassured this House, with respect to his Department's priority concern over a native language programming and, in general, the total injection of native oriented programming into the curriculum.

The difficulty was also noted of delineating native programming from regular programming. However, my question to the Minister is: could he provide us with a financial and policy breakdown of his Department's input into native oriented content in the school system at each of the instructional, administrative and developmental levels?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have this in written form and I submit it now.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Question re: Whitehorse North Land Management Project

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, I believe, with respect to the Whitehorse North Land Management Project. I had hoped to give him a rest, but...

This report was tabled yesterday, and an indication of the report's recommendations seems to be that rural living outside the

City boundaries should have no impediment put to it by this government and, indeed, should be encouraged.

First of all, does the government agree with this summary?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that yet. This is a draft, a final draft and, until it gets into report form, the Government has not considered it or made any decisions in respect to that particular document. Once we have made a decision, we will let the Honourable Member know.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: In the course, of their considerations, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if they will be directly consulting with the City of Whitehorse, not only with respect to the provisions that directly affect them in these recommendations, but also in respect to the effect that this may have on the City's tax base?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we will have consultation with the City of Whitehorse, but at the same time, I hope the Honourable Member realizes the final decision lies with the Government and with the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: My concern on this, and I want to express it in the form of a question, is that despite of having consolidated the City of Whitehorse, some six or seven years ago --

Mr. Speaker: Order please, I do believe the Honourable Member is embarking upon a statement and perhaps, he could place his question.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Well I will place my question then, we have gone through a City reorganization in order to take in rural areas, such as Crestview and so forth, and we now seem about to do the same thing all over again. I would ask the Minister if he would consider the implications of this before making his opinion known?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is probably a statement, so there is no reason for my replying.

Question re: Dempster Highway/Year Round Maintenance Cost

Mr. Penikett: I would like to return, for a moment, to the subject of the Dempster Highway.

I would like to ask the Minister if he has obtained any reliable estimates of the costs of year around maintenance for that road as yet?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am sure this will be a subject that will be brought up during the debates of that particular department.

Mr. Penikett: I am sure it will, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Minister if he has examined the Alaskan experience, with the Alyeska haul road, a much shorter road over similar terrain, which is costing currently three million dollars a year to maintain?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member needs a little bit more information. It should be noted that we have maintained over the summer months for the past couple of years, the areas that have been completed through the YTG. Quite obviously, the costs of the upkeep of that particular road, which is roughly 295 miles, I believe is going to be in the area of an additional, approximately, five to six hundred thousand dollars over and above what we are spending in that area now.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if this Government has obtained a cost-benefit analysis on this road of winter maintenance?

In other words, have they examined the likely benefits to the Territory from it being open year around?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, no.

Question re: Native Rights

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to change direction for a minute and put a question to the Government Leader.

Yesterday and last Thursday, I asked the Government about its policy on the question of aboriginal rights. Yesterday, the Minister admitted they had as yet no position on this vital issue, of extinguishment or enshrinement of rights, but added this policy would remain a secret of this Government.

In view of the great public interest in this matter, will the Minister reconsider this position?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, since every government in Canada involved in claims negotiations at this point in time has made public statements on this question, including British Columbia which favours complete extinguishment and Canada which does not, can the Minister explain this contradiction?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I do not know that I could allow the question if you are seeking an opinion of the Minister. That would

be quite out of order.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would explain that I am seeking an explanation of the way in which this Government's policy departs from that of other governments involved in similar situations.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I answered the question yesterday and the answer that I gave yesterday must stand today and will stand for every day.

I intend to honour the request of the CYI that our negotiations be kept in confidence.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, this issue is a matter of policy rather than simply, a negotiating point and; therefore, I ask, can we assume that this Government shares the position of the Federal Government on this question, until such time as it has established a position of its own?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Member is free to assume whatever he wishes.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

We will then proceed to Orders of the Day, under Government Bills and Orders.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill Number 1: Third Reading

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

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number 3, Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1978-79, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Government, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number 3 be now read a third time.

(Motion agreed to)

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number 3 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, that Bill Number 3 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that Bill Number 3 has passed this House.

May I have your further pleasure?

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

Hon. Mr. Lang: I second that.

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

(Motion agreed to)

(Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I shall call the Committee of the Whole to order. I will declare a very short recess at this time.

(Recess)

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

At this time I would like to welcome our witness, Mr. Wilson.

This afternoon we are on Bill 4, First Appropriation Ordinance, 1979-80. We will be starting with Vote 4, page 82 in the blue book.

Vote 4, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Establishment 400, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, \$661,100.

I will now anticipate general debate.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, perhaps I could ask the witness if the 1978-79 figures for administration and

joint stock companies reflects more or less the same departmental functions as the 1979-80 administration in Consumer Affairs and Corporate Affairs?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the split out of Consumer Affairs and Corporate Affairs is from what we used to call joint stock companies. So, in the past where we had \$99,700, that could be split out to represent Consumer Affairs and Corporate Affairs.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do not propose to address the whole principle of Consumer and Corporate Affairs because I think that is probably fairly well established that such a department should exist.

I do have some questions respecting the individual amounts involved in this and, if that is in order, Mr. Chairman, unless somebody else wants to, perhaps the Minister would like to give some justification of his Department before I start on the figures.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would be happy to, Mr. Chairman.

The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department is not a programmed department as such. It is rather a department concerned with the registration and enforcement of the Ordinances and the accompanying statutory regulations.

Establishment 400 is the main establishment under which all the major activities are carried out, including Motor Vehicles, Safety and Labour Standards Inspection, Consumer Affairs, Corporate Affairs and Metric Conversion, plus others.

Also included under this Establishment are the Electrical Public Utilities Boards, Transport Public Utilities Board, the Labour Standards Advisory Board and various other boards and committees.

Establishment 410 is the establishment under which the Medical Profession Ordinance is administered and Establishment 420 covers the Legal Profession Ordinance.

The increase in this Department is almost totally, due to the increase in the wage sector for the addition of 1.5 man years to the Department. One man year is requested in Consumer Affairs to handle workload increases which will occur with the proposed new Medical Profession Ordinance. This position will also assist in the handling of the secretarial work for the director and others in that Department.

The other one half man year is for clerical activity in the Motor Vehicle section. With the increased work load of the Transport Public Utilities Board, the Motor Driver Control Board and the Medical Review Board, it has necessitated the additional one half man year.

With the exception of the Metric Information Program for which we received 15,000 recoveries, all the activities in this Department are legislative in nature and we are therefore, locked into our budget increases.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I take it that this Department handles the many inspections of various natures on behalf of the Government. Perhaps we could have a list of the things that are under the jurisdiction of this Department that your inspectors inspect.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am not sure whether this actually has anything to do with the budget. I would have to get a list of all the inspections that we do. I do not even have that for my own information.

Mr. Penikett: Before the Minister commits himself too far in that matter, let me explain to him a way in which it does concern the budget.

Inspections amount for inspections is down over the previous years. The Minister knows that there have been, from time to time in the past, critical comments made about the failure to provide inspections for some Ordinances, I think notably the Consumer Protection Ordinance and a couple of the others. So, I think at least some explanation of the decrease in that area will probably be requested from this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to get this sorted out exactly. Some of our inspectors are the Labour Standards Inspectors, Licence Inspectors. I have not got a list here. I will get the list here for you in a second.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Lest there be some mistaken impression from the other side of the House, the reason for my question is that I find there are too few inspections. The reason for my question is that I think there are too many in some areas. I think when we are talking about budgeting and so forth that this is one area that perhaps the Minister could be looking at in respect to reducing the costs.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I can give you the inspections under 400. There is a chief inspector, the Inspections Branch is a chief inspector, a clerk-typist, a field inspector and a safety inspector.

That amounts to \$92,675.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to turn to Primary 20 under Consumer Affairs, we have a budget in the amount of \$30,500 for professional and special services. Could I have an explanation of that?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That was Primary 20, you say?

Maybe Mr. Wilson could, I am having a problem with my paper here.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the \$30,500 is broken out of such Electric Public Utilities Board Meetings, ten meetings, four members - \$5,500 consulting fees - \$18,000, this is in respect to hearing expenses, secretarial, and recording costs. In addition to the Electric Public Utilities Board, there are expenditures for the Credit Union Mutual Aid Board, Real Estate and Insurance Licensing Appeal Boards at \$2,500, then there is \$4,500 requirement for inspection and audit of Credit Union by Credit Union Reserve Board of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Thank you, Mr. Wilson, I have myself located here, now.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could ask the Minister or the witness, whoever is prepared, just for a brief explanation as to why the amount for inspections is down over last year in the budget with the same man years?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the man years have gone from five down to four. The main reason for the 1978-79 Main Estimates going down is because one man year was transferred to the Workers' Compensation Board. The reason for going from \$121,300 in the projected were because there were special studies done that were outlined in the Supplementary Estimates of 1978-79 resulting in a decrease in requirements for 1979-80.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am looking hard for an item under Grants. I am wondering if, perhaps, there is any funding contemplated to the Consumers Association in Yukon under this budget.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, no, I do not believe there is.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I believe there was one last year. Is there any reason for not supporting them this year?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I do not see any under last year either.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I have not found them in the outgoing. I think the Consumer Association told me they had received one and if it is not coming out of the Minister's Department, there is some other department under which it is coming under, I would be pleased to find out.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I believe there was a grant that was given to the Consumer Association that was based on an application by them. It was my understanding that this was not considered an ongoing grant and, as a result, has not been placed in the Estimates.

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, the Consumer Association does some work for this Government in compiling their surveys. That is something that they are paid for from this Government.

That is through the Economic Research and Planning Unit.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no more general debate on Vote 4, we will get down to specifics in Establishment 400, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, \$661,100.

(Establishment 400 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 410, Medical Professions Ordinance, \$100.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, this is voted \$100 just to keep it open in the case of an inquiry, as some of the others were yesterday, as is 420, they are exactly the same.

(Establishment 410 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 420, Legal Profession Ordinance, \$100.

(Establishment 420 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I direct your attention to Page 87, Expenditure Recoveries which is for information only. On page 88, Revenue. Are there any questions before we proceed on?

Mr. Fleming: This is just a general question on motor vehicle licences that the Minister might be able to clear up. On a PSV that is owned by a private person, for instance, is it the Government's policy not to let him transfer or transfer, say, that PSV licence to a limited company of which he has just become the owner?

In other words, if he has a licence and he is operating privately, he in turn turns his whole concern into a limited company, is he not allowed to turn that PSV to that limited company at that time?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, I realize what the Member is

trying to get at and I realize that it has happened in the past. I will have my Department review it, with the idea of tightening up that aspect of the PSV.

Mr. Fleming: Just a comment, I was not really thinking of tightening it up. I was just wondering if it is possible that a person can do this, and I wonder if the Minister could get me the information, whether it is possible or not possible.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Chairman, yes, it has been done in the past.

Mr. Fleming: Is it going to be done in the future?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That was what I was just trying to tell the Member in the first answer that I gave, that I would be trying to tighten it up so that it could not be done in the future.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just to refresh my memory, we are recovering money from the Workers' Compensation again. Is this the inspection area that we are receiving funds for?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the recovery is for the safety inspector, which is an employee of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, under Inspections. It is for the salaries and fringe benefits.

Mr. Chairman: If there are no further questions, we will go on to Vote 5.

Vote 5, Human Resources, Establishment 530, Administration of \$1,363,200. I will entertain general discussion on all of Vote 5 at this time.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: I would like to give a brief description of the Department before we get into the Mains to give the newly elected Members a general overview of the Department.

The Department of Human Resources is responsible for the delivery of services and the administration of a wide range of comprehensive and diversified social service programs.

These programs include family and children services, social assistance programs, youth services and services to seniors.

Last year saw the consolidation of departmental reorganization, and by rearranging staff functions and departmental priorities, the emergence of a youth service division and a community and family service division. This reflects a trend towards the strengthening of preventative services and a move toward the Department working with the community towards the development of appropriate social services.

The Department of Human Resources 1979-80 budget shows a strict adherence to financial restraint.

The 10.4 increase over 1978-79 Mains represent a sum of \$453,000. Of this amount, \$30,000 results from the increase of caseloads while the remaining \$423,000 is a direct result of the costs and price increase and increase in service costs.

In this new fiscal year, there will be no growth in staff establishment, which will remain at 94.3 man years. Any new program or program expenses will have to take place using the existing staff.

It is my intention to request an evaluation of existing programs during 1979 and 1980, with a view to estimating the efficiency and the appropriateness of the service. I am particularly interested in continuing the development of a preventative thrust and community based programming for social services.

Presently, the staff of the Department, together with volunteers in the community, have established the foundation of a Big Brothers Program, and are working closely with the Yukon Committee for the International Year of the Child in planning a variety of activities for this year.

During the last year, the Department enjoyed the experience of having two native trainees from the Northern Careers Program. It is hoped to continue working toward an increase in native participation within the Department during the next fiscal year.

Although, the Main Estimates for 1978-79 show a no growth, no expansion in the program area, it is my intention to work closely with the staff in the development of those programs which are designed to alleviate property hardship, human suffering and unhappiness. This, I hope, can be done at the same time as encouraging individuals to self discipline and self sufficiency.

Legislation under which my Department operates is the Social Assistance Ordinance Regulations. This statute allows this Department to give assistance to people in need. To qualify for this assistance, applicants are subject to a means test. After an assessment of means if they show a budget deficit, the Ordinance allows financial help.

Under the legislation of the Child Welfare Ordinance, this is a statutory base for child protection. The Ordinance gives the director of Child Welfare the authority to apprehend children in neglectful situations. It is also implicit in the Ordinance that the director of the Child Welfare provide services to prevent neglect and avoid

admission to care.

Another legislation, under which the Department operates is the Juvenile Delinquent Act. This is Federal legislation which defines the situation in which children under the age of sixteen can be found delinquent. Both this legislation and the Yukon Child Welfare Ordinance, in spirit, attempt to find helpful rather than punitive solutions to problems.

The Corrections Ordinance, this Corrections Ordinance is important to the Youth Service Division as it gives authority by a letter from the Director of Corrections to the Director of Human Resources to carry out the program of juvenile training, detention and probation.

Pioneer Utility Grant Ordinance, this ordinance enacted in 1978 gives us statutory authority to provide an equal grant of \$300 to senior citizens who meet certain requirements. An essential requirement is that they be resident in a dwelling which is unsubsidized by any other government or government agency.

The Canada Assistance Plan Agreement is an agreement with the Federal Government which provides cost-sharing on a fifty per cent basis for all social service programs which meet the definitions outlined in the plan.

Later on, during the Vote, we will probably, talk more about sharing mechanisms as far as costs are concerned.

We have a Young Offenders Agreement. The above agreement is similar to Canada Assistance Plan and was contracted with the Federal Government in 1976. This agreement allows for cost-sharing on a fifty per cent basis for programs related to juvenile delinquency and juvenile detention and probation.

Mr. Chairman, just to go on a little further in describing the Department and the cost-sharing mechanism, since 1969, the Department of Human Resources has cost-shared most aspects of our program under Canada Assistance Plan, and Canada Assistance Plan allows for cost-sharing with the Federal Government on a fifty per cent basis. The programs are eligible under the Plan's definition. Throughout this whole process, Canada Assistance Plan Agreement has been the cost-sharing agreement in place and will continue to be so until such time as the Federal Government decides to resurrect some financing agreement arrangement which will probably, be similar to the block funding mechanism proposed in the Social Service Financing Act.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: With respect to the general debate on this budget, I am pleased to hear a number of things that were being said by the Minister, pleased to hear that they are going to continue with the preventative thrust as opposed to trying to bolt the door after the horse has fled.

I am a little apprehensive that, in the cause of strictly saving costs, this preventative type of thrust may be impaired. I hope that is not the case as we go through the budget.

On a general note, I think that this Department, in the past, has been generally acknowledged as being fairly well recognized by the public as doing well and I am pleased to see that there has been no great cutback in it. I am not saying there is no problem in the budget, I am sure as we go through there will be some, but in general I am fairly pleased with this one.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no further general discussion, we will get into Establishment 530 specifically. Establishment 530, Administration, \$1,363,200. The information pages on Administration are 93 and 94.

Mr. Byblow: I am assuming from the Vote that the administration of forty-six people includes all the work associated to the Votes 531, 532, 533, 534, 535. Is that correct?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, included under Administration are the actual administrative personnel plus social workers, social service workers, juvenile probation officers, all those individuals who would have to carry out the functions that would be costed under 531 through 535.

(Establishment 530 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 531, Child Welfare Services, \$955,300.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I have some questions in this area, Mr. Chairman. Could I have explained to me what are other resources and why it has increased some \$50,000?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, other resources is relating to Primary 52 on the following page 96, which is a description of a number of people and it is broken down into rates for the year. For instance, you have two children in the Child Care Services at \$28.35 per day for 365 days, you would have \$27,695.50 for those two particular children.

It goes on to four children, another one, another one, if I can just

add them up, Mr. Chairman, children, at the rate of \$236,223.93, those are as defined in other resources.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: A little further on that, the Minister is saying that there are twenty-three children who are being supported under this subsistence and maintenance area. Could I have some explanation? Are they in group homes, foster homes or where? Why are we paying for them?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the category Other Resources is to mainly describe the use of facilities outside of the Territory, such places as the William Roper Hall home in Calgary. This would be where, if we cannot place the children at group homes, foster homes, therapeutic foster homes or under the receiving and assessment centre, they will be placed in locations, resources outside of the Territory.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I have some explanation of what kind of problems these children may have that would make it impossible to place them in the four other areas that we have, like group homes and foster homes?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I think I identified those under the legislation that I went through prior to debate on the Votes.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: The Minister will have to excuse me. He mentioned a lot of things in the general debate before, and I have not been able to pinpoint which particular area we were referring to when he said he mentioned it before. Perhaps he could tell me the particular area under which we are shipping these children out.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: The only information I can give to the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, is where these children are sent here in Whitehorse, and other parts of the Yukon and at what expense.

Under Establishment 531, Group Homes, you have the Villa Madonna, which is in the west end of Whitehorse. It has an occupancy rate of seven at \$19.10 per child, which adds up to \$133.70 for seven children per day.

The Adolescent Group Home have five children at \$18.39 per day, which gives us five children for one day at \$91.95. The Lowe Street Group Home has four children in it and it costs the Department \$14.45 each, the a per diem rate for four children per day is \$57.80.

We have another group home which is called Multi-handicapped Home, which has four people in it at \$18.39 for each individual, which gives us \$73.56 per day for four children.

Another group home which is in Dawson City has four individuals in there at \$15.25 per individual, which gives us \$61.00 per day.

Watson Lake has a group home and it has four individuals in it at \$15.25, which is the same as Dawson City, which gives us \$61.00 per day.

So, the total is twenty-eight individuals at \$479.01 for occupancy. Now, we also have unoccupied situations, too, in these group homes.

In these Group Home that I just named, there are twenty-four unoccupied areas which cost \$301.87 per day. I would like to ask the witness if I am correct in saying that?

So in all, the total you have twenty-eight people, total occupied 365 days a year at \$479.01. That equals \$174,838.65 so that twenty-four individuals, with regret, the unoccupied areas, that is 365 days times \$301.87, gives us \$110,182.55 which gives us a total of \$285,021.20.

So the rates are increased at ten per cent over 1978-79. You have ten children at the rate of \$6.15 per day for 365 days gives you \$22,447.50 per year. Another area, there are twelve individuals at \$6.60, multiplied by 365 days gives you \$28,908. These are figures as it relates to the budget this year.

We have another one that is thirty children at the rate of \$8.15 per day at 365 days would give you \$89,242.50 and that would total, Mr. Chairman, \$140,598.

With regard to special therapeutic foster homes, we have two children at \$10 per day for one year, again I used 365 days, gives us \$7,300. Two children at the rate of \$8.15 plus \$10 --, now here, perhaps, I can ask the witness why the \$10 is used?

I can say that it is two people at \$18.15 per day times 365 days, gives you \$13,249.50. The rate of \$13.15 times 365 days, gives you \$4,799.75.

Again, in special and therapeutic foster homes, we have another child at \$6.60 times one year, plus \$172.50 times twelve equals \$4,479.

We have two children at the rate of \$8.50 for 365 days, plus \$172.50 times twelve equals \$10,089.50.

One child, at the rate of \$313 times twelve -- I assume that \$313 is one month, times twelve, it equals \$3,756.

One child, at the rate of \$375 times twelve equals \$4,500.

One child, at the rate of \$8.15 times 365 days, plus \$202.50 times twelve, equals \$5,404.75.

Another child, at the rate of \$6.60, for 365 days, plus \$187.50 times twelve, equals \$4,659.

I have another child at the rate of \$8.15, for one year, plus \$330 times twelve, equals \$9,909.50.

Another child at the same rate, this other child is included in that last estimation that I made.

Another child at the rate of \$8.15 times 365 days, plus \$105. times twelve equals \$4,234.75.

Another child, at the rate is \$6.15 times 365 days, plus \$37.50 times twelve equals \$2,694.75; another child at the rate of \$8.15 a day at 365 days, plus \$120 times twelve equals \$4,414.75. Your total will add up, Mr. Chairman, the total would be \$79,491.25.

Under the Receiving and Assessments Centre projected overall increase in per diem rate for this home is 11.3 per cent. I have calculated expected occupied and unoccupied costs as well as, as follows: nine individuals at the rate of \$22.76 per day equals \$204.84. The unoccupied rate for eight individuals at the rate of \$18.77 would give us \$150.16, so the total occupied at 365 days times \$204.84 equals \$74,766.60 and total unoccupied gives us, at the rate of 365 days times \$150.16 equals \$54,808.40, so the total for Receiving and Assessment Homes is \$129,575.

I have already calculated other resources for you and it comes out to \$236,223.93. I believe if you add all that up, Mr. Chairman, it would come out to \$955,300.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to thank the Minister for that very thorough presentation of his budget and commend him for being so well prepared. It is very nice to get all that information.

Perhaps I might ask one or two questions that come to mind from the information I have been given. We seem to have a lot of costs related to unoccupied space both in the Group Homes and the Receiving and Assessment Centre and it does relate to my earlier question in respect to the \$236,000. Is there any direction within the Department to try and use up the unoccupied space we have here, at the expense of sending people outside to other places?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Yes, I appreciate the question that the Honourable Member is asking. I will investigate that.

Mr. Byblow: I would like some indication of what the Receiving and Assessment Centre actually does in terms of a service or a program. It is the only one I am a little uncertain about.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, the Receiving and Assessment Centre brings in children from all over the Yukon and it is like the Correctional Institute. What they do is they bring in these children with problems and they receive them in good care for a period of two weeks.

They assess them during that time of stay at that centre and then, from there, they tell them to go forth into another area. It could be a foster home, it could be therapeutic, you know, it depends on how they act in the receiving centre.

On this basis, they assess them and put them in respective areas. (Establishment 531 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 532, Social Assistance, \$1,700,000. The information is on pages 97 and 98.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, we see about a quarter of a million dollar increase in this budget over the 1978-79 Main Estimate. I am wondering if there is some particular reason for this. Is it an increase in the amounts given to each individual or is it an increase in the number of individuals seeking assistance?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I can give the Member a breakdown of the \$1,700,000, if he wishes. From there, maybe, we could make other assessments.

Under Primary 20, Professional and Special Services, in 1978-79, we had \$46,500 and we had a ten per cent increase in this Main Estimate fiscal year, which gives us an increase of \$4,600 and that would give you \$51,100.

On 31, the Travel - Non-government, in 1978-79 you had \$9,000. Again, we estimated a ten per cent increase in this coming fiscal year, which, in addition, gives you \$900, thus giving you \$9,900.

Under Subsistence and Maintenance, in 1978-79 you have \$669,900. The supplemental to be requested for 1978-79 is \$169,000. The cost of impact of anticipated increase in caseload is 3.4 per cent giving me a \$30,000 increase in food rate. Excuse me, increase in case loads is \$30,000 and the increase in food rate is \$28,500, a ten per cent increase of other non-food components is \$49,200. You would come out with \$946,600. If you add that up with Primaries 20

and 31, you would come out with the figure that you see on page 97.

I might also make a statement here, with regard to the Establishment the Social System Statutory Program which provides assistance to people in need as determined by regulations and as our regulations permit us to provide funds for actual expenses for the basic needs of shelter, utilities, actual expenses for special needs, I suppose to set rates, we are unable to forecast on the basis of said rates multiplied by case files.

In the area of Social Assistance, we endeavor to accurately estimate by relying on previous experience caseload totals and expenses incurred.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do not know if the Minister can answer this, but it is an interesting question. With the tightening up of the Unemployment Insurance Act, the ministers of this kind of department across the country were concerned about a large increase of their costs because of the number of people who would then, come off unemployment insurance and go on to this kind of thing. Has this Government seen an experience of that yet, and is there any way they can monitor it, in any event?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: With regards to people coming into the Yukon, I am referring to transients now, who do not have the money and often they come into the Human Resources Department requesting funds. Upon doing that, we tell them that there is no employment for them. They say that they have already looked for work and we say that based on that fact, we will assist you in trying to get out of the Territory. Under those strict regulations we do not hand out money to those same individuals if they come back again. But, on the other hand, if you are a Yukoner, this is a Yukon Territorial Government and we are obligated to try and assist Yukoners as much as possible.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to thank the Minister for that summary. If you just go on, a bit, about this, I am concerned about whether or not there is an increase in the amount of this budget, because Yukoners can no longer qualify for Unemployment Insurance as easily as before. I am just wondering if you have any experience of that increase, if there has been such an increase.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: I can look into that, Mr. Chairman, I can check on that.

Mr. Fleming: I wonder if the witness might be able to give us a little clarification on the man years, I find the man years, one area extensive and in some areas there are no man years, we go way over on 36 again, I wonder if we could get an explanation why there are not man years in each area so that we know what they are doing or have been doing?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, the 94.3 man years, as stated earlier in the Votes are divided up. We have a director in the department which is one man year itself. We also have an assistant director which is another man year and an administrative officer in the Department is another man year and they need support staff, so we come up with thirteen man years in Whitehorse, and 3.4 man years in the area offices.

As well, Mr. Chairman, we have one man year each with regard to supervisors of Youth Service, one in Social Services, one in Community and Family Service, and one in Placement and Support Services. In addition to that, we have Senior Citizens Services. As we go on further, in 536 with the Youth Centre Staff.

In the field, we have one man year with regard to supervising the field staff. We have seven social workers that are out in the field and two in the area offices, there is one office in Dawson, Faro, Mayo and Watson Lake. These 94.3 man years in the whole of Human Resources, Mr. Chairman, is divided in that manner.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: In the Minister's previous summation to that one, he said that there is no way of forecasting a basic cost or rate or cost per case. I am wondering if there is any historical experience. They must have some historical experience. I am wondering if you have any data with respect of what it has cost per individual per case. I am not too sure how you keep your statistics.

Are there some numbers in that?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the Department does keep statistics on social assistance. They keep them by various categories, I think, approximately, fifteen to twenty separate categories. It is difficult at this point in time to be able to say how much per case it costs, because each case is not necessarily a year long.

If you wanted it in an average number of cases per year, then it would be a matter of then, if you took at look at 1977-78 actual, we spent \$723,300. I could not say how many cases that represented, because some are one month, some are two months, some are a full year.

Individually, however, statistics are kept on how much is given by a particular category.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I do not want to get into that detailed kind of detail here, but perhaps, I might have an opportunity to discuss the matter further with the witness, if that is permitted by the Minister. I would just like to take a look at the numbers.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, I can get that information for the Member today, if we can get that information.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would appreciate it and if it can be done without any inconvenience, that is fine. If not, I would be quite happy just to talk to the witness.

Mr. Byblow: I am curious about any figures available or known amount of expenditure in this, not specifically this Establishment, but perhaps, all of them, because of the unique type of service, how much money is spent outside the Territory, either through transportation or special service from cases within the Territory?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, I do not have it specifically within each of the Establishments, but an example was given under 531, where \$236,000 was spent on Other Resources. These are two facilities outside the Territory.

It would be fairly difficult to determine what, in fact, within this total budget, especially in terms of social assistance, would be to locations or to people outside the Territory, if any.

(Establishment 532 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 533, Day Care, \$20,000. The information is on pages 99 and 100.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I think this is an area that has been walked over so many times that there is really not much left to say.

I would be curious, though, just for a brief description of how you actually qualify for this money.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, please note that the figures of \$20,000 in the Main Estimates provided for 1979-80 to provide for day care subsidies only relates to funds provided to families in need, according to the Social Assistance Ordinance.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Say I have a family in Watson Lake. The mother wants to go to work and what I would like is, if somebody phones me up and asks me how you apply for this thing, how do you apply for it? Is there an office in Watson Lake or in all the small communities, or in Whitehorse, do they come up to the Department of Human Resources here, and get a form?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do have a number of people who are working in the field. In the Dawson area, we have a social services worker that you can contact. We have two workers there and in Mayo you have a social worker. The North Highway is described as from Whitehorse to Beaver Creek and all points in between, you have three social workers.

In the Watson Lake area, Upper Liard, Swift River, Robert Campbell Highway to Finlayson Lake and Cantung, you have two social workers.

In Faro, of course, you have one there.

You have got two contract positions, one in Dawson and one in Carcross, with 4 man years each.

So, you know, Mr. MacKay, if your child feels he wants to be on social assistance, then you get in contact with one of these people.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: That is the answer I was looking for, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the day care subsidies. Do you have an actual application form. I know that you cannot have day care very well or be provided with a subsidy if there is no day care in your district or in that town, but we will say the City of Whitehorse, where they have a day care and somebody wants to be provided with a day care subsidy. Then, do you have an actual form to fill in?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Yes.

Mr. Fleming: I wonder if the Minister could make one of those forms available to us sometime, not today. I would like to see it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps the Minister could also, it has been stated clearly, of course, that these funds are purely for the assistance of needy parents.

The other side of the question is: why any surpluses in this area cannot or could not be applied to assist needy day care centres?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: I cannot answer that now. The Honourable Member will have time sometime in the future to discuss that if he approves of this \$20,000, the day care centres in the future, with regards to the Ordinance.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am wanting the final word on this Vote before we take it.

Perhaps in our future discussions, the Minister could address the

dilemma that I have of hearing nothing but complaints about people who are unable to use day care centres and the paradox of seeing this budget declining. Something is not fitting here, and I am wondering if, by the time we get to discussion on the Bill, I think that is what he is alluding to, that some kind of assessment could have been made of the need for government assistance to day care.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: This day care is actually not day care itself. It is part of the social assistance and we cannot mess around with the \$20,000. It is there by the regulations, if you understand me.

So, I would like to reiterate that it is not day care, 533 is just pulled out of Social Assistance just for a matter of keeping the money away from the other parts of the Social Assistance.

(Establishment 533 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 534, Grants, \$57,300.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I know that this grant is going mainly to the Yukon Family Services Association and I am very pleased to see that, Mr. Chairman.

I am wondering what increased services, though, will be provided by this increase in grant.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: It is to provide funds to community based social service agencies.

Going further on that, Mr. Chairman, on Establishment 90 the Youth Hostel Grant will be \$7,000. The total grant is \$12,000, but the Department of Education will be providing the \$5,000, which was stated earlier.

The Yukon Family Service Association will be getting \$50,200. Homemaker's Services, just to show the intent of the program, is \$100.

The increase is due to significant rental increase to the Yukon Family Services, and an adjustment in salary to reflect a realistic pay range for one counsellor and one secretary.

(Establishment 534 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 535, Children's Group Homes, \$36,200. The information is on pages 101 and 102.

Are there any questions?

(Establishment 353 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 536, Youth Services Centre and Senior Citizens' Facilities, \$1,288,300. The information pages are 103 and 104.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Chairman, if I may, in the past couple of days, I am not sure, on March 12th, Mr. MacKay asked me a question, is it in order that I answer that now with regard to this particular Establishment?

Mr. Chairman: If it is in regard to this Establishment, yes, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: On March 12th, 1979, Mr. MacKay intimated that he was giving notice of a question, he would be asking in the 1979-80 Mains. He was concerned about the Youth Service Centre to know what the average population of residents of that facility was in the last year and what we are projecting for 1979-80.

In addition, he asked if any studies were being undertaken respecting the cost of this facility and whether the Minister would be able to give some explanation of this large amount in the total budget.

The answer to the first part of Mr. MacKay's question is that in the year 1977-78, the average number of residents in the Youth Center was fourteen. In the year 1978-79 the average number of residents was eleven.

Projected in the Mains for 1979-80 is the average number of fifteen. The reasons why we anticipate the offenders before the court, together with growing awareness by the judiciary that the Youth Service Centre offer a worthwhile and useful program to young people requiring help.

In response to the question on cost reflectiveness, it is difficult to justify, financially, the high cost of care at the Youth Service Center which in the year 1979-80 is projected at \$120 per day or an annual cost of \$43,700 per child.

There is no question in my mind that this is an expensive institution and yet, we have to provide these services by law.

It is interesting to note that the more young people placed in the Youth Service Centre, the cheaper the per diem rate becomes; however, I am not suggesting that more children should be sentenced just to make the per diem rate seem more attractive.

I have asked my staff in the Department of Human Resources to examine the possibility of alternative programs, and to report to me on proposals for the future within the next six months. I do not

think that there is an easy solution to this problem. The facts are that under the Juvenile Delinquent Act we are required to provide a juvenile facility of some kind and; furthermore, a facility which allows us to detain young people.

It is not enough to assume that those young people could be helped in a group home or a foster home. There is clear evidence that no matter how this survey is designed, there is requirement to have staff on a twenty-four hour basis, seven days a week, working three shifts a day, meaning twenty-four hours a day. This is where the real expense lies and a close examination of the total cost will show that the bulk of expenses goes towards manpower.

Only marginal savings would occur if the programs were housed in a smaller building. A similar number of staff would be required. Nevertheless, I am concerned in this time of financial restraints that costs are so high and I intend to pursue alternatives with my staff.

Since this program has been in existence since 1974, I do not intend to proceed hurriedly with the review. Any alternatives proposed for this program should be agreed to, only on an understanding that they will be suitable for the needs of the next five to ten years, and in this planning we must take into account, proposed federal legislation for young offenders, which, if brought in by the Federal Government, might require this Territory to provide detention and training facilities for young offenders ages sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen. I, therefore, make no apologies that I have asked my staff to take the next six months to make these recommendations.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I make no apologies for raising the question either. There are a number of problems with this facility. Certainly, the answer to the problems is not to encourage the sentencing of offenders to this place.

I believe that if we have fifteen kids, on the average, there next year, it will be quite the highest per capita population in the country of young offenders in that place. The thing is grossly over-built in the first place. It was designed to hold, not only young people, but women offenders as well. It was found afterwards, that this could not be done. The thing is built in the wrong place because a lot of the programs that the people who are supervising these kids out there would like to do is to re-introduce these people into society under fairly controlled conditions. That is not happening because it is so isolated. It is a real bind to be able to get them into town and participate in the community, and it is a real bind to get people in the community to participate in helping these young people. So it is the wrong place, it is the wrong size, it is not secure. The thing is not built as a great penitentiary at all. It is quite insecure and if it was thought of using this place for older offenders as a result of new legislation, I am quite sure it would require extensive renovations to be able to do so. So I do not see that as a practical solution.

I would like to offer a couple of thoughts on the matter. I think that there are maybe, one or two kids there at any one time who could be considered security risks, and I am making a sweeping assumption here, I have some knowledge on this subject. Now, the vast majority of these kids are there for their own protection, are there because they have got to be put in a routine situation, they are given rules to go by and they appreciate that. That can just as easily be done downtown as out in the bush. I would suggest that the Government look very seriously at selling this facility to Foothills Pipeline for example, who need a camp out in that area, I understand, and get rid of this thing. They can also take the Fourth Avenue Residence across the road here, and I am sure put it to a lot better use for some of these kids who are not security risks, but just need a secure environment, but those are just some thoughts for your officials to look at.

I sure hope that when we are looking at the 1980-81 Estimates that we are not looking at seven hundred thousand dollars or so for this place another year.

(Establishment 536 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 537, Pioneer Utilities Grant for \$61,500. The information is on pages 105 and 106.

Mr. Fleming: I have no comments on the budget itself or anything, I am just curious to know whether the Minister does intend to, either change the wording of the Ordinance, although I think it is all right, or change the wording on the application form for the Pioneer Grant. That is where the problem has arisen in the past and I am sure he is aware of it and I just wondered if he intends to possibly, try to get that changed in the future, in this fiscal year, for instance.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 7th, Mr. Fleming asked a question regarding eligibility of the spouse of a deceased person to qualify for the Pioneer Utility Grant. In addition, he asked if I would take a list of the recipients of this grant.

May I ask the Honourable Member a question? Is that the one you refer to?

Mr. Fleming: No, not that question, the Minister answered that question. I think the Minister does understand the problem because we had some negotiating between us about three months ago when the problem arose. It is in the wording, in the area on the application where you have been married and the deceased is gone and now you are applying for a grant in that area. The wording on the application form is really, very confusing. It could go back to when you are married, way back in the days of Abraham Lincoln and if you were still alive you would start applying for the Grant. This is what I would like to know, are we going to apply that grant back to those people, years back in marriages and so forth, or is that grant supposedly, to be used from the time the grant came into being in this House?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: If you would permit me, Mr. Chairman, I have gone through those questions with the Legal Advisor, with the Justice Department as well as my Deputy head and the Executive Committee Members.

I find that there are some parts in the Ordinance that do not specify quite clearly in one section of the Ordinance, the specifications under which the recipient can apply for that grant.

However, other parts of the Ordinance cover that up more clearly than that section, so it does not require any amendment at all. I think that if the Honourable Member from Campbell still is confused about the Ordinance itself, I am quite willing to spend ten, fifteen minutes with him on the Ordinance at some other time.

Mr. Penikett: I am just curious as to whether the Minister has any information at all about the number of people who may be eligible for the Pioneer Utility Grant, but who are not making applications. I am thinking, of course, whether there has been any comparison with old age pension statistics, or perhaps, some of the other grant programs that are made available to senior citizens.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Last year there were 207 applicants who applied for the grant. None were turned down.

(Establishment 537 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I now direct your attention to page 108, for information.

We move on to page 109, Capital Estimates. Before we get into Capital Estimates, I will call a short recess.

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee to order.

We will go on with Capital Estimates, page 109, the first item Establishment 550, Furniture and Equipment, \$49,000.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just for my information now, the equipment and furniture for group homes, these group homes, I take it, are owned by the Government entirely, and all the physical facilities are owned by the Government, is that correct?

Mr. Wilson: I am not certain if the group homes are, in fact, owned by the Government. I do know that the equipment and furnishings are.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Some of our group homes are contracted out to parents who have significant background and they look after children for the Department. These people have their own furniture, their own house and we just contract. They sign a contract with the Commissioner to look after those children for us. But, some group homes we have complete ownership of.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, in the case of the homes that you do not own, Mr. Minister, there is furniture bought for these homes and the contract expires next year, what happens to the furniture? Is it still controlled by the Government?

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Can the witness answer that?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, all assets remain with the Government.

(Establishment 550 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 551, Recreational Equipment \$16,000. Are there any questions?

(Establishment 551 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 552 Renovations to Macauley and MacDonald Lodges, \$30,000. Are there any questions?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Just perhaps, a break down between the two lodges and a brief description of the kind of improvements envisaged.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Fire inspection and health inspections required that humidifiers, sundries and a tool shed be acquired. There is some replacement of equipment, renovations and improvements

with regard to the two lodges. It is for safety and health features, \$13,000 and \$17,000 for better services to the residents, for instance, trying to make the building better suited for the individual. Say, for instance, that the individual has a hard time getting into a regular tub then there would have to be means and ways of getting this person into that particular tub.

There are other things such as large windows that we have to put into the lodges so that the older people can enjoy the view. In one lodge there right now, it does not have any windows where the senior citizens could look out of. So that is the expensive, up to \$17,000.

(Establishment 552 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: That concludes Vote 5. We will continue on to Vote 6, Department of Municipal and Community Affairs. Establishment 600, Administration, \$151,300. I will now anticipate general debate on this Vote.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that all of us being reasonable people, that this budget should not cause anyone problems.

It is obvious that the budget presentation, while it combines operation, maintenance and capital budget has increased by some 4.7 million dollars to a total of 22.7 million. The administrative costs have remained relatively stable with only a slight increase in man years, 1.7 years to be precise. In other words, Mr. Chairman, what this means is that much of the overall spending increase is in the form of direct or indirect transfer payments to Yukon municipalities, L.I.D.s and unincorporated communities.

Of the \$4,000,000 operation and maintenance budget, our communities are receiving almost \$3,000,000 in direct grants for services. The breakdown is approximately 1.6 million to municipalities, and is delivered in forms of per capita grants, grants in lieu of property taxes, water delivery subsidy and transit system subsidy and so on. L.I.D.s will be receiving, by way of direct operating grants, \$633,000 while our unincorporated communities will be receiving community services which will cost approximately \$200,000.

Other general programs of universal application will cost \$220,000. These programs will include such things as the annual mosquito control program, television program to small communities, et cetera.

With respect to our community television program, I am pleased to learn of the recent decision of the Department of Communications which may permit private ownership of satellite-earth stations. Attention, Mr. Fleming.

The decision resulted after months of hearings across the country to which this Government, the previous administration, presented briefs. The Department will be initiating immediate negotiations with Telsat Canada, the owner of Anik Satellite Systems, with a view to withdrawing from our current agreement of purchasing a receiving station from Telsat. It is hoped that successful negotiations will result in long term savings to the Government as well as to the small communities that are provided that service.

Sufficient funds are provided in the Department's budget in order that the Yukon may host the Provincial Ministers of Municipal Affairs Conference in August, 1979.

Yukon and Northwest Territories are now, full voting delegates at the conference and since this particular conference has not to this date been held in the north it is a great privilege for me to announce to all Members that it is going to take place.

Over the years, Yukon's municipality-related legislation has been altered many times, for all very good reasons at any given time, and the Government should continue the concept of being responsive to changes to municipal ordinances. However, in our survey of the situation, it has resulted in the municipal legislation being fragmented throughout many ordinances. It is our intention to review, update and consolidate this legislation in close cooperation with the Association of Yukon Municipalities.

The budget reflects this project, which is presently underway.

I am pleased to be in a position to advise the Assembly that the Municipal Affairs Capital Budget is most ambitious for this forthcoming year. Of the \$3.4 million allocated under the Community Assistance Program, a total of \$1.4 million will be made available to the City of Whitehorse who, again, will be given the opportunity through their elected City Council to establish project priorities.

The balance of the fund will be used to finance capital projects throughout the rest of the Territory. This will include projects from the completion of the cemetery in Faro; to a sewage treatment facility in Haines Junction; to upgrading the curling rink and community hall in Mayo.

It should be noted that the City of Whitehorse is the only community where an allotment has been set aside for which the local council can determine priorities. The Executive Committee determines priorities for the balance of the Territory.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, and I hope all Members take note, especially the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that the Minister of Education and I have offered the services of the Vocational School to the City to allow the construction of the Porter Creek Alternate Access Road and I would suggest that the Honourable Member, if he has a few minutes in his other capacity as city council member, could perhaps, raise that with his colleagues.

One further capital budget item, which I am sure Members are aware of is the Dawson City Sewer and Water Replacement Program, which has been authorized under the Dawson City Utility Replacement Ordinance.

In order to meet current and future land needs, our land development program has been accelerated considerably. If you will note in the budget, we have allocated \$7.5 million for this area for making a variety of lots available to all communities from major, single family residential development in the Hillcrest subdivision, to an acreage lot development in Destruction Bay.

I must add, in respect to this particular area, I do not think anybody should be under the illusion that this money will be sufficient to carry out the programs that we have envisaged. Presently, we are looking within the government and other areas to see whether or not we can get more monies, because it would appear that what we have projected could cost in the area of \$10 million.

So, I want to alert all Members that it may well be that I may have to come back to this Legislature, either with a supplementary, or perhaps, an enabling legislation for the concept of borrowing money for land development.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the Member for his remarks about the Porter Creek Alternate Access Road and I am sure his representation as to the method of building it will be taken most kindly, so long as the Minister is prepared to see it constructed at the cost estimated by EPEC Consultants, rather than the cost estimated by Stanley and Associates, a difference of about \$3 million, I might point out.

Mr. Chairman, we are in general debate now, so I would like to take, at this point, the chance to make a couple of comments about the Department for which the Minister is responsible.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that, if there is one department in the government for whom I have a profound, deep and abiding affection, it is the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Not only in my personal, but my professional associations with people in that department have been very pleasant and productive.

However, there is an area under the Minister's responsibility which he has heard me mention before, and that is the question of taxation and we will be getting into that at some length, and I expect in some considerable heat, later in the life of this assembly.

I want to point out and review some problem areas that I am sure the Minister will want to respond to later on. We have, as we know, in Whitehorse been living under new general assessment for the last couple of years. As he knows, the Court of Revision in Whitehorse has found in the last couple of years that a lot of the assessments were out of line, particularly the basis used to establish land assessments were found to be quite inadequate.

Recently, several of the types of assessed land values were revised and reduced and you will recall, I think, these included land in the core commercial class, and the tourist commercial class. You will also recall that Supreme Court reduced the assessments on the multi-residential class. Most recently, I think, the Court of Revision in Whitehorse found reason to take a look at the problem in the Country Residential Class properties.

Now, I think the Minister has a problem which perhaps, he recognizes, but all the circumstances and the kind of debate, anxiety, even anger that has been generated, has called into question the credibility of the Territorial Assessment Branch.

Now, that is not to say that the new head of the branch has had his qualifications or his ability challenged, but I think that a large number of people in the public have found reason to seriously doubt the wisdom of adopting the Alberta Assessment Manual.

I would just like to mention this briefly. The fundamental problem in that was the unfair burden placed on land. It was assessed, as everybody knows, at 1976 market values and the improvements on the land were, of course, assessed at 1963 Edmonton replacement costs. That means that large lots with small improvements

pay a lot more than small lots with large improvements. The burden on taxes in this city falls more heavily on the residential sector than the business sector and exactly the reverse situation was the case in most jurisdictions in the country.

We have, in the nation as a whole, a trend developing toward the use of market values, whether they are called market value, market value in one form or another is the basis for assessment.

Of course, we have a situation here, because of the supply, of land not meeting the demand, the market has become severely distorted and as a result, so has the assessments.

The Minister will understand that there are some people even so unkind as to suggest that the Government of the Yukon Territory can profit from such a situation when the assessments are forced up unbelievably high.

Of course, you have a situation in some areas of the City where the taxes went down as a result of this new assessment, and those people were very fortunate. There still remains, I think, the fundamental problem of equity and the root cause of the problems we had there occur in the assessment that has been produced by his Department.

Now, I do not want to be getting into a debate now, about tax policy as I am sure we will have plenty of opportunities to engage each other on that question.

I do, though, want to begin, while we are in the general debate, with a problem which I have in the budget that the Minister has just presented to us. It is something I do not understand at all.

In the Recovery section for municipal tax assessments, it shows this year, a figure of \$60,000. Now last year, the bill from the Territory to the City, the City of Whitehorse alone, was \$80,000, just for the City of Whitehorse.

Now, what I would like to ask, before I sit down: is the Minister therefore, changing the one-half mill formula for billing people on assessments or has he, in fact, decided the assessments were not worth what the municipalities were paying for them previously, and has decided to give them a cut rate this year? I would appreciate an answer to that from the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Chairman, I would not want to make legislative changes behind closed doors, as the Honourable Member well knows.

I would just like to point out that that is a subject that should be debated at that time. I will answer his question, but I think we should be going through the Estimates, establishment by establishment.

My only comment is no, and the other point that should be made is that that is not an accurate figure in the Recovery section. I understand that it should actually be showing approximately, \$97,000, if my memory serves me correctly.

So, subsequently, in respect to the projections in the makeup of this budget, I would suggest to the Honourable Member that it should actually, as a recovery, show \$97,000.

Mr. Penikett: Just on the understanding of what the Minister is then saying is, that there is a mistake in this budget then and the total recovery section should be changed, the figure \$60,000 changed to \$97,000, therefore, the total in that column changes.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would not suggest that it is a mistake, but I would suggest that you direct the question to the witness.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, when the Estimates were prepared it was known at the time that the assessment would be one-half mill. However, the assessment itself was not known, and without that information the Department proceeded with using the same estimate as they had in the prior year.

Now, because subsequent to that estimate, we have better knowledge, we will be showing the increased recoveries by means of a supplementary estimate, it will not be changing the actual Main Estimates. It is not a mistake, it is an update of information.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, are there any other updates of information necessary so that we can accurately deal with this budget?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would also, just point out in the Recovery section, I believe that under recoveries for TV, I think that actually should reflect \$9,000 as opposed to \$5,000, just for the Members' information.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I trust we are still in 600, are we, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: General debate, we are going over 600 specifically, now. Do you have a question on general debate?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: It was on general debate, it is a general com-

ment to this whole budget. I had to leave to get my Supplementary Estimates from last year to check on a figure.

This department has a lot of problems, some of which have been enumerated by my colleague here in some length, some of which will appear when we review the supplementaries next year. We are about to give the Minister some ideas of the problems he is about to receive in the course of the ensuing year, because this budget, for this department, makes very little sense.

We are told, in his introductory remarks, by the Minister, that rather than spending \$7,500,000 on land development, we may well be looking at spending \$10,000,000 on land development.

We tend, after a week or so of debate, to throw millions around as if they were not really a lot of money, but spending \$10,000,000 on land development is quite a difficult feat in the Yukon. As a matter of fact, all we succeeded in doing last year was to spend half of that amount.

Now, I would suggest that before we get even as wildly ambitious as to spend the \$7,500,000 that we are talking about, and that before we start looking at \$10,000,000 that you have to look at the things that relate to that.

I can see no increase in administration in this department to cope with this kind of large scale development and I question very much the ability of this department to carry out the program it has set for itself with the staffing that it has. The areas that you would expect to see increases in, to carry out this kind of thing, are not there. I suspect that next year you will come forward with supplementaries that would show us as having failed miserably to spend the \$7,500,000 in the process of land development, and in conjunction with that, there will be outcries in the streets of every town in the Yukon saying: where is the land we have been promised? I would suggest strongly, that the Minister is underestimating the problems of spending this kind of money, and spending it well. That is the major criticism that I have of this. Naturally, when you get into the assessment services I will be looking forward very much to the detail questioning and answers which may arise out of this area because of the problems that we have had. I will also be questioning, I think, all the areas in this budget as we go through.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no further debate, we will move on.

Mrs. McCall: I think this is question of general debate. I just wondered if there is anyone left in this house who remembers why they used the 1976 Edmonton assessment, why our assessments are based that? Having been involved in real estate, assessments are based on market value, and Edmonton is strictly non-applicable as far as Yukon is concerned. I can see it was the last legislature that did this. I just wondered if anyone was left who knows what the reason was, perhaps the witness?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the Assessment Manual is adopted by the Commissioner by order in council. The concept of the Assessment Manual is replacement costs of a home, and it actually dates back to 1963, with 1967 Edmonton replacement costs on a per square footage basis, and other factors taken into account.

This is one of the major problems that they have had in the area of assessment, in that this Assessment Manual has not been constantly updated. In fact, Alberta, at the present time, is in the process of developing, or have developed, a new assessment manual, which I understand will be adopted later on this year. So, it has been out of date.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no further general discussion, I will take specific debate on Establishment 600, Administration, \$151,300.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the Administration section shows no man year increases. The present staff complement includes a director, secretary and administrative officer 1.

This branch provides the general departmental administration as well as the financial administration capabilities. The salary increase is shown as a result from the negotiated increments.

Primary 60, rental of land and buildings shows a \$10,000 increase. This resulted in the fact that an additional 1,000 square feet of office space was acquired by the Assessment Branch, and the rental rate within the facility here, I believe runs approximately \$23 per square foot.

Also, you will recall my opening remarks, Primary 20 allows for \$4,000 for the Yukon hosting for the Ministers of Municipal Affairs conference this August.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I just clarify one thing in this? He said that you are renting space at \$23 a square foot?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a chargeback within the government per department for rental of space, whether it be in this building, or whether it be in other facilities outside the building.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, the real charge is \$7.23.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: With respect to the Professional and Special Services on which we are looking at spending \$7,000, what kind of professional services are these?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not believe I have that information here with me, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps Mr. Wilson could answer that.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this includes an item Mr. Lang mentioned, the Ministers Conference, at \$4,000, and funding for minor studies, \$3,000.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Perhaps I have missed it somewhere, but we are told about this study of putting together all the municipal ordinances and the various branches of that, would the expense of this not appear somewhere in this administration budget?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the amount of the consolidation is projected to be \$3,500. I do not believe it is out of that particular primary. Perhaps Mr. Wilson could help me. I believe it is later on in the budget.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have it here under Establishment 605, Primary 20, under Municipal Services. That is later on in the budget, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, further to my opening remarks, I am concerned about the administrative capability of this department. In respect to these three man years, could I have a description briefly, of the kind of functions these people do. I am not too interested in what they are paid, just what are their functions and responsibilities?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, you have a director, a deputy head, who is responsible for the overall management of the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs and we have an Administrative Officer who is responsible within the Department for the financial management of the Department.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition is under the impression that we administer the contracts that are let for water and sewer, and he is equating that to the man years that we have within this Department. This is not accurate. This is related to the Department of Public Works, where contracts are let and; subsequently, are managed through the Department. At the same time, it has been the practice of the government to use consulting firms for the overall overseeing of the contracts. So, when you talk about \$10,000,000, you may be talking about one \$3,000,000 project or a \$4,000,000 project.

A lot of that is just strictly the cost of the materials of the project, plus the labour and the contractor's price. Like the Honourable Member opposite, I am sure he would agree, I believe in private enterprise, and I would suggest these should be tendered out, rather than be done in-House.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, I am certainly glad to hear the Minister reiterating his position again and again. This is almost as if he has something to hide on this.

We have a Director, who is a Deputy Head, an Administration Officer, and I presume a typist in there somewhere, too. Who actually oversees, who makes the decisions with respect to what land is going to be developed? Who makes the decision as to when it is going to be developed?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this is a very difficult area. It is one in which we try to work very closely in consultation with the communities, whether it be Whitehorse, whether it be Faro, whether it be Haines Junction, and, as you know, they have the authority for zoning and all this type of thing, and it has a direct bearing in respect to the development of land and what the land will be utilized for.

If you come to me on behalf of the City of Whitehorse and start talking about a project, you are actually looking three years from the date of initial discussions to the date the actual project is completed.

This is the problem that one gets into in land development, of which I am sure the Honourable Member is aware. For example, the problems that were encountered by my predecessor, that of the actual jobs that were on line, the decision had been made three years prior.

So, this is the problem you get into, and I think the basic question has to be asked of all members, is it the philosophy of members to have a surplus of land on hand, or is it the philosophy of trying to play catch-up? Those are the two basic questions that have to be asked.

So, as I said earlier, in respect to more money being needed for land development, it is obvious to me that we should be getting a

surplus of land on the market. From this side of the House, we feel Yukon has a future, and we are optimistic about it, but whether or not those lands will all be sold at one given time remains to be seen, but I would just as soon have a hundred or a couple of hundred lots handy that could be put up for sale and I am sure the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West is going to stand up and agree with me.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, the Minister asked us a question as to whether we would like to have a surplus or a deficit. Let me tell him right now, we would like to have a surplus.

I think, though, he has not understood the question, or at least the foundation of the question from my colleague to my immediate right, and that is the question as to whether the department, at present, is capable of delivering this land as promised in the budget. Whether there is the manpower, machinery, and all the means available to, in fact, deliver on his promise.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I feel, and I am sure that my deputy does as well, that we can deliver on our projections for land development. Once again, it depends on money, and as I said earlier, and perhaps we are getting into debate on the capital side of this budget, it is going to depend on money, and we are looking at roughly \$10,000,000 as opposed to \$7,500,000, and these are the projections that we have been given, and a hard decision will have to be made by the executive in the next week or so so that one way or the other we can put out the contracts, so that we can get on with the job and get it done, which I am sure all members will be happy to see.

Mr. Byblow: I would like to express a concern to the Minister that one of the perpetual problems out at Faro, with respect to just general administration, is the time lag to get anything done in delivering existing, developed lands, and perhaps, very specifically, my question is to the Minister, whether he feels that his administration has the research capabilities to look into the problems that the municipalities are having with respect to land and services.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, as you well know, I am relatively new to the portfolio, it is an area that I will take under consideration in the course of this year in reviewing the situation. But in all fairness to my department, my officers attempt to work very closely with all communities, attempting to resolve the problems as they come up. I would suggest further that, as I said, for a community to come up today and say we want a land development for early spring this year, it makes it very difficult for our department. It is a two-way street. The particular community, if they want land development, have to understand that there is planning and design work that has to be done. Caveats on land, all these other legal technicalities enter into the picture, so I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I am prepared to look at the situation over the course of the year, to see how things are developing, but at the same time, it must be fully understood that it is a two-way street. The various communities have to be working with us, as well. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Members are indicating to me that they are in favour of a burgeoning bureaucracy, come out and say yes or no.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Chairman. Yes and No.

I am in favour of speeding up the process of delivering land to the people who need it, and from the Minister's own lips, he just told us it takes three years for his department to be able to process this kind of thing. It takes three years. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can give the Minister an example of where private enterprise, with a piece of property, in eight months produced a subdivision from day one, when the property was purchased, to the point it was delivered to the market. It took eight months. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has a problem. If he is reconciled to the fact that it takes three years to do all this, that is his problem. He is accepting far too low a standard of performance in his department.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I could point out to the Honourable Member, if he happens to have read the newspapers prior to have coming to public office, that it took us five years to get a piece of land in Haines Junction to develop. Now, this government cannot be blamed for that. I would suggest that you take a look at our problems in respect to being the junior government to the Federal Government of Canada. These are the problems you encounter. I should also, like to point out, Mr. Chairman, if we are talking about land development, and I think we are away off the subject, as we are on the administration of the department, then perhaps, we should be saving this debate for when we get into the Capital Estimates, or else move over to that establishment debate it and clear it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: We are discussing the administration capabilities of this department in respect to this budget, and I still have not heard any convincing reply from the Minister as to why it

takes three years on land which is already in the hands of the Territorial Government, which all the land in Whitehorse is. If that is the standard that we have to live with, I suggest that it is a very low standard.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that if the land development goes into the Whitehorse area, as projected, we are looking between 400 to 600 lots that should be on the market by early spring next year, depending on how things go with the contractor, and that is something that I cannot dictate - whether the backhoe is working or whether it is not. I am sure the Honourable Member could not either, if he was on this side of the floor. The point is, that we have projected this and if moneys are available to go with the full projection of the Hillcrest area, we will be looking at roughly, 600 lots that will be available to the market, which I am sure the Member will support. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Members are under the illusion that there are only 3 man years in the whole Department of Municipal Affairs, and I would suggest that we get further into the budget. If one moves on to 601, Community Planning and Land Disposal, you have a total of seven more man years in that area.

(Establishment 600 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 601, Community Planning and Land Disposal, \$275,000, with information on pages 116 and 117.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, that is a functional roll within the department, and it has been clarified that its primary function is to administer all YTG land dispositions, which includes the development and disposal of land, including such areas as quarrying and timbering regulations, and there is a possibility, God willing, that the Government of Canada, with the possible advent of Recreational Lots Subdivision Program being transferred to this government, will bring additional policy responsibilities to our department.

The reason for the reduction of man years and spending allocations as compared to the 1978-79 financial year is simple. It is simply because the land development and planning program, and responsibilities, are now identified under Municipal Services, Establishment 605. Funds are included in the development of proper quarry management plans in the Whitehorse area. Existing positions are: one lands administrator, one lands disposal officer, one draftsman, one land inspector, two clerk-typists and one clerk.

So, I am sure this answers the Honourable Member's queries that he had earlier.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I would like to point out to the Minister that in spite of Mr. Trudeau being an outstanding leader in Canada, he is not God yet.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am curious on this one, to dig a little bit into it, as to at what point do the costs of planning these developments get charged to the cost of the developments and; therefore, are recovered through the subsequent sale of land?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the planning, design, implementation of the contract are all charged to the area that is being developed within the subdivision and; subsequently, that cost is reflected in the sale price of that land.

Is that not correct, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am curious then, as to the \$245,000 that we are about to talk about. It has no direct bearing on any developments that are going to be made.

Mr. Wilson: The \$245,000 is not charged against the cost of the land, if that is what he means.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Because there are various on-going functions in respect to the Department, is the Honourable Member intimating to me that it should be charged to the land on an annual basis?

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I believe, actually, I asked during the Primaries if I could have a description of how the costs of developing land are charged and I assume that that will be available later on in the debate. Is that correct?

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

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I, therefore, am not taking any position as to whether this should be charged to it or not. I am just asking questions. It seemed to me illogical that if there were some costs that could be charged and passed on it should be in order to keep the cost of this burgeoning bureaucracy to a minimum.

One question: professional and special services, is this strictly a reduction in this Department? Are we going to run into a shortage of developable lots three years down the road because of the lack of spending in this area today?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, I do not think so. Perhaps Mr. Wilson has some information on Primary 20.

Mr. Wilson: The Professional and Special Services are for a number of different contracts relating to squatter removal, quarry management, legal expenses, and biophysical inventory on the Whitehorse South Access Region. These particular professional services are not directly related to the development of land either, however, there was a transfer of professional services funds over to 605, which are related more to survey costs and that sort of thing, which we will get into later.

Mr. Fleming: I am interested if the Minister could inform me as to whether, in an area, for instance, and I can specify one area that he knows about which is the Teslin subdivision, it is the Teslin Acreage Subdivision, where there was approximately fifty lots to be surveyed and then a road to be built for two or three miles to there. Of course, the price of all this would be in the lots.

Now, all that came up in there when it was finished was 15 lots for sale, at approximately \$4,000 to \$7,000 a lot. My calculations on a \$78,000 contract would be, if those 54 lots were available, that possibly those lots could have been \$1,500.

Now, just where does the government stop? Are they going to continue now, if a road is built to that area, to charge \$4,000 to \$7,000 for a lot when they are probably only going to put in \$500 to get to that lot, more than what they have done now?

It bears some thinking. I think it behooves the Government to make the people in the communities aware, which I have done in our community where we are developing another area, that if they can put in a larger amount of lots for practically the same services, they are going to be cheaper, much cheaper.

As far as I am concerned, the Teslin subdivision that was put in last summer, the lots were just twice what they should be due to that very fact. They were not aware of what they were doing.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will try to find out more information in respect to the problem the Honourable Member is speaking of, but he must remember that when the contract was let, that is the contract by itself, there is also other work that is done in the planning and design which is not reflected in the contract price to a contractor who, is actually doing the physical installation.

But I will check out the statements made by the Honourable Member.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me if his officials have proceeded further with the idea which they were discussing last year to tack a recreation levy on to the price of lots in new subdivisions?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member asked me that question earlier in debate. I should point out that it has been very difficult for us to put this on behalf of the City because, as he well knows, we like to take direction from the City in all areas that we possibly can.

Now, whether or not we would accept this recommendation by the City is another question, but the point that I would like to make is that the decision has to be made by the Whitehorse City Council and the City has been asked by my officials on at least two occasions, to address the question and the decision, to my knowledge, has yet to be made formally, by the members of City Council.

Mr. Penikett: Supplementary to that, I may be very wrong, there is always a slight possibility of that, but my recollection is that the origin of the idea was with the Minister's Department. I do not think the first initiative of this question came from the City of Whitehorse.

The point I am asking about, because I do not think it is just a question of interest to the City of Whitehorse, it may be a question of interest to a number of communities because, as the Minister well knows, the problem of recreational capital is a difficult one. He says that he has asked the City for some response, but what is the view of his department now. Do they wish to proceed with this idea or not?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, of course I cannot speak of the time that I was not present here. All I am saying is that perhaps the idea was put out by my department because the City is having problems in the recreation field.

I would suggest that the basketball, if you like, is in the court of the City Council, and if they make that recommendation then we will consider it. This government is definitely not going to push for it.

Mr. Byblow: I suppose to some degree I will come to the defense of the Minister respecting some of his department's land development. By point of fact, Faro undertook a small acreage subdivision in a conceptual sense early last spring, and we should see the

release of lots this summer, which is very good.

Perhaps my earlier references to the administrative capabilities was more to the municipal dealings that have to take place. Too often, there is a tremendous frustration with getting replies, getting transactions completed, getting the detail of land titles conveyed, and sales, and so on. That was the reference there.

I want to raise one point with the Minister at this time. Earlier, he made reference to the development costs directly reflected in the sale of the land and perhaps the Minister has some comment at this time with respect to my inquiries in the past regarding Faro land costs, which are allegedly a profiteering situation by government.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the government does develop land. I think there are a couple of points that have to be made here. The the government, under the present legislation, has to sell land at appraised value.

Therefore, if an area is appraised in the commercial, or the industrial sense, then it is appraised for that particular zoning of that land. For example, if there is enough residential land on the market that it is in the area of, let us say, \$12,000, which is the going selling price, that is the price on a piece of property now for that area.

So, I would suggest you have put your problems to me directly, which I appreciate, and in the review of the Lands Ordinance, they will be taken into consideration. I would not make any commitment that we may change that area. It will be looked at. I still maintain that if you take a seven acre piece of property with a 50 foot frontage, do you sell it for whatever the cost of that frontage is if it is in a major commercial area?

These are the questions that have to be raised, and it will be looked at at that time.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I may have misunderstood, this is one pet peeve of mine, the timber regulations that this government does not have, it was always under the Federal Government and we have a problem in the communities even removing a tree from a lot or anything else.

Did I hear the Minister mention something about timber regulations about five minutes ago?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, it must be understood that we do have a liaison with the Government of Canada in the forestry area, in areas of Commissioner-in-Council land.

Mr. Fleming: Do I understand the Minister to say that we are actually going to have some timber regulations that we can go by other than a piece of paper that is up in the land office that was, I think made in 1968 or something, that just outlines what just might happen under the Government?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, you are aware that the Commissioner owns the land, it is an area that we definitely will have to look at.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps at this point too, the Minister could entertain some thoughts on some of his earlier statements respecting the consulting services to land development. I raise the point that in some of the outlying communities, the sophisticated machinery that you put into place to plan a sub-division are perhaps not necessary, that more local resources could be utilized because, to a large degree, in the outlying areas you do not have the same sort of market situation that you do in an urban area like this and you do not require that degree of planning.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will take the comments of the Honourable Member under consideration.

Mr. Byblow: In a supplementary, the planning of the standards, you set that as well? This is in the question.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yes, the Minister, in his opening summation of this budget, went very fast so I may be asking a question that he has answered already.

How many man years have been transferred out of this area into 605, that we were looking at, and also how much professional services have been transferred out of this area into 605?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, from 601 to 605 there have been two. If you looked at the 1978-79 year, it was four and you are looking at six for the 1979-80 year, is that not correct, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, there are two, in fact, and in addition, there is \$40,000 transferred in professional services.

(Establishment 601 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 602, Protective Services, \$489,200.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, this branch administers the following ordinances, regulations and standards: The Area Development Regulations, Canadian Electrical Code, Elevators and Fixed

Conveyances Ordinance, Exposed Foam Plastics, Fire Prevention Ordinance, Fire Safety and Fire Prevention in Residential Trailer Parks, Gasoline Handling Ordinance and Regulations, National Building Code, National Fire Code, Self-Serve Service Stations, Steamboiler Ordinance, and Regulations Governing Installations of Gas Burning Appliances and Equipment.

We provide, through this Department, all inspections in the Territory under these Ordinances, regulations standards, with the exception of fire, building and plumbing inspections in Whitehorse. In the case of Dawson and Faro, inspectors have been appointed by the municipal bodies to administer the municipal building bylaws, and we retain the permit fees extracted from these municipalities.

Existing staff complement, one fire marshal, two fire inspectors, one boiler elevator inspector, three electrical inspectors, three building inspectors, one plumbing-gas inspector, two clerk-typists.

Due to heavy work loads and demands for inspection services, we found it necessary to hire an additional boiler and plumbing inspector for the summer months. With this Government's philosophy that we should be attempting to hold down costs, which I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree, we have hired additional inspectors, not on a permanent basis but on a temporary basis for the summer months. Therefore 7 man years have been added to the Protective Services budget. It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, inspectors will travel between 80 to 100,000 miles a year within the Territory, because of the heavier responsibilities.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, one thing, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could briefly explain why the Area Development Ordinance is administered by this Department. That seems curious to me.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, we have got so many ordinances, one more will not make any difference.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are aspects of the Area Development Ordinance that would require the building inspectors to be involved in. It would be a crossover in responsibilities there as well as under the Municipal Affairs Branch.

(Establishment 602 agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 603, Assessment Services, \$276,600. For your information, it is on pages 120 and 121.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think we have had a fairly thorough debate in this particular area until such time as we come down with the policy paper which I have committed to the Members.

I should point out that there has been an increase in man years for this Department which I am sure all Members will support, a chief assessor, there is one assessment technician, the job entails data processing computer input, et cetera, three assessors, there is one assessor position which we have in the Department which is presently vacant along with a new position which we have not advertised because we would not be so presumptuous as to go ahead and hire somebody without have the full authority from this House, and one clerk-typist.

Last year, there was apparently great difficulty in filling the assessor's position. I am hopeful that we will not encounter this again this year.

There will have to be a major decision made by this House later this Spring in respect to the method of the assessment which both Honourable Members, the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Whitehorse West referred to earlier.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you how absolutely ecstatic I am about the prospect of this House being involved in that discussion, rather than the previous method of adopting an assessment manual procedure.

Mr. Chairman, this Department is really all people. The largest amount in this budget is, of course, the salaries and wages of the people in the Department. The Minister has mentioned one vacancy which they have not yet been able to fill and he has also alluded to some problems experienced in previous years in filling these positions.

I would like to ask him, therefore, one basic question. Is he satisfied that the salaries and benefits being offered by the Government for these positions at the present time are sufficient to attract the best people to these positions?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, you are asking a very difficult question and that is one that should actually be addressed to the Public Service Commissioner. As you know, that is one of his responsibilities under the legislation.

I do know that there was a review of the salaries and a classification structure last year, and the Public Service Commissioner felt that the classification that they are presently in is sufficient.

Now, in view of the fact that we are advertising for the assessor that was voted in the past year, not the present one, we will have to look at our success in that area, and if we have none, we are going to have to demand another review of the situation. It is a concern of the department. It is one that we are going to be looking at very seriously.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, from time to time it is alleged that there are a number of people in the community who have some broad experience in the field of assessments, perhaps not in government positions, but certainly in the private sector.

I am wondering if the Minister has considered, or will consider, if the problem of obtaining good staff continues, hiring for an on-the-job training program, for example, some local people for the Department, and see if you can, over a period of time, build up a permanent staff that way?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I will not hesitate to look in that area if we are not successful in advertising, and I appreciate the constructive comments of the Honourable Member.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Could I have a description from the Minister of what areas will be assessed in 1979-80, what areas of the Yukon is his Department now working on in respect to making new assessments?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the assessing branch is currently updating the land values in the Whitehorse area, as they were in 1976. Obviously, we are in a state of flux at the present time because, as you know, no firm decisions have been made in respect to the method of assessment, which makes it difficult for the assessors to go about their jobs.

The other area of major concern to us is the Watson Lake area. I think that it is going to have a priority this year in respect to assessment.

As you know, in the Miller Report, there were recommendations that we do an annual assessing and it is one that you just cannot do overnight and depending on whether the Legislature accepts that recommendation in our review of the Taxation Ordinance.

So, it is a case of where we are going to have to take areas of priority and say look, these are the areas that are going to be done and, at the same time, the following year, do other areas but continuously update the areas that have already been completed.

So, that is only as far as I can comment at the present time, until such time as the policy paper is before the Legislature and hopefully I can get more information to the Member in respect to questions of that nature.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: I am concerned about this whole problem. The major problem arose, on the taxation, partly because it was two years late in having the assessment completed, so we have a long gap between one assessment to the next which created the shock waves to some extent.

Are we not at this moment, going to increase this problem by not being able to get at some of the areas outside of Whitehorse, which are still going along with some pretty old assessments, is this not a concern from the point of view of the change that it will create there, and also from the fact of lost taxation revenue?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the major areas of revenue do come from the municipalities within the Yukon Territory. It is a question of whether or not we can do it, and I agree with the Honourable Member, we have reason to have some serious concern about this and as I said earlier, I am hopeful that I can perhaps give a more specific answer to his question.

It should be pointed out, in speaking to the head of the assessment branch, he feels that it will take some time to catch up, but once we have determined the method of assessment he feels, given period of time, he will be able to get an overall assessment in the Yukon in the next couple of years and then keep it continuously updated. I think he feels he can do it with the present staff that he has. All I can do is wait and see.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: To coin a phrase, I am sure that Honourable Minister opposite will agree with me when I say that this delay that we are now experiencing in being able to get on with the assessment is mainly due to not putting forward the required amendments in the Taxation Ordinance last fall.

Moving along to professional and special services could I have a brief description of what that kind of expenditure is for?

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

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Chairman, this is to provide for the funds for a contract assessor required to assist existing staff to complete the on-going assessment programs.

In addition, it is to provide funds for a specialist in the mine

assessment programs, to add up to \$28,800.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Was that a specialist in mine assessments?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, mine assessments.

(Establishment 603 agreed to)

Mr. Hanson: I think the next page is quite long, so I would move, Mr. Chairman, that you report progress on Bill Number 4 and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Hanson to report progress. Are you all in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

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

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Chairman: I would like to thank Mr. Wilson, our witness, and at this time he may be excused.

(Mr. Speaker resumes Chair)

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 4, First Appropriation Ordinance, 1979-80, 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?

Mr. Hanson: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, that we now call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, that we do now call it 5:30.

(Motion agreed to)

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

(Adjourned)

The following Sessional Paper was tabled:

79-2-17

Report on Regulations

edit01 000000

