



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 31

3rd Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Monday, October 31, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Bill Brewster, MLA, Kluane

## CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government House Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office (including Land Claims Secretariat and Intergovernmental Relations); Public Service Commission; and, Finance.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs; and, Economic Development.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources; Highways and Transportation; and, Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Hon. Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South	Minister responsible for Education; Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources
Hon. Clarke Ashley	Klondike	Minister responsible for Justice; Yukon Liquor Corporation; Yukon Housing Corporation; and, Workers' Compensation Board
Hon. Andy Phillipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources; and, Government Services

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow

## OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West Leader of the Official Opposition
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre
Piers McDonald	Mayo
Dave Porter	Campbell

(Independent)

Don Taylor	Watson Lake
------------	-------------

Clerk of the Assembly  
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)  
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)  
Sergeant-at-Arms  
Deputy Serfeant-at-Arms  
Hansard Administrator

Patrick L. Michael  
Missy Follwell  
Jane Steele  
G.I. Cameron  
Frank Ursich  
Dave Robertson

**Whitehorse, Yukon****Monday, October 31, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

**Mr. Speaker:** I will call the House to order.  
We will proceed at this time with prayers.

*Prayers*

**DAILY ROUTINE**

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

**TABLING OF RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have for tabling today, a document entitled "1983 Constitutional Accord on Aboriginal Rights".

**Mr. Speaker:** Reports of committees?  
Petitions?  
Introduction of bills?

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I move that Bill No. 31, *An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that a bill, entitled *An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.  
*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further bills for introduction?  
Notices of motion for the production of papers?  
Notices of motion?

**NOTICES OF MOTION**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I would like to give notice of motion today, with respect to Yukon Placer Mining Guidelines.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any statements by ministers?

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** On Friday, the National Energy Board released its report concerning its investigation into the Northern Canada Power Commission.

Our government is extremely disappointed with the report. We do not feel that the board has come anywhere near adequately addressing the issues involved nor has it recognized the basic aspirations and political development of Yukoners. We have a fundamental disagreement with the major thrust of the report; that being that regulation of the Northern Canada Power Commission remain under federal jurisdiction. In fact, more so than it has in the past.

We are wholeheartedly in agreement with Mr. Penner, the member of Parliament who chaired the subcommittee on NCPC, when he stated this morning that "the National Energy Board report fails in any way to take into account the aspirations of the territorial governments and it certainly does almost nothing for Northerners".

I interpret the National Energy Report as a perpetuation of the colonial attitude that Yukoners have been subjected to for 80 years. We feel it is a fundamental principle that regulation of utilities operating in Yukon should be the responsibility of our own public utility board, as opposed to making it responsible to a federal agency.

Our government cannot accept the principle that the head office of NCPC remain in Edmonton. This recommendation continues with the federal government's philosophy that Yukon is a great place to visit, but they could never subject their employees to live here. We maintain, if Yukon residents are paying the bills, NCPC employees should live here and contribute to the general economy of Yukon.

The Government of the Northwest Territories and ourselves are in complete agreement that the differences in operating conditions and electrical requirements dictate that NCPC should be split into two corporations for the two regions. This position is strongly supported by the Parliamentary Committee Review of the Future of NCPC.

It is beyond me how anyone can agree with the principle that a utility serving northerners must be located and regulated in the south. Just because Canada provides some of the financial resources for the operation of the commission, it does not necessitate the regulations and control by Canada. What is it that Ottawa is concerned about? What do they feel would be so disastrous about Yukon doing what ten provinces are already, in effect, doing?

Even if we were to accept the board's recommendations, which we are not, is it feasible to have our public utility board regulate the one private utility and a yet to be designated federal agency regulate the commission? This appears to be the ultimate in bureaucratic proliferation and, furthermore, can only lead to duplication of effort and confusion for Yukon consumers. This division of regulatory authority over our electric utilities will make it impossible for this government to ensure fair treatment of all Yukon's electrical consumers.

I ask you, was the National Energy Board awake when Yukon and Northwest Territories stressed that we were two separate entities and should be treated as such? Mr. Penner heard us. Is that why his report went nowhere in Ottawa?

Although we cannot discount the financial recommendations of the National Energy Board, it does not come anywhere near meeting the recommendations of total debt write-off recommended by the Penner Report, which was supported by our government. We are pleased that the board concurred with the Penner Report in recognizing the need for special financial arrangements to allow hydro-electric projects, which are economical in the long term, to be developed without risk to northern consumers. This recommendation, however, is meaningless until we know what is intended. Can we expect that initiatives will be taken to develop reasonably priced power to support our economic and social development?

The National Energy Board admits that rate design beyond cost of service allocation is a political prerogative. As such, it must rest with the local body politic, which is accountable to its constituents. It is totally unacceptable to have Ottawa set the rates Yukon consumers will pay. In view of the public statements made in the past week by the Minister of Indian Affairs, we expect him to reject the general recommendations of the National Energy Board and implement the general principals of the Penner Report.

**Mr. Byblow:** By way of response, we on this side want to share with the government our supreme disappointment in rejection of a major number of the recommendations in the NEB report. The minister is quite correct. The report does not adequately address the development aspirations of Yukoners and these were so clearly and consensually stated in at least two public hearing processes over the past couple of years on energy and NCPC in the Yukon.

In my party's written submission to the NEB this past summer, we reaffirmed our party's position to restructure NCPC into a single public energy utility, exclusive, entirely, of the debt load and accountable to the public that it serves, and that is Yukon. We called for an independent regulatory regime, responsible, again, to the public interest. We supported the need for a power rate equalization scheme to be put in place for Yukon consumers. We went so far as to say that a Yukon energy corporation ought to be struck in order to work towards eliminating the inadequacies of our present delivery system.

Our position was not unlike the popular consensus position of Yukoners. That position essentially said that there was questionable long distance management of NCPC, and having taken place over a number of years, this has led to the enormous and onerous debt load that must be forgiven and in turn, has precipitated the kind of expensive diesel generation that we are currently faced with. For many in Yukon today, the monthly power bills are a constant reminder of the astronomical cost overruns of the Aishihik project. It appears, as the minister has stated, that the NEB has not listened to Yukoners.

"It appears that, in fact, as the minister stated, we are blessed with a colonial attitude from the federal government towards a very critical economic factor in the Yukon today. I find it singularly ironic that NCPC should show a profit last year, the year in which Cyprus was shut down, United Keno had shut down and our territory was really in an economic disaster. We are facing rates going up and we have a report here saying, "the feds are doing a fine job and it should continue that way".

In a slight positive note, there are some suggestions worthy of further consideration and positive in nature in that report. Certainly, the minister has mentioned a couple: the stabilization fund, the elimination to northern consumers of development risks, the lifeline rates, and certainly the conservation of waste heat. In the main, we are extremely annoyed with the reversal of the major positions in this report from the previous Penner report. It is our insistence that the federal minister responsible reconsider his actions in face of that previous report, in the face of the wishes of Yukoners, and precipitate the kind of restructuring and responsible utility management more in line with the thinking and the rationale of Yukoners.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further statements by ministers? This then brings us to the Question Period.

### QUESTION PERIOD

#### Question re: Royal Commission on Economic Union and Development Prospects of Canada

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the government leader. Concerning the brief by the Government of Yukon to the Royal Commission on Economic Union and Development Prospects of Canada, which said, "it is not the intent of this submission to portray the federal government as an adversary responsible for all the ills that have befallen Yukon over the past century".

In view of the recently hostile relationship between this government and the federal government, could I ask the government leader if this statement to the MacDonald Commission, this summer, indicates a new direction in the relationship between the two governments?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I would have to take issue with the leader of the opposition. Our relationship with the Government of Canada is not hostile at all.

**Mr. Penikett:** That seems to be a bit of revisionist history, but I will put a supplementary to the government leader.

The same brief also refers to further analyses and studies on Yukon's economic aspirations that will be completed this year. Could I ask the government leader if, in fact, there will be substantive studies, such as sector analyses and position papers on the Yukon economy, which will be published in the next few weeks or months, or ones that will emerge in that timeframe and, perhaps, tabled in this House?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I doubt very much that they will emerge in the timeframes outlined by the leader of the opposition. However, we have undertaken to do some studies that will allow us to speak, once again, to the commission about the goals, the objectives and the aspirations of the people of the territory, with respect to the particular inquiry that has been undertaken by the Government of Canada.

**Mr. Penikett:** The territory's brief to the MacDonald Commission suggests that, historically, without a federal commitment to planning designed to diversify the Yukon economic base, the population and productivity would inevitably decline early in this century.

Could I ask the government leader, in light of this critical comment about the lack of planning by the federal government, if the Yukon government now takes a favourable view or more favourable view of the kind of economic planning being initiated by the federal government in this region, at the moment?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I would have to ask the leader of the opposition to get very specific. I do not know of any economic planning that the Government of Canada is planning for this particular region, at this point in time. He has just returned from Valhalla; maybe he knows something that I do not know, at this

point.

#### Question re: National Energy Board report

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development on the subject of the NEB Report, to which he spoke just minutes ago.

Will this government be making a statement in line with the one just presented, to the federal minister responsible, addressing the deficiencies of the NEB Report?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Yes, it would be our intention to do a detailed financial analysis of some of the various recommendations put forward as far as the rate design is concerned, the stabilization fund, and things of this nature, then correspond with the minister directly with respect to the NEB report and our position on the various factors as we have outlined both in our statement today as well as in the rate design.

**Mr. Byblow:** Considering the continuing high cost of energy to all consumers in the territory, will it be the continuing policy of this government to support the federal energy rebate program currently in place to residential and commercial consumers?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** As the member knows, this is a federal program that is administered through the Department of Economic Development. We would hope to continue that particular program over the course of the next couple of years until we get this energy situation in Yukon straightened out.

**Mr. Byblow:** Cyprus Anvil has repeatedly stated that its critical factor towards reopening are, in fact, power rates. What is the position of this government toward mitigating against that issue in light of the report?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It is one of the issues with respect to Cyprus Anvil's problems as far as opening is concerned. I think it is safe to say that the Government of Canada and this government have done a great deal with respect to putting dollars forward to initiate the stripping project that is presently underway. That, of course, is an area that is going to have to be reviewed with respect to the classification of rates as far as industry is concerned, as opposed to residential consumers, and as to who is going to pay the amount of dollars that are required for the running of the various electrical generations that are required in the Yukon territory.

Therefore, I would not want to comment on that specifically. I think it is more of a general question, not about Cyprus Anvil by itself, but a question of industry and what industry is expected to pay.

#### Question re: Land claims, production of documents

**Mr. Kimmerly:** On April 13, this House made an order for the production of the land claims papers. When is the government intending to comply?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure whether I will be able to comply with that motion of the House this week. If it is not this week, then certainly it will be next week.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is the government leader able to inform us now why the approximately six months delay was necessary?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am sure, when the member receives the package, it will be self-evident to him.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Are we able to know now if all of the documents included in the order will be released next week?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I anticipate that the members opposite, particularly the member who is asking the questions, will read every bit of what is tabled, word-for-word, and will check and make sure that everything that he has asked for is there. I sincerely hope that the members opposite will take the time to peruse these documents very, very closely.

#### Question re: Management of Porcupine caribou herd

**Mr. Porter:** My question is directed to the minister responsible for renewable resources. Does the Government of Yukon still take the position that it is not in favour of an international agreement with respect to the management of the Porcupine caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If the member across the floor is talking about a joint international agreement between Canada and the United States, yes, our position is still the same.

**Mr. Porter:** Is the minister aware that Governor Sheffield of

Alaska has agreed to pursue and actively participate in meetings to achieve an international joint agreement for the management of the Porcupine caribou herd? Further, is the minister and his government, in view of that announcement, in favour of changing its position on an international agreement and will the minister give his undertaking to the House that he will cooperate with the Governor of Alaska and support an international agreement with respect to the management of the porcupine caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I was not aware of Governor Sheffield making any announcement and, no, I would not guarantee our support.

**Question re: Parliamentary Committee on Visible Minorities**

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the government leader. The government leader stated, on Thursday, that officials of this government would be meeting with the Parliamentary Committee on Visible Minorities on Friday, October 28. Could the government leader tell this House if that meeting took place?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** When I was asked the question on Thursday, I indicated that I would be meeting with members of the task force. I misunderstood because I was aware of the fact that I was going to meeting with the Commission on the Inquiry of Equality in Employment which is also a committee that is taking under consideration visible minorities in Canada.

<sup>108</sup> With respect to the commission that the hon. member was asking about, they contacted this government, advised us that they were going to be here, did not seek any meetings with us and did not ask us to make any presentations to them. I am confident, had we been asked, we would have looked at the chance very seriously because, normally, we do. However, as I said, they advised us they were coming to Yukon and that was the last we heard from them.

I did meet, this morning, with the chairman of the federal commission concerning equality in employment and visible minorities. I am also aware that a number of the departmental people in this government have met with the chairman of that commission, today, as well.

**Mrs. Joe:** The Committee on Visible Minorities has indicated that they would be accepting written briefs from anyone who was unable to attend. Is it the intention of the government to submit a written brief to them?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I was not aware of that committee's intention to accept more briefs. As I have indicated to the member, certainly, it is something we would consider very seriously because we normally will take advantage of opportunities like this.

**Question re: Mayo-Elsa-Keno tourism promotion**

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a constituency question for the Minister of Tourism.

It is widely felt by people east of Stewart Crossing that the promotion of the Mayo-Elsa-Keno district in government tourist publications and pamphlets is limited and quite unrepresentative of the area's potential. Is the government planning to alter these tourism publications this winter and will we see changes that will better reflect the tourist attractions in the Mayo district?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I would anticipate that, when the organization that has been established for that area comes forward with some recommendations, we would be taking those into account.

**Mr. McDonald:** I will repeat one aspect of the first question; is the government planning to alter their tourism publications this winter. My first supplementary is that one concern that Mayo district residents have: should they take the time and spend the money to submit reasonable proposals for government tourism funding is they will not be given the same consideration by the Department of Tourism as would proposals coming from the traditional tourist corridors. In light of that, can the minister state, unequivocally one way or another, whether or not that concern is well-founded?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Before we alter publications, we have to have some information as to services that those people in those communities are prepared to provide to tourists. We have never before had any information from the communities in question as to what services they are prepared to provide and how involved they

are prepared to get into the tourism business.

However, since this organization has been established, I will repeat for the member for Mayo that, once we see their presentations, we are certainly going to be prepared to take them under consideration.

**Mr. McDonald:** I am not going to repeat the entire first supplementary, I will just ask whether or not the proposals submitted by the people in the Mayo district for government funding will be given the same consideration as all other proposals made in this territory?

<sup>109</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am surprised that the member would ask such a question. Of course, they will be.

**Question re: Disability pension case**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have another question for the government leader. It is one to which I have given him notice.

It concerns the case of a constituent of mine, Mr. Broeska, who suffered a heart attack while working for the Yukon Liquor Corporation and was placed on disability pension when his sick leave ran out. He found himself out of work, unentitled to UIC, and with a restriction placed on the work he can perform when his disability ran out. Could I ask the government leader, since Mr. Broeska seems to have slipped through the cracks between government programs and personnel policies, if he will be reviewing this case with particular reference to avoiding a repetition of such cases in the future?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I want to assure the leader of the opposition that this particular gentleman has not slipped through the cracks. We are very, very cognizant of the problem. It is one where we are strapped, primarily, by the condition of the gentleman's health. We have constantly reviewed the possibility of being able to give this man work that he would physically be able to do. We have not been able to meet that requirement yet. We will continue, though, with the highest priority, to look into this matter.

**Mr. Penikett:** Could I ask the government leader, on the matter of policy, if he has in fact considered reviewing the present system of sick leaves, disability pensions and personnel policies which seem to affect a worker under such a health restriction as Mr. Broeska, who is now apparently not eligible for any of those normal protections and is also, if you like, in the labour market but under a very tight restriction for employment.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It really has nothing to do with our policies with respect to sick leave and so on. The fact of the matter is that the gentleman has suffered severely from health reasons and he is not healthy enough to obtain normal work. We have to find him some kind of light duty work. It has nothing to do with policies.

The policies of the government with respect to sick leave and so on affect thousands of people and certainly we cannot be rewriting those policies in order to meet one individual case. I want to reiterate once again to the member opposite that it is not the policy of the government where the problem arises. The problem is that the gentleman whose case he is raising is just physically not capable of doing most of the kinds of work that we have available for him.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would insist to the government leader that I am not only concerned about the one case, but other, similar cases if they were to occur. I wonder if the government leader can tell the House if he, as a matter of policy — as he seems to be doing in this case — to show some special consideration for public employees who have been forced to leave their jobs for medical reasons, but who would, after a certain period of time, like to return to positions with this government?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Once again, we hire people on the merit system. However, one of the criteria of being rehired by this government is, of course, the factor that they have worked for this government before. I do not know that it is a policy, but certainly it is an unwritten rule and it is one that is followed very closely, particularly, with respect to good employees who are forced to leave us for reasons completely beyond their control.

<sup>110</sup> **Clarification of previous answer**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I would like to make a correction and a clarification of some questions that the leader of the opposition asked me regarding a July 18th press release. The error is on page

484 of *Hansard*, October 26th. The leader of the opposition asked me about a figure of \$200,000 for every man, woman and child. I had said \$20,000 and it should say \$2,000.

The clarification I would like to make regarding the 365,000 visitors we receive every year is: I had made a commitment to come back if being to the closest 100 was not entirely accurate, and it is to the closest 500.

#### Question re: Dempster Highway construction

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question I will direct to the minister responsible for highways.

I have in my hand a press release, dated September 9th, from the highways and transportation minister, on the awarding of a \$5,000,000 contract to Dawson Construction for work on the Dempster Highway. The final paragraph in the release says, "While base work is normally included in the main construction contract, it was split off at the request of the federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to provide an opportunity for small contractors to bid".

Could I ask the minister: why did the federal government have to request this split off?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The reason it had to be requested from the federal government is because all we are doing is facilitating the federal government contract.

**Mr. Byblow:** As a supplementary, could I ask the minister: did YTG object to the splitting off of the contract in order to allow smaller contractors to build?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, as the members across the floor well know, we try to break down contracts as much as possible in order to have smaller contractors bid throughout the Yukon Territory.

With regards to the Dempster Highway, it was thought that it would be much more economical if one large contract was put out to a major contractor in order to take this project on, which, incidentally, called also for \$2,000,000 to be spent in this fiscal year, which now has turned out to be impossible. That was the reason for the large contract, and all of the withdrawals are done in consultation with us. We actually put the contract out for the federal government. It is federal government money.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am still curious as to why the federal government had to make the request to split this off. Is it not a policy of this government to request, where possible, that contracts be split down so that smaller contractors can bid?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, it is our policy, and there was no problem at all with us splitting it off. As I just finished saying to the members across the floor, it was done with consultation between both governments.

#### Question re: Bill C-157

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the government leader: recently, a number of provincial governments expressed concern about the federal Bill C-157, setting up a civilian security agency. A new bill will be reintroduced, it is announced. Has this government taken a position on this question and, if it has, has it communicated it to Ottawa?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Since this is such a major and broad issue, is the government investigating the issue with a view to eventually taking a stand?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** As the member opposite is quite well aware — I am confident he is quite well aware, I notice there is a motion on the order paper sponsored, I believe, by the member asking asking the question — we do not have, at the present time, a deputy minister of justice. We feel that is a definite lack in the territory and in our administration and, frankly, those kinds of issues are not ones that we have been devoting any of our time to in the past months, primarily because we have not had a deputy minister of justice.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** When is the appointment of a deputy minister of justice expected?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not know whether I can properly answer that question, with respect to the motion that the member has put on the Order Paper.

#### Question re: North Slope

**Mr. Porter:** My second question is also addressed to the minister responsible for renewable resources. On the question of hydro energy development, the Yukon territorial government's submission to the MacDonald Commission says, with respect to such developments, that "it is necessary to note that the Yukon government would not support such options until comprehensive environmental and socio-economic studies have been completed." Could I ask the minister, in view of its position and in view of its readiness to see major energy developments go ahead along the North Slope of Yukon, without comprehensive environmental and socio-economic studies, to explain why he favours such studies in the case of hydro development but not in the more environmentally sensitive North Slope?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The North Slope is not an energy development. That is the first criteria. Also, there has been a great deal of work done on the North Slope and we have had presentations before the federal government, our government and before the project review group, saying that all of the potential problems can be mitigated on the North Slope. We feel that those two projects could and should go ahead. That is not to say that we feel that every project in the territory — in fact, we made it quite plain — should go ahead without some environmental studies done on them, and some of those were the energy projects.

**Mr. Porter:** Maybe I should ask what business is Gulf Canada involved in? Does the minister, in fact, support the view recently stated by the member of Parliament for the Yukon in the House of Commons that, "such developments on the North Slope of Yukon can and should go ahead in advance of both land claim settlements and environmental studies".?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we do support the development of those two projects and we believe that they can and they should go ahead. With regard to the statement made by the member across the floor that it is an energy project: it is not an energy project. Gulf Oil is involved in oil exploration, but that is not an energy project; it is a business project for a proposed port.

**Mr. Porter:** On a question related to the North Slope; in view of the fact that most jurisdictions that have a responsibility for the management of the Porcupine caribou herd favour movement toward an international agreement, why does this government continue to oppose giving the Porcupine caribou herd, and the people of Old Crow, the protection of an international agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** All I can say is: which jurisdictions? The jurisdictions for the caribou in the Yukon Territory rest with the Yukon government.

#### Question re: Victims of crime

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the government leader. The Minister of Justice has stated that one of his reasons for not supporting the ad hoc committee on victims of crime's proposal was that they were asking for dollars in mid-term budget. Since the funding available was from the federal government and not this government, could the government leader tell this House why this government refuses to support this proposal?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** This is obviously a question that should be put to the Minister of Justice. I regret that he is not here today. It is one that I cannot answer.

**Mrs. Joe:** The proposal from the ad hoc committee indicated that they want to provide greater awareness and education to the public. Could the government leader tell this House if this government has any specific objections to this public awareness proposal?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Once again, I have not seen the public awareness proposal. I do not know what it means or what it says. Until I have seen it and I do know what it means and what it says, I cannot make any kind of a value judgement whatever.

**Mrs. Joe:** Could I then ask the government leader if he will make a commitment to find out about this proposal and report it back to this House?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No.

#### Question re: Keno water delivery

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a constituency question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, for which notice was given.

As the minister knows from previous conversations we have had, the water delivery truck in Keno until this September was mechanically unsound and safety features such as brakes were deteriorating rapidly. In September, a temporary replacement was provided when a final breakdown occurred. Can the minister say when a permanent replacement will be provided that is to the satisfaction of the community?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It is my understanding that a unit replacing the one that was obviously worn out was on its way to the community as of October 18, at a cost to this government of approximately \$11,500.00.

**Mr. McDonald:** On the same theme, regarding the Keno waterworks, the minister is, I am sure, aware that a well was drilled in Keno a couple of years ago and was scheduled to be flushed and operating this spring. Can the minister give any guarantees that it will in fact be operating again next spring?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Maybe the member opposite could give me some guarantees, if he went back there and spent some time there.

It should be pointed out, to give some background on this, that the Keno Community Club was to install the new pump last summer and unfortunately they did not get around to it. On October 18 our person was in the community, along with the water truck that we just spoke of, and we installed the water pump that was necessary for the well. I should point out the Keno Community Club has agreed to install an extra five feet of suction hose on the well, and perhaps the member opposite could participate in that.

**Mr. McDonald:** I would be happy to. I am there daily. Perhaps the minister, when he promises to flush the well in the spring, would do so next spring.

The lack of an adequate land or property survey for the Keno community has been a continuing concern to residents, as it severely hinders community development. During the Cabinet tour, a local mine operator, a man named Martin Swazinsky, stated that he had partially surveyed the community but would like government inspectors to inspect the survey lines and establish their authenticity. Will the minister undertake to send inspectors to the community for this purpose this spring when the snow disappears?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I will have to take notice on the question.

#### Speaker's ruling

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps that was more of a representation than a question.

There being no further question, we will proceed to the Order Paper, under government bills.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

##### Bill No. 28: Second Reading — adjourned debate

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill Number 28, adjourned debate.

**Mr. Byblow:** I will be relatively brief in my reply today, essentially to give notice on a number of areas that we will be wanting to discuss at some greater length in the committee stage of the bill. By way of initial response, on a positive note, I would like to say that we approve of the principal of labour intensive job creation projects built into capital expenditure. At the same time, we approve of the kind of investment that builds permanent jobs and returns, in the long term, social and economic benefits to Yukoners.

Having said that, it would be our intention to pursue these two principles with regard to their application more specifically in vote-by-vote proceedings.

However, there are a number of other principles that appear in the budget and I want to raise them now and perhaps the government leader may wish to respond briefly or in committee stage.

In the first instance, when this capital budget for next year is compared to what capital expenditures actually took place this year to date, we actually intend to appropriate about \$11,000,000 less in the next year than we have already spent to date this year.

That includes the \$5,700,000 surplus as if it were appropriated and spent. In other words, I am suggesting that this budget may

reflect a six per cent increase when compared to the original Estimates of last year, but it reflects about a 25 per cent decrease when you compare it to the actual expenditures of this year.

Anticipating the government leader's response, I would expect that what has taken place is an accelerated funding for the current year in light of the economic recession, but it does raise the question of planning a financial regime. I remember the government leader speaking last year about a ten-year capital forecast based on guidelines of formula financing with Ottawa. Certainly, we will want to pursue the developments that are taking place on that front, in relation to this capital budget.

I guess the bottom line to the question seems to be that we are not yet in an acceptable relationship with the federal government in terms of negotiating our financial needs, or this budget would reflect a steady, ongoing increase year by year.

Also, in Committee, I suppose we will want to discuss or, perhaps, challenge some of the government leader's remarks relative to the priorities of spending. For example, the government leader notes the high priority of funding towards highways. Again, on the same line of argument I made earlier, the interesting fact is that the budget before us reflects an actual decrease in terms of what was spent this year.

Again, that raises something of a puzzle about budgeting: a question surrounding it. I note that a number of departments in the current fiscal year actually doubled their expenditure from the original estimates. I realize that I am referring to the supplementary estimates, for the most part, but it does raise the question of the validity of the figures before us in the capital budget. The government leader may well suggest that the developing and ongoing financial arrangements from the federal government help cause the substantial changes that take place and, certainly, we would like to know the extent of that possibility taking place in the coming year.

In that eventuality, I, personally, would be curious about the application of funding under the anticipated General Development Agreement. For example, what opportunities will the House have to debate that agreement and its subsidiaries in the whole area of funding guidelines under that funding?

Speaking of debating budgets, there is some concern on this side about the considerable increase in the intended surplus for next year: percentage-wise, it works out to about 110 per cent. Now, we saw the evidence this past summer of this government's style of passing out dollars prior to debate in the legislature. Clearly, the whole process of public accountability is lost, in that the process is undemocratic and, certainly, unacceptable over here.

I suppose, also, by way of notice, I would like to think that I will place some tough questions for the Minister of Education, respecting priorities of this government in the provision of training facilities and the need for continuing capital upgrading of various Yukon schools. Also, unless it is well hidden somewhere, I see very little evidence of any move to catch up in the capital acquisition in the computer and technological field. That is an area that we have fallen somewhat behind in and, certainly, we have to address that in some measure because, in the long term, we are going to have some of our educational deficiencies, particularly in the outlying areas, addressed through that means.

I know my colleague from Mayo is in total harmony on this, but I will want to know why I could not find a line item for the Faro Vocational School in this budget. For that matter, I could not find a line item on Yukon hydro, either, nor did my colleague from Mayo find any Elsa recreation centre funding, but, I suppose, these questions can wait until Committee.

In terms of priorities, I am very pleased to see the energy initiatives in economic development. I believe the government leader highlighted that. With the presentations we had this afternoon respecting the National Energy Board Report, the need to prioritize alternate energy sources, as well as conservation means, are, indeed, welcomed on this side at any time.

We probably would have preferred to see more specific long term and permanent economic initiatives. However, I believe this government does not believe in marketplace participation but, perhaps, the business development fund may provide some substitu-

tion for this vacuum of policy.

This government may, in fact, be providing 285 person-years of employment within this budget. I would note that we do have nearly 2,000 on unemployment insurance rolls and certainly those numbers are increasing. There is no question that public works may be short term job creation and certainly very useful. Perhaps we ought to be looking more at some joint ventures, at some secondary manufacturing, and more initiatives that capitalize on labour-intensive, regenerating economic exercises.

Where the market is depressed and the private sector is not responding, certainly government should be. On that note, and for example, I would remind ourselves of our very successful parka factory, assisted by government, the seasonal fishery at Dawson, also in part a government initiative. I submit that even the Peter Kiewit proposal would fly better if we were part of the bucks and decision-making of that resource development. This kind of initiative would then be something a little more solid, a little more long term and permanent, and certainly would guarantee the jobs and the economic and social benefits to Yukon.

We emphatically have stressed that development should take place on our terms. A guarantee of employment, a guarantee of business opportunity, and it is even our preference to see the resource revenue sharing initiative take place.

In closing, we will have a few questions in committee about a number of the specific projects. We will have some questions on the long term planning and the permanence of jobs and job creation. We will have some questions on policy respecting budgetary surpluses and certainly questions on this government's federal financial arrangements, especially with respect to this capital budget before us.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. government leader, now speaking, will close debate.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have to tell the member opposite that they were very emphatic about where they were coming from with respect to development in this territory and job creation. They had the opportunity to back an initiative from this side of the House; a very, very important issue. It could have meant up to 400 jobs for Yukoners. The vote is well-recorded and it does not matter what they were trying to say. The bottom line was well-recorded.

I am surprised to hear talk of job creation from the other side of the House today. It seems to be quite a bit different than what they were saying the other day. The member has said that this budget is not as big as the last capital budget, or the amount of money that we are spending during this fiscal year in capital money is not. You must always be careful when you make comparisons that you, in fact, compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges. There is quite a substantial difference in any year, given the size of the capital budget that is passed by this government, and the amount of capital money that is spent by both the federal and territorial governments in the territory during the course of the year.

I must emphasize that the capital money that is spent on territorial programs by the federal government has to be voted by this House. I would like to bring to mind one of the agreements. I have taken a lot of shots from the member opposite about our incapability of negotiating with the Government of Canada.

<sup>15</sup> Here is one agreement that we have inherited and we have not been able to renegotiate it. I do not think that even the member opposite, given his alleged power of negotiation, would have been able to renegotiate it. It is that the Department of Health and Welfare of Canada spends a specific amount of capital money in this territory each year. We are expected to put up 70 percent of it. The government of Canada puts up the other 30 percent. The Department of Health and Welfare decides how, where and when it is going to be spent. We are sent a bill.

Now, we are going to be giving second reading to the *Fourth Appropriation Act 1983/84* today. In that particular bill there is an increase of capital expenditures of \$17,000,000. A large proportion of that is identifiable as, in fact, federal money that the federal government, through their own initiatives, has put into this territory during the course of the year. We anticipate that there will be like amounts — because there is every year — during the forthcoming year. We certainly have to hope so because it is a major portion of

the money that is expended in the territory.

The member opposite has to be aware that there a number of line items in the budget that were voted at \$1,000. Now the reason for that is because it is necessary that we have the line item to allow us to enter into cost sharing agreements with the Government of Canada. These cost sharing agreements, like the Economic Development Agreement, may be a 90-10 split, or it may be a 17-83 split. It may even be a 25-75 split. We just do not know. We do not know until those negotiations are completed. It is our experience that those negotiations are not completed until well after the beginning of the fiscal year that we are going to be working in. It is just the nature of the beast in Ottawa. They just cannot get it done any sooner. We pass this budget at this time to facilitate being able to get the work done next summer here in the territory. It does not meet the criteria that is set down by the federal government, nor will they change their budgeting cycle to meet that criteria.

So, we go into every capital budget six months early and in spite of all of the planning, in spite of all of the speculation, we simply do not know what some departments of the Government of Canada are going to do. We had absolutely no way of knowing that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was going to be able to pick up the telephone one day and say to us, you have an additional \$15,000,000 of capital money to spend on highways and accelerated programs. Neither I nor any of my colleagues — and I am sure not the members opposite either — would ever question or want to say to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, "no, no, you better not give that to us because we have not got that in our budget".

What we have to be able to do is have the money in our budget to be able to facilitate taking that money and using it. That is the way that this budget is built.

He mentioned Yukon hydro. It is not in the budget for that very reason. There is, in fact, a line item that was voted this year. If the agreement is not signed during the course of this year, it, of course, will be revoted next year because the vote is there in order to allow us to enter into an agreement. We do not know how much money is going to be involved yet. When we do know that, then of course, we will be signing the agreement and we will have to vote the funds as a supplementary estimate.

So it is not a case of being able to identify all of the money. We do not know until well into the fiscal year how much money we might have. Once again, as the member opposite is aware I am sure, the capital estimates that we voted last fall have been increased dramatically: the \$17,000,000. But, primarily, that is not on our initiative, but on the Government of Canada's initiative. They supply that capital money.

<sup>16</sup> Motion agreed to

#### Bill Number 29: Second Reading

**Mr. Clerk:** Second reading, Bill Number 29, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that Bill Number 29, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1983-84*, be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill Number 29 be now read a second time.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** This is just like sort of carrying on the conversation that I was just having with you, with respect to the supplementary estimates. We have been able to determine that we are going to be receiving, over the course of this year, some \$2,764,000 extra in income tax revenue, approximately \$1,408,000 in other types of revenue, an additional million dollars in recoveries on the O&M side of our budget, and as well — as I was just advising members of the House — some \$12,000,000 in additional capital.

Given the surplus that we have budgeted, these supplementary estimates which we are tabling today will reflect more accurately the spending patterns of the territory. We have been advised by the Government of Canada, with respect to a lot of their spending that we are required to vote, and that is reflected here. So, we end up with projected deficits and surplus at the end of the fiscal year that, I would suspect, will be much more realistic to the members opposite.



*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. 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 call the Committee of the Whole to order. When we return from a short recess, we will be going on to Bill 28, *First Appropriation Act, 1984-85*.

*Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** Committee will come to order.

We will be now proceed with Bill Number 28, *First Appropriation Act, 1984-84*.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think the discussion on this started, earlier, in the House and it probably now will continue. I think, by way of notice, that I raised a couple of points with the government leader, several of which I want to go back to.

The first one relates to the validity of the capital budget before us. I understand and I respect what the government leader explained earlier about the inability of planning the federal government's whim at any given point in the coming year. However, I do recall discussions in the previous legislature regarding the federal fiscal funding arrangement that was being worked on and would, eventually, be put in place. I am curious about the very real developments on this front, because the government leader also talked about the eventuality of this territory being able to plan its capital budget as much as 10 years in advance so that there would be a definite knowledge ahead of time of what money was available, what could be spent, where priorities could be put and the juggling exercise not having to take place during the course of a year.

As the government leader rightfully pointed out, during the course of this fiscal year we saw a \$15,000,000 insertion into the capital budget, which resulted in quite a number of variances in how departments spent their money and which departments spent that money.

<sup>17</sup> To zero in specifically, what I would like to hear from the government leader is: what are the current developments on the federal fiscal arrangements respecting capital budgeting that are taking place now?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I want to assure the member opposite that this is a very valid exercise that we are going through. This is a very valid budget. There is no one who can, at all, question the validity of the budget.

We have been involved with the Government of Canada trying to negotiate and they are very intense negotiations. They are very, very important. Probably that is why they are taking such a long time. It might seem overly long to the member for Faro but I submit there is a tremendous amount of area that has to be covered with respect to the establishment of a ten-year capital plan which we are hopeful of being able to make and the establishment of formula financing with respect to O&M budgets, which we hope we are going to be able to do.

I hope the member opposite does not get the idea that this is going to be the end all, because it will not be. There will still have to be annual negotiations carried on with respect to unforeseens that, in fact, will happen, because we are a very small territory. We do not have a very big economic base at all and we cannot possibly be expected by anyone to react to the very substantial fiscal impacts that may be upon us in future years, just because of development.

I want to assure the member opposite too, that because the Government of Canada puts in some extra money during the course

of the year through these cost-sharing programs, that does not detract one iota from the amounts of money that are voted in this House for specific projects and spent on those projects. That is something we adhere to very, very carefully. We may spend more money, but with respect to projects that are approved by this House, in 99.9 percent of the cases, those are the projects that we spend the money on, particularly in capital. There are no transfers at all. We cannot, for instance, transfer money from Capital to O&M. We can transfer from O&M to Capital. We can transfer up to five percent of our O&M budget and make it Capital, but we cannot transfer it the other way. So there is very little transfer between projects with respect to Capital monies. That is what makes this such a valid budget. We fully intend to proceed with the projects that are delineated in this budget.

**Mr. Byblow:** I understand from previous discussions what takes place in the negotiations surrounding formula financing, and as I understand it, that applies to O&M expenditures. But I am not terribly clear as to how this government goes about establishing the guidelines for their capital budgeting. In the case of the preparation for this particular budget, this government, no doubt, has established its own policy initiatives of where they want to see money spent. They established the line items and they obviously then go to the federal government. But in those negotiations, what are the guiding principals by which the federal government will authorize the capital transfer?

<sup>18</sup> **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not know. With all due respect, the member would have to ask the federal government.

What happens is that we sit down and we come up with what we think would be a reasonable capital budget for the territory each year and, armed with that information, we go to Ottawa. Normally, I think probably the first thing they do is they take our numbers and they just arbitrarily cut them all in half, or something very close to that, and end up, a day or two later after an awful lot of talking, advising us that this is the amount of money we are going to get. In this particular year, it is \$31,702,000, which, no matter how you slice it, is \$4,500,000 more than we got last year. It is a fairly good increase. I have to admit that it is better than I thought we were going to get.

The Government of Canada must have an awful lot of criteria that they are using. One of the main ones is going to be how much capital money they have to spend across Canada. That has to be one of the major ones. Also, you have to realize that we are dealing some six months in advance. We are talking about expenditures, at this point in time, in the fiscal year 1984-85. None of this money, even though we vote it all now, approve it all now, can begin to be spent until April 1, in 1984.

**Mr. Byblow:** I appreciate what the government leader is saying. I want to lead into another aspect of the capital budget and that relates to the surplus. I think I made the earlier statement that there was some concern about the rather large surplus budgeted for this year and I recall debate over the previous capital budget about the surplus. The argument, at that time, was that there was a need for the surplus to address and respond to unforeseen circumstances, emergency situations, and, in light of the economic scenario at the time, it was what appeared to be a fairly valid argument to make.

This year, we see over a 100 percent increase in that surplus and, from the evidence that we have had this past year on this government spending that surplus arbitrarily prior to legislative approval, it gives some rise for concern. Why is this budget the size that it is, and is it the intention of the government to expend it similarly to this year?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am sure the member is not losing sight of the fact that the surplus last year in the capital budget was \$2,700,000. I think he is making reference to an expenditure of some \$10,000,000 that we have spent questionably, as far as he is concerned. I have not heard him say, yet, that we should not have done it. We explained, at the time, why we were doing it. Those expenditures will become evident in the supplementary estimates.

That surplus is budgeted, once again, for exactly the same reasons as it was budgeted last year, and, in some instances, even more so than last year, because we still do not have an economic development agreement, we still do not have the contract with

Yukon Electrical signed, and we still do not know how much capital money National Health and Welfare is going to require us to spend.

<sup>19</sup> When you go through the budget, you will note that there are quite a number of \$1,000 line items in here and they are there specifically because we do not know yet how much money we are going to need. We are put in the enviable position of having to react in each of these cases. We are simply the facilitator; we are not the initiator of these projects. As I have tried to explain, the Government of Canada is. We are the facilitator because we are supposedly the Government of Yukon and we have a requirement to vote the money.

**Mr. Penikett:** Perhaps I could just ask the government leader a general question or two about the job impact of the capital expenditure. If I am correct, I heard a number being used; 285. Was that the figure used?

Let me explain my line of inquiry in, perhaps, what may be a rambling question. The government leader may care to ramble a little bit in his answer, too. I had occasion, prior to the sitting, to have a look at some of the numbers in connection with the \$1,900,000 program that was announced at various times and at various places over the summer. I was curious, at that time, about the source of all that money. My attention was drawn to the government press releases, including the government's information sheet that it puts out, where I think the claim was that there were 215 temporary jobs that were going to be created as a result of this \$1,900,000 expenditure.

I was curious, when I looked at that number, as to whether there was included in the calculation of 215 jobs, the assumption that there would be a certain amount of private money spent on some of these projects in order to achieve that employment goal. I will explain to the government leader why I was curious about that. The reason is that I had heard a long interview on the radio, one evening, about the kind of criteria that Employment Canada used in evaluating its programs and describing the kind of funds used to create a job, or the averages used to create a job.

A crude definition they used for a job was that a job, in terms of these kinds of employment-creating programs, was defined as approximately 20 person-weeks of work. When I went through the numbers in the government programs, it was suggesting that there would be 3,312 person-weeks work. I think, in that \$1,900,000 program, which translated into approximately 166 jobs if you did the simple calculation of dividing by 20 person-weeks. I was interested, therefore, if the government leader had any discrepancy between the 166 jobs that my calculation showed that would be created and the 215 talked about by the government. Another way of asking the question would be: does this government use the same rough guide when calculating the number of jobs? In other words, do they define a job for these purposes as approximately 20 person-weeks of work or do they use some other rough approximation? Or, perhaps, is there a third method of calculating a job which is, in fact, to talk about the specific number of short term jobs calculated on each project and then simply to add them up?

I realize, as I said, that this is a rambling question. I wonder if the government leader could respond to that and ask by what definition or in what terms does he see the number of jobs that he has projected to be created by this budget created?

<sup>20</sup> **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** If my memory serves me correctly — I am sorry, I do not have a copy of it here — but I believe that in my budget speech I indicated that we anticipated that the job creation magnitude of this particular budget was 285 person-years, and 500 jobs. They were established on a job-by-job basis, taking into consideration the estimated amount of time that would be worked in virtually all instances with respect to capital budget, of course. They are virtually all private sector jobs because capital money is used primarily in the private sector. We contract out that work. Then, each job is identified and they are all added up and these are the numbers that we came up with: some 285 person-years in 500 jobs.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand better now, because the government leader is really talking about jobs that will probably last, on average, something in excess of five months by these calculations

which are somewhat, but not much different than, the twenty weeks talked about in the government statistics.

Could I ask the government leader if he could, a little bit, for the record and for future reference — because I expect we shall be doing much more of this kind of thing in the immediate future, anyway — tell me something a little more about the way of calculating those two numbers that he gave: the 285 person-years and the 500 jobs. Was it a number that is calculated on the basis of the number of jobs that will be created in each of the projects, each of the activities that were identified there? Is it the kind of assessment job creation that is made right at the outset, at the beginning of the design of the project? In fact, while the numbers may go up and down on various projects, is that the way, in fact, that it was done?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Those numbers may vary somewhat because, of course, as I say, we let this work out to contract and where we might be anticipating a contractor hiring two people to do the work over a specified period of time, the contractor might, in fact, hire four people and do it in half of the time. Or, he might hire one person and do it in twice the time, given that he has the time constraints there, because, really, in our contract all we do specify is the time constraint. If he can get finished earlier, of course, that is normally to his advantage. It may change the mix but it does not change the actual numbers with respect to the jobs created or the number of person-years that are going to be worked.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I have a very specific question. The Minister of Justice is absent. I will ask a justice question in any event.

I am specifically interested in a courthouse — not as a personal interest, although I am personally interested as well, but as a capital project that is probably going to occur in my riding and which is badly needed. May I ask if the courthouse appears in the negotiations on the ten-year plan and at what stage, or where, are the negotiations for the courthouse? Is there any hope in the next capital budget that a courthouse will be announced? I would realize it would probably occur over perhaps two years.

<sup>21</sup> **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I want to start out by saying to the hon. member that there is always hope. He should never, ever give up hope.

We, of course, are very cognizant of the fact that a new courthouse not only would be highly desirable, but is absolutely necessary. If I might go back for just a moment. When this building was built it was foreseen by the Government of Canada that they were going to build two buildings: one being this administration building with the legislative chambers in it and the other being a new territorial courthouse. They managed to get this building built and the Government of Canada was not quite so magnanimous any longer. I think they took a look at this building and figured that they had better slow down for a little while.

We have looked at options. One of the options, of course, is the one that they use in the Northwest Territories, where they rent the space. We have looked at that option. We do not know whether it would be reasonable or not. We have a set of design plans for a courthouse. I do not know whether it would be in the member's constituency or not because, contrary to what Mr. Halliday might say, we do not look with covetous eyes upon his property, although I am sure that we would be most interested, if he were interested in selling.

But, be that as it may, I think we have a number of things — and this is all part of capital long range planning — such as, I think, a real desire and a real need for new vocational and technical training facilities somewhere in the territory. We should be getting started at an early day, with respect to our Yukon Campus. We must get a courthouse built.

There are two ways we can go about major projects like this. For the edification of the member for Whitehorse South Centre, when we talk about constructing a courthouse, I think we should be talking in the magnitude of approximately \$15,000,000 in today's dollars. Given that this building cost \$7,400,000 to build nine years ago, I would guess that a courthouse of the size that we would require, allowing for a bit of expansion and so on, would be something around \$15,000,000.

So, it is going to take more than two years, respectfully. I would

think that we are looking, once again, given the size of our capital budgets, at a project a little bigger than a two-year project; maybe a three- or four-year project.

We negotiate these kinds of things with the Government of Canada. The ideal situation, from a Yukon taxpayer's point of view, of course, or even a Yukon resident's point of view, is, if we can negotiate the construction of a major addition to the infrastructure of the territory, like a courthouse, outside of our capital agreement — as this building was done — it is a lot better for us because that does not cut into the other capital expenditures we can make in the territory. If we finally despair of negotiating along those lines with the Government of Canada and say to them, "We want to build a territorial courthouse and we are prepared to put \$5,000,000 of our \$30,000,000 a year for the next three or four years into the project", then we could do it that way. But, if we are going to do it that way, we have to come to the point where we think that that is a priority, given the other capital projects that are in the budget.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Some specific questions come to mind after that answer, which I thought was an extremely good answer. Is it the current intention of the government to negotiate for a courthouse outside of the normal capital budget? Is that, in fact, the course of action that is being followed now?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We have been following that course of action ever since 1979. As I say, we have gone to the point where we have architectural drawings of a territorial courthouse that we are using with respect to negotiations with the Government of Canada. I must say, once again, I think that probably we, as a government on this side, are getting very close to the point where we are going to be saying to the Government of Canada, "look, in spite of all of the talking that we have done, you have not seen fit to give us a courthouse as the senior government. Therefore, we are going to have to go ahead and do it ourselves". I am quite confident that they will say, "okay, go ahead. Do it yourselves. But you have to take it out of your capital money". I just do not know at what point in time we will, in fact, despair of the negotiations and go it on our own.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I asked about a courthouse and the answer came back as a courthouse, and also vocational and technical training and Yukon campus. Is it possible to rank in priorities, one and two, which is the greater priority of the government at this point in time: a courthouse or a Yukon campus?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No. I am not prepared to do that right at this point. However, I believe that it is something that we, during the next few months, will be attempting to do. We are looking, as I said, at a number of major capital projects with respect to the infrastructure in the territory. I think that we are going to have to, now that the federal government has virtually finished the fourth wheel project. I anticipate that by the end of this summer they will have virtually finished the airport here in Whitehorse. Those kinds of projects are major stimulators to the economy of this territory and, particularly, of this city. I think that we are going to have to look at what might happen in future years and set some priorities, but, not at the present time. I am not in any position to say whether, from this side of the House, we favour a justice building. By the way, that is what it should be called, rather than a courthouse. There will be a number of courts in the building, but it should actually be referred to as a justice building because, of course, we foresee, in that kind of a complex, all of the justice administration offices as well.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I have various comments about the concept of a courthouse and a justice building and the advisability of including the other offices in the building where the court is actually located. There are obviously arguments pro and con on that issue and I will save my comments until the Minister of Justice arrives, perhaps under that line in the budget.

I am interested, because it affects the timing and the planning, where the building is going to go. Obviously the municipality is interested as to their zoning and the region of the city is obviously already determined by the municipal zoning plan; or practically so. I understand that the land bordering the YTG extended parking lot on First Avenue is owned by the government and is presently used

as a parking lot for some other businesses. Is that the courthouse location and is that land, in fact, owned now?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not absolutely certain to which piece of land the member is referring, but I think I can say safely, yes. I think that he is referring to the same lot or set of lots that I would be referring to. YTG does own some land in that vicinity.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is there any more general debate?

**Mr. Byblow:** I just want to draw a reference in general debate to the financial summary where it is identified that the transfer payment for this year is in the order of \$28,000,000 and the recovery from what appears to be through the rest of the budget cost-shared programs in various departments. It also reflects substantially higher recovery this year than last year and I am wondering if that has any particular significance. I raise that simply because the variance, of course, brings the transfer payments much closer together if they were the same. Is it fair to assume that the number of cost-shared programs have increased or just the amounts on the specific items?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** There may be a slight increase in the number of cost-shared programs but there is a significant increase in the amount, particularly with respect to the energy conservation programs, that were highlighted in the second reading speech. When we get to economic development, it will become evident that we have put a lot more money in those particular areas and as a result, of course, our recoveries — because they are cost-shared programs — from the Government of Canada have increased substantially as well.

**Mr. Byblow:** This will probably become evident as we go through vote-by-vote proceedings, as well, but I have another question relating to funding. Was any of the \$2,000,000, advanced under the federal-Yukon tourism incentive this past year built into any capital identification in next year's budget?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No. That incentive program is with respect to this fiscal year.

I must emphasize, once again, we do not have anything built into this budget with respect to the new Economic Development Agreement, simply because we do not know what it is going to be yet.

**Mr. Chairman:** If there is no further general debate, we will turn to Schedule A.

*On Yukon Legislative Assembly, in the amount of \$8,000*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I could say that we are doing so well with *Yukon Info* that we have decided to go into the radio business, as well, but that is not really the reason for this. It does not seem that the leader of the opposition is overly concerned about it. I was surprised: I had anticipated a question from him.

The system that we use for recording *Hansard* is being overloaded by the number of speakers that we now require. As I am sure you are all aware, there are speakers in deputy minister's offices, and so on, throughout this building because there are a lot of people who are vitally interested in what is said in this Chamber and they feel that they should be kept up to date on what is happening.

This is a system that is being used in other legislatures. It allows us to do away with the speakers and simply have an FM receiver in an office. We are going to be required, given the approbation of this House, to make application to the CRTC for a license. I believe that we make that request in the name of the Speaker, because this would be the legislature's radio and we would be transmitting at a very low power, as low as it could possibly get, and we would be transmitting in a radius of about a mile-and-a-half from this building.

**Mr. Penikett:** I did not raise it in the way in which the government leader suggested that I might have done for two reasons: it is not for the reason that he suggested, that I have overcome my outrage at the highly questionable advertising engaged in by this government last year. It is because, on this matter, unlike most matters, I happen to have been consulted. To the credit of the clerks of the Table, this happened to be a question on which, as leader of the opposition, I was consulted.

I should also say to the government leader, some time ago I was

consulted by the minister responsible for government services, asking if I would have any objections to deputy ministers having speakers in the office before MLAs, because MLAs would get them eventually. It was only then that we discovered that the system probably could not handle speakers for MLAs.

Let me say that I understand full well — full well — the purpose of this system. I understand very well that Cabinet ministers will be able to drive around in their Cabinet cars, as long as they do not go as far as Riverdale, or much further than to Riverdale, and they will be able to listen to the debates in the legislature, if there is nothing better on their radio. I would be curious to know whether the Cabinet cars will also have FM radios now as standard equipment. I expect they shall.

I do want the government leader to know that this item did not come as a complete and absolute surprise to me. In fact, it was less of a surprise than 90 per cent of the stuff in here.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is any additional expense involved in increasing the wattage only slightly so members of the public outside of a small radius could also listen? I would expect that if the wattage were increased into the rural areas at least one member would be well pleased and his constituents better informed.

**Mr. Penikett:** I know that the member has appeared before a great number of administrative tribunals but I believe he has not yet had the pleasure of performing for the CRTC. The CRTC is a strange animal. One thing it has never done, I do not think, is take anybody's licence away when it has granted it, but it is somewhat nigglerly about handing them out. It is, in fact, true that it is easier to apply for a one watt licence than it is to apply for a five watt licence or a 100 watt licence, or a 50,000 watt licence. I do not want to suggest, for a minute, that anybody has it in mind to get their foot in the door. It seems to me that we ought to deal with the problem of getting the one watt licence before we contemplate expanding the system.

*Yukon Legislative Assembly in the amount of \$8,000 agreed to*

#### *On Economic Development*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Before you, you have the capital estimates for 1984-85 for the Department of Economic Development. There is some background that I think should be put on the record. The present departmental structure results from a government reorganization of the Department of Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations in June of 1983, whereby the Intergovernmental Relations component was split from the Economic Development component and transferred to the Executive Council office. At present, the Department of Economic Development is responsible for taking care of Yukon's interest and enhancing Yukon's involvement in major, and, for that matter, minor, resource related projects wherever necessary. The department also has long term aims to expand Yukon's economic base wherever possible. Our efforts are directed at programming intended to strengthen and enhance the short term as well as the long term general economy of Yukon.

As you will note, the departmental capital budget was increased by \$1,040,000 over the previous year's, and the reason for that was to meet a number of our governmental objectives. I think it is safe to say that one of the major objectives of our department is to bring policies forward for management board as well as Cabinet consideration with respect to looking at ways to lessen our dependency on imported fuels. That, in part, is covered by the federal-territorial arrangement under the heading of Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Agreement, which are funds that will be requested to be voted for the purposes of looking at ways residential and commercial establishments can take advantage of some dollars to go into retrofit for the purpose of conservation measures.

I should also point out, to enhance the area of looking at alternative energies — which is so important to the territory — we will be requesting for you to vote dollars to implement an energy supply investigation fund, so that we can look at various energy alternatives that may be advantageous in the long term to the territory.

At the same time, we have provided for you two other new

programs, one of which would be the Energy Conservation Fund, which would enhance the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Agreement that we have with the Government of Canada. We are in the process of developing various policy options for Cabinet to consider to implement this particular program.

Another major aspect of the department is to develop policy over the course of this winter as to how we could further help the small businesses in the territory. What we refer to here is the Small Business Development Program. We are in the process of developing various policy options in this area to submit to Cabinet, to put a small business development program into effect for the 1984-85 year.

It would be my intention, for the three programs that I have outlined here, the Energy Supply Investigation Fund, the Energy Conservation Fund and Small Business Development Program, to table in the legislature, in the spring, the various guidelines that we have developed for the purposes of delivering such a program. I think it is safe to say that both sides of the House are vitally interested in these areas. I think it speaks well of the government that we have brought forward dollars to these crucial areas for the purposes of looking not only at the short-term, but also the long-term, so that either government, where it is applicable, or the private sector, can expand or, for that matter, go forward into the future, as far as government support is concerned.

I want to point out that the member for Faro raised a question of the Yukon hydro company and the fact that there was not a line item in this budget. The reason for that is the fact that, in the 1983-84 budget, there was a line item in that particular vote and it is not necessary for us to put it in this budget because we are hopeful that we will come to a successful conclusion of negotiations prior to the commencement of the 1984-85 year. As I indicated to him verbally, and I will be putting it in writing to him, as well, in reply to his written question, it would be our intention to table the terms and conditions of that agreement once we have come to a successful conclusion of negotiations.

I think it is safe to say that the government has put a high priority on this area. It is an area that we believe is of very much importance as far as Yukon is concerned.

I just want to add one other comment, as far as the Small Business Development Program is concerned: it would be my intention to consult with the business community on this program prior to bringing the necessary guidelines forward for the purposes of Cabinet consideration.

One concern I want to raise is the Small Business Loans Fund. The Government of Canada has had approximately \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 voted every year for the purpose of dollars being made available as a lending agency of last resort. Unfortunately, we have not been able to get those dollars available to the territorial government. We are still working on it. I have to say that I think it would be very beneficial to the territory if that program could be made available to small business in the territory. We will continue to work with the Government of Canada to look at methods of getting the fund transferred to us so that we could make those dollars operative — as opposed to a line item within the Government of Canada's budget, which really is not of much value to the taxpayers of the territory or, for that matter, Canada.

**Mr. McDonald:** My comments, I guess, will be limited to a series of questions. We certainly do agree with the minister that this is an extremely important department. The goals and direction of the department are certainly valuable and the policy initiatives regarding energy conservation we find laudible.

I do notice, of course, that there is an increase of \$1,230,000, of which \$1,000,000 of that is in three new programs: the Energy Supply Investigation Fund, the Energy Conservation Fund and the Small Business Development Program.

The minister mentioned that, in these cases, the policy guidelines had not yet been established and, for that reason, I believe that we should have some very serious questions placed before we wholeheartedly support such large expenditures. There certainly are a series of questions which should be answered prior to the expenditure of these funds. I am sure the minister is fully aware of the degree to which these capital funds are going to be labour

intensive, what businesses will be eligible, and what eligibility requirements there will be available under these programs for the successful application funds.

<sup>27</sup> I certainly have questions for each of those programs, but if the minister is going to postpone them until next spring, there really does not seem to be much point. It is about as useful to vote these funds in now as it is to watch the funds expended on Cabinet tours, or something of that sort. If we do not know the reasons why, or the details of these funds, then the whole exercise seems slightly meaningless. If the minister had any details for these programs that he could provide the House now, we would certainly appreciate hearing about them.

I have a couple of questions, as well, on some of these line items. I could, perhaps, ask them in general at this moment. The statistical data line item, which mentions the receiving and using of StatsCan information, has been dropped by \$18,000. It would be interesting to know why that has taken place.

The minister did mention briefly and he did suggest that the small business loans fund was not operating this time around because we did not anticipate receiving funding from the federal government. I wonder if the minister would mind expanding the reasons why we have not been able to successfully negotiate funds for that?

The final thing, I guess, would be a question for the minister. He mentioned in his preamble that we should recognize that there was a split in his department with intergovernmental relations going to the executive council office. Could he give us some sort of indication how we should see that split reflected in these figures? I would be interested in knowing about that. I am sure it would be useful information. I am sure I have given the minister a lot to comment on and I am eager to hear his replies.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** We felt that it was important that we identify the dollars that would be made available to the various programs for the purpose of voting, in the fall, what would come into effect in 1984-85. Subsequently, with the amount of dollars that we know are going to be allocated in these areas, it gives us a very good ability to say, within the parameters of these dollars, what should be the guidelines for the purpose of implementing a program. Therefore, that is why I told the House that I was prepared to table the guidelines, once they have been developed, at our next sitting. The department will be working over these various three programs for the next month-and-a-half to two months and, as I indicated in my opening remarks, I would be taking the appropriate documents to Cabinet for consideration.

I should point out that the three areas that we are speaking of are largely to support the private sector wherever we possibly can, as a support agency, as opposed to being the major proponent. I think it is a step in the right direction as far as the allocation of dollars are concerned.

As far as the statistical data is concerned, the reason there is a decrease in this area was because it was required when we did our first complete set of Statistics Canada publications; it went from 1970-82. Therefore, that is why it cost \$23,000 this current year. Next year, all we will require is an updating of that particular information and that is the reason for the decrease to \$5,300.

As far as the small business loans fund is concerned and the possible transfer thereof, it is a question mark in our mind. We have continuously brought it forward to the Government of Canada asking why they are not transferring this dormant amount of dollars that are voted in the Main Estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I understand that there may be some legal question. I would submit that it is probably more a case of opposition within the bureaucracy to make those dollars available.

<sup>28</sup> All I can do is make my own hypothesis on the situation. What I want to assure the House is that it is not because of us that the transfer is not taking place.

**Mr. McDonald:** I just have one more question for the time being, then I will turn it over to my colleague from Faro.

The minister suggested that the allocations for these three new programs — the \$200,000, \$300,000 and \$500,000 allocations — were necessary so that guidelines could be established according to the dollar amount in each of these programs. I am wondering if he

could expand just a little bit on why the minister felt the need to establish a dollar amount first before establishing the program guidelines.

In particular, perhaps the minister, in an illustrative manner, could suggest how the investigation fund is supposed to work. This seems to be quite interesting to me. I would be very much interested on what these funds in general, in more specific detail than the minister has already provided, are going to work.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** We could have waited until the spring to vote these particular dollars. We felt that we had to come forward and give an indication to you, as well as the general public, what our intentions were in the coming year. The reason I feel it is important that the amount of dollars be identified is so that we can tailor our program accordingly.

I say, for example, when we talk about the economic regional development agreement, we are initially talking about \$50,000,000 over a five-year period. Well, you can plan accordingly. You look to say how many sectors we can help over the course of that five years with the \$50,000,000 projected allocation of dollars. Well, we found to our regret, that we are probably looking at between \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000, as far as our economic regional development expansion program is concerned. If that comes to fruition, then obviously we have to cut our objectives and clearly delineate three or four areas as opposed to perhaps eight or 10 areas where we could have used the government monies that were available.

So that is the reason I have said that it is important that we identify the dollars. I can understand the member's concern that perhaps the guidelines are not here to be presented in concert with the budget, but as I indicated to him, we are in the process of developing it. We want to consult various people with respect to the development of guidelines to make sure we help as many small business people as we possibly can with respect to the small business development program. There are probably 10 or 15 or 20 alternatives that we could utilize for the purposes of implementing this particular program.

I have assured the House that I am going to table that information. We can debate it at that time, if you wish. I have no problem with that. The point is, I think there are a number of steps that have to be taken with respect to that. In the energy conservation fund, obviously, there is going to be a program set up to help the private homeowner wherever we possibly can. We are looking at a number of options there as well with respect to putting this program into effect.

The energy supply investigation fund is primarily for the government to look at these various alternative energy sources and contract with consultants, if necessary. It seems to be a necessary evil in the area of energy today that you have to do that. We really have not had the dollars available in the past and these dollars should be made available for that type of investigation.

So, I think it is very straightforward. I think that I have made enough of a commitment to the House that I will table the necessary information. For that matter, if they are developed prior to the sitting of the next House, I will send the member opposite copies of the guidelines that we have developed so that he can be fully abreast of it.

<sup>29</sup> **Mr. McDonald:** The minister's point is taken. I am sure that he is going to fulfill his commitment to provide the policy guidelines to this House; I think that would be the minimum commitment.

If I could just try to explain it briefly, the only thing that puzzles me is why we have come up with these figures, why we have \$200,000 or, one \$300,000, \$500,000? The dollar figure has already been given. Why is it that particular amount? Is it that particular amount because this is what was left over when everything else was done? Were there any sort of preliminary guidelines which sort of suggested that \$200,000 for an investigation fund was necessary or that, say, \$300,000 for a conservation fund seemed reasonable, given certain needs? Is there any good reason why these dollar figures have been given as opposed to any other dollar figures?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It was a question of dollars and the overall expenditure of funds that were available to the government. There

were very general proposals brought forward by the department with respect to these areas, as well as others. We said that economic development was going to be a high priority, as we have in the past, but even expend that many more dollars in that particular area. We felt that these dollars, to give us a guideline, should be allocated for these particular programs.

Now, as the member opposite knows, nothing is cast in stone. If we find, for example, over the course of the next year, that one program is very popular, then we may have to look at transferring some of the dollars. We have done that in the past. We are saying that these are three major objectives that we want to pursue, these are the dollar amounts that we have available over the course of this year to pursue these areas within the general economy of the territory, for the purpose of energy conservation, as well as to aid and abet the small business community and, therefore, we have outlined it as we have here presented it in the budget.

All I can say is that I have gone through the Votes and Proceedings and these are areas that the members opposite have talked at length on, through various debates over the course of the past three or four years. We have been doing our best to meet these because I think, from a non-partisan point of view, we tentatively agree that these are areas of concern to the general populace. One may argue how we get to the objective and whom we help through those objectives, and whether or not those dollars are being wisely expended. The point is that these are the dollars that we have available and I think it is in the best interest of the public that we delineate the amount of dollars that we have available so we do not raise expectations.

As I indicated, with the Economic Regional Development Agreement, our expectations were very high in this House. I can recall figures of \$50,000,000 being brought forward — this type of thing — and I am here to tell you today that, once we get discussing the bill — it is in first reading at the present time and I will be proceeding on to second reading in the near future — that we are going to have to bring our expectations down in this area. At least we have said, "Look, here are the dollars available and we are going to put programs into these areas".

**Mr. McDonald:** We will be looking forward to the policy guidelines and I thank the minister for expanding a little bit on my question.

I have one brief final question regarding Special ARDA. Is it the intention of the minister, especially in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture, to encourage applicants who may decide that they would like to enter into any sort of agricultural venture to come and use this fund?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would have to take notice on that question because I am not too sure how they could take advantage of that program.

It is my understanding — and I will have to double-check this — that our responsibility, really, in the Special ARDA agreement that we have, is to the native community of the territory. Now, if you will note, in the municipal estimates that have been tabled in the House, we have \$10,000 being requested to be voted for the purposes of getting some equipment for the government to aid us in going into the area of agriculture.

I cannot answer any more than that. I would have to check and see whether or not that particular program could apply to agriculture. I know that in the provinces it does, but I think there could be other subsidiary agreements. I am not sure on that.

**Mr. Byblow:** I thought the minister, moments earlier, said that he was going to be "aiding and abetting" some organizations. I am sure my colleague for Whitehorse South Centre may have something more to say on the criminal overtones of that reference but I am sure it was just a comment.

My colleague from Mayo raised a number of issues and I want to raise a couple more. Firstly, with respect to the departmental transfer of Intergovernmental Relations, the current budget identifies in the 1983-84 estimates \$1,700,000 as having been the line item. That figure appears to remain the same in the carry-over of that figure to this year's budget and my question would simply be: were any capital items carried over with Intergovernmental Relations when they left the department?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No. The capital expenditure program money that was made available was spent through the Economic Development side. The only reason I mentioned that was to clarify to the House that there was a split and make it very clear to everybody just exactly what the responsibility of Economic Development was, as far as personnel was concerned.

**Mr. Byblow:** Having cleared that away, I would make an observation that this department, while it has had a substantial increase this year in terms of the amount of money that is being spent in this branch, also happens to be one of the very few departments not to have had a supplementary during the course of the year. I suppose that is by virtue of there essentially being established programs about which nothing was changed during the course of the year. The minister can correct me. I think I said earlier that certainly we were quite pleased to see the initiatives in the energy area and particularly so in light of the rather distressing report from the NEB which does very little to provide any form of relief in this area.

I have a question, generally, on several of the programs, such as the conservation fund, the investigation fund and even the business development program, strictly from a budgeting point of view. Why are these not O&M items, as opposed to capital items? Certainly, the conservation fund is a program requiring personnel to go to do some investigative work. Why is that not an O&M project?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** There may be a requirement for certain person-years, if you like, to go on the O&M side of the budget that it will represent in 1984-85 but this is basically capital money; it is not necessarily ongoing. For example, for the small business development program, at the present time, we are estimating five years. At that time the government of the day may decide "look, we are going to totally revamp the delivery of this particular program". But, it is not an ongoing operation and maintenance cost similar to, for an example, to get down into pragmatic terms, the cost of running this particular legislature, which is an ongoing O&M cost.

In the energy supply investigation fund, we are looking at a number of areas that we can look at for alternative energy areas for doing certain studies, perhaps cost sharing with the private sector, if possible, with respect to looking at some areas of conservation, and this type of thing. It is not necessarily an ongoing dollar amount such as we would put in our operation and maintenance budget.

Also, at the same time, I think it is beneficial to have it on the capital side of our budget because if you put it in the operation and maintenance side, of course, then these are not direct federal dollars, if you like, through the capital side of our budget, which is really 100 percent funded by the Government of Canada in our general financial framework. As you recall, capital is the only real benefit that we have, if you want to call it a benefit, in that the government of Canada takes from us, and gives back to us, dollars for capital programs, as opposed to a province.

I guess that is the best way that I can explain the idea of the programs and meet general objectives. I thought the idea of the discussion today was looking at the objectives; are these the areas that the government should be going into and giving an indication of the dollar amounts that we, as a government, felt should be going into these areas for the purpose of developing the necessary policy guidelines.

I think there is another point that has to be raised here with the tabling of the budget in the fall, which is a relatively new procedure for government. I believe we have done it three or four years now and, therefore, identifying dollars for the purposes of planning and getting that type of thing out of the way so that we can implement it for 1984-85. That puts us six months in advance, as far as our dollar allocation, and leaves us the six months to do the necessary policy framework for implementation. There are pros and cons to either side. If it had been done in the old way, of course, we would be waiting for the spring to table this particular budget and then we would have had the policy guidelines to go along with it.

This way, I think it is a clear indicator to the general public. In some cases, where we are looking at a segment of our economy, such as the small business development program, it is clear



indicator to those people that this is an area that we intend to help in the forthcoming year and the policy guidelines will be announced well before April 1, so people can take advantage of whatever program we decide to go into.

**Mr. Byblow:** I do not think anyone is objecting to the presence of the Capital budget in the fall. I think we have all recognized the value of that, and particularly so with respect to the kinds of projects that require some planning in terms of construction. Contractors are certainly in a position to prepare for the kind of money that government is spending in terms of their work schedules.

The minister raised a point that perhaps could have been raised earlier in general debate on the overall budget, and that is with respect to establishing a line item on a project. He indicated that government did these line items on the basis of some projection that they have made in terms of their priorities and their policy, and the need to the Yukon general public, in terms of economic development. That is fine.

Let me propose this to the minister: if, for example, the small business development program, for which he has identified \$500,000, does not materialize, then, in effect, the government has the option of revoting that money without having to come back through the legislature. Essentially this is how it would happen. The program does not materialize. The money reverts to surplus. The surplus is spent and supplementaries are tabled. Perhaps the minister might want to clarify my thinking if there is anything wrong in that. I am simply proposing, from what he said, that an item can be voted, not spent and, in effect, revoted.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** You have just answered your question. In order to be revoted, it has to come before the legislature. It certainly is not done by management board. I would submit, with the new *Financial Administration Act* we have to have vote authority to go with what we intend to do financially. I harken back to our conversation with respect to the Yukon Hydro Corporation. Because we have a dollar vote and if we do not come to a conclusion of our negotiations prior to April 1, we will again need the necessary authority from this House. I am saying that we will have an agreement prior to that because we have every intention of proceeding with that particular area of concern. But we have the vote authority.

If we were to go into that agreement in a new year, then we would have to come back for line authority. It is called, as you determined earlier, a revote, if the money is not expended. But, if the money is not expended in the current year, of course it stays in the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund. And, if we use the dollars for something else within government, then we have to come forward with our supplementaries and justify it.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister is quite correct in most of what he has said. However, the point is simply this: if a line item identifies half a million dollars for something and that project never materializes, the money obviously becomes unspent and is essentially surplus. Through the course of the year, without having to come to this legislature, this government can expend that money and come back with a supp after the money is spent.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** You are entirely correct, as long as we deem it to be in the public interest and it is an emergency with respect to the allocation of those dollars, but we have to justify it to you if we go that route. We do not like to do that. That is why we are trying to find, wherever possible, the various lines items so that we have the vote authority to proceed with your approbation.

**Mr. Byblow:** I do not think that we disagree on much, but the minister took a long time to accept the point that the government can eliminate a line item and spend the money for a completely different purpose before it comes back to the House for approbation, as he says.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** But then we have to justify it.

**Mr. Byblow:** Yes, the government leader is quite correct, the government then has to justify that newly-voted expenditure. But my point is simply this: line items are simply what they can be called in terms of a budget. A budget is a projection, not necessarily how money will be spent.

In the same line of discussion, the minister made reference to

Yukon Hydro. Let me propose this: in the current fiscal year's budget, a \$1,000 line item was established for Yukon Hydro. Now, the government is currently in negotiations on that socialist plot and it is not telling us what amount of money that it may spend on that project. In the supplementary estimates that the government tabled last Thursday, there is a surplus in the capital budget of \$1,700,000. Would I be over-reaching my imagination if I were to assume that that surplus has something to do with the Yukon Hydro cost of acquisition?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No, I do not think that is a safe statement. We know that we are negotiating for this particular portion of this company. We have a ballpark figure on what dollars it would cost us and, of course, we cannot enter into any agreement unless we have dollars available to pay for whatever we are prepared to go into or enter into on behalf of the Government of the Yukon Territory.

So, I think it is safe to say that the member opposite will get his opportunity to debate that question when the time comes in this House. If we come to a successful conclusion of the negotiations, there will be a bill before the House for the purpose of voting dollars for this particular acquisition.

**Mr. Byblow:** Will the minister concede the point earlier that the acquisition of Yukon Hydro will, in fact, be money expended without an approbation, other than a single dollar item?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** You have already granted me the approbation in the vote authority you gave me of \$1,000. You agreed in principle with us, as a government, going into this particular area and we appreciate the support that we got from the other side.

**Mr. Byblow:** And the minister can carry on. We look forward to the final agreement and the effort of a public utility in the territory with government equity.

Anyway — and I think the Chairman wants to break for coffee — I do have several more general questions before we get into the line item. Would you wish me to quit?

**Mr. Chairman:** Maybe we should break for coffee now and come back.

#### *Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** I now call committee to order.

We will continue with general debate of economic development.

**Mr. Byblow:** My colleague from Mayo raised the subject of the small business development program and from my recollections, we have had, in the past, legislation tabled in the House. We have had a bill, reading and committee stage of such legislation. We have had motions respecting business development funding and, I believe, we have had many questions raised over the course of the last two or three years on the subject of the infamous \$5,000,000 sitting in Indian Affairs. Without any great detail, why have we not had this money transferred yet and how does this line item relate directly to it?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It just provides the authority to have the money transferred to us if it does come, say in the middle of next year in 1984-85. I cannot answer for the Government of Canada. It would be appropriate to put that question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We keep raising the question and they are saying they are looking at it, they are reviewing it. I, like you, have to ask how long do you look and review a question before a decision is made and a yes or no comes forward. We have not come to that point and to try to move the Government of Canada is darn near impossible, especially if the civil service at the federal level decides not to cooperate.

**Mr. Byblow:** Further to the queries from my colleague, is it the intention of this government to table similar legislation in the spring as the legislation that we have passed in this House in previous legislatures. I believe 1980 was a case in point, where we had a business development ordinance at the time passed.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** That is a decision that would have to be made. If the small business loan fund comes forward to us and we can put it under the present legislation that is in place — but has not been proclaimed, to my knowledge — I would assume that it would go under that particular legislation, but that remains to be seen. If there

is a change in direction, then it would require legislative changes in this House.

**Mr. Byblow:** On the subject of the GDA, currently under negotiation, I assume, can the minister say at this point whether or not any of the accelerated funding that came from the federal government this past year, and possibly even the \$25,000,000 relating Cyprus Anvil, has any impact at all on that GDA?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Not to my knowledge.

**Mr. Byblow:** The specific vote under Economic Development identifies the various energy programs: the loans fund and, I suppose, statistical data collection. There is a significant drop in the statistical data one, which perhaps the minister can answer later on the specific line item.

Now, in addition to the Yukon hydro project, is this government contemplating any other form of joint venture or direct economic initiative of its own?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I am assuming the question is for the purpose of power generation: no, not at the present time.

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps the minister did not completely understand. It was with respect to energy generation, but in a more general way, as well. Is the government contemplating any type of joint venture with respect to other resource development or other economic initiatives of a permanent or long term nature?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Not at the present time.

*On Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Agreement  
Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Agreement, in the amount of \$1,314,000, agreed to*

*On Special ARDA*

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps I did not hear correctly when my colleague was questioning the minister on this, but is this one category under which an agricultural incentive can take place?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** That is a question I said I would give notice on and bring the appropriate information back.

*Special ARDA, in the amount of \$638,000, agreed to*

*On Energy Supply Investigation Fund*

**Mr. Byblow:** When we are talking about a new program, and we are talking about the investigation of alternate energy sources, it becomes a matter of some significance that we are taking this initiative. I have said earlier that we welcome it from this side.

I would like to have some better idea of this three-year program and what sort of things we are really going to be looking at. Are we looking at some wind generating plants in certain areas of the territory? Are we looking at some thermal experiments? What is intended under this program?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I should point out that the program is going to be designed to investigate specific energy alternatives that would be advantageous to Yukon. One that comes to mind is the utilization of coal. It is for this type of thing. It will allow a reserve of dollars to be made available for the purpose of our investigation of the possibilities of alternate energy utilization. It enhances what we are already doing, in some part, with the Government of Canada under the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Agreement, as far as demonstration programs are concerned.

It allows us some flexibility as far as dollars are available, depending on the source of energy; looking at it very seriously, employing the necessary expertise to say "Is it viable or is it not? If it is, what is it going to cost", and this type of thing. So, I think it is essential for the department, as far as looking at and investigating, as opposed to implementing, per se, a program. That is the prime purpose of it and I will update the House this coming spring session if we have taken any definitive steps in this area.

**Mr. Byblow:** If I am reading what the minister is saying correctly, I am led to understand that this is not a cost-sharing program. This is going to be an opportunity for the individual Yukon resident to undertake alternate energy projects.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No, it is more for investigation and the government would be doing that with respect to employing the necessary expertise to look at alternative energy sources. We would have to look at the various areas and see just exactly what areas that we would want to take a very serious look at to see how beneficial it would be. It is that amount of dollars that we are requesting vote authority for, for the purpose of having it available when we deem

it necessary to invest those kind of dollars.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister has clarified what I did not know about the program. As I am understanding it, now what he is saying is that we have an investigation fund being set up under the administration of the Yukon government for alternate energy initiatives they will undertake by way of investigation.

*Energy Supply Investigation Fund in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to*

*On Energy Conservation Fund*

**Mr. Byblow:** Again, as with the previous line item, this line item is also new, and if I understand its purpose correctly, it would be to continue similar kinds of retrofit programs to the residential sector of the territory upon application and those guidelines will be made available to us by spring.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Correct.

*Energy Conservation Fund in the amount of \$300,000 agreed to  
On Small Business Development Program*

**Mr. Byblow:** The amount that the minister has identified as \$5,000,000 in that program, to my understanding, correlates with the amount in the Indian Affairs budget that we have been waiting to be transferred to the territory. Now, I guess the only problem I have is, if this government is intending to spend \$500,000 to set up this program and it has no bearing on that Indian Affairs line item, why would the minister want to directly connect the two?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think it is safe to say that we are connecting the two. It is a small business development program; it is not the small business loan fund identified later on in the budget with respect to the Government of Canada on the following pages. Basically, the dollars are identified for the purposes of identifying the amount of dollars that we are prepared, as I indicated earlier, to put forward, for the purposes of encouraging and helping small business within the territory. I indicated earlier that I would table the policy guidelines that would be put into effect to administer such a program.

*Small Business Development Program in the amount of \$500,000 agreed to*

*On Statistical Data*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I indicated earlier the reason for the difference between the \$23,000 and the \$5,000 is that \$23,000 was necessary because we were updating our statistics from 1972. I believe it was, until 1983. It was a very comprehensive look at Stats Canada and now the \$5,000 is required for an annual update.

*Statistical Data in the amount of \$5,000 agreed to*

*On Small Business Loans Fund*

**Mr. Byblow:** I recognize now my earlier confusion about the two programs because they are, in fact, quite distinct. I am wondering if the minister would not respond to the suggestion that by setting up the previous business development program, it may lessen the bartering strength to recover the federal government fund from Indian Affairs.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Well, I guess it is one way or the other. We have been waiting for this program transfer for the past three years. How long do we wait? I want to stress to the House, we still have not decided on policy guidelines whether it should be a loan or allocation of dollars for the purpose of grant applications similar to the tourist incentive program. All these options are available to us and we are going to have to sit down and decide which way we are going to implement such a program.

*Small Business Loans Fund in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to  
Department of Economic Development in the amount of \$2,958,000 agreed to*

*On Education, Recreation and Manpower*

**Mr. Chairman:** We now go to Education, Recreation and Manpower for \$2,261,000. Under Capital Estimates, turn to page 16. It is now open for general debate.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No doubt the member for Faro will be asking about setting priorities, and the major direction that the department is taking this year, and so on and so forth. I hope that I will be able to answer a few of his questions in the general debate with some comments I have to make comparing this budget with last year's capital budget.



Of course, when we were setting the priorities, we consulted with school committees and pursued various avenues as to what capital projects we were going to embark on this year, as well as input from the departmental staff. Most of our major new constructions were completed. For example, the Pelly School and the Porter Creek Junior Secondary School; the large amounts. Major renovations and expansions that we had last year were: Whitehorse Elementary, Christ the King High School and the Carcross expansion. We had to take a look at any continuation of those renovations or expansions. For example, if they were in the second or third phase of the expansion, as for example, the Whitehorse Elementary electrical upgrading. We had to identify that in this year's capital budget. It was a major expense at \$450,000.

And we identified any previous commitments we had made. For example, we are doing some renovations at Jack Hulland for the installation of permanent walls and carpeting; also, the G.A. Jeckel School renovations for the gymnasium and kitchen unit that had been previous commitments.

We also took a look at computer education. The department and the government, recognizing the age of high technology, determined that the introduction of computers through computer science and literacy courses was essential in the school system in Yukon. I believe microcomputers are considered an essential part of schooling today. We looked at identifying funds, which we did — quite a sizeable amount: \$267,000. The submission was just approved very recently and funding will come from our working capital for laboratory sets of microcomputers, for printers for those microcomputers and for the possibility of resource people to provide necessary professional development of the teachers in the teaching of computer literacy. I think the quality of computer-assisted instruction in Yukon schools will continually improve and our students will have the opportunity to acquire a computer education that is comparable to that available in other parts of Canada.

I, as the Minister of Education, had made a commitment to the school committees to visit the schools in Yukon, particularly the ones in the outlying areas, to have a look at their facilities. I did that in the first year of office. At that time, we identified two areas in particular — the Ross River and Teslin areas — that had industrial arts facilities but had a very large number of young men and women interested in that particular aspect of education. We found that their facilities really were not adequate to suit that interest, so we identified funding for expansion and upgrading to the industrial arts facilities in Ross River and in Teslin.

I also had an opportunity to look at the grounds and the general physical layouts of the schools across Yukon. Under special projects, we identified quite a bit of money and a large amount of money in this year's capital budget, as well, is for school ground improvements.

For school ground improvements, \$193,000 is identified this year.

We also took a look at Yukon College and advanced education, again. We looked at renovations. We had been successful in receiving some funding under the Skills Growth Fund, as I have indicated to the member for Faro in Question Period. We made a contribution, as a government, of \$92,000 for that and the majority of the money goes towards capital and O&M, some for the modernization and expansion of facilities and revision and development of courses. In course development costs, the federal government only contributed a very small portion of money; Yukon contributed 80 per cent of the course development costs.

So, without having the ability to proceed with a huge capital investment such as Yukon College or a campus facility, I am sure we are looking at an expenditure of probably over \$40,000,000 now. We had some architectural designs and planning done a few years ago that would have to be updated.

We looked at some major expenditures in the area of advanced education for equipment, for another portable classroom to attach to the annex, too, and for some renovations that will be taking place at Yukon College.

The capital budget is considerably less than last year, as the member for Faro indicated, by more than half. However, I think I have identified that in the statements that our major new construc-

tion has been completed. I want to caution the member not to forget about the special project money. We did get some extra funding for that, so that, in fact, was an enhancement to our present capital budget.

We did try to set priorities when we were identifying money for special projects, as well as when we identify money for the capital budgets. We look at not only what the department needs and what the requests from school committees and parents and departmental staff, principals, teachers have been, but we also look at projects that are labour intensive, yet do support the needs of the department. We were working under some objectives with special projects to keep our private sector going this winter and we wanted to give them some support, and such things as paving, ground work and painting and some minor renovations seemed to benefit all our needs.

I will be looking forward to some input from the Post-Secondary Education Advisory Council as to exactly where we will be putting our capital funding in post-secondary education, in the future, in Yukon. I also look forward to comments from the hon. members opposite.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think, in a very positive way, I want to compliment the minister for taking the time to address several of the concerns I gave by way of notice in earlier comments. I want to caution the minister that I have no intention of giving her a particularly hard time.

In her closing remarks just now, she identified something that is of some significance in budget planning, particularly with respect to education, and that is whether you spend the money on labour intensive efforts or capital intensive efforts. Unfortunately, it does not quite narrow down to that kind of black and white decision-making. You have to take into account many more complex factors in dealing with education.

I am pleased to hear that the minister visited most of the outlying communities and the schools.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** All.

**Mr. Byblow:** She corrects me to say "all", and I want to assure her that I am following in her tracks and so is the hon. member for Mayo.

However, I want to get into a couple of specifics. I raised with the minister, earlier, my intention to question the area of priorities with respect to training facilities. The capital budget, as already admitted, is considerably less this year — at least by half — in terms of its capital expenditure. That is understandable in light of the effort, I am sure, that the government made to make labour-intensive projects a priority over capital-intensive projects, as well as the simple fact that a number of facilities, as the minister said, have completed their expansion programs and this government was not prepared to do further expansion at this time.

On that note, I want to recall very specifically to the minister's attention one particular school. I think, perhaps, this is the way I will proceed: I have a number of specific questions, and I had best deal with them one-by-one. The question is with respect to Carcross. The minister will probably advise me that they are in the process of an expansion there now, and that is correct. I understand that there are a couple of classrooms and a library facility being added on and there is, I am sure, in the minister's opinion, adequate attention being given to the school facilities.

However, I have reason to believe that that is not quite so. The community has been lobbying long and hard for an improved facility and I want to hear from the minister what her intentions are now with respect to further expansion in that community. It does not have an industrial arts facility, it does not have a home economics facility. It has schooling up to Grade 9, it has a busing problem, it has a sense of neglect. With respect to school facilities and capital items, what is the intention of the government in that community?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Some time ago, when I was first Minister of Education — I believe I had been Minister of Education for about two or three weeks — we went out to Carcross to respond to some of the demands they were making. As I remember, they had some concerns about the facility, at the time, and were looking at expanding it; they had concerns about the busing, which were two-

or three-fold; they had concerns about the portable facilities there.

We addressed all those concerns. We increased the busing subsidy; we allowed children to receive the subsidy even though they were sick and not attending school; the subsidy was still paid. We looked at making plans for an expansion; we kept in constant consultation with the school committee. When it came to choose as to what would be involved in the expansion, we were not capable of meeting all their demands and the option or choice was given to them as to which they felt was a priority within the community and, as a school committee and as parents and teachers, which part of the expansion they wanted to pursue first. The school committee chose to have two additional classrooms and the library added on. It was their decision and their choice to make to take that, as opposed to the industrial arts and the home economics expansion.

At that time I told them that, in future years, we would look at another expansion, once this one was completed. Well, it is not complete and, as the parents asked me on the Cabinet tour, I told them we had not identified money in this capital budget for the industrial arts and home economics expansion; however, we were quite prepared to look at it for the subsequent year.

It was then that I found out that there was a new school committee. The school committee had resigned. After they had made the decision about the expansion they had resigned and we had not heard whether a new school committee had been elected or not.

As far as the busing problem goes, we pay a subsidy to the people in Carcross. We increased it a year and a half ago and we increased it again, just recently. I made the announcements in all of the communities that the bus subsidy has been increased again by 12 per cent.

"We are looking forward to meeting with the new Carcross School Committee. I understand they have a newly elected committee. I have spoken to them and they are coming into Whitehorse for the conference this weekend, November 3rd and 4th. I will be meeting with them and we will be addressing some of their concerns at that time.

**Mr. Byblow:** Given that the minister appears to be meeting with the new school committee, I will reserve further questioning at this time, until the minister has a first-hand, new experience from the community. I do want to say that that community has a tremendous feeling of neglect in educational facilities and certainly the minister's priority attention ought to be given to Carcross.

Before I do leave the topic, can the minister advise me at this time what the department's intention is with respect to the portables? There is some concern as to whether or not they are going to be used in any expansion of the industrial arts or home economics programing and I suppose there is some confusion as to whether or not they are, in fact, going to even be staying there, or perhaps used for adult education purposes, which is another need identified in the community.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Well, as far as the portables are concerned, we are still looking at exactly what we want to do with them. The consensus in Carcross seems to be that they were rather unsightly and they would like them removed. This is something we will be pursuing with the school committee; what they would like done with the portables. We will make that decision after we have met with them and everyone has had an opportunity to have some input.

I would like to make a couple of comments about expansion in Carcross. We are looking at 57 students there as opposed to Teslin, which has 83 and Ross River, which has 74. These are the areas where we are expanding industrial arts facilities. They are not quite up to the numbers of the other communities. However, we will address that issue when we discuss with the school committees when the expansion should carry on and, in fact, if the expansion should carry on in relation to their closeness to Whitehorse. I think I can tell the member from Faro that I think we have discussions well under control. The member for Hootalinqua relays the concerns of the people of Carcross to me at regular intervals. He is on top on the situation, so to speak, at all times, and the school committee is in touch with their MLA. I get various messages through the MLA from the school committee. I just want to make a

final comment and reassure the member from Faro that we have Carcross well in hand.

**Mr. Byblow:** I can reassure the minister that I will be pursuing the subject of Carcross as the winter carries on and perhaps several other communities in more detail as well.

Before I do leave Carcross, on the busing question, I do believe that the minister is aware that not only is the busing situation a problem relative to the transportation of students to Carcross, but there is some question with respect to the busing into Whitehorse, and I call to the attention of the minister that those students are traveling a distance of 50 miles one way, or 100 miles in a day. There was considerable concern expressed about that particular aspect of busing in addition to a couple more specifics that I will be raising with the minister privately.

Perhaps I could leave Carcross for the moment and just talk about the training programs, a priority that I identified earlier as one I will be raising with the minister.

"I believe the minister advised me that there was some \$92,000 identified for Yukon College upgrading and if that is a correct assumption, could the minister confirm it?

Perhaps before the simple question is left, I want to tell the minister that in regard to the Yukon College upgrading, in addition to the capital upgrading of facilities, there is the need, of course, for the programing end of things to be addressed. Now, I realize programing is not part of a capital budget as such, but they really have to go hand in hand any time that you are doing any planning of any budget. So perhaps the minister could, at the same time that she is confirming the expenditure of upgraded facilities at the college for training facilities, advise me as to the intentions of government with respect to monitoring the training needs of Yukon residents with respect to future placement for employment.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The skills growth fund is a government program that was set up, as a federal government program, and we made a submission in March of 1983. Under that program, funding is available for capital and O&M costs. The federal government contributes a sizeable amount to the capital; however, to course development they do not contribute a large amount of money. They contribute a very small portion. Under the terms of the agreement the government of Yukon is required to provide 80 percent of the cost development costs, and that is what the \$92,000 came under, which would be O&M money. That was for some modern training places and some new training places to be established: heavy equipment mechanic, electronic equipment technician, drafts-person, systems analyst training places. These training areas chosen for development under the funding is determined in consultation with CEIC and they have to be designated occupations or the federal government does not give us the funding for them. They have a system, the Canadian Occupational Projection System, COPS, which I have mentioned to the member before, under which they identify for all of Canada, designated occupations. In all their wisdom and knowledge they seem to be able to identify for every region occupations that they feel that particular region should pursue in their course development and in their college training programs.

We do not necessarily agree with the federal government and there are some studies that we are doing on our own, now that we have the manpower and planning branch of the advanced education of the Department of Education almost fully staffed and we have done some research in economic development. My colleague has some statistics in that area and some indication of possible future course development for Yukon territory. We have done this through all of the departments: Intergovernmental Affairs, Economic Development, and Advanced Education; in meetings with some of the corporations, Dome, Esso, Gulf, as to what Yukon's requirements are going to be in the future. However, without a commitment from these people as to what we are going to need in Yukon, as with the pipeline, we made a lot of predictions and they were saying that we were going to be needing particularly skilled individuals, however, the pipeline never materialized. So we are looking at it. It is very complex. We will be looking forward, as I said before, to input from the Post-Secondary Education Advisory Council, and we will continue to monitor requirements through the

COPS system — the projection system — for our particular region. The federal government has given us a commitment that that would be broken down for Yukon. They have never done that, so we have to sort through the statistics and try to apply them to Yukon and we will also continue to monitor it through out negotiations, through economic development with Dome, Esso and Gulf and other potential developers.

**Mr. Byblow:** I appreciate the minister's detail, respecting the identification of training needs and the programming that takes place in consultation with the federal government.

However, to the subject of facilities, I suppose the way to put the question best would be to ask the minister if any of these training programs materialize in the course of the next fiscal year, what is the capability of Yukon College to handle training programs that may become identified or designated and instituted here in the territory for Gulf, for Dome, for jobs in the Beaufort?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have contracted some specialists to give us some information as to the future of Yukon College and space where we could provide certain courses. As the member is probably aware, we have an annex at the F.H. Collins High School and we are going to be putting a portable — it has been identified under this budget — to put some more classrooms there and some washroom facilities.

We had some courses being taught in Selkirk Street School, I believe. When Grey Mountain Primary had their unfortunate accident, we moved the Adult Education Courses out of there in order to facilitate the children. They will be going back, I am assuming, after Grey Mountain Primary has been rehabilitated. So, we have adult classes scattered within the various schools in Whitehorse.

We are looking at some upgrading at the College itself, but I am sure the member can appreciate that the only place we have to expand there would be into the residence and then we would be looking at an accommodation problem for our students. So, it would be premature for me to announce exactly what our plans are right now, until we have our study completed and we can make a decision, as a government, as to what we are going to do for future needs in Yukon, whether we are going to pursue the idea of building a Yukon College or whether we are going to pursue the idea of putting these facilities in smaller areas within Whitehorse and doing some renovations or some reconstruction.

**Mr. Byblow:** Extending from the identification of training needs here in Yukon and having the facilities to be able to do the required training once you have the programs in place, is the question relating to adult upgrading and, specifically in the rural communities. I want to tell the minister that the mobile training unit — I believe the small engines mobile — has been highly complimented and, probably, there is some need for extending that kind of specialized programming to the rural communities. I do not see any identification of that here and the minister may want to respond to that.

On the same general subject, we have only three communities, I believe, that have community learning centres. I want to ask the minister if she has identified any capital upgrading in those communities or expanded that concept into other communities with facilities — not physical, as per building, but as per equipment and program requirements — that cost money, such as textbooks, such as supplies, such as technological equipment, which I will get into, as well, later?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We purchased another unit last year, a mobile unit, I believe they are referred to, for Yukon College. We wanted to get the two units working well. We have had some difficulty recruiting instructors because they find that they are spending a whole year in the communities and living in hotels, and it can be a rather difficult time for them. We hope that we will be able to continue to hire well-qualified, competent instructors to go to the communities. So, before we advance to more mobile units, we would like to get the two running smoothly that we do have.

<sup>42</sup> As for the Community Learning Centres, we have community learning centres in six communities: Watson Lake, Mayo, Carcross, Teslin, Dawson City and Whitehorse. We have over 100 students in total. The services are being decentralized from Yukon College to

be community-based. We hire coordinators locally and the learning centre operations are advised by local committees.

I think, in developing these community learning centres, we have put the emphasis on the recognition of the individuality of the different communities and it is a lengthy process developing community learning centres. We think we are doing fairly well with six communities having them. If we are to look at the decentralization of adult education in the future, it will certainly be through this avenue.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister anticipated this question and she can be pleased that I have only allowed ten minutes debate on it. The government leader made a reference earlier in his comments about a courthouse to my colleague for Whitehorse South Centre. He made the statement to the effect that there was a need for a vocational training centre of some sort, somewhere in Yukon. The minister has repeated that they are currently engaged in a study to identify exactly what type of facility that is going to be. I am wondering, given the previous debates in the House on the subject, whether any further consideration has been given to creating a satellite of vocational training outside Whitehorse in the rural communities?

As I said earlier, and my colleague for Mayo is in total harmony with me on this, the subject of a vocational training ground in Faro is still very much an alive issue and certainly in light of the current economic circumstance of things and the availability of those things that lend themselves to a good training environment. Well, the minister has heard my spiel before. Is there an updated response?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, I do not have an updated response. It is something that we are continuing to review and I will be looking forward to comments that our advisory council will have for us on the matter.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister does not want to debate. Dealing on the subject of an upgraded vocational facility and the ongoing study that is taking place with respect to the extent that Yukon College should change location, has the minister, at this point, a general figure of what has been spent to investigate the relocation, or expansion, of that \$40,000,000 facility?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, I do not. We have just embarked on the study to see where we are going to put our facilities that we have presently; which schools we are going to put them in. Also a study to show us what the adult educational needs of Yukon may be, facility-wise, depending on the numbers of programs that we presently have in place and looking at the courses that we are interested in expanding to in the next year or two.

I must say, we have a lot of programs. We have increased the courses at Yukon College tremendously. Last year, we made an identification about literacy courses. We made an identification to have more upgrading courses. The basic training for skill development courses, for those individuals who had not even reached an academic level where they would be eligible for Yukon College. We have utilized a lot of space with those programs. We are also looking at a lot of native training programs that we hope to be able to establish, as well as programs such as mineral sciences, technologists and so on. This study that we are having done should give us more insight as to what our immediate and our long term will be for Yukon in the advancement of post-secondary education.

As far as Yukon College, as opposed to a courthouse or a justice building, that is a decision that this government is going to have to make, as to whether they are prepared to commit the funds or not. The federal government had made a commitment at some time, I understand, for both facilities however we have not seen that materialize. When the federal government was approached last about a Yukon College, they did give some commitment that they were prepared to support us with the technical aspect of the expansion, however they would not have anything to do with the university courses or programs that we wished to pursue. So, we still have some discussions and some planning to do in that area.

**Mr. Byblow:** Given that the hon. member for Porter Creek East has already received an \$8,000,000 school, when he thought he was getting a \$3,000,000 one, I am sure he would have no objection to seeing poor neglected Faro receiving some occasional benefit.

<sup>43</sup> **Hon. Mr. Lang:** (inaudible)

**Mr. Byblow:** The member for Porter Creek is suggesting that I

speak to the press. That may be his line of thinking when speaking, but certainly not mine.

I do have another line of questioning. Perhaps you may want to adjourn, at this point.

**Mr. Chairman:** We shall now recess until 7:30.

*Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee to order. We will continue debate on the Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower.

**Mr. Byblow:** One more line of questioning I want to pursue with the minister is in the area of high-tech equipment. The minister identified, prior to the break, that there were some \$267,000 being spent in this budget towards the capital acquisition of those types of improvements.

Before I ask the minister where this is taking place and in what aspect it is taking place, and what type of high tech improvements are we engaged in, I want to say that it is certainly an area that we are getting a fair amount of feedback in that we are not moving quickly enough to keep up with ongoing developments either elsewhere in the country or even in other northern jurisdictions.

Certainly, with respect to the rural communities, the advent of some high tech equipment will help alleviate some of the deficiencies in education that rural schools feel that they have. Perhaps the minister could respond in two counts there. Where is the \$267,000 being spent, and to what extent are we moving quickly into the high tech field in our educational facilities.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I elaborated a little in my opening comments. The \$267,000 will be coming from our working capital; it is not identified in this Capital budget. I thought I made that clear when I said that we had just made the decision regarding the expenditure for the upgrading of the computer system in the Yukon schools. We will be starting the purchasing of computers as soon as possible.

We are going to be getting laboratory sets of microcomputers and printers for the computers. I believe it is one printer for every four computers. I do not have the whole detailed submission with me.

Also, we are going to have to be looking at a resource person to provide the necessary professional development of the teachers we have in our computer literacy and so on, because we have noticed that in some of the outlying areas particularly, the teachers do not have the qualifications nor the expertise to teach computer technology.

<sup>102</sup> We have to get the teachers to a standard where they will be able to communicate these computer literacy skills.

As to the distribution throughout the territory, I believe the rural areas will be getting a considerable number of computers and they will be evenly distributed all over the territory, so that all children will have the opportunity to utilize them. We certainly are not as flush here in Yukon as, say, a province like Alberta, which has just established a policy for computer education — I believe it is one computer per eight children. We certainly think that would be nice and very idealistic, but we just do not have the financial capability.

However, we are going to try to maintain a standard that will ensure that our children, as I said before, receive a comparable education to other places in Canada.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am certainly encouraged by what the minister is saying, albeit, perhaps, a little slower and a little later than maybe we ought to have moved, but hindsight is always an easy judge.

I want to confirm with the minister, though, that we are distributing the computers and the training into the rural areas. This decision that the minister refers to, having been made by Cabinet, I assume, lately, is a fair distribution outside of Whitehorse?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, that is correct, it will be a fair distribution.

We made the decision at some point when we were on the Cabinet tour, because I recall it was in a particular community where someone directed questions to me regarding computers. We had made the decision. We just had not established the whole program and made the identifications of where all the computers were going to go. We have a much better idea now that I can say and, hopefully, reassure the member for Faro that it will be a fair

and even distribution. Faro will get them.

**Mr. Byblow:** Cabinet tours are wonderful initiators of decisions and I am glad to hear it.

I would raise one more point on the subject of high tech developments and that is with respect to the Vocational School. I realize there is a Yukon College equipment line item later. Now, just for the moment I will just skip through it. Is a substantial part of that equipment in the high tech field?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I could go through the list when we come to that line item, if the member would prefer. I cannot say that a high number goes towards that kind of equipment, but a large portion of it does. It is going to be going for all kinds of technological equipment.

<sup>103</sup> **Mr. Byblow:** I have one last question relative to the use of high tech in the classroom. Can the minister say whether, in this decision that the government has made to move a little more quickly into the high tech field within education, it is the intention of this government to utilize computers and television concepts in the classroom in rural areas to help provide better balance to those areas?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, we are talking about computers. We are not talking about audio-visual or televised systems of education. I am assuming that the member is referring to a system of education that may replace teachers. I am not clear about what he is getting at.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am not talking about replacing a teacher. I am talking about complementing a teacher, and the use of audio-visual or Anik systems, or the use of imported specific programming, all transmitted into the classroom through modern technological means.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We find that teachers in the outlying areas do use audio-visual aids to complement their teaching methods. We have not looked at that concept and I do not think we will unless a request is made by school committees.

<sup>104</sup> **Mr. Chairman:** Is there any more general debate?

*On Miscellaneous School Equipment*

**Mr. Byblow:** Just for the sake of understanding, I would conclude that these replacement classroom custodial equipment relate to things like desks, shelving, other furniture as well as the normal line of custodial equipment pertaining to vacuum cleaners, shampooers and so on. Perhaps the minister could give us some general idea of what the \$180,000 is being spent on?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Most of the money is being spent on course equipment: audio visual equipment; special education; desks and chairs are a very small portion; typewriters; industrial education equipment; music equipment — this is particular course equipment; home economics; physical education; curriculum development, outdoor education; French language — that is equipment in the French language centre; some miscellaneous administrative equipment and custodial in very small amounts of money — \$25,000, \$17,000.

*Miscellaneous School Equipment in the amount of \$180,000 agreed to*

*On Public Schools - New Construction*

**Mr. Byblow:** I recall this past summer on one of the infamous Cabinet tours, that there was an announcement of \$100,000 for each of these two schools. I see this line item now showing up as \$400,000 for both schools, in effect doubling what was announced this spring. Could the minister clarify for me whether we are talking about the same amount of money, an additional amount of money, or is it my suspicion that the same money was announced a few times?

<sup>105</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** What a nasty inference to make; this is new money. The money that we announced was for design work and both of these facilities, the Ross River School and the Teslin School, have present industrial arts facilities. However, they are inadequate and we needed some architectural design as far as expansion was concerned and now we have to identify money to do that expansion.

**Mr. Byblow:** I will permit the minister to put into the record the suggestion of the government leader by standing up and asking for it.

The minister said that what was announced this summer — the \$200,000 announced this summer — was design, and what we have here now is construction. I would note for the record that the line item description calls for design and construction, \$400,000. If the minister would just clarify once and for all: the \$200,000 announced this summer is in addition to the \$400,000 announced here?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, it is. I hope, in view of the fact that the member's colleague who represents the Campbell riding is not here and both of these are in his constituency, he would not be looking for funds for an extension of an advanced education facility in Faro, as opposed to these expansions of the industrial arts facilities.

However, with the line item being for design and for the construction, when we looked at the design and we were looking at the renovations and expansions, we found that one of the facilities, the one in Ross River, involved a more complete extension and we needed some further design work. So, in order to keep everything on the up and up, we put it in the line item, as well, so that we would not find ourselves in a position of spending funds that we had not identified before.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am even more confused now by the minister. Let me put the question this way. In the design and construction of the Teslin and Ross River industrial arts facilities, are we planning to spend \$600,000?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes. What the member does not understand is, and I think I just tried to tell him, that we did the design work but we had many, many projects within this government that were requiring design work and so on. When the design work came in, we found that one of the facilities — the Ross River one — needed considerably more design work than we had anticipated because it needed a much larger extension. So, we had to identify, in the line item, more money for design work in view of the extensive work that had to be done.

**Mr. Byblow:** Well, given that it may be apparent that some money may be left over, would the minister consider an investigation of a design of a vocational school in another community?

**Some hon. Member:** Oh, you want to take it from Ross River? No. No.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I think that should be recorded for the hon. member for Campbell to read. I hardly think that I would be able to get away with spending money on something that was not identified in the Capital budget and I do not see any line item in this Capital budget for expansion of adult education facilities within the community of Faro.

**Mr. McDonald:** We understand that the \$200,000 was for design work and the construction stage is going to cost \$400,000. Is it a standard cost, for my own benefit, that the design work be 50 percent of the capital construction costs?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We identified in the special projects money, \$200,000, hopefully for construction and some design. So, some renovation has already taken place with that \$200,000. If I have misled the member in separating the two amounts of funding, I did not mean to do that. We looked at upgrading both facilities. We had to get some very quick costs on it for design work and for possible construction. When it came time to evaluate the design and the estimates for cost, we found that they were, in fact, going to be a lot more than what we had predicted. Therefore, we identified money in the Capital budget to complete the project.

**Mr. McDonald:** I have one brief question. For my benefit, can the minister just say, out of the \$600,000 costs, what the design for the two projects would be and what the capital construction costs would be?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The designing costs are usually approximately between six and 10 per cent of the total costs.

I do not have the exact figures in this case. If the member really wants to scrutinize these figures and he feels he is doing this on behalf of his colleague for Campbell, I can bring them back.

**Mr. McDonald:** On behalf of my colleague for Campbell, I will accept those figures when the minister is prepared to bring them to the House.

*Public Schools-New Construction in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to*

*On Grey Mountain Primary School Windows*  
*Grey Mountain Primary School Windows in the amount of \$10,000, agreed to*

*On Christ the King High School Expansion*

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister identifies this as the first portion of the three-year program. Is this entirely an interior renovation and upgrading of classrooms, or is there a capital equipment cost involved, as well? I raise this because we have seen escalated costs from what has been originally estimated many times in the past. Could the minister identify just what is constituted in the \$300,000 to be spent this year, in a general way, and elaborate on the entire \$2,000,000 cost?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** This renovation project has been taking place since 1981, in order to upgrade the physical plant. This is phase three of a three-part program, as it says in the line item in the budget.

An additional wing presently under construction will provide the additional classroom space and industrial education shop, washrooms and the shower rooms. Phase three involves the final renovations to part of the old portion of the old building in order to extend its life and bring it up to the standards of the other Whitehorse junior secondary facilities: this will be the third phase of the project. Completion of this project in three phases allows the work to be done with a minimum of disruption in the school programs.

*Christ the King High School Expansion, in the amount of \$300,000 agreed to*

*On Jack Hulland School Renovations*

*Jack Hulland School Renovations in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to*

*On Selkirk Street School Renovations*

*Selkirk Street School Renovations in the amount of \$26,000 agreed to*

*On G.A. Jeckell School Renovations*

**Mr. Byblow:** The reference to the kitchen unit; is that the home economics area?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, it is. That is an additional kitchen unit required so that the number of students working in each area can be reduced and that improves the efficiency of the home economics program.

*G.A. Jeckell School in the amount of \$11,000 agreed to*

*On Whitehorse Elementary School-Electrical Upgrading*

**Mr. Byblow:** I only wanted some detail on that upgrading. I would assume that it is an urgently required upgrading. It is also a substantial amount. Could we have a little more detail?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** This is for the upgrading of the electrical wiring and security system. The existing wiring is obsolete and it does not meet the current electrical code standards.

Several of the Whitehorse schools have been equipped with an electrical security system which has proven quite effective in the reduction of vandalism and theft. We are also going to be rewiring and updating the fire alarm system and the enunciator panels.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister made reference to a central control system for fire alarms. Am I to conclude that all schools are connected to a central fire alarm system?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes. This system requires updating to the current standards with enunciator panels. An enunciator panel is a panel within the school, at a strategic location. When the fire department comes into the school, the enunciator panel indicates where the fire is in that school. It is the same as they have in hospitals and other schools.

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps I did not understand correctly the first explanation. The schools are not centrally located to either this building or some other location, i.e. the fire hall?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, the fire hall.

**Mr. Byblow:** They are connected directly to the fire hall, on the fire alarm system?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, they are, as this building is.  
*Whitehorse Elementary School Electrical Upgrading in the amount of \$450,000 agreed to*

*On Watson Lake High School Flooring*

*Watson Lake High School Flooring in the amount of \$48,000*

agreed to

*On Robert Service School Laboratory*

*Robert Service School Laboratory in the amount of \$8,000 agreed to*

*On Eliza Van Bibber School Renovations*

**Mr. Byblow:** I recognize the amount is not much in comparison to the other line items, but why would the dust collector have to be relocated?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The location of the dust collector makes it extremely noisy when the machine is operating and it is somewhat distracting to any degree of instruction, so we are going to be relocating it.

**Mr. Byblow:** The agency that designed the system a short while ago is not being held responsible in any way?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The dust collector was placed unisolated in the instructional area in the industrial arts facility and they have found since that it is too noisy to facilitate adequate instruction, so we are going to move it.

*Eliza Van Bibber School Renovations in the amount of \$4,000 agreed to*

*On School Ground Improvements*

**Mr. Byblow:** Okay, where is it?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Everywhere.

This is for public school ground improvements all over Yukon. We do not have all the exact places, yet. Most of them are for track and sprinkler systems; playing fields; landscaping; playing fields for some of the elementary schools that have not had any work done since they have been built; walkways; some sprinkler systems; paving and some fencing.

**Mr. McDonald:** Are these school ground improvements concentrated in any particular area or do they include all the rural schools in Yukon, or what?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** They include all the schools. We have a rotation system, in conjunction with government services, at which time each school that has had no work done gets its turn. There are some at the junction and some in Whitehorse that have not been done yet; two schools that come to mind are Selkirk, which has not had any playgrounds for some time, and Teslin is lacking in adequate facilities, as well, and we are going to be doing some work there.

We identified some of these, like I said before, with the schedule and through demands from school committees. When I visited the schools, I tried to assess which schools could do with the upgrading before some others.

*On School Ground Improvements in the amount of \$193,000 agreed to*

*On Yukon College Equipment*

**Mr. Byblow:** I think the minister was going to do some generalizing as to the nature of the equipment.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have quite an extensive list. College administration equipment — we need some chairs, a cash register, dictaphones, convener, dial-a-tele-conferencing, word processors, plastic laminators, some instruction materials for the basic training for skill development. We are required to purchase quite a bit of equipment for the extra classes we were putting on.

As I indicated to the member last year, we had 200 and some students who required this course, so it did include quite an extensive amount of equipment.

Microscopes, bubble balancers, travelling crane for the welding course; the nursing assistant course needed a few high-low beds, and such things. Business education needed display writer stations, printers and dual work stations. These are for the word processors that the students are using. The additional stations will enable part time students to have access to the equipment.

Work desks for IBM display writer and printer — these are to house present computers that we have. Four Apple microcomputers with double disc drive and controller card plus Apple-3 monitor and stand. This is to expand the community services through increased access to the choices program. We are using the microcomputers for microcomputer familiarization, for the business application of computers, and so on, in the upgrading courses. More Gemini-10 printers with parallel cards, micro soft cards, IBM selectric

typewriters, typing tables, and so on. The rest of the list are miscellaneous things for some of the programs.

*Yukon College Equipment in the amount of \$325,000 agreed to*  
*On Yukon College Portable Classroom*

**Mr. Byblow:** The only point I would make here is to call to the attention of the minister again that the mobile units, the one established last year and the one the year previous, are obviously very popular items in the rural area as far as specialized intense training goes. Certainly the minister ought to consider further development of this type of training facility in the future. By way of this line item, recognizing that a portable classroom is what it is, I am wondering if any thought has been given to the day when that portable classroom will not be needed and could become a useful mobile unit or am I way off base?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I would never say that the member was "way off base", but I have a feeling he may be a bit off base.

The mobile units are quite a different entity than what we are describing here. This is just sort of an extension of a facility that we have here for classrooms only and they would not have the technical equipment in it that the mobile units do have.

I want to reassure the member that we are looking very closely at the mobile units but I was very serious also when I said we do have great difficulty recruiting instructors because they do find it rather uncomfortable when they have to go to communities for great lengths and they spend a lot of time teaching in those communities during the day, and full evenings as well. They are away from their families and they are living in hotel accommodations where meals are irregular and so on. We do have a lot to deal with with the mobile units and we are trying to make the program as efficient and as successful as we can. We have a tremendous demand for it and we are trying to meet that demand.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am sure that, if the minister has some problem with continuing the mobile unit program, perhaps she ought to consider a permanent facility in a community and therefore, the instructor would become a permanent resident of that community, thereby contributing to the economic base of the community. In any event, I think the minister understands what I am saying. We will have this item cleared now.

*Yukon College-Portable Classrooms in the amount of \$60,000 agreed to*

*On Yukon College Renovations*

**Mr. Byblow:** Aside from the natural improvements that take place in a renovation, is there any increased facility or efficiency or space created as a result of this?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, not really. This is mostly for new freezer units, which cost \$52,000. Our present units are very old and they no longer meet with the required health standards. We are also going to be improving the ventilating system in the kitchen and the cafeteria. The present system, again, is old and is not adequate for our use. The present system for the vacuum in the carpentry shop is also old and we are going to be updating that — it is a makeshift system that we have had. We are also going to replace some old window screens and curtains for \$15,000.

*Yukon College Renovations in the amount of \$146,000 agreed to*  
*Department of Education, Recreation and Manpower in the amount of \$2,261,000 agreed to*

*On Executive Council*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** This is for the replacement of some of the photography equipment that is used the Public Affairs Branch of the Department of the Executive Council Office.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am sure the government leader did not tell us that it was photography equipment for Cabinet glossies.

I would want to ask a serious question on whether or not the transfer of the intergovernmental relations created any capital requirements and, if so, obviously they are not anticipated to come into this next year.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not understand the question. If it had created capital requirements, they would be here. It is anticipated that this department will need \$1,000 of capital funds next year for the specific item of photography equipment for the Public Affairs



Branch. It has absolutely nothing to do with intergovernmental relations, at all.

*On Public Affairs Bureau - Equipment*

*Public Affairs Bureau - Equipment in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to*

*Executive Council Office in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to*

*On Government Services*

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** As all members are aware, by reading the departmental objectives of the Department of Government Services, this department is responsible for the supply and service of all other departments of government and all items listed are for the ongoing job of facilitating the requirements of the previously mentioned departments.

In this capital budget, 12 of the 18 items are directly related to the areas of computer services, which accounts for a large portion of the 1984-85 Capital budget.

I could list these items but it would only be repeated as we go through the budget, so I am now prepared to go through this item, item-by-item, if the members opposite wish.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think we understand the function of Government Services as it has changed in the last couple of years, so I would prefer to go into the line items and raise questions specifically with each vote.

**Mr. McDonald:** One line item that I do not identify here is one item that was included in the last budget. I cannot exactly recall the specific name; however, it had to do with renovations to buildings and small repairs. The closest thing in this current budget is miscellaneous building maintenance equipment. Now, as the minister is aware — we have discussed this on numerous occasions — there are problems being experienced with the Mayo Administration Building. I sent a letter to him on September 16 outlining 19 possible problems to be investigated. The most serious problem at the time, as I stated in my letter of September 16, and a previous letter of July 14, was that there were serious problems regarding the air circulation system in the cooling system in the summer. I mentioned in both letters, and I believe the minister may have received direction from his department, that quite frequently people had to leave the office building early on summer afternoons because of the stifling heat, complaining of headaches.

It became clear in investigations that some sort of renovations to the building would have to be conducted in order to relieve this one particular problem. I am wondering if the minister had planned to make that change this time around, and if so, where would be able to identify that in this budget?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** We have been looking into the problems identified by the member opposite, but those problems are part of the contract itself, and those are what are known as deficiencies. Those problems will be sorted out between the government and the contractors. Further to that, the other things he has mentioned are under the operating and maintenance budget, not under capital budget.

**Mr. McDonald:** So is the minister saying, that either the fact that the construction company had neglected to include an air conditioning system in the building was a mistake of the company, or that the inclusion of such a system would come under operation and maintenance in some way? Which choice?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** What I am saying is that a contract was awarded and there were specifications on that contract. The contractor who did the job, as we all know, defaulted and we went into a rather lengthy procedure to get the building completed, but it does not stop the person at the bonding company from completing the contract to the specifications set out for that building.

I understand that the problem being delineated here by the Member for Mayo is a problem with air conditioning and I believe that problem was being created by the fans not working properly in the summer time. That problem is being addressed and I believe we are also looking at putting mylar on the window to try to cut down the glare of the sun and reduce the heat inside the building.

If there is a further problem identified next summer, I am sure that I will look at installing an air conditioning system if the

building is not comfortable to work in.

**Mr. McDonald:** As the minister, I am sure, can appreciate, I am extremely interested, if at all possible, in finding some solution to this problem prior to next summer. As the minister was made aware a number of times, this situation was rather severe. As I understood it, during the summer, it was not that the fan system was not working, it was that the fan system was on automatic and was not turned on at optimum times during the day.

Even when it was turned on at optimum times, whichever department had demonstrated the greatest largesse would supply its employees with portable fans. That still, as was experienced by people at the end of the summer, was not considered to be adequate for their purposes. The problem essentially was that the circulation system within the building was blowing hot air from outside inside, overnight and during the day. The problem remained when the air circulation system was turned on and the problem was obviously exacerbated when the air circulation system was turned off. Nevertheless, it was still a problem in both situations.

Obviously, one question would be whether or not the government had investigated this problem to maximum advantage? Have they actually found out whether or not an air conditioning system would be necessary under the circumstances?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The problem was delineated to the end of the season. Hopefully the cure has been fixing the fan system so that it will move the proper amount of air through the building during the hot spells and hot times of the summer. If that is not the case, this government does not wish any of its employees to work in an uncomfortable or unsatisfactory working condition and we will alleviate the problem if it so arises next summer.

*On Furniture and Office Equipment*

**Mr. Byblow:** Again, because the amount has increased somewhat from last year, I would be curious if there is some major initiative in the acquisition of replacement furniture? And, to what extent are local suppliers used in the procurement of new and replacement furniture and office equipment?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The rationale behind the amount of this line item would be that, obviously, last year we had a decrease of 44 percent in our furniture. This year, because we did not purchase what would have been normal over a period of time, the amount will be greater to pick up that difference. We have historically had an average increase over the years of 23.6 percent. In order to come to this figure, the amount of \$95,000, which was approved for special projects last year, it was increased only 11.9 percent. To base the new requirements on this figure, plus a percentage for escalation of costs, is unrealistic. So, the request of the 1984-85 budget is based on the original amount, \$164,000, plus 15 percent.

To answer the other question about local purchasing: we attempt to purchase locally anything that we purchase, through government services.

**Mr. Byblow:** I believe I raised this with the previous minister, and it did not always hold true that tendering took place in the case of furniture. In the case of supplies, there is a listing made of government requirements which is sent around to a list of suppliers. What is the practice in the case of furniture? Certainly, with respect to furniture, it is conceivable to go outside the territory. I want to know what procedure this government follows?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The procedure is, as the member opposite has mentioned, that the furniture is tendered and we do buy locally.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am interested in furniture in the Cabinet office. Rumors went around some time ago about the cost of Mr. Pearson's new desk and Mr. Philipsen's desk. I have not seen any of them. In order to stop the rumors, would the minister give a complete answer, without any cross-examination, as to the costs of the Cabinet desks?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The rumors are exactly that, rumors. The cost of my desk, from my understanding, is \$1,200, and I would invite all members opposite to come up and gather around it and peruse it and stroke it and fondle it, at any time they wish to come and do so.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Would the minister also answer about the cost of the government leader's new desk.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Unfortunately, I would be unable to do that as that desk was purchased 13 years ago. Also, I would suggest that the members opposite may wish to go from my desk, where they were fondling it, and go fondle the government leader's — that would be in order, too.

*Furniture and Office Equipment in the amount of \$190,000 agreed to*

*On Pooled Road Equipment*

**Mr. McDonald:** My friendly colleague for Faro wants to get through this line item very quickly. This represents an increase of \$275,000. I wonder if the minister would just care to give an explanation of that?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Certainly. I would be happy to.

The item that we have here, to explain it in its entirety, would be to tell you that the central pool operates a fleet of 157 vehicles. Government vehicle replacement is based on mileage and condition. The units are evaluated at 100,000 kilometres and when, if the unit is in unsuitable condition, it is relegated from highways to commuter use. At 160,000 kilometres, again dependent on condition, units are written off and replaced.

This is approximately 12 percent of the total fleet, so that the total conversion of the pool occurs over an eight year period. If you are interested in what is required for this year, I would be happy to give you that.

**Mr. McDonald:** The only reason I am asking is that the 1982-83 estimates were \$180,000, the 1983-84 estimates \$125,000, and now we are, at least, \$200,000 greater than what we normally do here. That is the reason for the question.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** As I have explained, this is the system that we use to replace these vehicles and, I believe, last year the system was bypassed slightly because we were trying to save money. This puts us in a position where we have to replace probably double the number of vehicles that we would have had to replace had we been able to replace some last year, as well as this year.

**Mr. Byblow:** As I recall a discussion previously on this, there was an attempt by government to reduce the number of cars in the fleet. If we are talking about a different road, if we are talking about a different pool, perhaps I could have this clarified.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** We did that in 1981 and last year. These vehicles came from public works into this department.

14 H10

*Pooled Road Equipment in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to*  
*On Computer Equipment*

*Computer Equipment in the amount of \$1,131,000 agreed to*  
*On Word Processing Equipment*

*Word Processing Equipment in the amount of \$245,000 agreed to*  
*On Queen's Printer Equipment*

*Queen's Printer Equipment in the amount of \$20,000 agreed to*  
*On Pre-Engineering-Public Works*

**Mr. Byblow:** Given the accuracy of the accompanying description for the line item, I would be curious if the government has at this time any known specific public works projects that it is going to be doing some pre-engineering or pre-design work on?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** This is a line item that we need to be held here for projects that will be identified during the coming year by various departments as the year goes on.

**Mr. Byblow:** Can the minister say if it is his department that is doing the monitoring or investigation surrounding the Dawson Sewer and Water project?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** No, it is not.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is it his department that is doing the continuing monitoring of the Faro School foundation?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** That is correct.

*Pre-Engineering-Public Works in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to*

*On Custodial Equipment*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What equipment is included? If we could get a list, it would help.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Vacuum cleaners.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I would like to thank the member for Whitehorse South Centre. I truly understood that question.

Some of the equipment that we would be replacing would be vacuums, floor scrubbers, polishers and carpet shampooers.

*Custodial Equipment in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to*  
*On Miscellaneous Building Maintenance Equipment*

**Mr. McDonald:** I, too, do not want to make the minister feel as if he is being put on trial, but I would like to return one more time to the Mayo Administration Building.

There are obviously some design problems which cannot be shunted onto the responsibility of the contractor, whether he survived the construction stage or not. One of those is a light standard out in front of the Mayo Administration Building which, because it was inconveniently located, is broken and bent already. I am wondering if that and, perhaps, some other design problem — lighting on the public stairwell in the same building — are going to be included under this line item or any other line item in this department?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The member for Mayo, I believe, is quite well aware of the fact that a member of the Department of Government Services has gone to Mayo and has solicited a list of deficiencies in that building. Those deficiencies will be cleared up.

If anything needs to be changed, any lights outside or any lights inside, that will definitely come under operation and maintenance.

**Mr. McDonald:** I am not speaking specifically of changing light bulbs; I am speaking of something that could be considered design problems and which would cost more than just the simple screwing in of light bulbs, one being the fact that light in the public stairwell is inadequate. It would require more than just standard maintenance to improve that situation. When the minister and some members of Cabinet were in Mayo, they received the same complaint. I am wondering if he is considering, in the very near future, rectifying this problem?

The reason why I am being rather sticky about this, is that this whole issue and numerous other issues, as the minister knows, has been on the burner for a very, very long time. By that, I mean in the last four or five months. Many of them may seem to be very trivial irritants but, nevertheless, they are irritants to the people of Mayo and I am here to represent those people. I would like to hear, if at all possible, that we are going to get some satisfaction on these numerous complaints.

In all due respect, listening for the umpteenth time in this House that something is going to be done down the road is just not going to make the grade, in my opinion. I would like to see if we can get some serious commitments from the government to handle what are admittedly trivial problems to someone who is living in Whitehorse, but which are rather serious, at the same time, to the people who use this building on a daily basis.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order please.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I am sure I will see that the Member for Mayo has his speech recorded in *Hansard*. I have said here this evening that we have a list; we have sent a gentleman up there; they have studied the problem; they have taken the list; it is the same list that the member for Mayo is speaking about. I do not need to be reminded of that list two or three times over. I am quite capable of understanding. We will be fixing that building to the standards that were supposed to be the standards in the specifications. If there are problems beyond the problems that are listed in the specifications that we need to fix, we will fix those problems also.

If you wish me to strap on a tool belt and go up there, I am sorry. I cannot do it.

*Miscellaneous Building Maintenance Equipment in the amount of \$6,000 agreed to*

*On Scissor Lift*

*Scissor Lift in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to*

**Mr. Penikett:** Just before you clear this item finally, since the minister himself has indirectly raised the problem of design faults, in his response to my friend from Mayo; a problem which the minister will know is not unique to a particular building in Mayo, or even unusual in connection with a number of the large capital projects that have gone on with the government.

I want to pursue this matter of capital project design or large building design, if you like, for a moment.

In the newspaper recently, I saw two advertisements. I am just



having another colleague of mine go to check the files — but one was for I think a design engineer, and the other one was for a different kind of engineer, or perhaps someone involved for the construction of projects and buildings. I was not sure if these were new positions, but reading the job descriptions of them, and the requirements for these positions in the government, which I could well understand, I was curious as to whether or not this government had ever considered the wisdom of taking onto its staff, perhaps, the skills of more than an engineer; perhaps an architect.

It occurred to me that the building program of the government is sufficiently great now and the need sufficiently great from an economic development point of view to incorporate other factors of designs than those elements which can simply be handled by engineers. In other words, the broader conceptual kind of sense that an architect has but an engineer will not. Whether this is not an opportune time to be considering it, especially as the capital program will, of necessity, if the territory grows, increase.

I make a couple of points about this. One, most communities where the economy is imperiled and quite leaky like ours, will have a natural desire to make a maximum use of local materials in buildings, for example, mineral materials or timber materials or whatever. They will also want to make maximum use of local skills.

An engineer is probably very good at adapting designs and plans from other places and other environments. It is fairly easy to do. Design engineers can do that, but I think it probably does take the skills of an architect to be able to recognize the distinctive qualities of this environment and to recognize that there are perhaps unique building materials here that may be adapted and may be used locally.

Because of the smallness of our communities, such skills may not always be available in the private sector among architects, and there might be some value — and I would ask the government if it has ever considered that there might be some value, at some point — in having this kind of talent and ability in-house, rather than concentrating on, and depending on, engineers to provide design services which, frankly, they are not professionally equipped to give.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The jobs that were in the paper that you noticed were short contracts in March that were put into place to help facilitate the approximately 220 contracts that were let in the past few months.

I do thank the leader of the opposition for his suggestion on the architect. It is a suggestion that members of this side of the House have been looking at in recent discussions.

<sup>16</sup> If it is possible to go ahead with this type of a proposal, I know now that it will be viewed happily by the members on the opposite side of the House.

*Department of Government Services in the amount of \$2,122,000 agreed to*

**Mr. Chairman:** We shall now take a short recess.

*Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** Committee will come to order.

*On Department of Health and Human Resources*

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** This is another item that I believe we would probably prefer to go through line item by line item. This is a very short capital budget this year. We have furniture and equipment, renovations, a young offenders facility and northern health services.

One thing that I would like to mention is the comment that was quoted in the newspaper the other day about this being a small budget compared to last year. The capital expenditure last year on Macauley Lodge, which is being done now, and obviously, without that type of a capital expenditure, the amount asked for this year shows a marked decrease that does not in any way reflect on the services provided or the health care that is being provided for the citizens of Yukon, and I would like that on the record.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** In general debate, one question only and it is

about an item or a project that is not here. Is there any consideration, in the area of the family court; that is, for wardships and possibly even adoptions, and the juvenile court. Is there any consideration for renovating some other place than the present locale in the federal building?

I mention it for several reasons. First of all, the juvenile court is now conducted in the federal building at night and it requires a separate doorman to open and close the door. The facility is very much alien to the atmosphere of juvenile courts and also family courts and I wonder if any initiative is planned to renovate a room suitable for wardships and juvenile court matters in this department?

I would also recommend that, if it occurred, that if a room was allocated and it was an appropriate room, that the social assistance appeal committee also use the same facilities.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I thank the member opposite for his concern in this regard. We, obviously, have not addressed this problem in this capital summary. I believe that this is an area that we would probably be looking at under the young offenders facilities, when the discussion of the *Young Offenders Act* is towards its conclusion. I believe that is the area where we would be looking at it.

<sup>17</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** I would ask, in the Youth Services Assessment Centre, is the containment room now used? I understand there is a bare locked room that is occasionally used. Is that presently in existence? Is it a policy to use that particular facility?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I am sorry. I am unable to answer that question. It is not an area that I have had any dealing with at this point in time, but I would be happy to bring that information back to the member for Whitehorse South Centre.

*On Furniture and Equipment*

*Furniture and Equipment in the amount of \$120,000 agreed to*  
*On Renovations*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Which of the group homes and lodges is that going to?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The renovations that we are discussing under this line item are for window replacement in the Liard Group Home and the Whitehorse Receiving Home for a total of \$7,000. Landscaping McDonald Lodge, Lowe Street and Watson Lake Group Homes; Whitehorse Receiving Home, Detox Centre and Fifth Avenue Residence for \$11,000, and to construct a small cabin at Annie Lake base camp for the use of Youth Services in the provision of wilderness programming for its residents for \$12,000. That is a total of \$30,000.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am interested in the Youth Services matter. Is this a new facility for a new program?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Yes, that is what it is.

Mr. Chairman, I have to admit this was not a problem of not understanding the question; it was a problem of not listening properly.

The base camp is a new construction and the program is an old program.

*Renovations in the amount of \$30,000 agreed to*

*On Young Offenders Facility*

*Young Offenders Facility in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to*  
*On Northern Health Services - Equipment and Construction*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is any of this going to Beaver Creek?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** It is a little bit difficult to answer. I do not believe any of this money is going to Beaver Creek, but money is identified for Beaver Creek for the setting-up of a health facility in the Beaver Creek area. A location is being turned over to us. The equipment has been purchased and is on the way to that location.

*Northern Health Services - Equipment and Construction in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to*

<sup>18</sup> *Department of Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$301,000 agreed to*

*On Department of Highways and Transportation*

**Mr. Chairman:** We shall now go to Highways and Transportation, page 36 in your Capital Estimates.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Two thrusts of the department are being maintained: firstly, the continued program to improve the Yukon's

highways and infrastructure; secondly, the continuation of the government's support for the construction industry in Yukon by the contracts that they give out.

This year, we are expending approximately \$1,115,000 to cover essential items in the development of the replacement of departmental infrastructure and the balance is going to highway reconstruction and construction. I will be happy to deal with any of the specific areas as we go through them.

**Mr. McDonald:** For my information, is there anywhere in this budget, the expenditure of monies to relocate the highway camp in Mayo outside the LID boundary?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Not specifically in this budget but, yes, that highway garage will be moved next spring as soon as weather permits.

#### *On Sundry Equipment*

*Sundry Equipment in the amount of \$250,000 agreed On Miscellaneous and Minor Projects*

*Miscellaneous and Minor Projects in the amount of \$25,000 agreed to*

#### *On Pre-Engineering-Highways*

**Mr. Byblow:** This, in conjunction with the actual expenditure of highways improvements monies, sort of identifies the priorities and thrust, as the minister indicates. Specifically, on this line item, with respect to the reference to future highway projects, besides the Klondike Highway, where is the emphasis on road construction intended during the coming year?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As the members across the floor knows, we are presently working on the Klondike Highway. We are also going to, as you will notice further on, be doing some work on the South Canol; some drainage. But the Klondike Highway has been the main thrust of this government with regard to highway construction. We are doing the work on the Alaska Highway, as well, under the Engineering Services Agreement. We are also doing the engineering for that. Then, we also do all of the work for the Dempster Highway or other projects for the federal government. We actually manage the projects, but the federal government actually does the engineering and the rest of the work.

Our main thrust is on the Klondike Highway and various other projects, such as the Sixty Mile Road or the Campbell Highway; anywhere except the Dempster Highway or the North Canol.

**Mr. Byblow:** Very specifically, the minister has been made aware, and I believe it is within his riding, of a deficiency on the Campbell Highway in the area of Carmacks, for a distance of approximately 20 miles.

I know the minister is aware of it and I know that he has responded that, at the earliest opportunity, his department will resurface that portion of the road which is, in wet weather, a particularly hazardous stretch of road. I am curious if the minister has been able to determine the cause of that deficiency. Certainly, at any time that a road is upgraded or resurfaced, as the Campbell Highway was about a year ago, one would expect that the type of surface material has passed some kind of engineering inspection and tests to meet specifications.

Somewhere here something went terribly wrong and we have not only a hazardous, unsafe condition on the road, but a tremendous cost, as well. Fortunately, I do not believe we have had more than some minor injuries but it could have been much more serious.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Number 1, that project was O&M. That is road maintenance; it was not capital construction. The material that was used on that road was used for at least close to 20 years out of this same pit. That material has been excellent material, up until this year. It was very unfortunate that we did about 35 miles using that material. There was a change in the material and no one seems to know why. It was not checked by a soils engineer because it had always been good in the past. There was another problem and that is that there was not as much traffic on the road as there was in previous years and when it got wet this year — and all members in the House know that we got rain almost every day this year — but it never had enough traffic on it, especially on the Campbell Highway, to actually compact it so it would last for any period of time before the rain would get it again and it would turn into slop.

It was not totally wasted. Members across the floor should not think it was all wasted because it is still on the road; all we have to do is add some more material to it in order to tighten it up and make it stay on the road without it turning into slop.

**Mr. Byblow:** I hope the minister is correct that it is not all wasted, because a good amount of it has been graded off and is currently sitting in ridges along the edge of the road, but that is not the point I wish to debate.

I have another general question relating to priorities and planning. The minister already identified the Klondike Highway as a priority highway for continuing upgrading and I would imagine that that is a conscious decision based on an economic need related to tourism and traffic volumes, and so on. He has also indicated that there are some priorities associated with the federal initiatives on the Dempster: I assume the Carcross Highway, I assume the Sixty Mile. Besides those priorities, what other highways does this government take into priority consideration for upgrading?

**Some Member:** Stokes Point.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We are doing some work on the Campbell Highway, but it is not a major priority. As the members will note further on, there is the Ketz River Bridge. There is some work on the Campbell Highway, but our major priority is actually the Klondike Highway and the Alaska Highway. Other than that, we have done some work on mining roads: the Hunker-Granville Loop, the Freegold Road. We will, in the future, put some more money into the various roads. We are now getting into the maintenance of all of the roads, such as the cottage lot subdivisions, which are also being done by the Department of Highways. If you are trying to find out if we are going to build a new road in the territory, we do not have any commitment to build a new road at this time.

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps one closing question for the minister: again, on the business of priorities and planning. We have talked at some length in the past about the business of planning long term road construction, and it was based on the principle that a road wears out after a given period of time and you have to build into your budgeting the need to replace or upgrade that portion of road. We, I believe, are in general agreement that a five-year plan is probably not enough upon which to build future road planning. We have to look at a much longer term than that.

With regard to long term planning, could I ask the minister how successful he feels he can be in the next year or two in putting into place a longer-term planning period so that road priority, maintenance and upgrading can be addressed without the kind of crisis emergency patch-up repair that has sometimes been the case?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member across the floor is vastly mistaken if he does not think that we have a road maintenance plan. We actually have an ongoing plan that is a great deal more than five years; it is a continuous plan. It is called the Jorgensen System and what it means is that every year so much money is spent on road maintenance and then, every few years, depending on the traffic levels, you upgrade the road, and that is exactly what is happening with the Klondike Highway right now. We are upgrading the road to a certain level. When the traffic becomes even heavier, the road will be upgraded to a better standard.

There is an ongoing, continuous program of upgrading the roads and that is what we are on right now. We are on the Jorgensen System. We have all of our roads on that system right now and that is what we are doing. Actually, the money that we are expending on the upgrading of the Klondike Highway right now is all part of that system.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am familiar, to some extent, with the Jorgensen System. The minister talks about a continuous plan and I want to know in what timeframe he is talking. Is it, in fact, a known quantity of expenditure now, today, that will have to be spent five years from now, given factors remaining constant?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, it is all predicated on the traffic level on the highway. Whatever traffic level there is on the highway increases the demand for road upgrading or reconstruction.

**Mr. Byblow:** So what the minister is saying, then, is that at any given time, when there is an increase in traffic volume, this government is capable of responding quickly enough to meet that increased traffic flow, should the road start to deteriorate faster than

normal.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, recognizing that roads do not deteriorate over a six month period, or even a year. It takes two or three years of below normal maintenance before a road actually starts to deteriorate and that is ample time for us to get to the reconstruction, or whatever, in our planning process.

*Pre-engineering Highways in the amount of \$160,000 agreed to On Parts Warehouse-Central Workshop*

*Parts Warehouse-Central Workshop in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to*

*Maintenance Camp Facilities*

**Mr. McDonald:** I wonder if the minister could just explain what major projects might be included under the maintenance camp facilities?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** These are projects such as re-insulation, and exhaust systems and garages, areas such as that, and yes, it also includes Mayo. We are also doing a location study to move Mule Creek Camp 75 miles to a better location on the Haines Road. Because of the upgrading of the Haines Road now, it is felt that the Mule Creek Camp — 75 Mile Camp — is probably in the wrong location and we are looking at moving that camp. The camp is also not up to par and, rather than reconstructing that camp, we feel that we should consider moving it and putting it in whatever location would be most beneficial to us in the future. All of that is included in this money.

*Maintenance Camp Facilities in the amount of \$480,000 agreed to*

*On VHF Radio System*

*VHF Radio System in the amount of \$85,000 agreed to*

*On South Canol Road Drainage Replacement*

*South Canol Road Drainage Replacement in the amount of \$700,000 agreed to*

*On Klondike Highway*

**Mr. McDonald:** Briefly, can the minister say whether any of this expenditure is recoverable?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, this is not recoverable.

*Klondike Highway in the amount of \$3,150,000 agreed to*

*On Other Roads-Recreation and Mineral Access*

**Mr. McDonald:** Firstly, can the minister say what amount of the earlier \$500,000 has been spent; and, secondly, regarding the current 1984-85 estimates of \$500,000, what areas of concentration is the government planning to stress in building, say, mineral roads in particular?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This is an ongoing project, so the member should not concern himself about the \$500,000 that has already been allocated. It will be spent. It is spent on roads such as the upgrading of the road into the cottage lot subdivision at Tagish; it is spent on upgrading roads as the Hunker Creek that we did this year, the Mount Nanson Road and the Freegold Road that we worked on this year and the Williams Creek Road. It is used for mineral access roads and for cottage lots and various roads like that. We also did a work on the road into the Pelly Farm. It will be used for various roads in the territory. I do not have the details of exactly which roads we will be working on this year. I can tell you that we are looking at for some upgrading for one down in the 710 area, where there is a potential mine or two going to be developed. We will be looking at that and we will be looking at areas such as the Annie Lake Road, perhaps. I am not sure if that is on our schedule for this year. But, for any mineral access roads or cottage lots roads that are not on our regular schedule of roads, the money comes out of this budget.

**Mr. McDonald:** Is the minister saying, then, that these roads around the territory — miscellaneous roads in a sense — are done on a rotational basis, depending on road wear and tear?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Not necessarily, it is also dependent upon demand. If there is a heavy demand in certain areas — it could be a placer mining area — we will spend the money there. For example, this year, because of the nearness of the road into the Tagish Lot subdivision and the safety factor there, we widened the road. That is the type of thing that we will be doing.

This coming year we will also be doing some work on the road at Judas Creek. We will have to do some upgrading on that road this

year. It is wherever or whatever comes up that is not on our regular schedule of roads.

*Other Roads-Recreation and Mineral Access in the amount of \$500,000 agreed to*

*On Stewart Highway Junction Weigh Scale*

*Stewart Highway Junction Weigh Scale in the amount of \$15,000 agreed to*

*On Ketza River Bridge No. 4*

*Ketza River Bridge No. 4 in the amount of \$230,000 agreed to*

*Department of Highways and Public Works in the amount of \$5,695,000 agreed to*

*On Department of Justice*

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I rise today for the Minister of Justice, who is away at the present time. Fortunately, the line items in justice are very easy to understand and there should be very little question on it, I believe.

The corrections equipment is an ongoing replacement of miscellaneous equipment for the correction facility and the territorial court equipment is the ongoing cost of replacing recording and transcribing equipment for the court.

**Mrs. Joe:** I just have a couple of comments to make. My colleague has already spoken on the absence of facilities for juvenile court and that is a real problem. I was wondering if the minister or government leader would be able to let us know if there are any future plans to improve upon those facilities.

I remember two years ago, they were in the courtrooms and they were looking around for a room that they could use for juvenile court, and also a place where you could have a waiting room, because when juveniles go to court they are not listed on a docket, and very often they would not want their names to be known because that is the way it is supposed to be. But there was nowhere for those juveniles to wait, so naturally everybody knew who was going to court.

There was a small plan at that time to upgrade the court facilities for juveniles, and I wondered if there was any plan in the near future to do something about that. With regard to the court registry, studies have shown very clearly that there are unacceptable and very, very poor working conditions in those areas. I think that the government has spent considerable money to move around other departments to larger facilities and they have made those places better places to work. I wondered if we might have some indication as to what and when they were going to be doing anything else to the courtroom facilities with regard to adult court and juvenile court and family court?

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I thank the member for Whitehorse North for the point she has brought up. It is my understanding though that juvenile court takes precedence over all other matters, other than those of a person who is incarcerated and waiting trial to see whether they will go to jail or not, and — I see him shaking his head — I believe it is absolutely the case. The justice system is being looked at, presently.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If only we had \$20 million to build a new courthouse this summer.

**Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Yes.

There are two areas where this will be addressed. One will be through the *Young Offenders Act* and the implementation of it. The other would be if we came to the position where we were indeed going to build a new justice centre.

**Mrs. Joe:** There was some rumour a while ago that the courtroom facilities were going to be upgraded in another part of Whitehorse, in another building, and I just wondered if the minister might be able to let us know if there are any plans to do something like that. As a matter of fact, the Lynn Building was the building that was rumoured.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure if the member for Whitehorse North Centre was in the House when I had a rather long discussion with the member for Whitehorse South Centre about the possibilities of a new justice building in Whitehorse some time in the near future. I want to say to her, though, that we recognize the inadequacies of the court facilities in the Federal Building and we

have been very much distressed by those inadequacies for some considerable time now.

The other factor that distresses us very much is the rent that they charge us for these inadequate facilities, but be that as it may, we do recognize the problem and I do not know that I can hold out any hope for any instant solutions. We do not have any plans at the present time to renovate any other space for juvenile, or any other, facilities.

As I said to the member for Whitehorse South Centre earlier today, we do have plans for a new justice building that would include juvenile court facilities, as well.

**Mr. Chairman:** The time now being close to 9:30, I would now rise and report. Is everybody agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

*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. Brewster:** The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 28, *First Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, and I am to report progress.

**Mr. Speaker:** You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees. Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I move that we do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

*Motion agreed to*

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

*The House adjourned at 9:29 p.m.*

**The following Sessional paper was tabled October 31, 1983:**

**83-3-24**

**1983 Constitutional Accord on Aboriginal Rights (Pearson)**