



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 38

4th Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Monday, November 19, 1984 — 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 Leader -- responsible for Executive Council Office; Public Service Commission; and, Finance.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Community and Transportation Services; Education; and, Government Services.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Economic Development and Tourism; and, Renewable Resources.
Hon. Andy Phillipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Justice; and, Health and Human Resources.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Clarke Ashley	Klondike
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South
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 Sergeant-at-Arms
Hansard Administrator

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

Whitehorse, Yukon
Monday, November 19, 1984 - 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order.
 We will proceed with prayers.

Prayers.

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

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Because of the questions that were asked from the floor by members of the opposition regarding Cyprus Anvil, Mr. Forgues took the opportunity to write a letter to Mr. Byblow and copied it to the Government of Yukon, and also all the residents of Faro. So that all members of the House have a copy of the letter, I will table it in the House today.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Pursuant to the *Yukon Public Service Relations Act*, I wish to table the Yukon Public Service Staff Relations 14th Annual Report for 1983-84, and pursuant to the *School Act*, I wish to table the Yukon Teachers Staff Relation Board 10th Annual Report for 1983-84.

Mr. Speaker: Reports of Committees?
 Petitions?
 Introduction of bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 42: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I move that Bill No. 42, entitled *Occupational Health and Safety Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that a bill entitled *The Occupational Health and Safety Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 104: First Reading

Mr. Penikett: I have for introduction a bill entitled *Yukoners First Act*. I move that it be introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition that a bill entitled *Yukoners First Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Notices of motions for the production of papers?

Mrs. Joe: I would like to give notice on a motion to provide better facilities for court circuits.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a notice of motion for the production of papers?

Mrs. Joe: I am sorry, I have stood up at the wrong time.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers?

Notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Speaker: The Chair will take it that the motion as presented by the hon. member for Whitehorse North Centre will be accepted as stated.

Are there any further notices of motion?

Mr. Porter: I have a notice of motion for tabling regarding support of the trapping industry.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by ministers?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Mental health

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources who, in introducing the amendments to the Mental Health Act last spring, repeatedly announced his intention to bring forward a completely new act this fall, as well as a separate act on adult competency and property administration.

⁰³ Could I ask the minister what legislation has been prepared in these two areas?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I will be making a statement on this issue later in the legislative sitting.

Mr. Penikett: I appreciate the minister undertaking to make a statement on this important subject. During debate last year he indicated that there were a number of problems in the existing mental health legislation. Could he apprise the House at this time as to whether or not either the existing act will be amended or is it a fact there will be a new act forthcoming in this session?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That is still under review as we are still, at this time, receiving the input that we were asking for; some we received as late as two days ago.

Mr. Penikett: Could the minister then clarify for the House the position of the government: it is that the minister does not yet know whether or not we are going to introduce new legislation this session, or does he doubt that time will permit?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I doubt very much whether there will be a new act for this House during this sitting.

Question re: Mental health

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question to the same minister on the same subject. The minister stated he will be making a statement later on. Will he say that there will be a statement of government policy, or a green paper, later on in session?

⁰⁴ **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** The member for Whitehorse South Centre will have to wait for the statement.

Mr. Kimmerly: Concerning the reception of public input that the minister spoke of, will the minister give a commitment now that there will be public input on proposed government policies?

Mr. Speaker: If that is representation, perhaps it ought to be made by motion. If it is a question, then I will permit the minister to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: No.

Mr. Kimmerly: Will the minister identify what is the purpose of public input: to identify and formulate a government policy or to comment on a government policy?

Mr. Speaker: I believe the question is asking the opinion of the minister, which would be quite out of order.

Question re: Mental health

Mr. Porter: A major problem affecting the debates, in respect to the amendments to the *Mental Health Act* last spring, was the absence of any expert advice being given. Is the minister of Health and Human Resources prepared to create a select committee of this Legislature to hold hearings to gather evidence and make recommendations before attempting to write and debate a new mental health act?

Mr. Speaker: The question is making a representation, again. However, if there are further supplementaries, I will entertain them.

⁰⁵ **Mr. Porter:** In his discussions regarding a new mental health Act, who does the minister plan to consult?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The list is fairly long and comprehensive, but some of the people who would be on that list would be the Yukon Mental Health Association, the Yukon board, the hospital board, and other groups that we have sent letters to asking for input at their convenience. We have asked for it as quickly as possible, and it is still coming.

Mr. Porter: During the consultation process that the minister talks about, is there any thought in his department, toward a process to engage the public in discussions on this act?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: No.

Question re: Mental health

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the same minister. Amendments were passed in this Legislature last spring that allow the forcible treatment of alleged mentally disordered persons for up to five days

prior to a court hearing and ruling on their sanity. The Minister of Health and Human Resources indicated at that time that it would allow successful treatment and thus avoid longer forced detentions. Could the minister tell the House how many involuntary patients have been successfully treated in five days since the passage of those amendments?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Questions of this nature should be dealt with in a written form. I am not going to stand here and try and come up with figures, statistics or percentages, and all the members on the side opposite should be aware of that. It will not come from me again in any sitting of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: As I must agree with the hon. member that perhaps questions asking for statistics or figures, which would be difficult for the ministers to answer, could be covered by a written question.

Mrs. Joe: Does the minister know of any benefits that have resulted from extending the period of forcible detention and treatment from three days to five days?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Not only do I not know of any, I would ask the member opposite if she would know of any that have harmed anyone.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the Chair cannot permit questions going in the reverse direction.

Question re: Mental health

Mr. Penikett: The minister says that he does not have any specific statistics. Given the tone of the debate this spring, and given the minister's own interest in this question, could he indicate to the House, since I assume he has been monitoring the situation of mental health care in the territory, the frequency with which the forcible detention provisions and treatment of persons with mental disorders has been used? Has it increased, has it declined, what is the situation?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I would entertain that as a written question, and I would seek to get the answer for the member as quickly as possible.

Mr. Penikett: The minister has been unwilling to give any statement about the general character of the situation. He said in the spring that the debate would open up changes which would open up issues that were legal, medical, and policy issues for fruitful discussion among my department physicians, the law society, hospital, and public over the next few months, and provide a necessary step for the development of new legislation. Could the minister tell the House to what extent those discussions with those professional and public interest groups have taken place to date?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The first point I would like to make is that the leader of the opposition has said that I would not answer questions. I will answer any questions of that nature, but they should be written, and I will have the written answers returned to them as quickly as possible. I am prepared to make a statement on the state of the *Mental Health Act* in Yukon, and the obvious one is that we have been dealing with those groups — as the leader of the opposition has cited — and we have been seeking their input.

Mr. Penikett: I must apologize to the minister. I did not mean to misrepresent his answer. I was not looking for statistics. I was looking for a general picture that the minister might give us.

Is the minister aware of any cases, since the new act was introduced last spring, in which mental health patients have been forcibly detained, and subject to forceful treatment?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am not aware of any, but if the members opposite would like to wait for the statement, we could save Question Period for pressing issues that we could deal with during this period. Any questions that they have other than that, they can get through written questions to me. The following of this type of questioning, beyond the point of me saying that there will be a ministerial statement and I will answer any questions, seems almost irrelevant to me.

Question re: Mental health

Mr. Kimmerly: It is unfortunate that the minister does not view this legislation as a pressing issue. We do. I would like to ask the minister, in a general way, if he is monitoring the implementation

of the amendments passed last spring? Is he aware of the problems occurring because of those amendments?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I monitor the situation. The people in the Department of Health and Human Resources monitor the situation, but, no, I am not aware of any problems that are being caused.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the minister aware of the input made by the Law Society concerning the difficulties under the new legislation? What is the government response to that input by the Law Society.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I received the Law Society's input on Friday. That should answer the member for Whitehorse South Centre's question.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the administrator aware of a similar input from the Medical Association?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I have not seen the Medical Association's input to date. It may be in the department now.

Question re: Mental health

Mr. Porter: In the absence of any public participation in formulating a new mental health act, could the Minister of Health and Human Resources tell the House whether his department has discovered any evidence to justify changing his government's policy of forcibly detaining and treating persons suspected of mental disorders?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am not sure what the Law Society and the Bar Society are, if they are not public input.

Mr. Porter: A more specific question is: is the minister aware of any request by persons forcibly detained under the act to have their cases heard by a Mental Health Review Board?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am not aware of any. There may be one but I have not heard of it.

Mr. Porter: Is it the policy of this government that the board hear such cases?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Not at the present time, no.

Question re: Mental health

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the same minister. In the absence of new mental health legislation for this fall, can I ask the minister if he is willing to introduce or entertain from this side an amendment to the *Mental Health Act* requiring persons being forcibly detained and treated, to be informed of treatment, such as drugs and their side-effects, that are and will be used on them?

Speaker's ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think that the question is not a question but more of a representation. The question would appear to make a representation asking the government to do something and would more properly come in the form of a motion. I must rule the question out of order.

Question re: Agricultural sales from Alaska

Mr. McDonald: A question for the minister responsible for agriculture: last week the minister stated that if Yukoners were to expect to sell products to Alaska we would have to invite the Alaskans to sell in our own local consumer markets.

One such market the minister stated as being ripe for Alaskan involvement is one which currently exists for agricultural produce. What specific *quid pro quo* does the minister expect to receive from the Alaskans when Yukon opens its arms to agricultural competition from Alaska?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No *quid pro quo*, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to reiterate, because it seems to be a point of confusion in the mind of the member opposite, is that all I suggested to the Alaskans was that agricultural produce is one consumer item that they could consider exporting to Yukon. That does not mean that I am recommending that they export any specific produce. All I said was that there was a market here that they should investigate. That does not stop my department or the government from trying to have agriculture bolstered in the territory and have it increased in the territory.

I should state that if we are expecting to compete with other countries in the world, and if we expect to develop our agriculture

here to a state where we can export, we would certainly consider Alaska as one of the places we could export to.

I would certainly consider that Alaska should also be considering Yukon as a point to export to.

Mr. McDonald: There is no confusion in my mind as to the minister's intentions. His remarks have generated considerable confusion in the agricultural community. In assessing what agricultural products that could be sold in the local markets, the minister stated that Yukon requires feed grain and hay for horses and other livestock. Can the minister tell us what source of statistical data he was using to support this?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The number of trucks that drive up the highway every year hauling feed grain and hay into the Yukon.

Mr. McDonald: We will have to debate that matter more thoroughly, obviously. Is it the government's position that agriculture development in Yukon will not be adversely affected by the introduction of heavily subsidized northern competition from another country?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not know whether any of the agriculture products that they would consider exporting into the Yukon Territory would be heavily subsidized or not. The member across the floor is raising a hypothetical point and trying to create dissension within the public, especially in the agriculture community. I would certainly think that he should know some more facts before he starts making those kinds of statements.

Question re: Signage

Mr. Penikett: I have a simple constituency question I would like to direct toward the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. I read in the minutes of city council that the City of Whitehorse announced a plan to co-ordinate its highway signage wherever possible with the Government of Yukon. Could I ask the minister if he was consulted, or if his officials were consulted, about the erection of signs at the top of the Two Mile Hill and the South Access Road directing motorists downtown, containing the words City Centre, Central Business District, and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I assume that the people within the department were consulted in respect to the signage, because they have to check with the Department of Highways, primarily from a safety point of view, on the zoning requirements for the areas within the municipalities. The erecting of signs is the responsible of the municipality.

Mr. Penikett: I appreciate the minister's answer. As the minister well knows, along the Alaska Highway between Porter Creek and the South Access Road, are three hotels, four restaurants, three bars, two service stations and a convenience store. Could I ask the minister if he or his predecessor received any representation to the effect that these wage-paying, tax-paying local businesses might suffer loss of business by having travellers, tourists and so forth, directed away from their enterprises?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I take the converse position on this. I had representation made to me by a number of the business people, of whom the member speaks, which my colleague, the member for Porter Creek West, in most part, represents. It should be pointed out that I made verbal representation to the mayor and to council to consider the possibility of zoning an area for the purpose of signage for those particular establishments in close proximity to where they are. I will have to check into it, but I hope that some action will be taken in that regard.

Mr. Penikett: Just to seek confirmation of the government's position, can I just understand from the minister that what it is that the government intends to do, is to, in addition to the signs that have been placed there directing traffic away from those businesses, there will be an additional sign erected calling travellers' attention to the fact that there are those hotels and restaurants and so forth on the Alaska Highway?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, I did not say that. First of all, the signs that the member refers to, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe, were in the most part paid for by the Chamber of Commerce through the City of Whitehorse.

Mr. Penikett: The signs I referred to would have to be private signs, which are their own responsibility so far as designating and pointing out those

areas where the businesses exist. That is something I intend to pursue at City Hall.

Question re: *The Children's Act*

Mr. Kimmerly: To the Minister for Education about *The Children's Act*. In the last session, a discussion occurred about the mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse. Has discussion occurred with the teachers or the teachers' union concerning the policy of the Department of Education on this important question?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will ask Jake Owens.

Mr. Kimmerly: I asked the minister responsible for *The Children's Act* if discussions have occurred concerning the policy of the nurses' association?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I have to know what policy of the nurses' association that the member for Whitehorse South Centre is talking about.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in discussions with the director of child welfare or his designate and the professional associations involved concerning their policy around the reporting of suspected child abuse which is not now mandatory. Have discussions occurred with the nurses' association and also the medical association?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: It is my distinct recollection that the member for Whitehorse South Centre was opposed to the mandatory reporting during the spring sitting of the Legislative Assembly and I am not sure where the question is coming from. I do not understand it.

Question re: Mental health

Mrs. Joe: I have another question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources. The minister is aware that the *Mental Health Act* empowers justices of the peace and judges of the Yukon Supreme Court, but not judges of the Territorial Court, to hear cases involving the forcible detention and treatment of persons apprehended for alleged mental disorders. Could the minister explain what extra training the justices of the peace receive to prepare them to judge the mental competence of persons expertly enough to commit them to hospital?

Mr. Speaker: The question would seem to require a broad answer. If the minister could be brief it would be appreciated.

Mr. Philipson: It would be training that would be determined by the justices in the Territorial and Supreme Court.

Question re: Mining task force

Mr. McDonald: I have a question to the minister responsible for economic development. Last spring the minister will remember that the government established a mining task force chaired by the member for Hootalinqua. Can the minister state briefly what the primary rules of the mining task force have been since the spring session.

Mr. Speaker: Once again, the question is very broad and I would ask that the minister be as brief as possible.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not recall any task force being chaired by the member for Hootalinqua. There was a mining advisory committee set up with the chairman being myself. We met last week. It was a very good meeting. We discussed various aspects of mining in the territory and what the government should be or could be doing to foster the growth of economic development in the territory, regarding mining. It was very beneficial. I do not really know what the member is trying to get at.

Mr. McDonald: We may be discussing two different mining task forces. At the Northern Resources Conference, the member for Hootalinqua suggested that perhaps he was connected in some way. The commander with the mining task forces expressed a desire that the deputy minister of northern affairs be kept abreast of northern mineral policy development in the north. The deputy minister mentioned that considerable discussion...

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe the hon. member is now entering into a debate making a statement. Perhaps he could get to the question.

Mr. McDonald: I did not intend to enter into a debate. I was trying to make my question clearer, because the minister expressed some wonderment about my suggestion that there was such a task

force chaired by the member for Hootalinqua.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member could get to his supplementary.

Mr. McDonald: Has the minister attempted to formalize any relationship between the mining task force whose existence was mentioned by the member for Hootalinqua and the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Perhaps there is some confusion here but I am not aware of any task force that was chaired by the member for Hootalinqua. I will reiterate: there is a mineral advisory committee. There is a federal advisory committee as well, which may not be in existence much longer. I am not aware of the task force that the member for Mayo was talking about. If the member would like to speak to me privately after the session, I am quite prepared to speak to him about it.

Question re: School enrolment

Mr. Penikett: Maybe the member for Hootalinqua can put in a request for this.

Can the Minister of Education confirm that some schools in rural Yukon again this year are experiencing difficulty reaching the minimum levels of enrolment?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not have the statistics in front of me. There are a number of schools that are described as very much on the border line as far as enrolment is concerned. On a year to year basis, they are reviewed by the department in consultation with the minister, and decisions are made as to whether or not we are going to carry on our responsibilities in those areas.

Mr. Penikett: Could the minister also tell the House if he has, since his reincarnation as Minister of Education, received representations from parents who are unhappy about the necessary decision to send their offspring away in order to complete high school.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Decisions have been made by this Legislature over the past four or five years where we have expanded the grade levels. It is interesting to note that in a number of cases where students are in the community and the grades are being provided, for example grade 11, we find that once the school year begins all the students decide to go to the larger community, which, for the most part, is Whitehorse. Subsequently we have to delete the grade.

There is a difference of opinion, depending upon the community, as to whether or not those grades are actually going to be utilized.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the minister for his frank reply. Given the problems of low enrolment and and parental resistance to sending youngsters away for the senior grades, has the department, to the minister's knowledge, ever considered the option of offering supervised in-school correspondence for high school students in the smaller communities, especially for those children whose parents do not wish them to leave the family home before they are ready?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The member opposite did not hear the answer to his second question. In some cases, in small communities where we are providing the higher grade levels, the students, once they get to their grade, are being sent into Whitehorse as opposed to attending school in that particular community. Therefore, I have to really wonder whether or not we are going in the right direction, because parents are obviously making the decision that they would just as soon have their children go into Whitehorse in most cases, because of the expanded programs.

As far as supervision for correspondence courses, there is some very peripheral supervision by the regional superintendents, if they are requested to stop in and have a look at what students are doing. It is not our intention to go further in this area because we are in the process of reassessing just what is taking place in the rural schools.

Question re: Smoking in public areas

Mr. Kimmerly: We debated the subject of smoking in public access areas in government buildings last spring. The minister promised internal interdepartmental action. Will the minister please inform if any decision now has been reached on this issue?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That responsibility now comes under me, as I am responsible for the portfolio of Government Services. There

have been some discussions with the department on the matter, and if any decisions are taken I will inform the member.

Mr. Kimmerly: Were there discussions with the public service and the public service union on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Kimmerly: Will the minister be announcing a government policy this session?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The policy is going to come into effect. I will announce it when it is ready.

Question re: Mental health

Mrs. Joe: I have another question for the minister responsible for Health and Human Resources. During the debate on the amendments to the *Mental Health Act* last spring, the idea of putting people suspected of mental disorders into jail was one of the points of concern to members of this House. Can I ask the minister if his department has considered using another facility other than the jail to house innocent people apprehended under the *Mental Health Act*?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The reason that the jails were talked about as places designated to hold a person under the *Mental Health Act* were in areas out of town where there is nowhere to hold a person who could be dangerous, other than in police cells. The other reason for designating that in Whitehorse was that there were only so many spaces available at the hospital, and if it was necessary to house somebody in a secure area other than the hospital, it would be necessary to do that in one of the cells in the RCMP holding area, and that is why those were designated.

Mrs. Joe: Can I ask the minister then if his government has taken any steps to investigate the cost of another facility other than the jail?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We are hoping that with the new federal government, we will have a new general hospital in Whitehorse so that, as a part of that new general hospital, the area holding cells for people who have problems of this nature will be included, and the problem will not exist beyond that point.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing there are no further questions, we will proceed to Orders of the Day under Government Bills.

TABLING OF RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Mr. Byblow: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour earlier tabled a telex of a communication from Mr. Forgues to myself. I have for tabling three supporting pieces of communication in order to complete the understanding of that communique.

Mr. Speaker: I do not believe the hon. member has a point of order, and it is rather irregular; however, the Chair will permit it on this occasion, but perhaps if the members have anything to table they can be tabled at the appropriate place under Orders of the Day. We will now proceed to Government Bills.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 39: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 39, adjourned debate, Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Penikett: When we left off last week we were discussing the small matter of \$48 million dollars, namely the capital budget.

The debates on this item at second reading have not, as a rule, been as lengthy as the discussions at the committee stage. That is appropriate because what engages the interest of most members, save and except the Cabinet, is particulars of construction projects that will be going on in their constituencies. However, I would like to make a few general comments while we are allegedly discussing the principle of this bill.

The first is that since this is the measure which creates most of the construction jobs or most of the jobs that derive from public works in the territory, I should say something about the efficacy of the legislation in that respect.

I think it is possible that more jobs could have been created by

this money than are being created. I want to make this modest point: during the recent budget debate in committee, the government leader and I spent some time in discussing the usefulness of increasing the local materials component in construction projects in the Yukon.

I admit right off that a great deal more research and work will need to be done before we can maximize the local material input. The government leader on that occasion was kind enough to say that he found my remarks agreeable, and he in no way differed from the sentiment. I only repeat the remark now as it has been observed by my colleague, the member for Whitehorse South Centre, that the courthouse, a major construction project, is going to be a steel frame building, we understand from the designs, as have many other major projects in the territory.

The Minister of Justice, quite properly, I think, in his remarks at the time the project was announced, talked about the desirability of local labour and local contractors working on the job. We share that objective. However, I would like to make this serious point: I think it would be worth our while to devote some energy and some thought, as a Legislature, but more particularly as an administration, to ways in which we can substantially improve the local material quantum in large capital projects, because, to state the obvious, I think that increases the possibility of local contractors being employed, and I think it increases, many-fold, the amount of local labour that can be employed, not only at the construction stage but in the case where we are using local Yukon timber, or conceivably local Yukon rock, local labour can be enhanced.

Just the other day I was reminded by a constituent of two things. One, that the amount of concrete in a structure also is a fairly good indicator of the amount of local labour that will be used, but as well, that there are other materials available in Yukon: limestone, quartz and electricity, for the manufacturing of cement right here. It so happens that the Canadian market is such that I gather most of our supply comes from the Vancouver area, and the business there is in the hands of a few very large companies. I do not know if any of those companies would feel threatened by any indigenous manufacture of cement here. I do not even know if, in the immediate future, such a local company could be competitive. However, it may be that the Yukon market is so small, as compared to the rest of the BC market, that should there be a major project such as a dam project here, it would be very wise for us to take a hard look at the potential of using some of the Yukon limestone, perhaps surplus hydro energy, if there is any, for stimulating such industries, because of the positive impact they would have on local employment.

Some people have observed that a lot of the major contracts in the Yukon Territory, in recent years, have gone to outside contractors. I think that has been true of the highway work and of major jobs like the airport. There may be an occasion for Committee to discuss an opportunity for this at greater length and what might be done to change that situation.

It has been noted by several commentators that the major projects — court house, the college, the young offenders' facility — will all be built in the capital city. I expect, there seems to be a certain inevitable kind of logic to that, that this being the capital city it should not be surprising that the work goes here, the most major institutional structures should be put here. However, I would hope that during this debate we might have some discussion about whether there are any alternatives to this.

I recall in previous years my colleague, the member for Faro, suggested, as I also remember my colleague, the member from Elsa, that there might be some wisdom of locating part of the technical plan for the Yukon College plant in his community. The reasons he gave were generally that there was an industrial plant there which would provide the laboratory and a good on-the-job training site, and that there was infrastructure in that community already existing, and could conceivably become, in a small way, — perhaps not a major regional educational centre like Fort Smith — at least some outpost for the Yukon College.

It is probably at this stage of the day, with respect to the development of Faro, not an opportune time to be discussing that eventuality, but I am mindful of fact that on a number of occasions

over the years this government has talked about diversification and decentralization.

I would only make this point, that when developing these agricultural facilities, I think that we should take a look at the possibility of some of the plants being located outside of Whitehorse in some industrial centre. It seems to me, it would serve two of the stated objectives of this government. One, it would help diversify the local economy of such a community as Faro, which is a single-industry community. I think that that would be desirable. It would help cushion some of the impacts of the kind of experience that they have gone through, now. I think that it would also serve the stated decentralization goal of the government.

I will not go on at great length about that. To make a contrary point: the construction and the spending in this budget as it is divided between rural and urban, is remarkably urban when it comes to major capital projects. But, in respect to capital money for campgrounds and historic sights, it is remarkably rural. In fact, somebody in my caucus has observed to me that it is remarkably Conservative in that it is all spent, or almost all of it spent, as has been in the case of the last three years, in the Conservative constituencies.

I am sure that this is a coincidence. There was no design in that arrangement, but I make the remark as it may be the subject of further debate during these deliberations.

I want, later on perhaps in the general debate, to ask the government leader a little bit more about his remarks on the special arrangements that this government now has with the federal government. I want to ask him how they benefit us. If we look at the capital budget that we adopted last year and the supplementaries, if you do not take into account the engineering services which the government leader outlined for us in his speech, the budget is — we are proposing if you take into account the original and the subs last year — less than this year's. I would also be interested to ask the government leader when we get into general debate and committee stage — and I am serving notice of this — something more about how the new formula financing arrangement with Ottawa will work, and to ask whether the budget we see is in some sense a base budget under that arrangement, and whether the operation of the formula will be expressed in some way that we will have incremental percentage increases on this basic budget or if the workings of the formula as we potentially move money between operating money and capital money will have a different impact.

The problems we always have when debating the capital budget, especially when we get into talking about record budgets and the like, is that we are debating a total which rarely resembles the total that we will have at the end of the year.

By the time we are done with items that are cut or items that are added, the budget only has a vague resemblance to the original document.

In some ways the capital budget debate has become a very different kind of debate from the operations and maintenance budget discussions in the spring. We get into discussion in the fall on a much more project-specific basis. We are discussing, for the most part, money which comes from Ottawa and which is handled through this government. We have spent some time in the past discussing the ways and means that this budget is established, and the government leader, in his remarks, indicated a rationalization of the process for the new capital planning process, which I think is commendable. I will not say any more at this stage, except to say that I look forward to the discussion on the specifics and I hope the government leader will take my observations about local material content in the tone in which they were expressed, as positive and constructive. I hope that together the Legislature may be able to join in a practical discussion about the ways of advancing what I think is a useful goal in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to make a couple of comments regarding the budget before use. I think all members realize that a substantial amount of money has been put forward to this House, and if it is all spent in the forthcoming year, it is going to provide quite a number of jobs for the local populace, contracts for our small and larger-sized businesses, and will, at the same time, help

the economy in general.

I would like to take exception to a number of comments that were put forward by the leader of the opposition. He referred to the budget as a Conservative budget in the connotation that all the money was going into the Conservative ridings. I would like to go on record to say that the justice building will be put into a riding presently represented by the smiling member for Whitehorse South Centre. The arena and the proposed curling rink is in the riding of the member for Whitehorse West, who happens to be the leader of the opposition. It should be pointed out that industrial art facilities were put into the community of Teslin, as well as Ross River. This year the proposed budget is to put the same facility into the community of Dawson City.

Also within the budget, there are dollars set aside for the community of Elsa for a recreational facility within the Elsa School in the amount of \$250,000, and we believe we are meeting our obligations there.

In the communities of Mayo and Teslin, ridings held by members of the NDP, there was a major program for the purpose of upgrading the streets, and BST is proposed to be applied next.

I do not have a total list of this, but if this is the kind of debate that is ensuing, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to apologize for anything done in a Conservative riding, and if the allegations are going to come from across the floor that in order to get something done in your community you have to be a Conservative member of this House, I will make sure that that happens. These innuendoes just are not true.

¹⁸ The realities of the situation are factually put in every budget. We meet the demands of the various areas of Yukon within the financial limitations we have, based on the need and what has to happen within that particular area. If the connotation is going to be put forward that it is strictly on political consideration, and who the MLA is in the area, as to what dollars are allocated, then we will go on that principle. I have no problems abiding by that principle. There is no problem at all. It makes it a lot simpler for me.

The question of decentralization came up. I want to point to the fact that a lot of people have not taken into consideration the exercise that we have taken as far as our communities outside of Whitehorse are concerned. That is the principle that we have adopted in our communities of going to municipal status. In itself, that is a method of going toward decentralization because over time, each community is going to take more and more responsibilities from the Government of Yukon, which is administered presently from the City of Whitehorse, in the long term. Sometimes, depending on the issue, may it be in the short term, it is administered within the community itself. I think we should look into that area as a further commitment that this side of the House has towards the principle of decentralization.

If one takes a look throughout the budget, there has been an honest effort by all members of the House to distribute the dollars throughout Yukon in an equitable manner. I think, in speaking to it, it is going to provide the jobs that are necessary as far as Yukon is concerned. In the long term, it is going to provide services to those communities that are lacking the facilities that we have planned this forthcoming year.

Mr. McDonald: I would like to respond to just a couple of comments made by the minister responsible for education. First of all, one point that the minister did not quite absorb was the argument about the local jobs. The minister reiterated that the construction of the major buildings in the territory, predominantly in Whitehorse, will provide a lot of jobs to Yukoners.

I do not think, for one, that that is disputable in the strictest sense. However, there is the concern that perhaps if one were to use local materials and a certain kind of construction technique, it would maximize the number of jobs that we could possibly create in the territory. The signs that have been made to us on this side of the House a number of times is that construction in concrete or timber would increase the number of jobs to local tradesmen. Metal frame buildings, they claim, are to provide jobs. They will provide a lesser number of jobs. These are the central policy considerations we would like the government to take actively under their consideration.

The minister's contention is that the majority of projects have been established in both opposition ridings and government ridings. The point that the leader of the opposition was trying to make was that the money that is to be expended for parks and historic sites will once again be spent predominantly in Conservative ridings. This was an issue for us in the last capital budget, and is a matter of some issue for us in this capital budget. Our arguments obviously will be much more meaningful when the debate gets to specifics. Certainly, simply claiming that the government is being fair-minded about its distribution of capital projects around the territory is not convincing to us and we are essentially putting the government on notice that we will be challenging that particular subject.

¹⁹ The one last issue that I would like to briefly respond to, as this is general debate rather than a more formal debate, is the minister's assumption that the facility that the government is to be providing for the community of Elsa is a rec facility in the school. To clarify the situation, some of this, as I understand it, is to be a playroom for small children, and as such is not qualified, in the strictest sense as a community recreation facility. Now, the minister has possibly suggested to me that if I were to at all criticize this expenditure, then they would have to review spending the money in Elsa. I want to state, specifically, on the record, that we are not critical of the government according to the wishes of the community with respect to education, with respect to municipal services, with respect to any of their desires. This meets a standing request that I have been aware of for the last three or four years, in some respects, and I hope the minister understands that if I quiz him on this particular expenditure that I am not criticizing the expenditure, which will give him no opportunity to withdraw it in an act of revenge. I am merely attempting to establish the boundaries of the expenditure, and the usefulness of the expenditure, et cetera.

I would like to reiterate one more time that as far as the community is concerned, this does not count as a recreation facility for the community. It sounds like a playroom for the school, and as such, we are in favour of this expenditure, and we wish the minister all haste in the establishment of this playroom.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I was not going to rise, but after the last member making some accusations about what we are doing for parks and historic resources, I feel that it is necessary to establish and clarify a couple of items. Number one, in the last five or six years that we have been elected to this government, I think we have already spent more money in non-Conservative ridings than we have in Conservative ridings as far as campgrounds go. I would just give you a few examples. In your own riding, Mr. Speaker, we have developed Simpson Lake and Frances Lake. We have developed the Watson Lake campground. Those are not all in your riding, Mr. Speaker. Some of them are in the member for Campbell's riding.

Last year and the year before, we did an awful lot of work on the campgrounds along the Alaska Highway. We have also developed, before the last election, Million Dollar Falls, and all the campgrounds along the north Alaska Highway that were then in a Liberal riding. I resent very much the implication that I, personally, am funneling the money towards Conservative constituencies, and, as the minister for Education stated, if that is the type of accusation we are going to get from across the floor, perhaps that is exactly the method that we should be taking. We should be looking after our own. They are making that accusation — perhaps that is exactly what we should do.

²⁰ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I know I should avail myself of the opportunity to close off debate, because there were a few direct questions asked by the leader of the opposition. He talked for a fairly long time on the use of local materials, in respect to the construction of some of these major buildings. We are required to build, in this part of the country, buildings that have a specific degree of earthquake-proofness about them, and we have to specify to our architects when we go out and look for proposals of buildings of this size, which are going to be housing people, that we get buildings that we are sure can withstand the pressures of earthquake incidents, as they are known to happen in this particular part of the country. This building is one of those buildings, and it is a steel frame building.

The other factor that comes into play in this case is that we have known for a long time where we wanted to build this building. We feel that it should be somewhere close to the existing administration building. There are a number of reasons for that. We have hopes of putting in a locally produced alternative heating system. It would be very nice if we could do it all from one plant. If the new justice centre is close enough to this building, we are going to be able to do that. But if we are going to build in the close proximity of this building, we also have to be very concerned about the final weight of the building, because the water table in this particular part of the City of Whitehorse is very high relative to the ground elevation, and therefore we are restricted in respect to footings, and a major factor becomes the final weight of the building. That is why this building is built the way it is, and that is why the justice centre is going to be built the way it is going to be built.

It would be very nice to be able to use local materials. Hopefully, this might be enough of an opportunity for the local cement business to get started. I would be very pleased if that were to happen. I do not know whether it will be, but in respect to it being a steel frame building, we just do not have any alternatives in that matter. It is an architectural fact of life that we have to build a steel frame building.

I regret, too, that these three major projects, it seems, are going to have to be built in Whitehorse. Given that this is the capital, given that we are just growing, we are just developing as a territory, it is very difficult to make a decision that at this point we should initiate, for instance, the construction of a Yukon College any place other than in the City of Whitehorse. I agree one hundred percent that there is a valid opportunity to diversify, to get out to the communities with things like extensions to Yukon College. But surely, in the first instance, we are going to have to look very seriously at building the nucleus of the College here in Whitehorse, where so much of our population is now situated.

The leader of the opposition also raised the question of formula financing and the capital plan. The capital plan is a five year capital plan. It is based on a set of standard and criteria that we have been able to come up with for construction of everything — every kind of building that you can imagine — in the Yukon Territory. We have sent our first attempt at this five year plan to the federal government. We are now seeking, and we think that we are going to get it fairly quickly, the federal government's approbation for those criteria. Given that we do get the five year plan approved as it is now, then this budget is a reflection of those items that we have in the five year capital plan for this current year and at the levels that we have asked for the money in the criteria that we have set in that five year plan.

We will be required each year to add to that five year plan, year number five, so what is going to be transpiring, hopefully, in respect to capital planning in the territory now and in the future, will be that the government will have the capability of planning five years in advance. We will be able to know what we plan to do five years hence. If the federal government accepts our capital plan, and the situation remains the same, then we know what kind of capital money we have and we will be getting each year for that five years. That amount of money each year will then be built into the formula. That becomes part of the formula. It will be a patch infusion into the O&M formula. That is how the two relate. I hope that I have been able to clear the matter up for the leader of the opposition to some degree.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 36: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 36, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move that Bill No. 36, entitled *An Act to Amend the Loan Agreement Act (1982) No. 1* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. government leader that Bill No. 36 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 36

do now pass and the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 37: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 37, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Philipsen.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I move that Bill No. 37, entitled *Denture Technicians Act*, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 37 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I move that Bill No. 37, *Denture Technicians Act*, do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 38: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 38, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Philipsen.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I move that Bill No. 38, *Canada and United Kingdom Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments Act*, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I move that Bill No. 38, *Canada and United Kingdom Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments Act*, be now passed and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education 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 will now call the Committee of the Whole to order.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would just like to inform the House of a number of procedures as far as dealing with House business is concerned. First of all, we have been requested by *Hansard* that we refrain from sitting on Wednesday evening and make up those hours at some other time. We have agreed that we would do that. I have discussed that with the leader of the opposition and we will arrange a mutually agreeable time to make up those hours.

Further to that, as far as procedure of the Capital Estimates is concerned, I would appreciate it if we could proceed with Mr. Philipsen's votes and then Mr. Tracey's since they are going to be absent for a period of time over the course of the next few weeks.

Mr. Chairman: Any disagreement? We shall recess until 3:00. When we return, we shall go on to Bill 39, *First Appropriation Act, 1985-1986*.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee to order. We shall now go on to Bill No. 39 *First Appropriation Act, 1985-1986*.

Bill No. 39: First Appropriation Act, 1985-1986.

On Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am rising now because I want to make just one point that I failed to make in reply to something said by the leader of the opposition at the second reading. He seemed to imply that, somehow or other, this was a smaller budget than this current

year's capital budget. I recognize that sometimes you can make numbers tell you just about anything at all. The fact of the matter is that, in this case, this budget is 42 percent higher than last year's budget. There seems to be some misunderstanding about what I said in my second reading speech and what we say on the capital summary page, on page three of the amendments.

I think that what the members opposite have to recognize is that in the 1984-85 revised estimates, there is included \$11,895,000 of engineering services agreement work. The amount for 1985-86, which we anticipate is going to be in excess of \$12,000,000, is not included in the 1985-86 estimates. By doing the simple mathematical function of deducting the \$11,895,000 from the \$45,813,000 that was voted in the 1984-85 estimates, you come up with estimates of \$33,918,000. The difference between \$33,918,000, which was last year's estimates with the engineering services agreement, and \$48,207,000, which is this year's estimates without the engineering services agreement, is 42 percent.

Mr. Penikett: I did not want to get myself and the government leader entangled in a numbers game. I am not sure how useful it is because we have money — if I remember correctly — added this spring to the capital budget as we may have next spring. There may also be some projects cut or reductions made for various reasons. The only point that I wanted to make is that it is very hard to follow the pea under the shell sometimes, to know what you are comparing.

I know that we are onto a new regime when we talk about the capital planning. I understand and appreciate the explanations given by the government leader today at the close of the second reading debate. There seems to be some cuts coming in the federal budget in a number of places and I note, from Mr. Wilson's statements of supporting documents, that there are, in some cases, capital projects being cut. Could the government leader explain what our situation is with respect to those cuts? If there are any cuts or cutbacks to have any impact on this budget, do we already know that or does the government leader know if there are going to be cuts down the road to affect this budget before we have a chance to spend the money.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry I cannot give you any guarantees about what might happen further on, but at this point in time we have been told that we do not have to anticipate any cuts in our capital budget, that our projects have been looked at and have been deemed to be necessary and, therefore, will proceed. At the present time, we are not anticipating any cuts in this budget, and it has been implied to us that we are going to be okay as far as this budget is concerned.

Now, there will be supplementary estimates in the spring for the engineering services agreement. The federal government is quite aware of that. It is part of the long standing agreement. I cannot perceive them cutting it in any way. The major portion of the engineering services agreement is the maintenance of the Alaska Highway, which is considered part of the Trans Canada Highway system of Canada and, therefore, the federal government pays for it. I cannot, in my wildest imagination, see them cutting back on that. That is where the potential cutback would be in respect to the supplementary estimates.

Some Hon. Member: I understand that our MP, the deputy prime minister, has been given the task of continuing to look for places to cut in order to achieve reductions. If I remember correctly, the timeframe he is operating on is a six month schedule. Without betraying any confidences, has there been any preliminary discussions with that person as to target areas for cuts which may impact on us — not with this budget, but six months down the road?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, there have not been from the deputy prime minister, and I am aware of the fact that he has been charged with looking at what can transpire within the next six months with respect to cuts. We have been dealing with the minister and with the departmental people with respect to our funding for next year, and we have made some suggestions to the minister that are not involved with program cuts. Rather, they are cosmetic things that we think can be done, that would change, to a small degree, the methods of financing in the territory. That would not amount to

cuts, but delays, in payments and things like this; the kind of things that we think that the federal government are looking for now. However, we do not have anything substantive. The latest word that we had from the minister was what he gave at a press conference in town. He was asked by the media whether he foresaw any cuts at that time, and he said no, he did not foresee any then, and there has been no indication. I have been in personal communication with him on this matter since, and there still are no indications. I think we can be fairly secure now that our programming, as we know it in the territory, will continue.

Mr. Penikett: This is a fairly large sum of money in tight times, and it comes from a government which is entering a new period of restraint. We have been in periods of restraint for a long time, but we are entering a new period. The largest single item in the budget is the justice centre. Were there any projects, perhaps in rural communities or otherwise, that had to be dropped in order to accommodate that large ticket item?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is possible to come up with a capital budget virtually unlimited, especially in this territory, with respect to what it would be nice to do in every community: provide territorial buildings, liquor stores, so on and so forth and all these nice kinds of things the member for Faro likes so much.

²⁸ In this case, no. We were put on notice by the federal government, something in excess of a year ago that we had to move ahead on the long years of planning that have gone on with respect to a justice centre. The major reason for the specific time now is that the federal government is planning to build a new federal building here in Whitehorse. They are planning to demolish the existing building to build a new federal building. As you are all aware, our courts are in that particular building. We have been given notice that we are to be out of the existing federal building on the 1st of April, 1985. Of course, we are not going to be able to do that. We are running the risk of delaying the construction of the new federal building until we get the justice centre built. So that is the conundrum that we are in at the present time.

The justice centre went on to the front burner as a direct result of a decision made by the federal government to build a new federal building here in town.

Mr. Penikett: What assurances has the government leader obtained from the federal government that the federal building, which will replace the one on 4th and Main, will be less ugly than the existing building?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: All I can say to that, is that we saw a set of plans. I am not sure whether any members of the opposition did, but we saw a first set of conceptual drawings of the new airport. We made our feelings known to the federal government about what we thought of that particular design, and it was changed. I would think that in these days of federal, provincial and territorial cooperation, everything being sweetness and light, that when a conceptual design is ready, we will have plenty of chance for input from the territory.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am sure that the input will include a statement about local materials and the capability of the local contractors where that is feasible and possible.

I was interested in the announcement about the financing of the justice centre some time ago. Approximately this time last year, I asked about a courthouse and the answer was that the courthouse was a long-standing request and it would be financed outside of the annual capital estimates. What has changed that process in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is a very good question, and a very valid one because I can recall when we were talking about it and, in fact, we did say this.

²⁹ At that time, we did not have our capital plan ready, in place, or drawn up. When it came time to put together the capital plan for next year, after some consultation with the Government of Canada, it was determined that it would be prudent and the best idea if we included the justice centre in the capital plan. That is what happened. We sent our capital plan to the federal government. I believe it was just about a year ago now, in December of last year. It may have been a little later than that, but about a year ago now. We had included the justice centre in that capital plan. By the same token, we had included the young offenders facility in the capital

plan. Once again, it was to be initially funded outside of our capital requirements. Once we were putting together the capital plan, and we knew these were the requirements that were not foreseen the year previously, then we felt we might as well build them in, and just make them a part of the ongoing capital plan.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would assume that the projected or proposed new hospital is not a part of the capital plan because it is not our jurisdiction. If it becomes our jurisdiction, will it be added into our plan if it is not already built?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would certainly hope so. It would have been nice, for instance, to have had local jurisdiction over the construction of the Whitehorse Airport. I think we could have done more for local hire, and so on, if we would have had local jurisdiction over the construction of that particular facility. One of the reasons why we wanted the justice centre to become part of our capital plan is that we would have local jurisdiction over the construction of the facility. It becomes our construction job instead of the Government of Canada's construction job. When it comes time for the hospital, it will be if, at the present time, it is outside the capital plan because it is not included in the capital plan. It is not in the capital plan for the next five years. When it comes time for that, we are hopeful that we will be able to bring it in as an addition to the capital plan. I would expect that there will be items, I am sure everybody hopes, not as large as that every year, I am sure each year, if not in spite of the fact that we have a five year capital plan, that will be instigated, if you will, by the federal government. Now if it is something that we have decided that we want to do for us, we are going to have to jiggy-pokery the money ourselves in the capital plan. But there will always be, for a long time into the future, instances where the Government of Canada are going to make an arbitrary decision, or even a joint decision with us, that they are going to build something in the Yukon Territory.

Another item that comes to mind is that some day the Government of Canada is going to have to build a science centre in Whitehorse. They have built them in a number of communities in the north, and they really owe this community one. Someday they will have to build a science centre in Yukon.

¹⁰ That will be outside of our capital plan because it is not in the capital now. It will be something that we may ask the federal government for but they will initiate the money for the project.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is it possible to make public or actually to table this five year capital plan?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is very, very difficult, because it could be used as information. There is information in the five year capital plan that could be used for the benefit of people who might choose to use it wrongly. I do not think that it would be feasible to make public a five year capital plan. In regard to the amounts of money, I do not think that we would have too much trouble in telling the House what the amounts of money are and I will certainly look into that. But, we could not get specific, at all, or, I think, we would all be in a lot of trouble.

Mr. Kimmerly: Regarding the locations of the projected buildings on the plan, I am asking a question in a specific context, actually two contexts. One is pertaining to my riding.

I am very well aware of the city's master plan concerning zoning and there is another, of course, a common interest in the jurisdiction of the city to zone and plan sewer, water, et cetera, and in the territory, in building. I am interested in the possibility of, or in the advisability of, the municipal government coordinating its plan with the territorial and federal governments. That is the first context: that it appears extremely desirable that these plans be coordinated.

The second context is: I would imagine that it is possible to identify priorities and needs — for example, a science centre or a court house or a hospital — and not a specifically planned precise location and, therefore, the publicity around the goal would have a different character. I would ask about those issues, and in the context of those issues, are the locations specifically identified on the plan and what consultations occur with the three levels of government?

¹¹ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** A considerable amount of coordination and information is exchanged between the three levels of government in

respect to these kind of plans.

If the member for Whitehorse South Centre will leave it with me, I will follow up and see what I can ascertain with respect to what we can say or do about giving them information about the five-year capital plan. I will follow up on that immediately.

Mr. Penikett: Thank you. I would just like to ask a question supplementary to that asked by my colleague, and perhaps the government leader would take it as notice when he is examining the government's position in respect to providing information about the five year plan.

The government leader titillated me when he suggested that there was potential abuse of the information or advantage to be taken with the information of the capital plan by someone. Presumably, I take that to mean that a land speculator might be able to know where a project was going ahead or some other speculator might be able to take advantage of this information.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I did not mean members opposite.

Mr. Penikett: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that at all. I do not think the members over here would be able to take advantage as I think we are all too poor to do that — well, perhaps with one exception.

What I would like to ask the government leader then, that being the case — I think I understand what the problem is — could he, when he is replying to my colleague, indicate what kind of security there now is in effect on that information to prevent leaks, through the public service or otherwise, that would give such speculators a similar advantage?

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

Mr. Byblow: I have a couple of questions surrounding that budget planning process. I understand what the government leader is talking about in terms of a five year plan and the need to update it each year, because one year passes and you have to make adjustments. It is about those adjustments that I have some questions.

Since 1981, at the onset of the recession, we talked every budget session and every capital budget session, about accelerated budget funding. We talked about advancing one year's money for the previous year's spending. I would like to know, what, if any, impact this has had on this current budget that we are looking at. We are looking at \$48 million dollars of intended expenditure in the next fiscal year, but we also know that last year there was an advance of some funding. I just want to try to understand that a little better. Are we are talking about vast volumes that were spent last year because of the recession and because of the need to increase employment and have that money flowing through the economy? Does the \$48 million represent sums already spent?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman, it does not represent any money at all already spent.

¹² I am not certain yet that we foresee any accelerated funding from this \$48,000,000, this winter. I do not know if that is going to be necessary.

Mr. Byblow: In the budget planning process then, last year we did distinctly accelerate some funding. Where did that come from if it is not being absorbed in this year's revised plan over the next period?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This \$48,000,000 is next year's, not last year's or this year's, but is next year's. There was a tremendous amount of interplay and accelerated funding between 1983-84 and 1984-85. With all due respect, we are now talking about capital estimates for 1985-86, the next fiscal year starting on April 1, 1985. I do not know that there will be any — as I said when I was previously on my feet — need for any accelerated funding this year, mainly because we have had supplementaries for this current year that we are in now. I believe that we are going to be able to spend virtually all of the money that we have voted. That is the object of the exercise: to try to get the projects completed. We have enough money to be able to keep as many people as possible working for this current winter. We were able to see a requirement in our forecasting. We were not able to foresee it two years ago. Now we have been able to foresee it and I do not think we will be doing this, what we call the accelerated spending, over the course of this winter.

Mr. Byblow: If I am understanding it correctly, what it amounts to is that in the current year of spending, we have already theoretically adjusted the books for any increased funding, and that is history. It does not affect the money that is going to be spent next year or the money that is represented here. This is new monies and in no way reflects the adjustments that have taken place this year for an accelerated funding.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This may make it a bit clearer for the member for Faro. On Thursday, I intend to table supplementary estimates for the current year that we are in now, and some of that will be capital money.

Mr. Byblow: Throughout the afternoon, as I listened to the budget planning process, I understood that while the process may have changed, the fact still remains that what is being projected here is an amount of money that has not been yet cleared from Ottawa in any formal and final way. If that is a correct assumption, then I want to assess the degree to which this money will become actual monies available to be spent.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We reached an agreement with the Government of Canada with respect to how much money that they are going to give us in the following year in respect to capital. "We get those capital funds, usually on the basis of when we need them for some specific project, and in other cases I think it is quarterly draw-downs: we get a quarter of the budget on April 1, we get another quarter of the budget three months later, and another quarter of the budget three months after that, and so on. Hence, we have to manage our cash flow in that manner, so that we can make sure that we do have the money required to pay for these projects when they come due. In respect to formal approval, I am not sure that I know what the member is saying. The Government of Canada has agreed that in the next fiscal year, 1985-86, they are going to forward to this territory \$48,207,000, less some recoveries that are going to accrue to the Government of Canada and to this government, to do the specific projects that we have in here.

Mr. Byblow: I guess the question arose from my recollection that in 1982 we saw an occasion where a capital budget that was in a magnitude of some \$38,000,000, I believe, in the final analysis, ended up being considerably less, and so that gives rise to my question on how firm is this funding in terms of approval. If the government leader is saying that that is an agreement already established, and draws can be made on it, and there ought not to be any changes, then we just have to accept that for the moment.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: My experience with the government over the years has been that rather than this number being reduced in any way, it is normally increased, because during the course of the year there are supplementaries, there are changes made, things come up that were not foreseen, especially when you are putting together a budget so early in the new fiscal year. After all, we are still five months away from the beginning of that fiscal year. The Government of Canada recognizes that we do not have the engineering services agreement in respect to the Alaska Highway only because we just do not know what those costs are going to be yet. They do not know what those costs are going to be. As I said, we anticipate at least another \$12,000,000 in this capital budget, and that should show up in the spring. By the time we sit in the spring, we will know what that number is.

Mr. Byblow: This is another subject. It will be a short question, but it may require a long answer. What is the status of the Yukon hydro proposal?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is an agreement or a proposal put together jointly by the Government of Yukon and the Alberta Power people and they have chosen, given the recession and the downturn of the economy, and the downturn in the requirement for electrical energy in the territory, not to proceed at this particular time. It is sort of in limbo at the present time, and it is staying there. Do we have a line item in this budget?

Mr. Byblow: Not in this one.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It was in last one. The decision is one that is going to have to be taken by the main component, being private enterprise, as to whether or not it is going to proceed. They will make that decision at that time. It would be our intention to participate with them.

Mr. Byblow: Just for the record, there is a line item, and I will come to it later, that says hydro development, and it is a nominal one dollar. Now, if that relates to Yukon hydro, fine. It is just that the wording of it does permit a much more broad approach to increased hydro development.

I have another question of a general sort, and it relates to Cyprus Anvil. Recognizing the scenario that has been painted over the last week or so on the future of that community, it gives rise to the subject of White Pass and their intention to go into a mothball arrangement this winter if they do not procure some ability to remain in readiness for re-opening. I recall an article just recently in the paper, in which there was a fairly grim picture painted about what will happen to White Pass itself at the end of December. There was a suggestion that the Yukon government may be able to play a part in terms of providing some interim financing there. I realize that is another very broad question and this debate could go on for hours, but I want to give the government leader an opportunity to explore it at his liberty and ask if there is any intention by this government to provide any type of financing towards the White Pass railroad as part of any package for economic development?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, there is none. It has long been our contention, and one that the federal government has not argued with, that the federal government is the owner of the resources in this territory, and has the responsibility to provide the infrastructure for transporting those resources. It is a federal responsibility, and one that they recognize as being their responsibility.

³⁵ Now, something may change with respect to that. I do not know what that might be, but something may change. I would think if that something changed then we, as a government, would have to sit down with the federal government and talk and come to some satisfactory arrangement. I believe that the actual funding, if there is any funding, would come from the federal government.

Mr. Byblow: Related to White Pass, and tied in with budgeting, it was last year that White Pass reimbursed its loan to this government by providing certain lands in exchange for the million dollars that was owing. How does that process go through any form of budgeting? Like the government had a debt that no longer exists, so upon the balance sheet, it just now has increased assets.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is correct. Our land assets increased quite dramatically by, I believe, \$850,000 or something like that.

Mr. Byblow: In the throne speech, the government leader gave the impression that his government was looking at rail as a mode of economic development. I got the impression, from what was said in the throne speech and from Question Period later, that this government was looking at more than an interlink between Alaska and BC, possibly to the exclusion altogether of White Pass. Is some form of policy developing there?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know how the member got that impression. Certainly, it was not one that anyone on this side meant to convey. Our first priority, our most desirable method of transportation to tidewater, is by railway. We have never deviated from that most desirable method. I said a number of years ago that we were very hopeful that, in the final analysis, the railway would be chosen by everyone as the most desirable method of getting Yukon to tidewater.

We, at the same time, have indicated that, given the economics today, the Government of Canada must make an undertaking to extend the railway because the railway is not economical if it is only 110 miles long. It is not realistic to expect the owners of the railway to be able to operate with only 110 miles available. If they had 300 miles of rail, they would probably be able to operate quite economically. They would be able to compete with the road. They cannot compete with the road system when the railway is only 110 miles long. Everybody recognizes that.

The Government of Canada must make a decision with respect to the short term. That is, whether or not they are going to, in the long term, look favourably at rail expansion in this territory as a basic part of the transportation infrastructure in the territory. We are pushing for them to make that position favourably. We have been on record since the day we were elected, and that is going to be six years ago tomorrow.

³⁶ For most of us in this House, it will be six years tomorrow. A

couple have been here longer. However, ever since we were elected, we have said that the railway is imperative to the territory. We think it is required. We have not deviated from that at all.

Mr. Byblow: I could not agree more with the government leader, but his comments do give rise to two issues, if you will. Both are related to the budget. The first issue deals with the proposal this government put forward last summer that it may wish to consider maintaining its portion of the Skagway Road this winter as something of an experimental exercise to determine costs.

I assume that would probably fall under maintenance budget as opposed to capital budget. I am interested in the intentions of this government when it proposed that, especially in light of the other half not being reciprocated in terms of maintaining and keeping the road clear during the winter to determine cost.

The second question I will leave until this is explored.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have heard from members opposite, time after time, that government has a responsibility to try to make sure that people are employed during these times; that the times are tough and we have to try to get as much winter employment, in particular, as we possibly can.

It occurred to me that, prior to the opening of the Haines Road on a permanent basis there was a year where it was kept open on an experimental basis, on agreement between Canada and Alaska. A number of things were determined that year. One: that they could keep the road open and, two, that it gave both governments the opportunity to assess the value of keeping the road open, and the cost of keeping the road open.

I went to Juneau and met with the Governor. I suggested to the Governor that it might well be worthwhile for both of us to consider, notwithstanding the railway — and I was not talking about ore trucks or anything else. I was talking about that artery open for the winter — keeping the highway open for traffic this winter, on an experimental basis to determine, (1) how much it would cost; (2) is it feasible; and (3) would we really want to do it in the future.

I suggested to the Governor that this would have the potential of putting a number of people to work in Skagway, as well as a number of people in the Yukon Territory — people who do not have jobs — this winter, because that road is not open.

The Governor of Alaska seriously considered the proposal and decided that they did not want to go with it because they felt that it may jeopardize any decision to use rail. I did not think it would because we were not talking about opening the road for truck transportation or increased load lifts or anything else. I was talking about keeping a transportation artery open. That is all it was. The word came back from the State of Alaska that they were not interested in it. We thought "very well" and forgot about it from that point on and we have not considered it since. We regret it because I still think that it would have been a good idea. I think we would have been able to take advantage of the fact that there is still high unemployment. We would have been able to have put people to work just keeping that road open for the winter.

It would have been very interesting to know how many people from Skagway, and how many people from Whitehorse, travel that road in the winter time. I honestly do not know whether or not it would be worthwhile. However, some year we are going to have to do it just to find out. We determined on the Haines Road that we were well justified; there was plenty of traffic to keep that road open in the winter time. Until we did it we did not know. Respectfully, until it is done on the Skagway Road, we are never going to know whether or not it is worthwhile.

Mr. Byblow: I suppose an experimental exercise on keeping that road open would help determine the costs, but it may not necessarily fare out an accurate assessment of volume of goods simply because you do not have the rail running. If you did have the rail running, it would have a different bearing on the body of traffic. I am sure.

My second question on the subject relates to a federal position that the government leader spoke about. With respect to the railroad and the debate that has taken place over the past year or so, with the CBC report in mind, does this government support the position of

providing a subsidy to the railroad? The government leader understands, I am sure, more acutely the complexities of that question, and it cannot be answered in a simple yes or no. I am sure. We have the debate where rail costs so much in comparison to road costs and that certainly has some relationship to the proposition by Cyprus Anvil and Dome Petroleum. We have the inevitable decision to make whether to retain that railroad or not and if it is going to receive any form of public support.

I am not sure if it is appropriate to mention, but the government leader is also aware that there was a position advanced by the deputy prime minister of a Crown corporation for White Pass, in order to preserve it as a tool for development and to put it into the hands of the public, through government, for the retention of stability and long term use.

³⁸ Having said all that, and because it has some bearing in budgetary matters, does this government see retention of the railroad contingent on the use of public funds to keep it in operation?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I guess the only way I can answer that question is by stating an obvious fact that I stated a number of times before. The White Pass and Yukon Railway is the only railway in Canada that is not subsidized to some degree or other by the Government of Canada — the only one. I believe we can even go further and say it is the only railway in North America that is not subsidized by senior government of whichever government that railway happens to be in.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in a specific question and also a very general area, and it is a follow-up of the questions I asked about the five-year plan. It strikes me that, if the government identified a particular city block in Whitehorse that it wanted to buy or to build a building on, it would be detrimental, or it would be bad business — let us put it that way — to announce to the public that the government wants that block and then negotiate with the private owners of the lots to buy them. Everybody knows the price of the lot would immediately go up after the owner knew that the government was involved. If a case arose that, in a five-year plan, the government wished to acquire either a specific land or a certain kind of land, how would it actually do that? Is it possible to buy lots piecemeal, and where would the money for the land acquisition be identified in that general process?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There are a number of ways. You can buy lots piecemeal. Sometimes the government gets lots back for nonpayment of taxes. Sometimes land comes back to us that way. The most common way, and it is considered the fairest, and the most equitable way, because it is removed from the whole negotiating process, is to use the *Expropriation Act*. That is deemed, in most government circles, to be the fairest way, because then it becomes the case of a judge making an arbitrary decision as to the value of the property and orders the government to pay that amount of money, whatever it might be. This is judged to be fair and equitable, hopefully from the point of view of the taxpayer being the purchaser, and the owner of the property.

³⁹ It raises interesting issues about property rights, which we will debate in a general sense under another item on the Order Paper, but I will ask this question: if the government is intending to build a building — and this probably arose on the justice centre — and wants to get architectural drawings or architectural information about the site or the land, in order to build a model such as the model in the foyer now, concerning the justice centre, and to not announce the type of construction of the building, where does the money come from to buy the architectural services, or the land, or both?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The project has to be approved in estimates. There has to be money voted in estimates in order to do that. Sometimes it comes in supplementary estimates, but normally it is done in the normal course of events through capital estimates.

I might say, while I am on my feet, I can recall that it is rather dangerous to ask, especially in Whitehorse, and probably just about anywhere in the territory, because of the drainage, and because of the soil conditions and so on, an architect to come up with a proposal and to design a building for you without giving him or her some site-specific land to work on.

A good example was the first proposal for the building that now

sits on this particular site. It was a 10-storey building; it was a tower three storeys high and had a tower going up 10 storeys, with the capability of building another tower 10 storeys high. Well, that was just great. It looked beautiful and it was going to be a nice building, except that when they then decided that this was the place they wanted to build it, in something like four years it was going to be underground. The whole thing was going to be underground because it was going to go straight down because it was just too heavy.

It relates to what I was saying before about the considerations that had to be taken into account with respect to the construction of the justice centre.

This building was then redesigned after the site had been selected. By the same token, we asked the architects to come up with proposals for the justice centre, knowing pretty well where we wanted build. All that had to happen was that some discrete soil samples had to be taken, and they could then design a building which could maintain itself in those specific soil conditions.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is probably a detailed question and the government leader may wish it as a notice. I was interested in what part of the vote for the courthouse is architectural, what part is land acquisition, and what part is actual construction. That may be answerable now or not. I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That was done last year. In the budget there was, in the spring I believe, \$2,500,000 put aside for pre-engineering. And further to that, the architectural has been proposed as a supplementary.

Mr. Kimmerly: That is part of it. Is any of this vote for land acquisition, or is the land already acquired?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The money that is identified in this capital budget is for capital expenditure. Capital expenditure is the building of the building itself.

Mr. Chairman: On Mr. Kimmerly's subject, I think that you are kind of getting on to justice. Can we not wait till we get to that budget.

Mr. Kimmerly: Maybe it is notice of the question. Where is the money for land acquisition identified in any budget?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: It is in the supplementary estimates.

Mrs. Joe: I have a couple of questions for the government leader. I was really pleased to hear about the plans to build a new justice centre, and also the facility for young offenders. I had talked to the Minister of Justice shortly after the announcement of the justice centre being built, and I was concerned at that time about what offices were going to be there, and he had indicated to me that he had talked to some members of the bar association and I think one of the things that we were concerned about was that all necessary offices and other things be in that building. One of the concerns that we had at the time was whether or not that would include the native courtworkers' offices, because they are not a part of this department, but it would seem that something like that would have to be included in that building. I just wondered if someone could inform me at this time whether or not those kind of plans are being made?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It seems to be pretty specific for general debate. I think probably that the question would be much better put to the minister when you are discussing the actual item. I am sorry, I cannot tell you what kind of considerations were given to that specific kind of question.

Mrs. Joe: Thank you. I will follow that up in general debate. I have another question in regard to some of the items we have listed under economic development and tourism, which include the restoration of many historical sites. There are a number of dollars that are allotted for certain projects, and I just wondered if the government leader could inform us about how the department determines the priority of these projects, and what kind of consultation do they have with other groups such as the Yukon Historical Museums Association?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, with all due respect, surely that is a question that only the minister can answer. I have not been party to the negotiations that went on. The size of the budget is determined with me in the chair. The issues are all brought. How they get there and the priorities used to bring them to Cabinet for

determination as to what will go into the budget, surely the minister is the only one who knows that answer.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no more general debate, we shall move on to Schedule A.

On Department of Health and Human Resources

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: As can be seen, a major initiative for the Department of Health and Human Resources next year will be the construction of a secure facility for young offenders as is required as an essential aspect of Yukon responsibility to the implementation of the *Young Offenders Act*.

The other capital expenditures are targetted as both maintaining and upgrading facilities to approved standards for alcohol and drug services, child welfare, youth services, senior citizens, and speech programs, and services administered by this department.

On Northern Health Services — Equipment and Construction

Mr. Kimmerly: How are you going to build a facility for a nurse in Beaver Creek with only one dollar?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is one of those items where, because we insist on being so early with our capital budget — as members opposite are surely aware is primarily for the construction contract — the government of Canada, who are the ones making the determination about how much money is going to be spent in this particular line, are not prepared yet to tell us what they are prepared to spend next year. We feel that we should keep the line item there so that when we do get their money, we are going to be able to spend it.

Northern Health Service, Equipment and Construction in the amount of one dollar agreed to

On Renovations — Alcohol/Drug

Renovations — Alcohol/Drug in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to

On Furniture and Equipment — Alcohol/Drug

Furniture and Equipment — Alcohol/Drug in the amount of \$24,000 agreed to

Mr. Penikett: I do not want to sound like I am flogging a dead horse here. I want to — as I promised myself that I would on the first furniture item that came up — again raise the local materials issue. In recent weeks I have had occasion to talk to two residents of the territory who are older people, not young, but who happen to be European-trained master craftsmen in terms of the manufacture of furniture.

There are people who happen to live in this territory, but who are not working at the trade which they were trained in in the old country. It occurs to me that in any one of these budgets, and I am sure that this is the case in the municipal level as well as the territorial and federal levels in the territory, there are hundreds of thousands of dollars of furniture purchased every year by all three levels of the government in the territory.

I have asked both these gentlemen whether Yukon woods are suitable for the manufacture of furniture. I understand that there are some difficulties because we do not have the full range of them and there is a fair amount of metal in modern furniture. However, as a rule, there are some sources of pine, for example, in the Yukon Territory which are perfectly adequate for the manufacture of furniture. I wonder if I could put this as a question to the government: is the government leader predisposed, or the minister of government services, to put out any small contracts as an experiment for the manufacture of furniture, especially some of the simpler items such as tables and chairs, and so forth, which, I admit, might be more expensive on a unit-cost basis in the short run than buying the mass-produced items from down south, but which, over time, would have positive economic benefits because they would be using local materials, and using a skill which is available locally, and could produce enormous benefits to the territory. It might start another little industry. The demand created just by the government or by the public sector is sufficiently great, perhaps, to sustain some small craftsmen or small contractors or small entrepreneurs in this area. It may be, if not immediately, but over time, that they could give us competitively-priced, quality furniture which is manufactured entirely locally.

I only put it forward as a suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I appreciate the suggestion by the member

opposite. For the information of the House, the purchase of the computers went along that line. The proposed costs that we received to put computers into the school system was somewhat higher than the lowest bidder. We took the second or third lowest bidder because there would be servicing available to us as opposed to it being shipped in from outside. Secondly, with the volume that we were buying, a distributor could be set up who would be able to service the general public and that is exactly what has happened.

Where is the cutoff point? Is it 20 percent in cost or is it 10 percent? Somewhere down the road, the question of economics comes into play here, as far as what are you prepared to pay on behalf of the taxpayer. I guess that that is the question that I would put forward to the member opposite in respect to the idea of encouraging this type of industry. I have no problem with the principle that the member is putting forward, but I think one has to translate that into what is the differential that one is prepared to go to and not go beyond, and strictly go to a competitive type of bid as we have in the past.

Mr. Penikett: I think that the minister has faced the problem very well and I admit that it is a problem. I would not like to, on my feet now in the House, suggest that the 10 percent differential or the 20 percent differential be established.

I think that the instance of the furniture is very different from the computers. I accept what he has done with computers and I think that that is fine. The point that I make about the furniture is that we would take a renewable resource in the territory and take something from the land right through to a finished manufactured product. I think that would be highly desirable if we could do it. I would think that the spin-offs from that at every level, both in the community where the wood would be coming from and from the people cutting it and the sawmills processing it further, to the carpenters and finishers and the craftsmen who would be putting the material together, would give us spin-offs at every step of the process — in fact, even more spin-offs than you would from a local computer facility.

« The minister challenges me to say what it is, 10 or 20 percent. For myself, and I have not consulted my colleagues, I think I might be prepared to say, off the top of my head at this stage, as an experiment, that by putting out the contracts for furniture here, to pay a 20 percent premium to have the stuff entirely manufactured here locally, from local woods, and so forth, I believe, and I hope it is not a misplaced belief, that, in the long run, the pay-off for us would be considerable. I do not want to get into a long debate about this, but I think this is exactly the kind of an issue we could spend some time on during these appropriations.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Just to add a little bit to this discussion, I think it should be understood that some of these items we are talking about are not, in fact, a chair or a desk. Some of the items that I can think of are mattresses, which are probably very difficult for a local business to make. Also, the pre-treatment of institutional beds, armchairs, chesterfields, kitchen and recreational items, light fixtures, those types of items. To get into another area, to go beyond this particular line item, you would get into the assessment centre and places like that where the furniture in those particular areas are built to withstand abuse, and I do not think we, in the territory, would have a great enough demand to set up the forms and those types of things to get the materials in for the building in the amount that would be needed. Also, in places like Macaulay Lodge and areas like that, small amounts of things are built for specific purpose for the aged. That might make it a little difficult. I am thinking if an individual has a product that he wishes to sell the government, in the line of desks and chairs and wooden products, he should bring that forward and let the government know that they are available to do this type of work. However, I am sure with the policies that this government has, if there was a way of retaining for any of the building that we would be doing, we would be very happy to have a report from him on what he could build for the government.

Mr. Penikett: I accept what the minister said in his earlier points and I understand completely. Just let me make this modest point with respect to the latter suggestion: both of the people I refer to, whom I had conversations with — and they are surely not the

only people in the territory capable of doing this — are, at this point, either unemployed or working in other areas. I think that, if you are going to do something like this, it may be that the government has to create the demand initially by issuing a couple of small contracts, maybe for some tables and some chairs and some bookshelves and things like that. If someone is not presently engaged in doing this work, such as making desks or bookshelves — and there may be a number of people who are, I just do not know, because I do not buy a lot so I do not know what the situation is — and who have not already sold to the government, they may not see it as a potential market. They may or may not come trying to sell to the Government of Yukon. What I am suggesting is a different situation. We have a natural resource in the community, and we also have some skills, or some human resources in the community, which are not being used in the way they were trained. It may be that, by putting out a couple of small contracts initially, to see if there was any response — if anybody was to bid on them — then in fact both craftsmen would get a good price, one might discover that there is some real potential there. If it is a success, from the point of view of the government, they could always issue over time some more of those contracts.

« So I agree with the minister except for the last point, and I am suggesting that maybe there is a role for the government in terms of creating a demand, that is all.

Furniture and Equipment in the amount of \$24,000 agreed to On Young Offenders Security Facility Construction

Mr. Kimmerly: There are a number of questions about this. One of the first and the simplest is, where is it to go? Secondly, what projected occupancy is the current plan, or current wisdom? Is this the extent of the federal government commitment or federal government's contribution to changes made necessary by the *Young Offenders Act* and is this going to involve more person-years, thus impacting on the O&M budget? Those are a few simple, general questions. I will ask more as we go along, perhaps after my colleague, the justice critic, does.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I hope I remember all the questions as I did not write them down. If I forget one, maybe you could remind me.

The first question was where this will be built and a wag on this side suggested it would be a Conservative riding, in a Conservative area. In actual fact, the location for it has not been established.

The next question was to do with whether it was a requirement of the new federal *Young Offenders Act*.

Yes, it is. On April 1, 1985, a person below the age of 18 years would have to be in a secure facility, aside and apart from an adult offender. We do not have that security facility at the present time.

The other question about the increased number of people to work on staff — I believe there would be a slight increase — but I have not studied that at present.

Mrs. Joe: I only have one question and that is in terms of the present facilities and the minister is aware that I have asked questions about this before. Since we do not have a place for this facility and, therefore, probably do not have a date for the completion of the facility, I was just wondering if there had been any money set aside at any time to use an alternate facility in the meantime until this building is finished.

« **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I believe I have made statements to that effect on a number of occasions. We have already made an agreement with the Province of British Columbia that, if it is required, we can send our young offenders to a secure facility in British Columbia.

Mrs. Joe: What is happening to these young offenders who are apprehended and put into custody along with the inmates in the existing RCMP jail awaiting trial?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: At the present time this is not law. It becomes effective on April 1, 1985.

Mrs. Joe: I am talking about when it becomes law. Also, from the time that it becomes law until the time that there is a facility that is available to hold these juveniles until they either have to go to trial or have to be sent to another institution out of the territory.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Places of temporary detention have been designated. In areas such as out of town, the RCMP will be able to

hold a young offender of the law for a period of up to 24 hours before bringing them into town, and the RCMP have set aside particular cells in their physical plant that are away from the adult offenders, and in a different part of the building.

Mrs. Joe: Just some clarification as to whether that will be in the communities that he is talking about, or is it in town. Right now they are being detained in the adult cells, and the explanation that we were given, and probably will be given in the future when this becomes law, is that sometimes there is not always room in the certain part of the jail in town. If there is not room at the time that that young offender is detained, are there any plans to put that person anywhere else in town?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Under the provisions of the *Young Offenders Act*, the youth court judge may order detention of the young person in the local RCMP cells and, in any community, for a very short period of time. It is the intention of the Department of Justice that that period of time will basically be overnight. The objective is to have a hearing within 24 hours. That hearing would frequently be in Whitehorse before the youth court judge or, if the circuit was coming into the community within the next day or so, the youth court circuit hearing could be in the community. Presently, the only facility in Yukon that is actually designated as a secure facility for young offenders is that of the Whitehorse Correctional Centre. All efforts would be required to ensure the full compliance with the act, as it relates to keeping young offenders separate and apart from adult offenders, as is possible. In the open custody settings designated in Yukon there are, at present, youth service facilities and the group homes. The only group home that is operated by the department in outlying communities is in Watson Lake. A youth from Watson Lake found in court to have committed an offence could be ordered to open custody in that community.

Mrs. Joe: According to reports that we have, there has been an increase in inmates incarcerated in the local jail. There has also been — as the minister stated — inmates detained in the jail separate from the adult inmates. With the increase of the population of the Whitehorse Correctional Centre, will there still be that space? Is there an alternative to what they have now for these young offenders because of the increase in the populations in the jails?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I seem to be going around in circles. I do not know. I have been doing it since last year. I have been trying to explain that the act does not come into effect until next April. If we have to send someone outside to a secure facility, we can do it. We have made provisions with the British Columbia government. At the present time we are doing everything in our power to keep adult offenders and young offenders separate. It is not mandatory at the present time and I have just explained the procedure that we will go through in the community and the amount of time people will be held in designated cells, in RCMP custody. I am sorry that we do not have a secure facility other than what I have mentioned. The fact of the matter is that we are in here discussing the capital budget to build a secure facility and there is absolutely nothing more that I can do with regard to the member opposite.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in the kind of facility there will be, and I will explain the question. There are various choices available. The department could build a building or even renovate a building on the present site of the correctional centre at Takhini. There are administrative advantages in that the administration is central — the same stores, and the same kitchen, et cetera — and the same perimeter of security could be used. The government already owns the land. There are some advantages to that kind of facility. The primary disadvantage seems to me is that it associates the young offenders with the adult convicted criminals, which is clearly contrary to the spirit of the *Young Offenders Act*.

Another choice could be to renovate or rebuild the existing assessment centre on Lambert beside the Liquor Store. That has advantages in that the staff is already there. Some of the people who would be housed in the new facility are already in that existing facility and that proposal obviously has some advantages.

Another proposal would be that a site like the old Wolf Creek facility would be desirable. That is a site outside the downtown core.

That has advantages and disadvantages. Probably some would

argue that a rural site would be extremely advantageous to remove the temptation of, for example, the availability of drugs in downtown Whitehorse or the availability of a target to break into in the downtown core. The disadvantages are that you cannot teach young people to get along in the city while they are in the country, or you probably cannot. If it is also a remand centre, there are substantial transportation problems and also there may be an increased staffing problem if it is outside of the permanent centre.

I am particularly interested in, because of the range of the choices available, what planning is occurring or what decision has now been made. Are we going to get a renovated older building or a new building? Are we going to get an institutional facility or are we going to buy, for example, a large residence and renovate it as a group home, which is a distinct possibility? What is the state of the plan now?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: At the present time, we have hired an implementation coordinator and they are working on the development of plans for a secure facility in Yukon, and on a system that complies with the federal act. The first suggestion for the use of the same facility as the correctional centre, now, and using the gymnasium and eating facilities, has been looked at and in the reading of the *Young Offenders Act*, it states "a stand-apart facility".

It is my feeling that they mean exactly that, so I feel we will not be in the same area as the present correction facility. It is not, to the best of my knowledge, this government's plan to renovate or rebuild the assessment centre to serve the purpose of a secure facility. We will be staying within the federal legislation as we see it and we will try and build a facility that adheres to the requirements of the federal act.

Mr. Kimmerly: That brings me to a related question. Is there now a projection of the probable population of the new facility? These projections, I am aware, are fairly tenuous in the justice area. Is it possible to say we are building a building for a projected population of probably under five or six, or in the neighbourhood of 20 or 30, or even more?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: It is my understanding that we will be building a building that will house approximately 20 individuals.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister may take this as notice because it is a fairly detailed question in the way that a number was arrived at. I am certain that one of the factors is to look at the number of people historically incarcerated between the ages of 16 and 18, and that would be a part of the number. The philosophy of the courts will change with the new act and the implications are not entirely known, but it seems to me that it is crucial to project as accurately as possible the number of people involved. I simply ask if I could be provided with the principles, or the process, by which that projection was arrived at.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Would a written answer to this suffice?

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, thank you very much.

I am interested in the implications of the O&M budget. It appears to me now that we are talking about an entirely separate building to house approximately 20 people or so, and if these people require three shifts on a 24-hour supervision basis, it appears that a staff involvement is going to be, at least, in the nature of 15 person-years, perhaps more. I am interested in a projection about the way those people will be acquired. Will there be a reorganization of existing person-years, or an addition of new person-years? Has that consideration come into play in the planning process of that particular building?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We will be looking at the people involved in this and we feel that, in some instances, the people will require a little different training than some of the people who are presently working in the system with the adult offenders. There may be some people who will possibly come into the system. Also, there may be people within the system now who, because there will be a reduced requirement as to the number of people who have been removed from some of the areas that they are presently working in, we will be able to use in a new facility.

One must remember that this is a requirement that has been brought about by federal legislation and is a requirement that we must meet. It is not something that we have decided that we would

like to do on our own. Therefore, the project is cost-shared and we would have to look at it in that light.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister may or may not wish to refuse to comment on this, but I will leave it to him, of course. It appears to me that the fundamental decision here is: what is the facility going to do? It could be essentially in the general sense or in principle. It could be a young person's jail, meaning a building with locked doors and fences and, simply, a jail for young people. Or, it could be a series of, say, three or four homes, as the group homes are now; all of them being designated as facilities under the act, but only one of them being a facility of secure detention with jail cells in it, with the others being basically group homes as we now know them.

It is certainly my philosophy, and I would urge upon the minister that it would be most appropriate — appropriate, especially to the small numbers of person involved here in Yukon — that we go the route of building three or four homes or buildings like residential homes or group homes as opposed to a new institution, being a new jail.

There certainly are some young people — and when the age is increased to 18, there will be more — who require firm detention. That is controversial, I believe. There are certainly some. However, the number in the territory is very few, perhaps two or three at a time and, in any event, no more than five or six.

⁵⁰ If the present population trends continue, that will be the case for a long time. There are many individuals, in Whitehorse especially, who are teenagers requiring a secure place to live, which is not exactly a jail, but is more akin to a group home. If there were three or four buildings, that would be far more effective to the programming aims of the young offenders legislation and it would fit in with the categories of punishment, which are now made possible in the young offenders legislation.

I suspect, in a capital planning sense, it would be substantially cheaper for three or four residences than a large institution costing \$2.5 million.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I appreciate the philosophical debate that we just had. The fact of the matter is that we have group homes now established as open custody facilities. It will be a judge who will make the determination whether a person will go to open custody or to a secure facility. There is nothing at all that could limit the way that a secure facility could be built. I would imagine that inside that secure facility, they will go from heavy detention to a very light detention, but it still will be a secure facility as required by the *Young Offenders Act*. We will abide by the federal legislation as set down. As I have said before, we have a coordinator studying the implementation of it and the facility will address what the federal government has said that we need; that is a secure facility.

Mr. Kimmerly: I rise again because that answer has stimulated me to make a further point. I not only believe, I can say that I know, that the legislation requires a certain designated facility. It is up to the provincial or territorial authorities to designate whatever building they require. It is entirely open to this government to designate the existing assessment centre as the new young offenders jail — or any of the units, or all of them — and there is a compliance with the federal act. The federal act allows a substantial leeway. It is obvious that we are going to need at least one place to house some young offenders who may be dangerous.

⁵¹ They are few and far between here, but they do exist. There is a necessity for an institution or a building which can carry out the function of a jail, or a kids' jail. The projected population must be very, very small, and I know that from my personal experience, and I am absolutely positive of it. The number of people now sent out to that kind of a facility is extremely small — two or three a year at most — and the facilities are not all jails in the real sense of the word "jail". There is substantial flexibility here. There is a possibility for the minister to make a choice and the choice is between a regime or a program, dominated by an institutional facility, being a jail, or a series of group homes, not unlike the present group homes. In this process of the capital planning, I would urge upon the minister to plan a secure facility only for the small number that do require jailing. The facility should not be an

all encompassing jail. The options open to the sentencing court in the youth court would be greatly expanded if the same amount of dollars was used to build or finance so-called facilities of differing levels of security. The possibility would also exist of putting some of them in the communities which, in Watson Lake and possibly Faro in the future, would be an extremely desirable and positive step.

⁵² **Mr. Falle:** I would like to know what the per diem rate is on the agreement that we had with these people of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I hope I do not have to give you a written answer but I will have to come back to you with that information. I do not know.

Mr. Falle: Another question that certainly intrigues me is on the school. I would like to know the difference, in the minister's eye, between a reform school and a security facility. I would like to know what he perceives to be the difference.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The security facility and the open custody are facilities that are set aside for a judge, on hearing a case, to make a determination of which type of facility an individual will go into, for a period of time. Far be it from me to suggest that I could either read the judge's mind or make a representation to a judge for putting a person in one of those facilities. You would have to leave that determination to that individual, not to me.

Mr. Kimmerly: If I could follow on Mr. Falle's questions. The per diem rate is approximately \$130.00 per day and it varies in the different institutions. In relation to the question about the possibility of open custody and closed custody, the *Young Offenders Act* sets out categories of custody and probationary supervision. It is for the sentencing judge, of course, to choose one of the categories as to what will be applied, and to choose the length of time that will be applied and the various terms and conditions.

The more facilities open to the judge, the better and the more sensitive the judge's decision will be. It is not a question at all of the minister saying to the judge what kind of custody will occur. It is a question of the minister providing, as the executive arm of government, various alternatives or choices that the court can choose from. The more alternatives there are, and the better planned they are to coincide with the real needs for guidance and correction that particular individuals going through the court have, the better the judicial decision will be.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I would like to thank the member opposite for restating what I have just finished saying.

⁵³ *Young Offenders Secure Facility Construction in the amount of \$2,500,000 agreed to*

On Furniture and Equipment - Youth Services

Furniture and Equipment - Youth Services in the amount of \$26,000 agreed to

On Furniture and Equipment - Child Welfare

Furniture and Equipment - Child Welfare in the amount of \$84,000 agreed to

On Equipment - Speech Disorders

Equipment - Speech Disorders in the amount of \$8,000 agreed to

On Equipment - Senior Citizen Facilities

Equipment - Senior Citizen Facilities in the amount of \$77,000 agreed to

On Other 1984-85 Items

Other 1984-85 Items agreed to

Department of Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$2,729,000 agreed to

On Department of Justice

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go to justice on page 39.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: As in the last vote, we have one very major item, and this particular item is the Yukon justice centre. \$7,250,000. I am sure we will have lots of interesting debate on that, and I would like to get into it immediately.

Mrs. Joe: Before we get into the items, I would like to ask the minister about the objectives where it says "to provide legal services to the government as a whole". What does that mean?"

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: What that means is that all parts of government function under legislation, and when they wish to know whether they are within our legislative responsibility, whether they are operating legally within their mandates, they can get hold of the

Department of Justice to have it checked. They could check out contracts. Health and human resources uses justice on *The Childrens Act* and on other pieces of legislation. The government, as a whole, has the Department of Justice to turn to on any of the legislation that we operate under.

Mrs. Joe: Does that include legal advice from the department? Is that what he is saying? Also, during the speech by the government leader, he mentioned that there were new solicitors who had been hired by the department. Was that included under this?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Under the objectives, yes. We do have three new solicitors to aid the government in its role and function.

Mrs. Joe: Where could we find that that would be included?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We are dealing with the capital budget now, and the capital budget does not deal with operation and maintenance.

Mrs. Joe: I only ask because it is listed under the capital budget, and I wondered why it was listed here.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We put the departmental objectives in these estimates at the request of the opposition. I have to tell you that no one on this side of the House has to be told what the departmental objectives are. The departmental objectives are set with respect to the operation of the department. The line of questioning is dealing with O&M. It is not dealing with capital at all. We are dealing with the capital budget here.

On Yukon Justice Centre

Mrs. Joe: I would like to get back to the question once again that I asked prior to this. The justice building has been announced and we were wondering when it was scheduled to be completed. During the process of the planning, the minister had indicated to me that members from the bar association had talked about who was going to be included inside the building. One of the concerns we had was whether or not the Native Courtworkers would be. At the time that I talked to him, he was not sure whether or not they were going to be. I feel that it is absolutely necessary that they be very close to the courts in terms of dealing with people who have to come in contact with the courtworkers. In other jurisdictions, outside the Yukon, the native courtworkers are very often installed in the same building as the courts.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The Yukon Native Courtworkers will have all the space available to them when they are in court but it will not be a permanent office.

Mrs. Joe: I am not really sure what the minister is telling me although I know what he said. The native courtworkers do a lot of work with regard to giving out information. They are funded by this government and the federal government. I wonder if the minister has decided it, and that that is the final decision that he has made in regard to the native courtworkers. I feel, and so do a number of other people who are involved with the justice system, that it is essential that they be included in that building.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The use of the side of the building that is not the court side of the building will be determined by the space allocation committee of this government. The native courtworkers will have space available to them on the court side of the building to use whenever they are in court. I believe that adequately answers the question.

Mrs. Joe: I understand now what the minister is saying. Usually, what happens is that the native courtworkers are in court every day and there are many, many cases that they have to deal with. There has to be a place where people can go to see them so that they have to have space there. I was wondering if the minister has any plans to increase the number of courtworkers and also to fit that in with the new facilities and the funding, and the space that could be available to them.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I believe that the numbers of courtworkers really should be addressed in the O&M budget. If the native courtworkers are in the building every day working in court, the office space will be available to them every day in court.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have many questions, but first of all, I have been lobbied by some people and I want to ask a question so that I know the answer in order to publicize the answer. I think it will lay some gossip to rest that, perhaps, is most appropriate.

Will the minister assure us that the Optometrists Building will not be torn down?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Yes.

Mr. Kimmerly: The question has been asked of me more than once. I would ask that the announcement of the building occur immediately prior to the Tory convention. Will the minister say that all of the land was acquired prior to the announcement of the building?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We are still in the process of trying to acquire some of the land.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is it contemplated that this land will be expropriated?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Some of the land.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in the space allocation that the minister has already announced, and it is a *fait accompli* that there will be a building of a certain structure and a building of a certain allocation and that it is essentially two buildings with a courtyard between. The space allocation I will address because there is still some practical reasons for doing so in that it may be what we say here may influence future decisions. That is why I am attacking this particular issue.

My colleague asked about courtworker offices, and the issue there is that if the government lawyers and the government have offices either in the same building or across the courtyard in the same structure as the courts, and the other people do not, there is a perception that the government people are on the inside and the other people are on the other side. This particular argument has been raised with minister before. I know I have raised it, as have others.

⁵⁶ I know there is no public defender system here now, but it is obvious that the new legal aid committee is going to look at that issue, and it is obvious that the new courthouse is going to serve us for years into the future; 20 or 30 or 40, or a lot longer. I am asking about the issue of the space allocation in the particular structure. Is the design appropriate to incorporating a Yukon court of appeal in that structure?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Yes.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the plan that the court registry for the Supreme Court and the Territorial Court be combined into one registry office?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That is a question that I will have to research.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is there a space for a law library in the structure, and will the library be open to the public?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: There is space, and there will be a way for the public to get into that space.

Mr. Kimmerly: If there is a public defender system, is there a possibility of allocating space in the structure to the public defender?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The first was "if"; that is hypothetical. The second is that if it is not hypothetical, it is possible.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister is being careful, as well he might be, but I have raised the issue and I would say that if the system develops that there is a public defender, if the Crown attorneys are there, the public defender has an equal right to be there. I can make that comment and the question will be addressed in future years. With any luck, I will participate again in the future.

Will there be a public information office in the courthouse; that is, a public, legal information office?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I do not think we have addressed the public legal information office as yet.

⁵⁷ **Mr. Kimmerly:** Considering that the decision is already made to not build the one courthouse, and to build a justice centre, has any consideration being given to leasing out a part of the building to the private bar?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We have looked at the size of the building as to the requirements of the government and the courts that are necessary. That is as far as we have gone. I do not think that we would be leasing out to the private bar in this building and I do not think we will be doing it in that building either.

Mr. Kimmerly: I raised that not entirely in jest because the private bar, I am absolutely positive, would choose to be as

independent as possible. It would not wish to lease from the government unless it is a lot cheaper, perhaps. It raises the issue of the appearance of justice and the accessibility to the courts of the government lawyers and the private bar.

I would ask the minister in a different vein, as I believe I have identified the nature of the questions about space allocation — they are not resolved, but they are identified — about the energy component in the building. I heard a claim that it was to be solar heated and it would require additional energy for heat for only four months a year and it would be entirely self-sufficient for eight months. I would love to believe that, but I have some difficulty. Could the minister explain how that will be achieved in the general sense and, more importantly, what degree of confidence or degree of tolerance the engineers are actually guaranteeing?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I do not think the architects are guaranteeing an exact number of days that we will be totally energy free, but I can tell the member for Whitehorse South Centre that eight months is the amount of time that we have been given as their estimate of the amount of time we can heat by use of the sun. I might also state at this moment that we were not given any guarantee that we could heat by any other method from anyone else. So right off the bat, we are eight months ahead.

During the spring, summer and fall, the primary heat source will be low temperature, hot water generated in the chiller serving the atrium. The low temperature hot water will be stored in tanks located in the basement, produced during the night. The low temperature water system will be 60 percent propylene glycol. The heating system works — if I understand it properly — as a collection of heat in the top piece of the atrium where there are four fans on each corner.

⁵⁸ The air is heated in that space, then taken by those fans down through refrigeration and heat transfer, and heats water that is stored in about 25,000 gallons of water storage. During the evening, when there is a temperature change, there is a heat blanket that goes automatically across the atrium to stop the heat from going back out through the area it came in. It is then that the water that has been heated during the day that is stored in the water tanks heats the building in the evening.

During the winter months, the water tanks could be charged by alternate sources of energy, such as electricity on an interruptable basis, in the evenings, or through a wood chip boiler steam system, which may be installed in the downtown corridor, which may be able to heat those water tanks. We are fairly confident that the people who designed this have an extremely good track record and are correct in their assumption that we could get eight months of the year energy-free. They also have designed in this building a complete air conditioning system so the building will be both heated and air conditioned.

Mr. Penikett: Just let me express a brief thought. I hope that the system will be designed in anticipation of the worst possible case, such as a burst pipe and having 25,000 gallons of glycol and water all over the floor. It could be kind of unpleasant in the winter, especially if it happened at the same time as the heating system was failing.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I would like to think that that would go without saying.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in the wood chip furnace and I am in favour of it in principle, but where is the smoke going to go, and where is this going to be?

Some member: We are going to pipe it into Riverdale.
Laughter

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: They have developed the system to burn wood chips through after-burning and some type of catalytic system where they tell us you can have that burning right in the middle of a downtown area and never see the exhaust of it, or the heat waves.

Mr. Kimmerly: Was any consideration given to using excess heat from the NCPC generators at the dam?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I believe that that is a long way away and the cost for underground piping of the sort that would be needed in that type of distance would be astronomical. The cost for the wood chip and steam in the downtown location is just marginal in a small area around the centre of court because of the expense of the pipe

that needs to be used.

Mr. Kimmerly: I understand that the smoke stack is going to be downtown and the minister is assuring us that the pollution factor will be nil or negligible. Is that accurate?

⁵⁹ **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** Before I make a statement, I would like to seek out the member for Whitehorse South Centre. If we were to go on the generator at the dam at the present time, we would be a long time getting warm if it is not running.

The smoke emission, from whatever source will be downtown, will comply to whatever health standards are available to us at that time.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to ask, and this is probably most appropriate in public works, as to the method of tendering or contracting for the building: is the government going to be the general contractor?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It will be tendered through Government Services. The idea is to go through a project management system so that there will be smaller contracts and, therefore, give the opportunity to our contractors, locally — a very good opportunity — of bidding on the contracts and getting them. We will be involved to some degree but it will be contracted out in packages.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: To finish the subject of air conditioning and heating systems, I would like to explain a little more about it. It may help reduce the number of questions in this area. The offices and courtrooms in these areas will be air conditioned by four variable wall and fan units. They are located on the third floor adjacent to the atrium. The variable air these fans will supply will be distributed to terminal units in each terminal zone to achieve cost and volume air distribution in occupied spaces. The four air-handling units for the atrium will be constant volume systems with low temperature hot water heating coils and chilled water cooling coils. Return air will be drawn from low level in the atrium on the heating mode and from high level in the cooling mode. The heat rejected from the chilled air in the cooling mode will be stored in the low temperature hot water tanks.

I hope that satisfies the questions on heating.

Mr. Kimmerly: On the point of heating, just one last question related to the capital expenditure. It is appropriate to ask it now. As this will use wood chips, is there planning to acquire the capital equipment necessary to have the jail inmates get the wood and prepare it? That would be most appropriate in my view.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: In that particular philosophical bent, we believe in private enterprise to the greatest extent and the proposal for wood chips would be from private enterprise. They would have to secure their own method of bringing in the wood chips and material for the wood chipper.

⁶⁰ **Mr. Kimmerly:** It would appear to me to be very appropriate that jail inmates be utilized to collect the wood, and it would be substantially cheaper and, as some members say, a consideration of the cost to the taxpayer should be absolutely paramount. In this case, that factor would be extremely significant.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: No, we thought that possibly those individuals would seek or find employment in the leader of the opposition's quarry, reducing rather large rubble to small rubble.

Mr. McDonald: I am not sure of the significance of the minister's last remark. I would like to get back to land acquisition. I have a few residual questions which I would like to put to the minister. Can the minister —

Mr. Chairman: Please could we just have one short one. We have two minutes before we recess.

Mr. McDonald: One short question. Let me see which is the shortest one I have here. All right, what portion of land has yet to be purchased in order to provide a full lot for the justice centre.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: A short answer to the question — the portion we do not already have.

Mr. Chairman: We shall now recess until 7:30 p.m.

Recess

⁶¹ **Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We are now at line item Yukon Justice Centre.

Mr. McDonald: I asked the minister one short question before the break and the minister gave me a pretend answer on the break. Would he give me a real answer to it now?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I never give pretend answers.

Mr. McDonald: The question was: what portion of the land for the justice centre has yet to be purchased? What portion of the total has yet to be purchased?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The same portion as at 5:30, the portion that we do not have.

Mr. McDonald: At this point in negotiations for the purchase of the land, what proportion of the land does the government not own at this point?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: At this point in time there are no negotiations.

Mr. McDonald: If the minister does not wish to answer the questions I have asked, perhaps he can at least give the reasons why. I would like to know how much land is left to be purchased for this particular justice centre.

Mr. Kimmerly: In an effort to solve an impasse, purely in a constructive vein, I would ask: eventually, when all the land is purchased, would the minister table the date of acquisition and the purchase price which would be public knowledge in the event, which may solve the problem.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The land that we are talking about is going to be expropriated. If it does come to that, then the figures should be available.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have neglected to make two points earlier and I will make them now. I asked about the law library and about public access, and I believe I did not adequately make the point that it is desirable that the library be readily accessible to the public. If it is off in a secluded corner of the building, it will be less accessible than if it is off the main courtyard, and I would make the representation that the law library is paid for by the taxpayers, and it is accessible to the public, albeit some members of the public, and relatively few, who use it. It is a substantial service to them.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The other point is around the issue of the family courts. I have repeatedly commented that the family courts and the youth courts should be in a different facility from the criminal courts. I would ask the minister: what efforts are made to establish a family court and a youth court, and are they going to be the same actual rooms as the criminal court or not?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: To help alleviate some of the problems of the member for Whitehorse South Centre on this building, the court side building was designed in a certain manner by an architect who had worked on the designs of court buildings in another city. The law fraternity came to a meeting with the architect and the people who had designed the concept of the building and were afforded the opportunity to make changes inside the court side of the building that they deemed necessary for a smooth-running facility, as far as the people in this area were concerned.

As we speak now, that committee and that architect are having meetings in this city. The law library has been discussed at length. The family courts have been discussed at length, and all parties, to the best of my knowledge, are coming to a resolution. I believe, from meetings with justices, that they are happy with the procedure and the way it is being done. I am sure that no one will be able to say when this is completed that anything was done that was contrary to the legal practitioners in this territory, and we look for a happy group of individuals working in the court facility.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am aware of those negotiations, as a member of the law society, and I thank the minister for his statement, which appears to go a little further than the statement of officials previously; that the wishes of the law society were reasonable and will be implemented. The law society will be comforted by that statement.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would like to reconfirm that that is on the courthouse side of the building. The discussions have gone in the vein that they will not go outside the original size of the building. It will stay within the dome of this allocated project. Beyond that, if the people who operate the court find that it is easier to change the

size of a room, to change it or to move them around, to move the library to one area within the physical design of the building on the court side, I am sure they will be accommodated.

Mr. Kimmerly: I personally know the answer, or the concrete answer, in any event, but I am asking to publicize the particular issue. Much was made of the issue of services to witnesses in the courts and the jury members, and the like.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: There are facilities which can be used as interview rooms and also waiting rooms for witnesses. I would ask the minister to explain what improvements there will be in the new building to accommodate witnesses who are compelled to come to court and, occasionally, wait for long periods of time?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Unfortunately, my conceptual drawing is the original. The meetings that are going on are not concluded yet. In my conceptual drawing, there are waiting rooms for every court: remand, civil, family court and supreme court. Each of those areas has a secluded waiting room, with interview rooms off the waiting rooms, so that no one will sitting in a waiting room outside the supreme court and see people in the waiting room outside the remand court. Those conceptual drawings could have been changed slightly over the course of the last few meetings with the architect.

On Yukon Justice Centre

Yukon Justice Centre in the amount of \$7,250,000 agreed to

On Court Equipment

Court Equipment in the amount of \$1,000 agreed to

On Corrections Equipment

Mrs. Joe: I would like to ask the minister just what equipment we are spending the \$84,000 on?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: There are issues, like a scanner, VCR camera, film projectors, washers, dryers, chainsaws, welders, table saws, radial arm saws, band grinders, in the kitchen. There are a change of an oven, replacement of coffee makers, toasters, steam tables, dish washers, garborators, meat cutters, propane stove, potato peelers, mixers, flour bins, steam cookers, steam kettles, meat saws, refrigerators, food cutter, beds, mattresses, chesterfields, TVs, chairs, medical table, weigh scales, office equipment and vehicles.

Mrs. Joe: I would like to have a line by line cost.

So, the minister is saying that there is just that money put aside in case they need any of those things; that there is nothing planned; that their washers and dryers are breaking down, or that they need a meat saw because the other one is wearing out, or what?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: If these were not planned, I would not have spoken of them. This is a capital budget.

Corrections Equipment in the amount of \$84,000 agreed to

On Liquor Store and Headquarters Equipment

Mr. Kimmerly: I just ask briefly what it is for.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Material handling equipment.

Liquor Store and Headquarters Equipment in the amount of \$16,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Any questions on other items 1984-85?

Department of Justice in the amount of \$7,351,000 agreed to

On Department of Renewable Resources

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As you can see, the renewable resources capital budget is not that large, and I will be quite happy to speak to any questions that the members across the floor have.

Mr. McDonald: I see there are a number of questions I have. One of them is the Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway. We have heard in the past that there has been a rather large portion of funding allocated to this park development. What portion does the \$445,000 represent? Does that finish off this parkway once and for all, or is it just the 1985-86 installment?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This is the 1985-86 installment.

Mr. McDonald: By saying that it is the 1985-86 installment, is the minister inferring that his capital plan is to spend more money for 1986-87?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Very likely, Mr. Chairman. As I told the members in this House on previous occasions, the total budget for the park will ultimately reach about \$1.2 or \$1.3 million.

Mr. McDonald: I do not detect funding for any new campground in the Mayo riding. I wonder if the minister could tell us

whether or not any campground rehabilitation was included for the campground at Mayo.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Not at Mayo, but at Pelly. But regarding the campground at Mayo, it is the intention of my department to do some new campground work in that area in 1986. I believe that is when we scheduled work on that campground.

Mr. McDonald: I am aware of some of the suggestions that were made by department officials when they had discussions with the Silver Trail Tourism Association in Mayo and Stewart Crossing, and once even in Keno, I believe. There were various plans submitted for consideration. One of them included a rehabilitation of the existing Mayo campground facility; one included a series of campgrounds over a three-year period, including one campground at Five Mile Lake, one campground at Hanson Lake and one campground at Mayo Lake. I wonder if the minister is aware or if the minister has made any specific plans to help us understand a little bit more clearly what the minister's intentions are for that riding.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, I cannot, but I can assure the member across the floor that there will not be three campgrounds built in the immediate future in the Mayo riding. As I have said on a number of occasions in the House, there is not the level of tourism entering the area to justify even building the campground in Mayo at this time, so it would be very hard to justify building three campgrounds when you cannot justify one.

I have said to the member that there may be campground rehabilitation this year; there may be some small dollars in there for some basic work in the campground. But, as I told the member, the new campground is scheduled in 1986 and that is the reason you will not see it in this budget. That will not stop us if it is necessary to do some maintenance work in the campground for it to be utilized. I know that the member would like to see three or four campgrounds in his area, but there just is not the level of tourist traffic to justify it. When that level is achieved, the campground will be built.

Mr. McDonald: I admit that at this point in time that is no more justification for the construction of three campgrounds in Mayo than there is for constructing a million dollar parkway in the Tatchun riding. The minister mentioned that he is planning to construct a campground in Mayo in the following capital year. He states that there is, in his opinion, no justification for a campground in Mayo at all. I wonder if the minister would just like to reconcile those two statements, and give us justification why he does believe there should be a new campground in Mayo.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We have been working with the Silver Trails Service Association in trying to develop tourism in the area. The construction of the campground in 1986 is still two years away. By then we feel that perhaps there will be enough tourism generated into the area to warrant that campground. Perhaps there will not be, but the member across the floor and members before him have raised the issue and so has the general public in the area. They would like to see a campground. In many instances, I am not sure whether they want to see it for the tourists or if they want it for their own use. As I said, we are prepared at this time to build a new campground in the area in 1986.

Mr. McDonald: I can assure the minister that the people of that district would like to have it for the tourists and they would like to have it for their own use as well. I do not think there is anything illegitimate about that.

The minister has said that his department has been engaged in discussions with the Silver Trail Tourism Association and those are the very discussions that I was referring to in my remarks a few minutes ago. The Tourism Association, until now, has been bewildered as to what the department's plans are going to be. If the minister is suggesting that the new campground established in the Mayo district will perhaps justify more tourist traffic, therefore breaking the chicken and egg cycle that that district faces with respect to attracting tourists, then I think that that objective is laudable. If that is the way the minister would like to put the justification for the campground, then I can certainly support that.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not particularly like the inference that he is putting on the comments that I am making; that I am trying to

break the chicken and egg situation. I am not. There is a campground existing in Mayo today, as I have stated many times in this House. It is not being utilized to its capacity, not even to a tenth of its capacity. To justify a new campground, to date, has been impossible to do.

As I have stated, I am prepared to work on a new campground for the area for 1986, and I hope that it will be in conjunction with the Department of Tourism and the Silver Trail Tourist Association that we can generate tourism in that area. It is not something to break the chicken and egg situation. There is a campground there already that is not being utilized to its capacity.

Mr. McDonald: I do not want to belabour this point at all. I detect a note of insistency in the minister's argument, and I am sure that a reading of *Hansard* will bear me out.

Mr. Porter: I would like to ask the minister responsible if there are any capital expenditures projected for the area of parks as opposed to campgrounds?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, Tatchun/Frenchman Lake is a park; Coal River Springs is a park and Kusawa Lake is a proposed park. So there are three proposed parks for the territory.

Mr. Porter: I would like a clarification from the minister with respect to the issue of parks. In the past we talked about territorial parks and other parks which should be jointly set in place in conjunction with the federal government, and in previous debates the minister specified 26 possible sites for territorial parks, but the difficulty in moving forward with these proposals had always been the federal government, in terms of their response to the establishment of these parks. Can the minister indicate to the House, with respect to his department's discussions with the new federal government in Ottawa, as to whether or not there is going to be movement on the establishment of territorial parks?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, I believe that there will be movement. At the present time, though, we are concentrating on getting the land that has been planned; Whitehorse North and Whitehorse South, and some block land transfers around the smaller communities. You will see funding that is identified in here for Kusawa Lake, \$150,000 for a park master plan, and once that park master plan is completed the land for the Kusawa Lake park will be turned over to us. Yes, we are very confident that we are going to get the land, but that has not been our number one priority at this time. The priority has been block land transfers around the communities.

Mr. Porter: With respect to the Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway, the minister stated that his department is spending in excess of \$1,500,000 on that project alone. I would like to get from the minister a clear picture of the total amount spent by this government to date, and we can look back at *Hansard* to 1983 during discussions on capital expenditures for this particular park. It was stated on page 531 of *Hansard* that the minister at that time announced \$295,000 for expenditure on the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Park. Further on, in response to a question brought to him on page 651 of *Hansard*, May 15th, he stated that the government had expended in excess of \$300,000 on that particular park up to that time.

I would like to ask the minister, just so we have a clear view as to what this government is expending on that park: can he give us to date the total numbers of dollars that have been expended on the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Parkway, and over and above the capital estimates contained in this document, 1985-86, what is the government's planned expenditure for the future?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There has been budgeted for Tatchun/Frenchman Lake, I think, \$660,000 to date, and most of that money has been spent or will be spent, by the end of this fiscal year. This \$445,000, here, is on top of that amount of money. That brings it to about \$1.1 or \$1.2 million. It is very likely that that will conclude the development on the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Parkway, for the time being, unless we can justify some further expenditures to develop it in the area of Five Finger Rapids, which is a possibility for the future. There will be more money spent on that in the future. I just cannot say exactly when. This will complete most of the work that is necessary to make it a viable operation.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no more general debate, then we shall go on to line items.

On Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway

Mr. McDonald: Can the minister give us an appreciation as to what the current work entails with respect to the park? What exactly is happening with the bulk of the \$445,000? How is it going to be spent?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Most of it will be spent on men and equipment to do slashing and road construction. It will opening the up the 26 kilometres between Frenchman and Tatchun Lakes. They will be finishing the campground facilities. They will be working, as well, on the recreation trail layout and interpretive sites and planning for interpretive sites and also planning for a Kelly Creek campground that will be part of the complex in the future. That is pretty well what the money will be used for this year. Most of it will be used in the construction and re-construction of the road between the two areas.

Mr. Porter: I would like to ask the minister how the government is handling the process of awarding contracts for the work with respect to the re-construction of the 26 kilometre road? Is that process being undertaken by the public tender process or is the government employing the use of its own equipment?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is private people who are being utilized — labour as well as equipment. The equipment is hired on an hourly rate. The quote is given to the government every year. The equipment that is on the job is hired off of that list of contracts.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister tell the House who makes the decision internally within government as to who gets the contracts in that particular area from the bids that have been submitted to government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There are no bids.

Mr. Porter: Who in government makes the decision as to who gives the contracts awarded by government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There are no contracts awarded by government. As I stated earlier, the member obviously was not listening, the equipment is hired off the equipment rental list and right now there are three pieces of heavy equipment working on the job and they are the people on the equipment rental list.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister inform the House who in the government makes the decision as to who on the equipment labour list is hired?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is no different than any other organization. It is made by the person who is running the job. In this case, it is the Chief of Operations of the Renewable Resources Department, Mr. Connelly.

Mr. Porter: We have discussed the road re-construction element of the expenditure. Can the minister explain as to how the slashing part of the operation is handled? Is it handled in the same fashion or is it done on the basis of contracting or is the government, again, simply going out and hiring local people to do that on an hourly basis?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We are hiring local people.

Mr. Porter: Then, following from the comments with respect to the issuance of the work with equipment in the construction of the road, I would suppose it is the Chief of Operations for the Department of Renewable Resources who makes the decision as to who in Carmacks gets those jobs. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes.

Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway in the amount of \$445,000 agreed to

On Coal River Springs Planning

Mr. Porter: Can we have an explanation from the minister as to what is involved in this planning process for the establishment of the Coal River Springs Park?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This will provide for the public participation process in the Coal River Springs area and will also allow for an impact analysis of an access road. Incidentally, the access road is hoping to be done in relation to a mineral access road that one company would like to have access to and we are trying to coordinate it all. The \$30,000 is for the public process to review the proposed park.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister give an explanation as to how the public process will be conducted?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, Mr. Chairman. If the member wants to

read the legislation, that is what it is for.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister explain what work his department has done with respect to identification of possible archaeological and anthropological sites in the proposed park near the Coal River Springs area?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think the member across the floor has put the cart before the horse. Number one is that we have to identify the area we want and, number two is that we identify the public process; and the archeological studies and all of that are all future parts of the park development.

Mr. Porter: Is the minister not aware that there is presently being conducted in the area, archaeological studies?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There may be, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister inform the House as to whether or not any portion of the access road that he is contemplating constructing falls within the Province of British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Not to the best of my knowledge.

Coal River Springs Planning in the amount of \$30,000 agreed to On Kusawa Lake Planning

Mr. Porter: Can I ask the minister to give the House a breakdown to the area of expenditure under the Kusawa Lake planning?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, but the member could find the same thing by reading the *Territorial Parks Act*. What we would be doing in this regard is soil inventory for recreational and agricultural suitability. We will be doing archaeological resource studies. We will do a habitat analysis and a track census for wildlife species and outdoor recreation analysis for potential site identification. We will have field crews out on the job combined with a complement of casual and permanent employees, including surveyors, wildlife technicians, vegetation and habitat technicians and park planners. We will also have approximately eight to ten hours of heavy equipment rental to be used.

Mr. Porter: Can the minister explain what the use of the heavy equipment will be with respect to this project?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I believe I can. I may not be accurate in this but I believe it is some of the work to be done in order to make access through part of the slide area where we had a slide previously. I may be wrong in that; I do not have the briefing note in front of me as to what the 10 hours for heavy equipment rental will be exactly.

Mr. Porter: Of the \$150,000 that are identified within the estimates here, is any portion of that funding going to go towards the work with respect to the Kusawa Lake campground or is that going to be identified under campground rehabilitation?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Most of that money would be campground rehabilitation for the crucial planning study, the actual study to plan the management plan for the proposed park.

Kusawa Lake Planning in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to On Campground Rehabilitation

Mr. Porter: Other than funds identified for the Kusawa Lake campground, what other campgrounds in the territory are going to receive funds from this particular line item?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There will be Ethel Lake, Quiet Lake, Kusawa, the campground at Carmacks and Tatchun Creek. This will create approximately 300 person-days of employment, and 800 hours of heavy equipment rental.

Campground Rehabilitation in the amount of \$143,000 agreed to On Departmental Equipment

Mr. Porter: We should get an explanation from the minister as to what is being expended here and what equipment the government is buying.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is replacement equipment such as radios, lab equipment, accessories for the drafting machine, a boat trailer, and other equipment that wears out and is required every year.

Mr. Porter: The minister used the phrase replacement equipment. Can the minister explain what happens to the old equipment? Is it offered through the auction system of the territorial government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That is the only way that we can treat it. *Departmental Equipment in the amount of \$70,000 agreed to*

Mr. Chairman: Questions on other 1985-86 items?

Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$838,000 agreed to

On Economic Development and Tourism

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not have too much to say in general debate. I think the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, now under its reorganization, is going to be a much more efficient and better organization for the people of the territory. We have streamlined a lot in the department although we have a few of the research positions that are necessary in economic development not full as of this date. The department has been working very hard in doing, what I think, is a very good job.

You will see that we have increased the loans assistance by \$500,000. I think that is going to be one of the most beneficial programs that we have in the territory. I am sorry that it is only \$1,000,000 because I believe that it is going to be over-subscribed. We have the economic development agreement that I hope, when I am down in Ottawa next week, I am able to convince the minister, Mr. Stevens, that the subagreement on the economic development agreement for tourism should be turned over to us rather than the federal government trying to deliver it on its own.

The Northern Oil and Gas Action Program project that we have put into, up to now, a little over a million dollars which will be utilized for the research in the territory and I believe that is going to be of benefit to us. All in all, I think that we have a very good capital budget in this department this year, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Byblow: Yes, I have several questions. Previously, I think we had discussed the entire prospect of developing an economic strategy. We also talked about this particular program getting a lot of programs thrown into it. That, in some respects, could be questionable as economic initiatives. I do not wish to debate that aspect of it. More specifically, I want to ask what steps in the reorganization and streamlining of this branch are taking place to develop long term economic strategy for government?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We have refined the departments so that there are distinct divisions between the divisions in the department. For example, there is an energy and mining branch, which will deal with energy and mining. There is a research branch that will deal with the research. We have made distinct divisions in the department so that we can develop, for example the mining branch, the capability in the mining area to the point where at some time in the future, if we are successful in having transferred the mining responsibility from the federal government, we can split that division of our department right off and form a new department of mines. The whole organization of Economic Development and Tourism is now laid out so that we can, in the future if necessary, split any part off and send it to another department or form its own. I do not believe that we will ever see it sent to another department but, certainly, for example in the mining, we could split it off and form a new department.

Mr. Byblow: I guess in some measure the entire capital budget is an economic initiative, simply because it is an expenditure of funds for work that in turn creates employment. When the minister talks about streamlining into branches for certain capabilities of looking into different sectors of the economy, what coordinating function takes place within the entire branch that makes all of the information that is gathered relevant and available to decision makers. Let me use a case in point. Clearly we have the Cyprus situation, which is one of a very complex nature, and very much an economic matter. How does the economic development branch respond in terms of providing this government with information upon which to make decisions relating to simulating that economic sector?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think he raised a question that deals with a lot more than just one part of the branch of economic development. It deals with the statistics of what money is generated, what the costs are, what the effect is that Cyprus Anvil has on the economy. It deals with the mining division, because the mining division deals with what is happening in the mining sector in Yukon, in total. It deals with the Department of Finance. It deals with a great many things besides economic development, and all of that material. When a question arises and comes to the Department of Economic

Development — say about Cyprus Anvil — the researchers in the mining sector grant part of that would research all of the effects that it could have on the economy by contacting all of the other departments that would be involved. It would coordinate and consolidate all of that information and would make a report to me or to Cabinet, which has been done.

Mr. Byblow: At this time, the minister can confidently say that, upon request, he can produce an entire set of statistics relating to the economic impact of that mine's closure, because that is, obviously, what has been looked at?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would not say the entire thing, because the study that was done on the effects of the closure of Cyprus Anvil was not a completely detailed study. What it did was pull together the concerns of every department in the government and coordinate and consolidate them, then send it to me as a report of what would happen over the closure of Cyprus Anvil Mine; really not the effect on the territory but on the government.

Mr. Byblow: Is that report available?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is an internal document.

Mr. Byblow: I guess the way then would be to become part of the internal machinery.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: That is right.

Mr. Byblow: Reality may come forth.

I would like to talk briefly about the economic development agreement. That is something that was signed this past spring and released some \$18 million over a five-year term, I believe. Because this is the first time the House has actually met since the agreement was signed, could the minister provide us with a quick summary of what is constituted by that agreement, what its implications are and what the next steps of procuring money out of it will be?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The agreement that was signed was a \$13 million agreement, but it was only a master agreement. Under that agreement, we have to sign the subagreements. Those subagreements have not all been signed, for example, the tourism one. I am not interested in signing it in the manner that it is now written. I would like to see it become a responsibility of the Government of Yukon. Although the master agreement has been signed, the subagreements are not yet signed. We do not have the economic development agreement in place.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps the minister could relate to me the significance of the line item under the EDA in this portion of the budget and, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to get away from general debate, although I have to draw reference to it.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Well, I would sooner deal with it when we come to the line item. I can give you a quick summary of it. I suppose, rather than dealing with it under the line item.

As I told you, we have a master agreement, which is the \$13.2 million agreement, of which we provide \$2.2 million as our share of the agreement. There are four subsidiary agreements proposed, one for \$3.8 or \$3.9 million in the renewable resources subsidiary agreement. There is the mineral resources subsidiary agreement, which will be administered by the federal government. There will be an economic development planning subsidiary agreement of \$670,000, which will be done by ourselves. There will be a renewable resources subsidiary agreement for \$4.2 million dollars, which will be administered by Renewable Resources, and a small business and tourism subsidiary agreement for \$4.4 million dollars, of which I was speaking earlier. Now, to date, the federal government has approved the mineral resources funding and they have also approved the renewable resources and economic development planning subsidiary agreements, but the \$4.4 million tourism agreement has not been finalized to this date.

The Treasury Board has not ratified the agreements to this date and it is not expected to happen until early in 1985. Hopefully, we can begin on April 1 with the first year, when \$1.58 million is expected to be expended, and that will be under all of those agreements. What we will be doing is on the renewable resource side and on the planning subsidiary agreement. We hope to have the tourism one switched over to us because we are not sure just exactly what the federal government intends to do with the \$4.4 million in tourism.

So, the \$1.58 million is next year's expenditure, of which \$1.4

million is recoverable.

Mr. Byblow: I appreciate that because it does provide some clarification of how this is flowing. One portion appears to be strictly federal responsibility; the mineral research one, I believe, or the resource one. Renewable resource clearly would be a shared expenditure; the economic planning one is the one that I want to ask about. Because I will be asking questions about the Economic Development Council, it may be appropriate at this time to relate the two. The minister gave notice that there is going to be \$670,000 under economic planning released under this agreement. We also have the Economic Council developing some initiatives. I want to understand whether those two will inter-relate or be integrated in any way for the expenditure and, specifically, how this government plans to spend that half million dollars in economic planning, because I believe the minister did say it was going to be strictly the responsibility of this government.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not have a list of what we intend to spend \$670,000 on.

If the member is interested, I can bring back what we intend to spend that money on. I do not have the list in front of me. Certainly the Economic Development Council will be making recommendations on areas that we should consider working on in the territory. That will be taken into full account when they do make their recommendation.

The Economic Development Council is not funded under this agreement and neither is the research capability that will be provided to them. That is not here either. It will come right out of the departmental budget and they will be looking at various things in the territory and making recommendations to us. Some of them, certainly, will be areas that we will, in the future, be planning.

Mr. Byblow: If I am understanding what the minister is saying, the Economic Development Council is strictly a creature of this government, under this government's funding, separate from the Economic Development Agreement.

I gather, from what the minister said, that economic planning that is going to be done under this agreement is going to be for special project initiatives. That would appear to me what it amounts to. He made reference to things like Keiwit. I would assume that under that planning will also be some investigative work with respect to, perhaps, some secondary industry, or with respect to some special resource development. It would appear to me that it is not so much strategy and long term planning as special projects. Could the minister clarify what his understanding is?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It may well be both, because it will also be gathering material and information that we will use over the next period of years to develop the economic initiatives in the territory. It will be gathering information. It will be providing us with relative information for future development in the territory and it will also provide us with the mechanism to put on the shelf, if you will, information that will be beneficial to us in the future.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will now call the Committee to order. We are on general debate on economic development and tourism.

Mr. Byblow: Prior to the break, we were talking about the planning component of the department. What I would leave with the minister, in something of a final question on the subject, is to ask him whether or not the department is in some stage of preparing an overall economic strategy or plan for the territory.

Now let me elaborate on what I am seeking in the answer. We talked about economic planning, we talked about developing a strategy, and we have come through several very tough years in the territory in terms of survival, much less planning for growth and development. Nevertheless, it becomes a matter of some urgency to map out the direction that a government is going to take, where it is going to place the funding available to it, in order to provide those stimuli for industry and business to proceed. We always talk about the chicken-egg syndrome in any kind of development. We talk about the initiative of the private sector. We talk about the responsibility of governments. Certainly, I am sure that the minister would agree that, in the territory, governments play quite a major

role in providing the kind of stimuli for growth in the form of economic development tools, or those things that industry look for in terms of making a decision about whether they are going to move in certain directions.

So what is happening in terms of that planning component? Is this government taking a direction of any sort? Are they saying that small scale mining is going to be an initiative? Are they saying that secondary manufacture is going to be an initiative? Are they saying that renewable resources are a major part of it? Are they saying that we are hanging our hats on tourism? What is the direction, I guess, is what I am trying to seek?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: All I say is that when you start putting things down in black and white, and you start saying we are going to support tourism or we are not going to support small mines, but we are going to support this or we are not going to spend our money on that, all we are doing is locking ourselves in, because as soon as something is put down in black and white, you restrict yourself.

What is an economic plan? All that we are trying to do in this territory is to try to spur economic development of any type we can get.

We do not have umpteen millions of dollars to start developing resources from MacPass to Mayo in order to spur the mining industry in that area, for example. That does not mean that we do not want it there. If we are going to say our economic policy is that we are going to support the small craft industries and tourism and we are going to forget about the large mining industry, all we are doing is putting down in black and white that we are not interested in certain sectors of the economy and that is not true.

It is great to talk about these policies, but the policy that is necessary for business is the fact that they know that the government is interested in economic development of whatever type they propose for the territory. We are willing to look at anything and we are willing to help wherever we can help. It is an attitude that you give to the people. Putting it down on paper does not mean anything.

So, it is great to talk about these policies, but when it gets down to the bottom line, the policy really is that the government is prepared to work towards economic development of any type in the territory, be it mining or be it tourism; or is it not? Quite frankly, I am not prepared to put in black and white that I am not prepared to support a certain sector of the economy because we cannot afford to. I would sooner have the proposal, and then be able to tell them on an individual basis whether or not we can support them.

Mr. Byblow: I am not sure that I would want to debate this at any great length because I do not believe that there is any consensus of outlook about this subject. What I am hearing the minister say is that he does not believe in any kind of economic plan that would enhance long term economic growth. It is an ad-hocery approach of whatever available funding and whatever initiative comes across, and may not necessarily be in the best interest of a region or an area, or a sector.

I suppose that we have something of a different outlook when it comes to an initiative of economic development. My colleague from Mayo, as the new mining and tourism critic, is just rearing to show his new-found wisdom and I will leave the floor to him.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Before we get off the subject, I would like to take a second to rebut what the member across the floor said.

It is a case that we are interested in whatever type of economic development anyone proposes in this territory, and we do have plans. The Economic Development Agreement is a five-year agreement to develop the economic base in the territory. We are working on a transportation policy to try to identify where future roads should be in this territory. We do a great deal of that, but that does not mean that we are going to have an economic plan of policy that says we are going to support a certain industry over another. Once you put it in black and white, as I said before, you restrict yourself. I do not believe we should restrict ourselves to anything in this territory. We should be prepared to look at whatever proposal comes before us.

Mrs. Joe: I am just going to speak ahead of my colleague from Mayo because I have a couple of short questions to ask the minister. I asked him in the general debate and was told to ask at this point of

time with respect to the restoration of different historic sites. I asked the government leader and now I am asking the minister how he determined what sites they are going to work on and how much money they are going to spend on it, and where they are going to be. I note that, and I am sure this is just a coincidence, the *SS Tutshi* is in Hootalinqua and Fort Selkirk is in Tatchun, and the Ladue Sawmill is in Klondike and so on, down the line.

I am sure there must be some other sites or places of historical value in the Yukon. I wondered if the minister might be able to tell us how they determine, and what priority given those sites to be worked on.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I resent the implication that, as I stated earlier about parks, we are picking areas out because they are represented by Conservatives. If that is the way the members would like to see us go, we can certainly do that from now on. As I stated earlier, we do a great deal of campground work all over the territory. In fact, the two major Conservative ridings in the central northern part of the Yukon have never had work done on them. They are only reaching it now. After five years we are starting to spend money on the Klondike Highway and, as far as the historic sites, most of these sites are identifiable and just happen to be in Conservative ridings. If you want to identify a site in Whitehorse North Centre, for example, why do you not do so?

We are restoring Fort Selkirk because it is representative of a river community. Just because it happens to be in my constituency does not mean that is why it is being done. The restoration of Fort Selkirk started before we even started into party politics. The *Tutshi* is a ship that we happen to own and we are restoring it for the visitor industry in Carcross. It has nothing to do with whether Carcross is represented by a Conservative or not. All of these areas are identified and have been identified in years past by a study of historic sites in the territory. Recommendations were made as to which ones we should be looking at — the most serious ones — the ones we should be trying to stabilize and the ones we should be restoring, and once that recommendation comes to management board we identify money for it.

For example, the Robertson Roadhouse is being stabilized on the Carcross Road for the benefit of the tourists who travel between Skagway and Whitehorse. We have others we could have restored other than that. We could have picked Montague House up near Carmacks to restore, if we had wanted to.

Mrs. Joe: I asked the minister a question, and I am not sure whether he answered me or not, but I had an opportunity to attend the annual meeting of the Yukon Museums and Historical Association and heard a report done on behalf of the minister. At that meeting, there was some concern, and I also share that concern, about the articles that were stolen last year during the showing in the library. The person representing the minister had mentioned that at that time there were some future plans to do some possible building of certain things to make sure that those articles would be secure and that people would not be able to walk away with them. Could the minister tell me if that is included in this list?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, and if the member across the floor had taken the time to go look in the Art Gallery, which she was talking about, she would will find that some work has all ready been done there. For example, the glass partitions have been put in there to protect them. The only other protection that we can give other than that is to have a watchman on staff and then we have to balance the cost of that watchman out against the possibility of losing some of the art work. Whether it is cheaper to pay the person for the art exhibit than it is to hire a staff person and have him on staff for protecting may not be, in relation to his wages, worth protecting. One has to be balanced against the other.

Mrs. Joe: I have not been to that little room for a while and I thank the minister for giving me that information.

There is a real concern and I ask that question very seriously. I think that some of the art work, especially the one that was stolen last year, was priceless — something like that you cannot replace. I wondered if the minister was willing to recommend that there be additional staff on at that time if they do not have all of those articles in a closed glass case?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We are certainly looking at it but, as I

stated, the two biggest shows that we have had — in fact one is in there right now, Ted Harrison's show and the other was Haycock's show — just to hire staff to police that gallery at hours when the library is open and there are not enough people around to staff it, would cost in the neighbourhood of \$10,000 a year.

We have to balance that out against the chances of having something displayed that is worth the kind of money that we are paying to have someone supervise it. Quite frankly, I have a little bit of a problem with saying that we should hire more staff just to do that for a few hours every week. The facts and figures have come to me. The recommendation has come to me. I sent it back to my department to have a further look at it to make recommendations of whether or not to hire staff.

Mr. McDonald: To be sure, the minister invited members of this side of the House to identify certain sites in our districts which might warrant some sort of renovation work. The Elsa Recreational Association's rec hall is an historic site to some, and does require some restoration work. Perhaps I will talk to the minister responsible for community and transportation about that. There is one industry, of course, that is going to require some long term help from the government in terms of a stable policy projection. That industry, as the minister is aware, is the agricultural industry. The industry obviously needs some assurance that the government is committed to its survival and its growth over a period of time and, notwithstanding the minister's comments about the free trade policy between Alaska and Yukon — which we can discuss some other time perhaps, unless the minister would like to delve into it now — can the minister state what sort of initiatives the government is taking to provide that kind of stability for the agricultural industry? Are there loan funding programs which the industry can take advantage of, which are long term. Is there funding within, for example, the loan assistance program, to identify specifically for the agricultural industry, and designed specifically for payouts over the long term, which is common to farm loans. I wonder if the minister can comment generally on policy initiatives in this area. I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would submit to the House that we should report progress on Bill No. 39.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committee.

Mr. Brewster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 39, *First Appropriation Act, 1986-1986*, and directed me to report progress on same.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of the Committee. Are you agreed.

Some Hon. 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 Education 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 9:00 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled on November 19, 1984:

84-4-34

Communication from Earl Forgues, President of Cyprus Anvil Mining Corporation, to Maurice Byblow, MLA (Tracey)

84-4-35

Yukon Public Service Staff Relations Board Annual Report, 1983-84 (Pearson)

84-4-36

Yukon Teachers' Staff Relations Board Tenth Annual Report,
1983-84 (Pearson)

84-4-37

Memo dated Nov. 8, 1984, to Faro Residents from Maurice
Byblow, MLA; Text of Nov. 8, 1984, telex to Mr. Forgues from
Maurice Byblow, MLA; copy of DEX dated Nov. 13, 1984,
Forgues from Byblow (Byblow)

84-4-38

Copy of letter dated Nov. 16, 1984 from Forgues to Cyprus Anvil
employees wattachment Comparison of Wages and Benefits
(Byblow)

84-4-39

Copy of Nov. 19, 1984 United Steel Workers of America Locals
1051 and 8243 publication Locked-Out (Byblow)