

The Pukon Legislative Assembly

Number 10

2nd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Thursday, October 17, 1985 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell DEPUTY SPEAKER - Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME CONSTITUENCY **PORTFOLIO**

Hon. Tony Penikett Whitehorse West Government Leader. Minister responsible for: Executive Council

Office; Finance; Economic Development, Mines and Small

Business; Public Service Commission

Hon. Dave Porter Watson Lake

Government House Leader. Minister responsible for: Tourism;

Renewable Resources.

Hon. Roger Kimmerly Whitehorse South Centre

Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.

Hon. Piers McDonald Mayo

Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation

Hon. Margaret Joe Whitehorse North Centre

Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's

Bureau.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston

Campbell Old Crow

Norma Kassi Art Webster

Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

Liberal

Willard Phelps

Leader of the Official Opposition Hootalingua

Roger Coles

Liberal Leader

Bill Brewster

Tatchun

Bea Firth

Kluane

Whitehorse Riverdale South

James McLachian

Faro

Dan Lang **Doug Phillips**

Whitehorse Porter Creek East Whitehorse Riverdale North

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly Clerk Assistant (Legislative)

Clerk Assistant (Administrative) Sergeant-at-Arms

Hansard Administrator

Patrick L. Michael Missy Follwell Jane Steele G.I. Cameron

Dave Robertson

o: Whitehorse, Yukon

Thursday, October 17, 1985 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: I will now call the House to order. We will proceed at this time with Prayers.

Prayers

Point of Personal Privilege

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I rise to inform the House of the untimely death of a senior, trusted and loyal civil servant in the Government of Yukon. Mrs. Patricia Alice Harvey died last night of a heart attack. She joined the government in 1968 as a clerk typist and rose to be an administrative officer and a program manager in the Liquor Corporation. She became an acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in 1983, and Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice, after a reorganization, in November, 1984. She is one of very few women who have risen to substantial heights in the civil service. She overcame a stuttering handicap with great courage, and I knew her well because of that.

She was born in Arcola, Saskatchewan, in 1927, married Bruce Harvey in 1948. He died an untimely death in September, 1982. She is survived by two children, Patricia and Robert.

Mr. Speaker, may I say, as her Minister, that she adjusted to the change of power in an extremely and thoroughly professional way. She was an extremely able administrator, a real trooper, and will be substantially missed.

⁰² Mr. Phelps: I rise to pay tribute to Pat Harvey. She was a dedicated Yukoner who worked very hard on behalf of all Yukoners. At work she was an inspiration to those who worked for her, and was extremely loyal and dedicated to those for whom she worked.

We will all miss her. Yukon has lost a good friend.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I should like to remind the House that Pat Harvey was also a candidate for public office, specifically for a seat in this Legislature, having represented the Conservative Party in the race for the Whitehorse West seat in 1982. I had the rare privilege of — not only in recent weeks and months — coming to know her as a public servant, but also having known her socially and, as well, as a political rival.

She was a worthy opponent in the political arena. She was an extremely valuable servant of this government and the people of this territory. She will not be quickly forgotten. Thank you.

Mr. Coles: I would like to rise to pay tribute to Mrs. Harvey, whom I have known for many years now, and who has probably taught me more about political circles in Whitehorse than anyone else. She will be sadly missed by me and my colleague.

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: We will now proceed with the Order Paper. Introduction of Visitors? Tabling of Returns and Documents?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Speaker: I have for tabling an Addendum to the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer, which I tabled in this House on October 7.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have for tabling an answer to a question asked by the Member for Tatchun on October 15.

93 Speaker: Are there any Reports of Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills? Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion? Statements by Ministers?
This then brings us to the Question Period.

OUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Phelps: I have a question with regard to the Frenchman/ Tatchun Lakes Road. We have asked a fair number of questions already, and they centre on the contract to pay \$100,000 to the Band up there for relocating the right of way around the beneficiary's home.

The land belongs to the federal government. The Withdrawal Order was enacted by the federal government. Did the Minister have any discussions with the federal government, prior to entering into negotiations with the Band, with regard to relocating the right of way?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I did not have any discussions with the federal government.

Mr. Phelps: Since the federal government owns the land, and the federal government is responsible for the Withdrawal Order, can the Minister advise me whether or not, subsequently, he has had any discussions or correspondence with the federal government with regard to the relocation of the road right of way?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have had no such discussions, but obviously the Department officials have been discussing it with the federal government. They obtained the Land Use Permit on October 13, and a subsequent amendment to that Land Use Permit on September 23.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Minister advise this House whether at any time the federal government took the position that the YTG had to pay money to the Band in order to have the right of way moved for the benefit of one of the Band members?

14 Hon. Mr. Porter: Not to my knowledge.

Speaker: New question.

Mr. Phelps: With respect to the same issue, in the past the parties at the Land Claims table always took the position that the Agreement-in-Principle was not binding until the final agreement had been signed and ratified by all parties — and this, of course, is a situation where a Subagreement-in-Principle had been signed and the Agreement-in-Principle has not been ratified. On several occasions, the definite position of all three parties at the table was that, where there were minor adjustments to be made because of an oversight on behalf of a Band, the CYI, the YTG officials, Government of Canada officials, or whatever, the parties would make those adjustments without considering the specifics of the agreement to be written in stone. In a situation where, on several occasions, there had been obvious slip-ups on behalf of government officials in the past, the parties had made adjustments to the satisfaction of everyone without monies being paid — give and take. Can the Minister of Renewable Resources tell us why, all of a sudden, we have a situation where the YTG is going to pay money every time there is to be an adjustment?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There has been no policy change to say that the YTG will pay money every time there is an adjustment.

Mr. Phelps: In this situation, it was a problem that it really was the Band's responsibility. We have no problem with an adjustment being made in terms of moving the right of way. Why would this government pay the Band for the privilege of solving their problem for them?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Because we had to gain consent from the Band to utilize lands that were selected and frozen under a federal Order-in-Council withdrawal, to be able to complete the road.

Mr. Phelps: At any time, has the federal government stated that a payment to the Band was necessary in order to make an adjustment? That has never been the case in the past.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I was personally not advised by the federal government to that extent.

Question re: Job evaluation study

Mr. Coles: I have a question for the Government Leader. Will the Minister undertake to determine whether or not some positions

within the bargaining unit were not evaluated in the job evaluation study?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am sorry — I apologize — I am not feeling very well today and I may not have heard the question correctly. I think the Member asked me if I would seek to establish why some positions in the government ...?

Mr. Coles: ... Whether some positions ...

Hon. Mr. Penikett: ... Whether some positions were not evaluated.

Following the Member's question yesterday about the Yukon College, I was advised that those positions in the bargaining unit at Yukon College were subject to the job evaluation study. However, there are a number of positions there that are short term contract positions, where someone is hired for a year or a certain period of time to teach a course or a particular type of course, for which there may not be a continuing need. Those types of positions at the college were not subject to the job evaluation study at all.

os Mr. Coles: Is the Government Leader aware that some tradespeople in the bargaining unit are going to be losing ground to non-tradespeople because of the job evaluation study?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, I am not aware of that, but that sounds like a matter for a bargaining table and a matter for the Union to be discussing with its members as we go through the ratification process. I think it would be improper for me to discuss particulars like that on the floor of the House.

Mr. Coles: In view of these facts, does the Minister think that the job evaluation study may not have been fair to all employees, especially in the case of tradespeople?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am afraid that that question is, as we say under our rules, argumentative. The answer is implied in the question. I do not accept the assumption in the question.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Phelps: Again, with respect to the earlier issue of the Frenchman-Tatchun Lakes issue and the expenditure of \$100,000 to the Band when the land belongs to the federal government, it reminds me of a situation where I would be buying Mr. Porter's house and paying Bill Brewster \$100,000 for that privilege.

Can the Minister tell us why he did not discuss this issue with the federal government prior to entering into negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Those discussions could very well have taken place between the Department officials at the YTG and the federal government. I assume that they took place. I was not directly involved in those negotiations.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Minister tell us why he did not discuss this matter with his Land Claims Negotiator prior to negotiating the agreement?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The issue, in terms of the Frenchman-Tatchun question, was an issue that was presented to me and to the Department to deal with more or less as soon as we took over government. There was no Land Claims Negotiator appointed until well into August.

Mr. Phelps: In view of the fact that in May there was a behind-closed-doors deal made between the NDP and the Liberal Party, which was negotiated according to statements made by the Members by two lawyers of the same law firm, I would like to know whether or not this particular contract was a result of that deal made back in May?

Some Hon. Member: Pretty low, pretty low. Clean up your

Hon. Mr. Porter: The negotiations we undertook with respect to the Frenchman/Tatchun issue in no way discussed any agreements that he alludes to with respect to the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the NDP.

Question re: Land claims, Carmacks Indian Band lands selection

Mr. Phillips: I have a question for the Land Claims Negotiator, but I am not quite certain who is the official Land Claims Negotiator, or the Minister responsible.

There seems to be some confusion by the general public, and at least by myself, as to what the new Land Claims policy is.

Yesterday the Minister of Renewable Resources stated that the land under question was frozen by the federal Minister of Indian Affairs.

Why was this land frozen, initially, and is the land under question involved in the Carmacks Indian Band selection?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: With the greatest respect, I suspect that the person who asked those questions knows the answers to both of them. The frozen land he refers to was in the land selected by the Carmacks/Little Salmon Band, and that is why it was frozen.

Mr. Phillips: If this land was set aside under the federal Land Claims process, then why did the Yukon government interfere with the Land Claims process?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I think that the question is what is known as a non sequitur.

Mr. Phillips: What I am trying to get here is some clarification. I am having a great deal of difficulty in understanding what this process is. My understanding is that Land Claims was to settle certain things such as land, cultural things and various other aspects of the Natives in the Yukon. Why could this problem not be handled by a simple decision at the Land Claims table by the federal and territorial negotiators? Why was it handled unilaterally by the Yukon government? Are they pre-empting the Yukon Land Claims settlement? Are we now in a dual process of Land Claims settlement in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I have two points. The first is that if the Member wants clear answers, then he has to ask clear questions.

The second one is that, at the time in question, Land Claims negotiations had not recommenced. As the Member knows, they had stalled some time ago, nor are they yet back underway. In any case, this side of the House rejects the oft' repeated implication from the other side of the House that somehow the cultural and economic development of Indian people in this territory should await a final settlement of Land Claims. We do not accept that proposition.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Lang: At the outset, I have to take objection to the comments made by the Government Leader in that respect. The point was the deal was made by the government with \$100,000 of our money, Native and non-Native alike across the territory for land that we do not even own. The fact was that there was an agreement in place. Why did the government go so far away from the agreement made by the Carmacks Indian Band, the Government of Yukon and the Government of Canada? That is the question.

The great negotiator, the Minister of Renewable Resources, said yesterday that he had a copy of the Agreement-in-Principle and that he would be prepared to table it subject to the Government Leader.

Would the Government Leader table a copy of the Agreement-in-Principle that was agreed to between the Carmacks Indian Band, the Government of Canada and the Government of Yukon, as it relates to the Tatchun/Frenchman Road?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am going to have to think about that because when I was given copies of those agreements I was made to swear by the now Leader of the Official Opposition, then the Land Claims Negotiator, that I would not publish, quote or, I guess, reveal the contents of those documents. Being a person of my word I do not intend to break my word to the former Land Claims Negotiator that I would breach the confidentiality of those documents.

mMr. Lang: We had an agreement arranged between three parties. We now have a government, representing the public interest of the territory, who has gone so far away from that agreement that the agreement is irrelevant. It is no longer in place.

Why will he not table it now that it is really null and void and has no effect on that part of the negotiations of the Land Claims, in view of the unilateral action by the Minister of Renewable Resources?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Members opposite have to get their acts straight. What is it they want us to do? Just last week, the Leader of the Official Opposition implored me to respect the principles of the existing agreements, even though they have not been ratified, even though they have essentially been rejected by the Indian people. Today, we have the Member for Porter Creek East, a

long-standing opponent of aboriginal rights and Land Claims, arguing that I should table this important document. Why should I table it? Because it is null and void and invalid.

The logic of that completely befuddles me.

Mr. Lang: In deference to the Government Leader, and I recognize that he is sick — maybe that is one of the reasons that he is not reasoning logically today — the point is that he stated to us, approximately three days ago that he was going to honour all of the Agreements-in-Principle until they were changed at the Land Claims table. Now we have, before this House, a breach of that particular commitment, if I can use that phraseology, because we now have an agreement between the Government of Yukon and the Carmacks Indian Band which goes far and beyond the initial agreement that had been negotiated.

Why will the Government Leader not table that document, in view of what has transpired?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Member is making an argument for tabling a document, and I will have to take that question under advisement. I will have to take it under advisement, given my word and my commitment to the former Land Claims negotiator. I will probably want to discuss it with the current Land Claims negotiator before I do.

Question re: The Children's Act

Mr. McLachlan: My question is for the Minister of Human Resources. In mid-August of this year, the Chief Justice of the Territorial Court, who is well known to the side opposite, struck down provisions of *The Children's Act* dealing with the removal of children from the home. Is it the intention of the Minister to now redraft these two particular sections, which are in limbo and in controversy?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We do have a bit of a problem with those two sections, and we will be looking at the Act. We will possibly be bringing it back to this Legislature in the spring.

Mr. McLachlan: Is it the intention of the Minister to redraft the whole piece of legislation, or only the two particular sections that have been thrown into doubt?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I cannot give him a breakdown of what will be amended in that Act. As far as I know, it will not be the whole Act. There are certain sections that will have to be amended.

Mr. McLachlan: Will the Minister then consider providing a public forum for parents to be able to come and address the concerns they may now have in the new, proposed legislation?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I would take that under consideration.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Lang: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources with reference to the agreement that he signed on August 22, 1985 relating to the Tatchun/Frenchman recreation road. It states, in the second part, "throughout the construction of the Tatchun/Frenchman recreation road, only Carmacks area contractors employing local residences will be hired. Any exceptions to this commitment must be agreed to by the Little Salmon/Carmacks Indian Band and the Government of Yukon." This was signed August 22, 1985 by one Mr. David Porter.

Would the Minister provide this House with a list of the contractors who are doing work on this road, which I understand is in the neighbourhood of \$400,000, since he signed the agreement? Who are the contractors?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would have to take that question under advisement. I would have to check with the department. I would have to check with the Financial Administration Act, to see if it is legally possible to disclose contracts between individuals and this government in the House. I would have to make sure that it is done properly.

Mr. Lang: I did not realize that things had changed so quickly with the change of government, this open government. This is public money. This is not Mr. Porter's money, this is public money. I would like that information. I want to assure the Member opposite that he has every right to table that in this House. I recommend to the Minister that he table that information in the House. I take it as positive if he finds out, as I have told him, that

he can table that information.

Further, on all the hourly rates charged for the rental of that equipment, were the lowest rates charged?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It is my understanding of the available equipment in the area, that that was the procedure followed. With respect to the tabling of the contracts, I am sure that the Member would appreciate that I would like to check on that. If there are no encumbrances, legal or otherwise, to the tabling of those documents, then I shall do that.

Mr. Lang: I am not talking about the area, I am talking about the territory. For the Minister's edification, and so that he is aware of this in the future, there is a third party rental schedule for contractual arrangements with small contractors. It is territorial wide. Were the rates charged out for those particular pieces of equipment the lowest ones on that particular rental schedule? If they were not, would he please provide me with the differences, as far as those hourly rates are concerned, with other similar equipment in other parts of the territory that could be employed doing that kind of work?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have here the third party rental equipment process. It is my understanding that in the policy there is a procedure in third party rentals to look at, where possible and practical, local equipment. That was what was done in this situation. We looked at the local area to utilize local equipment and that was the decision that was made. We did not look at the third party rental agreement and the schedule that affected other equipment from other communities.

Speaker: New question

∞ Mr. Lang: Do I take it, from what the Minister of Renewable Resources said to me, that the third party rental schedule, which is basically a contractual arrangement, a tender document, is no longer valid as far as the territory is concerned?

Would the Minister of Renewable Resources provide me with the information that I requested? Basically, I asked whether or not they were the lowest hourly rates charged out as far as that particular document is concerned. If not, I want to know what the differences were with similar equipment that was placed in that particular tender document.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I can obtain that information for the Member.

Mr. Lang: I would ask a further question on the Frenchman/ Tatchun Frenchman Lakes project and the \$100,000. Yesterday I asked the Minister if he had done an evaluation or an assessment appraisal of the land he had purchased, which was actually owned by the federal government, in order to come up with a dollar figure of the value. Could I ask him why he did not instruct his department to do an appraisal of the land so that, if he had to purchase that land, it could be justified as far as the value of the land was concerned?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We were not purchasing the land per se. We were negotiating to free up a land freeze to gain a right of way.

Question re: Civil servants benefits

Mr. Coles: Would the Government Leader please advise the House as to what the Public Service Commissioner's policy is as regards the YTG public servants' pay status or leave credits while travelling on either the YTG or federally-appointed boards?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: That sounds to me like a matter of administrative policy. I am afraid I am not sufficiently intimate with that kind of detail and cannot give it off the top of my head, but I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Coles: This is for the same Minister: is the Minister aware of whether or not in the past the established standard or policy of the Commission was the same for all federal and territorial appointed boards?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not know the answer to that question but, once again, I will be pleased to find out.

Mr. Coles: Once the Minister does find out what the policies are with regard to these matters, would he be willing to undertake a review of the existing policies to determine whether changes are in order to guarantee fairness to all, as opposed to selective standards?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Not knowing what the administrative

policy is in this matter, I cannot, of course, know whether they are selective or not, or whether they are unfair or whether they are, indeed, in need of review. However, the Member has brought them to my attention. I will discuss the matter with the Public Service Commissioner and I will try to make my own judgment as to whether they need reviewing.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mrs. Firth: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources regarding the Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes issue again. The Minister has told this House that he did not consult with the federal government, that he did not go to management board for an approval for the expenditure of funds and that he did not go to Cabinet to get a decision. Could he tell us if he discussed the issue with the Minister who is responsible for Land Claims, the Government Leader?

¹⁰ Hon. Mr. Porter: I am sure we have talked about it a number of times in one fashion or another.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Government Leader tell us when he first became aware of the issue? Was it before the Minister had signed the agreement with the Carmacks Band, or was it after?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I cannot honestly say from memory when I first became aware of the issue. There may be some minutes or notes of meetings that may assist my memory, and I will attempt to find out.

Mrs. Firth: I would appreciate if the Government Leader would report back to the House with that information.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Lang: I would like to direct another question to the Minister that has to do with the Frenchman/Tatchun Lake issue in reference to his answer or response to the Leader of the Official Opposition in not speaking to the Government of Canada on this particular issue.

He stated yesterday in the Blues, and it states very specifically, Mr. Porter said, "I read the entirety of the Agreement-in-Principle prior to becoming involved in negotiations with respect to the Frenchman/Tatchun Road issue".

If he was aware that there had been a three party agreement for the purposes of that road and also had provisions in that agreement for the purpose of relocation, why did he not speak directly to the federal government since he took it upon himself to be the negotiator?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I cannot understand why they keep referring to the agreement because, as we all know, the Agreement-in-Principle that we are talking about is only that, a proposed Agreement-in-Principle. It has no legal affect whatsoever, but the land freeze that froze the land was in effect. There was an Order-in-Council Withdrawal.

Mr. Lang: That substantiates my question. The land freeze is a federal order. Why did he not go and speak to the federal government when he was talking about \$100,000 of yours and mine and everybody else's money? Why did he not go and speak even directly to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as far as this problem was concerned?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We had to get the consent of the Band whose land it was that was selected and frozen prior to going to the federal government to have the lands transferred to the Yukon government.

Mr. Lang: The Member opposite is not aware of history. That has never worked like that in the past. That land was owned by the federal government. He has already said that it was a legal, binding Withdrawal Order. I am not going to argue that point.

The point I want to know about is why did he not speak to the federal government about how to help resolve this problem as opposed to going out and negotiating on behalf of the public interest — and he is elected to serve and should not forget that — and arbitrarily, unilaterally make a deal like this without speaking to the federal government who owns the land?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The federal government owned the land but they had withdrawn the land as an Order-in-Council Withdrawal. It was frozen on behalf of the Band. Because the federal government had frozen it in the interests of the Band, I had to speak to the Band

beforehand to gain its consent, which was what occurred.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Phelps: Let us go through this again because I am really getting confused now. I thought that I understood this process. The Withdrawal Order is federal, and the land belongs to the federal government. None of the land belongs to the Band, because the agreement is not binding. Always, in the past, these kinds of problems were worked out without cost to any government or any Band. The problem is that of the Band, because it was a Band beneficiary, and it was their oversight. In view of all this, why would you not approach the federal government and work it out as it always has been in the past without any money being offered for these oversights, because that always was a clear policy.

Hon. Mr. Porter: At the outset, I think that it should be clear that what is at issue here is the lands selected, the Order-in-Council withdrawal. It is clear that that had been federal lands, but they had reserved those lands in the interest of the Band. The Band had selected those lands under the Land Claims process. The federal government had frozen the lands on their behalf so it would follow that if you were to gain access to those lands, we had to receive the consent of the Band. The Leader of the Official Opposition shakes his head and suggest that he would do otherwise. He would simply go to the federal government and ask the federal government to proceed, and I do not think that is right. You should go to the Band because they had those lands set aside because of an expressed interest and that is where the consent had to be obtained.

Mr. Phelps: That is wrong on all accounts.

The Withdrawal Order is there to prevent third parties from staking the ground, to prevent alienation to third parties. That is what the Withdrawal Order is there for. It does not indicate any ownership on the behalf of the Band because the Band has not ratified the agreement.

Nobody is saying that you just go one place or the other. What you do is sit down with the two parties who signed the agreement in the first place and work it out jointly, without paying money. That was always the understanding. We knew that there would be some oversights and some minor adjustments. It was very clear that nobody was to be placed in a position...

Speaker: Order. Will the Member please get to the question. Mr. Phelps: Will the Minister admit that he has squandered \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money needlessly?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The obvious answer to that is no. As the Leader of the Official Opposition points out, the withdrawal freeze was to protect alienation of those lands. We as a government were proposing to alienate those lands that were selected by the Band and frozen by the federal government, in order to complete a road that his previous government initiated and spent over \$500,000 on, and could not complete. That is what the situation was. To date, we have an agreement to achieve completion of that road that has seen enormous investment of public funds.

Mr. Phelps: Did the Minister of Renewable Resources consider giving \$100,000 to the first person he met on Main Street at a given hour to get this from the federal government?

Question re: National Parks

Mr. McLachlan: My question is for the Government Leader and relates to national parks in the territory.

Has the Government Leader expressed any disapproval to Ottawa over cutbacks in funding for national parks of theirs which affect us here in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: To be honest, the last time I recall expressing an opinion on cutbacks in parks was those that were slated to affect Dawson City, I believe last summer. If I remember correctly, all the cuts initiated there were restored. All the positions were restored, so there was in fact no continuing grievance.

Mr. McLachlan: My next question, again to the Government Leader, relates to his expression of any concerns or feelings regarding mining exploration or commercial development within federal parks here in the territory. Has he made any representation to the federal government on these issues as they affect parks?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. If the Member is suggesting that, for

example, Kluane is about to be opened up for that purpose and that we should respond, I certainly have not had any suggestion of that kind brought to my attention.

Question re: Frenchman/Tatchun Lakes Road

Mr. Lang: I have a question to the \$100,000 man, the Minister of Renewable Resources. The agreement signed by the Minister stated at the outset, and I quote: "The department agrees to make representation before the Management Board of the Government of Yukon and in the Legislative Assembly of the Government of Yukon for funding of a contract to complete cultural history studies and develop a proposal for the interpretation of the cultural history of the Little Salmon/Carmacks Indian Band. The contract amount is not to exceed \$50,000. The provision of funding for this contract is to be considered during approval of the Capital Estimates for the fiscal year 1986-87." That was signed on August 22, 1985.

The same day, August 22, 1985, the Government of Yukon issued a press release, which clearly calls for a payment to the Band of \$50,000 this year to go towards a culture study of the Little Salmon/Carmacks Band, particularly in relation to the Band's traditional occupation of lands through which the road will pass. In addition, another \$50,000 will be paid in 1986-87, subject to legislative approval.

Why did the agreement he signed call for \$50,000 when, in the space of an hour, another \$50,000 became part of the arrangement? What happened in that 60-minute interim?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member opposite has been a part of government so surely he knows how the system operates. If you are going to spend money, you have to bring the proposal before Management Board. Once you have your budget approved, you have to bring it before the House, as we have done. Obviously, that is what the agreement and the press release speak to. There had been the ability to pay it out of the current fiscal year in which the agreement was negotiated, and you could not prejudge the legislative process and commit monies before the Legislature itself has had the time to review the budgetary requests of the government and debate that approval.

13 Mr. Lang: The agreement that the Minister signed, while negotiating on behalf of the public interest, states very clearly that the contract amount is not to exceed \$50,000. That was the contract that I understood you had signed for the purposes of buying nothing, as far as I can make out.

Later on in the day, you issued a press release that said you were not only going to give \$50,000 for the particular agreement, but you were going to give another \$50,000 for this year, making it \$100,000.

How did we get from \$50,000 to \$100,000 all in the space of an afternoon? The agreement was signed on August 22, and the press release was sent out on August 22.

Hon. Mr. Porter: It would be interesting to find out where the Member got the agreement from. Maybe he will tell me that in the final supplementary.

The agreement was broken up that way in order to conform with the legislative process. Obviously, I could not commit the Legislature prior to the Budget being given approval by the Legislature.

Mr. Lang: We have an agreement that calls for \$50,000. Then, in the same afternoon, we get a press release that calls for \$100,000. I do not know if there was a secret deal made in that two hours between the signing of the agreement and the issuance of the press release. How did we get from \$50,000 of taxpayers' money to \$100,000?

Do not give me a bunch of gobbledygook, give me an answer. **Hon. Mr. Porter:** You are asking a gobbledygooky question. That is why —

Mr. Lang: Well, it is just funny, isn't it, Dave. What is \$100,000?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Obviously, you do not understand the process of government. You cannot commit the Legislature prior to the Legislature approving the funds. You must understand that after ten or eleven years in government.

In terms of this issue, I find it ironic that the same Members who

are criticizing this are the same Members who, in a meeting with the Council for Yukon Indians, represented by the Leader of the Official Opposition and others, including the former Minister of Renewable Resources, in a meeting with the Council for Yukon Indians in August, sat down and agreed to look at giving the Carmacks/Little Salmon Band a contract with respect to this particular issue.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed. We will now proceed with Orders of the Day. Government Motions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 9

Clerk: Item No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Porter.

Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item
No. 1?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader, THAT Standing Order 45(3) be amended by deleting the words "six members" and by substituting for them the words "five members".

Hon. Mr. Porter: I bring this Motion forward to conform with a commitment made by the Government Leader on July 18, 1985. When the original Motion on this matter was presented, the Government Leader made the commitment to the Opposition. I will quote from Hansard. ". . . I will give a personal invitation as Government Leader that if in fact these Motions go through as we see now, I am prepared to bring a motion at the fall sitting to reduce our membership on the Public Accounts Committee by one ...". What, effectively, this Motion does is to live up to the Government Leader's commitment that he made to the Leader of the Official Opposition in the July session to delete the government's representation on the committee by one member.

Mr. Phelps: We acknowledge what the House Leader has said, and would like to thank the government for it.

Motion No. 9 agreed to

Motion No. 10

Clerk: Item No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Porter. Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 2?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader:

THAT the appointment of the Hon. Piers McDonald to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be rescinded.

Motion No. 10 agreed to

Motion No. 16

Clerk: Item No. 3, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Porter. Speaker: Is the hon. Member prepared to proceed with Item No. 3?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader:

THAT Mr. Brewster be appointed to replace the late Mr. Philipsen on the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments.

Motion No. 16 agreed to

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 14: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 14, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 14, entitled An Act to Amend the Chiropractic Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 14, entitled An Act to Amend the Chiropractic Act, be now

read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is a relatively simple Bill. The qualification and registration provisions for chiropractors are dealt with here. The original provisions were passed in 1958 and, at that time, there were no Canadian chiropractic schools. There now are. The Bill is essentially an update to provide for the modernization.

The other provision, which is controversial in a sense, among the medical profession, is the use of the title "Doctor". In 1982, we amended the *Optometry Act* to provide for a limited use of the title "Doctor" for non-qualified medical practitioners, but a qualified title for use in the *Optometry Act*. We are doing the same here.

The principle involved here is that the title "Doctor" should be qualified. That is, chiropractors should not be entitled to call themselves doctors as MD's are, but there is a technical difference. They would be entitled to use the title, "Doctor of Chiropractic". There is a perception among the regulating authorities here that the public is sophisticated enough to distinguish between those titles and chiropractors should be entitled to such recognition.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 30: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 30, entitled An Act to Amend the Sale of Goods Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 30, entitled An Act to Amend the Sale of Goods Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There is a saying that is often attributed to lawyers that goes as follows, "A verbal contract is not worth the paper it is written on". This Act will affect the law, or will change the statutory law about that provision. In the old Sale of Goods Act, there was a limit to the legal enforceability of oral contracts and it was \$50. It is proposed to raise the limit to \$1000 in keeping with a very widespread Yukon practice of buying and selling, without a written contract, of substantial items frequently in excess of the value of \$50. This is an overdue modernization of the law.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 32: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 32, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 32 entitled, An Act to Amend the Partnership Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 32 entitled, An Act to Amend the Partnership Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am pleased to be able to point out that this Act is in an effort to deregulate the partnership registration situation and is designed as a service to the private sector to cut some of the red tape involved with government regulation.

The main thrust of this amendment is to dispense with the requirement that the Registrar of Corporations be supplied with the names of all the limited partners in a limited partnership. The information will be able to be kept by the general partner and not by the government, if this Bill is passed.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 38: Second Reading

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 38, entitled Central Trust Company and Crown Trust Company Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 38, entitled Central Trust Company and Crown Trust Company Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I had thought, until the day before yesterday, that it was possible that this Act was completely unimportant for Yukoners and might not affect anyone, but I was

wrong. I spoke to a person whom it will affect. The problem is that, in Ontario, the Crown Trust Company, Greymac Trust Company and Seaway Trust were the subject of alleged fraudulent activities; this was brought to the public's attention in late 1982.

The Ontario Provincial Government, after an investigation and after the government essentially took possession and control of many assets in the private sector for a short time, established an Act called *The Crown Trust Company Act, 1983*. As property and civil rights are a provincial jurisdiction, it was necessary to look after the assets of these trust companies that may be in other jurisdictions by laws in those jurisdictions. It affects persons in Yukon who may have assets — lawyers may call it paper assets or intellectual property — affecting Crown Trust, Greymac Trust and Seaway Trust. This Act will simply legislate the same provisions as exist in Ontario and, I am told now, in all of the other provinces. That will correct that problem.

17 Motion agreed to

Bill No. 46: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 46, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 46, entitled An Act to Amend the Matrimonial Property and Family Support Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 46, entitled An Act to Amend the Matrimonial Property and Family Support Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The original Act does not contain an appeal section. This Act simply adds an appeal section, similar to all other Acts with a similar principle.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 50: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 50, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 50, entitled An Act to Amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 50, entitled An Act to Amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The explanatory note is entirely sufficient here, I believe. This Act corrects technical deficiencies in the procedures established by the original Act.

We did not perceive that it was appropriate to put all of these provisions in the *Miscellaneous Statute Amendment Act*, because there are some issues which are not of a merely typographical or mistake nature. It is entirely a housekeeping measure.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 56: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 56, entitled An Act to Amend the Noise Prevention Act, be now read a second time.

18 Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 56 entitled, An Act to Amend the Noise Prevention Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is not simple housekeeping or of a technical nature; the intent or principle here is to broaden the scope of the Noise Prevention Act. It is specifically aimed at loud parties in residential neighbourhoods. It widens some definitions, and the principle is to especially give the RCMP additional powers to stop noisy and disruptive parties. We have looked carefully at the restriction on individual freedom or the constitutional rights of individuals to act as they see fit, and we have drafted legislation which we hope is entirely uncontroversial in the area of restricting freedom and will be supported by residents of urban residential areas, we expect.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 70: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading Bill No. 70, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 70 entitled, Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Act, 1985, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 70 entitled, *Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Act*, 1985, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The title explains the principle very well. This corrects what are essentially errors and some redundancies in the present law. It is appropriate to pass this before the revised statutes are actually published. The principle should be entirely uncontroversial. I may add, for the benefit of Members of previous Assemblies, we have put a more stringent standard on what is included in the Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment on the principle that anything that substantially changes an Act should not be here at all. These are simply corrections of things like numbering errors and slight wording changes and putting some phrases into modern language.

19 Motion agreed to

Bill No. 42: Second Reading

Clerk: Second Reading, Bill No. 42, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 42, entitled Revised Statutes Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Justice that Bill No. 42, entitled *Revised Statutes Act*, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am particularly pleased to be able to present this Bill. The principle is clear from time to time but usually, at about five year intervals, jurisdictions republish the laws or the revised statutes so that it becomes manageable to look up the law. When Acts are amended year after year, it is an extremely cumbersome procedure to find out what the law is. This will be of substantial benefit to lawyers and, more especially, to the general public.

I cannot take the credit for this Bill. It was started by Andy Philipsen and the funds to do all of the work were voted by the previous government in previous years. The work has ended and the revised statutes are ready. They can be published very shortly, indeed, after this session. The Bill is written to include the Acts that we pass in this session in the revised statutes.

For the benefit of all Members, as an appendix if you like, the entire statutory law of the Yukon is included in the passage of this Act. We did not reproduce it or photocopy it, as that would cost a lot of money and would weigh down the briefcases or the arms of all Members if they even moved it, let alone read it. The appendix is deposited with the Clerk and is available for anyone to see as a public document. It runs into thousands of pages.

mr. Lang: I just want to speak to the principle of what we are dealing with here. There has been an offer made by the government side as far as the review process is concerned and going through it. It is a very technical and detailed review that will have to be done. I will be speaking with the Minister and the House Leader further on that. We have not given our preference as to how we would like to deal with it. I appreciate the work that has been done. I know the necessity of it. We do not have to go into that. The Minister of Justice has.

We can support the principle and the spirit of intent of what has been done. The key element here is to try and ensure that there are no mistakes.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 34: Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 34, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Penikett.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I move that Bill No. 34, entitled An Act to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government Leader that Bill No. 34, entitled An Act to Amend the Home Owners' Grant Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In 1981, an amendment to the *Home Owners' Grant Act* increased the grant from \$300 to \$350. At that time, section 3(3)(a), which applies to senior citizens, was not amended accordingly. Since the intent of the legislation was to provide a grant of \$350 to all, including senior citizens, this legislation is, therefore, being brought in to amend that Act.

It is our view that that was the will of the Legislature in 1981, and we want to give effect to their wishes by this amendment. Therefore, this is simply to correct that oversight in the last amendment, and to make the benefits uniform for all people.

Motion agreed to

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

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader that the Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do now resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

22 Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole to order. We will continue with Justice which appears on page 48.

Bill No. 52: First Appropriation Act, 1986-87 — continued

On Justice — continued

On Correction Facility Planning Study

Mr. Lang: Why does it take \$100,000 to do such a study? That is a lot of money.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is a very responsible question. The answer is that it is entirely an estimate that is essentially drawn out of a hat. It is not a figure that has been analyzed well. The intent is to do planning and to try and estimate the number of spaces we need in the Correctional Centre over a long term and that can be very difficult over as much as ten years, and to determine where they might come from — that is, which communities — and if it is possible to house convicted persons, who have a sentence over two years or not, here, pursuant to an agreement and a funding arrangement with the federal government, and whether or not that is desirable.

It will also involve some assessment of the existing facility. There is a crack in the wall. I did not go and look at it. There is some nervousness about some structural deficiency there and there will be engineering study work done on the existing building. The figure here is essentially a guess. I will undertake to give the information very specifically by the end of the period as to what exactly was spent and I will promise that I will personally look at the expenditures before they occur and make sure that there is no wastage of money. We very well may have a lapsed sum here. I hope we do, in fact. That figure is simply a guess.

23 Mrs. Firth: Is the Minister going to look at the correctional facility becoming an accredited correctional facility?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes. If my memory serves me, it is accredited now, or it is very close to being accredited; it is at some stage or other. I am aware of that general issue but not in the specific. I will pay more attention to it, but I know the general policy of the previous government was to gradually raise the standard to become accredited. That policy has not changed in any way.

Mrs. Firth: I know there were some discussions some time ago about the accreditation of the correctional facility. Our concern was the cost of it. It seemed that if it became an accredited institute it would cost considerably more money. That is what my concern is.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: That also is my concern. The Leader of the Opposition, as he then was in 1981, I believe, stated that it would be cheaper to send all of our inmates to Hawaii. The Member for Kluane would not agree, I am sure, but it may be cheaper. Looking at the daily expenditures, it has actually gotten a little worse. It would be cheaper to send inmates to Hawaii and pay their bar bills. It would still be cheaper.

That fact should be looked at very, very seriously. It is my view that it is our duty to house these inmates in the jail in an acceptable standard as to food and heat and shelter, but the expenditure, in my view, is getting out of line. Frankly, the direction of the department overall should be to direct the funds to services to the victims as opposed to housing for convicted people. It is a touchy issue. It is a nation-wide issue. The housing costs for the trailers in the experimental work camp will be a small fraction of the housing costs of the Correctional Centre: less than a third, amd perhaps even less than a fifth.

A large part of the expenditure, of course, is the staffing requirement for security purposes in the jail and that is, by and large, justified, but things like the expenditures for cable TV may be debated at the appropriate time.

24 Correctional Facility Planning Study in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to

On Liquor Warehouse

Mr. McLachlan: I presume these are warehouse facilities to be built on land presently owned by the Liquor Corporation.

Prior to passing this item for almost a million dollars, I am wondering if the Minister can tell us if we have had a chance to look at the shipping of the liquor into the building, and then the distribution out to five warehouses in the territory.

The point that I am trying to get at is that if the liquor always arrives at the wrong time, is shipped out at the wrong time, we will always be full and it will appear that we never have enough space. I am wondering if the Minister has any comments about the method by which it is brought in, temporarily stored, and then shipped out again, before we build more space.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not know. I should look into that. I do know that this proposed expenditure has been on the long term Capital plan for some time. It was proposed to move it into this year partially because we had the money this year. It is perceived as needed. It is not absolutely essential, but it will be a facility that will be needed within the next two or three or four years.

The decision was made to build it now, more for an economic stimulus and for a job creation reason than for the backup problem in the warehouse reason.

Mr. Lang: I share the concerns with the Member for Faro. Where this particular line item is concerned at the outset, you will recall, I made the comment there were a number of projects in here that had to have some justification.

I find it unacceptable for the Minister to come forward and say it was in the Capital plan. There were a lot of things in that Capital plan that no one, politically, forget partisan politics, was married to. The Capital plan was to say in the future what could happen and what would be necessary.

I find, as a Member here, to be asked to vote \$900,000 to an extension of a warehouse, to be really unacceptable. I cannot accept the Member's points of view.

I cannot accept it for the fact that over the years, this government, the Legislature, has voted money for the purpose of liquor stores in the rural communities consistently, to the point where, in Watson Lake, we have our own liquor store, Dawson City has one that has to be replaced somewhere down the path here, as far as being able to store liquor. We have Faro, which was a great debate in this House, a \$800,000 bill.

²⁵ As the Member for Riverdale North says, we talked about Mayo and we have Haines Junction. We have a population that has not risen to any great degree. We have indications that the consumption of liquor may be going down. We have a Minister of Justice who is

going around the rural communites and throughout the territory saying that the liquor consumption in his estimation is too high and should go down as far as our local residents are concerned. I do not take exception to that long term objective. If he is successful, God help him.

I think the question here is that all of a sudden we have the same Minister coming forward and asking for \$900,000 under the pretense of job creation. Surely, we have to be thinking of the long term and where would \$900,000 be better spent? I can make a suggestion. I would put money into further incentives as far as the mining industry is concerned, or add to the programs that have been initiated. That would make more sense to me than to put an extension on a warehouse which is not necessary. If the Minister checks his books, and I am going on memory, I believe there was some work done a few years ago. It was not major, but there were thousands of dollars spent for further accommodation and there were also dollars spent for shelving so that space could be better utilized. Those steps were taken by the government of the day. Based on the justification thus far, I cannot accept it. Perhaps he would like to speak further on the topic?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to speak further. In my view and in the view of the government, this is justified. It could have been postponed to next year, but that does not make it unjustified. We will have to build this facility sometime in the next five years or so. It will be cheaper and more efficient to build it now than five years from now. It will avoid any build-up of problem. It is a good long-term plan to put in place the infrastructure that we will be needing in a time of high unemployment. The expenditure now is very timely. The expenditure in two or three years will increase and it will raise the possibility of a bottle-neck in solving it on a crisis basis, as this is a responsible long-term plan to put in place the infrastructures that are going to be needed.

²⁶ Mr. Lang: I am sure if the Member reads *Hansard* tomorrow, he is going to have to give his head a shake. To justify the spending of \$900,000 for job creation — and we may need it three years down the road, or five years down the road, to utilize the Member's figures — I think is totally and absolutely irresponsible. To ask this side of the House and to ask your colleagues, under the justification you have given us, I think you had better re-examine just exactly what you are doing. I would prefer, quite frankly, as a resident of Whitehorse who pays property taxes, that you gave the \$900,000 to the City of Whitehorse so they could reduce my taxes.

I want to move a motion here, and I think it should be fully debated.

Amendment proposed

Mr. Lang: I move that Bill No. 52, entitled First Appropriation Act, 1986/87, be amended in the Capital Estimates, 1986/87, page 48, by reducing vote 08, Department of Justice, line item "Liquor Warehouse" by \$900,000.

I think we should debate this; I think this side of the House has made a valid observation.

Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Lang that Bill No. 52, entitled First Appropriation Act, 1986/87, be amended in the Capital Estimates, 1986/87, page 48, by reducing Vote 08, Department of Justice, line item "Liquor Warehouse" by \$900,000.

Mr. Lang: I am not putting this Motion on the floor because of any last minute decision — note the October 15th, 1985 date. I have given this a lot of thought, and the reason I gave the thought to it was because I was going to wait to see what justification the Minister could give to this House, and to the people of the territory, as to why we should be spending \$900,000 to extend a facility that, in my view, is quite capable of handling its liquor shipments presently and in view of the major expenditures we have made in our central communities throughout the territory.

We have made major significant investments in our warehouses and liquor outlets in communities, as I outlined earlier. I think it is important that we take this very valid point into consideration. I am putting it on the floor in a constructive way; I did not put into the motion that the money should be put somewhere else. We, on this

side of the House feel that money of this kind could be better put into such areas as incentive for the mining industry.

I think the Minister has a responsibility to give us further reasons why he is asking to spend \$900,000.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The statement was made that we "may" need this in the future. That is not accurate. We will need this in the future.

The territory is going to go ahead. It is going to expand and develop. This is part of an infrastructure that is necessary for the efficient operation of the Liquor Corporation in the long term. It is a responsible expenditure. In fact, in business terms, in private enterprise terms, it is a very good business. The sale of liquor generates revenue to the territory, and the use of liquor has widespread support in the territory. The responsibility of all of that is another question, but the present facts are that the government maintains a warehousing function and a retailing function for liquor, supervised by the Liquor Corporation. It is simply good business to have adequate facilities.

This expenditure is not something that may be required in the far future. It will be required. It may not be required this year, or perhaps even next, but in the next years, it will be efficiently utilized. It has been analyzed as a responsible business decision to construct this facility.

I leave aside the moral questions and the social questions about alcohol abuse. I recognize, and the Member opposite, in speaking to the Motion has raised it squarely, that there is an anomaly here. People can responsibly ask: why is the government trying to reduce alcohol abuse, and at the same time, sells the stuff? That is an anomaly. We will deal with that in the context of social issue; however, here, in the context of the Capital Budget, it is a responsible decision, considering the long term, reasonable plans of the Corporation to have an addition to the liquor warehouse.

28 Mr. Brewster: I agree with the Minister, number one, that liquor is a very good business. However, I know, for instance, in Haines Junction, their warehouse is usually only half full. As a

liquor is a very good business. However, I know, for instance, in Haines Junction, their warehouse is usually only half full. As a businessman, you do not build a business five years ahead of time, because the average building deteriorates after 25 years. You are building a building that, according to the Minister, you do not need for five years, so it has already lost one fifth of its life before we start to need it.

The other thing I would like to point out is that we do not need the extra work. We have \$80 million in this Budget. If every one of these projects go, there is no way that there are enough people in the Yukon to do all that work, and we will be bringing people from outside to do the work.

Mr. McLachlan: I want to point out to the House that I simply raised the issue to see if there had been a computer study done on the freight shipments into the territory from Edmonton and Vancouver for the carrying of the full loads. It may not be that, due to the particular carriers' time schedule leaving Vancouver or leaving Edmonton, they can arrive at such a time to do that.

The question was simply asked in that conjecture. I want to remind the Member for Porter Creek East that when he was in the driver's control of the Yukon Liquor Corporation a new facility was built in 1982 in Faro for, I believe, \$737,000, at a time when the people did not want it in the location where it was. That facility was eventually built because of objectives that fulfilled the long term plans of the Corporation. They could handle the empties better, there was more space to distribute to Little Salmon and the Ross River areas.

It does not always follow that it may seem incongruous at the time to go ahead with the construction, but it will not always fall within the plans and the feelings of the Corporation. We have experienced the same in Faro.

I simply raised the question to see if an analysis had been made of the shipping needs of the Corporation.

Mr. Lang: I want to reply to the MLA for Faro. I know in 1982 a liquor store was built there. I happened to be sitting over there. I happened to have these people on this side asking why a liquor store was being built, and the obvious reason, that got lost in the political shuffle or the political discussion of the day, was, very clearly and simply put, that we had rental space and the price was going to go

up. The decision had to be made, rightly or wrongly.

The point is, and I concur with the MLA for Faro on this, that there is a liquor store there now which provides service to Ross River, Little Salmon, and hopefully the people of Faro if Faro goes back into production.

The Minister has told us that this facility really is not necessary until five years hence. He is asking you, the Liberal Party, you as MLA's, with the public interest that we are here to serve, to vote for \$900,000 for an expenditure which is not, according to his calculations, really needed for five years, and it may not be needed at all, depending on shipments, depending on how the liquor arrives in and out of the territory, if there are changes in the modes of transportation. All those things come into this as well.

I think the MLA for Kluane raised a very valid observation about Haines Junction, as an example, where at many times the warehouse facilities there were half empty. I know that when I was the Minister responsible for the Liquor Corporation I had complaints at times, going to the communities outside Whitehorse, where liquor was not being provided, stocked well enough, in some of these communities where there was warehouse space. There was obviously a bottleneck being created here in Whitehorse.

At times we would have to come back, which I am sure the Minister of Justice, in his capacity as responsible for the Liquor Corporation, will have to come back at times once he goes to the rural communities, and say, what is the problem? How come the liquor is not getting out there?

All we are going to do is increase the storage space for \$900,000. I do not think that it is a justifiable expense at this time. Money should be going towards creating new wealth, creating further revenues for the Government of the Yukon Territory. This \$1,000,000 here should be going to the mining community to augment the programs that are going to be initiated as incentive to the mining industry.

To say that the excuse for this \$900,000 expenditure is for job creation for a facility we will need five years from now does not make any sense.

In the argument regarding the Faro Liquor Store, nobody argued the requirement for facilities, it was a question of where the facilities were going to go. The question of cost also came into that argument. I think that the Minister has made a very unwise judgment by including it in the Mains. All I want to do is help him. I have a Motion here to take the money out and utilize it somewhere else, hopefully as incentives to the mining industry.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have three points to make.

Mr. Lang has said that the excuse is job creation and that we may not need it or that we may need it in five years. That is not accurate. I did speak about job creation and the factor of job creation is a factor but it is not the excuse for building it. It is a factor that was considered in leading to the decision to build it next year because of the job situation in the country. This is a "jobs" budget. We promised a "jobs" budget in the election campaign, and we are delivering on our promise. We are not building it simply for job creation. It is not wasted work. That is not an excuse. That is definitely a factor, and that is what I meant.

One factor is that this is a job creation measure. Two, it is not the case that we may need it; we will need it. It is possible that we could have postponed it a year, perhaps even two. No, not five. The projections for the use of this measure are that it is needed. It is not a desperate situation today, but the territory is developing and growing. It is responsible to put this kind of infrastructure in place now. That is just good planning.

30 Thirdly, there is a factor about transportation that is not wholly analyzed, but there are good reasons to require an increased warehousing capacity with changing the transportation route from an all-road route to a barge and road route through Haines and possibly Skagway. That is not, in itself, sufficient reason to build the warehouse and that is not the reason or the excuse, but it is a factor. We do need a better warehousing capability.

Those things, when you balance them and when you reach a decision considering all the factors — the availability of resources, the need for a jobs budget, the need for this building — it is a most responsible decision to build it next year.

Mrs. Firth: I find it quite unusual, and I am sure I am interpreting this correctly from what the Minister has said, that it is now going to be their policy to build buildings to create jobs and that those buildings may even stand empty for a while, from one or two or up to five years. There is \$80 million - \$81 million, with this project — identified in the budget to create jobs, and the Minister of Community and Transportation Services has another \$2 million in a local employment opportunity program to create jobs. The Government Leader has said there is going to be a thousand jobs if Cyprus Anvil goes back and I am sure that will be additional money that will be coming forward to create jobs. I would like to know if the government has any idea how many jobs they want to create, how many jobs need to be created, because for a government to spend almost a million dollars to build a building when there is some possibility it could stand empty is not going to be perceived by the business community to be a wise investment.

If a building is going to be built, it should be built because it is needed, because something has to be put in it and it is going to be used as a facility. How could we responsibly stand here and say we are prepared to spend this money when the building may stand idle? I am not prepared, on behalf of my constituents, to stand up and say, well, it was going to create jobs and we had hundreds of thousands of other dollars' worth of jobs that were going to be created but the building is standing empty. I just do not see it as a wise business investment, particularly in light of the Minister's past reputation regarding alcohol and alcohol consumption and liquor and so on. He has done an absolute and complete reversal of when he stood up in this House when he was in Opposition and criticized the other government so severely for it. Now, if he was going to build a rehabilitation centre for the abuses of alcohol, or something like that, I would say fine, that is consistent with what the Minister has said in the past. But to stand up and say we are going to build a liquor warehouse that is going to stand empty just does not make sense to me and, therefore, I cannot support the expenditure of these funds.

³¹ Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Member asked how many jobs was it we wanted to create in this Budget. The answer is 1,200. She asked about Cyprus Anvil. I believe there are a thousand-plus there. If we succeed in creating 2,200 jobs in the next year as a result of these two initiatives, then I shall be extremely pleased. Unfortunately, at that we will not have completely eradicated unemployment in the Yukon Territory. Nor will we have brought the workforce back up to the point which it was in 1981.

If the territory is going to grow, and if the territory is going to expand as we are confident it will, we will have to continue to create jobs, but not quite at the same rate as that, because I am not sure that there are not going to be that many Cyprus Anvils on the horizon.

Those are the objectives. I think right now there may be something, I would not be surprised, like 2,000-plus people collecting unemployment insurance in this town right now. I do not know what the true unemployment rate is at this moment. I know it is far higher than the national average. I also know, in answer to the final question, that we will put that facility that is contemplated in this proposal to very good use.

Mrs. Firth: I appreciate the unemployment rate, and I appreciate the government's position in creating jobs and growth in the territory. However, how can the government justify, if they do not know what the unemployment rate is, how many people are unemployed, what their target is for the number of jobs to create to take care of that unemployment rate? How can we justify building an empty building just to enhance that?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We are not proposing to build an empty building. That has happened in the past. It has happened, and there are a number of empty buildings in Faro right now. There was a liquor store which was put there which the community said they did not need, or did not want.

Those things happen. The government of the day acted according to what it thought was the right judgment. We are making the right judgment in this respect. If we were to have put to us a suggestion that we should put up a building that would remain empty for the foreseeable future, believe me, we would not do it.

Mr. Lang: This goes back to my question that I had in Question Period. Was there any project that was brought up by the civil service that the government said no to. I have to say that this is an example of it. I honestly have to say that it is \$900,000 and I cannot understand the Government Leader standing here justifying building a building that we may not need for five years. We do not know. I find it totally and absolutely ludicrous that we would have somebody legitimately standing here in the public forum saying, "well we may need it five years from now, maybe two years from now", as far as the expenditure is concerned.

I am saying to the Government Leader that there are other areas that this money could be put into. He tries to give the impression that he is the only Member of this House who is worried about job creation. We all represent constituents. We all represent working people. Yes, it is our view that people should be working. I am giving him a constructive alternative to augment the incentives to the mining industry. It would create new wealth. Perhaps if new wealth were created, it may bring more revenue back to the government as opposed to maybe looking at deficit financing as the Government Leader indicated may be down the road and we may have to look at it.

I am saying to him, in all seriousness, that I think this is an affront to every Member of the House. We have you, as the Government Leader, and your Party, standing up and saying the objective of the government is to have people drink less.

32 At the same time we have him in this House asking for \$900,000 to extend the warehouse facilities. I think that my colleague for Riverdale North is totally and absolutely accurate when she says

Riverdale North is totally and absolutely accurate when she says that it just does not add up. There is no thought being given to where we are going with this particular item. I know the City of Whitehorse put forward a proposal to the government in the neighbourhood of \$10,000,000 and we voted \$2.5 million. I am sure that if another \$1,000,000 were given to the City of Whitehorse that that would create jobs and do something for the city, such as waterfront development for tourism. There are all sorts of ideas as to where the dollars could be given. Just to say, for an example, for a construction project I really have to question it. I think that the Government Leader is sitting there saying why did we approve this? I am trying to help the Member opposite.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I doubt if the Member is even helping himself. He suggests that this money should have been put into something like initiatives to help the mining industry. There is more money to help the mining industry in this budget than in any previous budget presented by this government. There is a \$1,000,000 program, discussed for 43 seconds the other night, which was rejected by the previous government when it was proposed to them by the Public Service.

Mr. Lang: That is not correct. You had better check your facts.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: That is what I am advised. I have checked
my facts with the Deputy Minister hired by that Member opposite.

Secondly, if the Members were so concerned about job creation, about putting this money to work, about getting on with the job of creating jobs and building the economy of the Yukon instead of going for a quick-fix election 18 months early, this spring, they could have called the Legislature into session this spring and we could have been debating the O&M budget, which we are just recently passing, this spring. The Members opposite made their choices. They made their choices, and we have made ours, and they are in this budget. It is a budget which is going to put the people of the Yukon Territory to work.

Mr. Lang: I have got to say to the Government Leader that you are making me ill. I say that in all seriousness. When he stands up and says that he has got a job creation budget together, he has got the money that we negotiated with the Government of Canada and he knows it. He is standing up there pontificating like he is the end-all-be-all. Let us get down to the truth and the meat of the matter. The fact is that the \$80 million you have got here is because of the previous government's negotiations with the Government of Canada. That is a fact.

The point we are making here is that there is \$1,000,000 that is being asked to be spent for a liquor warehouse. We are saying that it is not needed. Why do we not put the money elsewhere? He said

that we rejected some programs. That is not correct. We were looking at a number of programs that were going to be put forward for this Capital Budget this fall similar to what he has done. There may have been some changes, but programs and incentives may have been put in place. There was no question about that. There were commitments made during the election. A Hell of a lot more commitments made by us than the side opposite. Do not stand up here and pontificate to this side of the House about the financial welfare of the government because he cannot take credit for it.

There is \$900,000 being asked to be voted for a facility that the Minister responsible has admitted to this House is not necessary for two to five years from now. I am saying that there are other alternatives.

³³ Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Member opposite would have us believe there was some special skill employed by the people opposite in obtaining the formula financing that puts the government in the present financial position it is in now. He will know that the facts are that the discussions were begun under the previous federal government, which was a Liberal government, not a Conservative one. They were conducted over a number years and, in fact, similar arrangements were concluded with the Northwest Territories by an entirely different group of people over there with the same federal government. There is no particular credit that goes either to the Members opposite or to the Members on this side, and I do not claim any credit for it.

Mrs. Firth: I agree with what the Member for Porter Creek East has just said, that this new government that we have in the Yukon Territory cannot take credit for the wealth of the Yukon territorial government that now exists. There is one different note here. After being in Opposition for so many years and criticizing about spending money and how money was spent, I think the Government Leader has found himself in the position where he is, for the first time, accountable. He has to be accountable to the public for the expenditure of this money. Building a building that could sit empty for one to two to five years to create jobs is not being accountable to the public.

Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Division.

Chairman: Division has been called on the amendment.

Would those in favour please rise?

Would those not in favour please rise?

The vote is five yeas, nine nays.

Amendment defeated

Liquor Warehouse in the amount of \$900,000 agreed to On Liquor Store and Headquarters Equipment

Mrs. Firth: I have one question for the Minister of Justice, and Alcohol, now. What has happened to the South African wine that he removed from the shelves?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We will put it in the new warehouse. Some Member: I am sure the public will be really pleased you asked.

Mrs. Firth: I had anticipated that kind of answer from the Minister, and I would like to know how long he is going to let it sit in the big empty warehouse and what is going to happen to it, since the public has already paid now for some South African wine that is going to sit in an empty warehouse they are paying almost a million dollars for. How long is this going to continue? Until the wine has aged enough? How is the government going to justify that to the public. We now have a warehouse full of exotic South African wine, all paid for.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: A substantial portion of that product is improving with age. The decision was made on a moral basis, not on a business basis, and I would ask the Member opposite if she is opposing the moral decision we made. The decision was that the product was taken off the shelves, not on a business basis but a moral basis. It is not a new policy of any kind. It is a reaction to our moral outrage at apartheid. That is why we did it.

The figure that we are talking about is approximately \$16,000. I may be slightly wrong, but approximately that. The product is being warehoused, and will stay warehoused; it will not be sold somewhere else. It will stay warehoused until the apartheid policy is changed, whenever that may be. That is the policy that we have

about South African wines.

Mrs. Firth: I have no difficulty with the moral concept; however, the wine that was here could have been sold, and the new purchases could have been denied. It would have given the same moral outrage and the same moral decision.

I am saying this to the Minister for the public record: the Minister has to be accountable. I do not care if it is only \$16,000, because now we have \$16,000 worth of something sitting in a \$900,000 warehouse. The Minister is going to have to be accountable for that kind of action, particularly in view of his strong moral conviction about alcohol that I have heard about in this House for three years.

The Minister will have to be accountable on polling day, when it comes time to put an 'X' by his name on the ballot.

Mr. McLachian: Moral issues aside, policies decisions aside, can the Minister tell the House if any effort was made to try to resell the liquor anywhere else in Canada, or perhaps sell it to South African House in New York, or somewhere where there might be an interest in this product?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No.

Liquor Store and Headquarters Equipment in the amount of \$80,000 agreed to

Department of Justice in the amount of \$4,179,000 agreed to

On Department of Education - continued

Chairman: We have concluded general debate on Education. We will now move to the line items which were stood over. On Miscellaneous School Equipment

Mr. Lang: I would like to make reference to the comments made by the Minister regarding this item that a lack of information had been provided to him when he was a Member on this side of the House. He went on at great length and for quite some time while trying to cover up the fact that he was totally and absolutely unprepared to discuss this Budget last night.

I would like to read something from last night's Blues into the record, which I think is important. He stated, "Mr. Chairman, I really cannot help this. You will have to allow me to respond to the phony point of order that the Member raised a few moments ago with respect to the provision of information. To have the Member get up on his high horse to request detailed information that I spent long, gut-wrenching hours — sitting in the chair where the Member for Faro now sits — and with great anxiety trying to eke out even the most minute information from the Member when he was a Minister sitting in this chair, I find that the Member's requests, though legitimate, are absolutely crazy and ludicrous coming from him".

35 That is a direct quote from the Minister responsible for Education.

I would ask the Page to come here, and I have underlined some of the statements Mr. McDonald made not too long ago, when I was sitting over on that side as the Minister of Highways. It has to do with Supplementary Estimates, Capital Estimates, dollars. I can tell the Member opposite, and he will have to agree with me, I was not too often stuck to the point where I had to leave my Budget for a day to try to get it repaired.

I gave quite a lengthy dissertation on what those expenditures were. I want to say in researching this, because I took very seriously the statements by the Minister last night, I went to *Hansard*, the books that we are all provided with, and I just thumbed through and picked out one page. I read a quote from Mr. McDonald.

Mr. McDonald said to Mr. Lang, me, the following: "I must say that I am really taken aback by the flood of information that has been laid before this House. I am quite grateful for it. I am sure that a sober review of the estimates will be a better record for our proceedings this evening. I think the Minister answered practically all the questions I was asking, and I was not asking for much more detail than that."

Applause

What I am saying to the Minister, prior to getting into the details of the financial thing here, is that he made a number of statements in this House about my asking for information, and made allegations that I and some other Members of this House did not

provide the Member with information, if requested, when he was in the Opposition.

I think his words speak for themselves. I would ask the Member if he would be prepared to apologize to me, because I would be prepared to accept it in the spirit that I am giving this dissertation, just so that I can keep the record accurate.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We just heard from a fading movie star reading old reviews.

Over the past three years, I would say, from my recollection, the opportunity to receive detailed information from the Member for Porter Creek East was a difficult and painful experience. It was certainly a rare pleasure when it happened. It was so rare that I had to stand up on my haunches at one point, I cannot remember the date — when was the date — I can still think of one stage when I really had to congratulate the Member in order to encourage him, perhaps, to provide a little more information in the future. Unfortunately, it was not a rule that he took to heart.

I think if we were to do an analysis of the kind of information provided, we would find that the item that the Member quoted was a rare item indeed.

When the Member did come forward with information, when in Question Period he decided to answer a question on agriculture, for example, I was more than grateful. I was more than prepared to flood him with compliments when he deigned to answer a question from a Member in the Opposition.

The Member wanted a breakdown of the \$899,000 in Miscellaneous School Equipment. I checked back through previous Capital Estimates and I looked at the kind of information that was given and I find that it is sparse information indeed. You can look that up in the *Hansard*. I looked that up this morning just to refresh my memory. The Member wanted a school-by-school breakdown of the school equipment of the miscellaneous equipment in the territory and I am prepared to give him that breakdown. If the Members will pull out their pencils, I will give them that information now.

Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. Lang: Would the Minister entertain a question prior to going into his dissertation? I would like to ask the Minister if he would simply give us a copy of the information that he has, as I asked last night? Perhaps he has not had enough time to prepare it then we can go on to another vote.

Chairman: That is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I will not accept any questions until afterwards, so that everyone has a chance to get the information all at once. FH Collins will receive \$44,000. Porter Creek Junior High will receive \$48,000. Junior Jeckell will receive \$41,000. This is for miscellaneous school equipment. Jack Hulland will receive \$19,500. Whitehorse Elementary will receive \$7,000. Selkirk will receive \$6,600. Watson Lake High will receive \$22,000. Del Van Gorder will receive \$21,000. JV Clark will receive \$19,000. Robert Service in Dawson City will receive \$41,000. Teslin will receive \$16,800. St. Elias Community School in Haines Junction will receive \$31,000. Christ the King will receive \$56,000. Carcross will receive \$5,400. Tantalus at Carmacks will receive \$26,000. Eliza Van Bibber will receive \$17,000. Ross River will receive \$15,000. The Old Crow school will receive \$20,000. Elsa will receive \$67,000. Christ the King Elementary will receive \$6,100. Takhini will receive \$3,200. Grey Mountain will receive \$8,100. Watson Lake Elementary will receive \$4,700. Destruction Bay and Burwash will receive \$8,700. The materials are all for Destruction Bay as the Member for Kluane will understand. Beaver Creek will receive \$1,500.

For FH Collins, I mentioned that there was \$44,000 budgeted there and what we have here is a security system, a microcomputer and printer, an index reference table for the library and a 60-drawer card catalogue. Both of those items are for the library. We will have tubular bells, an electric keyboard and synthesizer a set of music stands and music chairs as well and some physical education equipment.

For Porter Creek Junior Secondary, and the Member for Porter Creek East will be most happy to hear this, we are looking at photocopy equipment, projector, video camera, index reference

table and a tenor sax, a bassoon, a bass clarinet, an alto clarinet, a bass trombone, a gong, tubular bells and also seven music room chairs. There is some physical education equipment as well. There is some industrial education replacement equipment; a cutting band saw, a bar folder, a metal lathe, a ten-inch bench bumper. The office will receive some computer accessories.

Junior Jeckell will receive some video equipment for the library and an atlas stand. They will receive a piano, a bassoon, a bass trombone, a double french horn, and a gong as well.

37 They would also get tubular bells and a set of music chairs.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Member go a bit slower, please?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I will do that. This will all be in print tomorrow when you read the Blues.

Mrs. Firth: However, maybe I would like to get my pencil out and write a letter to my constituents tonight to tell them what they are getting.

Mr. Lang: Is this accurate information?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Yes, this is accurate information.

Continuing, we are also looking at music stands and music room chairs and one stereo, also a tape deck, turntable and speakers. The school will receive parallel bars and uneven bars, and miscellaneous equipment of that nature. The industrial education shop, we hope will receive a scroll saw before too long and they will also get some computer accessories for the office.

For the Jack Hulland School — and the people from Porter Creek might be interested in this expenditure — we are looking at a piano for Jack Hulland and computer accessories and a business computer and word processor. For Whitehorse Elementary, we are looking at an atlas stand, a photocopier and a safe. For Selkirk Street, we are looking at a 16 mm film projector and computer accessories and a safe as well. For Watson Lake High School, the Member for Watson Lake might want to pull out his pencil and paper or he might want to look over my shoulder as I read these expenditures, we are looking at uneven bars here and a universal gym...

Hon. Mr. Porter: That is for Danny to play with when he comes down to visit.

Hon Mr. McDonald: ... a score board and miscellaneous items for \$17,700. They will get a six-inch tool grinder, we hope, and two work benches as well for the industrial education shop.

This brings us to Del Van Gorder School in Faro. We are looking at a film projector there and an atlas stand. They, too, will hopefully receive parallel bars, uneven bars, a universal gym and some other equipment, as well as a safe for the office.

All take special note of this one. This is JV Clark School in Mayo and I am very happy about the expenditures here. We are looking at uneven bars, a universal gym and a scoreboard as well.

The universal gyms for Watson Lake and JV Clark are, in fact, the same amounts. There is no preference given to either school. We are also looking at a safe for the office at JV Clark.

Robert Service School will, I hope, receive a 16 mm film projector.

Much of this equipment, by the way, is replacement equipment, not new equipment. They, too, will receive an atlas stand, parallel bars and uneven bars and a universal gym and a scoreboard.

I remember, when I was in Dawson during the education task force hearings, we visited the industrial arts shop and I recall quite clearly that at that time people were concerned about the state of repair and the variety of equipment in that shop and suggested it should be upgraded. So I am pleased to announce today, in this public forum, before all legislators in the territory, that the industrial education shop at Robert Service School will receive a scroll saw, a bar folder, a welding bench, an electric welder, a 10-inch pedestal grinder, a metal lathe and a 10-inch bench buffer. Also, a safe for the office.

38 The Speaker, in his capacity as the Member for Campbell, is present, and he will be happy to hear that we are looking at a 16 mm film projector for the library in Teslin, and two parallel uneven bars, a scoreboard and a safe for the office.

The Member for Kluane has likely been waiting with bated breath for his St. Elias School in Haines Junction. He does not like people putting words in his mouth, but I am sure that he has been waiting for this expenditure. I can tell him that industrial education in the

St. Elias School quite conceivably, if all goes well, will receive a table saw, a band saw, a 6-inch tool grinder and a 10-inch bench grinder.

Not only that, but the physical education department at this particular school will receive parallel bars, uneven bars, a universal gym, as well.

Christ the King School is going to be quite fortunate in terms of its allotment for musical instruments. It is my understanding as well that they have indicated an interest in upgrading their musical program. We have gone to some lengths to ensure that the equipment for this particular program will be sufficient to meet their needs.

We are looking at a piano, a baritone sax, a tenor sax, a bassoon, two French horns, two bass clarinets, two alto clarinets, a set of three timpani, a bass trombone, a double French horn, a gong, tubular bells, electric keyboard and synthesizer. They will also get music stands and music room chairs.

We have not forgotten the physical education department in this particular school. We are looking at uneven bars and a universal gym for this school as well.

The Leader of the Official Opposition may be interested to note that in Carcross we are looking at an atlas stand, a photocopier and a safe for the office.

At Tantalus School in Carmacks, the library, we hope, will receive a 16 mm film projector, colour TV, atlas stand and circulation desk. In physical education, a universal gym at \$6,600, as you will note.

In industrial education, we are looking at a tool cabinet, a school saw, band saw, bar folder and a 6-inch tool grinder, a 10-inch bench buffer and a safe.

For Pelly Crossing, Eliza Van Bibber School, the library will receive an atlas stand and a circulation desk. The physical education department will receive a universal gym at the going rate of \$6,600. The industrial education department will receive a radial arm saw, a jointer, a scroll saw and a surface planer.

Ross River School, in the library will get an atlas stand and a circulation desk, as well as a universal gym, radial arm saw, jointer, scroll saw, and a safe.

39 The school in Old Crow: universal gym, tool cabinet and radial arm saw, jointer, skill saw and surface planer and electric typewriter for the office.

Elsa School: Looking at an atlas stand, a photocopier, an electric typewriter, the latter two for the office and the former for the library.

Christ the King Elementary: an atlas stand, a photocopier; the former for the library, the latter for the office.

Takhini: an atlas stand and a safe; the former for the library and the latter for the office.

Grey Mountain School: a circulation desk for the library, a photocopier and an electric typewriter for the office.

Watson Lake Elementary: an atlas stand and a piano.

Destruction Bay: video cassette recorder, a TV, a piano and an electric typewriter for the office.

This is not the only expenditure on this item. That was only miscellaneous school equipment.

There are some funds for the learning resource centre and for custodial equipment. We are looking at a video machine for the library. Eighty-four thousand dollars of this expenditure is for custodial equipment. I have it broken down by school.

F.H. Collins: utility tractor and accessories, Dust Bane vacuum. Takhini Elementary: floor polisher.

Whitehorse Elementary: a hydro vacuum and something called a Michael's Vacuum. I cannot honestly say that I understand what a boom Michael's vacuum is. A snowblower.

Christ the King Elementary: a scrubber vacuum.

Christ the King High: vacuum, floor polisher and a Dust Bane vacuum.

Jack Hulland Elementary: We are hoping that a Dust Bane Vacuum will be put in there if all goes well.

I hope that we are buying these things on consignment. We seem to be purchasing quite a number of them.

Porter Creek Junior High: We have not identified any major

expenditure in custodial equipment. Maybe the Member will definitely have questions in that regard.

GA Jeckel Junior High: We are looking at the Michael's Vacuum again, and the scrubber vacuum.

Selkirk Street Elementary: floor polisher, two vacuums and a scrubber vacuum.

Grey Mountain: We are not looking at any major expenditure there.

You will note that Elsa will receive a Dust Bane floor polisher. Tantalus at Carmacks will receive a vacuum.

40 JV Clark will also receive a floor polisher and snow blower. For Watson Lake Elementary, a wet and dry vacuum, a vacuum and a floor polisher. At the high school, a floor polisher and a vacuum.

At Beaver Creek, we are looking at a vacuum.

We are not looking at anything for Destruction Bay and Kluane Lake School, nor for Keetsadunku, which is not currently operating, as the Member for Kluane well knows.

At the St. Elias Community School in Haines Junction we are looking at a floor polisher and a carpet cleaner. There are a number of carpets there that must be cleaned, I presume.

At Del Van Gorder School we are looking at a vacuum, floor polisher and snow blower. Again, I am not sure whether it is gas powered, or what.

At Teslin we are not looking at any expenditure there.

At Ross River we are looking at a vacuum.

At Old Crow we are looking at a vacuum, and at Robert Service we are looking at a vacuum.

We do not have a breakdown for the drapes in the various schools. We replace them as needed. There is a standard expenditure, and this year we are looking at \$16,000. The drapes are replaced on an as-needed basis. I will undertake to make sure that schools that do not need drapes, do not get drapes.

That brings us to a total — and I will just review this again for you — of \$593,000, believe it or not, but it all adds up, which leaves us money for instructional computers. We went into this in some detail last night, but I was unable to provide the number of computer terminals per school. Perhaps what I could do is provide those now to the Members, just to verify that the information I gave last night was correct, that every school does have computer terminals.

Beaver Creek School, with an enrolment of nine students, has two computer terminals. Carcross, with an enrolment of 58 students, has six. Old Crow, with an enrolment of 51, has seven. Christ the King Elementary, with an enrolment of 166, has 13. Christ the King High School, with an enrolment of 133, has 11. Del Van Gorder, with an enrolment of eight, has one computer. Eliza Van Bibber, with an enrolment of 45 — these are all projected enrolments, they are not intended to be taken as absolute fact as of October 17, 1985 — has six.

41 FH Collins Senior High has 47 computers for 640 students. GA Jeckell Junior High has 28 computers with projected enrolment of 356. Grey Mountain Primary School has eight computers for a projected enrolment of 106; it may be a little less than 106 students. I know JV Clark has less than 108 but that was the projected enrolment of the day; I think it is closer to 100 and they have 24 computers. Jack Hulland Elementary has 36 computers and it has an enrolment of 489. Keetsadunku, of course is not currently operating. Kluane Lake has two computers with a current enrolment, I believe, of 15, if I am not mistaken. Porter Creek Junior High, with a projected enrolment of 350 would have, this year, 23 computers. Robert Service with a projected enrolment of 136 would have 16. Ross River with a projected enrolment of 72 would have seven at the end of this year. Selkirk Street Elementary with an enrolment of 343 would have 24. St. Elias with an enrolment of 102 would have 11. Takhini Elementary with an enrolment of 232 would have 17. Tantalus with an enrolment of 102 would have eight. Teslin with an enrolment of 76 would have eight. Watson Lake Elementary with an enrolment of 195 would have 13. Watson Lake High with a projected enrolment of 120 would have 10, and Whitehorse Elementary with 364 students would have 25.

When I say "would have", I mean that, when the computer

policy that I stated last night is finalized and approved, then those computer terminals, 391 of them, will be in place.

The expenditure here proposes that the following schools receive more computer terminals: Christ the King Elementary and Christ the King High; Elsa to receive one; FH Collins to receive 16; Jeckell Junior, eight; Jack Hulland Elementary, 12; Porter Creek Junior High, 10; one for Robert Service; one for Ross River; nine for Selkirk Street; seven for Takhini; two for Tantalus; five for Watson Lake Elementary; two for Watson Lake High; and, 10 for Whitehorse Elementary, for a total of 95 if this expenditure is used to the fullest extent.

I believe I explained the computer policy last night. That is as complete information as I have at the present time. If the Members have further questions requiring further detail, I will be happy to provide them with it. More than likely, it will be in writing at the appropriate time.

⁴² Mr. Lang: Can he tell me if, in the outline that he gave us, speaking specifically as an MLA in the Porter Creek School, there was anything that was refused as far as requests from those particular schools? He has given us an outline as to what he has so gratefully put forward to the schools. I would like to know if they met all the requests by these two particular schools?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: My understanding to date is that the schools put forward quite reasonable requests for equipment. There was no suggestion from our office that we should penalize in any way the Porter Creek schools. I hope the Member takes that for fact. Neither did we penalize the equipment available for the schools in the Member for Riverdale South's riding. As the Member for Kluane may recognize, we have not penalized his school. The allotment of funds for the various schools was handed out in a very fair manner. I think that it would be fair that there was no fiddling with figures of this sort, in favour of any particular school in the territory, opposition or government riding.

Mr. Lang: What I was asking was if anything had been refused of any magnitude as far as the schools were concerned. Did they put in a request? Did they get everything that they wanted? I do not have that information.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I can tell the Member, as a matter of absolutely incontrovertible fact, that we spent a delightful half an hour one day in Management Board removing several million dollars from the Education Capital proposal.

Mr. Lang: I am not asking in that context. I am asking if there were requests put forward that were not met, and if so, what?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I will be happy to see if I can obtain that information for the Member. I hope that does not mean that the Member wished to stand on this item because I think that this information is pretty complete.

Mr. Lang: I think that he has done a fairly adequate job, especially in contrast to last night.

Miscellaneous School Equipment in the amount of \$899,000 agreed to

Chairman: Is it the wish of the Committee to continue or take a short recess for ten minutes, or continue.

Some Members: Continue. Chairman: We will continue. On Yukon College - Equipment

Mr. Lang: I would like a general breakdown of what this is. Hon. Mr. McDonald: All I had to do was be asked.

We have new equipment for existing programs and the programs include computer management, business administration, food services, academic upgrading, resource centre welding and human skills development. For computer management, we have got one HP 11-inch colour plotter. We have an addition of 20 computers to our local area network, connecting hardware and hard disc and 26 colour monitors. For the business administration course, we have an Apple IIe computer system. For food services, stainless steel, three-shelf food trucks; we have mobile racks, a tapered trolley, three beverage dispensers, and a proofing cabinet.

For academic upgrading we have three electronic typewriters, a Panasonic VCR and a monitor. For the resource centre we have four-drawer file cabinets, one electronic typewriter, bookshelves, and six study carrels.

⁴³ For the welding program, we have a hardness tester, one air chipper, one plate nibbler and a power supply with wire feed unit and a portable video camera for human skills development. That totals \$207,000. We also have, interestingly enough, some funding here for another mobile unit. As Members will know, the mobile unit program in the territory is extremely popular. It is expensive to run, but it is extremely popular. There are two units currently available and we feel, and I concur wholeheartedly, that we would like to have one more mobile trailer primarily for the carpentry program.

There have been a number of requests around the territory for the carpentry program to be delivered and we have to look at a more efficient and effective rural delivery of this kind of program. Given that it requires some equipment that is not readily available in some communities, we have identified some funding for this new mobile unit. It is interesting to note that it was always my suggestion that, perhaps, for carpentry courses we ought to consider using existing carpentry facilities in the high schools in various communities. I think that is a pretty darn good idea and I would like to promote it over time. In any case, there are not high schools with carpentry tools in every community and that is one reason why we would add another mobile unit.

That is \$105,000. That leaves us with approximately \$84,000 for the campus. It leaves us with one final major item, which is the replacement equipment for existing programs. This is for replacing equipment that has broken down or has run its useful life and must be replaced. For various programs, we have 40 trapezoid tables, five office desks — three with run-offs — a four-drawer lateral file cabinet, 100 plastic stacking chairs, six IBM Selectric typewriters, eight L-shaped typing tables, 24 No. 204 EIS Steno chairs for administrative services, we have three dictaphones and four Apple Ile computers for administrative services, as well. We have four Okadata M93 printers for computer management, one Panasonic 2200 VTR for the resource centre, a periodical display stand, three telephone cassette recorders, three Elmo overhead projectors, one AV filmstrip viewer, and one Kodak slide projector, all for the resource centre. We have one fuel injection pump stand, plus accessories, for the heavy equipment operators, an electric hoist for welding, and, a number of 6084 drafting tables — six of those for engineering design and drafting.

That totals \$84,000. All, as I have said, are for replacement of existing equipment, which we need to replace due to age, et cetera.

Yukon College - Equipment in the amount of \$\$460,000 agreed to On Community Learning Centres 8 Equipment

Community Learning Centres - Equipment in the amount of \$114,000 agreed to

On Grounds and Landscaping

Mrs. Firth: I would like to know which schools are going to be getting some landscaping.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I can provide that information — surprisingly. For the Members who are not aware, these funds are for the improvement of activity areas and playing fields of various schools. Christ the King will have refurbished grass, fencing and a proper driveway for safety reasons. Carmacks and the Watson Lake High School and Elementary School will get topsoil and grass. Mayo will get a fence, topsoil and grass for the playing field. Ross River will get a fence, topsoil and grass.

That is not a complete list. Let me just run it down for you. We are looking at providing additional topsoil for Robert Service and to complete the seeding. Christ the King High School will have the ground improvements completed and courtyard areas completed. Carcross will get general ground improvement, fencing and turf installation. Tantalus will get topsoil which will be seeded to grass. Watson Lake High will get topsoil which will be seeded. Watson Lake Elementary will get the same. JV Clark, as I mentioned, will get fencing, topsoil and grass seed. Ross River will get the same.

Clearly, as Members all know, these facilities are used extensively by the public during evenings, weekends, and especially when school is not in operation during the summer months. This is the reason why we spend such large amounts in this area. I think that there is some desire to improve the playing fields generally, especially in the City of Whitehorse, as they are extensively used

for softball. I am actually investigating, with the Department of Recreation, the assumption of responsibility for that kind of item. We have not come to a final determination on that score yet, but I can tell Members of the Legislature that it is my intention to investigate the responsibility — perhaps a shared responsibility — for the grounds of the various schools around the city, for that reason.

Grounds and Landscaping in the amount of \$228,000 agreed to On Yukon College — New Construction

Yukon College — New Construction in the amount of \$13,500,000 agreed to

On Carcross School Upgrading

Carcross School Upgrading in the amount of \$748,000 agreed to On Grey Mountain Primary Activity Room

Mrs. Firth: I wanted the square metres and why the increase in the cost

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The activity room, we anticipate, will be 380 square metres with 25 square metres for the accompanying storage facility.

This project is obviously over two years, as the Member for Riverdale South knows, for a total of \$622,000.

45 We still anticipate that the construction will be in the neighbourhood of \$510,000. There are various other costs, contingency, administration, inspection costs, design costs, which have to be taken into account.

The construction cost, essentially, is going to remain, as I understand it, as the amount that I had indicated to her in a memo some time ago. Any further or greater clarification on how the activity room is about to be built will have to be directed to the Minister of Government Services.

I should also say, as I have said to the school committee of Grey Mountain some time ago, that we will be reviewing the design of that particular facility. Concern was expressed about the design. I wanted to ensure that the school committee is entirely happy with the design. We want the final product to meet the needs of the people in that school. We also want the design to be sufficient to allow for a new construction of an entirely new facility for Grey Mountain, should the study dictate that such an expenditure would be worthwhile.

It seems the design might lend itself well to the construction of a new facility. It might be altered to some extent to ensure that any new construction will not interfere with, and will complement, the existing activity room once it is built. That is the information I have.

Grey Mountain Primary Activity Room in the amount of \$622,000 agreed to

On Haines Junction Student Residence

Mr. McLachlan: I would like the Minister to tell us who it is being built for and how many it will accommodate, and when it is scheduled for completion?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is an interesting subject. It is a subject that has been brought up in this House before in another manner. I will not put words in the mouth of the Member for Kluane, but my understanding is that his criticism was that we did not have a dormitory available in time for the four students who would be using the facility at the beginning of the school year.

Part of the reason for that was that we could not get a variance from the Village of Haines Junction to allow for a multi-use facility in the Yukon Housing unit. We have not been able to pursue that at greater length. They have, to our satisfaction, quite graciously allowed us to do minor renovations and, for this year at least, to use the Yukon Housing facility for a dormitory.

Because there are great distances between communities, and because they are so small, there is no way in the near future that we could consider justifying another high school facility on the north Alaska Highway. There has obviously been the need to send students in the junior high and post-secondary grades to another school in the territory.

46 Traditionally, the rural people have gone to Whitehorse, to the St. Elias dormitory or to private accommodation in Whitehorse, and have gone to Whitehorse city schools. This is not a satisfactory solution for all the people on the highway, and it is not a

satisfactory solution for everybody in the territory. Many people who come from a rural setting want to have their children attend school in a rural community so that the transfer from home to a situation where the child is living outside the home and going to high school would not be too much of a shock to them.

What we have done here, at least this year and perhaps in previous years of which I am not aware, is that we have accepted, in principle, that that is a valid concern for rural people. They should not all be put into the St. Elias dorm in Whitehorse; we should give consideration to putting them into a facility other than the Whitehorse facility.

In smaller rural communities, Members will appreciate that it is not that easy to find people who will take in students, for a fee, while they are attending school. At Haines Junction, we identified this problem as being quite serious this year because the person who had previously been providing this service was not willing to provide the service for their own valid reasons. This left us in a quandary as to what we were to do. We made a decision that we still believed in the concept of allowing rural students to go to a high school outside their communities but board in a rural community; therefore, we approved in principle the funding for a student residence in Haines Junction — at least as a pilot project.

While we have budgetted the \$200,000 for this particular item, we are still developing a plan with respect to how we want to approach the problem. We felt it was responsible to indicate an interest in the Budget for the residence, realizing that in any given year the people along the north Alaska Highway, the numbers of the children who use this facility would fluctuate greatly. This has caused me some concern, and the government as well, because when you build a facility to accommodate a specific number of students in a given year, that number may fluctuate the following year, and you might find yourself with a facility capable of holding 10 and you have got 15 students who could have used the facility. The next year, because numbers fluctuate drastically, you might have a facility which is capable of holding 10 and you might only have two students.

It seemed to me at the time of making the decision that it would be wise to consider using existing Yukon Housing units in the community for the purposes of providing group home situations for students from other communities because those facilities are otherwise left vacant. It is perhaps a more homey situation for the students when they are living away from home at a tender age.

So, we are intending to do something about this problem. We are identifying the need to deal with the problem. If there is a way I could give greater consideration to using Yukon Housing units and a group home setting in Haines Junction, then I will investigate that seriously. If there is not a way, then I think we will still have to address the issue — and the traditional response has always been a residence as we have in Whitehorse.

47 One way or another we are going to ensure that there is going to be a lasting solution to the problem, because we recognize it as being a problem, and one that needs to be addressed.

Mr. McLachlan: I appreciate the sensitivity of the situation both for the Member for Kluane and for the Minister's explanation.

I would like to make a couple of points here. I have received requests from other rural communities, from Old Crow to Watson Lake in the south for assistance with a similar type of situation as we find in Whitehorse as has just been described by the Minister.

In checking with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, they will not touch it. They will not touch it with a ten foot stick, because they say we have money for Native programs, we have money for seniors, we have money for disadvantaged, we have money for everything but student housing. That is way down at the bottom of the list. It exists on the books of the CMHC. There has been no money allocated for ten years.

If you go to the federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, if it is primarily a Native situation in Whitehorse that you are looking at, they will not touch it. They do not want anything to do with it, as we have seen by situations in this city recently. Here is the situation right here: the Government of the Yukon will build a residence home for the students in the city.

My questioning to the Minister is: are we looking at only a rural

situation where you would do this? You would not, I would take it then, get into this type of thing in the City of Whitehorse for students from Old Crow, from Watson, from Teslin? At one point consideration was given to Ross River students living in Faro and going home on the weekends. I wonder where that falls?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The statement that we are not considering group homes in the City of Whitehorse is not correct. We have to look at the situation where people have requested a group home setting for a given community in the city. We are habitually overcrowded in the St. Elias Dormitory in Whitehorse. That is the reason we are looking at design funds for expansion of that facility.

Obviously, many rural students who come in to live in that facility find it to be too large, not sensitive enough to their problems, and they want the comfort of a facility which has other people from their community and is not, in a sense, a large residence. This is an interesting concept. The Member for Old Crow has broached the subject with me a number of times. I think it is worth investigating.

We are looking at residential facilities in Haines Junction because there has been an historic need which is being addressed by the Department of Education.

It would be worthwhile to consider some sort of residence facilities for students, or parents of students who may not want to come to Whitehorse, but who would like their children to go to other rural high schools. That has to be an option. If we can, in any way, accommodate that in a cost effective way, we should investigate it.

With respect to providing facilities in Whitehorse, I do not believe that we should, strictly speaking, look at one large dormitory where we herd all the rural students into one facility, and treat them like cattle. That is not to say that we do it in St. Elias. 48 The facility gets larger and larger and larger, and the impersonal nature of a large facility with lots of students will maybe become more acute. It may be worthwhile investigating, in the future, the group home concept, or the small student residence concept rather than the large facility concept. It may be more sensitive to the emotional circumstances that the child finds himself in when he comes to Whitehorse and leaves his family. In general terms, we are not ignoring the requests. We are investigating the requests but we have not had time to identify funds for those requests at this time.

Haines Junction Student Residence in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to

On St. Elias Residence - Equipment

Mr. Brewster: I would like to put something straight on this. The St. Elias School is in Haines Junction. The St. Elias group home is in Whitehorse. This is for Whitehorse. Thank you.

St. Elias Residence - Equipment in the amount of \$5,000 agreed to

On St. Elias Residence - Expansion

St. Elias Residence - Expansion in the amount of \$80,000 agreed

On Departmental Equipment Storage Facility

Departmental Equipment Storage Facility in the amount of \$15,000 agreed to

On Robert Service School - Upgrading

Robert Service School - Upgrading in the amount of \$75,000 agreed to

On Eliza Van Bibber School - Equipment Storage

Mrs. Firth: Can I just go back to the Equipment Storage Facility and ask the Minister where that is going to be? Is that a new facility and where is it going to be constructed?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is designed for a facility to house all the surplus equipment that is currently housed in various schools. The Department of Education has an inventory problem. We have not determined where it will go at this time.

Mr. Phillips: Could I recommend that they store it in the Liquor Warehouse for the next three years?

Laughter

Eliza Van Bibber School - Equipment Storage in the amount of \$35,000 agreed to

On Installation of Computer Labs

Installation of Computer Labs in the amount of \$45,000 agreed to On Christ the King Elementary School - Library

Christ the King Elementary School - Library in the amount of \$20,000 agreed to

On Del Van Gorder School - Rebuilding

Del Van Gorder School - Rebuilding in the amount of one dollar agreed to

On Conversion of Films to Video Format

Conversion of Films to Video Format in the amount of \$30,000 agreed to

On Branch Library Equipment

Branch Library Equipment in the amount of \$25,000 agreed to On Audio Visual Services Equipment

Audio Visual Services Equipment in the amount of \$15,000 agreed to

On Technical Service Equipment

Technical Service Equipment in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to On Storage Equipment

Storage Equipment in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to On Library Planning - Whithorse

Library Planning - Whitehorse in the amount of \$25,000 agreed

On Northern Oil and Gas Action Program

Northern Oil and Gas Action Program in the amount of one dollar agreed to

Department of Education in the amount of \$17,161,000 agreed to

On Health and Human Resources

On Northern Health Services — Equipment and Construction Mrs. Joe: This explanation as to the line item is not quite as long as my colleague's but I will let you have it. I also have a copy here if anybody wants to follow it; it is not that long.

For the benefit of the Members, I would like to provide some additional information pertaining to this capital expenditure item. Members should be aware that the Government of Yukon is obligated to cost-share 70 percent of certain capital expenditures made in the territory by Health and Welfare Canada. These areas include construction, renovations and equipment purchased for health stations and hospitals, excepting the Whitehorse General Hospital, and nursing stations and equipment acquisition and replacement relating to community health, environmental health, mental health and school dental and health education programs.

Mrs. Firth: Speak up, please.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have a copy here that I can have sent over to the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale South.

The capital projects and equipment purchases, which require a 70 percent contribution by the Government of Yukon, for 1986-87 are as follows: renovations and additions to the health station at Old Crow, total 1986-87 cost estimated at \$600,000; construction of a health centre residence in Pelly Crossing, total 1986-87 cost estimated at \$1.6 million; construction of a staff residence at Faro, total 1986-87 cost estimated at \$1.3 million.

On this point, the Member for Faro is quite correct in that \$900,000 is being requested from this Legislature as a contribution to the construction of a staff residence in Faro representing 70 percent of the projected cost forecasted in 1984. Although the existing health care facility is temporarily closed, this reflects the government's optimism regarding the long term future of Faro, which I am sure the Member for Faro shares. Seventy percent of plant expenditures on major and minor equipment of approximately \$680,000, and vehicles of \$176,000. Equipment replacement by the federal government is based on its final life expectancy plus formal replacement repair decision points, and seventy percent of miscellaneous building renovations of \$79,000.

It is very important that the Members appreciate that the federal government operates on a five-year capital planning cycle which is slightly different than this government's schedule which is designed to obtain legislative approval for capital projects in the fall before the upcoming construction season.

For this reason, the capital expenditure cost-sharing of \$3,103,000 is based on the capital plan prepared by Health and Welfare Canada in the fall of 1984. Planning decisions respecting

the actual projects for 1986-87 will not be available to National Health and Welfare or to this government until early December. It is quite possible that federal plans for 1986-87 may be modified based on decisions which, to our knowledge, have not yet been made. Rather than inform this House after the fact of our cost-sharing responsibilities, we are disclosing project expenditures up front now based on the best available information. It is quite possible that the final expenditure level by the Government of Yukon will be different. Should this occur, this House would, of course, be informed through the customary supplementary estimates.

I would like to clarify for all Members that Health and Welfare Canada does undertake capital projects in which the Government of Yukon does not participate financially.

Based on the federal capital plan for 1986-87, projects including an additional regional office, renovations to a nursing residence in Whitehorse and some other minor constructions are being considered

so Whether the federal government will proceed with these planned undertakings is unknown at this time. There were some questions yesterday concerning this government's role in the Health and Welfare's Capital planning process. As most Members are aware, the Government of Yukon has had little involvement in federal decision-making in this area for years, although it is obligated to contribute financially.

Frankly, as the Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources and looking into this issue, I was surprised at how little this government's role had been in the past. I am committed, as the Minister responsible to this House, to increase the Yukon's participation in federal planning and decision-making respecting health services in the territory, and with reference to this particular discussion, to a greater role in Capital project expenditures.

I am pleased with the progress made by this government in this area to date. Our full role as a participating member of the steering committee overseeing identification of requirements for the proposed new health complex replacing the Whitehorse General Hospital is, I believe, but an example of what can be achieved through cooperative relations, initiative and hard work.

Mrs. Firth: I would like the Minister to give some justification for the construction of a staff residence in Faro.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: As I mentioned, this was a plan that was put in place by the federal government. We accept the fact that if the mine does open, there will be the possibility that that will be built. We are not saying that it is going to go ahead and be built. As I also mentioned, there would not be a definite decision by the federal government until December.

Mrs. Firth: How many staff is this going to house? There must be lots of empty houses in Faro to be used for temporary accommodation. To build a facility for \$1.3 million just on the hopes that the mine is going to open does not seem to be very responsible.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We do have hope. As a matter of fact, if the decision is not to build the facility in Faro, it will not be built. That is a decision that would be made by the federal government.

Mr. Lang: I am not clear on this, on the comments that the Minister gave to us. Last night she said to us, in the Blues: "As I understand it, I am sure the Members on the other side are aware of this, there are certain projects that are projected for 1986-87. There are planned different projects in consultation with this government. Apparently in the past, from the information I have, this government did not have that much input into what was going to be built and what was not. I can assure this House that we will have more input than in the past in deciding what has to be built and what does not".

What she tells me, if I heard her correctly, is vote \$3 million and the federal government will make the decision. That is one of the reasons we raised the policy question. How much are we being able to exercise our franchise as far as the Legislature and the government is concerned. That is one of the reasons it is being raised, not only the fact of the \$900,000 and questioning the credibility of putting \$900,000 into the project that she has asked for. What is just as important is the policy side. I do not think that

she has accomplished what she has said she has accomplished.

Do I take it, policy wise, you are asking us to vote in broad policy guidelines, as far as what is being proposed here, and then saying that the federal government will decide in December? Is that the question being put to this side of the House?

so Hon. Mrs. Joe: As I mentioned last night the decisions have not been made and will not be made until the end of December. The Member is very aware of how this process works. If there were plans to build a hospital or a facility in Faro then there would definitely be consultation with this government. The Member knows that as well. If we go ahead and decide that it should not be built because the mine does not open up, then it will not be built, but there is provision for it in this budget.

Mrs. Firth: If that is the case, why do we have to approve \$1.3 million? Why can we not just have a line item for one dollar and then if it is going to be built it will come back in the Supps? Why are we saying, okay, you can have \$1.3 million?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I seem to recollect us voting on a bill last year with regard to \$2.5 million regarding the Young Offenders facility and we did that without much problem. You can either leave it in here in the form of one dollar with the intention to build or you can put it all in there. We decided to put it in and as I said it is very simple to take it out again.

Mr. Lang: If it is that simple to take it out, why do you not put the motion on the floor to take it out? Then we will vote on it in the spring. Is the Minister prepared for the motion on the floor asking that the \$1.3 million be deleted.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: No, I am not.

Mr. Lang: The point is that she used the Young Offenders facility as an example of what has gone on in the past. It was the intention of the past government to build a \$2.5 million building. You are the one who cancelled it, no one else. That is your prerogative. I do not argue that. The intentions were to go ahead with it, now you are saying to us that you wish to spend \$1.3 million and you do not know if it is going to be built. You are not really sure if the decision will be made in December. I really think that we are in a dilemma where some undertaking has to be given that the Minister is going to report back to the House as far as what the decision is and how much actual input she has with it. She is saying to the House and the world, quoted last night that she has nothing to say to the federal government. We are being put into a real bind here.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It is not my intention to let this thing pass by and completely ignore it. If there are plans, and the mine opens, to go ahead to build this facility in Faro, then we will be deeply involved in the consultation process.

Mr. McLachlan: For the edification of the House, the status of the Health facility in Faro has been upgraded in better times from that of nursing station to Cottage Hospital. The staffing then required on a year-round basis was three shifts a day. There were not enough residences available within the building. This has necessitated going outside the building to house the other staff required. This department, in conjunction with Northern Health, has had to purchase alternate housing. It may be, depending on what happens, and I beg the indulgence of the House to consider that we are in limbo on what happens in Faro, that part of all of this is, or is not needed. However, the Member for Riverdale South does have a very good suggestion in that the mining company that is trying to buy the assets has indicated publicly that they do not need all the housing that exists in the town. If it is possible to purchase alternate housing from Curraugh Resources I am sure that may be the logical solution. If those mortgages must be taken down at a lower cost it is quite possible and I would be the first one to want to save this government and Northern Health some money on this one. That remains to be seen. I just beg your indulgence in considering the facts. There are no clear cut answers on what will happen in Faro. Let us not destroy everything because we do not know what is going to happen.

⁵² Hon. Mrs. Joe: It is not our intention to completely agree that the federal government can walk in and do whatever they expect to do. I would be happy to take any suggestion that may come from the Member for Faro, or from anywhere else.

Mrs. Firth: I have a basic question I would like to ask about

how her Budget process went along. I want to know if she asked her officials the kinds of questions we are asking her in the House right now. Did she put these questions to her officials?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I did not ask the questions that are being asked right now. As a new Member on this side of the House, I had a lot to learn in regard to how this line item here is cost-shared with this government. We went through a learning process about how things were done.

I got as much information as I felt that I needed at the time. It is a fact that you never stop learning. If there are other things that I would like to ask from my officials in how this Budget works, then I will definitely talk to them about it.

Mrs. Firth: I hope all of the new Ministers are learning from this. I do get the feeling, like the Member for Porter Creek East has said, that there was really nothing that was denied. This is where the Members have to be accountable. I know the Government Leader has said there was so much money denied and he was going to bring that back to us, and we will look at that.

This is where the Members have to come and justify to us why this expenditure is necessary. If they do not ask their officials some of the questions, and anticipate some of the questions that we are going to ask, and ask the officials these questions, then they are going to be put in the position of being in the House with an expenditure like this, and an empty liquor warehouse, and an education storage facility, that is a new facility, and they are going to have to justify it and be accountable. I think that all the Members should be asking their officials more questions. It does not make sense to me. It does not seem to me that the Members have done their homework properly.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I would like to thank the Member. She was on this side of the House and she had a lot of learning to do. I do not pretend that I know everything that has to be done in this Department. I have no problems with going back to my officials and asking them all the questions, and finding out all the answers to the questions that were asked of me today. I have no problem doing that. You only get wiser as you ask more questions.

I took it upon myself to sit down with them to talk about this Budget, to go over it myself, so that when I left there I could comfortably come to this House and support what I had in front of me.

Mrs. Firth: I am not trying to be unkind, or give the impression that I know everything. The message I am trying to give to the Minister is that if she has to come here and justify things to us, and then she ends up saying that she is prepared to listen to our recommendations, that should happen infrequently. We have seen it happen three times or so just this afternoon in this Legislature. I am just making the point that the Members are going to have to look through their Budgets with a more scrupulous, critical eye, so that when they bring stuff here they can stand up and justify to me why they think this expenditure is necessary. That is all I am asking.

When I was a Minister, that was the way I looked at it. I was very reluctant to come to the House with anything that I did not feel I could justify. I do not think the Minister is feeling quite as comfortable about justifying this expenditure as she would like to think.

¹³ Hon. Mrs. Joe: I would like to say that the Member cannot read my thoughts. As I mentioned before, there is an expenditure in here for \$900,000 for Faro. If that facility is not built, then it will be taken out of here. We are not saying that we are going to build it. If it is not needed, it will not be built.

Mrs. Firth: I do not see why we have to approve that amount of money. Why can we not approve a dollar, a line item; then when the Minister makes her decision as to whether she is going to purchase houses, as the Member for Faro has indicated is a possible solution, or if they are going to build a facility, she can come back and get approval for the funds. We are approving an expenditure of \$1.3 million; because part of it is being spent, the rest is going to have to be spent.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I, as a Member on this side of the House, have a lot of hope. It is my hope that sometime not too far down the road the mine in Faro will open, and that is why I have this in here. If it does not open, the money will not be spent — it is as simple as

that

Mrs. Firth: I have hope also. However, I do not feel that I have to approve \$1.3 million to justify to the public that I have hope. Having hope means that you put a line item in there, you identify a dollar, you look at reasonable solutions to the problem. Maybe we can purchase houses that are going to be empty instead of building a new facility. I am sure my hope is just as large and wide as the Minister's, but I do not see why we cannot just identify a line item.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: This is the way I chose to do it — unlike the Member; she may have done it another way, but this is the way I chose to do it.

Mr. Lang: I have to register my objection. We disagree with this particular line item. I think it is irresponsible to vote money and then, if the federal government decides to do something, we are going to pay for it. I think we have every right to ask the questions that are being put here. If you want to purchase housing, that is one thing; then you put a bill before us to purchase housing and we debate the merits of whether or not we should buy housing. We are debating about four different principles here for \$1.3 million.

It is nice to have faith and hope in the future, and I will be the first to congratulate the Minister when things come to fruition. On the other hand, we are voting hard, taxpayers' dollars that have to be justified. She is not telling us what she would do with it even if the mine was opened. I have to agree with the Member for Riverdale South. We have so many things in this Budget, and we are being asked to, carte blanche, say fine, go ahead, do what you want. I am against the line item.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Minister not consider the purchase of houses from the mine, as the Member for Faro has indicated and surely he knows best what is good for his community. Could that not even be perceived to perhaps be of some assistance to the mine opening — the fact that we would be utilizing some of their empty space and maybe paying rent for it or whatever, as opposed to building a brand new facility?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have no problem considering that.

Northern Health Services — Equipment and Construction in the amount of \$3,103,000 agreed to

Department of Health and Human Resources in the total amount of \$3,352,000 agreed to

On Department of Renewable Resources

Hon. Mr. Porter: Briefly, our Capital Budget is focused on several key and complementary initiatives that will contribute to our research, management and reporting capabilities. They will help to establish and expand the territorial park system in the region. They will provide more recreational opportunities both in specific locations along trail corridors. It will also allow for greater access to, and thus the opportunity for a broader appreciation of our natural features.

The present Budget then will consolidate existing and past parks, significantly expand our present conservation and wilderness recreation programs through our parks and trail systems and allow for future growth in our facilities and programs through a balance of planning and conservation activities.

On research, management and enforcement, this is to support our ongoing research, management and field operations requirements. Renewable Resources is proposing to replace, update and add to existing equipment such as snowmobiles, outboard motors and net guns. At the same time, the Department is planning to upgrade its laboratory facilities at Burns Road.

We will complete upgrading work at the regional offices in Dawson and Watson Lake by hooking into previously drilled water wells and plan for the possible relocation of the conservation officer facilities at Ross River. Total cost of the projects is \$87,000, for a less than six percent of the overall proposed Budget of \$1,507,000.

The Department will continue to work toward the implementation of a regionally representative system of territorial parks by completing field planning work, and starting construction of the Cold River Springs Park. Our Budget will allow for trail layout, road access and the development of an interpretive program.

The other end of the territory, we will be consulting with the

Inuvialuit and the people of Old Crow as we prepare a preliminary management plan for Herschel Island Park. The proposed allocation for Coal River Springs is \$225,000, and \$75,000 for Herschel Island.

On recreational area development, both of these new parks will become key components of a broader reaching network of recreational and conservation areas. Working with the Carmacks community and the Carmacks/Little Salmon Band in developing, hopefully in the future, an interpretive program. We will be developing an interpretive program and recreational area planned for Frenchman/Tatchun recreational road, a matter dear to the heart of the Leader of the Official Opposition.

We plan to initiate a public input process on management options for the Kusawa area, gravitating a trail site and facility development work for a recreational area in the Watson-Wheaton River region. We are proposing to continue with our planning for Fort Selkirk in collaboration with the Selkirk Indian Band, to undertake new work on a recreational and historic trail development to expand our existing work on providing access to significant features along the highway system, through access trails and through interpretive work ranging from signs to a mobile centre.

Our outdoor recreational development program in the Department of Renewable Resources has grown and expanded from our original campground development activities. Our proposed Capital Budget includes funds to maintain and build upon our campground program. We have included proposals for campground rehabilitation and campground development in heavily used sites such as Marsh Lake and Watson Lake. Our Budget makes provision for new campground development in the Mayo area, Quiet Lake, and along the Nahanni Range Road. We will also be reassessing and planning our campground needs along the Dempster and the Atlin Road to Tarfu/Snafu Lakes area.

Close to half of the proposed Budget will be spent on this key component of the Department's Capital projects.

35 The capital budget includes projects from the Beaufort Sea to the BC/Yukon border and from our eastern boundaries to Dawson. It combines construction activities with planning and assessment work. It is based heavily on the assumption that local communities will provide significant input to all planning and development activities. The budget will contribute to the present needs of Yukoners for job opportunities and provides the opportunity for residents to participate meaningfully in regional planning and development projects. It contributes to the long term social and economic development of the territory by providing a representative range of facilities, recreational opportunities and specially protected areas to visitors and residents alike.

Mr. Phelps: I must say there are a lot of things in this budget I really like and I am always pleased to speak in general debate about renewable resources. It is one of my favourite departments and, indeed, one of my favourite Ministers.

Looking generally at the plans and expenditures, I am very pleased to see much of it. Unfortunately, through some kind of masochistic wish on the part of the Minister, I see the first line item, when we get to it, is probably going to cause a little consternation. Aside from that and on looking at the rest, I am very pleased to see most of that budget and congratulate him on most of the work.

Mr. Lang: I just want to make a point overall as far as the parks program is concerned, and he has indicated there is a major change in direction as far as the parks systems are concerned. A very major concern is his terms of protected areas. I do not know if the Minister is aware of this, but we are getting to the point where about 25 percent of Yukon's land mass is committed in one way or the other. As far as parks are concerned, whether it be territorial, whether it be federal, whether it be pre-selected land as far as Land Claims are concerned, the COPE Land Claim — all these various things are coming into play and I am very concerned that this government is starting to move towards the direction of what they call protected areas. The *Parks Act* that was passed in this House was for the purpose of multi-purpose use, and it was very clear that that principle was to be abided by as far as looking at certain areas within the territory. Sure, there may be some further stringent

controls that have to be put in but, on the other hand, it was with the idea that development could occur. It is an area that I just want to put the Minister on notice that he should be taking a look at very seriously. The Coal River Springs is one where I understand there are 33 square miles set aside and nothing can happen in it except for traffic. I think that should be looked at very seriously, philosophically and idealogically, by the government. Is 33 square miles a requirement to be set aside for total protection where nothing can happen except that the Minister can go down and walk around and have a look at the birds and maybe go for a swim?

I think, in fairness to the situation, that that particular principle has to be addressed as far as the *Parks Act* is concerned.

Mrs. Firth: In view of the time, I move that the Chairman report progress on Bill No. 52.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

56 Speaker: I will call the House to order.

May the House have a report from the Chairman of Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Webster: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 52, First Appropriation Act, 1986-87 and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I will declare the report carried.

May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I move that the House do now adjourn. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 Monday

The House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was tabled October 17, 1985:

85-2-10

Addendum to Report of the Chief Electoral Officer on Contributions to Candidates During 1985 General Election (Johnston -Speaker)

The following Legislative Return was tabled October 17, 1985:

85-2-6

Yukon Pavilion tenders - Expo '86 (Porter) Oral - Hansard p. 134