



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 20

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Monday, April 21, 1986 — 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 Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

Willard Phelps	Leader of the Official Opposition
	Hootalinqua
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East
Alan Nordling	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Doug Phillips	Whitehorse Riverdale North

Liberal

Roger Coles	Liberal Leader
	Tatchun
James McLachlan	Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Hansard Administrator	Dave Robertson

01 Whitehorse, Yukon
Monday, April 21, 1986 - 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: We will now proceed to the Order Paper.
 Introduction of Visitors?
 Are there any Documents or Returns for Tabling?

TABLING RETURNS OR DOCUMENTS

Speaker: I have for tabling the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer on contributions to the political parties during 1985.

Speaker: Are there any further Documents or Returns for Tabling?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As required by Section 16(1)(d) of the *School Act*, I have for tabling a Report entitled, Department of Education Annual Report, 1984-85.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: In view of the discussion in Committee of the Whole, I will table a list of Legal Aid billings for last year and this year.

02 Mr. Lang: I have correspondence for tabling vis-a-vis municipalities.

Speaker: Are there any Reports of Committees?

PRESENTING REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Coles: I have the honour of presenting the first report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments.

Speaker: Are there any Petitions?
 Introduction of Bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 88: First Reading

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I move that Bill No. 88, entitled *An Act to Amend the Apprentice Training Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that Bill No. 88, entitled *An Act to Amend the Apprentice Training Act*, be introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

03 Bill No. 38: First Reading

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I move that Bill No. 38, entitled *Municipal General Purposes Loan Act, 1986*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Community and Transportation Services that Bill No. 38, entitled *Municipal General Purposes Loan Act, 1986*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 55: First Reading

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I move that Bill No. 55, entitled *Municipal and Community Infrastructure Grants Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Community and Transportation Services that Bill No. 55, entitled *Municipal and Community Infrastructure Grants Act*, be now introduced and read a

first time.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Are there any Notices of Motion?

04 Are there any Statements by Ministers?

MOTIONS OF URGENT AND PRESSING NECESSITY

Mr. Lang: I rise to ask the House for unanimous consent under Standing Order No. 28 to deal with an issue I believe to be very important to the Yukon, particularly the community of Watson Lake. It has to do with the increase of taxation that the people of Watson Lake are facing if actions are not taken by Members of the government and by all Members of this House. This is not a new issue, it has been raised constantly. This is a situation faced largely by Watson Lake, but also communities such as Mayo and Dawson City. I should point out there are difficulties arising now because of the inaction of the government, primarily from the point of view that March 15 has passed and the tax levy for the community of Watson Lake has not been levied.

I would expect the MLA for Watson Lake to listen very carefully. Some communities have seen significant increases in transfers, up to \$75,000, yet Watson Lake has seen a decrease in operating grants transferred to the community of \$50,000.

Some Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Lang: I am not out of order, I want to point out there is a meeting tomorrow evening at 8:00 p.m. in Watson Lake to discuss increasing the taxes in Watson Lake.

If this House acts today on the motion, which I will read shortly, it will bring the intent of the Legislature out and perhaps soften the blow to the people of Watson Lake who are facing up to 80 percent increases of taxes in some cases, and generally a 10 percent minimum tax.

I would move that it is the opinion of this House that the Government of Yukon should introduce legislation that will amend the *Municipal Finance Act* to rectify the financial inequities in the transfer of grants to the communities.

I would ask that all Members consent unanimously.

Speaker: Is there a unanimous consent?

Some Members: Disagree.

Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

05 This then brings us to the Question Period.
 Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Phelps: My question concerns the very important issue that was raised by the Member for Porter Creek East. We understand that the municipality of Watson Lake is facing a severe crunch with regard to their revenue situation to run their municipality over the course of the next year. I understand that the Member for Porter Creek East corresponded with the Minister regarding suggestions about changing the financing formula for giving grants to municipalities under the *Municipal Finance Act*.

Why has nothing been done yet? Why does Watson Lake now find itself in this predicament?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I would like to remind the Leader of the Official Opposition that the formula was determined after extensive consultation with the communities, and determined by the previous Conservative government. This government approached the Association of Yukon Communities a number of times over the course of the fall and early this year to determine whether or not they would consider changing the formula. They said no at their annual general meeting on the motion that was moved by the Dawson contingent.

We have taken a number of steps to rectify the situation as we perceive it. We have numerous times described the remedial action that we are prepared to take, including capital block funding, including a change in the assessment practices. In the face of that and the very clear signal we received from the Association of

Yukon Communities, we have not taken action to change the formula to date for the reasons that were stated at that meeting.

Mr. Phelps: The municipality of Watson Lake is in a severe financial crunch. It is a crisis situation. They have no money at all set aside for contingencies. They now have a new swimming pool, thanks to the largesse of the new government, but they face a crunch with respect to the O&M costs for that pool. That is a feature about which we have been forewarning this government from time to time over the course of the past six months.

06 **Can the Minister advise this House whether or not he has had any consultation with regard to his colleague, the Member for Watson Lake, about this severe situation?**

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member brings up the issue of the capital funding arrangement, which requires communities to take from their O&M allotment their portion of capital funds for capital projects. That, too, was a methodology for distributing capital funds that was determined by the previous Conservative government, not by this government. This government has taken steps, which I tabled in the House today, to rectify that particular situation. The situation, as it exists in Watson Lake, is one that every government is going to face in the future. There are always going to be pressures for increased funding. We, as a government, have tabled in this House a budget that included an increase of \$189,000 to operating grants for municipalities under a formula established by the previous government. That is a very definite commitment to all municipalities in the territory. We have taken a whole range of remedial action to clear up some problems, some anomalies in the system, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Phelps: Did the Minister receive this letter from the Member for Porter Creek East about the dilemma that Watson Lake is in, and the suggested changes to the *Finance Act*. If so, why did he not act upon it?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I did receive a letter that the Member for Porter Creek East sent to me, and we discussed this in the House at some length during the supplementary estimates, and during motion debate, which the Member had introduced in the House some weeks ago. Clearly, the remedial action that the Member offered was different to that which was already offered up by the community of Watson Lake. The situation, as expressed by Watson Lake, we felt was in error in some respects. We communicated our feelings to that extent to Watson Lake in the letter which I did provide to the Member for Porter Creek East. All correspondence has been made available to this House. Our position has been made crystal clear with respect to this situation.

07

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Phelps: I am not exactly sure what the position is. It seems to me that it is a stated position that, tough, if you have to raise your taxes, if the people of Watson Lake and other communities are treated unfairly, that is fine with this government. Mayo is not a member of the Association of Yukon Communities, and they are in a similar predicament. Will the Minister do something to try to ensure that they are treated fairly with regard to the formula for grants under the *Municipal Finance Act*.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I reiterate: this formula, which has been in place for a couple of years, was established largely by the Member for Porter Creek East, in consultation with the Association of Yukon Communities and the Council for Yukon Indians.

That unfair formula, which the Leader of the Official Opposition refers to, was the product of the Member for Porter Creek East.

The Member for Porter Creek East says, "Make me the Minister of Community Affairs, then I can correct a problem I created". We are trying to correct any anomalies in the communities. We are consulting with all the communities in this respect. We have suggested, and have taken very concrete action to assist communities.

For the information of the Member for Hootalinqua, the Municipality of Mayo has submitted a balanced budget. I do not know why he would want us to give the community of Mayo funding. We are going to deal with all of the communities fairly. We have approached the Association of Yukon Communities to ask them whether or not they felt any action should be taken on

changing the formula. They said, "No".

Mr. Phelps: Mayo is not a member of the Association of Yukon Communities. In view of the fact that the Member for Porter Creek East, some time ago, wrote the Minister about the inequities that were becoming apparent in the old formula, and in view of the fact that our party stands, in a flexible manner, to look at changes in circumstances in each of the municipalities and to try to ensure that they are treated fairly, would this Minister not do something besides consult? Could he not take some concrete action to ensure that residents of Watson Lake, Mayo and Dawson are treated equally and equitably under the formula?

08 **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member for Hootalinqua is displaying an incredible ignorance on this issue. The situation as exists in Dawson, Mayo and Watson Lake are different. They are different situations altogether. Dawson, for the Member's information, did not submit even a projected deficit some months ago. Dawson has very large reserves, and they have not, to me, ever, suggested that the O&M formula is the cause of their financial concerns. It is not, in fact, the case that it would be the cause of their financial concerns.

The Member suggested the Conservative Party has been flexible. It was the Conservative Party, I reiterate for the umpteenth time, that created the situation that we are in right now. The Conservative government created the situation. The Member wanted to know what the NDP government is doing in the way of direct concrete action. I can tell the Member that the NDP government is doing some very concrete things to improve the situation for communities.

We are instituting capital block funding, which will allow the communities to make their own decisions with respect to capital funding and to dedicate O&M funding for O&M purposes. We have indicated to all the communities that the assessment practices will be changed so that the shocks associated with . . .

Point of Order

Speaker: Member for Porter Creek East on a point of order.

Mr. Lang: It is very clear in the rules that a question is asked and there should be a short answer. We should not be getting a speech. I would like you to watch the government on that particular rule, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: There is a point of order, and would the Members please keep to that rule that all questions and answers are to be short.

Mr. Phelps: The hon. Minister made an amusing remark. — don't worry about Dawson, they have a surplus. Is this government taking the position that they will bleed the surplus from those communities that have, through prudent management, managed to set aside some monies over the years? Do they want to bleed away any surplus that accrues because of prudent management?

09 **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** The Member for Hootalinqua has demonstrated some incredible ignorance on the subject. The surpluses that Dawson accrued over the last few years are a result of the fact that the Government of Yukon failed to collect water and sewer charges and education taxes. We suspect the surpluses are very large. They were not accrued through what the Member refers to as prudent management.

Question re: White Pass Railway

Mr. McLachlan: My question is to the Minister for Tourism. In regard to the announcement of last week on the White Pass and Yukon Route Railway, is it the intention of the Minister to enter into any negotiations or discussions with White Pass regarding their proposal to lease the railway operation for some \$3.7 million?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As it is my department that is investigating alternative uses of the railway operation between Whitehorse and Skagway, including its use as a tourist carrier, I will answer the question. We have taken the initiative to review the operation of the railroad largely as a result of the anticipated abandonment plans put forward by White Pass.

With respect to the tourist train as an option, we are going to investigate all the options. We have discussed with the mayors of Whitehorse, Skagway and the Commissioner for Transportation of Alaska the use of the train as a tourist train. I have also discussed the situation with White Pass and Tom King, who is presently in Winnipeg.

Mr. McLachlan: Can the Minister tell us if we are prepared to abandon the abandonment plans the company has put forward, in light of last week's announcement, or are we still carrying on with both sides of the same argument?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We cannot abandon White Pass's abandonment plans so we will have to be prepared to respond to them should they come forward with them. White Pass has made it clear that they would be more than happy to rent the operation, the rolling stock and railway, or tracks to anyone who would be prepared to pay approximately the \$3 million rental fee per year. I would think that that proposal might hamstring tourist operation in an unwarranted way. For that reason, we did not jump at their offer. We are going to review it to determine the financial soundness of their offer. Obviously, if anyone was to use the train, they may be faced with rental fees should White Pass not abandon their operation.

Mr. McLachlan: I would agree with the Minister that the \$3.7 million given for, at the most, four months tourist season is, indeed, a cost-burden. Is the Minister's department also prepared to examine other uses for that railway, during the other eight months of the year, that could be of some benefit to the Yukon, plus make it a more sound economic proposition for an operator?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Clearly, we have already reviewed the operations with respect to the ability of the operation to carry freight for the Curragh ore haul, and have determined, conclusively, that it is not economical for us to operate the railway. If there is something else that might come up that we have no knowledge of at the present time, we would be happy to consider that.

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Lang: I have a question for the Minister of Community Affairs, or who claims to be the Minister of Community Affairs. It has to do with the situation, once again, of Watson Lake. For the record, and for the Minister's edification, I am getting awfully sick and tired of hearing, "I have been in government 10 months, and it is the Conservatives' fault". I would like to refer to the...

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: The hon. Government Leader on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I have the same rule that the Member objected to a moment ago. I believe questions are supposed to be put, not speeches made, during Question Period.

Mr. Lang: On the same point of order, I would like to point out that this is a very brief preamble. I would like to quote the government side opposite, on March 27, 1984, when the now Government Leader, Mr. Penikett, stated, "I think we have to be frank in saying that it is clearly this formula may yet prove to be flawed for reasons we cannot anticipate, and we may have to come back to the House again in a year or two and continue the search for the perfect formula to provide grants for the local governments in the territory".

I, quite frankly, agree with that particular statement. I wrote a letter to the Minister saying that there were inequities. Is the Minister of Community Affairs going to take any action, at all, in view of the fact that the taxpayers in Watson Lake are, in some cases, facing increases of 80 percent, and, in some other cases, 10 percent increases in property taxes in the community of Watson Lake? Could the Minister please inform this House what actions he is going to take to rectify the situation?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member may want to disassociate himself from the formula as designed in the past, but he never will. The action that we have outlined already is very concrete and quite revolutionary in terms of municipal funding for communities. Capital block funding is revolutionary. We have decided that we are going to change the assessment practice to soften the blow for communities.

With respect to action taken, we will do as we have done in the past, we will consult with the AYC and with Mayo on whether or not an agreement can be arranged for any changes to any formula, any given year. This year we have approached the AYC, and they have turned down any suggestion for change. We will not change the formula on the basis of consideration for one municipality. Any formula would have to apply to all the municipalities and we would

like to see a consensus from all the municipalities.

Mr. Lang: While the Member opposite is searching for consensus, the people of Watson Lake are going to experience a real high tax increase. I hope he is happy with that.

Under Section 16(1), extraordinary assistance grants, is the Minister prepared to invoke that section, and prepared to provide some financing to the community to offset the major tax increase that they are going to face?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The assumption in the Member's question is that the formula for assessment equalization is at fault here and the sole reason for the tax increase in Watson Lake. We have taken a position, in a letter, of which a copy was sent to the Member, that we did not believe that the formula was at fault in terms of any tax increases that were determined as necessary by the community.

Every year the communities are going to have demands made on them by their constituents to increase services. They are going to have demands made on them to provide certain services. They are going to have to face their taxpayers the way we face our taxpayers.

With respect to the question at hand, we have allotted an additional \$189,000 to the formula to fund communities. That is a fairly solid commitment to municipal finance.

Mr. Lang: That is the point. That is why I am asking the Minister: does he think it is fair that one community, which has not been effectively operating to any great degree, — in fact, some facilities are closed down that are normally operated — gets an increase of \$80,000 and the community of Watson Lake gets \$50,000 less. Is that a fair formula? I want to ask the Minister why he is not acting on that particular section of the act to rectify the situation.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Assessment Equalization Grant that the Member is referring to is a grant that is intended to make up for short drops or increases in assessments in a community. The revenue potential in Watson Lake increased as a result of an increase in assessments. The revenue potential increased \$70,000. The Assessment Equalization Grant dropped \$35,000 for a net of \$35,000 to the community.

Presumably the expanded boundaries for Watson Lake are going to require some services. The total of \$70,000 should be sufficient to cover off those expenses. Those were the items that were covered by the Municipal Board when the Municipal Board went into the community to discuss boundary expansion for Watson Lake. Watson Lake was informed of what the situation would be in the future, should it expand its boundaries. It has now faced the expanded boundaries and has now seen an increase in revenue potential of \$70,000.

Mr. Lang: How does the Minister justify to this House, and to the people of Watson Lake, why they get \$35,000 less in their transfer this year and a community such as Faro gets almost an \$80,000 increase and Whitehorse gets an increase of \$143,000. That does not say an increase to the community of Watson Lake; that is a decrease. Does he think that is fair?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Equalization Grant is simply that. It is a make-up for sharp increases and decreases in the overall assessments in communities. When the assessment rises, increasing the revenue potential in the community — in Watson Lake's case by \$70,000, then the assessment equalization drops as a result of that. In this case, it has meant a net increase to Watson Lake of \$35,000.

Mr. Lang: There has been a net increase to the Town of Faro under the present formula, and a net increase of \$143,000 to the City of Whitehorse. Is that fair? That is the question: does the Minister think the present way the formula is written and administered is a fair formula to a community such as Watson Lake?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Like all equalization grants, this is meant to address the problem of dropping assessments in a community. If a community's assessments drop dramatically, it is meant to increase revenue to that community as a result of the revenue potential dropping. Now like all equalization grants, which the Yukon itself benefits from, because we do not have the ability to generate our own revenue to the extent other jurisdictions do, it

is meant to make up for those communities that are in rougher shape than others.

According to the formula, Watson Lake's revenue potential climbed dramatically and Faro's declined dramatically. Faro received buffer funding, and Watson Lake's funding dropped somewhat as a result of the change in the assessments.

In Watson Lake's case they ended up with a net increase of \$35,000.

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Phelps: Is the Minister trying to say this is his concept of fairness, that first of all you drop the grant to Watson Lake so they have to raise their taxes, and you increase by over \$100,000 the grant to Whitehorse and they keep their taxes the same, and that is supposed to be fair to all the residents in Watson Lake? Is that his position?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: It is incredibly frustrating because of the absolute refusal of the opposition to understand what is going on and their desire to make a political issue out of this because it happened to come up on the radio over the course of the weekend.

The assessment equalization is an equalization payment that is meant to address the conditions that exist in the communities. That is the fundamental principle.

In Watson Lake's case, I will reiterate once again, their assessments increased dramatically. That meant that their revenue-generating potential increased dramatically, by \$70,000. Now the Assessment Equalization Grant only dropped by \$35,000, so they have a net increase in revenue potential of \$35,000.

Mr. Phelps: The Minister is dancing around at such a speed that it is hard to see where he really stands at any given time, or whether he actually touches the ground on this issue.

I would like to know whether or not he is now saying, after blaming the formula for grant financing on the previous government, that he is perfectly content with this, and it is fair, unless he takes a straw poll and the consensus says he is wrong? Is that his position?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Members for Hootalinqua and Porter Creek East are desperately trying to make this an issue so that it gets into the media. I have explained the Assessment Equalization Grant and the formula. The Members do not understand it. It is still meant to address concerns of the communities. In Watson Lake's case, is not the reason for any tax increase.

I have explained the concrete action that this government plans to take with respect to the concerns of all the communities, so that they do not have to allocate O&M funds for capital purposes. That is a very real, concrete action. We have talked about changing the assessment practices for communities to improve the situation for communities. We have indicated to communities that, in any given year, if they would like to change any formula upon which grants are based, they are free to discuss it.

In this particular case, the community of Watson Lake went to an annual general meeting of the Association of Yukon Communities, and any proposed changes for that particular grant were turned down by the Association of Yukon Communities.

Mr. Phelps: I must say that the remarks of the Minister, to quote the Government Leader, are pure piffle. He talks about us raising this issue for the first time because it was in the media. Will the Minister not agree that he has had correspondence from this side over the course of the last couple of months? It has been raised in the House by the Member for Porter Creek East on several occasions during debates over the course of the last month. Will the Minister not agree that that is the case?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I may have missed a question. It was probably just another representation. I think the Member was trying to summarize his position so that it would fit his 30-second clip.

When the Conservatives were in power they ignored the Association of Yukon Communities. We are not going to ignore this association. They have expressed themselves very coherently to us. We have discussed with them municipal financing arrangements in detail, and I have demonstrated an understanding of municipal financing arrangements that the Members opposite clearly have absolutely no understanding of.

¹⁵ I have discussed the situation with Watson Lake, in Watson Lake. It is true that the Member for Porter Creek East sent one short letter saying please refer to the letter from Watson Lake, it is a concern to me too. If that is the written representation, it is not cogently or coherently stated.

We have taken concrete action to resolve financing arrangement, capital and O&M, for all the communities. We have approached them in a coherent way and we have received a coherent answer. We are always concerned about the financing of communities and we are taking direct and concrete action to resolve the problems.

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Lang: For the record I would like to point out that when the amendments to the act were put forward on March 27, 1984, it was made very clear, "Since the *Municipal Finance Act* has been in force for two years, I request that the staff of the department review its determination..."

Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lang: At that time I instructed them to ensure the review was conducted in consultation with the Association of Yukon Communities. Did the MLA for Watson Lake make any representation for you to change the *Municipal Finance Act* in view of the correspondence of February from the town council?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member for Watson Lake has demonstrated a very clear understanding of the municipal financing arrangements, and supports this government's initiatives to assist communities. I am pleased to say that if the Member wants to canvass all Members on this side of the House, we are all, in total, committed to assisting communities on all fronts and willing to consult with communities at all times and are always concerned with their problems.

Mr. Lang: To the Minister who claims to have responsibility for this particular area, did the MLA ask for changes to the *Municipal Finance Act* in view of representation made by the town of Watson Lake?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The conversations between Cabinet Ministers are confidential. If the Member wants to ask the Member for Watson Lake what he believes, he is perfectly entitled to do so. But the Member for Watson Lake understands the initiatives this government has taken, understands the situation in Watson Lake and, I am pleased to say, supports the government's actions.

¹⁶ **Mr. Lang:** It seems to me you have to be an interest group to get any money out of this group. What is wrong with the property taxpayers? Maybe somebody should start taking care of them.

If the Minister had an invitation to attend a meeting in Watson Lake on this particular issue, would he attend?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I would certainly be prepared to attend if the House is not sitting. I have already been to Watson Lake to discuss the municipal financing arrangements with the people there. I have already done that once, on January 17. The government has indicated that it is prepared to assess communities on the O&M side, and that is the reason why we have requested of the House approval of an increase of \$189,000 to the grant. This government is committed to assisting communities. It does understand the community's problems, as well as the financing arrangements that are not understood by the Conservative opposition. We are committed to helping communities on an ongoing basis.

Question re: Faro recreation centre

Mr. McLachlan: Is the only thing that is holding up the reopening of the Faro Recreation Centre the successful conclusion of the agreement that is being negotiated between the town, the Department of Education and Curragh?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not claim absolute and total knowledge of the discussions that have been taking place between the Town of Faro and Curragh Resources with respect to the reopening of the Faro Recreation Centre. It is anticipated that the Faro Rec Centre is going to cost money to operate, and the Town of Faro and the Government of Yukon and Curragh Resources all wish to ensure that those financing arrangements will be tied down prior to an opening, so that nobody commits himself in an unwarranted way.

Mr. McLachlan: I had asked the question because the concept is there in the town that the Department of Education must take the

lead role, and then the other parts of the jigsaw puzzle will fall into place. I could rephrase the question by asking the Minister if he expects to have a gymnasium come September 1 for the Faro Del Van Gorder School, as opposed to the situation now, where we do not have anything?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: It is quite true that the newly-built gymnasium has been condemned for the purposes of use by students in Faro. It is our intention to use, in whatever form, the Faro ex-Centre gym for students at the school. In that effort, the Department of Education is involved, as well, in discussions with respect to their participation in O&M operating costs of the rec centre.

Mr. McLachlan: My final supplementary to the Minister of Government Services is on the same subject of the elusive Faro gymnasium. Has a decision yet been made on what you intend to do with that gymnasium? If it has not yet been made, when will you be prepared to make that decision?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I did not understand nor hear the question.

Mr. McLachlan: Has a decision yet been made on the fate of that gymnasium? If it has not yet been made, when will you decide what you are going to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, a decision has not yet been made. It is dependent on the instructions of the client department, not Government Services.

Question re: Fuel prices

Mr. Nordling: I have a question for the Government Leader with respect to fuel prices. I understand that, at the present time in British Columbia, diesel fuel costs are approximately five cents less per litre than gasoline, while, in the Yukon, diesel prices are approximately five cents higher per litre than gasoline. Does the Government Leader know why the price of diesel fuel has not fallen at the same rate in the Yukon as it has in B.C.?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As you know, I have received representations on that from the Member for Faro, and more recently from the Member for Riverdale North. I have undertaken to make enquiries of the dealers to establish the facts and the reasons for them. Accordingly, I have communicated with those people and I hope to hear from them soon, so I can answer the questions put by the Member.

Response re: Job evaluation study

Hon. Mr. Penikett: While I am on my feet, I have an answer to a question asked last week by the Member for Tatchun with respect to positions not evaluated under the JES, and why. The answer is that college instructors, counsellors, teachers and tutors, and education consultants, a total of 385 positions, were not evaluated. The reason that was made by the government of the day was that academic positions are traditionally paid under an instructional grade and no reference is made to job content or to the complexity. In that respect, perhaps it is similar to MLA positions. As well, the deputy ministers were not subject to the JES evaluation, and the informal system established by the previous government, in that respect, was retained.

¹⁸ There were, in total, 398 positions that were excluded from JES.

Question re: Wolf studies

Mr. Brewster: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. On April 14, the Minister described a number of ongoing studies with wolves, particularly the Donjek wolf study being conducted by a student from the Michigan Technological University. Considering the Department of Renewable Resources is funding part of this study, what specific benefits and information will come to the Yukon from this?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not have the briefing material available. These books are not big enough to contain all the material needed for the Members' questions.

I am going on memory, as the Member for Porter Creek East so often does, but the research is related to predation of wolves on dall sheep. As the Members can appreciate, the question of the interaction between the predator and prey species is of direct

concern to this government. I would suggest that any information that we can find relating to the predatory habits of wolves with respect to dall sheep would be valuable information to this government.

Mr. Brewster: Can the Minister tell us if the student is studying the same Kluane Park and Kluane Game Sanctuary wolves, which were studied for many years on the Burwash upland flats by Dr. Theberge and his students from the University of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would undertake to check the records for the Member's benefit to see if they are the same wolves that are being studied, and report back to the Member.

Mr. Brewster: Is the student live-trapping or snaring wolves as part of his study? If so, what permits, conditions, safeguards and training for the welfare of the animals has the department issued for this study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I understand that the student is engaged in the snaring of wolves. I trust that the department would have issued all the necessary permits that would be necessary for him to carry out this activity. If the Member is worried about it, I will check on the department again to make sure that they are doing things as they should, and report the findings of that investigation to the Member.

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

19 ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 25: Second Reading

Clerk: For second reading, Bill No. 25, standing in the name of the hon. Mrs. Joe.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I move that Bill No. 25 be now given second reading.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Health and Human Resources that Bill No. 25, entitled *An Act to Repeal the Cancer Diagnosis Act*, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: For the information of Members, the *Cancer Diagnosis Act* predates both hospital and health care insurance. Its original purpose was to provide basic health insurance benefits for those persons who were suspected or confirmed cancer cases.

Since the introduction of comprehensive health and hospital insurance, the Act has permitted the provision of benefits to cancer patients above and beyond those provided through basic health insurance. That is, special benefits such as ostomy supplies, medical appliances, prosthesis and drugs recovered under the provisions of the Act.

We are now in a position to broaden the benefits the *Cancer Diagnosis Act* permits us to deliver to persons with diseases and disabilities other than cancer. A new Chronic Disease and Disability Program, to be established by regulation under the *Health Care Insurance Plan Act*, will be in place by early fall of this year.

That broader program will include the benefits previously available for cancer patients only. It is because of the advent of the new Chronic Disease and Disability Program that the *Cancer Diagnosis Act* becomes redundant.

The Chronic Disease and Disability Program, which will replace and enhance the benefits currently available to cancer patients, will also serve to rationalize and extend benefits provided previously under a range of programs and statutory instruments. For example, various drug, medical appliance and prosthetic service programs will be rationalized into a single coordinated program. Some features under that program are drug benefits for children and adults with chronic conditions such as diabetes, chronic heart and lung disease, severe allergies and a range of other long-term health conditions, and provisions of medical equipment and appliances such as wheelchairs, walkers and home oxygen equipment, provision of prosthesis and aids such as braces and artificial limbs and provision of medical supplies such as ostomy supplies and syringes.

²⁰ 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 resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed.

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Recess

²¹ **Chairman:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. Bill No. 17 continued. Department of Justice, Legal Aid.

Bill No. 17 - Fourth Appropriation Act, 1985-86 — continued
On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures
On Legal Aid

Legal Aid in the amount of \$136,000 agreed to

Chairman: Any comments on Policing? It is not a line item or an over- or under-expenditure.

Mr. Phelps: I have a few questions about that item. What steps are taken by this government to ensure that the policing is being run effectively and efficiently?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The Chief Superintendent and the Officer-in-Charge and I, and frequently the Deputy Minister of Justice, meet, periodically. It is generally approximately monthly. If we are discussing particular issues, it is more often than that. The Police Services Agreement sets out the sphere of influence, or the requirements, where the Chief Superintendent is required to obtain the consent of the territory or to consult with the territory. We discuss the concerns in general. That is the procedure that we follow.

Mr. Phelps: Does our Department of Justice look into the issue of internal discipline and complaints about the actions of police?

²² **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** No, the Leader of the Official Opposition will be aware of the recent amendments to the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, which deal with that question. Frequently, complaints about individual incidents come to my office in the form of phone calls or letters and I refer them on to the police. There has never been an occasion in my tenure when I have considered a complaint that warranted investigation that is not in the nature of the normal course of the police internal investigation.

Mr. Phelps: Has the Minister any comments with regard to the policing activities done by the Kwanlin Dun Police Force and the request for an increase in personnel?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: That is very difficult and a sensitive issue. The comment that I have for the position of the department is that that is an appropriate issue to be discussed at the land claims talks. The overall position with regard to native policing is most relevant. Consideration of the allocations of funds does not come into it technically, however in the overall picture it obviously does. Ultimately, it falls on the taxpayer. The funding for the native police for Kwanlin Dun is entirely federal and comes through the Department of Indian Affairs and that is entirely separate from this item.

There is, of course, a consideration considering the coordination of the RCMP services and the Kwanlin Dun services, and it appears to me that there is more a lack of coordination than coordination. That sensitive issue ought to be resolved in the context of the overall direction for the future, which is ultimately a land claims question.

²³ *On Legal Aid*

Mr. Phelps: Going back one line, I have just had a chance to look at the document tabled, entitled Legal Aid Expenses. I am wondering whether the Minister would undertake to provide us with a breakdown as between fees and disbursements. Would that be possible? What we have here are some figures, some of which may

be somewhat misleading because it does not break down disbursements by the lawyer, that is, travel and so on, as opposed to straight fees. Would that be possible?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am assuming it is possible. I will ask for that breakdown and provide it in due course.

Mr. McLachlan: On the subject of the Legal Aid billings, on Thursday the Minister was putting forward the idea of limiting legal aid time per day to eight hours. Is this in response to the fact that you have some concerns that eight hours of billing is being billed for only six hours of work, or is there some other matter you are trying to get at?

Chairman: I would like to remind Members that when we have cleared an item and we wish to go back, I am going to have to ask for unanimous consent of the House that we do reconsider that line item.

Mr. Lang: Could we have unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman: Do we have unanimous consent to go back to Legal Aid?

Some Members: Agreed.

Chairman: Mr. McLachlan, had you finished your question to Mr. Kimmerly?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Were a lawyer to charge for eight hours and only work six, that would be fraud. The question is that frequently there is a charge for more than the daily rate, which is charged on circuits. The daily fee for a lawyer with three years' experience is \$550. It is my position that that \$550, even considering the overhead, is sufficient remuneration for a day's work. If a lawyer works nine hours or ten hours or an hour after supper on circuit, they are adequately paid at \$550. There should be a cap on the fee at \$550 a day, or whatever daily rate is determined and agreed to.

²⁴ **Mr. McLachlan:** I do not want to prejudge entirely the results of the legal review that will come out. I am sure one of the things that will be pin-pointed will be the amount of time that the legal aid lawyers have to spend in town, on circuit, which, at times, seems to be inadequate.

If working in the evenings is required, that would be hours, in some cases, over and above the eight hours. I see nothing wrong with working in the evening to get through the caseload to interview the clients. If it is the wish of the Minister to have them for only eight hours, I am concerned that everything will stop at 5:00 or 5:30, and nothing will get done in the evenings. The only other answer to that then is to stay another day in town. What are your wishes and concerns on that matter?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The circuits will only work efficiently if we abandon this kind of clerical mentality. Some would call it a union mentality in pejorative sense against the unions. The courts generally do not operate by a punch-in clock, neither should lawyers, especially on circuits.

If they are paid \$550 a day, surely that is enough for a day's work. Administrators, managers, politicians, do not always require specific overtime pay if they interview a person after supper or outside of normal hours. That is the way the circuits should work.

Mr. McLachlan: I have no problem with that if the Minister thinks \$550 is adequate for six hours, eight hours or nine hours of work. A definite statement of eight hours a day, \$550, does not limit, in any way, the ability of the defense lawyer or prosecuting attorneys to work after supper if that is required. That is my only concern.

Mr. Lang: There seems to be a consensus here. I would ask the Minister how soon is he going to act? When is he going to put a cap on? Are we talking days, hours or minutes?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The consensus and the publicly expressed consensus in the House is extremely encouraging. It leads me to consider, unilaterally, establishing such a cap. That could be done this week, in fact.

I have been careful not to act unilaterally, and to act in a consultative way. The conclusion of those consultations with the bar and the Legal Services Society should be soon — certainly this spring. It should resolve itself before the July and August season.

²⁵ **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** It may speed things up to arbitrarily put on a cap, even if it is a temporary cap, and that is a responsible

suggestion, I thank the Member for it.

On Criminal Injuries Compensation

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I made a Ministerial Statement and explained this. We are advertising the program. The awards have been \$84,000, I believe, to the end of the year, and there are some administrative costs. The Workers' Compensation Board is the board that actually sits on the determination of the awards. The awards have primarily been in spousal assault and sexual violence cases. The \$34,000 has been a virtual historical figure. The program, after it is advertised, is used more and I would expect next year the figure to be higher still.

Chairman: We have not yet cleared Policing and Mr. Brewster has a question.

Mr. Brewster: One question that I think the Minister is well aware of, is that we have police on the highways. Is he prepared to do anything to help the people at Burwash? I fully understand the situation with the police being at Haines Junction, but it certainly is not satisfactory. I certainly would like someone to look into this and help those people up there who have a serious problem and are doing their best to clear this up. They have trouble with people going to the village and raising a lot of trouble, and it just is not fair to expect the police to go 100 miles to get there all the time.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The Member for Kluane is raising a legitimate concern and it is a serious problem in that all communities would like a policeman, especially at times when there is unlawfulness. It seems to come and go in cycles and is generally cycled around one or two individuals or perhaps a gang, generally young males, but not always. That has occurred in Burwash and Burwash would like a policeman. There is an anomalous situation, in that there are four policemen in Haines Junction.

²⁶ The overall direction of the government should not be to increase the cost of policing in the territory, as it is an extremely high per capita expense now. The police per capita ratio here and in the NWT is vastly greater than in the provinces, although that is not the case if we consider only the northern end of the western provinces.

The concern is a legitimate one, but we simply cannot place a policeman in every single settlement or hamlet. It is not cost-effective. At the same time, should there be a particular problem concerning unlawfulness, the RCMP are capable of temporarily stationing or locating people in a location to overcome a particular problem. The RCMP are trying to do this with Burwash, and there is also a consideration of a Band policeman, although that has the same problems as all of the considerations of Band policemen do.

The government is well aware of the concern, and we are continuing to monitor it. The response immediately is to increase patrols from the Junction to Burwash and keep a very close eye on the situation.

Mr. Brewster: I would like to thank the Minister for that answer. I certainly understand it. I understand the problem the RCMP have. They have a very large area. They have a very hard time getting around. However, unfortunately, when these patrols leave Haines Junction everybody in the mocassin telegraph knows this, and by the time they get there, the people causing the trouble could be back into Beaver Creek or into Whitehorse.

I am very concerned, particularly with Burwash, because there has been a fantastic job done there by the new Chief. He has done his best to combat alcoholism. He has done a terrific job, however, he has been in some very bad positions there. I certainly will promise the Minister that I will be watching this very closely, and hollering my head off every time anything happens.

²⁷ **Mr. Phelps:** Just before we leave this, I would like to raise a concern and bring it to the attention of the Minister. It has to do with the architectural design of the stations that are erected in the communities. This happened in Carcross several years ago but I would hope that this government would take steps to ensure that any new police offices or facilities would fit into the general architecture of the town. I am thinking particularly of Carcross, where it is a nice facility, but it sure does not fit in.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I thank the Member for that. I totally agree. I have not mentioned that as of today with the RCMP, however I will point it out to them.

Criminal Injuries Compensation in the amount of \$63,000 agreed

to

On Yukon Courtworkers

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It has been an aim of mine to stay within the budget, and even though there was a report done, I am pleased there was no disruption in service back in September when the changeover occurred. The meeting with the chiefs has been scheduled for May 2, and I confirmed that this morning.

Yukon Courtworkers in the amount of a reduction of \$3,000 agreed to.

On Consumer and Corporate Affairs

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The JES figure here is \$3,850. The overexpenditure here is, aside from some salary dollars with JES, the signing bonus and some accumulated leave, entirely due to the Branigan Inquiry. There were savings, in fact, on consultant services and travel costs. As I indicated earlier, travel for the department was cut back 50 percent — that is out-of-territory travel. I will list the costs for the Branigan Inquiry as I am sure I will be asked. I have figures that do not exactly add up with the figures in the budget book because the figures in the budget are as of period nine. The figures I will give are year-end figures and are substantially larger.

²⁸ The total figure for the inquiry, which includes travel costs and rental of space and the inquiry investigation and the inquiry itself, so far, to the end of the year, is \$109,460. It is anticipated that the legal procedure that will occur, scheduled for June in Alberta, will cost that much again, and possibly more.

Legal fees for the inquiry to date are \$16,258.55 plus \$38,561.28 plus \$970.79. That is for three lawyers, none of whom are government lawyers. They are lawyers employed through the medical council.

Mr. McLachlan: On the Branigan inquiry, other than the legal fees, totalling some \$55,000, what is the balance, the \$54,000, related to? Is this travel?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The honorariums for members of the council and of the board of inquiry, their expenses, the expenses of expert witnesses and their travel expenses, telephone calls, rental of the hall and the administrative expenses of the inquiry.

Mr. McLachlan: Surely the honorarium of the medical council people is not sought in this additional \$73,000? Surely that is budgetted as part of the 1985-86 O&M anyway?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, although the additional activity of the medical council as a consequence of the investigation and the enquiry amounts to probably \$6,000 to \$7,000.

Mr. Phelps: I would not want this item to go by without a few comments about the findings of the Public Accounts Committee. We look forward to examining very carefully the steps taken by this branch with respect to establishing proper performance indicators. I just mention this because in further supplementaries we will be following up.

Mr. Lang: In this particular section, is the cost for the purposes of the development of the human rights legislation included? Is this the section?

²⁹ **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** No, that is under administration.

Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$73,000 agreed to

On Administration

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The concern is raised about the activities about human rights. The work was done by the person who was in the Women's Bureau before it became the Women's Directorate. That changeover took place. That same individual was hired on a contract basis to follow the progress of the bill. Subsequently, I believe it was in early February, another researcher was hired to plan and develop the public education and public information campaign. That program is still underway, and that person is still on staff on contract.

The individual who was supervising it resigned as of last month, and there are advertisements in the paper, I believe, to fill the position. That is where it now stands.

The administrations branch here also is responsible for an under-expenditure due to the death of Pat Harvey and the fact that we have not filled that position. Out-of-territory travel and long distance calls were saved, and transportation and professional

services were saved, and they balance out leaving a net under-expenditure.

The costs for JES are \$1,408.

Mr. Phillips: The other day I asked the Minister about the drafting of the human rights legislation. I wonder if the Minister could clarify it again. Was most of that drafting for that legislation, or all of it, done by government lawyers?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, all of it. There were no expenditures as I am aware, for outside consultants. There was some consultation that occurred with other commissions around the country but it did not cost us anything. I did not hire a consultant to write it.

Mr. Phillips: I wonder if the Minister could explain what the procedures are for obtaining explanatory notes to accompany a bill such as the human rights bill?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Subsequently, the government contracted for explanatory notes with, I believe it is, the Canadian Human Rights Commission. I forget the proper name, but it is a group in Ottawa and the Member has obviously gotten wind of that. We have contracted for the preparation of explanatory notes to a subsequent bill, not the original bill. Those will be largely incorporated in the White Paper. The decision process occurred in stages after Bill No. 58 received such a stormy ride. It was my intention to introduce a new, amended bill and we contracted for explanatory notes. We subsequently made a decision to do a White Paper before a second bill is introduced in the Legislature. Those explanatory notes are extremely useful in the preparation of the White Paper.

I am not aware of the precise cost, and the bill is probably not in yet. I can supply that and I will. The purpose is to describe the practical effect and the case law under the sections or the principles encompassed in the bill.

Mr. Phillips: I am wondering why we would contract an Ottawa firm for two weeks work, costing us — according to my information — \$6,500, to write explanatory notes on a human rights bill and explain what the drafting of the bill actually meant. Why do we not just ask the people in the Justice department, who have initially written the bill, to write explanatory notes, because they are being paid already to do that kind of work. Why are we asking someone else, and paying \$6,500 for two weeks, to explain what someone else wrote? I do not understand that.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: What a delightful question. First of all, I do not believe it was two weeks work. If it was \$6,500, I thank the Member for that information. I will not need to supply it, as he already has it. The purpose is twofold. One is that that is where the experts are, and it is fair and reasonable to get a second person to check the work of the first, especially with respect to legislative drafting. The second is to lend some authority to those notes. Those notes were independently drafted, and are not susceptible to the criticism that the government is embarking on a propaganda campaign to sell a particular bill.

The intent of the government is to draft a bill that brings us into line with the rest of the country. We have shown the draft to the experts in the field in Ottawa, and have asked them to independently tell us what the meaning and implication of the sections are, and we will publish it for all to see.

On the last bill, Bill No. 58, we saw a disgraceful perversion of the meaning of the sections in the act. This is a procedure that may correct that.

Mr. Lang: Unless we seem to have fallen on the information somewhere else, nobody is prepared to volunteer it. It makes it difficult for us to go through the budget. We get accused on this side of filibustering, yet at the same time in the Minister's explanation he never mentioned to us that there had been \$6,500 spent on a particular study.

This makes it difficult for us to ask questions, when we know that we are not getting all the information unless we stumble on it elsewhere other than in this House.

Is it the policy to get explanatory notes from people outside the territory now, as far as bills are concerned? If somebody has a bill and is putting it forward, I always thought they took responsibility for it, and overall the authorship of it, and subsequently proceeded accordingly. That is almost after the fact, after we had the bill in

the public forum.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I could make some partisan comments about the previous government's payments to David Humphries and David Elliott, I believe, and people like that. I answered the question that was put and the question was about the preparation of Bill No. 58. I then answered the second question about explanatory notes. Incidentally, the expenditure occurred after the preparation of this supplementary and we had no intention to hide it at all. Indeed we will be proud to say we had independent, authoritative advice.

Mr. Phillips: I am wondering why we waited until after the public outcry to have this second interpretation. This is very important in the Minister's mind. Why did the Minister rush a bill into the House at the last session, ask everyone to look at this bill, and not have this homework that he feels is very necessary done prior to bringing this bill to the public? Why did he not do this in the first place, if it was even necessary. I still find it difficult to have someone else interpreting what the person who wrote it means. I think the best way to find out what a bill means is to ask the person who wrote it. I still have that difficulty.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I think I will quote the Member at the appropriate time on that comment about asking the person who wrote it. This is obviously a partisan issue and it is like talking about the past rather than the future, however I will answer the question anyway. The intention of the government was to catch up, to bring our laws into line with our international agreements and the laws in the rest of the country. The previous government, for whatever reason, delayed the whole question for, I would say, in excess of six years. It was my decision at the time that we would try to catch up quickly. In view of the public outcry, I was obviously wrong and we will do it step by step.

Mr. Lang: Would the Minister be prepared to table the explanatory notes so we could see whether or not we agree with the explanation that has been given by the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The explanatory notes are in note form and will be substantially incorporated in the White Paper. It will all be public. As to the original documents, the answer is: yes, I will table it at the appropriate time.

Mr. Lang: There was \$73,000 voted in this particular section last year for what the Minister had outlined. Did the \$73,000 cover the expenses of the Select Committee?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have already answered that. It is also obvious to know that they were borne by the Legislative Assembly. It was pointed out in *Hansard*.

Those funds were not completely expended. As of period nine, a very small portion of them were expended. I do not have the year-end figures exactly. I can get them. It is in the neighbourhood of approximately \$40,000 that was expended.

Mr. Lang: I read that in *Hansard*. It was \$40,000 or \$50,000. I would like a breakdown of what that figure entails, since it does come under this section. I guess I could go to the Clerk and see what was spent on the Yukon Legislative Assembly to see how far we have gotten, as far as this particular issue is concerned, and how much it has cost the taxpayer. I hope I can have that breakdown from the Minister during the debate on Justice in the Mains.

Mr. Phillips: When the Minister has his White Paper put together, encompassing all these notes, will the Minister then be having this law firm, or organization that looked at it before, going through it clause by clause before it is made public again, and making some more explanatory notes on the White Paper? Is the White Paper going to have it spelled out very clearly so we can all understand it, and we know that this time it did come completely from the Minister of Justice's department?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, and I believe it is not a law firm, it is the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Administration in the amount of a reduction of \$11,000 agreed to On Corrections

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The JES figure here is \$15,392. There are a large number of person-years here, and the salary expenditures due to the JES, the signing bonus and casual wages is \$167,000. There is also an over-expenditure due to heating, and some food price increases due to the larger than anticipated population that

amounts to \$46,000.

The policies are completely unchanged here. They are adjustments for the day-to-day needs.

³⁴ The institution is overcrowded and as the previous Ministers are aware, it was in the capital plan to build a \$40 million new facility. However we are not contemplating such a facility. We have a far less grandiose plan and we are trying to alleviate the population pressure and the expense by means of the Fine Option Program, the Community Release Center and a satellite camp, which will temporarily be in Haines Junction.

Mr. Brewster: I think most of the expense of the satellite camp will probably be in the O&M. How much of it is in here for the planning and the work that was done to get ready to move into this camp?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I had those figures all collected in a neat form, but I cannot find them at the moment. The site preparation and electrical service are the expenditures that have occurred so far and I will supply that information, it is in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 to \$30,000 totally. Currently, there is a competition for casuals and the posters are up in Haines Junction. The competition closed on April 16 and the interviews are occurring this week at Haines Junction. The selection of inmates and the work that they are to do is well underway. The septic and leech pit installation should have finished last week.

Mr. Brewster: How were the tenders for contracts put out for the site preparation? Were they public contracts or through invitation of tender?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not want to be incorrect, so I will find out the specific information. There was a letter to the editor complaining about the procedure. The factual information in that letter was wrong and I wrote a long letter to that individual explaining what exactly occurred and I will send a copy to the Member. The procedure was well publicized in the Junction and the work was done locally.

³⁵ **Mr. Brewster:** I look forward to seeing that letter, and I also look forward to seeing the advertisement. I quite frankly wonder about that. As you all know, I disagree violently with this, in spite of the unemployment that I have, but that is fine, I cannot stop it. I will be looking for every bit of costs. I have already notified them in Ottawa, National Parks, that I want all the costs. I am not too sure if I am out of order on this, or if I will have to wait for the O&M's. Have you any idea what the helicopter cost is going to be to fly into these trails and who is paying?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There are no helicopter costs that I am aware of, and I do not totally understand the Member opposite's violence. I will send him a copy of the approval of the federal Conservative Minister.

Mr. Brewster: There is no question that you have the copy from him. You are the government and they are going to give it to you. However, he also got a letter from me stating what I think of him going around with socialist policies. I still maintain, and I will be quite frank with you, that this is not a laughing matter. I have an awful lot of people out there out of work, and a lot of these people will not be able to qualify for the jobs on that jail because they are not that type of person. We all sit here and laugh and think these things are funny. I do not think it is funny at all. I think it is very criminal when you have over 25 percent of your population not working, and you turn around and spend all this money to put a prison camp up. You do not put the bids out fairly. You put them out on an invitational tender. The only reason the man who got it did is because he raised so much trouble that he was finally given one to shut him up. I do not think very much of the whole thing. I do not think very much of the attitude that the Minister is taking in here.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The attitude that I am taking is not that it is a laughing matter, whatsoever. It is a very serious matter. The Member talked about employment. If it were not for that camp, there would not be that employment in the Junction. There will be substantial local purchasing there, which is supported by the town council there. I will table all of that information.

What we have here is a fundamental disagreement about a policy. It has been well expressed in the past. I can characterize it as this:

we on this side believe that sentenced individuals should be doing useful work, if at all possible, in order to pay back something to society and in order to learn useful and valuable work skills.

The Member opposite obviously disagrees with that. There is also another significant reason. We had made a policy decision that the public expenditure on inmates is too high. We wish to cut it down. We wish to reallocate funding in the department to crime prevention and create assistance to victims generally, and away from housing criminals. This program is substantially cheaper than the locked door institution up the hill.

³⁶ That is another policy reason, but the policy disagreements I understand very well and we will simply have to go along in disagreement on those.

Mr. Brewster: It certainly is a policy disagreement and certainly one of the few things where the socialists are moving in to control everybody. When young people come to me and say I guess I had better go and smash some windows so I can go to jail and go to work, it is not very nice. I have to live with these people.

Also a band wrote to you that was promised an agreement in principle that they would turn around and get some of the work in the park. They have been left out completely. I have young people there, 29 and 30 years old, who have never had a job, and I think that is disgraceful, absolutely disgraceful. You say this work would not have been done. I have it right from the Superintendent of National Parks that this work is not needed for five years, but they are getting a good cheap deal from the territorial government. It does not matter about the people. They come in just like this government and they promised us they would look after the people in that area when they were voted in, but they did not do it either. Here is a cheap deal, we will get all our trails done now, we do not care about the native people running around with no work who have to live on welfare. It does not matter, because the government has given them a cheap deal.

We disagree on philosophy and we will keep on disagreeing on philosophy. We will be watching this very closely and believe me I will have an accounting from you and the federal government before it is over.

Mr. McLachlan: Of all the particular locations the camp could have gone into, why was the Haines Junction location chosen, assuming it was to be rural.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The logical places are Haines Junction, Teslin and Carmacks. It could also easily go into Faro. This is an experimental project and the location of the Junction was chosen for two reasons: its distance from Whitehorse and the availability of work in the area, with reference to the trails in Kluane National Park. I travelled to the Junction twice to speak with the municipal council. They supported the project and it was therefore decided to do the first experiment there.

Mr. McLachlan: Thank you for the answer. If I interpret one of the reasons correctly, it is because of the distance from Whitehorse, 100 miles, et cetera. If I understand the Member for Kluane's argument directly, it seems to be that it is taking some employment from people who could otherwise be working. The only reason I submitted the argument was that Faro is the one place I could identify that has very minimal unemployment where nobody would be put out of work. Therefore, is that a valid consideration in future years?

³⁷ **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** Yes, it is. It would be politically easier to put it there for that reason. It is my hope that it will travel around the territory, although, numbers permitting, it may be desirable to establish it permanently somewhere. The council in the Junction has already asked for a permanent establishment there; however, those decisions have not been made yet.

Mr. Brewster: I think we should get a few things straight on that. Number one, it is not even inside the village district, and why you should choose to let them make decisions on this when all the work is going to be done in the national park, which is outside the village. Why you did not talk to the Burwash Band who was promised this work, I do not know. You run to the council and you made a little deal there, now you tell me it is a permanent one. I would be very happy to put this in *Hansard* that you have said that the Village of Haines Junction wanted a permanent one. I will see

to it that it gets out there tomorrow afternoon. I have a few more allies now, so we keep up.

Politically, you say you would be better off not to be there. That is quite correct. I am very concerned. You keep laughing. Maybe I am not talking to you very straight. That is fine, but I am very concerned about the young people, especially the native people. I think it is a disgrace, what is going on here. It is your policy; it is your philosophy. That is why I am not running as an NDPer, and never would. I will stay on this side where we have a little bit of independence.

Mr. Lang: I would like a comment from the Minister. I understood that there were some structural problems with a portion of the Correctional Institute. At one time, there was a structural study done, if I recall correctly. I understood that maybe further work was going to be done to see the validity of what had been requested, I think about a year ago — maybe a year and a half ago.

I am wondering, has any work been done, and if so, what are we dealing with here? Are we dealing with it next year or this year? Where would we find the money, and if so, how much?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There are some identified problems with a crack in a concrete block wall, I believe. It is not something that cannot be fixed. I believe the study is done, but I may be wrong about that. In any event, the building is in no danger of falling down; it is structurally sound. It may require repair. It is my view that all of that is simply trying to build evidence or ammunition to support a new jail.

It is not the government's intention to spend \$40,000,000 on housing criminals, as it obviously would be Mr. Brewster's.

Mr. Lang: I just want to make it clear for the record that nobody is advocating a new jail. To make the comments, such as at the end of the Minister's non-partisan statement, is not really justified. I am strictly asking what happened, because there had been some structural questions in portions of building. I am pleased to see that he made it very clear that it is not necessary to do any large repairs, which, at one time, was suspect.

It is not the intention, I am sure, of any of the three political parties to be building a \$40 million jail. You people have enough of a time getting the assessment centre together. I certainly would not want to see you launching into a jail.

Corrections in the amount of \$224,000 agreed to

On Contingency

Contingency in the amount of \$145,000 agreed to

On Total Operation and Maintenance

Total Operation and Maintenance in the amount of \$473,000 agreed to

Chairman: Before we move on to Capital Expenditures, we will have a 15-minute recess.

Recess

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

On Capital Expenditures, are there any comments on the first six items, which do not show an over- or under-expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: If I may, the question arose earlier about the explanatory note. The correct address is the University of Ottawa, the Human Rights Research and Education Centre. It is not a private law firm at all, and it is not the Canadian Commission. It is a branch or centre with the University of Ottawa.

Speaking to the issues, which would be in order, on all of the first six items we are on target, except for the Community Release Center. We had budgeted monies in the supplementaries to purchase or build a centre, and at period nine we still anticipated spending the money. The entire amount will lapse. It was not spent in the fiscal year. The rest are the same as in the Capital Mains.

Mr. Phillips: For clarification, the Minister mentioned the Human Rights Research and Education Centre. Was that contract for \$6,500, and was it for two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The exact amount I am unaware of, and the time period I am also unaware of. The bill has not been received, or if it has, it has not come to my attention.

Mr. Phelps: On the Yukon Justice Centre, I noted a letter in the

paper with regard to the signs to be affixed on the outside and interior of the building. Can the Minister explain those plans to the House and whether he consulted and whom he consulted with in arriving at that decision?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The policy of the government is to not name the courthouse proper after any individual, as is it the view of the Justice Steering Committee and the very strong view of the federally-appointed judge here.

The public knows the building as a single building, although in fact it is two buildings connected by an atrium. The policy of the government is to put signs above the front door which will say Andrew Philipson Law Center and on the court house section to put signs inside the atrium saying The Law Courts.

Consultations were by representation. The Member asking the question made the first representation to the media and indirectly — to me — started the controversy. The law society has expressed the view that the courts should not be associated with an individual and the judiciary have the view that the name Andrew Philipson should not be associated in any way with the courthouse. Those, basically, are the groups consulted.

Mr. Lang: Does this section include the section for furniture? If so, how much?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. The furniture was voted in the Capital Mains for this year, and explained at that point.

Mr. Phelps: On the issue of parking, can the Minister tell us what provision has been made for parking on the grounds surrounding the courthouse?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There is parking underground for a limited number of spaces, and there will also be parking on the Third Avenue side between Steele and Jarvis. I am not aware of the number of spaces, but the movement from the original site on First Avenue to the present site enabled additional parking on Third Avenue, which will be primarily allotted as public parking for that building.

Mr. Lang: I do stand corrected. The furniture was voted in 1986-87. Is there going to be another contract let very soon for that particular furniture, or was it included in the tender that you are deliberating at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There will be a contract let for furniture soon, I hope, this week.

I was wrong about the street. It is Jarvis and Wood, not Jarvis and Steele.

Mr. Lang: We will not make an issue over that.

Monies were allocated for a Correctional Facility Planning Study, \$100,000. Could you update the House as to where that is at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is not identified here. It is in the Mains for the current year. It has not started as of now. Neither the planning nor the decision as to how it is to be done has been done yet.

Mr. Lang: When is it going to be made?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not know that precisely, but within the next several months is the best I can do.

On Regional Facility Planning

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is the study of the facilities for the courts outside of Whitehorse. It was started by the previous government and continued in the budget. It was voted in the summer. The work is not completed as of now and it will not cost the full \$100,000, but the architects who did the Whitehorse facility — Carlberg, Jackson — were contracted to study the regional facilities and it is almost complete. The portion that is completed this year is \$40,000. There is probably another \$10,000 worth in the present year that will probably be voted as a supplementary next year.

Mr. Lang: Is this basically to build new facilities in the rural communities? Are we talking about architectural plans, or are we strictly talking about a study of whether or not they should be built.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The latter; to decide if we should build, and the planning of which of the existing community buildings we could use as court facilities on a part-time basis. We are not contemplating further court buildings, with the exception of the territorial administration building in Dawson, which includes a

room that will be used as the circuit courtroom.

Regional Facility Planning in the amount of a reduction of \$60,000 agreed to

Mr. Lang: Liquor Store and Headquarters Equipment is an interesting section if one wanted to get into a deep discussion. I do have a serious question that I do not believe has ever been answered. What have you done with the \$20,000 worth of South African wine?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We have stored it.

Mr. Lang: Where?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: In the warehouse.

Mr. Lang: I take it that we are waiting for the extension to store the wine then.

On Liquor Corporation - Warehouse/Compound

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This was a paving contract originally approved by the previous government, and the work is complete. It cost us less than the budgetted amount.

Liquor Corporation - Warehouse/Compound in the amount of a reduction of \$9,000 agreed to

On Departmental Equipment

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is two air purifiers, I believe, for Occupational Health and Safety.

Departmental Equipment in the amount of \$3,000 agreed to

Total Capital in the amount of a reduction of \$66,000 agreed to

On Public Service Commission

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Members will note that without the \$10,000,000 leave accrual liability, the Public Service Commission is \$65,000 under its 1985-86 Main Estimates. There are explanations for each of the items for which there is a variance from the original amount voted, and I am prepared to deal with them line by line.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

On Administration

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Generally there is an over-expenditure due to salaries, telephones and resource centre costs. I can give further details if Members have any particular questions.

Mr. Phelps: What can you tell us about the resource centre costs? What are they?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This resource centre is the information resource centre for the PSC. It was originally intended that contract services to maintain the resource centre would only be required for the first half of 1985-86. It was assumed that during that time a staff member would be trained to assume this function. Due to the heavy workload, this contract service was continued and will be required on a continuing basis in 1986-87. I believe we estimate a cost of \$7,000 or a bit more for 1986-87 for this purpose.

Mr. Phelps: What does the resource centre provide?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This includes a library of all the research and background material on labour relations matters, all the Canadian law and law from other jurisdictions, as well as all the research on compensation matters, which would come in from time to time from other jurisdictions in the country, including the material we gather ourselves and the material that is obtained nationally.

Mr. Phelps: The contract person's chief function is to act as a librarian, or custodial person?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: A local firm provides consulting services to maintain this library in good working order.

Mr. Phelps: I am just a little unclear. I can understand the need to have the material available, but why would it be so expensive to maintain? Is the contract position full-time, part-time, or what?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: A huge volume of material comes in every month to be catalogued and organized. By doing it on a contract basis, we are able to get it done on the basis of 25 hours' work a month. If we were to do it by staff position, we would have to create an extra half a person-year in order to do it, which we think would cost us more than having it done with this local contractor.

Mr. Phelps: With respect to telephones, can you tell us whether that was a significant over-expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I just have to consult on the actual cost. It is a result of the installation and relocation of departmental

telephones as staff were moved to best utilize office space, and new employees were hired subsequent to the PSC 1985 reorganization. I do not have the actual cost of the telephones handy, but I will be pleased to get it.

Mr. Phelps: Is there any reason why that would not have been reflected in the budget under Government Services rather than here, if it is for provision of changes in the telephones?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I think the way accounts are coded at the moment, those kinds of telephone costs are coded under administration for most departments.

Administration in the amount of \$25,000 agreed to

On Recruitment and Training

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In general terms, this is made up of two broad categories. An estimated \$30,000 underexpenditure is due to vacant positions and there was a transfer of the Employee Assistance Program to Labour Relations from training where it was previously located.

Mr. Phelps: Are the vacant positions going to be permanently vacant or is it intended to try and fill them?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: There were four positions within the recruitment section vacant for a time during the year. They were subsequently staffed at lower salary levels than those of the previous incumbents.

Mr. McLachlan: Under Recruitment, do we pay for the relocation of employees to new jobs in Whitehorse with the Government of Yukon under this line item, or is that the responsibility of the respective departments that are hiring them?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When we relocate someone from Faro to Whitehorse, that is paid for by this government and comes under Recruitment and Training.

Mr. McLachlan: No, I meant from anywhere else in the country, as well as to Whitehorse.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The same answer.

Mr. McLachlan: Is there a limit on what we will pay and where they will come from?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, there are limits that are laid down in regulations.

Recruitment and Training in the amount of a reduction of \$40,000 agreed to

On Employee Records and Pensions

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Workers' Compensation claims were lower than anticipated. That is the general answer. To explain it to the new Members of the House, the \$190,000 is due to unused dollars in the Workers' Compensation fund. In 1985-86 the Workers' Compensation fund was transferred from the Department of Finance to the Public Service Commission and to expedite the transfer, the fund was included in the Employee Records and Pension Branch. You will notice, if you look at the 1986-87 Mains, that it has been separated into its own program.

This fund is used to reimburse the Workers' Compensation fund for benefit claims made by Yukon government employees for lost salary, medical and transportation expenses resulting from work-related accidents. The fund was established at \$300,000 to recognize the worst possible scenario and will continue to be budgeted at that level in order to cover unforeseen liabilities, with the expectation that actual expenditures will not be that high. Unused dollars from this fund are not be reallocated to other departmental programs, but are allowed to lapse.

Again, if you look at the next year's budget we have budgeted in the same order again, based on the worst-case scenario, even though we do not expect that we will have \$300,000 in claims.

Mr. McLachlan: The Government of the Yukon does not pay Workers' Compensation premiums? The coverage of our employees is set up by another mechanism?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We are, in that respect, self insured.

Mr. McLachlan: Further to this reduction of \$190,000, would this also reflect fewer people reaching a retirement age of 65 years of age, plus not drawing from their pension plan, in this particular line item?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We are talking about Workers' Compensation here, not pension monies.

Mr. McLachlan: Are we not on Employee Records and

Pensions?

Chairman: We are on Employee Records and Pensions.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Employee pensions, as the Member will know, comes under the federal Superannuation Plan. We do not maintain that account in our budget.

Employee Records and Pensions in the amount of a reduction of \$190,000 agreed to

On Labour Relations

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This is made up of two separate items. Report costs were greater than anticipated, and, as I mentioned earlier, there was the transfer of the Employee Assistance Program from Recruitment and Training.

Labour Relations in the amount of \$13,000 agreed to
On Compensation

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This over-expenditure is due to greater professional and contract services, mainly due to JES.

Mr. Phelps: I have a few questions on this line. I certainly hope that I am on the right line item for this. There are some contracts that went to outside firms that I would like to ask some questions about. First of all, there was a contract given to a firm in Brandon, Manitoba, Independent Counselling Consultants. Apparently, it was for a five-day Reality Therapy Workshop. There were two of these, at a cost of \$4,500. Can the Minister tell us what Reality Therapy Workshops are?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe that question was put the other day to the Minister of Health and Human Resources who, I believe, is responsible for Reality Therapy. There is nothing of that kind done under the Public Service Commission, as far as I know.

Mr. Phelps: There were also some contracts to a Calgary firm, Proactive Learning Consulting Ltd; one to customize the Government of Yukon competency profiles for managers and supervisors and one to design curriculum materials for computer literacy for managers. Why was it necessary to go to outside firms for these services?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In the opinion of the Commission there were no capable local people to offer those services to the government.

Mrs. Firth: Just to clarify the record regarding the Reality Therapy Workshops, I did ask the Minister of Health and Human Resources about those workshops, and there were some provided through that department, but the ones that the Leader of the Official Opposition has just questioned was an additional \$4,500 for a contract of the same workshop, only it was provided to the Public Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will check into that. I do not think it was for the Public Service Commission. The PSC facilitates all sorts of training programs for different departments throughout the government. This is the first I have heard of this one, but I will check back and find the answer for the Member.

Mr. Phelps: Another contract was made to Mr. Waruck, a management consultant in Vancouver, to present two two-day seminars on the management process for administrative projects, at a total cost of \$4,800. Can the Minister tell us what that was all about?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am sorry. I did not get the name of the principal or the company.

Mr. Phelps: Walter A. Waruck in Vancouver; \$4,800 for two two-day seminars.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This person was brought in to give some courses on capital project administration. I believe the initiative to start retaining this kind of person occurred first following the problem we had with the Faro school, some time ago, and the need to make sure that people in this government, as we were developing new capital project manuals, were capable of administering capital projects of this kind.

Mr. Phelps: There was another contract — Proactive Learning Consulting Ltd., in Calgary — for one customized manager's competency inventory, \$5,000; one customized supervisor's competency inventory, \$5,000. What is that about?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: These are kits that are developed by the firm in question to enable managers, when they take on a person in an underfill position, to be able to guide that person through a

training program to bring them up to the desired skill level to be able to take the position they are underfilling.

Mr. Lang: Let us just go back for a bit. Did I hear the Minister correctly say that we had a contract for our administrators to ensure that they could run capital projects? On the one prior to the one we just discussed, I do not understand that at all: the Walter Waruck of Vancouver, B.C.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This person has been here before and will, I understand, be back here again. His area of expertise is to teach project management. There are some principles of project management that can be passed on to managers. A capital project manager of the kind I described earlier is something that is just one part of what he does.

The former Minister will remember, because in the days when we first had these problems they were subsequently debated, there was quite a low level of understanding in this government of the difference between commitment authority, spending authority, areas and centres of responsibility. When we were dealing with whole concepts of capital project management, the broad principles that are in place in the federal government, and are now in place here, of the five stages, needs analysis pre-design, design, construction and post-project evaluation, I think it was generally concluded that the needs analysis was not being done, the post-project evaluation was not being done, and in some cases, the pre-design stage was not being done adequately.

Having established the new procedures, there are some techniques and some management skills that can be passed on to the people in government so that they are able to do their jobs of managing projects better than they have in the past.

Mr. Lang: Could I ask for an undertaking from the Minister, if that is the particular case, that we could have this done with respect to the addition to the Dawson City School. For example, they could give us an analysis and go all the way through to see what exactly did happen in that particular case. I gather, because of your knowledge and the way you spoke, it had something to do with the Public Accounts Committee, at least indirectly. Could I have that undertaking that it will be done within the next year?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This person does not do those projects himself. He teaches people how to do them, such as the Critical Path Analysis and Program Evaluation.

You know that we are only just getting into program evaluation. The kind of external process that might have been done, such as look at the Dawson School, the Faro School, the Dawson sewer and water project in the old days, does require a fairly substantial management audit. If the Member is making a recommendation about something we should do with respect to the Dawson School, I would certainly take that under advisement and discuss it with the Minister.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Minister tell us how many times the Program Evaluation Committee has met, and if he has received a report from them yet?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, we have had two or three reports. It, of course, has nothing to do with this budget item here. I could not say how many times the committee has met because, at a certain critical stage, we lost two members who left this government for other jobs. It has met several times, and it will be meeting much more frequently. As a matter of interest, there is a work plan that has been established for this year.

Mr. Phelps: Again, on this line item, and looking at some contracts, there seems to be a large number of contracts directed to a strategic action group in North Vancouver, attention: Diana Millen. In addition, earlier contracts were directed to D. Millen and Associates Ltd., Vancouver, B.C.

Are these the same groups under different names? Is it the same Diana Millen?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is the same individual. This person was with Peat, Marwick and is now on her own, or with a smaller firm. She was involved with Peat, Marwick when it was doing major organizational work with the government and has subsequently done a number of smaller organizational studies for this government. As the Leader of the Official Opposition will know, there was the responsibility under the Act for the Public Service

Commission when the departments are doing reorganizations.

Mr. Phelps: It just seems that there is an awful lot of work going to an outside consulting firm. I am wondering why some of these things could not be done in-house, among which are: development of communication strategy and communication materials for JES, development of training courses for JES, writing position descriptions. Some of these are for as much as \$31,000. Can the Minister tell us why this kind of work cannot be developed in the Yukon by government employees?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is my earnest hope we can develop our capacity to do this in-house and where we can, over time, have those kind of skills available in the local business community.

Let us just take the case of JES. We had work done in writing the JES manual, in writing bench markrationales, in the development of the whole JES program and the appeals courses, and the writing of the appeals handbooks. All work on the manual and courses was expected to be completed in-house. Due to the workload, however, these assignments had to be contracted out and completion deadlines could not be postponed as the assignments referred to items covered in the collective agreement. Approximately half of this branch's supplement was required to complete a contract approved in 1984-85 for a consultant to provide analysis of our pay survey and pay lines, a male-female analysis briefing for the Yukon Government Employees Union, in preparation of the final JES Report.

The government and the former government did want to do it in-house, but it proved impossible with the staffing situation.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Minister tell us what steps, if any, were taken to see if these consulting services could be provided by resident Yukoners?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The only skills present in the local community for doing this type of work were in our compensation branch. At certain critical points during this past year we have had as many as four vacancies in a branch of six people, and that severely impeded the ability of this branch to do this work.

Mr. Lang: Did the government publicly advertise to see whether anybody outside the civil service had these skills?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Is the Member talking about the vacancies or the contract?

⁵⁰ **Mr. Lang:** Did we publicly advertised to say we are looking for somebody with these skills to submit a proposal to provide us with the necessary work being requested? If it was not advertised, I would like to know why.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The people who were contracted with had been involved with this government for the last two years going through the reorganization process and from the conceptual work of JES through to its implementation. The people in the Public Service Commission believe they know the people who are in the local economy with the kind of skills that would be required. The positions that have been vacant in the department are extremely hard to fill locally. The skill levels that are required to do this kind of work, the evidence suggested, were just not present in the local economy.

Mr. Lang: I understand, in part, what the Minister is saying. When we are talking about substantial sums of money, maybe it would be worthwhile to at least make a public request for proposals. If there are none there, then you proceed accordingly. I believe two years ago proposals were asked for from various organizations to look at the government's various organizations, and subsequently it was done. Looking ahead, could we get an undertaking from the government, in these particular cases, to go through the exercise of a one-time public advertisement to see if there is somebody who has moved into the territory who has incorporated themselves and who may be prepared to do a one or two month contract, as opposed to this money being sent outside?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In the government, we do hire people on contract work. I am quite happy to do what the Member has suggested, once a year, knowing that we have certain kinds of research needs and certain kinds of management consulting needs, to put an advertisement in the paper to see if we can invite proposals from people and see if there are people who can deliver the services. We have no problem doing that.

Mr. Phelps: Perhaps this, too, is a line item under which I could ask questions about what process was undergone to determine the bonuses paid to employees, once they signed the agreement and had negotiated under the JES?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The amounts were negotiated at the table. I cannot replicate the actual negotiating process, because I was not party to it.

Mr. Phelps: My understanding was that after negotiations the government came back and gave a fat bonus to a bunch of employees because there was money left in the pot. Was that correct?

⁵¹ **Hon. Mr. Penikett:** At a certain critical point in the negotiations, we did not have an agreement, and the union was not prepared to sign. The government revised its offer, and was able to get a collective agreement with that money.

Mr. Phelps: Is it a situation where the union learned that there was money left over in the negotiating pot and then came back and made this demand on the government?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not know that. To the extent that I know what was going on, I believe there was some internal dispute inside the union, or some internal differences, as to whether the contract that we were proposing was acceptable, for one reason or another.

Mr. Lang: Just to follow that up a little further, was it reported accurately that at that time the government had an agreement, and had gone for ratification? A vote had taken place? Subsequently, the executive came back and said they would not count the votes unless the government acceded to a number of their demands. Is that the scenario? That was the way it was reported.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It was not exactly like that, but I gather the executive made a number of demands on us, some of which we acceded to, and others we did not.

Mr. Lang: The Minister says it was not accurate. Just go through it clearly for me and tell me where I was off base in asking the question. My understanding was that the government had negotiated an arrangement. The arrangement went to the membership. The membership voted, and then once the vote was in and in the ballot box, the decision was taken by the then executive that they wanted certain things from the government and were not prepared to count the ballots unless the government acceded to whatever demands they had. Where am I wrong in this? I am expressing what I read in the newspaper.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Member is generally accurate, but I cannot, nor do I think it would be proper for me to, get into all sorts of particulars about what may have been said at the table by one side or another.

Mr. Lang: Further to that, is it correct that the requests of the union amounted to an added \$93,000 over and above what had been negotiated at the table?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will have to verify that figure, but it may be approximately accurate.

Mr. Phelps: Is the stance of this government in negotiations going to be that the negotiators be authorized to negotiate up to a certain amount of money and if they are successful and manage to arrange for and negotiate a package for less, that the government is going to throw in the rest afterwards as a gift?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. The final settlement was within the mandate given to the negotiators.

Mr. Phelps: That does not answer my question. The point is that if a mandate is to negotiate salary increases up to a certain amount, and the negotiator is successful in negotiating less than the allowable maximum authority given by Cabinet, is the government then going to say, gosh, we could have given you more, and throw the money in?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No.

⁵² **Mr. Phelps:** Is that what happened during these negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am not sure how proper it is to get into these types of details in negotiations but we had made an agreement with the union, or thought we had, based on certain assumptions about the value of certain items in the package. At the stage that we are now discussing it, it was determined by mutual agreement that the value of the items in the package was not as we had assumed

throughout negotiations and the final agreement in the settlement was reached as a result of recalculating the value of those items and bringing the total package up to what we had agreed to.

Mr. Phelps: I would like to approach this in a different way so that I am clear on it. First of all, is it the practice of this government, through Cabinet, to place a maximum amount on the scope of authority under which the negotiator may negotiate the salary increases for the oncoming year?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, but it is Management Board that does that.

Mr. Phelps: Thank you. Would the Management Board and the government be pleased if the negotiators were able to settle for a gross amount less than the authorization given by Management Board?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, we would be pleased, and we were pleased because that is what happened this time.

Mr. Phelps: If the negotiator is successful in arranging for an agreement at less than the total mandate given, the government then would not reveal their hand and, as a bonus, throw in whatever was left over?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No.

Mr. Lang: I understand certain parameters were reached and effectively agreed to and then you said there was a difference of opinion mutually agreed upon. Did that go back to Cabinet for a decision on whether or not the government was prepared to move further than what had been probably reported to the Government Leader's office?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, because it was within the negotiator's mandate.

Mr. Lang: Is the Minister saying to me that something as important as a major change as far as a vote was concerned, when a vote had been taken under a specific agreed-to mandate, that the Cabinet or Management Board was not made aware and decisions had to be made to see whether or not that particular situation would be addressed?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Of course, at certain critical stages of negotiations, the responsible Ministers are advised. There is, however, only a requirement to come back to Management Board or, if necessary, Cabinet, on a question of policy, if it is impossible to reach an agreement, according to the negotiating position or the bargaining position established previously.

Mr. Lang: Was it the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, the Government Leader at this stage, who made the decision that there would be \$93,000 added to the financial package to get the necessary approval by the executive?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I was advised by our negotiators what was necessary to get an agreement.

Mr. Lang: Did you give them direction to go ahead and do that?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The negotiators had already received direction from the Management Board on the negotiating position.

Mr. Lang: He has not answered my question. My understanding was that there was a vote taken, under certain principles, by the Public Service, and rightly so. I understand that approval had been reached, other than the fact that the executive was not prepared to count the ballots. First of all, who does the Government Leader give direction to and, second, did he give that direction to go ahead and make that final decision?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I give direction to the Public Service Commission. Of course, I do not unilaterally overrule decisions of Management Board. The vote was taken by the union on the basis of a financial package having a certain value. That was the question that was put to the Members: do you accept a package worth x dollars? At the point where they were about to count the vote, it was mutually agreed, or discovered, that the value of the package was not worth x , but some amount less than x . At that point, that created an impasse in the negotiations. Good faith in negotiations do require some mutual understanding about what the facts are. I was upon agreement of the realization that the package was not worth what the negotiators had originally believed it to be that the impasse and the subsequent negotiations took place.

Mr. Lang: I still do not have an answer to my question. Did the

Minister of the Public Service Commission, in this case the Government Leader, give direction to go ahead and revise the financial package that had, initially, been agreed to by the two parties?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Having been apprised of the facts, I gave the negotiator the instructions to conclude an agreement if one could be concluded within the mandate given to it.

Mr. Lang: All I want is a yes or a no. Did he give direction for that additional \$93,000 to be offered to the Executive in order to get approval?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I have just explained to the Member that there is a question of Cabinet confidentiality. I am not going to repeat on the floor of this House about what advice I get or give. I gave instructions to the negotiator to conclude an agreement. I see that the Member has been briefed by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I gave instructions to the negotiator to conclude an agreement within the mandate given to him by the Management Board.

Let me explain again. The Member is talking about an extra \$93,000. There was not an extra \$93,000, because we had agreed on a package, an amount x . It turned out that the elements of the package, when we got to that stage, did not add up to x . We had agreed to a package of x , and that is what we subsequently agreed to — a package approximating x .

Mr. Phelps: This leads to some other questions. I suppose we could start this way: why the shortfall? Was it because there was a mistake in certain calculations with regard to certain positions in government?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As a result of the long drawn out negotiating process, which I remind Members, lasted six months, a number of classifications were argued about, and things were reclassified. At the end of the negotiating process, the total value package was recalculated and was found to be worth less than we believed the package had been at the beginning of the process.

Mr. Phelps: The concern is this: it would seem that the union would be negotiating on behalf of various positions for various job classifications. We wonder why the actual total amount of the package would therefore become so important. Can the Minister answer that question?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: What was put to the members to vote on was a package that, at the point where an agreement was initially reached at the table, all parties believed was worth x . Sometime later, when it was time to count the vote, a recalculation had been done based on the details and specifics of the negotiations — which the Member opposite knows, as a result of being involved in lots of negotiations — and was worth substantially less than x when an accurate calculation was done of the value of the package. The members were asked to vote and approve or reject the package worth x . When it was determined that the package was worth less than x , that is what created the situation that caused the eleventh hour negotiations.

Mr. Phelps: Were the individual members voting on the basis of what impact the package would have on their individual salaries and positions?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The members in the bargaining unit were given that kind of information. If I negotiate with the Member opposite to buy a house or a car, or some other property on the basis of US dollars, and I want to pay in Canadian dollars, but the exchange rate has changed, and these Canadian dollars are not worth the same, I suspect he may want to come back to me and ask for the difference.

Mr. Phelps: Let us approach it from a different direction then. There was a package calculated by somebody that totalled x . It came out to be less than X . Was this because any given, specified positions were getting less for some reason by some error in calculation? Was there any job description that was less than negotiated that led to the total being less?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When the negotiations went on there were some positions that were reclassified and some that were reclassified in a way that would make them worth less, or valued less than we had originally anticipated in the negotiations. All I can say to the Member is, because I do not want to betray any confidences about the negotiating processes, nor do I want to unduly take the

time of the House, if the Member opposite would like a detailed briefing on the particulars of the negotiation and particulars of what happened in concluding the final agreement, I am prepared to arrange that, if he is interested in finite details.

Mr. Phelps: I do not think that is necessary. What I want to know is if there were one or two positions improperly classified that led to a global difference or shortfall of \$93,000, then why did the government simply throw this bonus to the union and have it split up evenly among all the members?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: If the Member is interested in precise dollar particulars, we can give him a briefing on that but he should understand that during the period of negotiations there were hundreds of positions that were classified and reclassified and it is that work, which is in some cases ongoing in the government, that caused us to do a recalculation at the end of the negotiating process that showed the actual value of the package was worth less than what the union had bargained for.

Mr. Phelps: The point is that if no one group felt that they were unduly restricted or misled with regard to the salary negotiated then what we have is a situation where it appears that a bonus was simply thrown in at the end. It would be understandable if there were some positions that fell through the cracks and there were some kind of misleading of certain categories. If that were the case, one would expect the \$93,000 to be applied, or the shortfall, to be made up by applying to those specific positions. That is not what happened. What we have is the appearance of a bonus being thrown to the union at the end for signing and it looks like it was for political purposes. It is as though you have a speaker coming negotiating on behalf of his union with Chrysler, Bob White, and the authorization is that you can go up to an additional \$300 million and the company, negotiator, settles for \$175 million. Would Bob White expect the company then to say, "well hah, hah, we fooled you, we paid the negotiator a whole bunch of money, and we are going to throw in another \$125 million just because we are good guys".

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Well, as the Member is sometimes inclined to do, he wants to renegotiate these arrangements. Let me just say I am not going to get into the particulars of what was said by either side at a particular point of the negotiations. However, it is quite possible that a representation such as the Member suggested may have been made. The fact remains that one group, the union bargaining committee, would not go along with such a proposal, and the proposal that they would make for allocating the dollars in the package — allocating difference between value of the package put to the members and the recalculated value — that is what we negotiated in the latter stages and we did not reach an agreement on the basis the Member proposed.

Mr. Phelps: Does the Government Leader anticipate that this style of negotiations will be carried on in future years, where a deal is made and then they throw in a bonus at the end after the vote has been taken?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is not likely that this government, or any future government, will have the situation of having negotiated something as complicated as JES along with the rest of the compensation package. It was that very complicated package that made an agreement this time around more difficult to arrive at.

The negotiations that will be carried on in the future will be carried on as they have been in the past, with Management Board establishing a mandate for the negotiators and then the negotiators being told to go out and do their job.

Mr. Phelps: If I may, I would like to move on to another area in the same line item. We have a situation where we received numerous complaints from people working for the public service. One of the major areas of concern is that where there was a reclassification of a job, it resulted in a situation where one long-term employee, who might have worked as many as five or six years in the position, moved into a new job classification at as little as \$1,000 per annum increase, whereas somebody who was making much less and with no job experience, no long-term employment record, could have moved by as much as \$6,000 into that same new category.

I am wondering whether the Government Leader would not agree

that it would seem unfair that the new job classification would not take into account the various steps that a long-term employee had moved through. There was discrimination against some employees for having been with the government for a long period of time.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I appreciate the Member's question, and I appreciate that this has been a concern from a number of employees. The Member for Riverdale South, a couple of months ago during Question Period, had some questions on this.

The simple fact is that by policy now, and by policy in the past, this government has not paid people on the basis of seniority. There were, as a result of JES, some 150 employees moved to the minimum of new ranges, who were previously at or near the maximum of their old ranges. This was not a negation of their seniority. The public service does not have, nor has it ever had, pay rates to recognize seniority, except for academic staff. Instead, this government has always paid by the job. A number of jobs, as a result of JES and the implementation of equal pay, were increased in their dollar value. The employees in those jobs received an increase on January 1.

In addition, those previously at the maximum of the salary range now have increased salary expectations for the future. They can, in other words, expect to receive merit increases over the next four years, assuming, of course, satisfactory performance.

Mr. Phelps: Then once again, given the annual steps, does it not seem unfair that a longtime employee starts off with a relatively new employee at the same basic level?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: If you have two people in the government doing the same job, you might have one person who has been doing the job for 20 years. You might have someone come along who is new to the government and does not have seniority with this government, but may have seniority elsewhere. If they are doing the same work and performing identically, especially after an initial break-in period, they will be paid the same.

There are many collective agreements in the world. There are many salary packages in the world that do pay people for recognized seniority. This government never has.

Mr. Phelps: I seem to be missing something. My understanding is that now, starting with new job classifications, a person who has been with the government for three or four years will make more money per annum than a new person, whatever that person's experience with another government, starting off in that same job classification.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We did agree some weeks ago to discuss these detailed questions about JES at the time we got to the PSC Main Estimates, and I have an undertaking from the Member for Riverdale South to do that. We did offer a briefing to the Opposition Caucus and to the other caucuses here, which the Leader of the Official Opposition did not attend, on some of these kind of questions.

Rather than taking up the whole time of the House on these complicated technical questions about personnel management, I am prepared to deal with them as a group, in great detail at the time of the PSC Mains. I am also, if the Members opposite are interested, prepared to facilitate another detailed briefing by the department officials on some of the intricacies, Byzantine as they may be, of the JES system.

Mr. Phelps: We appreciate the Government Leader's efforts in that regard and we do not want to carry on at great lengths with regard to the intricacies of the JES itself. I am dealing with one major concern that has been voiced many times by a number of long-standing government employees, and I want a direct answer to the one question. It seems to me that along the way, employees of long standing have been treated less than fairly when compared to newer employees who have been stepped up into the new job classifications. Now if the Government Leader can explain why he does not think this to be the case, we can leave further detailed examination of the issue, and other issues, to the Mains.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Clearly, I have little persuasive powers when it comes to the Leader of the Official Opposition. However what I am prepared to do, and I think it will facilitate matters, is come back to the Member with a detailed written answer explaining how the system works, how seniority does not work, how people

who have been in positions for sometime are affected in different ways, recognizing the concerns, many of which have been articulated to me as well as to Members opposite, and try and satisfy the Member's concerns by way of a substantial written answer and preparing ourselves as we were promised by the Member for Riverdale South, that we would deal in substance and in great detail with these matters when we came to the PSC Mains.

Mr. Phelps: I thank the Government Leader for his cooperation in this regard, and that will satisfy me for the present line item.

*Compensation in the amount of \$77,000 agreed to
On Leave Accruals*

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As I previously explained to the House, this \$10 million item was established at the request of the Auditor General to provide for authority for recording leave accruals for all Government of Yukon employees. Leave accruals include unused sick, special, long service, vacation leave, a payout of one-third sick leave upon resignation, payout of severance pay, et cetera.

The situation right now is that we cannot do an accurate accounting of this thing, because we only have manual means to do it, but there is a leave accrual system that will be in place this fall as part of the human resource information system that will be in place in the Public Service Commission. By this fall, we expect to have a more accurate estimate of the exact count of the leave accruals.

Mr. McLachlan: I have no problems with the concept of setting it up. I am curious as to the mechanism by which the accounting will be handled for this. Is there a separate fund with \$10 million, out of which the leave accrual will be paid? Is it just a simple line item for accounting purposes? How will it be handled?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is a line item for accounting purposes. When it is paid out, it will be paid out by the departments. We have an early run on what the actual number may be, and we believe it is around \$9.3 million at this point. Once the system is computerized, we will be able to do a calculation at any given point in time.

Mrs. Firth: I would like to ask the Government Leader a question about the leave accruals. Say the government took office, and there were highly paid Order-in-Councils, who were no longer employees of this government, and a considerable amount of funds were required to pay out salaries and benefits to those employees. Would that come under this?

Does the government have a special fund set aside for that kind of situation?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Our understanding is that this amount of money here is strictly for public servants. If you will notice the Executive Council's supplementary, the payout for OICs will come out of the Executive Council vote.

Mrs. Firth: Does the Government Leader have any funds set aside for that? Does the Department of Finance make any allowance for that kind of contingency fund?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, nor did the previous government. That is why you saw it turn up as a supplementary.

Mr. Phelps: I am a little unclear from that answer. We have a budget in which \$10 million has been identified for the contingency item of leave accruals. Contingency may not be quite the right word. Is that a separate fund now?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is not a separate fund. At this point it is a bookkeeping item, because the Auditor General requires us to show what our liabilities in that area are. We have just finished a rough calculation by the old means that will eventually be computerized. We estimate it is about \$9.3 million. As the actual money is paid out, it is paid out by the departments and will show in their budgets. I am not exactly clear how we will state it in future budgets.

That is a liability that we estimate at this point.

Mr. Phelps: I do not have my head around the rationale for having leave accruals, a lump sum of \$10 million, show up in the supplementary as a sum of money that we are supposed to vote for. Where is that money being placed?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: You have to understand the way accountants think. The theory of the Auditor General is that some day somebody may come down and shut down this government. We have a liability of something approaching \$10 million, in terms of

employee leave. We have to show that somewhere in our books as a liability of this government. That is what the Auditor General is requiring us to do.

For the first time, we are putting this number in the budget here, as required by the Auditor General. There will be a number in future budgets. I cannot guarantee it will be in exactly the same place, because this may not be the right place to show the liability. We do have to have it in our budget as one of the liabilities on the Treasury of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Phelps: We have a budget, and the budget shows transfer payments from Ottawa of various kinds, and revenue is generated in the territory by way of taxation, licence fees, and so on. It balanced out last year, partly because there was this \$10 million item inserted on the expenditure side. What happens to that money? It is money that was either collected here, or came by way of transfer payments from Ottawa. Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is in the accumulated reserves in the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is where the money is.

Chairman: The time now being 5:30, we will recess until 7:30 p.m.

Recess

Chairman: I will call the Committee back to order. We will continue with Leave Accruals.

Mr. Lang: What?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe that we have discussed this at sufficient length and I think we can clear this item now.

Mr. Lang: I hate to disappoint the Minister. I would like to know why, in some cases, when they are paying out an employee — my understanding of that is leave accrual, time, all added up — it is in other departments? For example, in Government Services, I believe there were some items that were identified as such.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When we actually pay it out, it is a charge to the department from which the employee is from. This year, we will no doubt have people leaving the government, and, let us say, they leave the Department of Education. Then, the Department of Education, out of their salary, their dollar item — their personnel item — will pay out the amount. The reason we have this \$10 million item here is that the Auditor General has said that this government has a liability, which you have not stated anywhere in either the budget or the accounts, and we are required to estimate that liability, estimate what we may owe. Let us assume that the government is shut down tomorrow, or that the federal government decided that we were rolled up as part of B.C. or the Northwest Territories, or some other awful thing, and we had to pay out this money, then we have to estimate what has accrued.

We estimated some months ago that it would be about \$10 million. I now know from information that has just recently been generated that it is probably closer to \$9.3 or \$9.4 million. It may be, in future, that we will not include it here. It may be that, as we break it out, when we get that computerized system, which I talked about having — the human resource information system, all the records which are held manually now — once they are on on-line computer, it may be that we can state it as a liability for each department. I do not know whether that is necessary, or whether it is possible. I am not sure that it will always be in this place in the budget. The Auditor General says that we have this liability and we must state it, and that is what we are doing. It is a book entry, to show that we have this liability.

Mr. Lang: My understanding is that there are five, 10 or 15 over this year whom we have been dealing with over this past year who were paid out. They have gone into retirement and we have settled our claims or whatever justifiably was a debt. How come that was not deducted from the \$10 million? We seem to be voting it twice. We are voting in Government Services for a minimum of one, if not more, and yet we see \$10 million here.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Understand that every day that goes by we add to the liability because there are more employees earning the various leave entitlements and so forth as time goes by.

The reason the \$10 million item was in is because it was a rough

estimate. We were not able to do those until the calculations were completed as to what it was. We now have a number that may be fairly accurate that has just been generated, which says that it may be about \$9.3 million.

Once we get the leave accrual system in place this fall, which will basically be a computer run, we will be able to have an accurate number. We may have a bunch of people leave and the actual liability as of that date may go down. But every day that goes by there are employees acquiring these benefits and the number is presumably approximately balanced out.

*Leave Accruals in the amount of \$10,000,000 agreed to
On Contingency*

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This item has been included as it is in other departments. It is included in this department to guard against unforeseen expenses, such as the payout of a long term employee who may have considerable leave and accrual entitlements. This was included at period 9. Obviously, in this case, it would be an employee of the Public Service Commission.

There could be some other kind of settlement or someone leaving March 31 and they do not actually get their pay to April. The auditors would say that it must be accrued to 1985-86 or 1986-87, those kinds of things.

*Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of
\$9,935,000 agreed to*

Public Service Commission in the amount of \$9,935,000 agreed to

On Department of Renewable Resources

Chairman: On page 27. General debate?

Mr. Brewster: I have some general debate, but I thought the Minister would like to start it off. I would like to go into general debate for awhile and then go into line items. The first one is the departmental objectives. I do not really understand how we can have resources. I thought it was renewable resources. I thought resources belonged to the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I did not see that particular area as an area of difference. I will check back to see that it coincides and complies with the general objectives of the department.

Mr. Brewster: We are starting out good, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. Sometime in the fall the conservation officers were moved back down to the Burns Building. What was the reason for this? Which branch moved back to the Marwell building to replace them?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would take that question under advisement, and when we get to the O&M Mains I will have a response for the Member.

Mr. Brewster: Perhaps you could tell me what the total cost of the predator control in zones 7 and 9 was for 1985, including the airplane, person-years and the food, et cetera.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, the most accurate picture with respect to the accounting procedure of the government to determine the final costs would be the tabling of the Territorial Accounts. I will promise the Member, in preparation for the O&M debates with respect to the Mains, I would ask for a complete breakdown with respect to the predator control program in zones seven and nine and break it down as the Member suggests.

Mr. Brewster: Are we talking about last year, 1984-85? How many grizzly bears were killed in zones seven and nine by overdrugging or other mishaps while they were collaring?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not have that information at hand. I have the information that is related to the piece of legislation that is before us.

Mrs. Firth: Maybe we should go back to the objectives, because the Minister has told us he will go back and check. I do not know with whom he is going to check. He is supposed to be running the department and should be familiar with the objectives of the department. What are the objectives of his department?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The objectives of the department, as has been the practise in the past, are very clearly spelled out in the O&M Budget Mains when they are tabled. In the departmental objectives that are articulated with respect to this bill to provide for the planning, development and management of Yukon resources,

the question was should that not read "renewable resources" as opposed to only "resources". My response was, as it should be, I do not know, and I will get back to the Member with the reason why it is written as such. If it is a logical explanation, I will report it to the Member.

Mr. Brewster: Maybe I am out to lunch here, but I am talking about the money that was spent in 1984-85. I would think that he would be able to come up with some answers.

If he has any interest at all in the bear study method, he would know how many were killed. Maybe he would like me to start telling him these things. For instance, I can tell him that when I was the Minister, I knew every week how many were being killed by overdrugging. That is how much interest I had.

Mrs. Firth: Well, perhaps the Minister — unless the Member for Kluane wants to proceed with more questions on general debate — could go to the line items. However, I should check to see if the Member has some more general debate items.

Mr. Brewster: I could not take some of this thing into line to debate, because, number one, I would not know where it was on that as it is such a small breakdown. I could not figure out where some of these things were. That is why they are in general debate.

How much money was spent on the Donjek wolf study by this department? How much was spent by North American Wildlife Sheep Foundation and how much was spent by the University?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That was a recent study that was just undertaken. I will ask the department for a cost breakdown, and I will table the information with respect to that particular program with the Member opposite.

Mr. Brewster: The wolves are being studied in the Donjek area. I asked a question during Question Period and did not get an answer. I do not expect to get one now. He brought in an awful lot of books, so maybe he could tell me something about it. These wolves were studied three years ago for two years. We now have another study going on. Do you follow these wolves into Kluane National Park with the radio collars on to see what they are doing in Kluane National Park? If you do, do you have the permission of Kluane National Park to do this?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the study is taking the individual wolves concerned into the park, I would assume that they would have received the necessary permits with respect to being able to enter the park. However, for that level of detail, I will check with the departmental administrators to ensure that they have the necessary permits to enable them to do the work in the Kluane National Park.

Mr. Brewster: What is the total cost of the buffalo project as of March 31?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I believe the original cost for the project was tabled in this House, as a written response to a question raised by the Member for Tatchun. From that response, which was already tabled and made available to this House, I will ask the department for an accounting of what has been expended from that moment to this point.

Mr. Brewster: How much of that did the Canadian Wildlife Service pay?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will have those figures broken out as well.

Mr. Brewster: With that, perhaps I will ask the Minister what he would like to talk about.

Mrs. Firth: Good idea.

Hon. Mr. Porter: What I would like to talk about is the bill before us, and the sums that we are going to vote on.

Mr. Brewster: Here is the contract of what they have paid for the Donjek study. They have spent that money, and I have asked for breakdowns on these things and I am not getting it.

When the buffalo increase and are turned out, who will have a say on the buffalo as to whether they can be shot on a quota system, or will the Canadian Wildlife Service still control these animals?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the buffalo, there are, to my knowledge, no long-term decisions made as to whether or not they are going to be shot. I think that that is a decision that is down the road from us. Together with the Canadian Wildlife Service, we will have to begin discussing long-term management objectives for that herd. Should they be successful in terms of reproduction, there is a possibility in the future that there may be some harvest by local

people.

Mr. Brewster: Who has control over these buffalo? You keep talking about the Canadian Wildlife Service. As I recall, I brought this up in the House before, and there was no more money being spent by them. Do we spend all the money, and they have the final say of what happens to these, or do the taxpayers of the Yukon look after these animals?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As far as I understand, the Canadian Wildlife Service has done their bit. They have provided us with the wood bison. We have built the corrals. The bison are now in the Yukon. We have the responsibility of the management of the game. We will look after them.

Mr. Phillips: Is the Minister aware of an arrangement, or an agreement, made between the Yukon Fish and Game Association and the last government that when the buffalo reach a certain number, there will be some hunting on the buffalo, and there will be some quotas on the buffalo hunting in that area? Is the Minister not aware of that agreement?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, I am not aware of the existence of that agreement, but in my next meeting with representatives from the department, I will ask that that agreement be delivered to me.

Mr. Phillips: Just on a point of information, at the time that that agreement was reached, I was president of the Fish and Game Association. The Yukon Fish and Game Association contributed \$8,000 to bring up wildlife fencing for the bison project. Part of that understanding was that, yes, if the buffalo ever reached sufficient numbers to be harvested, that those buffalo would be allowed to be harvested. We were told that probably in five to seven years, there would be certain numbers of bison that could be harvested by both native and non-native on a quota basis: everybody puts their name in a hat and it gets drawn. That is the clear understanding that the Fish and Game Association has of that project. I wonder if the Minister could check into that and verify that and come back to the House?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I give my undertaking to ask for the production of such an agreement. With respect to speaking to the philosophical objectives of the Member's statement, if the herd can sustain itself, and biologically it can withstand a harvest in the future, I do not see any reason why the people of the Yukon cannot harvest the herd.

Mr. Phillips: After talking to the biologists involved with the project and the Deputy Minister and the people in his department, if he determines that that is the case, will he fulfill that obligation made by the previous government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If it is signed and it is of a contractual nature, then I think that there would be some legal obligation that I would be responsible for it. If that is the case, then yes, of course, if there is a legal obligation, I will meet those obligations.

Mr. Phillips: I can tell the Minister that there was no signed contract. There were a lot of discussions. There was some urgency in getting the bison project going. There was very clearly a message given to the Yukon Fish and Game Association not only in meetings privately with myself and the Executive, but in public meetings with the department that specifically said that yes, there would be harvesting of the bison in the future. I think that was even written up in the local press because I think they covered those meetings where they talked about that.

Will the Minister honour those agreements that were made then, written or not written?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have given the undertaking that I would like to review those agreements with respect to the issue that the Member puts on the floor for discussion, the idea that they should be able to, as residents, harvest the herd in the future. Philosophically I agree with him.

Mr. Phillips: I have no problem philosophically either. If the bison can stand a harvest, we felt they should be harvested. What I am asking of the Minister is, if that is the case, and if his officials tell him that there was a verbal agreement, will he honour that agreement and tell us today that yes, or no, he will honour that agreement? Can he give us a clear answer one way or another? Is he going to honour it? Yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Porter: This is a very difficult line of questioning.

The Member should appreciate that it is raised in the hypothetical sense with respect to my position. He is asking me to commit myself to an agreement that I have not even seen. I have a hard time agreeing to that kind of concept. All I can do is give him the undertaking that I will review the agreement and, if there are legal obligations, clearly I am committed to living up to such obligations should they exist. With respect to the idea of harvesting a resource in the future, should it be proven that it is biologically sound to do so, I give my commitment that that is the direction I approve and that is the direction I think the department should be moving in.

Mr. Brewster: I would like the Minister to explain to me exactly what is the competition that was put out to complete Phase 1 and 2 of Canadian Heritage River system?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I believe that the Member is referring to an agreement that we are conducting with Parks Canada. He is talking about those contracts that were tabled in the House. The contracts are recoverable. That shows up in the line item, by the way, in the recovery section from the federal government. I believe it is 60 percent recoverable. What I am attempting to do is to find the contract that he is speaking off. I obviously do not have that information at this time, and I would like to look through this pile of notes to see if it is there.

Mr. Lang: I think we should give the Minister some time then.

Chairman: Are you prepared to move to the line items?

Mr. Brewster: No, I am not. I want to understand the philosophy of this thing. I want to understand why we are studying heritage rivers in the Yukon and then we get someone from Vancouver to do it. We have an archives here full of material that should have been of value. I want to understand what they are doing on this philosophy of continually going outside for studies when we have everything here?

Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Speaking from memory, with respect to that particular contract, that was for the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River and, if I remember the details, 60 percent is recoverable from the federal government.

With respect to the person who is doing the contract, Martyn Williams is as Yukon as anybody I know.

Mr. Brewster: Then it is funny that the address is down in Vancouver. I might suggest, in the case that you say Mr. Martyn Williams is on it, that would be a very biased report would you not think?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would ask the hon. Member what he means by those remarks?

Mr. Brewster: It just makes sense when you make a report you usually look at all sides of it and his name is not on this contract. This is a contract made out of Vancouver.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not know whether or not the report that is going to be produced is going to be biased or not. The individual I am aware of is highly regarded, not only in the Yukon, but the world over as a very competent outdoorsman.

Mr. Lang: The Minister seemed to run it off as 60 percent cost-shared by the federal government, and that seemed to justify the end of having a consultant. The address is Vancouver. Maybe Mr. Williams has changed his name. The information we are provided with is Piirdu Juurand, but that is neither here nor there. We are becoming alarmed at the number of studies that are going on. What is the purpose of the study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The previous government had apparently moved to have the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River designated as a heritage river site; to have it designated as a heritage river under the federal initiative. We are simply following through with that designation.

Mr. Lang: Every time we get up here we talk about the previous government. I am talking about the government that has been across the floor for a year. You have a contract with some guy you do not even know for \$10,000 with a mailing address in Vancouver and I ask what the purpose of the study is and you answer that the previous government had a tacit agreement with the federal government, so we just carried on ordering studies.

I know there was an agreement with the federal government as far as at least, in principle, designating the Yukon River and Chilkoot

Pass, if I recall correctly, the Klondike Park. I do not recall any so-called designation for heritage parks. I would like to know what the purpose of the study is? What is the reason? What are you going to get out of it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member may not be aware of the work that was done by the previous government. My understanding was there had been a resolution to move toward heritage river designation for the Thirty Mile section. We are not talking about the entire Yukon River. We are simply following through with that initiative and completing the necessary work that is needed for the designation. As well, I believe a second part of the study, which is being funded by Parks Canada, is to do an inventory of rivers in the Yukon.

Mr. Lang: In deference to my colleague, the MLA for Kluane, although in some cases we have had trouble getting information, this is number one so far. Has the Minister met with the individual involved? Did the Minister authorize the contract? What are we going to study the river for? What are we going to get out of it? What is the purpose?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the issue of heritage rivers, the purpose of designating rivers as heritage rivers is simply that; they mean something to the heritage of the country, to the people. They have historical significance. They have significance with respect to the evolution of certain parts of the country with respect to the transportation routes that they served. There is an awful lot of history in the Yukon.

Mr. Lang: God bless you. I agree with you. What are we paying \$10,000 to some guy from Vancouver to tell us that there is lots of history in the Yukon? What is the purpose of the study? Why are we paying \$10,000 to Priidu Juurand. I would like to know why we are spending \$9,993.35. Where did the 35 cents come from?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I said that we are preparing the necessary research that will meet the criteria and conditions of heritage river designation as called for by the federal legislation.

Mr. Lang: Then the government has accepted the principle that that is a Canadian heritage river in principle, and the only thing left now is to identify it so that we can catalogue it with the federal government? Is my interpretation right of what has just been said?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It is not a question of identification. There has been previous work done with respect to this particular section of the Yukon. If the Member would like me to research in the department the necessary information as to what has been done to date other than the study on this particular proposal, I would be happy to ask the department to make that information available.

Mr. Lang: Has the Minister seen the results of the study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, I have not.

Mr. Lang: I would like to point out that it was finished on January 31, and this is the middle of April.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The department had not brought the study to my attention.

Mr. Lang: Once the Minister has found time in his busy schedule to apprise himself of what this does, maybe he will report back to the House. This heritage river designation is very important. It has implications of what can be done in those waterways, vis-a-vis development and things of this nature. I want to caution the government in their haste to please some of their constituents that this is going to have long-term effects, as far as the Yukon is concerned. Which particular section does this fall under, as far as the present budget that is before us?

Mr. Porter: As I understand it, this particular section is under the recoveries of the vote.

Mr. Lang: Some of our money has to be in this, too. If I recall correctly, in discussions with the Department of Renewable Resources, we were never told a study was going to be undertaken, so I am assuming that our 40 percent was taken from somewhere as well. I am asking the Minister which particular section does the 40 percent Yukon come from, prior to sending it to Vancouver to be spent?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My information is that this is broken down under the recoveries section of the program. The monies are recovered from Water Resources, Parks Canada, DIAND and the North American Wild Sheep Foundation. As well, this particular

budget item is included in the specific line of cost-shared projects.

Mr. Lang: I am just told that we are going to recover 60 percent. In Supplementary No. 2, we are voting \$40,000 — 60 percent of \$10,000 is six grand. How many more projects do we have that the Minister has got to enumerate for us?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If we are into line by line discussion under cost-shared projects —

Chairman: No, apparently we are not. We are in general debate.

Mr. Lang: Well, what are we dealing with, Mr. Chairman? I want an answer to something.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am quite prepared to discuss the line items as they appear here. That is what I understood our job to be.

Chairman: We are in general debate.

Mr. Brewster: You know, I have not been in this here House for very long, but it sure is strange that I have never seen no Minister who would not go into a general debate and try to avoid this picnic like is going on right now. On the Heritage Rivers, how far is the study gone on the Tatshenshini River?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My understanding is that this government is not studying the Tatshenshini.

Mr. Lang: Are you telling this House that the discussions between British Columbia, Yukon and Alaska have discontinued regarding the utilization of that particular waterway. Rafting is one element. As a river, there are other elements as well. Did the government make representation to the BC Wildlife Advisory group that was set up for the purpose of looking at the environmental consequences of development in that area? Did the government bother to send a brief. If so, when, and would they be prepared to table it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Continuing with the O&M general debate, the answer that I gave is very specific that this government is not conducting a study of the Tatshenshini. Yes, we are involved in discussions with British Columbia and Alaska with respect to the Tatshenshini.

Mr. Lang: Following through with the other question: did you, as a government, put a position forward to the Environmental Review Panel that was set up by the Government of British Columbia to look into the future of the Tatshenshini and that particular area of British Columbia. Did you send a position to them?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Can we continue with the O&M General debate?

Mr. Lang: On a point of order. I want to stress to the Member opposite that this is general debate and a question of general policy. Where would I find a line item if Mr. Porter bothered to appear somewhere. I think it is a very valid question and I am asking a very serious question on behalf of the Yukon and on behalf of the possible mine that will have major affects to the MLA from Kluane.

Chairman: Is there anyone else on a point of order? We will continue with general debate.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to this particular issue, there have been discussions between our department and the British Columbia government as to whether or not we have officially tabled a position to a public review, we have not tabled a Yukon Government position on the Tatshenshini for any public body that I am aware of.

Mr. Lang: One thing about it, the government is consistent. I have not seen them appear before one public body to put a position forward. I want to know why not?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We did not.

Mr. Brewster: Am I to understand that this government did not put anything into the wilderness study that was made on the Tatshenshini River? No mining companies, rafting companies, or private individuals all over BC were put in? We are very concerned that no study, no recommendations, nothing was put into this study.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not know what study the Member is referring to. One Member asked if we put a position before a public body. My response to this was that there was no position put forward by the Yukon government to this public body. That was the answer.

Mr. Lang: Why not?

For the third time: why not?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Are you saying that we should appear before every public body that is structured in B.C. that concerns a river in the Yukon?

Mr. Lang: That river happens to flow through part of the Yukon and a part of B.C. The point is that if the BC government is taking certain actions and they have more authority than this government does then they can do a lot to affect what is going to happen on our side.

I think that you have a responsibility to put forward a position of this government regarding the utilization of that waterway. Is the Member prepared to get a position together to put forward? You seem to have studies going everywhere else. With one that really affects us, we do not even know it is there until it is raised in here, until after the panel has reported to the Government of B.C.

You say you have had discussions with the B.C. government. What have you said to them?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I did not say that I had discussions with the British Columbia government. What I reported to the House is that the Department of Renewable Resources officials were discussing with the BC officials.

Mr. Lang: What position was transmitted through your officials to the Government of British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will undertake to obtain the specific information for the Member.

Mr. Lang: Do I take it then that the Government of Yukon that is looking for more responsibility never took a political position regarding the utilization of this waterway. Is that correct? You gave the department no direction?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The specific question is whether or not we appeared before a public body in British Columbia with respect to this issue, and the answer is no, we did not.

Mr. Lang: Have you given instructions to your officials, in their discussions with officials of British Columbia, of what the position of the Government of Yukon is?

Hon. Mr. Porter: To my knowledge, we have not been asked to put forward a position of the Yukon government. The question that the Member asks is with respect to British Columbia's jurisdiction in this issue. This is an interjurisdictional river, and British Columbia has a public process in which they engage in that affects their rivers or resources. Likewise, we have a process in the Yukon with respect to our resources, and so does Alaska. As far as I am concerned, the discussions have not reached a stage of any negotiations with respect to positions between the three jurisdictions. My understanding is that there is a move initiated in British Columbia to have some discussion with respect to their process and their thoughts about the use of the Tatshenshini in their jurisdiction.

Mr. Brewster: I am a little amazed. When the wilderness committee started out in BC, it advertised all over. People in Toronto saw those advertisements and sent in positions. Almost everybody in Canada seems to have done it, except possibly the Yukon.

I would like to get another thing on record. The Tatshenshini River starts in BC, comes through the Yukon and goes back. It does not, technically, go into Alaska. It is then the Alsek River. I am wondering if the Minister even knows where the Tatshenshini River is.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, I rafted it last summer.

Mr. Phillips: Was the Minister even aware that there were meetings held with respect to the future of the Tatshenshini?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I understood that the BC government was initiating this effort, that it had not been considered by the BC Cabinet, it was simply a committee. That is my recollection of it. There had been responses. I have seen correspondence with respect to the mining interests, tabling their position with respect to the development of the mineral resources in the area.

Mr. Brewster: I am rather surprised with the Minister making statements. I have, in my file on Tarr Inlet, a statement from the Yukon's Deputy Minister of what they put into this committee. I can inform him that the Deputy Minister did it for him. Apparently, he does not work at these things.

Mr. Lang: When is the BC Cabinet going to make the decision

so we, in the Yukon, can be informed exactly what is going to happen to us?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am not in the BC Cabinet, so I do not know when they will make their decision. If he would like, I will endeavor to contact my counterpart in British Columbia and ask when the Cabinet of BC will consider the Wilderness Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Lang: Yes, and at the same time, once he is briefed on what your government's position is, perhaps he can report back to the House.

Mr. Phillips: Getting away from the Tatshenshini permit and back to Heritage Rivers, are there any other rivers in the territory designated as Heritage Rivers covered under this budget?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River is the only designation I know of that is actively being researched. The only other aspect of the study is to do an inventory of other rivers in the Yukon and to go through the history, the length, water flow and which communities they flowed by, that kind of information.

Mr. Lang: I wish he would advertise for these particular contracts as I would be more than happy to apply. With the money you are paying, I can give you all the answers today.

Just prior to leaving the Heritage Rivers, is it clear there are no other rivers under study other than the Thirty Mile? Is that the answer from the government, yes or no.

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I stated in terms of the broad scope of the study, most rivers in the Yukon will be covered inasmuch as they will become part of an inventory process. With respect to active research leading up to possible designation, the only area I am aware of is the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River.

Mr. Lang: Could he undertake to check with his department to make sure that is the only one, when he comes back with his position on the Tatshenshini River?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will give that undertaking.

Mr. Lang: I would like to know if the government has been approached for the purposes of designating international biological sites by the federal government? Have they been approached in the past year since they have become the government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not remember any specific approach. There are a couple of sites on the Dempster, Old Crow and Kluane. There has been no new approaches that I am aware of with respect to designations of new sites in the last year.

Mr. Lang: Could he check with his department and see if they have been approached. Do I take it from his position, not necessarily the department's, that Cabinet has not made any decision as far as this particular area is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, the department has not.

Mr. Brewster: We will go on to an easy one: it is colouring pictures and posters. I noticed that there were a great number of pictures and posters put out in and there is all different prices on all these. Were these put out to tender to Yukon people and advertised at any time?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not know what the Member is talking about. Can he rephrase his question and be more specific?

Mr. Brewster: I could have brought some down from up at the office in the lobby here. Apparently, you solicited posters all over the place. Was this tender put out in the Yukon, and why are five of these done down in Vancouver outside of the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If what he is talking about is what I think he is talking about, it has happened under the education information section of renewable resources. The government had produced wildlife posters for children, and these posters depict all the wildlife. Yukon artists have drawn these posters.

As to the tender process, I thought I brought the contracts with respect to renewable resources, but all I have here are the tourism contracts. As to the tendering process, I will have to double check so that I do not give any wrong information to the House.

Mr. Brewster: Seeing as I do not speak the language as those colored posters. These cost anywhere from \$150 up to \$300, and I think some of them are close to \$500. There are five of these contracts that were put out in B.C., Atlin, and down in Vancouver. Do you feel that Yukon artists cannot qualify to draw something

like this for the program, or should it not have been tendered out?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Obviously, Yukoners are capable of doing the work. The information that I received was that Yukon artists were involved in the effort. With respect to the tendering process, I made a commitment to the Member that I would doublecheck on the information and bring the information back to him.

Mr. Lang: As an individual who happened to have not received one at home, I think the idea is a good one. The one that I have seen, by Chris Caldwell, who is local, was very well done. In fact, I liked her comments on the back of her poster. I think it was exceptionally well done, as well, and I would like to receive one as soon as possible. Why are we going to, for example, Burnaby, B.C., for posters of this kind? It seems to me that the lady I talked about, and I gather that Jim Logan put one forward as well, these people all live here, and I am sure the revenue to them is very welcome. I do not understand why we have gone to, in some cases, British Columbia for it. I want to express my concern, again, for the record. We seem to be going outside more and more for consultants and people to do this work, which is contrary to the policies established on the side opposite. Quite frankly, I think it is against the policy of all three political parties. Yet, at the same time, we go through this procedure and we seem to have a lot of friends in Vancouver.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the sentiments expressed here by the Member, those are shared by myself as well. As to the explanation as to why not all of these individuals were Yukon artists, I did undertake to research that question and have the information made available to me. I will table that information in the House.

Mr. Lang: We are going to be at a loss here. We could be here a long time. I want to warn the Minister that maybe he better get some help behind both his right and left arm for tomorrow. It seems to me that we are not getting any answers. I want to assure the Minister, in all full cooperation, we are not going to leave this particular section until we get some answers. That is fair notice. I think the way we have gone through the budget, it has been very clear and has been exhibited by ourselves that we are scrutinizing fairly closely.

In deference to your colleagues, I think in most cases they have tried to come forward with the answers to the questions. So far, this has been unsatisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In response to that representation, my responsibility in terms of this legislation is to respond and have accounting for the House the figures that are presented on this particular page. That is the nature of the bill before us. I have all of that information, if the Members would like to proceed with line by line debate. That information is here and available. I am prepared to do that.

Mr. Phillips: I have to express my feelings here this evening, too. I had a lot more confidence in the Minister, as the Minister of Renewable Resources, and I really felt that he would be one Minister who would have a handle on his department. I have to say, very honestly, that the answers we have gotten here tonight have been an utter sham. It has been disgraceful. We have not had one straight honest answer. I am going to give the Minister a real chance to give us an answer to something: Can the Minister tell us what the status is now of Project Wild? Is it continuing with the government, or where is Project Wild now with his department?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In response to the angry representations made by the Member, I say to him that I am prepared to do the job that I am asked to do with respect to this vote. I have the information. If he would like to proceed with the discussion on the line by line, I have the relevant information. If he wants to seek information in detail with respect to the department's ongoing programs, that would be available. I would be prepared to do that with respect to the O&M debates.

Project Wild is a program that is national in scope. It originated in the United States. It is being taught in many schools in Canada and the United States. A departmental representative attended a Project Wild administrative workshop in Ottawa on August 18 to 21. There have been some reservations expressed about the particular program, as it may be implemented in the Yukon. My

understanding is that the discussions are continuing. A meeting was held with a senior official of the Department of Education on December 4, 1985, and further discussions were held January 13 with Department of Education officials.

It was decided through those meetings that the information package on Project Wild would be prepared and distributed to all school principals prior to their spring meeting in Whitehorse. My understanding is that that package had been prepared.

Mr. Lang: Is the government taking a political position on that program. Do they agree with it or not?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Going on memory for the detail that is obviously the point of this exercise, in terms of the program, basically there are some reservations about applying the specifics to meet the Yukon situation. With respect to the philosophy of the program, that is supported by this government.

Mr. Lang: Do I take it that the government has taken the political position and endorsed the program with some minor revisions to be done? Is that correct? I am not asking about the nuts and bolts. I am just asking if the Minister has the political endorsement of the government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I stated that politically, in terms of the philosophy of the program, we have no problem with it. I think it is simply a question of adapting the program to meet the Yukon situation and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Brewster: Seeing that we are not getting very far in general debate, we will go on to another line. I will point out to you that some of the questions we asked that are going to be very hard to figure out from line to line, especially on O&M. I hope you will be a little patient with us if we get off on the wrong line.

I would like to point out that we broke down all the 111 contracts that I had and 24 percent of that money was spent outside and there is a leakage of about 20 percent of the money. This is a government that kept saying that they are going to look after everybody in the Yukon with respect to local hire. Some of that work is on posters and things, and I know there are people in the Yukon who can do just as good a job any time.

There is some more work done in the Department of Fisheries that I will bring up in the line item. We drew pretty fish that was drawn in Vancouver. I hope they do not draw a halibut because I do not think we have any in the Yukon. I hope they drew the right fish when they were down there anyway.

Chairman: Are we prepared to go line by line?

Mr. Lang: Will we be setting this department aside without clearing it, totally? If we do, by chance, get to the end of the page, will we not clear this section? Will we wait and have the Minister come back? There are a lot of outstanding questions? Is that your understanding?

Chairman: No. My understanding is that we will continue with general debate until you are satisfied. Then we will go into line items.

Mr. Lang: You mean, for example, we will wait until the Minister returns with the answers to the questions? How are we going to deal with this? I want to make it very clear that we want answers to those questions.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the specifics of the questions that were asked, I gave the undertaking that I would obtain the information for the Members. I will also give the undertaking that that information will be available prior to the O&M Mains discussion, and that we will continue discussion on those specific items.

Mr. Lang: Our choices are limited are they not. I guess we have to agree.

On Administration

Mr. Brewster: Could the Minister possibly give us a breakdown as to what the \$78,000 is for?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The \$78,000 reflected in this line item is due to salary adjustments because of JES. A large part of it is severance pay for the previous deputy minister.

Mr. Lang: Are there any study monies in here? Perhaps he could outline the studies to us.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The item we are being asked to vote on is strictly those two items.

Mr. Lang: I beg your pardon, I cannot accept that. You are asking me to vote in total \$852,000 in administration with a \$78,000 increase. With the monies allocated to you last year, I want to know if you moved any money around other than what you identified to this side of the House during debates on the Mains. Was there any money spent in this area on studies? If there were, where were they?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not have those specific budgetary items available. With respect to the specifics of the studies, those debates traditionally take place with respect to the O&M discussions. On this particular item we are being asked to vote in the supplementary an expenditure level of \$78,000 and the accounting for the expenditure of that additional \$78,000 is due to JES and as well to the severance pay for the previous deputy minister. Although this is kind of a personal area, it is \$74,000.

Mr. Lang: We understood that there was severance pay given because of what took place when you took over government. Whether I agree or not is another subject altogether. I want to know if studies were conducted under the auspices of Administration and, if so, what they were? Would the Member opposite be prepared to set this aside and go back to his department to find out?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The purpose of this particular vote, as I understand it, is to vote on the increased expenditure and give an accounting as to why the increased expenditure is needed.

Very clearly I have given the reasons to the Member for Porter Creek East as to why the funds were needed. With respect to the specifics of the debate, if the Member wants specific details of the nuts and bolts of whether or not there were studies commissioned, I would like him to be more specific in terms of what particular studies he is asking about and when he would like the information.

Mr. Lang: I do not need a lesson on how to go through the budget. I asked a very general question expecting the Minister to have some knowledge of his department, and what do I get? A lesson to say that \$78,000 was because of the JES and because of the severance pay for one Deputy Minister.

If that was the way we had been connecting going through this particular document, we would have been through it within one day. We are asking general policy questions. I do not need the quacking from the MLA for Faro behind me, agreeing with the MLA for Watson Lake.

Is the Minister prepared to stand this aside and find out tomorrow whether or not any studies were conducted different from what had been identified in the Mains when this was last discussed by the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of the specific question, that is not related to this expenditure item that we are discussing. I will give an undertaking to check with the department and ask if there have been any studies conducted. I am sure the answer is going to be positive, and I will articulate what those studies are and what the costs are.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell me how many person-years are under this line item, and what those positions are?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to that detail of information, that is clearly an O&M debate question. When we get to the discussion of the O&M of this particular department, I will have that information. It has all been prepared by the department, and when we move on to the O&M Mains, it will be broken out and debated at that point.

Mrs. Firth: I would like to know if the Minister knows how many people he has working in administration in the Department of Renewable Resources, the department that he has the responsibility for as a Minister of this government, and a responsibility to be accountable to the Yukon taxpayer.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do have that information. That is contained in the notes that are appended to the O&M Mains debate. We will discuss person-year placements, the difference between the two years, when we discuss that particular item.

Chairman: Is it the wish of the Committee Members to recess, or to continue?

Some Members: Recess. A long one!

Chairman: We will recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole back to order. We will continue on administration.

Mr. Phelps: I have been listening to the debate with some interest. There are no officials here from Renewable Resources to help the Minister and I would submit that we have had answers to less than 10 percent of questions asked in the first hour and perhaps it would be worthwhile to stand the department aside and move on to Tourism in general debate.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the bill that is before us, Bill No. 17, which calls upon the Legislative Assembly to consider and debate the difference of expenditure as to what had been voted to date in the O&M previously — the O&M the previous government had initiated and we tabled in the House and passed — between that vote and the votes articulated in the Supplementary No. 2, I have the information related to those expenditure areas and am prepared to continue line by line with explanations as to the variance between what had been voted previously by the Legislature and what is being asked to be voted by the Legislature now.

Mr. Lang: I heard the Minister said a little earlier that he had brought his notes for Tourism as opposed to Renewable Resources and we are trying to oblige him because it is somewhat embarrassing for the side opposite and quite frustrating for this side. It would seem to be very advantageous if he had his deputy minister in conjunction with going through the budget. I recognize that some of them are very specific but they have to be specific. So I would suggest to the Minister that we go with Tourism if, as he said earlier, he has notes for that particular department. Then we could go back to Renewable Resources tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Just to reiterate the position again. I have the information relative to the vote consideration before the House and I see no reason why we should move to Tourism.

Mr. Lang: It definitely, in our judgement, has been demonstrated that notes are not there. If the response that we are going to get to each section is the JES and maybe the payout of the odd civil servant, then I would recommend strongly that the Member refresh his memory and go through the budget that he has before him in a much more detailed manner with his officials. We are not going to accept that. We can stay here all day and look at each other and jump up and down.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We are being asked to consider Bill No. 17, a supplementary bill to the O&M Mains that were passed. I have the information that is relevant to the variance with respect to the expenditures. For that reason I see no need to depart from this particular department to another. I think that we should proceed. We have been here 20 days. We have virtually passed only one bill. We have to keep at it boys and move along.

Mr. Lang: I say to my quiet but arrogant friend that we have not had any answers to the questions. That is all we are asking. We are saying, in deference to the Minister, accepting the premise that he did not think that he was going to get to his vote today, that he could perhaps use tomorrow morning and get briefed on the budget he has before us.

I, for one, am not prepared to accept each line item as a consequence of the JES. There are other things that have happened in these areas and I think he has a responsibility to brief the House. If he comes clean, we will go through it quickly.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The JES is not the reason for every expenditure. The reasons will become apparent as we move along the line by line discussions.

Mr. Lang: Perhaps we could hear from my Liberal colleagues. Maybe we should have a motion here to decide whether or not we should go with the Department of Tourism or stay with the Department of Renewable Resources.

Motion proposed

I move a motion that we set aside the Department of Renewable Resources and move to the Department of Tourism.

Chairman: Those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Members: Yea.

Chairman: Stand up, please.

All those opposed to the motion, please stand.

The results are yea six, nay nine.

Motion defeated

Mr. Lang: The MLA fro Faro says, "Do what the Minister wants," just like he says everyday.

Chairman: Back to Administration.

Mr. Brewster: I am probably going to be called out of order, but the Member for Faro says, "Do what the Minister wants." I can answer some of the questions I have asked the Minister, but he cannot give me an answer. I can answer some of those because I happen to know, and if he cannot answer where he spent the money and what he did with it, then we have no right to stand in this House and vote for any of this.

Mr. Lang: The Minister of Renewable Resources seems to have lots of time. All we are trying to do is help him.

Where is the contract for the cultural study at Frenchman-Tatchun Lake? Is that in Administration?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member will recall the Capital debate we had last sitting, it was a Capital measure.

Mr. Lang: Then the Minister is saying that it is taken out of the Capital allocation, under the Capital expenditures. Is that correct? When we get to that particular section in the days to come, will he have the study? Has he received the study? Will he be prepared to table it at that time?

Hon. Mr. Porter: When we reach the relevant line item, I will have the information relevant to the discussion.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell us if there are any vacant person-years in this Administration line at present?

Hon. Mr. Porter: At the present time, I am not aware of any vacancies in the administrative area of the department, but I will double check to make sure the information is totally correct.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell us whether, at any time during the past year, any person-years were vacant that would have created a lapse in salary dollars, and if so, approximately how many salary dollars would have lapsed?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member is asking a question of general nature as to whether or not vacancies in the department affect the votes, if she will note, in the next line under Policy Planning, that is clearly the reason why we are reflecting the decrease by \$32,000. These are the two policy analyst positions, which were held vacant longer than anticipated.

Mrs. Firth: I am talking about the person-years in administration. In administration, there are a certain number of person-years identified according to the budget to which this is a supplementary. I would like to know if, for that year, all the person-years were filled at all times and if there were any lapsed salary dollars because of some person-years being vacant.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In the vote we are being asked to consider, the \$78,000 does not reflect on any vacant or lapsed positions. The reasons for the \$78,000 increase are the fact that we had to pay out holiday pay, sick leave benefits and severance settlement to the previous deputy minister, and the remainder is made up of JES implementation.

Mr. Lang: It does not make sense. You are asking us to vote a \$78,000 increase and you told this House that the severance pay alone for the Deputy Minister is \$74,000. You had JES and you had other areas as well. Where did you find the money from within the department? It must have lapsed somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The \$74,000 was made up of specific areas of holiday pay, sick leave benefits and the settlement package. As you go through the budget, you will see the areas where we lapsed and where we have increased.

Mr. Lang: That settlement was quite a bit more than just the JES. This budget also takes into account the settlement that was reached in negotiations with the public service.

Subsequently, that would be reflected in the vote as well. Is that not correct or am I wrong on this? Does this include the negotiated settlement with the public service with the JES plus the increase in total, throughout the public service. That has got to be more than \$4,000 for 13 people.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The answer regarding the \$78,000 is that \$74,000 of that relates to the payout of benefits accruing to the previous Deputy Minister.

Mr. Lang: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Porter: What is the question then?

Mr. Lang: There is another \$4,000 here. I am being told that is all the consequences of the settlement that was reached with the public service. Is \$4,000 the only increase for 13 person-years? Is that the consequence of the JES plus the public service negotiated raise and the \$1,000 bonuses?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member's is asking for a specific breakdown of the total JES expenditure under Administration for this department, I do not have information of that nature. We can stand Administration aside and I can get the breakdown on the specific dollar basis and report back to the House.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate that and I will take it in the spirit that it was intended.

The bonuses alone are \$13,000, a \$1,000 bonus per person-year depending on the tenure. You have that. How much money was the raise itself? What are the consequences of the JES study? Where did the department find the money in the other parts of Administration, the lapses, so that you did not have to ask for more money than the \$4,000?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is asking for the offset with respect to the total increase and I will obtain that information for the Member.

Chairman: Do you agree to stand over Administration.

Administration stood over

On Policy and Planning

Hon. Mr. Porter: As stated earlier, the decrease of \$32,000 was caused by two vacancies of the policy analyst positions. They were held vacant longer than anticipated. I believe we filled one position in December, and we filled the second one in January.

Mr. Lang: Maybe the Minister would be so humble as to brief us on what policies he is looking at, what he has completed over this past year. Were any major studies undertaken in this particular area? We are talking \$500,000 for what was estimated, he tells us, as four man-years. At \$50,000 a throw, that is \$300,000 there that has been spent somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the major effort in the policy branch, as Members are aware, the policy branch basically advises the department in total on general policy questions with respect to issues that are dealt with in the House. They are responsible for the preparation of relevant material for the Minister's office regarding policy issues on a specific nature. I would say that a major part of the policy workload for the department for the recent time has been related to the green paper exercise, the select committee that was structured on instruction from this House. That tied up one policy position for that exercise.

As well, another policy person is working on the question of devolution. As the Members are aware, Renewable Resources is targeted as an area for considerable discussion in the future on devolution for freshwater fisheries, forestry, areas like that. In terms of policy, their role in the past would have been related to the Porcupine Caribou Herd Management Agreement that has been struck. They would have been involved in that. They would have had a role to play in preparation of materials for any discussions related to interjurisdictional concerns with ourselves, NWT, Alaska and the federal government.

Mr. Lang: He still has not answered my question. I understand there are four people working in the department. As of January, I gather there may be six. For the purposes of our discussion, there is \$200,000 spent on direct wages for the four person-years I am referring to that were filled over the course of this past year.

What did we do with the other \$300,000?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not understand why we are digressing to debating the O&M budget of the previous year that has been passed. In terms of the \$32,000 decrease that is represented in this vote, the answer to that specific vote to be considered by this House is that this resulted because two policy analyst positions were not filled. That is how we came to this particular amount.

Mr. Lang: I am asking a very broad question. Three hundred thousand dollars was spent by this particular section of the department, and I would like to know what policy and planning areas it was spent in? I do not think it is too much to ask: where did

you spend the money and how did you spend it, because it must have gone into studies? It could not have gone anywhere else. If the Minister does not have that particular information with him, I am more than prepared to set it aside, and he can give us a general briefing tomorrow along with Administration.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The money is made up of costs associated with personnel costs, travel, telephone and printing costs. That discussion should have occurred with respect to the particular item during the budget debates prior to the implementation and passage of the budget in the new year. With respect to this specific vote item, the \$32,000 decrease we see here has resulted because of two vacancies in the policy analyst positions.

Mr. Lang: What new regulations or legislation did you develop over this past year in this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the previous year, the only legislation that emanated from the department was the *Agricultural Products Act*. The department would have done work on regulations for the previous hunting season and also on regulations concerned with the trapping season.

Mr. Lang: Did you spend the amount of money on information and education that you told this House you would last spring? Is that where you went into the contracts, in part, with the outside people for the colouring poster contest where your name is so predominantly displayed?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, the funding for the public relations effort on the posters did come from the information section of the department, which is part of the Policy and Planning Branch.

Mr. Lang: How much did it cost?

Hon. Mr. Porter: This was raised earlier in general debate, and I undertook to obtain the information related to this area and make that information available to the Members.

Mrs. Firth: I remember, when we were debating the O&M Mains, of which this is a supplementary to, we talked about public relations within the Department of Renewable Resources. I raised a concern about the department launching its own public relations campaign when there was a public relations department within this government to take care of that. Can the Minister tell us how much money was spent on other public relations projects in his department?

²⁶ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** None of the \$32,000 that we are voting on.

Mrs. Firth: I am sure the Minister does not find the concept unreasonable that if he said one thing in the O&M Budget debate, we would have the right to come back and question that that is actually what he spent the money on. I think that is a fair concept, and I cannot see the Minister disagreeing with that.

We talked about a public relations campaign during that debate. The Minister told us then that he did not know how much money was going to be spent on public relations. The money has been spent. I would like to know how much of that money was spent on public relations, and on what projects, and what they were?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That specific request will be forwarded to the department for a response, in terms of the information requested by the Member. I will release the information for the Member.

Mr. Lang: In this particular section, was there any money spent on the anti-trapping question? If that is the case, how much came out of this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The answer to that question is no.

Mr. Lang: Do I take it that all the commitments towards this kind of effort, as far as public relations is concerned, is contained in the 1986-87 budget; that there is none in this particular budget?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The answer to that particular question is "no", as well. The information related to the anti-trapping issue is covered in this supplementary, but not under this vote item.

Mr. Lang: Could I humbly ask and beseech the Minister to identify the line item at this time, so that we can discuss it when we get to it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, and for the edification of the humble gentleman across the way, the information will be debated when we come to the Contingency allotment for the department.

Mr. Lang: In this past year, did the Minister spend \$190,000 for information and education in this particular area, as projected in the estimates of 1985-86? To refresh his memory, it is on page 223

of the Main Estimates.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will review the detailed expenditures of the department. I do not recall whether or not we spent exactly \$190,000. I will check the financial records to look at the expenditure and report the specifics of the expenditure level in the House.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate the cooperative attitude now prevalent from that side. Would the Minister also check in to see where the dollars lapsed for the positions, where that money was spent as well — if he agrees with that.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

²⁷ **Mrs. Firth:** One of the objectives of this line, Policy and Planning, is to formulate policies. Has the Minister given his policy people any direction regarding new policies within the department?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The new policies for the new fiscal year will be a relevant subject of debate in the O&M Mains. To anticipate that debate with respect to policy initiative in the future, we clearly made a commitment to have a public process in the form of a select committee process to examine Yukoners' views of the Department of Renewable Resources.

From that report, the government would then respond in detail to the report and build a general new policy direction for the Department of Renewable Resources for the future.

There is work ongoing on the fur farming issue. That is of major concern to the Trappers Association. I met with them this weekend at their annual meeting and that was impressed upon me as an area that was necessary for policy decision. Our undertaking to the Trappers Association is that we would comply with a policy prior to the beginning of the new trapping season.

On other areas of policy initiative, there has been a draft policy developed with respect to the issue of birds of prey. That has not been formally adopted by the government. That is being prepared by the policy branch of the government.

The commitment to combat the anti-trapping lobby has to be seen as a policy development of this government. At the present time, those are the most recent policy initiatives that come to mind.

Mr. Lang: With the filling of the two positions that you said had been vacant for so long, is that going to adequately give you the capabilities for policy and planning in the foreseeable future for staff?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I think that it would be fair to say that governments, no matter what stripe they are, always lack resources. Given the current workload that we envision for the department, I would say that the policy allocation that we have is going to meet our needs. I think that the fact that we have dedicated one policy analyst specifically to the area of devolution is a critical decision because in the next little while there are going to, hopefully, be intensive discussions with the federal government on devolution matters in forestry.

²⁸ **Mr. Lang:** The reason I am asking is that you had six person-years allocated, and you had four over the balance of the year and you filled two. Could I take it from the Minister's response that these six person-years that he has allocated for this purpose will meet, in the foreseeable future, the needs that he sees in view of the policies that he has enumerated?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of the current workload of the department, I would suggest that the policy allotment is equitable.

Mrs. Firth: I want to follow up on the policy person-year identified for devolution. What is the relationship between this person-year and the Office of Devolution that the Government Leader is responsible for?

Hon. Mr. Porter: This is not directly connected to the Devolution Office, as it is under the responsibility of the Government Leader's office. This is a policy analyst position. Because of the fact that we have so much in the way of devolution-related questions under the auspices of the authority of Renewable Resources, we made a management decision to simply dedicate a policy analyst position full-time to the devolution question. There is a lot of research that is related to the questions of devolution on an issue-by-issue basis, that we have to prepare for.

Mrs. Firth: Maybe the Minister could just clarify something for me. The objectives of the department is to formulate policy, and

also to evaluate management programs. Does a policy analyst fulfill both of those functions, or are there two separate individuals? Is there not a position created for formulation of policy, which would be a policy planning person-year, and then the policy analyst. Do they not do the evaluation management of the programs?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the specific position of the policy analyst that has been dedicated to devolution, I do not see a responsibility to do an analysis as to the effectiveness. This position is a one year term position. The focus is going to be to prepare the necessary research on policy-related questions for the government, specifically for myself as Minister, which I then take to the government as a whole for adoption by the government as a position.

29 Then we enter into a process of negotiations with our counterparts in Ottawa — that is provided we are not here for an eternity — and we do have the opportunity to meet with them and negotiate. That specific position would not have a great deal of responsibility toward analysis and evaluation.

Mrs. Firth: If the Minister is prepared to table it, I would like a copy of the job description for that term position.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I see no reason why that information cannot be tabled and I will obtain it for the Member.

Mr. Brewster: There are eight posters of fish being done. Were these put out to public tender, these pretty pictures of fish and such things?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member is speaking about the posters we prepared recently, my undertaking is to answer that question specifically for the Member. I have agreed to check with the department to see if that particular competition had been tendered and provide that detail to the Member.

Mr. Brewster: If it was put out to tender I would like one of the copies of the tender made, because here again I see three contracts were issued outside to draw Yukon fish. Do you suppose a copy of the tender could be registered in the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, I will get the information and table it.

Mr. Brewster: Could the Minister tell us why we are spending money like this on fish when actually we have no say about fish? The federal government control fish.

30 **Hon. Mr. Porter:** The issue of freshwater fish management is of critical importance to this government. As a matter of fact, the federal Ministry of Fisheries and provincial Ministry of Fisheries and the territorial Ministry of Fisheries are meeting in Winnipeg on May 9. Unfortunately, we will be sitting here talking about whatever, I guess, and will not be there representing Yukon's interest in those negotiations. We are going to sit here and not pass any legislation.

Mr. Brewster: There is a fish survey for \$3,000 and questionnaire for \$2,000, and a publication on Yukon fish which we are doing and paying for. Yet, once again, the federal government has all the right to make all the decisions and do everything. That is not correct.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I cannot agree with the Member opposite more. If we are to get out of here and make some decisions in this House, we have a very limited agenda to get through it, to get the business done, and account for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money for keeping us here, then I can go down to that meeting, speak directly with our counterparts in Canada, with the federal Minister and lay our position on the table, that we are in favour of transfer of responsibility regarding the fishery resource.

Due to the time, I move that you report progress on Bill No. 17.

Motion agreed to

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

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I call the House to order. May we have a report from Chairman of the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Webster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 17, *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1985-86*, and directed me to

report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

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 p.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

31 **The following Sessional Papers were tabled April 21, 1986:**

86-3-24

Report of the Chief Electoral Officer on Contributions to Political Parties During 1985 (Speaker - Johnston)

86-3-25

Department of Education Annual Report 1984-85 (McDonald)

86-3-26

Legal Aid Expenses, 1984-85 and 1985-86 (Kimmerly)

86-3-27

Correspondence regarding municipal financing (Lang)

86-3-28

First Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments, 3rd Session of the 26th Legislature (Coles)

