



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 4

5th Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, March 30, 1982 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Grafton Njootli, MLA, Old Crow

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government House Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Public Service Commission, Land Claims and Intergovernmental Relations.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, Tourism and Economic Development.
Hon. Geoffrey Lattin	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs, Highways and Public Works, Yukon Housing Corporation and Yukon Liquor Corporation
Hon. Meg McCall	Klondike	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Education and Heritage & Cultural Resources
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Justice, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Government Services and Workers' Compensation Board.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Robert Fleming	Campbell
Doug Graham	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Peter Hanson	Mayo
Grafton Njootli	Old Crow
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penkett	Whitehorse West
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre

(Liberal)

Ron Veale	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

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

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

01 Whitehorse, Yukon
Tuesday, March 30, 1982

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

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time to the Order Paper, under Daily Routine.

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS FOR TABLING

Mr. Veale: I have a Document for Tabling. It is entitled, "The Implications of Agriculture and Livestock to the Management of Large Carnivores in Yukon", prepared by Grant M. Lortie and submitted to Michael P.C. Hawkes, Director of Policy Administration and Information Services, Department of Renewable Resources.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Documents for Tabling?
 Reports of Committees?
 Petitions?
 Reading or Receiving of Petitions?
 Are there any Introduction of Bills?
 Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?
 Notices of Motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Graham: I have a Notice of Motion respecting Members' salaries.

02 Mr. Veale: I have a Notice of Motion, moved by myself, seconded by Alice McGuire, that this Assembly is of the opinion that MLAs should not take their 1982 pay increase in order to set an example for all Yukoners to exercise restraint.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion?
 Are there any Statements by Ministers?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Workers' Compensation Board

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Finance. The Workers' Compensation Board has loaned the Government of Canada and Bell Canada over \$8,000,000 at very low interest rates through bond and debenture investments, and have almost \$7,000,000 in cash in short-term deposits.

I would like to ask the Government Leader exactly who makes the investment decisions for the Workers' Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Board makes their investment decisions themselves.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to ask the Government Leader if he could confirm if the Board, that is those Board Members appointed by this Government, are the people who make those investment decisions? I would ask him that question since the Board is required, I understand, to make sound investments to protect the interests of Yukon workers, but I would ask the Government Leader, is it not this Government's policy to invest Workers' Compensation funds right here in Yukon in such things as mortgages, possibly?

03 Hon. Mr. Pearson: As far as I know, this Government has appointed all of the present Members of the Board. It makes the investment decisions, which is part of the criteria of the Board.

Mr. Penikett: Can I ask the Government Leader to just confirm one last time that the Board has therefore invested no money in the Yukon economy, and if that is the case, can he confirm that the Board has not on any occasion ever loaned money to the Government of Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I can certainly confirm that since I have been the Minister of Finance, the Board has not loaned money to the Government of Yukon.

Question re: Cogasa Mining Corporation

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister in charge of Labour. I provided the Minister with a photocopy of the news release from the Vancouver Sun on March 22nd of this year outlining a proposal of Cogasa Mining Corporation, a well-known if somewhat notorious Yukon mining company, to share mine ownership with workers through a partnership arrangement. Does the Minister consider that such a proposal should be allowed to proceed, considering that it is a blatant attempt to put all the risk on workers?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am aware of the proposal. It has been made in Eastern papers and Central Canadian papers as well as the Vancouver Sun. Trading has been suspended in Ontario's stock exchange, a cease trading order has been issued in Manitoba, and I have just instructed my department to cease trading here while we review the situation.

04 Mr. Veale: My concern is that if we end up with a number of people that are presently unemployed in Vancouver coming up to work at the 60 Mile River...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the Honourable Member making a speech, or would the Honourable Member please get to the question?

Mr. Veale: I am asking a question, but we are normally accorded one opening sentence before we put our question so we can help the Minister to understand it.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Honourable Member would now then get to the question.

Mr. Veale: I will get to my question. Will the Minister do all in his legal power to ensure that we do not end up with the situation that we ended up with last summer, where a number of employees are left on a creek with no way to even get out of the Yukon, and the owner takes off? Will he do all in his legal power to stop that from happening again?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: We are a responsible Government. We always try to do whatever is within our power to do.

Mr. Veale: Will the Minister also instruct the Workers' Compensation Board to make an assessment on all the parties to the partnership so that they will have to pay at least Workers' Compensation payments in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not know what is the matter with the Member across the floor. I just finished telling him, and telling everyone else here, that I instructed my department to tell them to cease trading. We were not going to allow that partnership to happen in that manner. Now he is asking me the question as if I had allowed the partnership to go ahead.

Question re: Local preference in Government contracts

Mr. Byblow: I have a question I will direct to the Government Leader. In consideration of the difficulties that local contractors are having finding enough work for their employees and their companies — and I believe only this afternoon we heard of a couple of contractors auctioning off their equipment — and in light of the Government Leader's answers to my previous questions, I would like to simply put to the Government Leader whether he is considering revising the policy for preference to local contractors to give them some extra help in coping during these particularly difficult times?

05 Hon. Mr. Pearson: I thought that I answered that question quite clearly yesterday.

We, on this side, have felt always, that the decision taken, the policy established by this Government to implement a five percent bid differential in respect to local contractors was a good policy, a sound policy and a right policy. It is as right, good and sound today as it was at that time.

Mr. Byblow: I do not think that I am questioning the soundness of the policy, but, in light of the present circumstances, I am seeking from the Government whether or not it would consider another formula: perhaps tying the bid differential to the rate of unemployment in the

Territory, and as an extension to that, whereby the local firms would receive more preference when there is less work to go around as there is now.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not think, that that is fair, nor equitable. The people who are going to have to actually pay the additional costs are going to be the taxpayers of this Territory.

Mr. Byblow: In light of that, I would seek an answer from the Minister whether or not he has a formula in mind whereby the taxpayers could benefit? Would he consider a bid differential formula that took into account local hiring ratios along with a commitment to local materials and suppliers?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I hate to have to tell, in Question Period, the Honourable Member how to conduct himself in this House. If he would like to see something else brought forward, why does he not make a motion?

Question re: Alcohol and Drug Services

Mrs. McGuire: I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources, in relation to her responsibility for Alcohol and Drug Services.

My question is, on January 20 of this year an inquest was held into the death of Art Brewster of Haines Junction, who died October 15, 1981, at the Whitehorse Detox Centre. Although the jury did not see fit to make recommendations, the Coroner, in this matter, did so. I will ask the Minister, further to the Coroner's findings, is the Minister taking steps to implement the recommendations at the Detox Centre?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The recommendations are being looked at very, very carefully at the present time.

Mrs. McGuire: I would like to ask the Minister, if she has taken steps to ensure that the carrying out of the Coroner's recommendations is monitored on a regular basis, if they are to ensure that the citizens of Yukon, the people using the Detox Centre, will receive the best possible medical attention to prevent another tragic accident?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: For financial reasons it is not, perhaps, possible to put into effect all the recommendations. Any recommendations that are possible are being very seriously considered.

06

Question re: YTG taxi contract

Mr. Kimmerly: A question to the Minister responsible for Government Services. Yesterday, I raised the issue of the taxi contract and stated as of January 15th, the progress payments on this \$15,000 contract were already \$27,000. The Minister stated and I quote, "They are much less than that." In fact, they are \$27,882.85. After studying the question, is the Minister now prepared to say that he unintentionally misled the House yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think I will rule the question out of order as being argumentive. If the Honourable wishes to answer the question, I will permit it. Perhaps Members could temper their questions, and keep within the Rules that surround the presentation of questions in the Question Period.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The statement that the Honourable Member made from across the floor, to the best of my knowledge, is totally untrue. I said to the best of my knowledge, it is quite a bit less than that. I also said that the Member must be reading my mail because I have not seen the figures yet. The last figures I saw were much less than that.

Mr. Kimmerly: Yesterday, I also asked about the program audit procedures. The Minister did not answer this, but he challenged me concerning evidence. My question is, if I present such evidence to the Minister of YTG officials charging taxi rides for private trips, what action will the Minister take against these officials?

Mr. Speaker: The question here again sounds quite hypothetical, but, however if the Minister wishes to answer, we will allow him to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This Member from across the floor, not more than a month or a month and a half ago, made accusations against the RCMP, without bringing any evidence forward. He sits in this House right now and makes accusations without bringing evidence forward. Whenever he wants to deliver the evidence to me, I will then take care of it. Until then, he should either keep quiet about it, or deliver the evidence.

Question re: Cease Trading Order

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister of Justice relating to my first question. Would the Minister explain the cease trading order that has been issued, and under what Ordinance it is being issued?

07 Hon. Mr. Tracey: Under the *Securities' Ordinance*, they have to register with the Government here, and they have to have a prospectus drawn up. They have done that. I instructed my department to tell them to cease trading, or not to start trading. The same thing has happened in Manitoba, as it has in Ontario.

Mr. Veale: Just to add clarification from the Minister, my understanding is that there are two ways that they can do it. They can either issue shares, which really does not concern me, but they could just have a partnership agreement. What can the Minister do if they just make a partnership arrangement and proceed to mine on the 60 Mile?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question again is hypothetical, however, if the Minister wishes to answer, proceed.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I am not totally knowledgeable on the ins and outs of partnerships and the limited partnerships. According to my officials, we are well within our rights to instruct Cogasa not to start trading.

Mr. Veale: I agree with the Minister on the cease trading of shares. I am encouraged that he has done that, but the newspaper article indicates that they are going to form a general partnership. My question is, and I would ask the Minister to perhaps come back on this tomorrow, would the Minister investigate what powers he has, if they form a general partnership, or if they set up independent contracts? Would the Minister advise the House what he can do on that score?

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

Question re: Northland Park development

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. The Lands Administrator of his department has indicated that the owners of Northland Park received a total of 13 months of extensions on their Phase 1 development and the owners have been granted an additional 39 months of extension on their Phase 2 development. Would the Minister indicate whether the granting of such extensions is a common practice in respect to such developments, or was Northland Park a special case?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yesterday, I was asked a question on the same thing. At that time, I indicated that I would be bringing in a statement, and that still stands. Until I bring in a statement, I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. Penikett: I have another memo from the Lands Administrator which states that for a single family residential lot, the policy is to allow for up to one year of extensions under certain conditions before all the terms of the agreement are up. If the required work is not completed by then, the property is to be sold by the Government. Could I ask the Minister, and this is a statement of general policy, not of the particulars in this case, if the Government has a separate policy for land developers and a different, more stringent policy for individual home builders?

08 Hon. Mr. Lattin: No. One of the things that I believe, when you are making policies for anybody, is that they should apply equally, no special policy for one or the other.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to ask the Minister, then, if the department does now, as of this date, have definite written policies on the administration of land sales and the issuing titles, or if it does operate on a case-by-case basis, in some circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I thought I just answered that. We do not address them on a case-by-case application basis.

Question re: Apprenticeships

Mr. Byblow: I have a couple of questions I will direct to the Minister of Education on the subject of apprenticeships. They relate specifically to some constituency problems. Presently the Apprenticeship Board requires that an apprentice must be indentured to a local company. Given this requirement, will the Minister undertake, either now or in a later written statement, to explain how an apprentice can gain accreditation for work done for outside companies that are doing work in Yukon?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, I will undertake to have that information

for the Member.

Mr. Byblow: The problem is a little more complex as well. An apprentice, who is a member of a hiring hall union, may work for several companies under the present regulations. Sometimes, though, apprentices are not credited with work done because a separate contract has not been signed to indenture the apprentice to the company. To simplify this problem of crediting work experience, under an Apprenticeship Program, will the Minister undertake to consider changing the Apprenticeship Board rules to allow indenturing to hiring hall unions?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: It is a very complicated question and there is criteria by which an apprentice is judged by experience in that way. I will undertake to have complete information given to the Member.

Mr. Byblow: At the same time that she is investigating and preparing the information, there is yet a third problem. The Apprenticeship Board will not indenture an apprentice to a local outside the Yukon. That is standard. But, there are several unions that do not have separate locals for the Yukon. Will the Minister consider, also, a possible change in the regulations to allow an apprentice to be indentured to an outside union local, given that there is no Yukon local in existence?

Mrs. McCall: Yes, it is a very involved question. I appreciate what the Member is saying and that is something that I will look into.

09

Question re: Wolf Creek Complex

Mr. Kimmerly: A question for the Minister responsible for Government Services.

Last Session I asked the Minister about the use of the Wolf Creek Complex, the old Youth Services Centre, what use is presently being made of that facility?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: At the present time, that facility is in moth-balls.

Mr. Kimmerly: In view of the stated plans last Session to use the facility as a minimum security risk jail, what is the target date for the residence in the facility by incarcerated people?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is not our intention to incarcerate anybody at this time. We investigated the use of it for a minimum security jail, and the costs were prohibitive. It was an excellent plan, but the manpower and money for O&M were too prohibitive to allow us to go ahead with it.

Mr. Kimmerly: Are there any plans for the use of that facility being investigated now?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, we are investigating the sale of the building. We would be most anxious to sell it to anybody who wanted to purchase it.

Question re: Low Cost Housing

Mrs. McGuire: I have a question for the Minister responsible for Yukon Housing.

Yesterday, I tried to bring to the Minister's attention a destructive situation that exists with the Haines Junction low cost housing tenants, but, he appeared to be oblivious to it all. Fluctuating rent fees have been proven to actually penalize people who live in low cost housing, who raise their family income to a standard rate. My question is, again, as any changes or discussions to the *Yukon Housing Ordinance* must take place in this House, will the Minister Table the *Yukon Housing Ordinance* for possible revision?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I take exception to the Honourable Member's remark that I was oblivious to what was going on in Haines Junction. I know perfectly well what is going on in Haines Junction, and so does she. As far as bringing that Ordinance into the House at this particular time, I am not prepared to do so.

¹⁰ **Mrs. McGuire:** It still appears that I have failed to bring to the attention of the Minister the seriousness of this existing situation in Haines Junction that are plaguing other Yukon Housing tenants and the Yukon Housing Board Members, which cannot be resolved at a local level. My question is, will the Minister agree to meet with all parties involved to try and resolve the problem?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: The problem she refers to is not a policy decision. They have ample opportunity to meet with the local board. The Yukon Housing Corporation Board was up there, and we also have

lines of communication through the Housing Corporation.

Mrs. McGuire: I have just told the Minister that there is a problem that cannot be resolved at the local level. I have no further questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. These statements are actually a very bad misuse of the Question Period, and certainly Honourable Members, I am sure, before they address questions have not been able to get the answers from Government and seek the answers here. I would ask that all Members temper their questions in such a manner as to stay within the rules of the Question Period.

Question re: Kyte Report

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister responsible for Cultural Resources, whichever Minister would like to answer the question. The recently released Kyte Report, entitled "Museums in Yukon: A Profile and Training Report", makes several recommendations for a museums policy, including a museum training program, a museum coordinator and a heritage resource centre. What plans does the Government have to implement the recommendations of this Report?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I would like to thank the Honourable Member for asking about this program. I am very happy to have interest shown in it. We are, at the present time, waiting for our new Director of the Heritage Branch, in Heritage and Cultural Resources, and we are waiting to see what we can implement of all the variance reports, including the Kyte Report, when he comes.

Mr. Penikett: To be specific, could I ask the Minister if it is her intention to hire a qualified museums coordinator to manage or direct, or assist museum development and training and to provide Yukon's museums with some advisory services?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: This would be something that we would be aiming for, museums coordinator. The new Director of the Heritage Branch is, at present, the Director of Barkerville and has past experience with museums and will be a very helpful person to have up here.

Mr. Penikett: I can see the Minister is inclined to hire an employee who might feel more at home in Dawson than in Whitehorse. I would like to ask the Minister if, during this Session, the Minister will be Tabling a clearly defined museum policy and comprehensive museum development program as recommended by Kyte?

¹¹ **Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I am delighted to have such interest shown on this subject. We will be tabling a Green Paper, a Working Paper, which is just for openers on policy on this subject.

Question re: Property Insurance

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Government Leader regarding the property insurance issue. It appears that the Government made a decision in the Budget not to have insurance on public buildings, in the same way that the Government of Canada is a self-insurer. Would the Government Leader now advise why the matter is now being reviewed?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, as a result of the fire in Old Crow, there was an indication that there was going to be a fairly dramatic jump in the cost of the insurance. As I am sure all Members are aware, this Government has the capability of taking advantage of the Federal self-insurance scheme, however, it was a policy decision made by this Government in 1979, that we would insure our Territorial buildings against fire loss.

We did not think, at the time of putting the Budget together, that we were going to be able to afford to carry on with that policy during this current year. Subsequent negotiations and information now leads us to believe that we will continue our insurance and that that cost will be one that will be reflected in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. Veale: I thank the Government Leader for that explanation. Would the Government Leader confirm whether or not there is a cost associated with joining the Federal scheme? What is the reason for the decision, one way or the other? Is it cheaper to go in the Federal scheme or is it cheaper to have a local insurer?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I guess that probably depends considerably on what a person's view is. If you happen to be the Minister of Education in this Government, the year that the Mayo School burnt

down, there is absolutely no question about it. We should have all of our buildings insured, because, then we can take immediate action upon a disaster happening, like we did with the Old Crow School. The Mayo School, I am sure for those Members who can recall when it burnt down, there was a great amount of agonizing in the Executive Committee of the day, and it took something like seven or eight months to get agreement from the Federal Government that this was a necessary building, and that they should replace it.

¹² **Mr. Veale:** Well, I am certainly in agreement with that particular policy. I would ask the Government Leader, in light of the fact that there may be an increase in premiums because of the Old Crow fire, will the Government Leader be seeking bids from a number of sources? Will it be a competition bid?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, I am sure I can anticipate these questions coming once more when we are discussing the Budget. We have a contract for insurance that we entered into, as a result of bids that were made.

Question re: School janitorial contracting

Mr. Byblow: I have a question which I will direct, I believe, to the Minister of Education, on the subject of the school janitorial contracting. In the discussions surrounding this subject, we were assured that there were no layoffs intended or planned by Government. However, the Public Service Commissioner was quoted on the radio yesterday saying that the Department of Education did plan to contract out the janitorial work in at least a couple of schools, on a trial basis, in order to compare costs.

I would like to ask the Minister if it is correct that this trial or experiment is really being planned to take place?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, we are still studying costs. I suppose what the Honourable Member is referring to is a new school starting up. There are no planned layoffs, and we still have no conclusive evidence that this is a good plan.

Mr. Byblow: The Minister is confirming that there is no intention to contract out the janitorial work in any of the schools in the Territory. However, I am advised this morning that in at least one school, and that is Dell Van Gorder School in Faro, a directive has come from Government instructing that no janitorial replacements can be called in for any sick leave or absences of the regular janitorial staff. Did the Minister initiate this directive?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I could say that things are on hold as far as the status of janitorial services and any directive to that end would be.

Mr. Byblow: Can the Minister definitively concur or advise, at this point, that Faro is not intended to be contracted out in its janitorial services?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, I can not.

¹³
Question re: Impaired drivers

Mr. Kimmerly: A question to the Minister of Justice. As the Throne Speech did not mention the issue of driving licence suspensions for impaired drivers, and the Minister promised, in the last Session, that there would be a policy forthcoming, what is now the Government policy with regard to that question?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think the Members across the floor will know, in a short period of time, when we table our Legislation, what our policies will be.

Mr. Kimmerly: In view of the Government's information that 87 percent of convicted impaired drivers have alcohol abuse problems, what additional steps are being planned to provide treatment for these persons?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I said, I think the Members opposite will know what our total policy is when I table the Legislation. Until then, I am not prepared to make any statements, and questions in regard to alcohol could probably be more rightly addressed to the Minister of Health and Human Resources.

Mr. Kimmerly: In the new version of the Throne Speech, impaired drivers were mentioned. Have any cost projections been done to project the additional cost of jailing these persons?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is very hard to project costs. How are we to know how many people are going to become convicted under a second offence of driving without a licence after being convicted of having

.08. We do not know. What we hope is that it will deter everybody from driving without their licence. So, how can we predict what the costs are going to be to the Government. I think the Member across the floor is quite capable of analyzing that situation himself.

Question re: Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon

Mrs. McGuire: Just a quick question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When will the work commence on the Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I will have to bring the answer back to that particular question.

Mrs. McGuire: My supplementary is, does the Minister know if the original awarded contractors will be doing the job, or will the tender be up for re-bidding?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I do not know at this time and I will bring that information in.

Question re: Wage ceilings for public servants

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Government Leader. Recently the Government of British Columbia announced wage ceilings for public servants as its anti-inflation measure. I would like to ask the Government Leader if, following that announcement, new instructions were given to this Territory's negotiators in respect of its dealings with its own employees for this year?

¹⁴ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No.

Mr. Penikett: I also understand that British Columbia has also imposed wage controls on its teachers. I would like to ask if the Yukon Government intends to do the same?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that is a highly improper question.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to ask the Government Leader if he has decided on a policy of wage guidelines or wage ceilings for public employees?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: If we do, the Leader of the Opposition will be the first to know.

Question re: Public Service Commission

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Government Leader regarding the Public Service Commission. The position of Sheriff became vacant in December, 1981, and the class concept for sheriff stated that considerable experience in the office of sherrif was a desirable qualification. Can the Government Leader explain to the House why the position for Sheriff was advertised as requiring several years of law enforcement experience at a supervisory level? Why these changes?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The question is raised as a result of an issue that became one for arbitration, in respect to the hiring of employees in Government, and I do not feel that I am competent to answer those questions. The Honourable Member is perfectly free to go to the Public Service Commission and speak to the Public Service Commissioner, and I am sure that he would be able to answer all of the questions.

Mr. Veale: I am quite prepared to do that. Would the Government Leader be instructing the Public Service Commissioner to then give answers to the questions that I will ask?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Not at all. The Public Service Commissioner is, in fact, a servant of the public of this Territory, and if someone has any questions to ask him, he is available, and questions can be asked. I am in no position, once again, to subject the Public Service Commissioner or any other employee of this Government to some kind of an inquisition by the Honourable Member, because he is a Member of this House.

Mr. Veale: It is no inquisition. It is just some simple questions and we require some answers. Would the Government Leader not agree that the Public Service Commissioner, who advertises and hires for a particular position, should probably not be the person to sit in judgment about complaints about how that position is hired?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Once again, the actions taken in this case, and in the others that come up, are pursuant to Legislation passed in this House. The Legislation is called the *Public Service Act*, at this point in time.

If the Honourable Member has a problem, or wants to ask some questions, maybe, rather than him going to the Public Service Com-

missioner, he should write them out and submit them to me as written questions, and I will be happy to get answers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. At this time we will proceed to Orders of the Day, and we will proceed with Government Bills and Orders.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

¹⁵ **Bill No. 12: Second Reading**

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua that Bill No. 12 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua that Bill No. 12 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The Government is introducing Legislation today which deals with income security measures targeted at Yukon senior citizens. As we are all aware, the cost of living in Yukon is quite high when compared with other jurisdictions in Canada. These high costs and continuing inflationary factors impact primarily upon those senior citizens who must rely upon fixed incomes. The Government of Yukon believes that the measure being introduced is important in both practical and philosophical terms, in that it provides necessary income support for senior citizens to assist them in remaining in their own homes for as long as that is possible, and to promote the dignity and self-reliance of these esteemed members of the Yukon community.

The measure to be considered today is the *Act to Amend the Pioneer Utility Grant Act*. I am pleased to announce the amount of the annual Pioneer Grant will increase, from the present \$360 to \$480. This is the second increase in the Pioneer Grant since its introduction in 1978. As all Members will recall, the amount of the Pioneer Grant last changed during the Spring, 1981, Legislative Assembly, when the amount was increased from \$300 to \$360. At that time, in the Spring 1981 Session, I made the commitment to this Assembly that, as the cost of living continued to increase, the amount of the Pioneer Grant would be increased accordingly, and such increases would be brought to the Assembly for review. Today, I am living up to this commitment.

The Pioneer Grant Program has been both a useful and popular program amongst senior citizens. I am certain it has enabled seniors to remain within their own homes and their own communities.

Mr. Veale: I would just like to rise in support of this Legislation. I think it is quite appropriate that we have income support for our senior citizens and encourage them to stay in the Yukon as long as they can.

Mr. Kimmerly: I thank the Minister for her explanation and we in the NDP are very pleased with this measure. The principle is an excellent one and I would compliment the Government for bringing this measure in at this time.

Before we go into Committee, I would like to put the Minister on notice with regard to the general principle that she spoke about — the cost of living increase — and I would hope that she has addressed the projections to the actual increase in the cost of maintaining a residence in the Yukon today, with specific reference to the projected NCPC rate increases which, of course, are far greater than the cost of living increase. I will be very interested in a projection of the actual costs and assessing the specific amount of the Utility Grant. On the general principle, it is an excellent measure, and we support it.

Hon. Mr. Lang: As a long-term Yukoner, I have to rise in support of the Bill before you. I have to commend the Minister of Health and Human Resources for bringing it forward. I think, at the same time, we perhaps better analyze the position of the Members opposite in respect to the principle of the Bill.

It was because of the financial management of this side of the House — which the other side has been condemning us for — that we have had the ability to bring forward this particular measure, at what I would believe to be a very opportune time for those senior citizens who have their home here and are going to continue having their home here. I think it is fair to say that, over the course of the last couple of years, we have managed our money in such a manner that we have fulfilled our social responsibilities and, at the same time, always keeping in mind the financial responsibilities that all Members should have in

respect to the general accountability of Government.

¹⁶ We have managed to, over the past year, to save enough financial resources to be able to bring a measure of this kind in, similar to the other Legislation that has been tabled, and to be discussed at a later date, the *Seniors' Income Supplement Act*. I think it is fair to say that the Conservative Government and the Conservative Party has made it very clear to the public of the Territory that one of the major areas of concern is the senior citizens of Yukon, and to ensure their longevity in respect to staying in Yukon. This measure allows that to happen, it permits it to happen. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that on behalf of the Conservative Party, and those people who believe in the people between the ages of 18 to 65, we have a responsibility to ensure that we have enough finances put aside so we can afford measures of this kind. I am very pleased that with the financial management that we have put forward over the course of the last couple of years, we have managed to bring forward this measure, similar to last year, recognizing the real cost-of-living to those seniors who are still staying in their own home and wish to stay in their own homes, as opposed to going to Government institutions. Further to that, I am very fortunate to have a grandmother who has attained the age of 101, who happens to reside at McCauley Lodge, and I want to commend the staff of that particular Home, who take care, not only of her, but many other senior citizens of Yukon, and they do an admirable job. I say on behalf of the people of Yukon, we are very fortunate to be able to afford those amenities for our senior citizens. One other point, as a Government, we also recognize that it is just, not just Whitehorse, but also the rural communities that are affected. Senior citizens should be able to stay in their homes, whether it be Mayo, Watson Lake, Dawson City, and the list goes on. We have put in senior citizen homes in other ridings which allows that to happen, and also the Pioneer Utilities Grants apply there. On behalf of the people of Porter Creek East and senior citizens throughout the Territory, I think we have to commend the Minister of Health and Human Resources for bringing the measure forward.

¹⁷ **Mrs. McGuire:** This Bill has my undivided attention and full support. Anything that benefits the senior citizens cannot be too much. I have waited patiently throughout many years for this Government to bring in a Bill on exemption of personal property tax for the elderly who own personal property. This practice has been in existence in many provinces, and throughout many of the states, and it is unfortunate that this Government has not had it brought into the Territory.

Mr. Fleming: I rise to support this Bill. I will not yet be in conflict of interest, although very close. We should all remember that people who support themselves, more or less, and are not dependent on Government housing, are certainly doing a favour even to the Government and all the other people of the Yukon Territory. Anyone who does support himself in the times of high cost of power, and so forth, does not hurt us to donate a little of our monies towards them. I, myself, hope that I am never a detriment or a handicap to any peoples or Government. I wish to live in my own little igloo as long as possible, and be allowed to plug in my electric blanket.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 3: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Pearson I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 3 entitled *An Act to Amend the Interpretation Ordinance* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 3 entitled *An Act to Amend the Interpretation Ordinance* be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker Is it your intention to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Minister of Renewable Resources, that Bill No. 3 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Minister of Renewable Resources, that Bill No. 3 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

¹⁸ **Bill No. 2: Third Reading**

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 2 entitled *Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1982-83* be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 2 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

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

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 2 do now pass and that title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 2 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Title agreed to

Mr. Speaker: At this time we are prepared to receive Mr. Commissioner in his role as Lieutenant Governor to give assent to certain Bills.

Commissioner enters the Chamber

Mr. Commissioner: Please be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please your Honour, the Assembly has at its present Session passed a number of bills to which, in the name of, and on behalf of the Assembly, I respectfully request your Assent.

Mr. Clerk: *An Act to Amend the Interpretation Ordinance; Interim Supply Appropriation Act, 1982-83.*

Mr. Commissioner: I hereby Assent to the bills as enumerated by the Clerk.

Commissioner leaves the Chamber

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Graham: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I call the Committee of the Whole to Order. We will be having a short recess, but, immediately after the recess we will be considering Bill No. 4, the Supplementary Estimates.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will now call the Committee of the Whole to Order. The Committee will be considering Bill No. 4, *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1981-82.*

On Bill No. 4

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have sat mute and suffered a little bit the last couple of days in the House, in respect to replies to the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech. I felt I had taken, unwarrantedly, some abuse for a set of Supplementary Estimates that we tabled here, that reflect a total expenditure of \$10,694,000.

Now, I would agree, that said that way, it sounds pretty bad, but, Members opposite knew when they said that, that that was not really the whole story. The fact of the matter is that the Operation and Maintenance Supplementary Estimates that are involved here, total \$1,450,000.

Those expenditures are enumerated on page 2 of the Supplement and a cursory glance will show that the major expenditures are in the Department of Education and the Department of Renewable Resources. Now, in addition to that \$1,450,000, and to offset it, there is \$4,310,000 of additional revenue. Yes, we made a mistake in estimating our revenue. We underestimated to the tune of \$4,310,000.

That revenue is itemized on page 39. We also underestimated the amount of the recoveries that we would be receiving from the Government of Canada, primarily during the course of the year, to the tune of \$578,000. Those recoveries are itemized on page 41.

So, in effect, what has happened is, in respect to Operation and Maintenance, this Supplementary Estimate reflects a surplus of \$3,438,000.

Now, also included in these Supplementaries, are expenditures for capital during the course of the year. There is an additional \$2,500,000 in capital grants, or recoveries, that we did not bargain on getting, and we have spent \$7,649,000 more than we estimated that we would. It will become obvious to Members, as we go through the Supplementary Estimates, that the reason for that is that in order to take advantage of economies of scale that were offered to this Government, by contractors, we accelerated our capital program during this past summer so that on jobs that we anticipated would take two and three years to complete, some contractors said if we would allow them to complete them in one year, or, in some cases, allow them to complete three-year jobs in two years — if we would accelerate our capital program — they would give us a break on costs. We looked at each one of these very, very carefully. We looked at our cash flow position and we judged that we should take advantage, in some instances, of these additional expenditures being incurred during the course of this year. We have done so, and they will become obvious during the item-by-item detailed scrutiny of the Supplementaries.

In respect to loan amortization, we spent \$1,595,000 more than we estimated. Of course, that is a straight recovery item, so that just comes straight back to us. It does not really affect the total. I just wanted to emphasize that these Supplementary Estimates do not indicate an overexpenditure of \$10,694,000 because of bad management of this Government. In fact, on the Operation and Maintenance side, once again, these Supplementaries indicate a surplus of \$3,438,000, and a deficit on the capital side of \$5,000,000, and we knew exactly what we were doing every step of the way.

Mr. Penikett: I have a couple of questions, but I would like to ask the Government Leader's advice before I pursue some of them. I have a number of questions which I had begun to ask in Question Period, but I would agree that, that might not be a perfectly appropriate use of that occasion. I want to ask about the Capital Spending Program. Some of that money is spent, or has already been obviously voted, commitments have been made. I could raise the questions now, or I could raise them in connection with the general debate on the Main Estimates. I am happy to do either, but I would appreciate the Government Leader's advice on that question.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Respectfully, I would suggest that we should make sure that the Members opposite do have time during general debate of the Main Estimates. I think that would be the proper time to do that. If we start mixing it up with the Capital that we are talking about today, we are all going to end up very confused. I am confident that the questions the Honourable Member wants to ask relate to 1982-83 Capital, and we are talking about 1981-82 Capital here.

Mr. Penikett: I have one question in terms of the Recoveries of \$2.5 million. Could the Government Leader elaborate a little bit on the information he gave us a second ago on that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Recovery detail is on page 48, and that is for the Recoveries in respect to Capital. Revenue for O&M is on page 39, Recoveries for O&M is on page 41, and Recoveries for Capital are on page 48.

Mr. Penikett: The reason for my question was that the Government Leader seemed to indicate that he had not anticipated that \$2.5 million. I wonder if he could just explain what he meant by that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: What happens is that during the course of year, we anticipate the expenditure of money on cost-sharing programs, primarily. In some of those programs, if there are funds available and we spend more money, that increases our Recoveries. In this case, that is pretty well what is happening.

Mr. Veale: Just a point of clarification. The Government Leader indicated that we would do the Capital deficit, but he referred to 1982-83, with our O&M of 1982-83. Is the \$5,100,000 deficit on page 1, a 1981-82 Capital deficit?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: That is not a deficit. It is an overexpenditure. I guess, in respect to Budget, it is a deficit, however, we are dealing with working capital as well. Not only Capital working capital but O&M working capital. We meld the two of them together. What it amounts to is that this is money voted, and because we anticipate we

are going to spend it, we vote it this year. We are moving it from money that is voted for next year. We have that capability of being able to move it back and forth that way. If we do not spend it this year, we have the capability of carrying it over to next year. It is not deficit spending *per se*. We overspent what we had voted.

Mr. Veale: Just to be specific, does it apply to cost overruns on Capital projects?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, some of that \$7,649,000 will be cost overruns incurred in 1981-82 programs. As I was saying before, the vast majority, as will become obvious, is simply as a result of acceleration of the construction programs.

Mr. Veale: The Government Leader referred to \$7,000,000. Did he mean \$5,000,000?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. Our actual overexpenditure is \$7,649,000 in Capital. Offsetting that is \$2,500,000 in recoveries.

Mr. Veale: Just one more question. Will the Government Leader be setting out the specifics of the \$7 million figure, just from the Capital side alone. I assume that we will deal with it on the O&M side. From the Capital side alone, is it set out explicitly in these estimates?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: On page 3 is a breakdown by department of those over-expenditures and three under-expenditures. In the body, as we go through these estimates, we will come to each of these areas, item by item.

Mr. Penikett: I would like to ask a question arising from a remark made by the Government Leader and it's something that I hope to pursue sometime in the future. He may wish to defer an answer to some more appropriate time. He used the expression, melding the Capital working capital and the Operating working capital.

In terms of accountability, is there any problem with that melding, to use his words. It occurs to me, that if I were running the private concern, for example, that it might be possible, through some operating procedure, to draw down your Capital working capital to the point where it might not be acceptable to your auditor, for example, and then have to move money from the other accounts. Is there, in terms of the accountability and legal responsibility, any problem in doing that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: If you went wrong, there certainly would be a problem. It is watched very, very closely. It is monitored very closely. When we get down to the final analysis, when we are talking working capital, we are, in fact, talking working capital throughout the whole Government. Both Operation and Maintenance and Capital working capital, but we keep two accounts.

Mrs. McGuire: Just a general question. Mr. Pearson said in his Throne Speech, in regard to the Special ARDA Agreement, that you would be negotiating a new agreement, and also that you would make changes so that it would be available to everyone in outer communities. Could you explain what you meant by that?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The ARDA Agreement that is finished at the end of the year, is one that is designed solely for Indian people. There is no way that a non-Indian person can get any benefit from that particular Agreement. It was designed that way.

We are trying to negotiate an agreement with the Federal Government that other people may be able to take advantage of.

Mr. Byblow: If I am reading correctly what the Government Leader is saying, in the melding of the two budgeting processes, Capital and O&M, the net result of what we have here is — and he does not have to confirm the figures, just the approximations — there are 15 departments, including the corporations and the loan amortization, where there is an increase in O&M over the estimates, and six departments in Capital that have had Capital increases over estimates. Then on the other side of the coin, the balancing is that decreases have taken place in two departments on the O&M side and four departments on the Capital side. That is how the two have been blended, in terms of the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, very simply.

On Clause 1

Clause 1 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: I would like to refer Members to Schedule A of the Bill. Also to the blue book, Estimates, Supplementary No. 1, 1981-82. We will now consider the Yukon Legislative Assembly to the tune of \$112,000 on page 5 of your blue book.

On Legislative Assembly

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This \$112,000 is primarily due to three items.

On April 16, 1981, after the Main Estimates had been dealt with, an *Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance* was passed by this House and that necessitated an expenditure of some \$75,000 to Members of the Legislature in salary increases. That amount had not been included in the Estimates. We also had an expenditure of about \$25,000 in respect to the Special Committee on Food Prices which was set up by this House. We had an expenditure of some \$12,000 to conduct the October 13th by-election for the electoral district of Whitehorse South Centre. All three of these items could not be foreseen by the department when they originally tabled their estimates in the House.

Mr. Kimmerly: In the explanatory note on page 5, it mentions preparatory work for the upcoming general election. What portion of the total \$112,000 is for that function?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would suggest, very respectfully, that it is not very much, because the three items that I gave you total \$112,000; \$75,000 for salaries, \$25,000 for the Special Committee on Food Prices and \$12,000 for the by-election. There has been, though, during the course of the year, a considerable amount of work done in this particular office in respect to the forthcoming election. It is deemed to be necessary work, and we did not provide any money. It has sort of been absorbed in the normal surplusses in the department during the course of the year, vacancy factors and so on.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps this should have been brought up in General Debate, but since it is going to be repeating itself through all of these votes, perhaps I could have an answer and never ask it again. At what point are these Supplementaries prepared, and how do they relate to the Estimates that you have just tabled?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: These Supplementaries are based on what is referred to in the Territorial Government as the Period Nine Variance Reports. That is a reconciliation of all expenditures, recoveries and revenues by each department to December 31st of a particular year. Then, based on that known number, plus what is anticipated for the next three months, or until March 31st, the end of the fiscal year, these Supplementary Estimates are made up. That is why, of course, normally, because it is impossible to guess exactly right on, even for that three month period, there is always one more Supplementary Estimate because, in the final analysis, legislatively, we must vote to the very penny exactly what we expend. We must account, on this side of the House, to you, for every penny that is spent by the Government. It all must be accounted for.

Then, the relationship, not to what has been tabled in the House, but rather to what was tabled in March of 1982, is the difference we are talking about. The vote up-to-date is what we tabled in March of 1981. For instance, on page 5, we voted \$989,000. We are now saying that to March 31st of this year, we are going to spend \$1,101,000.

Mr. Byblow: So then, the known estimate of expenditure by Government up to the end of March 31st, 1982, is this revised vote figure, and that is the same figure that is used in the Main Estimates as the 1981-82 forecast. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, that is correct. That is referred to in the new Estimates as the forecast.

Mr. Veale: I am sorry to belabour this, but could I just have that breakdown again. The by-election was \$12,000, Food Prices was...

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The by-election was \$12,000, Food Prices was \$25,000 and the indemnities about \$75,000.

Mrs. McGuire: I wish to correct the Government Leader on the statement he made that the Special ARDA was designed only for Native people, that they could be the only recipients of it, I think that is what he meant. I would like to read out this bit where it says, "The object of the Special ARDA program is to encourage economic development and social adjustment of disadvantaged people, primarily of Native ancestry." On record, there are people who are not of Native ancestry who qualify for this grant with provisions of hiring Native people. So it is not strictly for Native people.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I did not realize that the Honourable Member was going to get me into a dotting i's, crossing t's session. The fact of the matter is that the program is run on the basis that it is going to be Native people who benefit by it. That is the criteria of the program.

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing right now the Yukon Legisla-

tive Assembly. Are there any more questions in regards to that particular department? Shall we carry the amount of \$112,000 under Yukon Legislative Assembly?

*Yukon Legislative Assembly agreed to
On Executive Council Office*

Mr. Chairman: I shall now refer you to page 7 in your Supplementary book, to the amount of \$99,000.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I will give you a bit of a breakdown of what this \$99,000 involves. There is \$36,000 for salaries, \$42,000 for travel and communications, \$10,000 for rentals of aircraft and \$10,000 for supplies and materials. The Deputy Minister of the department left unexpectedly. I do not mean she left unexpectedly, it was unexpected at the beginning of the year. It was not accounted for and as a result of that, there were benefits she had accruing to her that were fairly substantial, in that she had worked for this Government for 15 years. That was an unforeseen expense, and there was a salary increase that was somewhat larger than we had anticipated in our Budget for the staff. Travel and communications, airfares — all of the airfares for the Cabinet Ministers are included in this — went up considerably during the year. We did not foresee that. Telephone rates also went up.

²⁷ In respect to the rental of aircraft, the same thing. We find it necessary to rent aircraft to travel, in some instances, around the Territory, and that did cost us more than we had anticipated.

Supplies and materials, exactly the same thing. It was just more expensive than we had anticipated.

Mr. Veale: Could the Government Leader indicate what part of the \$36,000 went to the Executive Assistants being hired, or is that not in there at all?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Oh, yes. That is all in there. I guess, probably, I am going to have to explain it all again.

We did not increase any person years hiring these people. They were both employees of the Government and in this department. We simply moved them.

Mr. Veale: You have not given any figures on how much of the 36,000 actually goes to those salaries. How much went to the Deputy Minister benefits and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is going to be very difficult if we start breaking down how much went to an individual person. What I am trying to say, is that it is highly likely that other than for the amount of money that we did not provide for in the Budget for salary increases — and that is a small percentage figure because, right now, I cannot recall exactly what we did provide for, although there were some unforeseen salary increases — there is nothing. In other words, those jobs are not additional jobs. They were not additional jobs to this Government from the day that they started.

Mr. Kimmerly: These are minor questions, perhaps, but I look at the 1981-82 Main Estimates, and on page 17 the vote is \$820,800, in the Supplementaries the figure is \$821,000. I realize that it is a small difference but is there an explanation for that difference?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, this is called rounding off. Now, you will find in the 1982-83 Estimates everything is rounded off to the closest \$1,000, and is rounded off either up or down depending upon whether it broke down to the \$500 mark, above or below it. That is simply all it is.

Mr. Kimmerly: A similar question, if this is passed, the revised vote is going to be \$920,000 and looking at the 1982-83 Estimates, the forecast is \$917,000. Is that also rounding off, or why is there that difference?

²⁸ **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have not got my 1982-83 Estimates here. In fact, the revised vote is going to be \$920,000. That is what we are doing in this House right now. We are not dealing with 1982-83. We are talking about the Supplementary Estimates for 1982-83. Now, it is \$920,000 that is going to get voted.

Mr. Kimmerly: Of the \$42,000 in travel costs, is the Minister able to give us a breakdown as to what proportion of that is within the Territory travel, and what is without, and is it airfares, or airfares plus accommodation, and per diem expenses and those sorts of things?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I would guess, in my own instance, that some two-thirds of the cost is outside the Territory travel, one-third in. In respect to the other Ministers, it would be closer to one-half, at least, outside, and one-half in. It is all inclusive, travel costs are travel costs:

fares, per diems, expenses, the whole works.

Mr. Veale: The Government Leader referred to two people who were moved. Where were they moved from and where were they moved to? Did they receive additional salaries in that move?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, they were both in the Executive Council Office. The salaries and wages for those people who work as support staff to the Cabinet Ministers, upstairs, are included in this Budget, along with the Executive Council Office, which is downstairs on this floor. Both of these people were Territorial employees who simply became contractual employees as a result of that transfer. They were employees that were in the Government and they just transferred from one job to another.

Mr. Veale: Were there any replacements hired for the jobs they left?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We have since hired one person, but I am not absolutely certain whether it is a replacement or not.

*²⁹ Executive Council agreed to
On Department of Education*

Mr. Chairman: I would like to refer Committee Members to page 9, with the amount of \$5,273,000 under the Department of Education.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I think the explanation pretty well speaks for itself. We were, on the O&M, \$773,000 over. This was due to Resource Corps activity such as building wildlife facilities, the Pelly dorm, Fifth Avenue Residence, Carmacks Pool, I think — a number of items — interviewing, under recruitment, bringing people up for interviews. At the same time, there were recoveries of \$613,000 under the Resource Corps cost-sharing, so that is to be subtracted from the \$773,000.

Under the Capital, of that \$4,500,000, \$3,609,000 of it, most of it, in other words, is due to being a year ahead on the Porter Creek School. We advanced it a year. We are about a year ahead. We are also ahead on the Carmacks School, and there was an overexpenditure on the estimates for Christ the King renovations. That about accounts for the \$5,273,000 total, O&M and Capital.

Mr. Veale: \$3,600,000 is required for the advance completion of the Junior Secondary School. Would the Minister give a history as to why that was advanced. I do not recall it being advanced. I assumed it was going according to schedule rather than being advanced.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, it is a year ahead of schedule.

Mr. Veale: I know the Government Leader has been through this, but this \$3,600,000 being an advance, is that something that is going to be voted on the 1982-83 Budget? Where is it coming from?

³⁰ **Hon. Mrs. McCall:** It was in the Budget. It was simply that when the tenders went out for contract — from year-to-year, prices change so much — the contractors want to have that condensed. They do not want to string it out any longer than they have to because it is more cost to them. So, in fact, we are a year ahead.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps the Government Leader is anticipating my question, but I still do not quite understand. Is the \$3,600,000 the original estimated amount which the contractor said, look, we had better do it all in one year instead of two if you want that figure? Or is it, in fact, a much higher figure than anticipated because of increased costs?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: If the Minister will allow, what happened, in this particular case, was that the cost of the school was voted at \$7 million and something, and we allowed for, say, \$2.5 million in our Capital Estimates for 1981-82, where we would have been allowing for, in our program forecast of Capital Estimates, the remainder in 1982-83.

When we go to Ottawa to deal, in respect to money, they look at the total amount and, if they approve the project, then we know that we are going to get that money. We do not have to get it re-voted in Ottawa. So then it becomes a case of talking to the contractor. The contractor is saying to us, "We will save you some money if, in fact, you will allow us to build it all in one year. We have bid on it in two, but if you will allow us, we will build it all in one and we will save you some money, save us some money, and everybody will be happier. You will get your building quicker." That is the way it happens. We can safely do that, if we have enough working capital to be able to carry us over until the 1st of April 1982 when we can then draw down new money from the Federal Government. We cannot put any of the 1982 money until April

1st, 1982. It is a case of us using our own working capital in order to take advantage of this kind of thing. That is what has happened in this case. There has been an acceleration of this particular school by \$3,600,000, that would have been voted for 1982-83.

Mr. Veale: Essentially, then, we are just drawing down on 1981-82 Capital. We are not voting on 1982-83. Or are we voting on 1982-83?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, we are voting 1981-82 money. If we spend it in 1981-82, we have to vote it in 1981-82. We are using our working capitals, at this point in time.

Mr. Kimmerly: I listened to the Minister's explanation about the Resource Corps, the Pelly Dorm and the Carmacks pool and interviewing for a fairly large amount of money. My question is, would she identify the relevant figures for each of those four categories?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I do not think I have a further breakdown of those figures. No, I have not. I can get them for the Honourable Member. They did include utilities and recruitment.

Mr. Byblow: On the O&M side of this vote, as indicated, there is a Supplementary being voted on for \$773,000. The Minister indicated that the Recoveries of \$613,000, the detail of which is on page 42, would be actually subtracted from that. I think that is not correct. In fact, in terms of the amount estimated originally for expenditure, the department has overrun by \$1.3 million. Is that a correct interpretation? If we have \$773,000 being voted now, but with a Recovery of \$613,000, theoretically that would have been that amount of overexpenditure. It is just that certain Recoveries were not anticipated and were not spent.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The Resources Corps program is federally cost-shared, so those Recoveries are against that amount.

Mr. Byblow: I see how the Recoveries on page 42 break into the total amount. On the Capital side, the Minister pointed out that \$3.6 million was an advancement on the Porter Creek School. I did not hear where the additional Capital expenditure is being proclaimed.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Additional monies are for the Carmacks School, that is another one that is ahead of schedule, and the estimates on Christ the King remodelling were over by \$44,000. There are a number of smaller amounts that were revoted, not spent in the 1980-82 period, such as the Teslin grade expansion, the Watson Lake Secondary, the Vocational Centre renovations, Vocational Centre mobile units, and the Haines Junction School.

³¹ *Department of Education agreed to
On Consumer and Corporate Affairs*

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This amount of \$37,000 is to cover some of the overruns that were encountered when we increased the Transport and Public Utilities Board and the Electrical Public Utilities Board by forming an administration branch.

This is the major increase in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Mr. Byblow: What does this administrative unit consist of in terms of staffing, in terms of materials, in terms of its total \$37,000 expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The Public Administration Branch now consists of the Transport and Public Utilities Board and the Electrical Public Utilities Board, a Secretary to the Board and an enforcement officer for the Transport Board.

Mr. Byblow: I take it that these two positions are in place now, is that correct? If so, for how long?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, they are in position. They have been in position for three or four months.

*Consumer and Corporate Affairs agreed to
On Health and Human Resources*

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, those amounts over in the O&M Budget and in the Capital Budget are exactly as described.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have another question relating to the 1981-82 Estimates and the 1981-82 Forecast. Mention was made yesterday by Government Members that the Supplementary Estimates explain the differences. In this department, if we look at the 1981-82 Estimate for Social Assistance it is \$1,760,300. In the 1981-82 Forecast it is \$1,870,000, a difference of \$110,000. My question is, if the Government is now forecasting an overexpenditure of that large an amount, why is it not included in the Estimates at this time?

³³ **Hon. Mrs. McCall:** These figures came from the Department of Finance and, as the Minister of Finance is not here, I am afraid I cannot answer that.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the Minister aware of a \$110,000 overrun in the Social Assistance Budget?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: If the Member would like to ask the Minister of Finance, he is here now?

Mr. Kimmerly: I will ask the Minister of Finance, then. Yesterday, Government Members made reference to the Supplementary Estimates as explaining the difference between the 1981-82 Estimates and the 1981-82 forecast. Looking on page 13 of the Supplementary Estimates, there is an estimate of an overrun, or an overexpenditure, over the 1981-82 estimates. However, if we look at the 1981-82 Estimates for the department, specifically on page 76, under Social Assistance, the estimate is \$1,760,300 and in the new Estimates, the 1981-82 forecast, it is \$1,870,000, a difference of approximately \$110,000. My question to the Minister of Finance is, given the size of that difference, why is it not in the Supplementaries to this date?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not have a copy of the 1981-82 Estimates here. I guess it is an oversight on my part. I thought if any Member had a problem with the difference in numbers that, just out of sheer courtesy, they would bring that kind of questions to our attention. If you wish, I shall take the time of the House and go and get a copy and try and answer the Member's question.

Mr. Chairman: It is the general opinion of the Committee to have a short recess at this time.

Recess

³⁴ **Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee back to Order.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I think, after having a short consultation with the Honourable Member, we have agreed that his question would be more properly asked, and it could be answered in far greater detail, if it did wait for the Main Estimates.

Mr. Veale: Was there an additional automobile or snowmobile bought for the Old Crow nursing station this year?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: It is a request that I made several times to the Federal people. I described the plight of the nurses who have to run from one end of the town to the other in 50 below, or so. I have never heard whether it was delivered. I do not believe it was.

Mr. Veale: It was a request, though, was it not, for a van or something?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: She had to go on foot, and she lives at the other end of the town from the nursing station. If she was called and it was an emergency, she had to try and make her way through the town as quickly as she could in whatever weather. It was a request for a snowmobile for her.

Mr. Veale: My understanding was that there was also a request for an actual van of some nature to take a sick person from their home to the nursing station.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: There may have been a request, but that did not come through me. The only one that came through me was from Helen Charlie, when we were up on a Cabinet visit, describing the situation and asking for a snowmobile. There could have been a request for a van, but it must have gone straight to the Federal people.

Mr. Chairman: Should the amount of the \$365,000 carry?

*Health and Human Resources agreed to
On Municipal and Community Affairs*

Mr. Chairman: I refer the Committee to page 15 at this point.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: It is pretty well self-explanatory. On the O&M side, the \$8,000 was a combination of various things. Some were over, some under, but the total net amount was \$8,000. This took in such things as administration, lands, technical services, et cetera, et cetera. On the Capital side, the \$766,000 reduction was primarily due to reduced expenditures, or expenditures that were voted and have now been delayed.

³⁵ **Mr. Veale:** Could the Minister outline which projects were reduced or delayed?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I will give you a list. One was that there was less work done on the Porter Creek Access Road, the Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon, the Mayo Administration Building was spread over two years. Those are the basic ones. We did not spend as much money

as we figured on land development. A fire truck due was not available so we did not take receipt of it. Those are the major ones in that particular program.

*Department of Municipal and Community Affairs agreed to
On Tourism and Economic Development*

Mr. Chairman: The next one is on page 17 of your blue book, a decrease of \$292,000.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am assuming that the Members opposite really do not have too many questions in that respect. It is largely confined to the Capital portion of the Budget, where there is a carryover in the Tourist Subsidiary Agreement, in respect to monies not spent. For example, we have a situation where \$380,000 was not spent this past year, but will be this year, to complete our plans for the Tourist Subsidiary Agreement. Under the Energy Agreement, we did have a surplus of \$35,000, due to the fact that we had a situation where we did not have that many applicants. The Highway Signs and Rest Stops, \$20,000 did not proceed during the current year due to negotiations at the Cassiar turnoff, and you will recall that we signed an agreement with the City of Whitehorse, late last year, for Whitehorse improvements, and most of the work is going to be done this year.

Mr. Byblow: Under the provisions of the Tourism Sub-Agreement, the Minister cited, I believe, three projects. My question would be, do those three projects entail the entire \$380,000, or are there additional projects, other than the three he mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The difference is, and I should just correct myself on that, was approximately \$800,000 that was not spent last year. I believe I said \$308,000. If you look at your Main Estimates, on the Capital side, there is an amount of money being voted for in this coming year in respect to projects which would get detailed examination during the Main Estimates.

Mr. Byblow: I am still not clear. We are voting back the \$383,000 on the Capital side. He has cited the Energy Agreement as comprising \$35,000 of that, because it was not spent due to insufficient applications. He cited the Highway Signs and Reststops programs as returning \$25,000. He cited the Whitehorse Business Improvements for an unspecified amount, but I believe, as I recall, that it was \$100,000. That total is approximately \$150,000 to \$160,000. Where is the additional \$200,000?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, on the Operation and Maintenance side, we are estimating an average of roughly \$90,000, which is going to be partially recovered through the Yukon River Basin, and various other things. Also in Tourism Planning and Development, we have some overexpenditures in that area, in respect to readjustments of salaries, and that type of thing within the administration. We are getting recoveries from the Government of Canada in respect to the cancelled Federal-Provincial Ministers of Tourism Conference, which the Federal Government is picking up, in view of the fact that they cancelled it. It had been planned for Dawson City.

There are very minor amounts of money on the O&M side Budget. On the Capital side of the Budget, we had a number of projects, as I indicated, that did not go ahead.

For example, as I indicated, in the Tourists Subsidiary Agreement, there were plans to go ahead with a number of projects, but they were strictly in the planning stages, and subsequently did not go forward, which will be revoted in the forthcoming Main Estimates, a result of the \$6,000,000 agreement that we negotiated with the Government of Canada. This will be the last year coming up, as far as that particular Sub-Agreement is concerned.

There were various programs that, for one reason or another, there were no applications for, or were strictly in the planning stages. Subsequently, the money that had been planned to have been spent was not spent.

Mr. Byblow: I guess, what I was seeking was a breakout of what has not proceeded, and therefore the money not used. It is all fine and well to restore the money to the general coffers, which is essentially what we are doing. What I wanted was a breakout of how the \$383,000 was originally budgeted, but is now not spent? We have had accounting for about \$160,000 of it, but there is approximately \$200,000 missing.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The main programs were the Watson Lake Interpretive Centre, and Carcross. There was some question that we are

going to solve in the next couple of weeks, in Dawson City, about the Carnegie Library versus Diamond Tooth Gertie's. Those were the major projects.

Mr. Byblow: Unfortunately, the Minister could not provide the actual figures, but I guess I will let it stand at that. On the Recoveries side for the O&M, we are voting an increased expenditure of \$91,000, inclusive of some recovery that is detailed on page 44. \$62,000 has been recovered through, what the Supplementaries refer to as third party recoveries. How does that come about? What are the third party recoveries, in this type of a department?

Hon. Mr. Lang: For example, we may be working on a Yukon River Basin Study. If we do, then we recover that money through that agreement, from the Federal Government, under Operations and Maintenance, where you vote the money.

For an example, the \$7,000 that we had allocated, that we spent in preparation for the Federal-Provincial Conference. In my conversations with the Minister responsible at the Federal level, he indicated to me that, in view of the fact that he took the initiative to cancel it, that he was going to pick up the costs of that work. That is basically how it works.

*Tourism and Economic Development agreed to
On Department of Justice*

Mr. Chairman: Shall now move to page 19 in your blue book. The amount of \$787,000, under Justice.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Most of this expense is because of the Police Services Agreement. As you all know, we were in the process of negotiating a new Police Services Agreement, and no one knew what the costs were going to be, so we left the Police Services Agreement at the same percentage as we were paying last year, and when the new agreement came in, we have to make up the difference. The other is the \$316,000 that was budgeted for the Correctional Centre. It was budgeted in 1980-81, and we are now spending it in 1981-82.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested in reconciling the Minister's statement about the Police Services Agreement and the explanation about the Police Services Agreement and greater than anticipated court and corrections activity. My first question is, what portion is for Police Services and what portion of the \$471,000 is increased court activity and what portion is increased corrections activity?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I believe that corrections amounted to about \$22,000. The court activity was in the neighbourhood of \$236,000. The Police Services Agreement, we think is going to be in the neighbourhood of three-quarters of a million dollars, but we have never adjusted that with the Federal Government, yet. We have never reached a satisfactory agreement with them. That is what it would be if we billed under, what we would consider would be our billing. However, that has not happened. There are other miscellaneous changes in it, but the court services was a total of \$236,000. What we have been billed so far, from the Federal Government, for Police Services Agreement plus the court services brings us up to this total of \$471,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: Of the figure, \$236,000 for court services, can the Minister identify what portion is attributable to the recruitment of the second Judge, and the extra costs involved of a Deputy Judge being employed for almost a year, and what portion is an increased expenditure in the Legal Aid Budget?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The increase in the utilization of Deputy Judges is \$64,000. For legal services, the increase is approximately \$48,000.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister just complete that then, if it is \$64,000 for the Deputy Judge and \$48,000 for Legal Aid or Legal Services, what is the balance then of the \$236,000?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There are increases in transportation requirements resulting from deaths, there are increased costs for attendance at Uniform Law Conferences, and that is pretty well it.

Mr. Veale: We have to find about \$150,000 or so, could we have a breakdown of that? I am not sure what transportation for deaths is, unless that is Coroners. What about the Uniform Law Conference? Could we just have a detailed out to get the balance of \$236,000?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not have every last little dollar here. There is about \$25,000 for deaths, I have here. There is a total of about \$50,000 for the Uniform Law Conference.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the Uniform Law Conference a separate item from Legal Services? Do I understand it correctly then?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: No, it is all part of it. There are also balances. There are staff vacancies that balance off approximately \$30,000. There are others in Court Services. There are vacant person years there that balance it off. The total package, in that department, comes to \$236,000.

Mr. Veale: Well, the Minister is at about \$187,000 now, by my calculation of \$64,000 for the Deputy Judge and \$48,000 for Legal Services, \$25,000 for the transportation of deceased people, and \$50,000 for the Uniform Law Conference. What is the balance?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The \$236,000 is Legal Aid, I am talking about. \$64,000 is utilization of Deputy Judges, \$76,000 is in Legal Services. For Legal Aid I have one line here, \$236,000. It is the extra that we had to pay for legal aid.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would, perhaps, give the Minister notice at this time — it is not a question under the Supplementaries — but if the Supplementary Estimate for Legal Aid is an additional \$236,000, I would be very interested to learn the explanation of the Minister's forecast in the 1982-83 Estimates of a decrease in Legal Aid and a decrease in Court Services. That is notice of a question.

Also, on the Police Services Agreement, there is a phenomenal increase in costs. I will be asking for all of the information that the Minister can gather about the Yukon control, if any, of the cost of those services.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think I can answer both questions right now.

In Legal Aid, for example, in one case alone, the Chartray Case, cost this Government many, many thousands of dollars. We had to bring witnesses from Quebec, and what not.

The Police Services Agreement is out of our control. We negotiate with Canada, the same as the provinces do. We pay a fixed percentage of the cost. We are billed by the Federal Government and we pay it.

Mr. Veale: The Minister has not given us a figure for the Police Services Agreement. Is that because there has been no billing and you are doing an estimate. I have just heard \$236,000 for Legal Aid, \$64,000 for Deputy Judges, \$48,000 for Legal Services, \$25,000 for transportation of deceased, and \$50,000 for Uniform Law Conference. Those are all correct, as I understand it, to that point. What is the amount then for the Police Services?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I did say what the amount was for the Police Services Agreement. I said that we have to pay, under the agreement as signed, will cost us \$750,000. However, we have not been billed that amount, so it has not cost us the \$750,000 to this date. It might still cost us that amount of money. We have not been billed, what we would calculate as the full amount we should be billed for. We have been billed at less than that amount. So, we could possibly end up paying quite a bit more money yet.

Mr. Veale: My question is specifically, what have we been billed for? If you have not been billed for the \$750,000, what have you been billed for that you are putting in this Estimate.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: As I stated, the Police Services Agreement is \$750,000. There are other balances, as I said. The total extra in Legal Services is \$48,000, \$41,000 in Court Services, \$236,000 in Legal Aid. We are saving \$40,000 in administration because of lack of person years, we did not fill positions. The total that these figures come to is \$471,000.

Mr. Penikett: The Minister may wish to take this question as notice, but, I will ask it now, in case he has an answer or is prepared to detail one.

On every occasion, when the Estimates of Justice Department have been before the House in the life of this Legislature, questions have been raised about the terms of the Base Agreement. The Minister's principle predecessor, the present Member for Porter Creek West, will recall numerous exchanges in this House; expressions of opinions by all Members as to the terms of the Base Agreement and the lack of influence that this Government seems to have on the terms.

Specifically, they were asked on a number of occasions if we could have included specific requirements for us in terms of policing, like numbers of officers on the beat at certain hours, and in certain parts of the Territory, certain types of services that we might regard as important, which the police might not have provided

for. Perhaps even a decrease in certain kinds of police services that are being provided that we did not regard as the most useful for this community. Can I ask the Minister if any such terms were negotiated? If not, why not? If they were, will he, at the time of the Main Estimates, be bringing to the House some explanation of the successful conclusions on those negotiations in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The Police Services Agreement is negotiated by the Provinces and the Territories together, with the Federal Government. It is not an agreement that we negotiate on our own. We have very little control over what happens in the Police Services Agreement. We have been fortunate, this time, to get a little bit more ability to get information from the R.C.M.P., but we have very little control over it.

The Federal Government will not give up control. They are contracting the R.C.M.P. to the provinces and they expect to maintain control.

Mr. Penikett: To say the least we, along with all the other provinces, are paying a fairly big bill for police services. I assume, since we have made these rhetorical points in respect of health services and other agreements in the past, that we did, at least, demand some say as to the kind of police services that we would be provided. Were such representations made by this Government, and what was the response of the R.C.M.P.?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: These points were made by not only this Government, but by every province of Canada. It is to no avail. As long as the provinces are contracting the service from the Federal Government, the Federal Government says that they will maintain control, no matter what percentage is paid. Sure, we are paying 56 percent of the costs, right now, of police services in the Territory. That is the cost that we are billed for. That is what we pay. We cannot argue about it. We have some little bit of control over whether there is going to be an extra policeman, say, in Carcross. They have some responsibility to talk with us about that now. They did not even have that before this last agreement. We have very little control over it.

Mr. Penikett: To say the least, I am astounded that we should be paying such a bill, and have no say, nor should any of the provinces, as to the nature of their services. Is the Minister saying that if we say we need a certain kind of police service, this community demands that service, that they say it is none of your business? If we say that we do not want a certain kind of police service, or we do not need it at the same level that it is being provided, that is none of your business?

Let me state the obvious. I am not betraying any confidences. I had an Officer of the Force comment to me that, in this City, during those few hours of the day which are the high crime periods, there are hardly any policemen on duty. Yet, if you go into that Divisional Headquarters during the daytime, there are dozens and dozens of people filing and typing and so forth, many of which are services we are paying for. We are not paying for all of them. Is the Minister saying that our representations, and the other provinces representations, as to the kind of services, even in broad terms, were not listened to responded to at all? That they have absolutely no accountability to us in regard to the nature of those services?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The Member has almost stated the facts. We have very little control over it. That is why provinces have opted out of the Police Services Agreement — Ontario and Quebec — but the problem is, right now, that the cost of going into a Provincial Police Service is slightly more than it is to stay under the Federal plan. So, as long as it is cheaper to stay with the Federal plan, the provinces will stay with it. We do have some ability to talk with the R.C.M.P. and ask that we have extra police for certain areas, at certain times. Anything that becomes an extra expense to that Police Agreement, we pay for.

Mr. Penikett: If I can just ask two questions which I would like answered. The Minister may not be able to answer them now, but if he could get an answer at some point, I would appreciate it.

As I understand it constitutionally, the provinces are responsible for the administration of justice in their jurisdictions and, to a limited extent, so are we. I would appreciate the Minister advising the House, at some point, if he can, after consultation with his Deputy, exactly why it is that we have constitutionally so little control over the activities of the public servants — because that is what they are — who are providing this service which we pay for? It seems to me that there is a constitutional point there, which puzzles me.

Let me get very specific now. Numbers of Members of this House have asked, on a number of occasions, that certain specifics, such as alluded to by the Minister, such as foot patrols in the evening in the downtown area of Whitehorse, be provided. I know that occasionally you see policemen there. Have the R.C.M.P. been responsive to that request and, if so, have they billed us extra for it, or have they accommodated that within the existing Budget?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Actually, right now, the R.C.M.P. perform services that we are not paying for, such as policing in the municipalities, such as transportation of criminals, guarding of prisoners. That is not an R.C.M.P. function, but they do it for us at no cost. However, they are, right now, making noises about collecting that. I guess it is the same as if I contracted you to do a job. As long as you do the job, I can ask you to move your manpower around, or whatever, but your contract is to do the job and as long as you do it, then it is up to me to pay for it. That is the Federal Government position. We pay 56 percent of the total cost. The other 44 is paid for by the feds for the feds, but we only pay 56 percent of the cost. They are not willing to give us any control. Incidentally, the costs could go up 1 percent a year until we reach, I think it is the 77 percent level, something like that. I have not, as yet, signed that Police Services Agreement. We have not got around to signing it yet.

Mr. Penikett: Just one last point. I would hope the Minister would consider the possibilities of there being some kind of addendum or letter of agreement, or some kind of communication of record, as to the kind of nature of the services we have requested. It seems to me a most unusual contract in which the vendor or purchaser did not have any say as to the nature of the service they provide. The Minister uses the example of a job and I would think if I were contracting to have a job done, I would define that job, and not someone else. That is all I want to say.

Mr. Veale: Just a question on the nature of that contract. Is that a contract that the Minister actually signs with the Federal Government? Was it something the Minister had input to in those collective negotiations with the other provinces?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It was a ten year contract. As I stated, I have not yet signed it. They are still busy with various provinces. They have not got down to the Territorial Government level yet.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister make that a public document? Is there any reason that it cannot be a public document when it is signed?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I have no problem with the Legislature seeing the Agreement. It is an Agreement that is signed between us and the Federal Government.

Mr. Veale: Getting back to the additional monies required under the Police Agreement in this Supplementary, I have added up all the figures you have disclosed in terms of Legal Aid, Corrections and the number of costs, such as Legal Services, Transportation, Uniform Law Conference, and I get a figure of \$128,000 that is going to come out in addition to the Police Services Agreement. Is that the portion of \$471,000 that you are going to attribute to the Police Services?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I cannot give you the exact figures. If that is the kind of figures you want, you are going to have to let me bring the figures back. I do not have the details down to the dollar.

Department of Justice agreed to

On Department of Highways and Public Works

Mr. Chairman: I shall now refer the Committee to page 21. Under Highways and Public Works, we will now consider the amount of \$2,628,000.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: It is fairly well explained in the notes there. Considering the O&M underexpenditure of \$782,000, that was mainly due to three or four things. One of them was that we had scheduled work to be done on part of the road, and we had a lot of problems up on the Dempster last year. We had to move the equipment up the Dempster, and that was recoverable from the Federal agreement. Another portion of the road that we had scheduled for maintenance last year, Public Works Canada decided that that would be part of the road that we would go ahead and do some work on. We felt it was inadvisable to spend money on a road that was going to be repaired. The early part of the year, we had less snow, although a lot of those funds have been expended in the latter part.

⁴⁴ We had plans to work on the latter part of last year on the Mayo-

Keno road. Due to the bad weather, we did not do it. This will be a priority to be done this next spring.

On the Capital side, we had an expenditure of over \$3,410,000. After we had prepared the Budget, Northern Affairs came forward with two more projects that took up the greater part of that. One was the Carcross-Skagway road and the other one was some work we had done on the Dempster. At that particular time, when we were preparing the Budget last year, we did not anticipate this, so that is there now. That is 106½ percent recoverable.

Mr. Veale: Just as a general comment, I am surprised, and perhaps the Minister can elaborate on this, but there was a great deal of complaint this winter about the type of service being provided, particularly in this Whitehorse-Carmacks section. The concern was, it was too icy. Yet, there is an amount of money that remains unexpended. Was there some slackening off of Government graders, or something, that happened this winter, because there was an incredible situation that occurred on the South Highway as well. The truckers felt there was inadequate service and inadequate sanding.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I think it was quite the contrary. This particular year was a bad year as far as maintenance on the highway in connection with ice. We have expended twice as much sand up to the first of this month this year than in any previous year, so we did not slacken up one bit. The results of the slippery roads and the conditions we experienced were due to warmth in the early part of the year and then all of a sudden it turned very cold. When you get down below 20 degrees, calcium will not work and the sand that we put on there did not cling to the road because it was so cold. Therefore, no matter what we did, we did not seem to improve the conditions of the road. I am not denying the roads were slippery, but we did everything within our means to address this problem. There was nothing we could do that would work.

Mr. Veale: The Minister referred to equipment that was up on the Dempster. Is he saying that that was equipment that remained up there, that was not utilized because it was too far away?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I will clarify that. What I said was that we had intended to do maintenance work on another section of the road, but due to the circumstances up there, we took up that equipment. It was recoverable, therefore resulting in less work being done on that particular section of the road than we had anticipated doing. We could only use the equipment in one place. The other was considered a priority at that time. As a result, we did not do some maintenance on other portions. That was not a great amount, but that was one of the reasons why we had a surplus.

⁴⁵ **Mr. Veale:** Where was that equipment taken from in order to put it in place up on the Dempster Highway? Just as an aside, you are saying that sand is not working at 30 and 40 below. Has the department resolved that? Is it using something else that is going to work?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I think we are confusing two things. It was in the summer time when we were doing the work up on the Dempster, caused by the washout of bridges. Now as far as the sanding is concerned, we tried several things. We heated sand, we used liquid calcium chloride. But, to this date, none of them proved very satisfactory when we experience conditions of 30 and 40 below.

Mr. Penikett: This is a subject on which, following a representation I received from White Pass drivers, I had written a lengthy letter to the Ministry over there and, if I am going to get a reply soon, I will not bother asking any questions now.

I wonder if the Minister gave some weather report for the winter, and I think we understand that situation. I understand also that there were, in fact, not as high maintenance costs last summer as there might have been in some seasons because of the wet. I am not sure about that. Maybe the Minister could elaborate. Perhaps he would, for the record, elaborate a little further on his answer in respect to the road between here and Carmacks. The most common criticism I heard, and the Minister will know I have written several letters on this to him about it, was that the road was not being graded to as well as it could have been, for fear of damaging the pavement. Would the Minister care to comment on that complaint?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Whether we run those graders over the road this year as much as last year, I am not prepared to say. When you have a very thin skim of ice over the road, it is very hard to do. There are limits to how much you can grade it. What we did to overcome that,

and the department felt that it was the practical solution, was to use some extra sand. At the time that the road got cold, of course, the first truck that came along would push the sand off. It would not adhere to the road. As I mentioned before, we tried other things and nothing would work. We certainly tried various other means to improve the conditions.

46 Mr. Penikett: Just one last point. Will the Minister be replying to my letter on this question.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Maybe I have been remiss, but I do not recall a letter that I have not answered. I will certainly check and if I have it, I will certainly get the answer back to you.

*Department of Highways and Public Works agreed to
On The Public Service Commission*

Mr. Chairman: I shall now refer you to page 23 in the amount of \$51,000 under the Public Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Public Service Commission is overexpended by \$51,000. A small portion of this \$51,000 is attributable to training expenditures but, the majority of the \$51,000, was required because of increased relocation costs.

Mr. Penikett: Is that coming or going?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: It is primarily coming.

Mr. Veale: You talk about relocation costs. Is this specifically for Public Service Commission employees?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: All of the relocation costs, for all employees recruited in this Government, are covered by this vote.

*Public Service Commission agreed to
On Intergovernmental Relations*

Mr. Chairman: We shall now consider Intergovernmental Relations in the amount of \$4,000.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We can only attribute this to the increased cost in air fares. Out of necessity, there is a fair amount of out-of-Territory travel done by employees in this department.

Mr. Penikett: I do not think that we are going to be bother talking about it very long. It sounds like one conference at best, \$4,000.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. It was just an accumulation of a number of trips and the increased fares this year.

*Intergovernmental Relations agreed to
On Department of Finance*

Mr. Chairman: Under Finance we have a reduction of \$331,000 on page 27.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The staff vacancies suffered by this department during the course of the last year were not from lack of trying. It is just that we were not able to hire the people to fill the positions in the department. That has now been rectified to a large degree, but we did have quite a surplus as a result of that, and we expected a request for more grants than were actually asked for, specifically in the area of the Home Owner Grants.

47 Mr. Penikett: It is interesting to see in these days of Constitutional developments that we have a Commissioner, again, in charge of finances in the Territory.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No one had better make any mistake about that. The Deputy Minister of Finance is Frank Fingland, a former Commissioner of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Penikett: A several-times former Commissioner.

I have a serious question in respect to the staffing of the department. The Government Leader refers to vacancies. Just, as of this date, how many senior posts in the department are vacant?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There may be one. I am not sure, but I do not think there are any, now. Because of the number of vacancies there has been some major reorganization in the department, and Mr. Fingland has indicated to me a desire to do some more. We are in pretty good shape, generally speaking, in that department, better, certainly, than we have been for the last six or seven months.

Mr. Penikett: Would the Government Leader care to comment at this time as to how the reappearance of Mr. Fingland in the Territory will facilitate or improve our negotiating position with his former employer?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I anticipate that it is going to be of great benefit to us. Mr. Fingland has proven for years that even when he was living in Ottawa, his heart was here in Yukon. He has been considered a friend of this Government ever since 1960. I am confident that his

knowledge and expertise in this particular field are going to stand this Government in very good stead in the years to come.

Department of Finance agreed to

On Department of Heritage and Cultural Resources

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, the \$95,000 was in O&M only. That consisted of \$10,000, which was an interim appropriation for replacement of water-damaged school library books, I think at Watson Lake. There was an interim appropriation to establish funds for the Heritage Branch which was \$21,500. There were some salary increases in administration, audio visual and archives. There was some casual hire and some rent for the new headquarters of the department.

48 Mr. Byblow: As I recall, this department got a bit of a revamping during the course of this last budgetary year. There was some amalgamation of museums, historic sites and archeological sites from Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Now, the original estimate on this vote was \$1,665,000 and I see voted to date in the Supplementaries \$1,691,000. So, in other words there is a variance of \$26,000. Am I correct in assuming that that \$26,000, which is the increased amount of the original estimate, came from these other branches where you amalgamated the various services from.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, there were some funds transferred from Tourism and from Renewable Resources, I think.

Mr. Byblow: So it would logically follow that, if each of these departments did an internal transfer to Heritage and Cultural Resources, this would show up in the Supplementaries as a revenue recovery, internally?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: That is a question for the Minister of Finance.

*Department of Heritage and Cultural Resources agreed to
On Department of Renewable Resources*

Hon. Mr. Lang: As you can see, within the Supplementaries there are a number of monies that are recoverable. Increases are in our office rental accommodations as well as office supplies and readjustments in salaries, a \$52,000 overrun in administration in the Parks Branch, \$24,000 for overtime.

If you will recall, last year there was some question in respect to the selling of the necessary permits for campers. In Wildlife we had overtime expenditures as well as increases in fuel and utility costs over this past year, which amounted to \$40,000.

49 We had a total of \$232,000 in recoverable studies, are basically 100 percent recoverable: the Yukon River Basin Study, in which there were a number of studies done in various areas of the Yukon, for Moose as well as water fowl. We also received from the Government of Canada, \$52,000, for the Joint Environmental Assessment that we were doing in the MacPass/Canol Area. Also, along with that, we had \$65,000 recoverable for some caribou studies that were done up North. That also reflects capture of gyrfalcons, which is in the area of \$7,000. There was an interim, over that period of time, of \$20,000 charged for administration, which we collected from the Yukon River Basin Studies. That roughly gives you an idea of what was advanced.

On the Capital side there was a decrease of \$17,000, and this was largely due to the fact that we did not proceed, last year, with the Carcross campground in view of the problems that we had with land acquisition.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister indicate the amount of additional expenditure for office rent and accommodations?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Veale: The amount of the expenditure for office rent and accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Lang: \$52,000.

Mr. Veale: Is that primarily related to the changes in the offices that took place in Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It was throughout the Territory. It is not isolated in Whitehorse, we have a Territorial responsibility.

Mr. Veale: How much would have been related specifically to Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not have a breakdown, site-by-site.

Mr. Veale: Of the studies that have been mentioned, there are several. Would the Minister list those studies and provide us with copies on request of some of that research?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It would depend upon what was being requested. In respect to some of the studies going on, some of them have not been

completed. Prior to them being completed and fully analyzed, I do not believe that they should be let out. I know that within the department there is some hesitation in respect to some of the studies, due to the fact that it could well put further pressures on areas that already have some pressure, in respect to pinpointing various areas where there is a good herd of sheep, or whatever the case may be. So, there is some trepidation in the department from that point of view. If that information does get out, as opposed to one looking for it, they are more or less plotted and one could go out, under the hunting regulations, and put undue pressures that perhaps should not get the pressure that would come about by releasing some of this. I think I would have to do it study-by-study. It is not that I do not want to, but I also recognize, from the department's point of view, and the expertise within the department, that I do have some reservations in some areas.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps the Minister could just provide us with a list of the studies: which are complete, which are yet to be completed, then go from there. If there are some parts of studies that he wants to keep quiet for those sorts of reasons, indicate such, and then we know what is available, and what is public.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Perhaps the Member opposite should just table them and then we could decide in the House.

Mr. Veale: I could do that.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would like to think that the reports that are being done are not someone's personal opinion, but they would reflect an overall Government responsibility. I have no problem, at a later date, giving you an idea of what studies have been done and in what areas. I should point out, over the course of this past year, we have made much more coordinated effort in respect to doing various studies and inventories in selected areas across the Territory. We primarily have been concentrating in the area between here and Kluane, as far as the moose inventory is concerned. The direction that I have given to the department was to do those areas where there is hunting pressures and, subsequently, we should have an idea exactly what the harvest can be. The Wildlife Advisory Council will be going through various proposed regulations over the course of this week. They will be meeting, I believe, tomorrow afternoon and making recommendations to me in respect to various options that might be available in respect to certain areas within the Territory.

Therefore, I want to emphasize to Members here that the responsibility and the priority that is being put on the Game Department is to go into those areas where there are hunting pressures, so that there can be an assessment of just exactly what our present populations are, as opposed to what the proposed harvest should or could be.

Department of Renewable Resources agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Because the Minister of Government Services is not present we will stand over that department until tomorrow so I would like to refer Committee to page 35 under Yukon Housing Corporation and consider the decrease of \$48,000.

On Yukon Housing Corporation

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I have not much to say about this. I think the notes are self-explanatory. There were two items that made up this amount. I do not know what else I can say about it at this time.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister indicate why there were fewer applications received under the rural and native housing project. What is the explanation for it?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I really cannot say why there were less applications. I guess there were not many people interested in it. I do not know what else to say. We did not have the applications. There just must have been a lack of interest. I think that accounted for the reduction. I understand that there were no applications at all in this last year.

Mr. Veale: What are we talking about there? Are we talking about one housing unit?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Really, I do not know whether it would be one or two housings. Some of these housings they put up are not as expensive as some they put up in the City. It would look to me that probably, and again I would just be making a guess, about two houses.

Mr. Kimmerly: Can I ask a question about Greenwood Place? I have asked in the Question Period about the old Bishop's residence and the present situation is that the building stands attached to the new building that is actually a residence, and it is unrenovated and unused. I have asked the Minister why some of the departmental funds were not

used to renovate that building. I understand that, in the past, there were discussions with the Golden Age Society and potential residents of Greenwood Place to renovate the old Bishop's residence as a recreation area or a clubhouse, sort of, affair, or a common area for the use of the residents.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I think that that is a different thing than what we are talking about in this Supplementary here. I believe that the people that were in there had some some changes of plans. We were, at one time, contemplating getting a lot of that work done through the Vocational School but, due to other priorities that they had, we were not able to do it. It is something that we are looking at very closely now. We have not made any decisions on it, at this particular time. I fail to see the relationship between that and what we are discussing now.

*Yukon Housing Corporation agreed to
On Yukon Liquor Corporation*

Mr. Chairman: I refer Committee to page 37. We shall now consider the amount of \$225,000 under Yukon Liquor Corporation.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: There is only one thing. It is an increase of \$225,000, due to the increased cost of the Liquor Store in Faro.

⁵² On the Faro liquor store, we did not anticipate at that time that we were making the details that the footings would cost considerably more and the testing that we had to do for the foundations costed considerably more than what we had projected in the initial stage of the construction estimates.

Mr. Byblow: Yesterday, the Honourable Member from Campbell said he was listening to fairytales from this side. I think we have a fairytale here. It goes something like, "Once upon a time, the Government of Yukon, in their infinite wisdom and power descended upon a little community in rural, north Yukon and asked the people, 'What do you want?' and the people said, 'We want a liquor store'." Well that is a fairytale. I do have some very serious question though.

It is my understanding that the tender award that was accepted on the construction of that edifice, or facility, was in the order of \$720,000. I see that with our revised vote we are appropriating \$550,000. I would assume that what the intention of the Government is, would be appropriate the additional \$175,000 in the next Capital Budget year. Is that the method to reach the full tender price of this?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Byblow: That was an excellent explanation I gave. The other question I have is, has the Minister any explanation why this particular facility has such an enormous cost overrun. I think we originally budgeted \$275,000, and we are looking at something in the order of nearly three times the amount.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: As I mentioned previously, a few moments ago, one of the overruns was the footings. Also, with the load capabilities we felt we had to reinforce the foundations. I think it is indicative of all contracts in the last year that they have gone up a substantial amount. A combination of all these factors were evident in this increase. I do not think I can say much more on that.

I was also sure that the Member from that locality would have something to say on this because I know it is something that is very dear to his heart, and I look forward to more of his questions. I assure him though, that when we put in the footings we will not jeopardize some problems that he is interested in.

⁵³ **Mr. Byblow:** I was going to ask the Minister if I was going to be invited to the ribbon cutting ceremony on opening. When is the construction expected to be complete and when is the facility expected to be ready?

Mr. Lattin: I am not dead sure of the date, but I think it is in early summer. As you are aware, we had the contract out in two different ways, for winter construction and summer construction, and went ahead with winter construction. It seems to me that it is early summer. I do not have the information at this moment.

Mr. Byblow: I was going to ask the Minister whether that was before or after the election, but I do not think he can answer that. The Minister indicated that he expected me to ask a lot of questions and unfortunately, I think my constituents have a lot more questions that they would like to ask, and I have been receiving quite a few comments about the construction going on there now.

The final question on that, in the tender award for the \$720,000 for

construction, does it include any groundwork surrounding the building. That is, in the order of the sidewalks, parking area and so on? Is that included in that tender? Does the Minister know?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, I do not know. I consider that an administrative thing, and that is something I do not involve myself in. If the Honourable Member wants me to see me outside the House, I can get him that information.

Mr. Byblow: If that is an offer for me to come to his office and get a copy of the tender, I accept.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I want to correct that. You asked about a specific thing about whether it included the sidewalks and the landscaping. I said I was not sure, but I did not say I was going to give you a copy of the tender. That is another issue.

Mr. Byblow: As a final question, is it permissible for me to see the tender?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: There are no problems for the Member to see the tender that went out. I am not denying that.

*Yukon Liquor Corporation agreed to
On Loan Amortization*

Mr. Chairman: I refer you to page 50 under Loan Amortization to the amount of \$1,595,000.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: This is simply a bookkeeping entry in respect to loans that we make and pay for during the course of the year. The payments of some these loans are predicated on what our cash position might be.

Loan Amortization agreed to

Mr. Chairman: After page 37, we have some pages that perhaps the Opposition Members may like to question. Revenue Summary is on page 38.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps we could just have a general explanation of the Revenue Summaries.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: With all due respect, in my opening statement I referred Members to these pages. What else can I say but that this is the Revenue, on page 38, that we have recovered during the course of the year that was not anticipated — that is, under the column Supplementary No. 1. In some cases, the Revenue is not as high as we thought it would be, in other cases it is higher. It ends up being a total of \$4,310,000 more than what we anticipated. We go on from there to the Operations and Maintenance Recoveries Summary on page 41, and then the detail, department by department. If there are any specific questions, I will try to answer them. I think it is fairly straightforward. I cannot anticipate any specific questions.

Mr. Veale: On Health and Human Resources, the vote there looks about \$2,897. The next page has \$2,886 voted to date, and I do not understand the discrepancy there.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We are referring here to Yukon Health Care Insurance Premiums. Is that the figure you are talking about? We anticipated that we were going to get \$2,886,000 in premiums. We are now saying that we are still going to get that, but we did anticipate that we were going to get \$12,000 in registrations and fees in the Department. We anticipate now that we are going to be \$1,000 light on that.

Mr. Penkett: I wonder if the Minister of Finance happens to know what the level of bad debt, uncollectable, or aged accounts is on uncollected Medicare Premiums right now?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry I do not know what that figure is right now, but certainly in Supplementaries No. 2 we will have a line item for our bad debt writeoffs. We always have to have that in order to make the books balance at the end of the year. In respect to overdue accounts, we have been working on them and, as I indicated in the Budget Speech, I am hoping that during the course of this Session, we will be able to announce a policy whereby we will start paying interest on overdue accounts that this Government is carrying.

Mr. Graham: I move that you report progress on Bill No. 4 and beg leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Graham that the Chairman do now report progress on Bill No. 4 and beg leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to

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

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Graham that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Njootli: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 4, *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1981-82* and directed me to report progress on same and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees.

Agreed

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted.

May I have your further pleasure.

Mr. Graham: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo that we do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

The House adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was Tabled March 30, 1982:

82-5-6

The Implications of Agriculture and Livestock to the Management of Large Carnivores in Yukon

