



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 18

4th Session

24th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Thursday, November 19, 1981 — 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 Information Services.
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. McGulre	Kluane

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

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

**Whitehorse, Yukon**  
**Thursday, November 19, 1981**

**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 with the Order Paper, under Daily Routine.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Tabling of Returns and Documents**

**Mr. Speaker:** Under Tabling of Returns and Documents, the Chair has today a matter of correspondence from Mr. Clerk, addressed to myself, dated April 16th, 1981, which reads as follows:

"On this date I attended upon the Commissioner, in his capacity of Lieutenant-Governor, and witnessed the granting of assent to certain Bills which had been passed during the Fourth Session of the 24th Yukon Legislative Assembly. Specifically, the Bills which received assent are as follows: *School Trespass Ordinance, An Ordinance to Amend the Pioneer Utility Grant Ordinance, Municipal Finance Ordinance, An Ordinance to Amend the Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance, and An Ordinance to Amend the Yukon Council Ordinance.*"

It is signed, "Yours sincerely, The Clerk of the Yukon Legislative Assembly."

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I have for tabling the written answer to questions asked by Mr. Kimmerly on November 16.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I have for tabling a report, entitled "Workers' Compensation Board Report".

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further Documents for Tabling?

**Introduction of Visitors**

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, might I introduce some visitors in the gallery at this time?

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Mr. Veale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to introduce Mattie and Chappie Chapmen, originally from Watson Lake, who are now living in Whitehorse. Mr. Chapman first arrived in Yukon in 1920 as a member of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. His wife, Mattie, arrived in 1932. They are pleased to tell me that have had 48 years of marital bliss and they intend to have a few more.

I would like the Members to welcome them.

*Applause*

**Mr. Byblow:** I have for tabling a brief, entitled "The Development of Tourism for the Campbell Highway Corridor", prepared by the Faro and District Chamber of Commerce, outlining tourism potential of the area and presenting a set of recommendations to Government for developing that potential.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further Documents for Tabling?

Reports of Standing or Special Committees?

Are there any Petitions?

Introduction of Bills?

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**An Ordinance to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance: First Reading**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, that *An Ordinance to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that a bill, entitled *Ordinance to*

*Amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance* be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further Bills.

**An Ordinance to Amend the Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance: First Reading**

**Mr. Byblow:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse South Centre, that a bill, entitled *An Ordinance to Amend the Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance* be introduced and read the first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Faro, seconded by the Honourable for Whitehorse South Centre, that a bill, entitled *An Ordinance to Amend the Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance*, be now introduced and read the first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further Bills for Introduction? Are there any notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

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

**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Question re: Investigation into Ku Klux Klan Activities in Yukon**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I have a question for the Minister of Justice. There is some indication of Ku Klux Klan activity in Yukon recently. Is the Minister currently investigating this?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The Ku Klux Klan have as much right to be in this Territory as any other person or organization. Until they have broken a law, there is absolutely nothing that we can do about it. We might disagree with their tactics, we might disagree with their recruiting people, but they have as much right to recruit as the human rights organization have.

So, until they do break the law, we do not have any recourse against them.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I understand, then, that there is no investigation. Does the Minister plan on introducing, in this Session, civil liberties legislation to cover this dangerous situation?

**Mr. Tracey:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I will direct my supplementary to the Minister of Education. Is there now active consideration to the implementation of anti-discrimination elements in the school curriculum?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** No, not as far as I know.

**Question re: Development of Yukon River: Klondike Gold Rush International Trail Concept**

**Mr. Veale:** I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources regarding the historical and recreational development of the Yukon River, in context with the Klondike Gold Rush International Trail concept.

It has always been my understanding that the Federal Government, through Parks Canada, and the Yukon Government, through the Department of Renewable Resources, have been having on-going discussions and planning about the development of this important aspect of the Yukon River.

Would the Minister confirm that there have been negotiations between his Department and the Federal Government and advise in which direction those negotiations are taking?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** There have been ongoing discussions with the various governments involved, British Columbia, Government of Canada and the Government of Alaska. I do not have the specifics with me in respect to the actual discussions that have gone on over the past year. I will be prepared to bring them forward for the Member opposite. As the Member knows we voted money last year to go into the Yukon River Basin

agreement with the Government of Canada and, I am going on memory, I believe the Government of British Columbia as well. That is in the process of getting underway in respect to the evaluation and study of the various aspects of the Yukon River.

**Mr. Veale:** These negotiations often proceed on the basis that proposals or papers are prepared. Have there been any documents of that nature prepared by the Yukon Government and Federal Government regarding the historical and recreational development of the Yukon River?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Yes, there was one put together some time ago. It has not had the blessing of the political arm of government. It was strictly a working document, internally, between the various levels of governments to attempt to come up with a direction in respect to what should be done on the subject that the Member is addressing.

**Mr. Veale:** I am sure that the Minister is aware of the importance of having public discussion on these issues, and the participation of the groups and individuals and associations in the planning process. Is the Minister prepared to open up public discussion about this by having that document produced and having an ongoing public discussion, so that public input can be made to the government policy decisions?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No, not at the present time. I think it is fair to say that once it gets to a stage that it would really affect the general public there would be a forum of some kind set up for public discussion.

**Question re: Rate Relief Program Applications**

**Mr. Fleming:** In the past few days I have had constituents who are in business come to me questioning the Rate Relief Program for small and non-government commercial enterprises. The form states that you must have your application in by June 30, 1981. That is the cut-off date. Many of them have seemed to have missed that cut-off date. Some of them did not know about the cut-off, even though they may have been informed by their MLA's, I think. I am wondering if the Government Leader could suggest what they could do about that, if he is going to do anything about it.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is a fact that the application form has not been returned by very many of the non-government commercial enterprises in the territory, in respect to the period June 30, 1980 to April 1, 1981. We would like to extend that date for application to December 31, and we will also undertake to mail to every known commercial enterprise in the territory that might be a recipient of this benefit an application form, and we will get that done within the week, so that they will all have an opportunity to get in that application.

One further point that I would like to make is we will be sending out, fairly soon, applications for the period April 1, 1981 to November 30, 1981, which is the cutoff date for that program.

Submissions have been made to the Treasury Board to try and have this program extended to the end of the fiscal year, March 31, 1982. We propose to hold off sending out those applications. Once again, Mr. Speaker, rather than just passing them out to agents and leaving them on counters, we will mail them to every known business in the territory that might be able to benefit from it. We want to wait until we have definite word as to whether or not the program is going to be extended. The moment we have that word we will mail out the applications for the period April 1, 1981 to, hopefully, March 31, 1982.

**Mr. Byblow:** I thank the Government Leader for his Ministerial Address. As a supplementary to the question I would like to ask the Government Leader if the monies under this program are advanced ahead of the applications or on the basis of the applications?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, it is just the opposite. What happens is we pay the money out and then we have to make application to the federal government to be reimbursed.

**Mr. Byblow:** Can the Government Leader indicate if any applications have been processed and paid for to this point in time?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Oh, yes. There are a number of applications that have come in. We did have to hold those applications

for some considerable length of time. When I announced this program when it first came out, I am sure all Members will recall me saying it, and that is there was a technicality that we had to get over. That technicality was that we were paying part of that program up until April 1, last year. There had to be a saw off with the federal government in respect to what they were going to pay, in view of the fact that we had been paying some. We have now reached that saw off, so those people that have applied and received our subsidy before, will now be getting an additional cheque to represent the federal government's subsidy.

There will not be any delays in these from now on because, of course, that program is now amended, as well.

**Question re: Federal budget re energy costs**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the Government Leader, who seems in an energetic mood today.

In the Government Leader's comments, earlier this week, on the Federal Budget, he stated, "The Budget substitutes rhetoric for practical actions so far as Yukon is concerned. There are no measures to ease our special burden of energy costs." So that the Government Leader may not be judged guilty of rhetoric on the energy question, could I ask him what specific action he plans to take, arising from the statements he gave in his speech this year, about the alarming prospect for Yukon, in terms of energy costs as a percentage of GNP?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am sure all Members are aware of the fact that I was in Ottawa as little as two weeks ago. At that time I met with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, who should have an abiding interest in this very serious problem in this Territory. A large portion of our discussion time was devoted to energy and to the alleviation of the problem here in the Territory.

There is a number of schemes and programs that the Federal Government has in effect in southern Canada that we are not able to take advantage of. We are hopeful that we are going to be able to convince the Federal Government that we should be able to take advantage of some of those programs.

As well, we are now in the process of putting together our new O and M budget for next year. I am confident that if there is any method that we can come up with between now and then to assist in this kind of a program, we will be doing so in that budget and it will be reflected there.

**Mr. Penikett:** To my knowledge, the Government, so far, has negotiated only two energy-related agreements with the Federal Government, both of which involve energy conservation.

Could the Government Leader say, in the Government's negotiations for more energy assistance from Ottawa, what exactly is on the table at this moment? Is there something like an oil import fund, such as Quebec and the Maritimes are now benefitting from, or is there some other specific proposal being negotiated?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The oil subsidy fund that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to certainly is one. We feel that we are paying into that. Everybody in the Territory is paying five cents a gallon into that fund and we, as Yukoners, are not benefitting from it. So, that is one problem.

I see the construction of the fourth wheel by NCP, at the Whitehorse Rapids Dam as being another major factor. At the present time it is anticipated that during the course of this fiscal year NCP will burn seven million gallons of diesel fuel at a very, very high cost to produce electricity. The fourth wheel will help to alleviate that kind of cost as well. We think that NCP should be looking at the construction of smaller types of hydro projects throughout the Territory so that we do not have to rely, solely, on diesel fuel in some of our communities for all of the energy that we require. There are a number of things on the horizon.

**Mr. Penikett:** In March of this year, the Government said that Yukon would be participating in a comprehensive northern energy policy review with Northern Canada Power Commission and Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. The

Government Leader said that it was his intention to inform the House, "of how things are developing in that respect."

Could I ask the Government Leader when we could expect a statement arising from those discussions or from some other Minister who may have participated?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I recognize that the Leader of the Official Opposition does not like to speak to me directly and, obviously, I can understand why.

Yes, we will inform the House. There has been ongoing study in respect to demand. That should be completed before too long. Also, at the same time, as you know, there has been a parliamentary committee put together by the Parliament of Canada to look at the question of Northern Canada Power Commission. We have submitted our position a number of months ago to them in respect to the Northern Canada Power Commission and what we feel should be done.

We are going to be looking forward to what comes out of that discussion. That is the key as far as the long term energy of the Territory is concerned. One can discuss various energy conservation programs and there is definitely a role to be played in respect to our everyday living here in Yukon. For the long term, there is no question in my mind, that the key in respect to further development as far as the Territory is concerned, is going to largely lie in the area of the Northern Canada Power Commission and how energy is produced.

As the Government Leader has indicated, energy is escalating in cost every day. We are all paying for it. I think it is fair to say that if it continues, and there is no agreement with the Government of Canada in this particular area, we are going to all be in a very difficult position, as far as the taxpayer and the consumer are concerned, in a very short time.

**Mr. Veale:** I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. I have received a document from the Parks Canada office in Whitehorse entitled, "A Concept Plan For the Yukon River," subtitled, "An Historical and Recreational Waterway, produced by Parks Canada and the Yukon Government." Does this document contain the policy of the Yukon Government regarding the plan for the Yukon River?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I was wondering why the Leader of the Unofficial Opposition was putting forward the questions earlier in respect to an internal document between the Government of Canada and ourselves, and now I understand why. He has one in his possession, which is fine, and he can probably table it with very little intervention, on Monday. I should point out, as I indicated earlier, it is not the definite policy statement by the Government of the Yukon Territory, it is strictly a document drawn up between the departments involved to try to get some direction in the area they were going. The question they are addressing is a very large issue. It does not just involve one department. Northern Canada Power Commission comes into it, environmental control, campground and various agencies of Government and, just as importantly, if not more importantly, how it affects the private individual who perhaps has some investment or some land which he or she is working on along that corridor. It is a document that the Member can refer to, I am sure. It will be enlightening reading for him in view of the fact that he is misinformed on the subject.

**Mr. Veale:** I would say most Yukoners are probably misinformed on the subject because of the lack of public information of this nature. Would the Minister indicate, having read the document, as it was prepared in February, 1980, whether his government is opposed to, or in favour of, the policy expressed in that document?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It covers many areas. There are some areas where there is no question that we are in agreement, in other areas we question it because a lot of areas contained in that particular document that have not been fully developed to the extent of how they would affect the total Yukon River basin, or any other aspect of the Yukon river. The Member probably accepts the report because it is in black and white.

**Mr. Veale:** It will be interesting to hear what the government's view on this particular document is when it is first read.

My supplementary question is: considering the often emotional and heated debates around the subject of ad hoc development of land, land sales, and leases in the Territory, what is the Government's policy on the advisability of having a public plan, and perhaps an intergovernmental agreement, so that all Yukoners are aware in advance what the rules are with respect to development of the Yukon River?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** In the long term that is what we are striving for, a general plan. I recognize that the Member opposite and the philosophy of the Party that he represents, is that it is going to plan and control everybody's life. I should point out we are looking at something that would be very general, to try to give the right of the individual every opportunity to go ahead and participate in whichever manner he or she wants to participate, whether it be the Yukon River Basin or any other area, as far as every day Yukon life is concerned.

**Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation: Apartment construction**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** A question for the Minister responsible for the Yukon Housing Corporation.

In light of the new federal budget's provisions making it less attractive for developers to build apartments, will the Minister now reconsider his statement made earlier, that the Yukon Housing Corporation will not promote apartment construction in Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** In a matter of day and a half, or two days, I have not changed my decision whatsoever.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** A supplementary to the Minister responsible for Social Assistance.

The Government has just rejected an increase in the Yukon's minimum wage. Will the Minister investigate the effect of the that on the Social Assistance budget?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** People who are deserving of social assistance are looked after, whatever their problems are.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Supplementary to the same Minister.

In view of the low-cost housing crisis and the rental crisis, and the increase in rents, is the Minister investigating the current cost to the taxpayer of the payment of increased rents for people on social assistance?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** As the cost of living goes up, in general, more people are dependant on social assistance. There are ways that these people must qualify. If their rent is too high or their income is too low, then there are grades of deservedness. This is always looked at.

**Question re: Green paper on human rights**

**Mrs. McGuire:** I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

The Government has indicated that they are reviewing the human rights perspective. My question is will the Minister tell us if a green paper on human rights will be Tabled in this House?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** My department is working very hard at trying to develop just such a green paper to put before this Legislature in the special committees that we are going to set up. I am hopeful that we will have it this Session. That is all I can say. My department does not have enough people in it to work on everything. We are trying to do it. I should also tell the Member that the woman who looks after the human rights part of my department is away on maternity leave. That makes it all the harder.

**Mrs. McGuire:** My supplementary to the Minister is, can the Minister tell us if it is his intention to consult with the newly formed Yukon Human Rights Association before presenting the green paper?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The reason for setting up the special committee of the House will be to get public input. That is exactly the place that I expect the organization to put its input into it, during the sitting of the committee.

**Mrs. McGuire:** I wonder if the Minister, in his review, would be considering the concept of a human rights commission or an ombudsman?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, I will be considering a human rights commission.

**Question re: Accommodation for Dawson Community Learning Centre**

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question I direct to the Minister of Education.

In mid-September the Minister announced that her department would establish a community learning centre in Dawson by the end of that month. However, the proposal ran into problems when the accommodation initially chosen for the classes ended up being used by Yukon Territorial Government employees.

Can the Minister say whether her department has been successful yet in finding an alternative location for the centre?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The basic education course is being offered in Dawson at this moment in a private home. The building that they had originally was deemed more suitable for residential space, whether it was Yukon Territorial Government employee, or whoever, since space is very short in Dawson. The Anglican Church Hall is being looked at at the present moment and I have not had word yet whether they have found it suitable.

**Mr. Blyblow:** I would like the Minister to know that I completely endorse the principle of the learning centres. Can she state when Dawson may look forward to locating its learning centre in quarters?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Accommodation for almost anything in Dawson is very difficult. Ever since we had the flood there it has become more and more difficult. The Anglican Church Hall may be found suitable but until I have some word on it I can not tell the Member opposite, but as soon as I do, I will.

**Mr. Byblow:** At the same time in mid-September the Minister announced that similar centres would be set up in Carcross, in Watson Lake, and in Mayo, and then, later, in Faro. I am having difficulty seeing any developments in these communities. Can the Minister indicate what is happening with respect to the setting up of community learning centres in these other four communities.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The Centre that we are proudest of, at the moment, is the Watson Lake Centre. The space has been allocated and it is being set up just at this moment. That is as far as we have got with the other Centres, but the Watson Lake Centre is well on its way.

**Question re: Agreement for Recreation and Conservation status**

**Mr. Veale:** I have a question again for the Minister of Renewable Resources. One of the major recommendations of the report that I have questioned him about previously is that there be a A.R.C. agreement, which is an Agreement for Recreation and Conservation, and that agreement should be preceded by a negotiation of development responsibilities, senior management review, acceptance of the concept plan, consultation with native organizations and public review. Would the Minister indicate at which stage of the process the Yukon Government is at the present time?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I am sorry that I am going to have to get the answers to the questions that the Member has raised so that I can be specific. I would appreciate that on questions of this kind you could alert me ahead of time, perhaps then we could have a fair exchange in the House as opposed to lurking in the background and trying to feel his way around.

**Mr. Veale:** I am afraid that it has been the Yukon Government that has been lurking in the background on this issue.

When the Minister is doing this, and I certainly appreciate his willingness to give a full and complete answer on the matter, would the Minister indicate the time frames for each one of these procedures, and when the government is prepared to announce a public policy on this most important matter?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** If it was today, tomorrow or next week, it would not be earth shattering to begin with. I should point out to the Member opposite that I am more than prepared to bring answers to the specific questions he has raised. I want to reiterate, on questions of this kind, whether discussing reports, or

whatever, I think it would be common courtesy to let me, or some of my colleagues, if it is a report they refer to, know that they want to discuss it and, as I indicated earlier, we could then use the Question Period for the purposes that it is supposed to be used for.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister also agree to have, in the same way that farmers are now having direct input into governmental agricultural policy, public input during the policy making process that the government is now embarking on?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I will have to have a look at whether or not we are prepared to go that far. Until something concrete comes forward, I cannot see much point in having public hearings. If the Member checks, in the last couple of years, in respect to public hearings, very few people are showing up. I think they are getting to the point where, when they hear the words public hearing, they go to sleep. There will be some method for people or organizations to bring forward whatever views they have when that time is necessary.

**Question re: Potential Hydro-electric Project**

**Mr. Penikett:** The public stops talking and the government stops listening.

Let me ask a question of the Government Leader, further to the discussion of energy plans earlier: according to a June 17 edition of the Vancouver Sun that BC Hydro is studying a potential two-dam development on the Liard River. It would be one of the largest hydro-electric projects in the world. Such a project would likely affect Yukon in a big way and I would like to ask the Government Leader if he has sought, or obtained, any details about this proposal?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, we have been, in the past, fully apprised, to the best of our knowledge, by BC Hydro and the British Columbia Government of their activities on the Liard River. Of course, it does not matter what they do to that river, as you are well aware, it is going to affect a portion of the Territory. We did receive a report. It is quite a lengthy report. It was in on my desk some two or three days ago. I have sent that on to the appropriate officials in this Government to be looked at as quickly as possible. I am confident that the Minister responsible for Tourism and Economic Development will be hearing back from them at an early date.

**Mr. Penikett:** Among other things, this billion dollar dam could obviously change the energy supply picture and the environment of this region considerably, in addition to requiring relocation of the Alaska Highway. I would ask the Government Leader and I appreciate he has only had this document for a few days, if he has yet given any political response to the proponents in B C in terms of our support, or otherwise, for this proposal.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, none at all.

**Mr. Penikett:** Has the Government Leader attained any insurances from B.C. Hydro or his friends in the Government of British Columbia that the Government of Yukon will be consulted before any firm decisions are made on this proposal.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes.

**Question re: New Heritage and Cultural Department**

**Mrs. McGuire:** I have a question for the Minister responsible for culture in Yukon. The exhibition currently on display at McBride Museum is a collection of Yukon Indian artifacts on loan from the Ottawa Museum of Man. Further to the Minister's announcement of the new Heritage and Culture Department on November 12, can the Minister state whether she has some assurance from the National Museum of Man in Ottawa, and also collection holders in Scotland, that irreplaceable Yukon Artifacts will be returned to the Yukon people? If she has had this assurance, will the recovery of the artifacts be a priority issue for the Heritage and Culture Department.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I have no such assurance. At some time I hope we will have that assurance. These priceless collections are so precious that they must be looked after in the proper atmosphere, and with fire protection. We will not ask for them back until we have a facility that will house them properly.

**Question re: Public speaking training for government employees**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** A question to the Minister of Renewable Resources. On October 20, all the civil servants in the Minister's Department met at the Whitehorse Ski Chalet and sat idle for almost an hour at the taxpayers expense. Is the Minister considering disciplinary action against the civil servants.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please, the Chair would rule that question to be completely out of order as being frivolous. The Chair has a great responsibility to all Members as your servant, and I would ask that questions of such a nature not be placed in the future.

**Question re: Selkirk Annex**

**Mr. Veale:** I have a question for the Minister of Education. The Minister has received, as I have, correspondence from the School Committee at the Selkirk Annex. I am asking her to name the newly independent school, Grey Mountain Primary School. Is the Minister going to name the school as recommended by the School Committee?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I have received that correspondence and the name is under consideration just at this moment. When we decide on it I will make an announcement.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister indicate when that decision is going to be made, because the school has a number of things they wish to publish, like a newspaper, and they wish to answer the phone in the name of the school, that sort of thing. On what date will the Minister be making that announcement?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I should say early in the week.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister advise if there are any other names competing with the recommendation of the School Committee?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The Member knows full well that there are other names. Yes, indeed there are.

**Question re: Takhini Hot Springs Subdivision**

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question that I would direct to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

The Minister may recall some controversy earlier this year concerning the Government's plans for a subdivision in the Takhini Hot Springs Road area. Can the Minister say if he has made his final decision respecting the disposition of land in that subdivision?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I thought that I had made it very clear that I had made my final decision on the matter. We are going ahead with it. There are some 30 parcels of land that will be available. In the near future we will be announcing the date of the sale.

**Mr. Byblow:** In the Minister's colleague's most recent White Paper on agricultural policy, and I am referring to the Minister responsible for agriculture, the first point says that the Government will identify lands that have the capability for agricultural use. What I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs is if he can state whether the lands that are set aside for rural residential lots in the Takhini Hot Springs Road area fit that description?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I suppose you could ask the question to six different people and get six different answers.

According to our classifications of land, this particular land is not a high priority as far as agriculture is concerned. There may be the odd little pocket there but they are very few. We feel that that particular land is best suited for rural residential living.

**Mr. Byblow:** In light of the Minister's answer, it appears that there is some question respecting the viability of certain classes of land qualifying for agricultural purpose. Is the Minister intending to locate a soils and/or agricultural specialist in Yukon to assist in this decision?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think that question is better directed to me and I would suggest that the Member read the last part of the agricultural policy paper that he has at his disposal. I think it answers the question.

**Question re: Environmental assessment review: Ibez Pass**

**Mr. Veale:** I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources.

The environmental assessment review process hearing regarding the pipeline route through the Ibez Pass for Foothills Pipeline was held recently. I am sure the Minister is well aware of the sensitivity of that route and some of the problems concerned with it. Evidence was heard from a number of trappers and outfitters about the problems they anticipated.

Will the Minister explain why there was no presentation at that hearing by the Yukon Government?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I do not know how long the Member has been in the Territory but there was a presentation made to a previous hearing in respect to the environmental assessment review process and it was deemed not necessary to do it again.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister confirm whether it is a fact that the employees and biologists of the Wildlife Branch were specifically instructed not to appear at that hearing?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** In their capacity, on behalf of the Government of Yukon Territory, yes. The position had been put forward as a government position at an earlier date. That was the position of the government.

**Mr. Veale:** I am sure the Government Minister would concede that Yukon wildlife biologists are some of the best experts in various fields in the world. Would the Minister not agree that the evidence of those biologists would have been very crucial and useful for that environmental review process hearing?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question is asking for an opinion which is not allowable in the Question Period.

I must also advise Honourable Members that the 40 minutes allotted for Question Period has now expired and we will proceed on the Order Paper to Orders of the Day.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**Mr. Graham:** At this time I would request that the House give unanimous consent to revert to Notices of Motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member have unanimous consent?

*Agreed*

**NOTICES OF MOTION**

**Mr. Graham:** I have a motion, moved by myself, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua that this House deplores the principles contained in the Gun Control Legislation proposed by the Honourable Warren Allmand in Bill 451 before the Parliament of Canada.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any other Notices of Motion?

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to Orders of the Day, Government Motions.

**GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

**Motion No. 12**

**Mr. Byblow:** I believe we are still debating the Motion that calls for approval of this government's activities since Spring Session. We heard, last week, the Government Leader outline various programs his government is delivering, the multitude of national exercises that he is involved in, and the wealth of potential facing Yukon. Then, we heard some constructive comments from the Leader of the Opposition, in gentle fashion, calling for the government to define its goals, establish priorities, and he suggested following the lead of his Party and start creating jobs and building homes and training people. Then we heard several other speakers, depending on their political persuasion, either chastising the government for its failures or lavishly and blindly applauding the government for its sensitivity to their ridings and wonderful leadership. And, at least at one point, there was a so-called synthetic spasm of servitude condemning this side of the House for a lack of ideas, of suggestions, of plans, of goals, and as to how the government really should be run.

I submit that government could not have been listening, either to my Party or to the people of Yukon, if it really believes that it cannot hear what it should be doing differently than it is.

I heard what the New Democratic Party was saying. I heard what the people of Yukon were saying. And I made a decision. It was the same decision that the people of Manitoba made a couple of days ago. That is what happens to governments that do not listen. Governments that stumble around, ambivalent to public reaction, void of vision, subservient to petty in-fighting and paranoid about criticism — they invariably tumble. So it should be.

This government has not clearly identified its set of priorities about the Yukon's destiny. The game plan of action is not clear.

Relevant goals, I am not sure about. Organized commitment, again, I am not very clear on them. What do we have? We have, every month or so, some new departmental shuffle as different Ministers play their games with administrative empires. An interesting way to observe it, as one of my constituents did, is that the Territorial Conservatives seem to be practicing their national dance. The famous four-step flip-flop: no, we will not; maybe we will; we are not sure; I guess we can. I say daycare is a primary example. There was a time, in this House, when daycare aid was a horrible socialist plot to subvert the innocence of children. Today, it is in the budget and the government applauds itself for its positive action. Good. But I say, maybe the government may have approved the spending in that area, but it was this side that brought that assistance to the Territory.

And that is because the Leader of the Opposition directs his Party with a plan, a relevant plan, a plan around people, the Territory's greatest resource. If the government still does not know what this Party's commitment to Yukon is, then it should be listening more closely.

The Yukon is staggering, and there is a problem with direction. We do not have job creation going on. We have a housing crisis, territorially. We do have this four-step flip-flop going on in the departments responsible for training our people for the job skills that we do not have. Last week we heard one Minister say that there was not going to be a vocational academic split. We heard another Minister saying that they were studying it and there might be a split. Then, we did have the Government Leader say there is no report. I have a report.

That just begs the question. Who is running the government? I heard another Minister say that there was no plan over here. I say there is no plan over there and we would be pleased to provide them with one, even though it seems that the government might have its role confused, judging from what was said. It should be their job to map out the plan, our job to criticize, but no matter, perhaps the government is practicing its yet-to-come opposition function.

Let me tell you how it should be. You build a plan on the base that is in place and on the resources you have. It is not a 'maybe' investment in pie-in-the-sky mega-projects, a careless protection of the businesses and industry that you have in place, and it is not a wanton disregard for people you have working here. It is a balance between the problems you have now and the future considerations that are in store, and that is in the economic and social area.

I heard about Mr. White Pass Driver from Porter Creek who had to be protected from wasteful government programs. It is regrettable and unfortunate that the Honourable Minister from Porter Creek is not here to let me tell him that Mr. Truck Driver from Porter Creek has a lot to say about wasteful programs. I know Mr. White Pass Driver, he comes through my riding every day, sometimes he has coffee with me, sometimes his truck breaks down and he spends the night and sometimes I help him put on the chains to get up the access road.

I think, that when for 12 years you disregard the safety conditions of the road that Mr. White Pass Driver runs daily to move the ore out of the territory, upon which your major revenue derives, you cannot call that protection. When you permit petty wrangling to affect the education of Mr. White Pass

Driver's children, you cannot have priorities in place. When you have instruments and controls to reduce the burden that Mr. White Pass Driver has to meet in order to pay the mortgage on his house, you cannot say that a plan exists. In fact, Yukon housing seems to have endured this agony of a four step flip-flop except that step four has not been executed yet. Far it be from me to suggest that there is clumsy foot work going on.

There seems to be the suggestion that Mr. White Pass Driver has no say in whether he wants to help the destitute, the poor, the non-housed, the uninformed and the needy. The suggestion is that Government arbitrarily declares who gets help and, in turn, oscillates that position according to the wind of public outrage.

Good heavens, this Government lent a million dollars to Mr. White Pass Driver's employer, White Pass itself, and that was not a bad decision. In light of the economic stability of the Territory at the time, that was a wise move. But I say this, what position, then, does this Government have to take to Mr. White Pass Driver's neighbour, kicked out of his or her house because of high rents? What happens to the economic and social stability of Porter Creek with this happening? You say that Mr. White Pass Driver has no right to decide whether he wants to help a single parent hold her job, or keep her house?

I find it ironic that this Government should stand up and say that it is not the business of government to tell people what to do and how to live, and then force decisions on the people of the Territory that are neither popular, thought-out, nor conducive to sound planning.

Yesterday afternoon, we listened and watched how this Government defeats the wishes of the people. I have another personal witness to that instance. There is a 24-suite apartment block in my community, and I would like to make it clear that I will be the first to compliment the Government in finally recognizing the housing problem in my community, but it seems to me that that situation was not either thought out or were the people living there consulted, and it is another decision being forced upon people. It is a good decision in terms of the recognition of the problem, but an objectionable one as to how it is being solved.

It is an exact copy of our liquor store fiasco last year. Into this apartment block are expected to go some 24 of the 30 teachers in town, all happy and content to be living together in blissful harmony, night and day.

I think this Government has had three years to respond to the housing situation in that community but, instead of something that borders on a mega-project, it ought to have organized a year-by-year development program that responds to the public need. That would be a far better approach than this style of crisis management, but Government would not listen.

It has the tools, it has the instrument, it has Yukon Housing to work with to do it.

I do not think that we find too much of a different situation in a number of areas. Certainly, the Takhini Hot Springs Road, the learning centres, the vocational training, all of these things come to mind in this same style, the same pattern of operation.

I heard the other day that there was some resentment about asking people what they thought were the issues of the day. I submit, if this Government did more asking and more listening, and less telling, some of the major issues would be resolved.

It is not my intention to totally condemn the Government, that is certainly not my job. I would like to conclude with something very positive. I ask the Government to listen. We have three priorities facing us. They are jobs, job training and housing, and in that network of concern you build the priorities of sound economic planning, progressive social programs and constitutional development.

If I were still in the classroom, I would issue a report card something like this: after yesterday they failed miserably on the latter, I would give them 50 percent on economic planning, and a total failure in social development. The goals of jobs, of job training and housing, if they would adopt them as the NDP



have, they could earn some good grades if they developed these goals wisely in the short and long term. In fact, if the Government is indirectly asking us to undertake the social and economic planning for the Territory, we would be happy to oblige any time the opportunity may arise.

**Mr. Falle:** I rise to support Motion Number 12. I am probably not qualified to speak about the entire Yukon, but I do feel that I am qualified to speak about my riding. You ask, from the other side, what the performance of this Government has been in my riding? Let me tell you, just in case you do not know.

When I ran for election I made a few promises and I am proud to be a part of a Party that helped me carry them out. One of my promises was that we would have title for recreational lots and it is through the efforts of this Government that got them.

We also said that there would be country residential lots and that was a promise of this Government and the MLA in the area and yes, Takhini Hot Springs lots are going ahead: that is a Government commitment, no flip-flop. It is straightforward and you know where we are coming from.

We also said there would be an agricultural policy. This will be a green paper, hopefully, before this House, and there will be an agricultural policy by this spring. You know where we are coming from and we are keeping our promises.

Another promise was for better school bus services; we obtained that. Another promise was that we were going to upgrade the recreational roads in the area. The Minister of Education, at that time, put the Education Department to work, the trade school people, and they upgraded the road in my area with no cost to the people.

More recreational roads are being plowed through the wintertime. We are listening to the needs of the people.

I listened with great interest the other day to a statement from over there that we do not hear, but we hear the people, too and, my God, I will tell you people certainly want to live within their budget.

I know this country today seems to be in a shambles because you spend more than you are bringing in and, when that happens, whether it be government or whether it be an individual, you are in trouble. The biggest boom that I can remember that ever happened in the mining industry in Yukon was when the NDP went in in B.C. Exploration came up here, a direct cause of the MacMillan Pass, and hopefully will be what you call a mega-project.

It is a fact that when you have a socialist government, the capitalists pack their little bags and they go some place else. When that happens, let me tell you, the Honourable Member for Faro, that it is the capitalists up there who are making that mine go around. It is the people with vision, it is the people who will put their money where their mouths are who cause work and create jobs, it is not the NDP.

This Party, on this side, tries to live within its budget. I, for one, happen to be one very proud member of it. In my riding, we have kept our promises. In other ridings we have heard people, we know where we are coming from and we do not flip-flop. I do not care what you say, we are straightforward, and we tell you what is happening. Sometimes the truth is a little bit hard to swallow, but you are going to get it from this party, hard or not, it is going to be the truth.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I move that we do now adjourn debate on Motion Number 12.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister for Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West that debate be now adjourned.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** We will proceed on the Order Paper to Government Bills and Orders.

## GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

### Bill Number 68: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West that Bill Number 68 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there a point of order?

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The point of order was that the Member for Old Crow was not in the Chamber but the Honourable Minister of Justice is correcting the situation.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West that Bill Number 68 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

### Bill Number 72: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, that Bill Number 72 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua that Bill Number 72 be now read a second time.

*Motion agreed to*

### Bill Number 74: Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill Number 74 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill Number 74 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I wish to speak on this Motion regarding Bill Number 74 on what I consider to be, an extremely important principle. The Bill is *Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Ordinance*. The purpose of the Ordinance is obviously to correct what might be classified as clerical or careless or minor errors in numerous ordinances passed previously by this House. There is however, one part of the Ordinance, specifically Section 4(1), where...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please, I know the Member is new to the House, but I must remind the Member, and also all other Members, that we are to discuss the philosophy of Bills at second reading and it is not proper for any Member to discuss a particular Section of the Bill.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I will not refer to a specific section of the Bill, but the philosophy of the Bill is inconsistent with the Bill's title, in that a part of the Bill is a substantial substantive amendment to the law and is not a miscellaneous statute amendment.

**Mr. Veale:** I am in agreement with the statements by the Member for Whitehorse South Center. The *Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Ordinance* should not be directed to making substantive changes of legislation presently on the books. It should be directed to minor errors and corrections. I am opposed to this particular Ordinance going beyond second reading simply for that reason.

In the event that it does, I certainly hope that the Minister will have an explanation of why the Ordinance is being used in this way and, in particular when we get into the details, that he will express what the policy reason is for that particular detail.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would have to disagree with both of the Members across the floor. The amendment to the area that the Member is talking about is not a substantive change.

*Motion agreed to*

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

**Mr. Graham:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into the 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 Campbell, 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. Fleming takes the Chair as Deputy Chairman of Committee*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I now call the Committee of the Whole to order.

We will be debating Bill Number 70 after we have a recess.  
*Recess*

*On Ambulance Replacement*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will now call Committee to order.

**Mr. Chairman:** I will refer you to page 19 of the Capital Estimates, Ambulance Replacement, in the amount of \$38,000. Is there any discussion.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I have a little bit more added information on the \$38,000. For the replacement of an ambulance in Whitehorse, we have identified the amount of \$35,000 and for the replacement of miscellaneous equipment for the ambulances throughout the Territory, we identified \$3,000, bringing the total to \$38,000.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister indicate the type of ambulance to be purchased for that type of money?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not have the type of ambulance; I would assume it would be the customary type of ambulance. If the Member opposite would like to know exactly which one, I will check into the information for him.

**Mr. Veale:** I would appreciate that because Socrates said there are ambulances and there are ambulances and it is quite conceivable that we should be getting a top of the line vehicle to be the most useful for trips around the Territory, because I would assume that ambulance is not exclusively for Whitehorse use. One of the problems, as I understand it, is that having a large enough ambulance that can go to some of the remote areas around Whitehorse is extremely important.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I will certainly look into that.

I might point out, while I am on my feet, that, as a rule, the ambulances that we use in Whitehorse are used exclusively for Whitehorse and they do not go throughout the Territory, as such. However, I will definitely get the information and bring it back for the Member.

*Ambulance Replacement agreed to*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I would refer you now to Roads, Streets and Sidewalks, in the amount of \$150,000.

*On Roads, Streets and Sidewalks*

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Before we get into it, maybe I can give you a breakdown as the Department sees it.

We have \$150,000 allotted for this expenditure. As you are quite aware, we are putting a little bit more emphasis on this item and have added an additional \$50,000. In regards to project expenditure, in Beaver Creek we have some crushing and resurfacing for about \$15,000; in Carcross we have to complete the access road, including crushing and resurfacing into Indiavillage for a total of \$45,000.

In the community of Carmacks we are upgrading the roads and applying crush in the amount of \$25,000. In Old Crow, we have some road upgrading to complete our river bank stabilization, for a total of \$20,000.

In the Pelly Crossing area, we are going to do some resurfacing for the sum of \$15,000 and in Teslin, we have some drains to do for a total of \$20,000. In Watson Lake, we are going to purchase some crush material for the amount of \$10,000.

The total expenditure of all these projects come to \$150,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would like to pursue a question about which I have given the Minister notice. My question arises from the resolution of the Association of Yukon Communities to which I referred in general debate.

I did ask the Minister for a comment, but he did not elaborate at the time, on the suggestion from the municipalities that they would like to have more money spent on the roads in the communities. A number of them had received comments from travellers that the situation in the Territory now was rather peculiar in that the condition of the highways, in many cases, was superior to that of the roads within the communities. Travellers had peculiar and unusual situations of arriving in a

community off a fairly well-surfaced road and finding a lot of dust and ruts and mud.

I am sure that the Minister and his officials will have considered this problem long before the AYC made it known to him in its present form. I would like to ask him if this \$150,000 is the initial recognition of the problem or if, perhaps, it possibly a case that the Government does not share the view of the Association of Yukon Communities about this priority?

Would the Minister care to comment on that and indicate whether this is just a beginning of a series of expenditures on this kind of program or if it is perhaps not a concern that he shares with the AYC?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I think the fact that we have allotted \$50,000 for this project would indicate that we have had some concerns about this. We realize that this is a portion of our budget that we have put emphasis on and we certainly are looking forward to continuing the program.

I might also say that, as far as the tourist travellers are concerned, some of the highways that they travel on, and it is a peculiarity of most of the communities in the Yukon, are the main road through the towns and are actually the responsibility of the Highways. This money is not spent on the highways, it is spent on the other roads, auxiliary roads in these localities.

I am aware of the AYC's position, but I think that before they ever made the submission to us, we had identified this. I feel that we are fulfilling our obligation to the communities and we are addressing the problem within the capabilities of our budget very adequately at this time.

It is something that we will continue to review and I hope in the future, when I bring a budget back, if I am so blessed, that we will still be following this philosophy.

**Mr. Penikett:** May the Minister be blessed one more time.

Let me ask him if his commitment to raising the level of the roads in smaller communities is part of his stated intention to raise the level of basic services and equalize the basic services in the communities? Might I ask him, when he is answering that, if he could elaborate to the point of what level of road condition in the small communities, not the main roads but the auxiliary roads that he talked about, does he want to achieve? Does he see this \$150,000 as being sufficient or does he see this as the first of a continuing program that might take five years, ten years, or is it something that he might have completed next year?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, I do not think so, because it is a fact of life in roads that a road life is only so long and it is something that is going to be an on-going expenditure; there is no doubt about it. On our major roads in the Territory the maximum life is usually 20 years. On these roads it is probably not so, but it is something that I see we are going to have to continue with because roads have a habit of wearing out.

Regarding the basic services and trying to bring all the communities up to the same time, I think that the Budget reflects that on this item because, as I mentioned before, we are addressing Beaver Creek, Carmacks, Carcross, Old Crow, Pelly Crossing, Teslin and Watson Lake. So, I think that we are addressing all the communities and trying to bring all roads up to a certain standard.

Regarding the standards, I think I can foresee, probably in the future when we get the roads up and the roads approved to have a good foundation, that what we will be thinking about is looking at some kind of a surfacing treatment. We are looking very carefully at this particular time at what we refer to as the chipseal treatment. I feel that when these roads are brought up to standards that we can apply this to, that that probably will be the next extension to this program. It has many benefits to it. It lowers the O and M cost and it is a better road to ride.

I think that one of the other things that we have to realize in the communities is that, because of the soil conditions in our Territory, it tends to be very dusty for quite a period of time in the summer and chipseal tends to address all these problems and I have a lot of confidence that we put down a little bit more of it that this will probably be the way that we will be going in these communities.

**Mr. Penikett:** Is he looking at it on a five-year program?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I have not really looked at it for a five- or a three-year program. I, with the Member opposite, have great faith in this particular chipseal program. We have experienced a few problems with it, but I think we are getting more knowledgeable of it.

The Highways departments are the ones that carry out the chipseal programs because we feel that it is a thing that you have to develop a certain amount of expertise.

We are looking at the priorities and I say that we are looking at, but have not committed ourselves to, probably five to seven years.

I guess the determining factor, as always, is the bottom line, which happens to be dollars and cents. The Department going to be looking at all of the roads after we get this initial work done and we are going to kind of forecast ahead. We have not defined a period or what our priorities would be or how long we foresee it would take to do these roads.

I might say that there are some roads in a community that probably will not warrant this. I think we have to look at usage of the road, the number of people on it and the sort of the things we have to take into consideration when we are developing these priorities.

I foresee that the main secondary roads, once we get the program started will probably be a five to seven year period.

**Mr. Veale:** One of the most bitter complaints that I ever received from anyone in Yukon was when a resident of Watson Lake heard over the radio that the citizens of Whitehorse were experiencing some difficulties and making complaints about the repaving of a road in Whitehorse. This Watson Lake resident called up and said that he just could not believe how upset he would have been to have had his road repaved because, of course, he did not have any pavement on his road.

The point he was making was that the standard from the City of Whitehorse as compared to the standard in Watson Lake is just an unacceptable standard. Is the Minister indicating that it is the intention of the Government to bring the road system in the residential areas developed by the Government, lots sold by the Government, to bring those areas, Watson Lake, Carcross, Haines Junction, up to the same level as in Whitehorse? I mean chipseal, I am not talking about the hard pavement that we have on some of our main arteries. Is that the intention of the government?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not know of any roads in Whitehorse in our developments that are chipsealed; most of those are pavement.

My answer to the question would be that we definitely are looking into it. There is one thing in our new subdivision that we should take into account and that is that chipseal is a relatively new process in this area—pavement is also, to the same extent. It is a better policy to have the road in use for a year or so, before you do it. Following through from what I previously said, after that time I think that it would be appropriate to do it. It does not make economic sense to do it before that time because we do have problems with the road. It takes a good year or two of use before the road settles down and these problems are ironed out. Waiting, we get the best dollar value for the money expended.

So, in the new subdivisions I would not start off with a chipseal until we gave the road a chance to settle down but after that I think that we would be looking at the chipseal program.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister indicate how he arrived at the decision to put the chipseal down or to do the pavement on the roads that he is working on presently, Carcross, Pelly Crossing and places like that? How were those priorities established? I would assume that all communities in Yukon have some specific road complaints. How did he arrive at the priorities that he has placed in this Budget?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Our people in that Department have the necessary expertise to establish such priorities. They are familiar with the various communities and the roads in the area and they addressed the roads in the worst condition. It is a

very pragmatic approach: you review the various communities, you see the roads that are in the worst condition and you address them as such.

We have addressed seven or eight communities and noted the worst roads in those communities. It is a very easy thing to say whether or not a road needs rebuilding. We are aware of their usage and the various problems encountered on these roads and these problems are the ones that we address first.

**Mr. Veale:** Did the Minister consult the AYC recommendations regarding what the priorities should be or did he in fact go to these communities, and ask them what roads they wished to be proceeded with first?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** You will appreciate that when the AYC made its submission to us we were well into the planning stages of this Budget.

In Teslin, Watson Lake, Carmarks, et cetera, we have an L.I.D. Board and we get a lot of co-operation with the L.I.D. Boards in these communities and they are aware of and part of the process, too. Mind you, they are all trying to get on the box and trying to get the best for their communities, which I appreciate, but they give us a lot of expertise.

If, in Teslin, we were going to do something we would certainly discuss it with them and get some input from that locality because, after all, I think in those localities the people living there have a better appreciation, and a better realization of what they need rather than having someone coming in on a spasmodic tour. So we do have a lot of consultation with them.

The AYC got a lot of their information from these communities, so it is a building process. Up until now, though, we have worked more directly with the communities themselves.

**Mr. Byblow:** The Minister is outlining the intention of his Government to continue with the chipseal coat method in the smaller communities and I suppose all I can say is that he ought to be cautious in the application of that particular method of road surface in the communities. Probably a good barometer for its total value in the communities, in terms of problems related to it in application and later use, would be the community of Faro where they have used that method this year for parking lots and for some of the road work. Unless that method of road surface is applied in a particular manner it can deteriorate very quickly.

I think the Municipal Council in Faro is waiting with baited breath for the spring to see just how well it stands up. I believe in the application of some of that surface treatment there was an immediate rain which has a very negative effect. Also, weather conditions in terms of warmth have a tremendous effect because the principle of that treatment has to do with oil permeating upwards into the gravel crush that is applied over that surface.

I am only raising to the Minister that he ought to be very cautious in its application, or, in how far he extends that program.

Also, there seems to be a factor involved and that is related to the use of the road. I think the former Minister will recall the application of that type of surface treatment in the Little Salmon area where it has turned out to be a very excellent road surface. It is good because it was done under conditions where there was favourable weather, where there appears to have been proper application, and where there was a high traffic volume which threw the gravel that did not get permeated off the road that it made a very good surface.

In a community, when you do not have that large volume of high speed traffic driving over that surface, it could have another bearing on the quality of that road. I would just, for the Minister's information, raise those concerns.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I have a few other comments on this subject. I want to be make it quite clear because, from the previous speaker, it would appear that we are going ahead with it now. I did not say that. We are looking at it at a future date.

I am aware of all those problems. The application of this chipseal is quite a technical thing and we are building up an expertise. We have done a major amount of the highways. My

Deputy and I had a long conversation with one of the other provinces last year when we were at a conference and they had some 30 year experience and we did get a lot of valuable knowledge from them. We have also had a lot of contact back and forth with the State of Alaska and it is quite true that there are three or four things that do interfere with the proper application of this surface. Weather is quite a factor in getting it down and, of course, that is something that we do not have any control over.

We are aware of the pitfalls and we have gone elsewhere where we feel that they have the expertise and we are certainly drawing all the expertise we can. We are dedicated to make good roads at a good price and get value for our money.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would only conclude by saying that you have an excellent experiment in your back door here in Yukon and that is what is going in Faro now.

**Mr. Veale:** Are there any other areas in the Capital Budget dealing with roads? Is this the only area that is talking about roads, streets and sidewalks or will there be some included in the Community Assistance Program?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Primarily this would be the biggest. There are some repairs, et cetera, but, no, this would be the part that deals with most of the roads in those communities.

**Mr. Penikett:** The Minister expressed some nervousness about the efforts on this side to extract a commitment from him on the question of this chip surface. He said that he is considering it. Could I ask him when he will be making this decision? Is he going to be making it on a community-by-community basis? Is he going to be entertaining applications for that surface on a community-by-community basis? Is this something that he is going to reach a conclusion on in this next year or is it something that they may not make a decision on until long after he is gone?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I hope that I will be around for a while yet. I think that when we are talking about these communities, that we are going to be getting a lot of input from them. We are certainly looking at it and, as we have not really done anything in the communities themselves, I am sure we will be getting at least a trial section down.

I believe that when we get this input we will find that all of them will probably want chipseal right off the bat, there is no doubt about it, but, because we do not have the money, I think we are sit down with them and, through discussions with them, I think we are going to be able to say, "O.K. we are going to do this this year. Next year we will look at that one." I think that through a little consultation with these people that we will be able to proceed adequately.

There will be some flak naturally, there always is, but I think that when we plan out what we intend to do over a period of five to seven years that all the communities will be quite in agreement with the process in which we select the targets for a particular year.

*Roads, Streets and Sidewalks agreed to  
On Local Services*

**Mr. Chairman:** Local Services, \$150,000, are there any questions?

**Mr. Penikett:** Perhaps the Minister could give us some indication of the major items on this list of \$150,000 proposed expenditure.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I would be very glad to.

On these Local Services projects we are addressing we are looking at a \$150,000. We have identified that we need a water truck in Keno City for \$25,000. We have some expenditures for a greater replacement in a water truck in the community of Mayo for \$45,000. In Old Crow, we need a sewer eduction truck for \$25,000. Ross River also needs a water truck and a shelter for it and we have identified \$40,000 for that. In Teslin, they need a sander for the streets; we have identified \$15,000 for that. The total for all these expenditures is \$150,000.

This fund is to provide the small items of equipment and machinery for the various communities throughout the Territory.

**Mr. Penikett:** Could I ask the Minister if there is any money in this item for ridings represented by MLA's other than the Conservative MLA's.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I would like the Member to know that when our Department is looking at a community we certainly do not look at the political affiliation of the member for that riding. I kind of take offense to that because there is no way that when I am looking at the facilities that are needed throughout the Yukon that I segregate one type of people from the other. I feel that we are providing services for communities and I consider the Yukon people as a whole and we are trying to do the best for the Yukon people. I do not look at the political things and I do not like the inferences that we are doing that.

**Mr. Penikett:** God forbid that anyone suggest that the Government over there would do anything political.

All I was asking the Minister was was his list that he gave us exhaustive, are there any other items, or was that the exclusive list? The list I am referring to is the one gave including the items for Teslin, Ross River, Old Crow, Mayo, and Keno. Was that the complete list of expenditures?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** At this time that is the list that we have identified under this line item. There is no other equipment that we perceive the communities would need.

**Mr. Veale:** Well, Mr. Minister, you are looking after my friend from Mayo very well in this section.

I have a question. I ask the Minister if he received any applications or request for any equipment from any L.I.D.s other than the ones that have been granted in this Budget?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am not aware of any. I cannot say whether the Department has, but I am not aware of any that we have.

If you wish me to bring an answer back, I certainly will.

**Mr. Veale:** I would appreciate it if the Minister would come back on that and provide us with the information as to what requests have been made last year and, if there are any, which have not been fulfilled.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, I indicated that I would bring that information back.

**Mr. Penikett:** Knowing my high regard for economy, efficiency and wanting avoid a waste of government time and money, I will be happy to save a lot of time and table the complete request from the communities of what they asked for under this Budget.

*Local Services agreed to  
On Land Development*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Land Development, \$3,500,000

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question, which I gave the Minister notice about, concerning the amount here. The Government already has a fair amount of land banked in this City. He did, in a general way, in the earlier part of the discussion, indicate some of the kinds of lands that were proposed to be developed. I think he indicated earlier that there was a little more detailed list and I want to ask the Minister if he has some kind of projection of the demand?

I know that his officials have prepared a document, called, "Residential Lot Forecasts," which I gather are basically generated from information gathered by the Economic Research and Planning Unit and the Yukon Housing Corporation. Many of the lots in this demand forecast, of course, do not include the non-residential kind which are being developed.

I am particularly concerned, given the amount we have banked already, that we do not have more than we need. I think it is very good to have a supply of land that exceeds the demand. I think if we could achieve that situation in respect to all kinds of lands, or at least have the supply slightly ahead of demand, it would probably be an ideal situation in terms of having a moderating effect on prices at the same time as meeting the community needs.

I wonder if he could just take a little time to describe for us the kinds of lands they are planning to develop, how the decisions were made about what and where, and if he has any fears at all about some of the land being developed being surplus to

the needs of the community at this present time.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I would be glad to elaborate a little bit on this.

I have a list here of where we are considering spending this money. This list is not cast in stone, but I will go over the items and the localities that we have considered.

In Beaver Creek we have a power line relocation for \$10,000; it is a small item. In Dawson City, in the Callison area, we are doing phase two legal survey for industrial land and that is in the amount of \$50,000. The lots in the Callison subdivision went very well and there is a demand for more.

In Faro, we are doing a dry industrial plan and a legal survey for \$70,000; for a commercial plan and a legal survey for that is \$80,000. In a trailer court there, phase one, we have the planning, the legal survey, engineer design and construction and have put \$500,000 towards that. For some medium density residential projects, we have identified spending \$70,000. I hope the Member for Faro is looking at the amount of money we are spending on land development in his particular area. I am sure that later on in one of the discussions he will commend me for being aware that Faro is still part of Yukon.

Continuing on to Mayo, for the design and construction of the airport lots, the roads, legal surveys, utilities, et cetera, we have identified \$130,000. In the same area, for acreage residential completion, we have identified \$40,000.

In Ross River, phase one, we have identified \$260,000. Going along to Watson Lake, for the planning design and legal survey, phase two, of residential acreages, we have identified \$50,000.

In Whitehorse North, road tower, et cetera, we have identified \$400,000. In Whitehorse South, we are looking at the possibility of considering between 30 and 50 parcels, for which we have identified a figure of \$225,000.

When we developed Crestview, the lots were to be all serviced lots. We have not done the paving in Crestview. I think was a good decision to delay it because the ground has had a chance to settle, if we had to make any corrections to any deficiencies in either the road or the utilities, we have now had time to do these things. We have identified \$900,000 for that project.

In the Porter Creek C area we have allocated a small amount, if there is any upgrading to do. Wolf Creek phase two of the planning, design, legal survey, \$200,000. Canyon Crescent, to resurvey roads, \$100,000. And we have identified \$370,000 for cottage lot development. We are looking at three areas in cottage lot development: Little Teslin, Marsh Lake and Laberge. We have identified that much money for these. The total of those figures is projected at \$3,500,000.

**Mr. Veale:** I assume that the Minister has made a projection of the time frame of the recovery of these expenditures. Could he indicate when he expects to have the \$3,500,000 fully recovered to meet the objective stated in the Capital Budget?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** That is a very difficult thing to do. I suppose there are two ways of addressing this particular problem: either wait until they knock down our doors to get to land developed, or get the land developed and hope it will sell. The demand has been in these particular localities. We do not have a land bank in excess of what we consider the demand will be. You will notice our land bank of lots available to the public within the Whitehorse area. We have considered no more development in that area because we think we have sufficient lots to satisfy our needs for the foreseeable future. In these other areas there is a demand for lots so we are preparing them. For me to say we are going to recover our costs in one or two years — I hope it will fairly soon — is pretty hard to project. I do not think the gentleman wants me to guess. There will be a fairly good demand for these lots.

**Mr. Veale:** I take it from the Ministers answer that there is no projection on the time expectation for recovery of this money. Is there not some way the Minister can look at interest rates in the market and determine what the demand is going to be in advance and come to some conclusion about the recovery

of the money? The Minister said he is going to be spending \$3,500,000. It seems to me it is logical to suggest that if it is not recovered for five years, it is really substantially more than that. It might be four million or five million, depending on how long these lots have to be carried and assuming that money could be put to good use somewhere else.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I foresee that if we did not have these lots developed, my Honourable friends across the way would be asking where they are? There is a good demand for them. You will notice that almost \$1,000,000 of that money is to be spent on the paving of the Crestview area. We are getting down now to \$2,500,000. We have not flooded the market in any particular locality. I feel that because we have had a demand for land in these areas, that there will be a good public response.

It is pretty hard, because of the fluctuating interest rates, to determine the public's reaction, but if people want the land and they are determined to build, then they are going to go ahead and build anyhow.

I think that the key to the whole situation is not to flood any particular market with too many lots. I feel that we have looked at it very realistically in those particular terms. I do not feel that we are building up a bank of land that will be in excess of what we think will be a reasonable public demand.

**Mr. Veale:** We all endorse the concept of land banking, which the Government appears to believe in as well.

Do the number of lots available in Whitehorse now, reflect an optimal land banking policy? Is this what the Government objective was, to have this many lots on the market at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Unfortunately, in Whitehorse we had anticipated a better demand and I feel that probably we have a land bank that is too large in Whitehorse.

At the same time we have learned a little bit by experience, and that is why in the outlying areas, we are going at it with what I consider to be fairly realistic numbers of lots to be developed.

We have a large land bank in Whitehorse today, but things can always change, and we may be glad to have that large a land bank.

One other thing about developing land, the way prices have been going in the last few years, probably we have saved money. It was cheaper to develop that land three to four years ago and even carry the interest, than it would be to make the same development today. In a place like Whitehorse, when we are doing this land development, our planning time is a lot longer than it is for the smaller communities.

**Mr. Veale:** Has he looked at the situation to determine whether the opening up of the rural residential acreages will affect the already large number of lots that are land banked in Whitehorse? Is that going to exacerbate that situation and make it worse? What is the impact going to be?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not think so because I think that all of us have our preference of lifestyles, the type of lots we want, the type of lifestyles we have, and I feel that if a person is dedicated to a particular lifestyle, like rural residential, he will wait until that land is available, and has waited, I believe, in lots of cases. It is where he wants to build.

The other thing is we are not building an excessive amount of these outside rural residential lots, and I suppose it could be argued there will be fewer sold here. But I think that for a lot of people that is the type of land they want, that is the type of a home they want, and they are probably planning for it. They know we are putting these on the market and I do not think that those people would really purchase land from the land bank that we have assembled in the City of Whitehorse.

**Mr. Byblow:** As the Minister has requested I am certainly very pleased to stand up and say that the \$650,000 identified here is most highly in order and will help the crisis that has developed in land development in Faro.

I have several questions relating to the dry industrial and commercial development of that specific area. Could the Minister repeat what is included in those two developments in terms of the work to be done by the Yukon Territorial Govern-

ment?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I will repeat it for the Member's edification. On dry industrial, the planned legal survey was \$70,000. We identified in commercial the planned legal survey for \$80,000. The two projects we had identified as \$150,000 together.

**Mr. Byblow:** In the trailer court development that would be, again, the survey and planning. Is the intent there to sell the lots individually to recover the monies, or is the government going to be a landlord and take rent? Can the Minister advise, at this point, if there is anything mapped out in that plan, or is it still to be developed with the Municipal Council?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I think with that particular thing we are working very closely with the City of Faro at this time. We have identified that. We have not really come out with a firm policy on that at this time.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question relating to that item on the budget respecting this past fiscal year, the one that we are in, 1981-82. Of the \$500,000 that was identified for land development there, has that been expended and developed and, if it was not, what happens to the money?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** If we do not use the money it goes back into working capital, and if we need the money for next year, we have to revoke it. I believe we have spent a great majority of it. If the Member so wishes I will see.

*Land Development agreed to*

*On Community Assistance Program*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Community Assistance Program, in the amount of \$5,000,000

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** This figure is for various projects. We have not identified all of them individually. This money will look after such projects as pre-engineering. We have identified some, like Beaver Creek Community Hall, Burwash, upgrading the dumps, Carmacks, upgrading the sewer treatment and completing it. In Dawson City, there is some sewer replacement. Faro, in general, we have to spend some money there. In Haines Junction we have a drainage storage and pump improvements, repairs to water tower, updated community plans. In places like Mayo we are looking at dog pounds, lagoon design and water supply updating. In Old Crow we are looking at water supply engineering designs and sewer disposal site. In Ross River we have been looking at a water supply properties. In Teslin, garbage dumps, engineering and design, water supply, phase one, and upgrading the community plans. In Watson Lake we can see that we are going to spend some money probably on sewer and rehabilitating the Eighth Street problem. We can identify that probably we have to spend some money on the Community Hall, and update the community plans.

These are the type of projects that we can foresee spending this particular amount of money on. You will notice that we have addressed pretty well all the areas throughout the Territory.

Whitehorse, too, will be getting a fair amount of money. What Whitehorse will do with their money, they will be deciding themselves.

This is the type of project that I envisage in this particular amount of money.

**Mr. Penikett:** I apologize if I have let this slip by earlier. I ask this question now and if I am asking it in the wrong place the Minister could perhaps take it as notice. I was looking through the Highways Expenditure and expenditures in this Department, and someone suggested to me somewhere that there was something in the budget for the chipseal services you were talking about earlier for Teslin, but I heard the Minister make no mention of that. Perhaps the Minister could tell me if there is something in there for chipseal in Teslin, so I might ask him some questions about it.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, and I presume you are talking about the side streets. I am not aware of any chipseal in Teslin. I did not make that statement.

**Mr. Penikett:** I had a constituent call about it. This constituent seemed to believe that it was in the budget somewhere.

My problem is I could not find it, the Minister did not mention it, and if it is true I wanted to know where it was so that I could ask questions about it.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** As far as I am aware that is not true. I am certainly not aware of it and I am sure I would be aware of it we were going ahead on that thing.

**Mr. Veale:** With all respect to the Minister I find it not very helpful to have a list of communities that are going to receive capital assistance program money without some designation of how much money is going to each community. Is there not some way that the Minister could have those figures prepared so that we could deal with this in a more rational manner before we actually get into it. It really does not make a lot of sense to be talking about it this way. Is it a dollar for Old Crow or is it \$100,000. It does not make any sense. I would rather adjourn and have those figures brought down, and then we can proceed to discuss it. It is the largest line item in the whole budget and we do not have any details.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** On these particular figures there are a lot of priorities involved. We do not like to lock ourselves in figures we have identified. There are always contingencies that come along that we cannot identify at this particular time. We have a rough idea of the figures. They are not cast in stone. If the Member wanted some of these particular figures I could give them to him. These figures are guideline figures at this particular time. In a particular locality we might not put as much in one thing as another. If he wants that type of figures I can get them for him.

**Mr. Veale:** Could we adjourn until we have those figures? Until we know what we are dealing with it really is not responsible to go ahead and discuss these things without the figure. I fully accept the Minister's decision that he wants to be flexible, and if he allocates something to a particular community he might want to consult that community and decide it should go somewhere else in that community. The point is, what are the dollars going to each community?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** If the Members opposite demand that kind of information from us, what we would be doing is doing away with the capital program and voting money for each community on a community-by-community basis. Neither we nor the communities, would have any flexibility then. I do not care what the Member opposite says, if we table a list of figures that says Faro is going to get \$1,000,000 and Whitehorse it going to get \$2,000,000, we are locked in. No matter what is said after that, they will go ahead on that. I would like to remind Members that two years ago a real crisis arose in one of the communities. We had to identify \$2,000,000 for that community in a very big hurry. We were able to do it because we had the flexibility in the program to do it, and for no other reason.

**Mr. Veale:** The Government Leader has a point in that they do not want to have things chipped in stone. On the other hand, it is irresponsible for the Assembly to proceed with a gross figure of \$5,000,000, and not have any idea or any concept of the government's priorities. I accept that the position remain flexible, but we do not vote specifically what amount of money must go to what community. We have not voted that on the Mayo grader. The Member for Mayo might not get that grader because you may want to be flexible. There has just been an indication from the Minister as to what he intends to do with that money. Of course we can always come back and ask why did he not do something. I think there has to be some indication, and I would be surprised to hear that the government does not have some preliminary position taken with communities so that it knows what is going to happen to that money. It may all go to the Dawson sewer system.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** When I listed the different projects and communities we had envisaged these particular expenditures in, I thought it would be very clear to Members that we are not going to dump it into one project, such as the Dawson water and sewer system. We have given you a list of the priorities and localities where we are going to spend the money. The only think he seems to want is to nickel and dime it and get into an

accounting course. I find it does not give us the flexibility. We have identified where we are going to put this money and we have identified the projects, what more does he want.

**Mr. Veale:** Even if we could hundred-thousand it, I would be happy. I do not want to nickel and dime it. Hundred-thousand it, half-million it, million it. They are big expenditures, and I believe the Assembly has the right to know where the Minister intends to spend them.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I recognize that the Member opposite is relatively new to the Legislature, but I think that we had better go on past history. I am sure that if he does his researcher to have a look at what was done approximately ten years ago, that is exactly what occurred. Everything was line itemed and it allowed no flexibility for the Government to work with the communities, altering their various priorities over the course of the year.

I think that it is fair to say that ever since, even at the start of this Legislature, that each Minister of Municipal Affairs brought forward three, four, and in this case, five million dollars, saying these are the areas that we are looking at, at the present time.

Now, there is a time for an accounting, and the time for an accounting is Supplementaries. I recognize that perhaps for the Member opposite, he feels that it is too late. I think that in fairness to the communities involved that flexibility has to exist. I think that we have shown as a priority exactly where we feel that the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs fits in respect to the Capital Budget, and it is obviously a very high priority.

**Mrs. McGuire:** I just want to ask the Minister if I heard him correctly. Did he say that there is money identified in here to update the Haines Junction water tower?

Does the Minister mean there are no plans for a different system? I cannot imagine spending thousands and thousands of dollars, which he has been doing over the years on this tank, which is inadequate, not to mention all the disputes it has caused.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I thought the other day that I said we were looking at the matter of the Haines water tower. There are certain repairs on this tower that have to be done. I did not specify that we are going to spend hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars on this. I just identified this as one of the projects that we would be doing with this money. I did not say any particular amount, but there are certain repairs that have to be done to the tower to make it adequate to serve the needs of the community at this particular time. I only used that as an illustration of where we put this type of money.

**Mr. Penikett:** Let me ask the Minister if the House may assume that as a matter of government policy, that except for emergencies, the Minister's priorities in respect to the capital assistance spending are the priorities of the communities, and of course not including those items already identified as land items in this budget.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** As I indicated before, we have a good relationship with all these communities. They know they have problems, they identify where they would like to put the money, and identify the project they would like. We certainly work very closely with them. I think that is the way it should be, because in each community they know the projects we have and they are very aware. And when they make application to us, we have a very good relationship with them. They do not always get what they want. We only have so much money, as you realize. But we do not go in there and say you are going to get something. I think that is the wrong approach altogether. Mind you, on some of the larger communities such as Whitehorse, they set their priorities themselves. I am talking about the smaller communities like Teslin and Watson Lake. We have a lot of consultation with them.

**Mr. Penikett:** I want to thank the Minister for his answer but I just want to pursue one detail that he remarked upon in closing. He said that Whitehorse set its own priorities and they had a global amount. Could he just, once and for all, for the

record, make it clear that it is the Minister's position that he will respect the priorities of the communities in respect to this funding?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** As I indicated before, as much as it is possible we certainly do. I cannot say emphatically that we endorse every priority because maybe their priorities exceed the amount of money that we have available. We work with them and I feel in that way that we are addressing what they consider their priorities in that particular community.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister advise how much money has been spent to date on the repair of the Haines Junction water tank, and what the projected estimate of the repair cost is going to be? I ask that question specifically because it is my belief that that has to be replaced, not repaired. I am surprised that the Minister is not allocating money to replace that water tower.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am sure the Member realizes that I do not have those figures at my disposal but I have no problem at all in getting the information and passing the information on.

**Mr. Veale:** Now I assume that the Minister and the members of his department have had a great deal of ongoing discussion with the City of Dawson regarding the sewer system and the problems that are now being encountered. Have any reports been received by the Minister on the estimated cost of repair and replacement to that system?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, at this time we have not. We are doing a certain amount of repairs up there that we have had to do to keep this system in operation during the winter months. On the Dawson water and sewer system, when we had the problems, we have had the people responsible for the engineering, we have had the people that are responsible for the construction, we have had the suppliers of the pipe, we made various studies, and also are doing work there now. What we have done on some of the pipes is to send them out to be tested to see they were up to the specifications that we had required. This takes some time. But we have been monitoring the system very, very closely. But, I have nothing concrete at this particular time to report on why the failures occurred. I am hoping in the future, I hope it is not too far away that we will probably have a complete report on all the studies that we are doing, because our people themselves have been doing a lot of work. Our engineering staff has gone up and looked at it. We have had a very good review of the whole thing and I hope that probably we will be able to identify why we have the problems that we have.

Always, on a new project, there is a shakedown period, and especially in an area like Dawson, where we have conditions that we do not experience in a lot of other localities. I am talking about the permafrost, the type of ground, and it is a new concept. I believe it has been blown out of all proportions. We know that we were going to experience a certain number of problems. At this particular time, unless something else comes along, I do not think that the system can be faulted because we have to make a few corrections and repairs to it.

As I say, we have conducted a study and, when I get the report, we will be able to say, what was done wrong, or whatever it may be.

**Mr. Veale:** Will the Minister agree to table that report in the House when he receives it?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** It is not really a report. It is a department review, but I see no problem why we would not. I would probably be making a Ministerial Statement, or something to that effect.

**Mr. Veale:** I am sure the Minister is well aware that he has \$5,000,000 to spend and he must have some concept of allocations to the various areas. I mean, he has a game plan and it may be flexible, but what is the game plan? What reserves, and that is a concept that is normally used — you keep a certain amount reserved for a certain problem areas — are set aside for the Dawson water and sewer system?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** What we are looking at in the Dawson water and sewer system is that we are making expenditures in the area of \$150,000 to \$200,000, at this time. Whether this will be

all that we need I do not know.

That is one of the reasons why we like to keep some flexibility, because in a case like the Dawson water and sewer situation or another breakdown, we have to have the flexibility to allocate money to that. If I were to bring back what the Member is asking me to do, it would be getting back almost to line budgetting, and we would not have the flexibility. In the case of the water and sewer in Dawson we see, at this particular time between \$150,000 and \$200,000.

**Mr. Veale:** Could the Minister indicate what that is going to be allocated to? Is it allocated to engineering reports or is it allocated to actual construction work on the system?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** The bulk of this money is definitely for the replacement and repairs, not for engineering. Engineering is not included in the figure.

**Mr. Byblow:** My question to the Minister is whether his department has now all of the submissions under the Capital Assistance Program that would qualify under this item in the budget? Does the Minister at this point in time know the communities' priorities in terms of their submissions for fiscal assistance? That again works out in different percentages of contribution towards the various programs. Does he have all the submissions from the communities in this point of time towards which he can disburse this \$5,000,000?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, not at this time. We do not have them all back.

**Mr. Byblow:** Could I ask what portion of this \$5,000,000 at this point is earmarked under the strength of submissions and requests?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** We have identified in our Capital Assistance Program the figure of \$5,000,000. We have had some submissions. I did not realize that we wanted an accounting for that particular item. Some of the questions I find that they are asking, we would be here for days giving the answers. There are some more submissions to be received. We have some of them in, but we do not have them all. That is one of the reasons that I cannot say a dollar value for this, a dollar value for that. I have outlined to the Members the projects that we are considering, the localities that we recognize that what we know now that they need this money for. There will be more to come and there will be probably be some oalignment of priorities within these communities. That is the way it should be. The moment that we get locked into a particular amount for a particular thing, I feel that we are restricting ourselves and we are not going to provide the services that we should be providing for these communities.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Thank you Mr. Lattin.

However, from the Chair, I would say that the Members have the right to ask most any questions on these things. So we must, I think, carry on in that sense.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** At no time did I want to muzzle the questions. I ought to say that. Actually what they are asking me for is figures of this and that and I do not have those figures yet at my disposal now. If they are not going to be satisfied until I bring these figures, I will try to bring them. Again, these are only guidelines. In no way did I suggest I do not want any questions. Do not misunderstand me. But they are asking me questions about the dollar value of things like this and I do not have them at my disposal at this time.

*Community Assistance Program agreed to*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** At this time I will call a brief recess.

*Recess*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will now call the Committee to order.

**Mr. Byblow:** I request the House to grant unanimous consent to permit me to ask one more question on the Community Assistance Program.

*On Community Assistance Program*

**Mr. Byblow:** It relates, in part, also to land development. Where the Minister has identified various land developments

throughout the territory in the amount of \$3,500,000, he has identified specific amounts for communities and I am raising the question of; before I raise the question, as I understand the Minister's explanation, he said that those specific amounts were for the design, the engineering, the surveys of these various developments. Then he says that they are wholly recoverable. Before you can wholly recover them you have to sell them, and before you can sell them you have got to service them. My question is this. If the money that is appropriated under Land Development is inadequate to service, and it obviously is by looking at the figures, where do the communities get the money to service these lots? Is that now an application under CAP.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I believe the Member is going back to the Land Development. He is specifically talking about Faro, the dry industrial lots in that. The money that I indicated that we would be spending on those things are for the industrial plan, the legal survey, and the engineering and design. Again on the dry industrial lots I had identified \$70,000 for that. This is a two phase process. At this particular time we have indicated that that is the amount of money that we are spending to get our designs and our survey into that. After that we will still, on these particular projects, be expending more money. That is the start of this development. This is not the complete development in any form at all. When we put in any other services that we have to put in to this particular things we will be bringing forth that amount of money. All that money under Disposal of Lands will be recoverable, but this is just the planning stages I am talking about at this particular time.

**Mr. Byblow:** So, if I am understanding correctly what the Minister is saying, then where he is developing parcels of land in next year's building season, it is only to introduce the engineering, the surveying, the plan. It is not to completely service them. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I thought I was quite clear. That is correct. *Community Assistance Program agreed to*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Porter Creek Alternate Access Road in the amount of \$500,000

**Mr. Veale:** Perhaps the Minister could just give us a little history on the Porter Creek Alternate Access. Last year's Capital Budget had projected an estimated cost of \$4,500,000. Would the Minister advise as to the projected cost at this time? What phase of the construction are we in?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** On the Porter Creek Access Road, we have identified \$500,000 for this particular time.

The Porter Creek Access Road was broken down into two phases. The \$500,000 will complete phase one and bring the road up to a sub-grade level from the Copper Road to Porter Creek. In phase two there will be some realignment of properties. This \$500,000 completes phase one.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I care about this particular project because it is major construction that is in the Porter Creek area. If Members opposite recall, during the last election, there was a commitment by the Conservative Party that we needed better access to one of the major subdivisions of Whitehorse. As you know, we proceeded to work out an agreement with the City of Whitehorse which the Member for Whitehorse West was a member of at that time, to proceed with the particular access road.

I should point out also, that another Conservative policy is to upgrade our vocational school and give better training to our young people. We did put a considerable amount of money into the Heavy Equipment course, which has allowed us to turn out very well qualified and competent operators for the various businesses that are in the heavy construction road-building industries.

A number of the managers from the various industries have commented on the quality of operators we are turning out. It is serving a function which is not only providing a necessary access to the good people of Porter Creek, but is also providing the necessary training for heavy equipment operators.



**Mr. Penikett:** I am sure the Member will forgive me for saying that I am not quite sure, but I do believe that I have heard that speech before. Six or seven times at least.

I just have one question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I want to emphasize that I put it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and not the Minister of the opposition over there. This road that was promised in the last election is not going to be ready for the next election. Am I correct in saying that?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I thought I had made it quite clear that this amount of money would finish phase one. Whether it will before the election or not, I cannot say.

**Mr. Penikett:** I do want to make sure that the Minister understands that it was perfectly clear to me, but it seemed that it was not perfectly clear to the Member for Porter Creek East. I did want to get that straight. He may have noticed that the road passes through my riding. I have just one small question and I do not want to sound carping about this but the Minister knows from time to time that there has been the odd complaint about disruption in the area, or trees knocked down on people's favorite walking paths and so forth.

Could I ask the Minister if he is still getting any of these complaints or is that fairly quiet now?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I have not had any complaints recently. The fact is I do not know whether the people are scared of me or not but I have had very few complaints on it. I am quite concerned about this road, too, because not only does it go through your territory it happens to end up in the district that I represent.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think that all three Members agree that it is a very good program and I just want to reiterate once again that it is another example that when the Conservatives make a commitment, they carry it through.

**Mr. Veale:** The Porter Creek alternate access is in fairly decent shape. I prefer the route rather than going down the main highway to come to Whitehorse. The question I have for the Minister is: if we are going to have flexibility in this Capital Budget, which he is so interested in, I am referring to flexibility for the Whitehorse swimming pool. Where are the priorities in terms of the Capital Budget? Is it a priority to have the Whitehorse swimming pool as a first priority, or is the Porter Creek access road the first priority? If we are going to have to sacrifice one for the other, which way will the Minister go?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not think we have to. On the second page are line items and this is the amount of money identified for these projects. These projects are considered very major projects. We can be specific on these particular items and we are identifying in the Budget half a million dollars for the Porter Creek alternative access. We have already entered into construction. It will serve a dual purpose as my Member beside me said. The city engineers are doing engineering and the design of it and we are also using the vocational school. It is a good training area I think they are doing a commendable job but this money is identified. It is not a matter of priority. We have identified this in projects and on the other page we have identified what we are prepared to allow for the Whitehorse swimming pool.

**Mr. Veale:** Is there any flexibility in the Capital Budget for projects that come in at estimates that are greater than the original identification of monies?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** On some things there would be and on some things there would not be. We have said in the case of the Whitehorse swimming pool how much we are prepared to give to it. Another item I looked at is the Haines Junction sewer lagoon, or the one at Watson Lake. It is conceivable, for one reason or another, that we would not go ahead with that project. We would have a certain amount of flexibility with that money. We do not know the costs of that and that is why we estimate these things at this particular time. I can see both these projects going ahead.

**Mr. Veale:** The Minister said he sees the City of Whitehorse swimming pool as going ahead. Is that his statement?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am not saying it is going ahead. We are

not the only actors in the particular play. We have identified how much money we are prepared to put in that and we have put it in the budget. Whether it goes ahead or not is not our decision but we have identified that much for that project. It is up to the City to come up with the rest. I think you are all aware of the controversy over it. That is what we said we are prepared to pay for that project.

**Mr. Penikett:** I look forward to discussing the swimming pool and I do not want to be excessively rigid, or even overly orderly. I wonder if we can discuss one item at a time. It would help me, with limited intellectual ability, to understand.

**Mr. Veale:** There is a connection, despite the Leader of the Opposition's inability to understand it. The point is that there is a certain amount of money being allocated to the City of Whitehorse. If there is not, somebody has made a big mistake here because there is going to be a dollar figure. I am just questioning the priorities that have been set. The Member from Porter Creek says the access road is the priority for Porter Creek. Well, maybe he is right. Maybe that is the first priority for the citizens of Porter Creek. But, maybe the swimming pool is. It is a question of priorities and I just asked the Minister to be flexible on that issue so that as you are flexible with CAP, so that we will have a swimming pool and maybe even spend that \$500,000 on the Porter Creek access road.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I would like to make it specifically clear that we are talking about line items. We have identified a certain amount for these line items. Because it is in the Municipality of Whitehorse, especially with the Porter Creek alternative access, they were part of the agreement we first had. They are quite aware of what our phases were and what standards we were bringing it up to. So certainly they have been concerned with it all along. Because we are working within the City of Whitehorse and because they have worked with us, I would say that this must be one of their priorities also.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Thank you Mr. Lattin.

I would also say to Members that we are on a line item and to be sure, if you speak, that it is on that line item.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to say to the Government Members that this is a rare opportunity that I feel I want to issue a compliment. The approach of combining the use of the vocational school and the building of a public project is an excellent one. It provides for training and it also gets the work done relatively cheaply. It is an excellent approach and I recommend that the government does a lot more of it, especially in the area of housing.

**Mr. Penikett:** Just let me ask one question, since we seem to be in a transitional period between Porter Creek access and the Whitehorse escarpment.

It is interesting that these two items are back-to-back in this year's Budget, since last year one of the problems raised in connection with the Porter Creek alternate road was a question of erosion on the escarpment. The Minister, at the time, said that he was going to monitor it. Has he been monitoring it and has he any reason to believe that the concerns expressed by residents in the area are real and is there any need for any stabilization as a result of the construction?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** The information I have from the departments and the various people who are connected with this, as I said before, we are monitoring it. They have assured me that there is no problem at this time with that and we do not foresee any problems in the future.

**Mr. Penikett:** Just on a supplementary so that so Members did not think the last question was a tremendous giggle, there are a couple of people living on Dieppe Drive who are very worried about the erosion of the bank underneath their houses. They are public houses so it is not a frivolous question.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not think it is a frivolous question because I think the Honourable Member has asked me before. In fact we have had some private conversations on it, and we are certainly monitoring it. At this particular time we are assured, and we are convinced, that there is no problem. But I think we will still continue to monitor it. I think that is one of the

responsibilities that we have to undertake.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Any more questions on Porter Creek Alternate Access of \$500,000?

*Porter Creek Alternate Access agreed to  
On Whitehorse Escarpment*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Whitehorse Escarpment, in the amount of \$100,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I doubt if this will be enough to buy even one house, but how close are we to completing this program?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Of course you know that there are more than one actor in this besides yourselves. I believe that when we first originally started we had roughly 100 to 120 properties. I understand now that we have purchased around 100 properties. We have in the vicinity of ten or more so to go, and that would complete phase one of the project.

The second phase is, and we have to have some consultation to between ourselves, the Federal Government and the City, is what we will then do.

*Whitehorse Escarpment agreed to  
On Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon, in the amount of \$1,250,000.

**Mrs. McGuire:** I have a couple of questions on this. The original vote was for \$2,000,000 on a two-year term. I want to know why the change? Secondly, this contract was let some months ago, but there seems to be no movement on the project. I am wondering why this is so, because most contractors prefer to do their work in the winter time as far as clearing is concerned. Was this contract withdrawn or was it just postponed?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** At one time it was probably that. We have had a lot of problems. I am sure that the Member is aware of all the problems in that it seems to be an ongoing problem of almost frustration, and it has probably taking longer than when we first envisioned it when we first entered into it. We have had a lot of consultation with the area LID on it and at this particular time we are saying that it costs in the area of \$3,000,000.

**Mrs. McGuire:** I wonder if the Minister could answer my last question. The contract was let a few months ago and there seems to be no movement on this project at all. I am wondering why? Was the contract withdrawn, was it postponed, or what happened there?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** As I indicated before, we have had problems with this project. I think we have had some more discussions with the LID. There are many actors in this particular thing because we have the Park, we have the Water Board, which gives us a never ending amount of problems in these areas, and we are still having discussions with it, and therefore we have not proceeded.

**Mrs. McGuire:** It seems to me that when a contract is let, and there is usually a date set when the contractor can commence. Now, it seems to me that that project becomes the ball game of the contractor. If the government postponed that contract, held it over a certain length of time, it seems to me that they should have re-let the contract because I can remember at least two local contractors in Haines Junction that felt that the Notice for Tender, in the papers, had a time limit that was too short to allow them to raise financing to bid on this job. They would feel, and I feel now that if this contract is postponed that that is a little unfair.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Any more questions?

**Mrs. McGuire:** Could the Minister identify for us, perhaps, what sort of problems he is having? I am not aware of anything and in talking to the LID Chairman he is at a loss on this, as well.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** There were all kinds of problems. There was the problem of the overflow. There was a problem of where it had to go. There was a never ending amount of problems that we had to address on this particular case. Everybody had their own ideas. I can remember people telling me that we were pumping sewage uphill, we should be pumping it down. There were many actors in this particular project.

I agree with the Member. It has taken a lot of time. These are just problems you have to encounter when you do any kind of project like that, when there is more than one actor in the ballgame.

**Mrs. McGuire:** Does the Minister find it a little unusual that the Government lets contracts when all their plans are not in place?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Not necessarily. If they are going to have problems, why go ahead and spend the money until we get all these problems resolved? At one time we thought we had, but they are not all resolved.

There are other contracts that we have not continued, which we let out, for various reasons.

**Mrs. McGuire:** Could the Government then be liable for some sort of penalty that the contractor may and can impose upon the Government?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No.

**Mr. Penikett:** I am fascinated by one of the Minister's remarks. What method did he finally select? To pump sewage uphill or downhill?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Any more questions?

*Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon agreed to  
Mayo Administration Building*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Mayo Administration Building, in the amount of, \$500,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** We have received 13 or 14 press releases about this building. Could the Minister tell us about the current state of affairs surrounding its construction? At the same time could he provide us with some information on the building materials and the design?

I received some comment, I do not know whether it was from an informed source or not, expressing an opinion that the design might not be appropriate for the environment or is out of character with the rest of the town. What are the basic elements in the building materials? Is it a wooden building or is it concrete? Is it steel?

I am sure that the Member for Mayo had a large hand in that sort of concept, but I do not expect that he had anything to do with the particular plans.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I have heard lots of comments, probably some of them unfounded. I heard that even for the heating system, we had some outlandish things, and I made inquiries about this particular point and the rumors I heard were completely unfounded. This is just an ordinarily constructed building. As far as the materials, I do not have a list of materials here. I think, as far as I am concerned, it is just a frame kind of construction building. It is not elaborate or a palace to commemorate the Member from Mayo, although pretty soon we will have to get an epitaph there, but I do not think this is the building we will do it with.

**Mr. Veale:** Is my understanding correct that the original estimate was \$1,250,000 and it is now \$2,200,000, which is an unfortunate escalation of some \$1,000,000. What is the explanation for that?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** It is just one of the basic facts of life today. When we originally looked at this thing we had estimates of that much. The escalating cost of construction today just boggles the mind. It is just one of the facts of life. The tenders have come in for this building and this is what it is going to cost.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister advise if the original construction estimate was simply based on some engineering report that made an estimate, and what went wrong with the estimate? Is it strictly a materials cost problem? Inflation runs at 10 to 12 percent and this is inflation of 100 percent. It can not simply be inflation. Where did the initial estimate go wrong?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I think again we are comparing apples and oranges. It is true that the inflation rates are probably at a different figure but the inflation rate takes into consideration all the various factors that make the inflation rate. In the construction field today, looking at the inflation rate of that particular segment of the over all inflation rate you would find

that it would be a considerable amount more than the figure that you quoted. Actually this is what the cost is today. We have experienced it in highway construction, we have certainly a good illustration right today in the cost of the swimming pool in Whitehorse and this is just a basic fact of life that the acceleration of the escalation of costs on this particular type of project far exceeds the average inflation rate. In all estimates, our department sits down, and they estimate what it is going to be. Then we send it out for contract and the fact of the matter is that this is the contract price we got, and I think we had two people bid on it. Naturally we took the lower of the two bids. That is just what the building is going to cost and there is no other way about it. If we want the building we have to pay that much for it or we do not have the building.

**Mr. Veale:** Just a final question. This may have been perhaps put out in the press releases but could the Minister state for us whether all the contractors are local Mayo contractors or whether they are Whitehorse contractors or whether they are outside Yukon contractors?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** On this particular contract, it is an outside contract. This contractor has previously built here, and he is going to utilize a lot of the local labour there. That has been his policy and that is what he intends to do on this particular one.

**Mr. Penikett:** I am sure he will be pleased to know, and those of the many friends that he has in this House, that we will be supporting this project for the Member for Mayo. I did express some alarm at the, what I hope was the premature reports of the Member's demise, from the Minister but, perhaps we can get that verified later.

I note the inflation problem here. I also note that the building is intended, in part, to house Federal Government departments. Can I ask the Minister if it is intention to inflate the rent accordingly for those departments?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, we set the rents for that. We certainly take those into consideration. Even in our own building I believe we do.

*Mayo Administration Building agreed to  
On Whitehorse Swimming Pool*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Whitehorse Swimming Pool, in the amount of \$1,000,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** Notwithstanding the representation from the Member for Porter Creek East that the Porter Creek Alternate Access was the number one priority, the submission we had from the City of Whitehorse this year states at least, in terms of their new priorities, the Whitehorse Swimming Pool is the number one priority.

We all know the history of the inflated bids. We all know the problem of costs. I asked the Minister the other day what alternatives he was considering in terms of seeing this project come to light. There have been some general suggestions that some CAP money may be found for the pool. Could he give us a prognosis on this project? Could he give us some report on the discussions with the City? Is he optimistic about some kind of pool facility being constructed in this budget year?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** We have identified for this particular project a total of \$1,350,000. The City is aware of our stand. We have earmarked this thing. They were going to raise the other money. Some themselves, some through community contributions. The figure came in, which amazed everybody, I am sure. The only other discussion I have had with this City was if we were still committed to this and I said, we are, and I put it in the budget so it is definitely committed. I have had no other feedback on any other funding.

The City can, if it wishes, use its Capital Assistance monies but they would have to come back to us on that particular money because under the Capital Assistance Program, as I am sure the Members are aware, there is a certain amount of money identified for certain projects. But, they have not come back to us on that. If they do come back to that and that is one of their priorities, I am certain that we would consider it. But at this particular time we have had no submission except that they said that they might. And I understand, talking to some of

the people at City Hall, the politicians, that they have really made no firm decisions themselves. Until they do I cannot say very much about it. The only thing that I can say is that we have identified this much money for it, and that is what we said we would do and that is where it stands at this particular time.

**Mr. Veale:** I am very pleased to hear that the Minister is going to be flexible on this issue and is going to entertain further applications for assistance by the City. I would just like to make a point that we have had two examples with the Haines Junction Sewage Lagoon where the cost went up \$1,000,000, and the Mayo Administration Building, where the cost went up \$1,000,000, and the government found the money to complete those projects. I think that the swimming pool is an extremely high priority for the citizens of Whitehorse, and I only hope that the Minister may communicate the view that he has put forward today in the House to the City to ensure that there will be communication on that subject. Will he do that?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** We have already done that and my communications with the City have been very good. We are in a kind of a transitional period. I would say that in the future when we get our *Municipal Aid Ordinance* in, we probably would not be having a problem with that, if the City understands our priorities. But we are still operating on this particular fund under the old priorities and that is why it is necessary for them to request it.

I firmly believe, and I have said two or three times today that I believe the people, in a particular locality should set their own priorities and if that is what they do then we will certainly look at it very closely. That is one of the reasons why I believe we always leave a certain amount of flexibility in programs

*Whitehorse Swimming Pool agreed to  
On Watson Lake Sewage Lagoon*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Watson Lake Sewage Lagoon, in the amount of \$500,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand from communicating with the Minister that there has been a history of problems with sewage disposal there. Can I understand that the current proposal is done with the advice and consent of the Water Board?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am sure that the Member across from me is fully aware that we have had problems with the Water Board. We feel that the conditions that they are imposing on us are just unrealistic for this community. On any project of this size, capital cost is one thing, but the O and M is the other. We feel that what we should be building this time is a primary sewage treatment facility. We have identified so much money to start the project. We do not have their approval. We are going back and we are going to be very firm about it. This is what we perceive we need at this particular time. At this moment we have another request going back but we do not have a definite answer.

**Mr. Penikett:** Is the Minister saying he is still not clear about the disposition the Water Board would have no matter how strong his presentation? Will this project not proceed without Water Board approval?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I guess we can go ahead with it, but I feel with the figures we have and the arguments we will have we should have their blessings. There is a possibility that we can go ahead and do it. I think we should go back and try and convince them that our ideas presented to the Water Board for this locality are sound. I guess we always have the ability to go ahead, but I would see further down the line that we might run into a lot of problems. That is where the project sits now. You must realize this is just an initial stage.

**Mr. Penikett:** If the Water Board turns down this particular proposal I assume that there will have to be some redrafting and perhaps a supplementary at some later date if we get stuck for a much bigger project?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, that would be so.

**Mr. Veale:** I asked the Minister a number of questions in the House in the spring on this subject and one of them was whether or not the department was going to put a preliminary proposal to a sub-committee of the Water Board before it com-

mitted itself to a position that the Water Board would not accept. There is a procedure at the Water Board where you go before the sub-committee and they give a general approval of the direction. Is that the procedure that the Minister is taking at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not quite understand what the Member across from me is asking. I am sure he is aware we made one application they were quite insistent at that time that and we would have to go with a project that would cost probably double what we are looking at now. We feel it is unrealistic for a small population. We have done some other research on it. We probably have information at our disposal, and can hope that our persuasive powers would be sufficient to resubmit our primary system to them and have a good chance of convincing them that this is what we should be doing at this time. It is very hard to perceive what the future will be and maybe in the future that we would have to go to a secondary stage. We would build the thing in such a way that we could put a secondary one there if the need may be in the future, with the least capital outlay.

**Mr. Veale:** I thank the Minister for that explanation. I know he believes he is on the right track and his department is on the right track and he has good arguments, but is he going through the sub-committee system to run it by them, when it does not cost them very much to get their general approval in principle of that direction. There is no point in spending \$500,000 if the Water Board is going to take the position that that is precisely what it said you could not do last time, and is not convinced this time. Does the Minister understand there is a procedure of going to a sub-committee before a major hearing is held. Is the Minister following that procedure, which is open to any applicant to the Water Board.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I suppose you could put it that way. I suppose there are two ways of looking at it. In the end, a sub-committee could only make recommendations and you would still have to go to the other board, so maybe we would go that process, but it is still the final board that would make the ultimate decision.

**Mr. Veale:** The \$500,000 is a very small portion of the estimated cost of \$3,133,000. What do we get for the \$500,000? Do we get the engineering plans or is part of that actually to be construction work in Watson Lake?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** This is definitely engineering work, and until we get the approval of the Water Board, I suggest that we are not going to be spending that. We have identified this as a preliminary design. Until we get the approval of the Water Board, I am not saying that we are going out and spending the \$500,000. We are certainly going to know where we are going before we spend this amount of money.

**Mr. Graham:** It is obvious that this argument could go on all evening. I see that it is 5:30 p.m.. I move that you report progress on Bill Number 70, and beg leave to sit again.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. Graham that the Chair report progress on Bill Number 70, and beg leave to sit again.

*Motion agreed to*

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

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** It has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Lang that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

**Mr. Speaker:** I now call the House to order.

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 70, *First Appropriation Ordinance, 1982-83*, and directed me to report progress on same and beg leave to sit again.

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

*Motion agreed to*

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

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

*Motion agreed to*

The House adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

**The following Sessional Papers were tabled Thursday, November 19, 1981:**

81-4-30

Letter re granting of Assent to certain Bills which had been passed during the Fourth Session, Spring Sitting.

81-4-31

Yukon Workers' Compensation Board Eighth Annual Report, for the year ended December 31, 1980

81-4-32

Development of Tourism for the Campbell Highway Corridor (A brief prepared by the Faro & District Chamber of Commerce For Presentation to the Tourism Advisory Board)

**The following Legislative Return was tabled Thursday, November 19, 1981:**

81-4-9

Social assistance payments and housing

The following Bills were introduced in the Legislative Assembly Thursday, November 19, 1981:

Bill No. 106

An Ordinance to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance

Bill No. 107

An Ordinance to Amend the Justice of the Peace Court Ordinance