



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 20

4th Session

24th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Tuesday, November 24, 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 Penikett	Whitehorse West
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre

### (Liberal)

Ron Veale	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	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**  
**Tuesday, November 24, 1981**

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

*Prayers*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I rise on a point of personal privilege, today, to deal with a matter that has been uppermost in my mind for the last couple of days. I have been accused by Members across the floor and by the press and the media in this Territory, for what they are implying are illegal acts on my part.

I would like to inform you and the public of what actually did happen. In May, of 1979, my 50 percent partner in Goldrush River Tours, and the general manager of that company, applied for leases on the river for Goldrush River Tours.

The reason that was being done was to try to build a tourism industry on the river. It is something that has been touted by many people in this Territory, including Members across the floor, as something that should be done.

I am a firm believer in tourism. I have been a member of the tourist industry in the last few years. I was one of the founding members of the Yukon Visitors' Association and I have been a member ever since, other than since I have been an elected Member here. I feel very strongly about tourism. I want to develop tourism in Yukon. I want to develop the Yukon River.

I want it plainly understood that it was not I who applied for leases on the Yukon River. It was Goldrush River Tours, a company in its own right, and the application was put in by my partner. I had absolutely nothing to do with the application.

When the *Whitehorse Star* comes out with bold lies, saying I applied for Government land, through the very Department that I was the Minister of, I start to get very angry. I have not dropped this. I have a legal firm looking at it right now.

To the best of my knowledge, and that of my legal firm, I have a very good case for defamation.

Even more than that, I question the acts of the Members across the floor. They know that I have done nothing wrong. It has even been printed in the *Whitehorse Star* that I have done nothing wrong. They have copies of all of the minutes, obviously, which are supposed to be confidential, and those minutes show that the YTG employees who were members of the Federal Lands Advisory Committee did not even vote when this came up. I question the motives of a lot of people, especially those of some of the Members across the floor. I question very much the motives of the *Whitehorse Star*.

If any Member across the floor wants to challenge me, and wants to have this referred to the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee, I would be quite prepared to do so. If he wants to accuse me of lying, such as the *Whitehorse Star* has done, I would be prepared to have it referred to the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee, to find out whether I have done anything wrong, because I did not do anything wrong.

I would hope that the Members either do that, and put their Seat on the line, or they drop the matter altogether.

I bothers me very much, because I am an honest man, and I do not like to be accused of being dishonest. I do the best for the people of this Territory that I can possibly do. When a newspaper starts printing blatant lies in the paper, to go to every person in this Territory, to impugn my honesty, I am so angry I do not really know what to do. I would challenge any Member across the floor to challenge me, and challenge my Seat. I would gladly see it referred to the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, speaking on the point of privilege, as raised by the Honourable Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Penikett:** On the question of privilege. I, too, must express my personal regret that from time to time we have had

issues of personal privilege raised in this House. I hope the Minister of Justice will fully understand that I fully understand the intensity and the depth of feeling and the anguish that he must be feeling on this point, and I think he is suffering right now.

I have no wish, nor have I ever, unless provoked, in this House — I say with respect to the Member for Porter Creek East — ever had a wish to personalize public issues, matters of urgent public policy, in such a way that demeans this Institution, or, I believe, the practice of politics.

I must say that I am glad that the Minister of Justice has, today, risen to inform the House on this question. He has made a number of assertions which we are pleased to hear from him. In saying that, though, I must express the wish that the assertions on this matter had been made at the time the question first arose.

When, some time ago, we debated the question of conflicts in this House, I supported the disclosure principle, and I suffered some criticism for doing so, because the inevitable, flimsy, political thing to do would have been to have pressed for a continuation of the former rules. I did not do that. I supported the disclosure principle, because I think in a community this small, it is extremely hard for any Member of this House to avoid conflicts; to avoid running into the reality that we have other dimensions and other aspects to our lives. That we have business affairs and personal affairs and personal relationships, friendships and marriages, and so forth, that occasionally may appear to bring us into conflict with our roles and responsibilities as legislators.

I have no hesitation in saying, though, that my feeling is that our first loyalty in these questions is to our public responsibilities, and I think the Minister of Justice indicated that.

Let me, for the record, indicate the problem I have on this issue, and it is not a question of any personal complaint against the Member. It is a serious question of public policy, in this question on privilege, which I will invite the Government Leader, or the Minister, to respond to.

Yesterday, the Government Leader told the House that Yukon Government representatives, on the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee that had granted the Goldrush River Tours commercial leases on the Yukon River, did not vote on the application. The Minister repeated that this morning. I would be interested in hearing from the Government Leader as to who, if anyone, instructed them not to vote. Especially since, on July 19, 1979, there was sent to Hiram Beaubier, in the Federal Government, bearing the signature of the Director of the Parks Branch, a letter which said that it supported the application for these leases.

As has been mentioned before in the House, on a matter purely of public policy, we have serious questions surrounding the land claims settlement, the River Basin Study, and so forth, which are crucial to the Territory. The implication has been developed — and this is not a frivolous matter — that public policy on these two important questions with respect to these lands was made in the context of one application.

If the Government Leader will check, the letter to which I refer, also from this official of YTG, while recommending the acceptance of short-term leases for this applicant, states, "...strongly recommends against any new similar commercial proposals."

The impression, therefore, was left — not, I suspect through malice, not, I suspect, through any kind of corrupt practice, but through a very badly thought out policy — that one applicant was being encouraged here, and only one applicant. No other applicants would be considered. All Members opposite will understand the fear in the public mind that that applicant, because of his relationship with a Member of the Cabinet, was a privileged applicant, and that this was a privileged application, and was being treated in a privileged way.

I am not able to debate narrow, legal points on the matters of conflict of interest, but let me say that those constituents from whom I have heard on this question, ordinary White Pass truck drivers, lay people, whatever personal regard or feelings or knowledge they may have of the Minister of Justice, do not believe that anyone else could have obtained these leases. That is the problem perceived, and it is part of that perception problem, I think, that probably has injected so much heat into the issue.

I do not want to move that this be referred to the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges; I think the Member's privileges are his to assert in that regard. In closing on the question of privilege, the problem we have here is one that has arisen because the House and the public have not had sufficient information; public policy on this matter has not been clear, has not been articulated, has not been defined or defended. Let me also say that, whatever offense the Member may take at what has been said in the media or in this House, there remain questions of public policy.

On my part, whatever general aspersions the Member opposite may have cast on this side of the House, I have not mentioned his name in connection with this question, nor have I made any allegations against the Minister. I have raised, from the beginning, questions of public policy, and questions of public policy, alone.

I regard, because I believe in the disclosure principle, any questions concerning the Member's business and his private affairs, and the ways in which they may impact, conflict, or appear to conflict, with the responsibilities in the Cabinet, or the responsibilities of this House, as questions of privilege for the Member to face in his own heart and mind, and then if necessary to raise them in this House.

I submit that if there is a question of privilege, there is no other way for you to resolve it, unless it is referred to the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges.

However, I would say with respect, I do not believe it is a responsibility, nor should it be, of any other Member of this House, save the Member offended against, to move that question.

**Mr. Veale:** I rise on the question of privilege raised by the Minister.

Let me make it clear that there have been, to my knowledge, no allegations of dishonesty against the Member by Members on this side, nor allegations of illegality. We are not dealing with illegality and dishonesty. What we are dealing with is the Code of Ethics, which Ministers and this Government must operate by, and that Code of Ethics has always stated that there must be no appearance of a conflict between the private interests of a Minister and his public duties.

That is the nub of the issue. The difficulty is that when an issue arises like this, there seems to be no other method of resolving the true circumstances other than through Question Period in this House, or through the media. That is certainly a completely inadequate way to deal with such an important issue.

The disclosure principle that has now been adopted for Members of the Assembly is a principle I think that we can all support, but it is something that has to be watched extremely closely, to ensure that there is always full disclosure of the assets of a Member.

I personally have some difficulty with the position that Cabinet Ministers can continue to be active in their private affairs.

I have stated my position before in this House, that it is inevitably going to lead to the exact situation that we face at this time, where there is a very clear and unmistakable public perception that there has been — the appearance, at least — of a conflict. The Minister has indicated that he would invite someone to challenge him to refer the matter to the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee, and I do not take him up on that issue, because that is not the issue before this House. The honesty and illegality issue is not before this House and has not been raised. The question of the appearance may be some-

thing that the Member himself wants to refer to that Committee, so that the air can be cleared. The Minister may feel that that is a far more appropriate forum than in the press and in Question Period.

The Minister says, "no guts," but if he is trying to incite us to attack him, we have never attacked him personally on this issue, nor suggested that there was something illegal about it. It is morality we are dealing with, and it is appearances we are dealing with. If the Minister thinks that the public is not concerned, then he should think again. I submit that they are concerned about the issue and that they have every right to be so concerned. I would ask him to refer the matter on the Code of Ethics issue, alone, not on the other issue that he raised: refer it to the Committee, and have the matter dealt with on that level.

There is another issue that may be missed here. That is the impossible position that a senior civil servant is put in, when there is a business interest of his political superior that he knows about at stake, and he is left to deal with the matter, and to establish or set public policy. That is an untenable position in which to place a senior civil servant. I have a great deal of sympathy with the civil servants who had to deal with this issue. It puts them in an untenable position, where they really do not know where to go. They really cannot get direction, because if they get direction, the conflict issue arises. It is extremely difficult. My position is that Cabinet Ministers simply should not have private businesses operating while they are in Cabinet. The issue will then not arise as frequently as it appears to arise.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I rise to speak to the point of privilege that the Honourable Member has raised, and I must say that from where I sit I have a great deal of sympathy for the Member for Tatchun. I have been in political office going on eight years. I have seen the media literally stab elected Members, to the point where they slowly bleed to death. In fact, what I am saying, with respect to the media and, specifically, the tactics that the *Whitehorse Star* has employed over the course of the last two to three years — and I am not just speaking of Members of this House, I am talking about City Councils, I am talking even at the Federal level — is that by innuendo, half-truths, in an attempt to get the red ink on the front page of the local "astinisher," they will do anything. I think it is a very difficult period of our history when we have that type of reporting, to the point where there is no need, because then there is no wish for good, sincere people to seek political office. Their remuneration is not the best in the world. You are not only attacked for public policy, but your own personal affairs are coming under the greatest of scrutiny, to the point where they are not looked at from an objective point of view, in, for example, the *Whitehorse Star*, but they look to see whether or not they can put some scandal on the front page of the local "astinisher."

Let us take the case of the Member for Tatchun. The implication made is that he left office because he could not continue running his business. Well, the truth is that the Member did everything he possibly could to sell his private interests. And the truth is, nobody would purchase them. So what would the Members opposite, or what would the local media, have him do: give them away? For public service? For a four year term? He did the honourable thing, and resigned.

The point, with respect to the case before you, and I think it is very important, is that no final decision was made, with respect to the allocation of the leases in question, until he was well out of office. He had left office, and had gone back to running his business, which he could not sell.

So, regarding the allegations that have been put forward through the media, and the innuendos that have been put forward by the Members across the way, I would say I have not found them. You take, for an example, the article in the *Whitehorse Star*, where all of a sudden, the Council for Yukon Indians have come forward with their objections concerning those leases being issued. They were consulted. They went, paid by the taxpayer, to review the various sites that were in

question. And, further to that, a number of them were moved, at their request, and everything was satisfactory. And now we read in the local "astonisher" that that is not the case any longer. In other words, you consult them; a deal is made; and if the publicity is not proper, they will reverse their decisions, because, perhaps, there was nothing in writing. But that is not checked out. No, just Members of this House, and the innuendo that is put across at any Member of this side of the House. I would say to you that if we wanted to get the gloves off, as I refer to the Leader of the Opposition, and get into personalities, and get into the vested interests that we have across the room, I, as an editor, and if I were to use the tactics that are being employed, could make some very good stories.

And, I could make some very good reading.

So, what I am saying, with respect to the Members opposite, is that they have not come forward with enough evidence, and they know they do not have enough evidence. Perhaps they have not questioned the Member for Tatchun, but they have questioned the Government Leader about the situation and how it arose, and, by innuendo, are perpetrating and perpetuating the basic trend that the *Whitehorse Star* has revealed.

I have been told by Members on this side of the House, and I have no reason to doubt it, that some Members opposite knew, back in 1979, that this had taken place. It was not a public *cause celebre* to them then, and, therefore, was not brought up, but now it is being raised because the *Whitehorse Star* has raised it. If it were such a pressing public, urgent message that it had to take up the Question Period in the last two days, I have to wonder — and perhaps one might call this innuendo — but I really wonder just exactly what the political motives are of anybody raising the question, in view of the fact that they knew almost two years ago what had taken place. I think that they were satisfied then that everything had been done properly.

I should further point out that it is not the YTG that makes the decision; it is not the YTG that is responsible for the policy on the Yukon River. It is the Government of Canada. We are strictly there, and you should take this into account, in an advisory capacity. We are there in an advisory capacity: to attempt to distribute land outside of municipal boundaries.

I agree; it is a very untenable position for the civil servant, and for this Government, to be involved in. We were beginning to question whether or not we should be involved, in view of what has happened in the past with the Cowley Lake situation. Now we have this pressing matter of urgent business; as the Leader of the Official Opposition says, of public policy, but which he did not press two years ago.

I should point out that, as far as I am concerned, the Member for Tatchun has done the honourable thing. If it is a matter of public and urgent business, and if it the Members opposite feel there is enough to question the moral, ethical, or legal conduct of my colleague from Tatchun, then I say they have a responsibility, and that is to put their seat on the line, as the Member for Tatchun has said, and refer it to the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges, and put your money where your mouth is.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I will permit the Honourable Government Leader to comment on this matter, and then I will close debate.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** This is a very, very trying time for the Honourable Member for Tatchun. I know, because I feel that I have gone through, and suffered, virtually the same thing he has, at one time or another, since being elected.

Twice I heard the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale South state, or imply, that Mr. Tracey or Goldrush River Tours were successful in this lease application of federal land while he was the Minister responsible for a department of this Government, any department of this Government.

Just to show you how far out of line it is, that is erroneous. It is wrong. It is a mistruth. It is not true at all. He was not a Minister. He had resigned, some considerable time prior to that.

A letter was written by a civil servant on July 19, 1979. At that

time, Mr. Tracey was out at Carmacks running his hotel. I am certain that he must have been there on that day, because he was not a Member of this Cabinet. He was not a Member of this Cabinet until 1981. He had, in fact, resigned his Cabinet seat on June 15, 1979. He had stated his intention to resign some three months prior to that, because it was becoming obvious to him that he was not going to be able to sell his holdings, as he felt he had to do, in order to meet the requirements of the strictest, most ridiculous rules that were ever put in place for any Legislature.

We changed those rules. Every Member in this House debated them, and no-one at that time voted against changing those rules.

The media has a job to do, and I appreciate that, but I also think that the Honourable Member does, in fact, have a valid point of privilege, if the media, or anyone else, is going to just blatantly lie about him. I feel that the *Whitehorse Star* has, in fact, done that this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please.

With respect to the question of privilege raised by the Honourable Member for Tatchun: as all Members know, it is the duty of the Chair to take into account the debate, not only on the question of privileges raised by the Honourable Member, but also the debate that has ensued.

I thank all Honourable Members who have spoken on this matter for giving the Chair your opinions in this regard. It is now the duty of the Chair to determine if, in fact, there is a *prima facie* case of privilege made by the Honourable Member. I will accordingly take this matter under advisement, and at another time bring back a decision in this regard.

We will now proceed with the Order Paper under Daily Routine.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In the debate previous, there was the allegation by the...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please.

**Mr. Veale:** I was rising on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Mr. Veale:** There was an allegation that Members on this side, some Members, knew of this issue since 1979. I want to state, for the record, that this Member has not known since 1979, and only knew when the issue appeared locally in the press.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please.

Perhaps, Honourable Members, if they wish to pursue this matter, will do so at some other time, and some other place, under the Rules of the House.

## DAILY PROCEEDINGS

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed with Daily Routine.

Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

Are there any Reports of Standing or Special Committees? Petitions?

Introduction of Bills?

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

Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** In recognition of our need to focus more heavily on meeting the demands of expanding industry, and in response to a growing labour market, my Government has been studying the feasibility of establishing a Department of Manpower and Labour.

We found that to implement such a new department at this time would be premature. Every effort, however, will continue to be made to update our existing labour legislation, and to set into motion initiatives which will permit us to assume total jurisdiction for all matters involving labour regulations. The heavy work load to accomplish this end has begun. We intend to accelerate its progress, enabling this future objective to be

attained: the eventual creation of a Department of Labour.

We are a Government committed to a policy of local hire. We intend, therefore, to strengthen our organization, to enable the implementation of that policy. Anticipated future economic and social development for Yukon will demand skilled human resources. We want Yukoners to be first choices. We must, therefore, be in a position to offer training opportunities, enabling our fellow citizens to prepare for future labour markets. The resources of the Manpower Branch to research, analyze and identify future labour markets in Yukon are essential to the existing planning capabilities of adult education. Consequently, the Manpower Branch will be moved to the Department of Education. Resources have been, and will continue to be, identified, to allow this Government to provide the option for Yukoners to participate in educational training opportunities here at home. Our Capital Budget reflects our commitment towards this end, in the allocating of funds for a vocational and technical training facility for Yukon and, eventually, a Yukon College.

We recognize the Department of Education to be effectively administering the two major functions: the providing of public schools and the providing of adult education. With the Department's strengthened Adult Education Branch, we anticipate that the Government will be in an improved position to plan and coordinate policies, enabling us to continue to progress in providing all Yukoners with the scope of being highly trained for major economic projects within Yukon's growing labour markets.

**Mr. Penikett:** I was not quite sure when I read this statement why the Government Leader was making it at this time, but I welcome it all the same, and the Government Leader will not be surprised if I say I find much to agree with in the statement. Regarding the references made to a growing labour market, I certainly hope that will be the case. I read the Government's previous statements on the feasibility of establishing a Department of Manpower and Labour. We are all well aware of the potential negative effects on Yukon economy from labour disputes, and I am sure, in the interests of both the Parties and the community itself, that if we can play some more immediate, useful and local role in resolving some of those disputes, I am sure it would be welcomed. I am sure there will be some pretty significant costs involved, or there may be, and that is a question that we will want to debate when the time comes.

I must say that, as regards the updating of our existing labour legislation, I was really disappointed that we did not have a new Labour Standards Ordinance this fall, because we really have been waiting for it for a very long time — much longer than this House has existed. I remember some useful hearings and work done by the Committee of the previous House, and I wish we had been able to build on that, and have legislation ready earlier.

The Government Leader says that he will be accelerating progress towards this objective, and I am glad to hear that. We still do not know when it is coming, but we hope that it will be soon. In the end of that paragraph, he seems to be discussing the eventual creation of a Department of Labour, as if that is a decision that has been made and is really just a matter of time. That may be an important admission in the Government Leader's statement.

I, of course, support the continued initiatives in terms of local hire, notwithstanding fears we may have had — and I use the word notwithstanding advisably — previously, about some provisions in the Constitutional Resolution.

The training initiatives and opportunities are, of course, something that my Party support wholeheartedly. We welcome the announcement that the Manpower Branch will, sort of, rejoin the Department of Education. I know, as all Members know, that there will have to be continued and very close cooperation between Labour and Manpower functions in this Government, and that is something, of course, that we will encourage as well.

The question of education policy is something that it is prob-

ably about time we discussed again in the House. I think there are new needs in the Education system, and we must begin, on behalf of the public, to articulate them, and reflect those in legislation and programs.

I think it is important to remember that the basic role and mandate of the Department is to educate and, of course, we want the people educated both academically and vocationally. We hope those will be regarded in coming years as equally important, and we encourage and support the Government in whatever proper initiatives they take in this direction.

**Mr. Veale:** We welcome this decision by the Government to shelve the decision to split the Department of Education, and we certainly welcome the vote of confidence in the Minister of Education. We are pleased that the manpower which was going to consume Education will now be back to the Minister.

There is a bit of a philosophical problem that our Party has with the creation of new Government departments. They certainly are needed on some occasions, but the costs to the taxpayer are quite often a significant burden. My understanding was that the cost, in the creation of this particular Department, would have been in the area of \$100,000 to \$200,000, due to the O and M costs and the increased costs in manpower. Our feeling is that those sorts of decisions should not be taken until there is just a compelling case for a Department of Labour and Manpower.

The objectives, however, of pursuing concepts of labour that are especially applicable to Yukon, in training and hiring, are extremely important, and I encourage the Government to continue to pursue local hire as a very important priority.

I would also encourage the Government to come forward with labour legislation and a new minimum wage, and do the things that are required at this point in time to be done, without the major step of creating that new department.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I must rise and respond to a couple of things that were said, and a couple of innuendos that were made.

I want to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the creation of a Department of Labour is, I think, going to happen in this Government at some point in time. I do not think there is any doubt about that. What we were able to ascertain was that this is not the proper point in time to create a Department of Labour, because it will be very expensive, and also because we do not have the necessary or the required responsibilities yet; we have not taken on those required responsibilities. I think it is inevitable, as this Territory grows, which I honestly believe it will, and as the labour force grows, that it will become necessary for a Department of Labour to be formed. I wanted to come out front and say that. I wanted to make that clear.

With respect to the Member for Riverdale South, once again his innuendo was that there was a decision made to split up the Department of Education. I and other Members from this side of the House have stood here for the last two weeks denying emphatically that there was ever a decision to split the Department of Education.

I believe the Leader of the Opposition asked why I was making this statement; it was once again to allay public fears raised by innuendo from Members opposite that we were going to split the Department of Education. It was never, ever intended; there was not even a recommendation to us to do this, and I really resent the Member continually standing up and saying this.

It just is not true.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further Statements by Ministers?

We will then proceed to the Question Period.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

**Question re: State of Application of Agreement-in-Principle re Yukon Land Claims**

**Mr. Penikett:** I would like to ask the Government Leader: in light of the new federal-provincial agreement which adds

the words "existing" to the aboriginal rights clause in the Constitution, can he assure this House that the present agreement-in-principle, which has been signed by YTG, and which defines the beneficiaries of the Yukon Land Claim, will continue to apply?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is a good question. There are a number of agreements-in-principle that are in place. I have sought legal advice and advice from what I consider to be constitutional experts, as to exactly what the ramifications of the addition of the one word, "existing", were going to be, to what was previously Section 34.

Their first impression is that it will be a very significant addition; it is not something that is not going to change anything. It is going to change things very significantly, but we do not know exactly what those changes will mean, at this point.

**Mr. Penikett:** As a matter of policy, would the Government Leader clearly state if it is the position of his Government that non-Status Indians, who are land claims beneficiaries in Yukon, do have existing aboriginal rights?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not know that I can state that as a matter of policy, but we are in the process of negotiating with the Council for Yukon Indians, on behalf of all of the Indian people in the Territory.

**Mr. Penikett:** Since the federal-provincial agreement goes further than the narrow definition of aboriginal rights proposed by this Government, is the Government Leader now prepared to reconsider his position on this question?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not know that it goes any further at all.

**Question re: Regulations for Whitehorse North**

**Mr. Veale:** I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

The Minister has been involved in the planning process for some time now regarding regulations in Whitehorse North. He was quoted recently as saying that he was going to proceed with no regulation. Is that still the position of the Government, that there will be no regulation for Whitehorse North?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** We were talking about another set of regulations. There are certain regulations now in force, and we will be going with them. I perceive that in the future we probably will get representation and will be looking at some other ones, but right now we are just going with what we have.

**Mr. Veale:** I am pleased to hear that the Minister is keeping the present regulations in force and that we are not going to a system of no regulations. The reason I am pleased is that Whitehorse North is contiguous to the City of Whitehorse, and I believe it would cause severe problems if there were no regulations in one place and heavy regulations in another.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do believe the Honourable Member is now making a speech. Would he get to his question please?

**Mr. Veale:** I am getting to my question, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister confirm that he is now preparing new regulations for Whitehorse North, to replace the old regulations that are still in existence?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** We are reviewing it.

**Mr. Veale:** Will the Minister indicate whether or not, in the process of reviewing the earlier regulations, he will be having input from residents of Whitehorse North?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Oh yes, we have always adopted the policy of having input.

**Question re: Increase in Personnel — Manpower Branch Transfer**

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question on the subject that the Government Leader just addressed in his Ministerial Statement. I noticed that in his announcement he indicated the initiatives being taken by the Department of Education to address the skilled labour shortage problem, a phenomenon that is not peculiar to the Yukon.

In the transfer or the return to the fold of the Manpower Branch, could I inquire of the Government Leader whether or not there is an increase in personnel contemplated immediately in that transfer?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Any immediate increases in personnel would be a reflection on the Budget; we are in the middle of a Budget year at this point in time. I would expect that it is possible that there may be requests from the Department with respect to this. Certainly, I am confident that there will be a reflection in our next Budget indicating the emphasis that we intend to put on this particular branch of adult training.

**Mr. Byblow:** Could I enquire of the Government Leader whether, in the return of the Manpower Branch to Education, the entire Budget and personnel of that Branch is being transferred to Education?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** As far as I know.

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps I could address the final supplementary to the Minister of Education.

Recognizing that the apprenticeship branch will remain with the Department in its function, I would like to ask the Minister, in light of the problem of practical on-the-job training in the apprenticeship program, whether or not the Government Leader's address was a commitment to stepping up the fiscal assistance for formal trades training in the private sector?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** We have not got down to specifics at this point, but I anticipate a more strengthened Department altogether.

**Question re: TV Reception in the North Alaska Highway Area**

**Mrs. McGuire:** I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

I have received letters, dating from some two years back to the present, from North Highway constituents, mainly from the areas of White River, Pine Valley, and Burwash, and I have also received letters from the Alaska Highway Visitors' Association on poor, or no, T.V. reception in the aforementioned areas. I have also received letters from the contractor responsible for O and M of the Timberland T.V. contract, explaining the impossible situation.

The Minister is well aware of the problems encountered with the T.V. system in these areas, and my question to him is: has he arrived at a solution to the problem?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, we have not arrived at a solution; we are considering various options, but we have not resolved it yet. It is just one of those unfortunate things, and because of the localities and the distances, there are obstacles that are very hard to overcome. We are certainly exploring every method that we are presented with, to see if we can improve the service to these people.

**Mrs. McGuire:** In my supplementary I will ask the Minister if he would, in the near future, set up a meeting with all the people concerned and involved, to discuss such viable alternatives as earth stations.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Question re: Beaufort Development Paper: Issuance of Permits Prior to Land Claims**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I have a question for the Government Leader concerning the Beaufort Development Paper.

On Friday, November 20, a delegation from Old Crow spoke, in Inuvik, to the Environmental Assessment Review Panel. It is my information that the delegation stated that no permits along the Arctic coast in Yukon would be granted until the land claims talks have been finalized and implemented.

It is my information that the Member for Old Crow joined in the statement. Was the Member for Old Crow espousing Government policy?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What is the Government policy, concerning the issuance of permits in the Beaufort prior to the settlement of land claims in that area?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Our policy is clear and has been stated on numerous occasions. We feel that it is our responsibility as a Government to, number one, negotiate a fair and equitable land claims settlement for all of the people of this Territory, and, number two, to ensure that development gets started and continues at a fair and reasonable pace while this land claims negotiation is going on.

We feel that, so far, we have been successful with respect to that. We have been most cognizant all the time, of land claims and what the effect of any development might be on land claims, with all the development work that we have done.

Land claims and all its ramifications will be seriously considered with respect to any permits that are issued on the Beaufort, on Yukon's north coast, particularly by this Government.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is it this Government's clear position that the settlement of land claims is not a prerequisite for the issuance of permits in the Beaufort?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Well, I would probably have to say yes to that; however, I think we would have to see what the specifics are. If it is a permit for off-shore use, prior to the settlement of land claims, I would think that we would have no problem with that at all.

**Question re: Conditions of Return for Students Under the Students Financial Assistance Ordinance**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the Minister of Education on the *Students Financial Assistance Ordinance*, Section 7(2) of which Ordinance states that "A student... at the discretion of the Committee, may be required to return to the Yukon during extended vacation periods for the purpose of satisfying the residency requirements...". Could the Minister explain, in general policy terms, under what conditions would that normally be applied?

**Mr. Speaker:** I should order this before the question is answered.

I just have to draw the attention of Honourable Members one more time to subsection (11), and I seem to keep bringing this up. "A question which seeks an opinion about Government policy is probably out of order, in that it asks for an opinion and not information. A question asking for a general statement of Government policy may be out of order, in that it requires a long answer. It should be made on Motion or in Debate."

I would caution the Members in placing their questions that questions such as the one just asked should be in deference to the Rules of Question Period.

However, if the Honourable Minister could make a brief reply, then I would permit it.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Generally speaking, I would think that it would mean when the student comes back to work between school terms.

**Mr. Penikett:** With respect, I believe you will see my question as both relevant and pertinent.

The daughter of one of my constituents was denied a grant to continue university study, because she was out of Yukon for four months for sports training, at the recommendation of the Recreation Branch. Since this student was assured her grant would continue, because her training was part of professional development, can the Minister explain why it was subsequently refused?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** That was a decision of the Committee. I have a letter from the parent of that student, and I think that the parent makes a very good case. I do not know why the decision was made by the Committee. I myself would feel that that particular student was more than deserving of assistance.

**Mr. Penikett:** Is the Minister considering taking steps, by way of amendments to the regulations or legislation, to prevent such a situation re-occurring, in which the Department would urge a student to travel and then would subsequently deny grants for exactly the reason the student undertook those travels?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** That particular case is really rather an upsetting case. I still cannot imagine how it happened. There must be some circumstances we perhaps do not know about, but I would think that that was a mistake.

We are taking steps to change the Ordinance, so that students like that do not fall through the cracks, which some have been doing, unfortunately.

**Mr. Veale:** I wish to pursue my question to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, regarding Whitehorse North.

The Minister has indicated that that land is suitable primarily for rural residential acreages: the 30 lots that he is going to put out. But would the Minister indicate whether he, in fact, will be identifying those lots among the 30 that are most suitable for market gardening, or haying, or something like that? Will the Minister be making that identification, in conjunction with the Minister responsible for agricultural policy?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Whether some of the lots are more suitable, or less suitable, I do not think that we will be making an assessment, as such. I would suggest though, that because these are rural residential lots, then probably if people want to use the land for that purpose, I think that they will make the choice. I imagine if there are 30 lots, and a person was going to pursue that particular lifestyle, and wanted to use it for, say, a small market garden, he would have the capability to do that, because if he were going to get into that business, I think he would have some expertise before he did so. Therefore I do not think we should be telling them which is which. They will make their own decisions. We have identified that these lots are for rural residential, and it is up to the people themselves to pick which they prefer. Why they prefer it is their choice, not mine.

**Mr. Veale:** My supplementary question to the Minister is: does he not consider it unfortunate that some person may select a lot in that subdivision which is very suitable for market gardening, but who has no interest, whatsoever, in such a use, and then that particular lot will be lost for future potential in market gardening? Is that not a serious consideration that the Minister should consider, in the allocation of these lands?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, I do not think that is right at all. I do not think that a person should be denied a particular lot, just because he is not going to use it a certain way, simply because we have identified all these lots as rural residential. We have made that decision.

Whether a person wants to go that way, or not, that is his prerogative, and I believe it should be his prerogative. Those lots are put on the market. Everybody will have the same chance. That is our procedure. If there are some who want it for a particular reason, I am sure they will go out and look at those lots, and they will make applications for those particular lots.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister not agree that the issue at stake is the encouragement of agriculture, whether it be small scale or large scale, and in encouraging agriculture, would it not be wise to have a soil expert identify those lots that can be most useful for encouraging market gardening, and improve the food prices situation in Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think he should be referring that supplementary question to me, in respect of my responsibilities for agricultural policy. I think that the Member is not aware that, in view of the discussion that took place in that particular area, with respect to lots being made available, in large part, almost totally, the lots that are being made available are very marginal, if they are even that, as far as agricultural potential — largely at the request of the people that lived out there. Now, we are going to be looking at the whole area with regard to the responsibility for agriculture. I have had discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I want to make it very clear. We are only putting out 30 lots, rural residential, in that area for sale. It is not our intention to expand it. We will be looking at other areas along that way, concerning agricultural potential, and probably putting some out in larger blocks for those people who want to work the land, which has agricultural potential; further to that, I would imagine the remainder will be pretty well preserved as wilderness.

It is not the aspirations of this Government to have a major satellite community at either end of the community of Whitehorse, but, at the same time, we recognize that there is a need for people who wish 20 acres, or 15 acres, of property, to pursue a lifestyle of that kind. We are prepared to provide that. At the same time, we recognize our responsibilities so far as agricultural land is concerned. We will be doing what we can, within our limited responsibilities, to ensure that it is utilized for that purpose. So I want to assure the Member opposite — I



think he is on a tangent with respect to the land in question, because it is my understanding that it is very marginal as far as agricultural potential is concerned, and the Government has taken steps to make it smaller, and move the subdivision over, so that it would not interfere with land that could have some agricultural potential.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I would like to respond to two questions that have been asked me in the last few days. A question yesterday, that was asked about the number of children on school buses. There is a limit on school buses of 72 passengers. A day in the life of the school buses — yesterday's figures were numbers like 45, 54, 52, 47, 69, in the morning, 69, 30, 53, 33, 57, in the evening. Those are average numbers of children riding the buses. I am quoting from a letter from one of my staff who looks after that: "In the event of an unanticipated number of riders, which would result in the number of passengers being in excess of 72, the 72 are delivered and the bus makes a double trip." So, we know of no instances where it was possible for too many children to be on a school bus, exceeding the safety limit. That limit is set by the bus company.

The other question that was asked was on the question of the windows at Jeckell School, and I am pleased to say that windows will be put into Jeckell School.

**Question re: YTG casual workers in Department of Highways and Public Works**

**Mrs. McGuire:** I have a question for the Government Leader.

According to the November 23, 1981 edition of the *Whitehorse Star*, no casual workers are employed by the Territorial Department of Highways and Public Works. However, "many casuals are hired through a capital budget supplied by the Federal Government, so do not specifically show up in the Yukon Government budget."

My question to the Government Leader is this: Are these people direct federal employees, paid directly by the federal government?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I want to say first that I do not read the *Whitehorse Star*, so I do not know what the article is all about.

I am sure all Members will recall when we were discussing the O and M Budget last year, when we got to the Department of Tourism and Economic Development, and we had a large sum of money, some \$6,000,000 under the General Development Agreement, that was going to allow us to get into a number of sub-agreements with the Government of Canada, with respect to projects and programs to be carried on. Most of those programs, in fact, all of them, are finite; they have a specific life. They are only going to last one year, or two years, or some of them, three years. And it was our decision that, rather than hire public servants, under the *Public Service Staff Relations Ordinance*, and have them be public servants of this Government, and as permanent employees of this Government, then be faced with having to find something for them to do, one or two or three years down the road, because they were, in fact, going into these finite programs, we would instead hire them as contract employees, for a specific period of time: one, two or three years, depending upon the program that they were in. That is what has transpired, and I am certain that is what the article was referring to.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, I was wrong in permitting the question. The question was clearly out of order, inasmuch as, if we refer to the rules affecting Question Period, it is not competent for a Member to enquire whether statements made in a newspaper are, in fact, true.

**Mrs. McGuire:** The quote from the newspaper came from one of the Departments of the Government Leader.

At this time, I have a written question for the Government Leader, if Mr. Speaker would permit me to read out the contents?

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Mrs. McGuire:** In the Public Service Commission, for the year 1980-81, I request the following information: total recruiting costs for the Public Service Commission; total recruiting

cost, specifically, for outside Yukon recruitments; number of staff turnover in the Yukon Territorial Government for positions of a salary schedule of \$20,000 and up; number of staff members of Yukon Territorial Government at the salary levels mentioned, and who resigned the position in the year; number of staff turnover within the Department of Finance for the year 1980-81; number of staff turnover in the Department of Human Resources for the year 1980-81; number of staff members at Yukon Territorial Government currently on the payroll on a contractual basis; and number of staff members at Yukon Territorial Government currently on the payroll on a casual basis.

**Question re: Manpower Branch and job training**

**Mr. Byblow:** For the Minister responsible for Manpower, it is my understanding that the number of people on social assistance in Yukon has increased in 1980-81 to 3,110, from 2,687 in 1979-80. Recognizing that not all of these are necessary employable, I would like to ask the Minister to what extent his Manpower Branch is addressing job training, specifically, in this group of potentially employable people.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The Manpower Branch in the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department handles research and planning. It does not do the training. It has been negotiating with the federal government to get better training programs here. It has been working with all the western provinces, to try to get federal government support to train more people here.

We do have a problem. That was one of the reasons why the study was done on Manpower: to try to put the Manpower planning and the Manpower training together, so that we could have a much better department. Then we could go to the federal government and demand some of these training programs. We do not have that capability now.

All I can say to the Member is that we are trying our best. We commissioned this study because of the problems with Manpower, and we are hopeful that we will be able to get our Manpower training done. As to the Member's direct question, I cannot give him a totally clear answer on it.

**Mr. Byblow:** I can certainly appreciate the Minister's remarks, with respect to coordinating the total exercise of delivering a manpower training program.

I will direct my supplementary to the Government Leader. In the area of job creation, again, in the same general area of social assistance, recognizing that in the present year, 1980-81, we have a figure of something like 1,200 employable people on Welfare assistance, I would then enquire of the Government Leader if he could state whether or not it is the intention of his Government to investigate the potential of job creation for those people?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure what the motives of the Honourable Member are. I am sure he is well aware that we do have a resource core under the auspices of the Minister of Education. Why he is not addressing these kinds of questions to her, I honestly do not know.

**Mr. Byblow:** For the information of the Government Leader, I was seeking a matter of policy. So, to the Minister of Education, then, responsible in her capacity for Health and Human Resources, I would make an observation to her that something in the order of...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I believe the Honourable Member is now making a speech.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have to preface the question with the observation that \$934,000 is being spent on social assistance, presently, for individuals, for couples, for heads of families, who are employable and available for work.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would the Honourable Member kindly get to his question.

**Mr. Byblow:** Would her Government consider matching this funding with a job creation program?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I am very glad to speak on this subject. We are very keen to help people get off social assistance. Very few want to be on social assistance. The resource core, of course, is a very successful training program within the Government, in the Department of Education; in the Department

of Health and Human Resources, we are, at present, studying a program of individual employment opportunities. It has been successful in British Columbia and we are hoping to do the same thing in Yukon.

**Question re: Yukon liquor sales**

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

In the last edition of the annual report, I note that there is an increase in liquor sales in Yukon of \$2,949,562 over the previous year. This is an increase of approximately 29 percent.

Will the Minister direct the revenue from the increased net profit to his counterpart responsible for Alcohol and Drug Abuse?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Once again I have to rise and answer the question, because that money comes to me, as the Minister of Finance. It does not go to the Minister responsible for Liquor Control. He has one of those unenviable jobs where he has to do all the work and he does not get any of the pay.

As all Members are well aware, liquor sales provide a major source of revenue to this Government. Those revenues go into the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund, for the use and betterment of all of the programs of the Government.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I direct the supplementary to the Government Leader, then. In the recent Medicare debate, Government Ministers espoused a user pay policy for Medicare. Will the Government adopt the same policy and logic, with regard to the payment for alcohol abuse treatment?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I always thought that the Honourable Member's criticism of us was that we in fact that were using that policy now.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the Government Leader, again. The newscast on CBC, aired this morning, quoted the Government Leader as stating that a cost analysis has been done concerning the abolishing of Medicare premiums. Will the Government Leader table the figures in this House?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I do not see any reason to do so. Our budget is very, very clear. We were forthright with respect to exactly what Medicare was going to cost us. Everybody in this House knows exactly what the estimated costs for the year are. They know exactly how much revenue we are going to be taking in. They also know exactly how much revenue we make each year as a result of Income Tax, and anybody can work out those numbers.

**Question re: Street lighting at school bus stops: Wolf Creek Subdivision**

**Mr. Penikett:** I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to ask him whether he has received representations concerning the lack of street lighting at school bus stops in the Wolf Creek Subdivision?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes.

**Mr. Penikett:** Is it the Minister's understanding that the Wolf Creek lots were sold on the understanding that street lighting in the Wolf Creek Subdivision would be provided by the Government of Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am not dead sure whether that is my understanding, because I am not very sure about it. It is something that we are looking at; beyond that I have no other comment.

**Mr. Penikett:** Can the Minister state his position as regards this department's responsibility for street lighting in this area?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, I cannot.

**Question re: Policy re leisure services**

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question which I will direct to the Minister of Education in her capacity of being responsible for recreation.

In August, a report entitled, "Study of Leisure Services, Delivery and Expenditure," was submitted to the Recreation Branch, and I believe the Minister circulated the report in some circles. One of the recommendations centred around the vacuum of policy, a comprehensive policy, in a coordinated

planning effort. Has the Recreational Branch responded to this statement?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes, a paper to that effect was left on the desks of each Member here a week ago or so. A Committee has been formed as a result of consultation with all recreational groups in the Territory — all people interested in recreation, in fact. We will have a policy paper drawn up.

**Mr. Byblow:** The Minister's information is indeed news to me. I also noted from the original study that a high number of Government departments were involved in policy planning, which is a fragmented procedure to go into, at the best of times. Has the Minister taken any steps within the Government planning sector, to coordinate recreation policy?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes, I assume the Member is referring to the recent study. In that study, the consultant looked at recreation in the very broadest sense, including tourism, for instance, and parks, leisure services, and everything you do in your leisure time. This study made us take a very clear look at the Government and see where the various types of recreation were coming from. It was a very good study, in that it did highlight exactly how fragmented things were in recreation. We found they were not that fragmented, but the problem highlighted most of all was the system of funding.

**Mr. Byblow:** The point of funding brings up the issue that has been debated with the municipalities over the past couple of years. It has been observed that municipalities are often in the best situation to, in fact, deliver recreational services, because they are in the closest contact with the community residents. Has the Government discussed the transfer of more recreational responsibility with the AYC?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I have had a discussion with the Chairman of the Association of Yukon Communities. It was decided that the consultation with all the recreational groups will probably point towards the municipalities taking over more responsibility for recreation, so that the communities are more autonomous when it comes to recreation.

Until the study is done, for the Member's information, this committee is consulting with everyone in the Territory. It will be a long process probably. At that point we will see what will happen with the communities, but I predict that the communities will become more and more autonomous.

**Mr. Speaker:** This then brings the Question Period to an end.

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**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 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 call the Committee of the Whole to order.

We shall be continuing with Bill Number 70, after a brief recess.

### *Recess*

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

### *On Highways and Public Works*

**Mr. Chairman:** I refer you to Page 35, Highways and Public

Works. General discussion?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I will just make a few preliminary remarks on general discussion, concerning this budget for Highways and Public Works. As in previous years, this Administration is placing emphasis on upgrading the existing road network in Yukon, to maintain a reasonable level of service to the travelling public and the transportation industry. In this regard, we will be improving and upgrading the Klondike Highway between the Alaska Highway and Carmacks. We will also continue to replace a number of old and unreliable bridges on the South Canol Road. In addition, the upgrading of the recreational and mineral roads, which we commenced two years ago with the Hunker Creek Road and the Mount Freegold Road, we will continue to improve upon.

Of particular interest to you will be the commencement of the construction of the Klondike Highway between the Alaska Highway and Carcross. This is what we refer to as the Old Carcross Road. This is the start of a proposed four year program which will see this road upgraded to the same standards as the Klondike Highway between Whitehorse and Carmacks. Another new project is the reconstruction of the Faro access road over a period of two years, mainly to improve the safety of this particular road.

You will also notice a small provision for the Campbell Highway. This provision will allow for engineering studies between the towns of Ross River and Faro to collect the field data and will enable the evaluation of possible reconstruction in the future.

On the Public Works side of the Department, we will continue to upgrade our existing facilities, to satisfy standards with respect to health, energy and safety.

As in the past, the Public Works Branch will assist other departments in the planning, construction and completion of their capital programs.

I do not think that I have much more to say at this time. I will anticipate and try to answer all the questions, when we get to a detailed study of this budget.

**Mr. Veale:** I would just like to give notice of a few questions that perhaps the Minister could answer in a general way.

In terms of priorities, I would like to hear the Minister explain how the Klondike Highway, between Carmacks and the Alaska Highway, has been prioritized, and why it has been prioritized, for the paving that is taking place. I am just not clear on the reasons for that, as opposed to working on some other areas that might need it as badly.

The other area I would like the Minister to address is the issue of the disruption that took place in that roadway this spring, when it was shut down for some week or ten days, and Cyprus Anvil was unable to make any ore shipments. I assume there has been an investigation into that. I have heard allegations, or suggestions, that there was some problem with the contractor, and they had not really made the roadbed properly. It was just sort of hard to understand why that particular section went, and everything else stood up. Maybe the Minister can advise us as to what the particular road conditions in that section were. Was it run-off, or what was the reason for the break-up of that road?

The South Canol drainage project is a very expensive project, and I know it was addressed in the Budget last year, as to why it was a priority; perhaps the Minister could indicate why it has been a priority over the North Canol Road. There is no mention, I see, of the North Canol Road. I thought this Government was going to be doing something. I am aware that the federal government is doing some assessment of how to rebuild it. But I thought that this Government would be putting money into that as well.

Finally, I would like to give notice of a question on the condition of the Hunker Creek Road. I have heard a number of complaints about that road. I have been on it several times. It is always in terrible condition. I am aware of the fact that it is not an easy road to keep maintained, because of the frequency and the number of heavy equipment taken over it. It seems to

me that there is a maintenance problem that should be addressed on that Hunker Creek Road, and I will be asking the Minister about that.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I will try to answer the question that the Member asked.

First, the priority of the Klondike Highway between the Alaska Highway and Carmacks. Before this Government came into power, it had been established that they were going to do this particular portion of the highway. We are continuing on with that policy.

You asked about the particular trouble we had last year during breakup. That could be attributed to many factors. One factor that played a dominant part in the problems that we experienced last year was the unseasonable weather. What really had happened, with the thaw and freezing, was that moisture had got down underneath the surface. This resulted in the problems that we experienced.

Why it occurred in some sections and not in others was because the soil conditions were not the same as on other sections of road-bed.

I must say that at this time we are reviewing. We are doing a certain amount of study. It is something that we have not experienced in the Yukon before. This is a common occurrence, I must say, in other areas outside of the Yukon. Last year was the first year that we experienced it, and the greatest contributing factor, as I said before, was the weather.

On the Canol Road, we are replacing bridges, culverts, et cetera. There is no doubt that it is quite expensive. If we are going to use that road, we have to keep those bridges up to a standard that will satisfy people that they are safe. That is why we have poured the money into doing this.

Some of these structures were constructed years ago, and we have come to a point where we have to replace them, or the road will not be safe for public travel.

As far as the North Canol Road is concerned, there has been quite a lot of study done on this road. One of the mining companies had a private engineer do some studies, of which reports are available.

Again, you must realize that on that road, the federal government would be the ones who will be pouring the money into that particular project. We have been in consultation with them.

We continue to consult with them, but I guess the decision was that we are not going ahead this particular year. We have great hopes that the MacMillan Pass area will be developed, but we have no real firm commitments at this time. We are certainly addressing it, and it will be appropriate to put it in the Budget until we know what the overall plan of that road is.

I have been over the Hunker Creek Road several times last year. This is one of those projects that is a hard road to address. It started, I believe, as a trail, and worked up from there. It is a very difficult road to do anything with. In the last couple of years, we have experienced a lot of heavy movement of traffic — traffic that was probably too heavy for the construction of the road, and it has presented a certain amount of problems with maintainance. We have upgraded that road a certain amount. I am not saying that we have upgraded it as much as it could be, but because of the general layout of the road, I feel that we have addressed that adequately at this time.

**Mr. Penikett:** Before we get into specific questions, I have one major question I would like to put to the Minister. Yesterday we heard an excellent outline from the Minister of Renewable Resources, on the number of jobs that were going to be created by the capital expenditures in his department, and I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he has any rough estimates of the number of construction and permanent jobs that may result from the \$7,000,000 he is proposing to spend this year?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** In answer to the question, it is very difficult to answer. Basically, we are upgrading roads, and there are extra people working when we are constructing roads, but after the roads are constructed, they are a linkage between development and other places, and I do not see that the con-

struction of the road, except for a little more maintenance, as we lengthen out our network, will employ very many people permanently. I consider roads to be a link in the development in a particular area; indirectly, the spin-offs are more in the projects that occur at the end of the road, or along the road, rather than the road-building itself.

**Mr. Penikett:** Just supplementary to that: will it continue to be the case that where roads are paved, maintenance costs are considerably reduced for the Government, and, if that is the case, will the number of jobs in the Minister's Department which are based in rural communities, and people employed in the maintenance of those roads, be reduced, as well, commensurate with the reduced maintenance responsibilities as a result of paving?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I suppose, if the network of roads remains static, that would be so. But, we were just talking about the Canol Road now. There was some discussion on the North Canol Road. If these roads are brought up to higher standards, and we have to maintain them, I would say that the people we save by going ahead with the modern methods of either pavement or bituminous surface treatment, will reduce the requirement for the number of people who work on the maintenance of what is in place. Those displaced will be absorbed in an expanded road network.

**Mr. Byblow:** The Minister will recall, last spring, a fair amount of controversy surrounding a road ban on a portion of the Klondike Highway, and that precipitated some extensive discussions with respect to road standards, and capability of the road to haul the load weights that were being expected by the road, in terms of industry. I wonder if the Minister, at this point, could relay to the House what the results of that investigation were? I think there was some question that perhaps the level of road standard was probably not great enough to withstand the loads that were being put on it?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** As I mentioned previously, one of the reasons we experienced so much trouble was because of the weather, and we have no control over the weather. We have reviewed it and we have done a lot of studies on it and, perhaps, we will in future be addressing this particular aspect of building roads. I guess the saw-off is this: you can build a road to handle any condition, any traffic, if you are prepared to pay the bucks for it. So what you do when you are designing a road, is over-design it to a degree, to try to get the best dollar value for that road; in this particular case, I guess when this road was designed, it would seem, we had not experienced the weather we had last year, and probably this was the contributing factor to the closure that we had to put on it last year.

This is not a unique thing for Yukon, because over all of Western Canada, load restrictions lasted, as a rule, twice as long as ours last year.

**Mr. Byblow:** There was some question, with respect to the road-bed we are talking about, that it was possible the actual road may not have been constructed to the standards specified in the original Tender. I would like to ask the Minister if that can be totally disputed and that was not the case; that the road was constructed by Highways as specified.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** To the best of my knowledge that road was constructed to the specifications.

**Mr. Byblow:** On this entire subject of road capability and road bans, has the Minister had the opportunity to investigate whether the standards for road construction ought to be increased, in view of the economic concern? I raise the question with note of the departmental objective, which is, "To improve and maintain the transportation system for economic development." In recognition of the importance of that road to economic development, which from this point in time can only increase, down the road five and ten years from now, rather than the 60 trucks per day of ore, we could very well have double that amount. Having had an opportunity, I believe, to investigate whether or not the standards ought to be increased, can the Minister respond as to the outcome of any results from that?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, for future roads we certainly are

looking at the construction and the engineering in a different light, as a result of last year, than we would have two years ago. We certainly are addressing that particular aspect.

**Mr. Byblow:** Accepting that the Minister is studying that, has he had any indication whether the asphalt thickness, or the road-bed below that, is going to be changed, in terms of standards?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** The asphalt thickness, I think, does not have any bearing on this. Asphalt thickness is a cover. It is not the load capabilities of a road in the asphalt skin. It is the sub-base of a road that we will be looking at.

**Mr. Veale:** The question of the impact of road improvement and maintenance on the existence of highway lodges was raised in debate last year. Has the Minister ever looked into that? What is the impact that the paving of a highway has on the number of lodges, or the viability of lodges? In other words, it is much easier to go from Whitehorse to Dawson once the road is paved. Has the department looked at that issue? Have any concerns been raised by lodge owners on the highways?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** There is no doubt that the people can travel further. Primarily we are interested in the construction of roads, and we have not addressed that aspect of it. During the last few years, there has been a continuous decline in the number of lodges, but we have not addressed that particular aspect.

**Mr. Veale:** Just as a matter of policy, does the Government, in any way, insist on or encourage contractors to make use of facilities at highway lodges? Is that something that is in the contracts, or is that something that just happens by sheer luck for lodge owners?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** That is a prerogative of the contractor. We certainly encourage them to use these lodges, but that is their decision. In a lot of cases they are using the facilities of the lodges. We extensively use the lodges wherever possible.

#### *On Sundry Equipment*

**Mr. Chairman:** Sundry Equipment, \$200,000.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I will just give you a breakdown. This is an ongoing program. This provides for the purchase of auxiliary equipment which is not included in Road Equipment Replacement Account. The types of equipment included are generator sets, culvert steamers, small pumps, chain saws, et cetera.

**Mrs. McGuire:** Would there be provisions in this item for replacement of tools in L.I.D. garages? It does not seem to appear in Municipal and Community Affairs.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** This particular budget is strictly Highways. It has no relation to what they do in L.I.D. garages.

**Mr. Penikett:** I apologize for having to leave the Chamber for a minute, but I had an urgent phone call. I apologize to the Minister who was answering a question of mine at the time.

I would like to ask the Minister if some change in the operation of the Road Equipment Replacement Account is indicated by this reference.?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am sorry, I did not quite get the question. Would you mind repeating it, please?

**Mr. Penikett:** The Minister will recall, during the time that we spent together on the Public Accounts Committee, and at other times in this House, that there has been some discussion about the Road Equipment Replacement Account, particularly in respect of the ancient legislative principle that the Government should be accountable to the Legislature for the expenditure of funds.

The Minister will recall that, as the Road Equipment Replacement Account had been operated at one time, it did have the possible effect of removing from the purview of this House the expenditure of those funds.

The Minister, I think, when he last reported to the House on this question, said that he was looking at it, and that there might be some changes on the way. I just wonder if the statement here on Sundry Equipment indicates that there have been some changes in the way in which that account is operated?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, I think that we will be giving more information on what goes on in that account to the Legislature, so that they can see what we are doing with it.

**Mr. Veale:** I gather there is no breakdown that the Minister is going to provide to us on the details of that expenditure? If there is, I will not need to go any further, because it will be available to us. My question, specifically, is on the maintenance on the Hunker Road since it has a heavy traffic. The maintenance is inadequate. Is part of the equipment replacement or new equipment purchases going to be for adding more equipment to that road?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** It is pretty hard to say. We buy equipment and the Department allots equipment, to wherever they feel the need is greatest for the particular equipment. We do not buy a piece of equipment for any particular road. We buy it for the over all network.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** This is Sundry Equipment for the Department, other than road equipment.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand that, but it makes a specific reference to the account, which is the only reason that I asked the question. I know that it is not about road equipment.

*Sundry Equipment Other Than Road Equipment agreed to On Garage Tools and Equipment*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Garage Tools and Equipment, \$13,000.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I cannot say very much. This is an ongoing program, and it is to purchase specialized tools, such as large wrenches, grinder drills, compressors, things like this, that will not be in the mechanic's tool box. This is an ongoing thing.

**Mrs. McGuire:** I know the Minister has already said that there is no provisions in here for replacement of tools for L.I.D. garages. I would like to ask the Minister where might I find these provisions? They do not appear to be in L.I.D. budgets, and they have not been explained in Municipal and Community Affairs capital, either.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** The L.I.D.s get certain money from the Government and they provide certain services. One of services they do is garages, and it would be in the monies that they receive for the L.I.D., and it would be their priorities as to what they do with it.

*Garage Tools and Equipment agreed to On Miscellaneous and Minor Projects — Buildings and Roads*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Miscellaneous and Minor Projects — Buildings and Roads, \$168,000.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Again, this is an ongoing program. I cannot say very much about it. It gives us the flexibility to take up small items of construction. It gives us the opportunity to do jobs which come along that we cannot make an absolute provision for. This is what we use this fund for.

**Mr. Penikett:** If the Minister might just briefly indicate if he could identify any other particular items under this expenditure, or are they just a large catalogue of very minor repairs?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Mostly, they are minor repairs. We had a building in Haines Junction where the doors were not adequate, and things like this; items that we cannot foresee. They are really too small to bring up as line items. There are numerous projects of this calibre.

**Mr. Veale:** Does that particular line item include the type of problem that was experienced on the Klondike Highway this spring? In other words, is that picked up under this item, or is that a major item that comes in in the Supplementary estimates? Maybe the contractor paid for the repair of that road, I do not know, but I assume that was not the case?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** That is O and M. Here, we are talking about capital projects.

*Miscellaneous and Minor Projects — Buildings and Roads agreed to*

*On Pre-Engineering — Public Works and Highways*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Pre-Engineering — Public Works and Highways, \$262,000.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** This is another ongoing program. These

are the funds required to cover engineering, planning, architectural costs to provide the preliminary information needed to define and propose capital projects. The sum also covers the design of projects which have not had specific funds allotted to them, as was done in Item 12, which is the Faro-Ross River road. The work can be carried out either by consultants or our own Department staff. Without this, it would almost be impossible to provide budgets for building projects.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister just clarify this? I am not clear on why there is such an amount of expenditure in this line item. It must be for Government buildings, exclusively, as opposed to other public works, because we have line items in many other department areas. The Watson Lake sewage thing comes under Municipal and Community Affairs. Is there any of this money going for that sort of thing?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** If I may, I might be able to cast a little bit of light on this one. Prior to calling a contract for a major chunk of road reconstruction — on the Klondike Highway, for instance — it requires a considerable amount of pre-engineering work. Because, in fact, what has to happen, is that contract is called, based on dirt quantities that are involved, and the pre-engineering work has to be fairly accurate. You can only call these contracts, and live with these contracts, if they are within specific parameters. So, it does require a considerable amount of pre-engineering work. The majority of this money is used for highway pre-engineering, not building pre-engineering.

The same applies to building pre-engineering, though, for Government buildings, in that there is a required amount of pre-engineering work that must be done in order to get architectural concept drawings, for instance, before you can go to contract. Also the contractor may well have pre-engineering work that he is going to do as part of the contract. That might be so. But this is the pre-engineering work that is done by this Government.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would like to ask whether or not, in either one of the two items that we are dealing with, and have just dealt with, if this could include the category or grouping of recreational roads?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No.  
*Pre-Engineering-Public Works and Highways agreed to On Exhaust Systems — Maintenance Buildings and Workshops*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Exhaust Systems — Maintenance Buildings and Workshops, \$398,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I just asked the Minister about this matter. I understand that it is an ongoing program. We have heard about it before.

Can he give us any kind of estimate as to when this program might be, not finally, but substantially, resolved?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** You are quite right. This is an ongoing program. It is a program that we seem to be discussing every year. We have quite a lot more to do on this particular program yet, so I think that you will see it around next year.

The program that we are proposing this year is looking at camps in Carmacks, Drury Creek, and Ross River. There are a considerable number of camps yet to be done, so we will have the program for another year or so.

**Mr. Penikett:** The Minister may have spoken on this question on another occasion, but it occurs to me that one of the effects of improving the exhaust systems in many of these facilities — I might mention that this is a desirable goal, from a health point of view — might be to increase energy expenditures and energy costs. I wonder if there has been some coordination between the energy conservation officials and the implementation of this program?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, we have had a lot of consultation. It has probably been in the last couple of years of the program that we have put particular emphasis on this, because there is definitely a relationship between the two. We feel that when we are doing one, we should address the other, and get the best possible results for the dollars that we spend. It is something

that we have worked on very closely.

*Exhaust Systems — Maintenance Buildings And Workshops agreed to*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Mrs. McGuire, would you wish to reopen discussion?

**Mrs. McGuire:** I notice that there are no provisions here whatsoever for the Dempster Highway. Are there provisions elsewhere in here, or do you have no planned capital expenditures for the Dempster Highway this year?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Would the Committee reopen this for Mrs. McGuire for one more question? Do we have unanimous consent?

*Agreed*

*On Exhaust Systems — Maintenance Buildings and Workshops*

**Mrs. McGuire:** Does that indicate that the Minister thinks that that road is in excellent condition? With their forecasts for traffic this winter, and the heavy trucks and equipment will be going through there; can the Minister not see any problems with this?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Yes, there probably are, but that is the O and M side of our Budget, not the Capital side of our Budget.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I might bring to the attention of Committee that I do not think we are speaking on the proper subject.

*Exhaust Systems — Maintenance Buildings and Workshops agreed to*

*On Maintenance Camp Facilities*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Maintenance Camp Facilities, \$300,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would appreciate it if the Minister would just briefly indicate where these expenditures are to be made.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** This program is for the highway maintenance camps, and includes such items as crew quarters, powerhouse, electrical generation workshops, and security at various camps throughout the Territory. One I can think of is Tuchitua, but all of the maintenance camps will be looked at and upgraded as we see fit. We set our priorities as the need arises.

**Mr. Byblow:** I recognize, from the amount of money allocated, what the answer to my question will be. I wanted to know whether or not any of this is intended for the actual creation or relocation of a camp.

I will not ask the question, but I will raise with the Minister the matter of what has been a considerable lobby — to relocate some highways maintenance camp facilities in a closer proximity to Faro. I think the arguments presented to the Minister in the past have surrounded the increasing demands for maintenance on the road, the airport; the fact that substantial construction is now going to take place there, and that the closest maintenance camps to that area are 40 miles on either side. This is not anything unusual, because it is at least 40 miles from somewhere almost all the time, but, with respect to the matter of a highways maintenance camp: to increase the service end of highways maintenance in the Faro area, has the Minister given it any consideration, and what is his response?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, we have not given it any thought. We feel that our camps are located adequately and I have no thoughts of moving any of the camp facilities.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just to try and pin the Minister down, has he considered the matter of relocating a highways camp closer to Faro?

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

**Mr. Byblow:** Does he intend to examine that?

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

*Maintenance Camp Facilities agreed to*  
*On VHF Radio System*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** VHF Radio Systems, \$60,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** The Minister will not be surprised to hear me comment that his Department seems to be still gobbling up VHF radios like corn flakes. I notice it is down from the pre-

vious year. I do not doubt that is due to the eloquence and the efforts of the Members for Hootalinqua and Mayo, who have certainly expressed themselves on this subject before.

Since there has been a 30 percent decrease, can I ask the Minister if we can expect this trend to continue?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not know whether that would be a valid assumption or not. Last year, we did a major replacement, and as a result of that, we did not have as much to replace this year.

We should always remember that this equipment has only a certain life expectancy, and we are always going to be faced with replacement. I guess I am going to have to advise the Member across from me that I think he will see it here next year, too.

**Mr. Penikett:** Just let me say that I probably have a shorter life expectancy than the Member opposite, but there are reasons for that.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister advise if these VHF items are purchased locally?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I am sorry, I cannot give you an answer. It is the policy of the Government to buy locally, wherever possible. Whether VHF Radio Systems are available locally or not, I cannot say, but I will check into it and bring back the answer to the Member.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I might be able to cast a little bit of light on it.

I do not know if the actual equipment is purchased locally, because I do not know if it is available locally, but the maintenance contract that we enter into with respect to this equipment is a local contract.

*V.H.F. Radio System agreed to*

*On South Canol Road Drainage Replacement*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** South Canol Road Drainage Replacement, in the amount of \$320,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would like to pursue the excellent question posed by the Member for Kluane, which had been previously posed by myself to the Minister. When I asked it, though, he did not answer it, so the Member for Kluane did better than I.

In respect to the Canol Road and the Dempster Highway, can we assume, then, that the Minister has made a choice between the suggested priorities posed to him by some gentleman in Northern Affairs that the Canol, for the time being, with this Government, does have a higher priority?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, we are specifically talking about the South Canol Road. I believe the implication was made to the Dempster and the North Canol Road, and that is something altogether different.

In this program, we have recognized the importance of the South Canol Road for quite some time. What we are doing is replacing some of the old structures that we deemed to be becoming unsafe to the travelling public. For instance, 12 structures have been replaced up to this date, and we estimate that there is probably another nine that still have to be replaced. This is only on the South Canol Road; it has nothing to do with the comparison between the Dempster and the North Canol Road.

**Mr. Penikett:** So the Minister is saying he has not made a decision yet. Is that what he said?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** *inaudible*

**Mr. Veale:** I gather the completion of the drainage structures is some years off. Does that, in any way, mean that there will be enhanced usage of the South Canol? Will it be open throughout the winter?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** We have not addressed using the South Canol Road as a winter road, at this time. If we do not replace these things, the road will not be used at any time. That is what I am saying.

*South Canol Road Drainage Replacement agreed to*

*On Klondike Highway*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Klondike Highway, in the amount of \$3,344,000.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister just give us a breakdown of where the actual construction is going to take place this year? It is quite hazardous, as the Minister knows, to be anywhere near the construction in a rain storm. He might also address the question of what specific instructions are given to road crews, regarding people coming through, particularly during the muddy stages of construction. It can be quite perilous, if any of the Members have driven through there lately.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Where we intend doing this work is at Kilometre 43; we are doing some paving.

As far as the travelling public is concerned, we are also aware that any road improvement causes a certain amount of difficulty. I do not think that on that road we have experienced, in the norm, any outstanding delay or annoyance to traffic.

There is also on the Klondike Highway, as some of the Members are aware, the Alaska Highway-Carmacks concern; we have some money set aside for the engineering of this. This will be part of it and it will be a four- or five-year project.

As I said before, this is a continuing project between the Alaska Highway and Carmacks, and we are getting quite close to Carmacks now; it will not be too long.

We are doing quite a lot of geo-technical work there, and in this area, too, there is some hydra-seeding along the Fox Lake area.

**Mr. Veale:** I gather the Carcross-Whitehorse Road is strictly pre-engineering, but could the Minister advise what the actual mileage of pavement is that will be done in 1982-83?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not have the exact mileage on the pavement, but it is 14 kilometres. I have not got the list of the mileages on the construction.

*Klondike Highway agreed to*

*On Other Roads—Recreation and Mineral Access*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Other Roads-Recreation and Mineral Access, \$475,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would like to ask the Minister a couple of general questions about this item. I am little confused about the lumping together of the Recreation and Mineral Access Roads, and I would just like to ask the Minister if, for his purposes, they are the same category of roads?

Let me ask a question on a specific road. The Hunker-Granville Roads were at one time recreational. Now, obviously, they are mineral access roads. It has been the expressed hope from people who happen to live along it that it does not become a highway, because the people who walking their cats along it will not be able to do it any more. Could I ask the Minister how he makes the distinction between the recreational roads and the mineral access roads, in terms of both definition and the capital spending?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I guess it is safe to say that the road that the Member mentioned serves two purposes.

I think there are other roads that are strictly recreational roads, which are separate from mineral roads. It could be argued, I suppose, at any time, that the road even to Mount Freegold would always have a certain amount of recreation on it.

We lump the two together to give us some flexibility, and we have to assess the needs for these roads; we intend spending these monies on what the Department will set as the priorities.

The priorities can change. We could have some problems on the Hunker Creek Road this year, like a big washout. We would have to put more there and to take monies away from another road that has less priority. But the Department sets the priority for the needs of the people. There are many reasons why we set the priority: the condition of the road, the needs of the public; there are various things you take into consideration when you do that.

We felt that because there is some dual purpose to the road, which gives us some flexibility, we should put the two in one line item.

You might notice that this is the first time that we have actually identified money for recreational roads. I think this is a significant step forward for this Government, because the

people of the Territory see the money going into the main roads, and it always has been in their minds that we are only catering to the tourists. However, we have identified that there are some basic needs for the people in the Territory to have money spent on recreational roads, and this is the start of recognizing that. I personally hope that we will put a lot more emphasis on these particular roads, which we can all enjoy.

**Mr. Penikett:** I believe it was the Member for Mayo who once told me that in the olden days when it came to recreational roads, they used to grow their own.

Let me ask a specific question about the Hunker Road. In terms of the departmental inventory, is it still a recreational road, and is that how it is listed in the Department's inventory of roads?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I really do not know. I would say that it is betwixt and between.

**Mr. Veale:** Will the Minister indicate if any of the roads designated here under recreational or mineral access are new roads, breaking new ground?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, as far as I am aware, there is no significant amount of new road. There might be a little extension, but basically they are roads, or trails, in lots of instances, that are in existence today.

**Mr. Veale:** Does any of the funding that is coming through under this line item have any relation to Tote Trail Assistance, or any of that style of programs?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** This is nothing to do with Tote Trail Assistance whatsoever.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister then indicate the other roads involved in this, if they are not too extensive? There is Hunker Creek Road, I presume; there is Freegold. I would like a little bit of history on Freegold, and what the Minister intends to do with that road, in terms of upgrading.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** There are various kinds of upgrading that we do on that road. We work on bridges, culverts, ditches.

There is Hunker Road. There are also a couple of roads in the vicinity of Mayo. There is one road up there that we have had some problems on.

There are some of our recreational roads closer to home near Whitehorse. There are some at Laberge. There are some in areas like that which are not very adequate.

Also, there are roads, small recreational roads, just beyond a lot of the communities in the Territory, that we are addressing. I have not brought a list here of what we have identified, but in general they are these types of roads.

**Mr. Veale:** Could we assume that the bulk of the \$475,000 is actually going into mineral access roads?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Again, I think I said that we wanted some flexibility. We have categorized it, roughly, to spending half on mineral access roads and half on recreational roads. We did not want to find ourselves in a spot. We want to see where the most need will be. We foresee about a 50-50 split.

**Mr. Penikett:** I heard the Member for Mayo suggest that some of the money could be spent in Mayo. May I suggest that if you are looking for places to spend some of this money, you might usefully spend some of it between Elsa and Keno.

*Other Roads-Recreation and Mineral Access agreed to*

*On Faro Access*

**Mr. Byblow:** Does the Minister really think this road upgrading is necessary?

*Laughter*

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** No, the Minister does not think it is necessary, but my colleagues talked me into it.

**Mr. Byblow:** I seem to be rising too many times in this budget in complimenting Government on good budgetary allocations. Recalling the length of debate on this subject last budget session, I think there is little to be said other than recognition of good judgment, well delayed, and certainly a fulfillment of the economic importance of the area, and in line with the objectives stated at the beginning of the budget.

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** Just a thank you would suffice, Mr.

Byblow.

*Laughter*

*Faro Access agreed to*

*On Campbell Highway (Faro - Ross River)*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Campbell Highway (Faro — Ross River), \$43,000.

**eHon. Mr. Lattin:** This program is to provide funds for the preliminary view of the road, to determine what work may be required on this road in the future years. It is a very small amount, strictly for pre-engineering.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think I brought up something quite similar to this in a previous debate on another budgetary area. I would like to ask the Minister if, in this feasibility that is being planned on the Campbell Highway portion, there is also an examination of any road relocation or creation, with respect to a joining up to the North Canol Highway for purposes of economic development.

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

*Campbell Highway (Faro - Ross River) agreed to*

*On Highways and Public Works Building - Whitehorse*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Highways and Public Works Building — Whitehorse, \$665,000.

**Mr. Penikett:** I have noticed a lot of moving of dirt done in that area. Could the Minister tell us if his government has sought and obtained the approval of the City of Whitehorse Planning Board in connection with this facility?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I do not quite understand what the Member is asking me. This is a building we already have. Basically, what we are doing is moving the sign shop and upgrading in the grader station, in the building we already have. So I do not think we have to approach the Planning Board for this particular project. It is no new building that we are constructing at this time.

**Mr. Penikett:** Actually, as the Minister well knows, he does not need Planning Board approval, but I remember in the olden days when I was on City Council, that used to be an expressed concern of certain members of the City Council. Presumably, since that time, he has had the occasion to discuss it with City Council, and they are all ecstatic about this development, are they?

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** If we were going to construct a new building we would certainly discuss it with the City to have their blessing. On this particular project, we are not constructing a new building. We are doing renovations and modifications in a building that is already in existence.

**Mrs. McGuire:** I notice it is to provide funds to upgrade the sign shop. I was just wondering if the Minister has set a bit of this money aside to make me two speed signs?

*Laughter*

**Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I have to really congratulate the Member across from me for continually trying. I will certainly take it under advisement.

*Highways and Public Works Building - Whitehorse agreed to*

*On Highways and Public Works - Total Authority*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Highways and Public Works — Total Authority, \$7,110,000.

*Highways and Public Works - Total Authority agreed to*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Before we move to the next item, the Department of Intergovernmental Relations. We will have a brief recess.

*Recess*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will call the Committee to Order. I draw your attention to Page 41, Intergovernmental Relations. General discussion?

*On Intergovernmental Relations—General Debate*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The reason this specific item is in the Budget as a line item is that we harbour some fond hopes of being able to recover, at some time in the future, from the proponents of the pipeline, any funds expended by this Govern-

ment directly on pipeline construction.

As I am sure all Member are aware, government equipment, particularly motor vehicles, is covered off in this Budget in one area only, and that is in Government Services. This one has been taken out of there and put in as a separate item just for that reason.

*On Automotive Equipment*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Automotive Equipment, in the amount of \$15,000.

**Mr. Veale:** Because there is only one item, perhaps we can just jump into it. What would the reason be for having a 4 x 4 under Intergovernmental Relations, as opposed to simply using it out of the car pool, where it could be used by other departments?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** As I just tried to explain, the vehicle is going to be used for inspection purposes on the pipeline. That being the case, if we can identify it as such in our Budget, then we stand a pretty good chance of being able to recover this money from the proponent through the auspices of the Northern Pipeline Agency and the National Energy Board.

**Mr. Veale:** Well, I still ask my question. Is there not a 4 x 4 in the car pool right now, or is this an addition to the car pool that would not normally be there?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** There are 4 x 4's in the car pool right now, but, obviously, this would be in addition to the ones that are in the car pool and probably, some day, it would go into that pool.

**Mr. Veale:** Can we assume that the 4 x 4 will not be purchased if it is not going to be recovered from the proponent?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, whether the \$15,000 is ever recovered from the proponents or not, we are going to need the vehicle.

**Mr. Veale:** What inspections is the Government conducting now of the pipeline right-of-way?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** There are some minimal inspections in respect to land and the right-of-way, but there will be more and more all the time.

**Mr. Veale:** When will the item actually be purchased? Will it be in the spring or summer, that far ahead, so that there will be some assurance that the congressional hurdles have been been jumped?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** None of this money, of course, can be expended before April 1, 1982.

**Mr. Penikett:** I am not going to ask the Government Leader about the potential for job creation of this Department since, having read the departmental objective, I can see the potential for creating jobs would be almost infinite, if we had infinite dollars.

I do want to ask a question about the pipeline grants, since that has been sort of absorbed by this new Department. If pipeline inspections is the function to which this vehicle is being put, in whose care is this vehicle going to be, and who is going to be doing these inspections? Is this really a serious activity of the Government as of April 1, 1982?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure that it is going to actually start on April 1, 1982, but we are fairly confident that we are going to be required to do inspections prior to the end of the fiscal year, and that we are going to have to have this vehicle some time during that fiscal year. We are quite certain of that.

**Mr. Penikett:** We will clear it, but we do note that there is a brand new one for sale in the paper today, for a lot less than that.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** As I said, I never read that paper. *Automotive Equipment agreed to*

*Intergovernmental Relations Total Authority agreed to*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I draw your attention page 45, Library and Information Resources. General discussion?

*On Library and Information Resources—General Debate*

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** There is not very much to say about this. It is for equipment, furniture, and storage equipment, except for the last item which is an item that has just recently been transferred over. As the Members know, this Department has



been sort of in transition, so the last item was just transferred over.

**Mr. Veale:** I wonder if the Minister could just give us an explanation. I have a press release here on the creation of the new department.

Which of the objectives that are outlined under Library and Information Resources have now been transferred to the new department? Do I correctly assume that there is going to be a Library Department, and a separate Heritage and Cultural Resources Department? Will the two departments remain distinct? In other words, will there be another Deputy Minister hired? How is it going to work?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The objectives are the same, with some additions. The new branch is the Heritage and Cultural Branch, so to speak. The Library remains the same except that the Whitehorse Art Gallery is being moved into the Heritage Branch along with museums, historic sites and so on.

**Mr. Veale:** The press release indicates that the Department of Library and Information Resources will be called the Department of Heritage and Cultural Resources. Is it simply a name change, then, without very much other change, except for the addition of a Cultural Branch within it?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes, it is a name change. Library and Information Resources is now Heritage and Cultural Resources. It has the added component of heritage, museums and historic sites, and responsibility for archeological permits and so on, so it has a new mandate.

**Mr. Veale:** Was the mandate not always within the Department before, for museums and archives and cultural and heritage resources?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The mandate was there for the Library, the Archives, the Whitehorse Art Gallery and records management. Now, added to that is museums.

Museums were really under Tourism, if anything, and historic sites were under Renewable Resources. Archeological permits were under Consumer and Corporate Affairs. What we have done is to draw all these threads together and make a proper department of Heritage, within the Library and Archives Department. The total Department is now called Heritage and Cultural Resources.

**Mr. Byblow:** When I look at the objectives and relate them to the total authority of the Budget, I feel disheartened to think that for \$190,000 the Minister can really and totally fulfill the objectives.

However, in relation to the Heritage and Cultural Resources focus of the new Department, I would like to ask the Minister if she can identify, in this Budget, whether or not appropriations have been made with this new focus, in other words, with the archeological permits, the historic sites, the aspects that were not in that Department before?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** We have had some operating and maintenance monies transferred, but the only capital money is the \$30,000 at the bottom of page 46. It is all pretty recent. I appreciate the Member's sentiments that it ought to be a larger budget but, who knows, perhaps it will be, eventually.

**Mr. Byblow:** I guess what I am really driving at is that if the Minister is now undertaking additional responsibilities in what amounts to a fairly important aspect of historical significance, she ought to have lobbied and received adequate funding to undertake those new and added responsibilities, because we are talking about a budget for next year, for next summer's work. I know that there is a considerable amount of archeological work that ought to be undertaken for permanent retention and preservation, and if this is part of this new Ministry, we ought to see some substantial funding that would do justice to it.

I would only leave the observation that it is fine to try to co-ordinate Ministries of a similar type service, but I raise the point of inadequate funding to do the job. I am wondering if the Minister does have any final response on that?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** It is not only fine to have these responsibilities put together, it is very marvelous. It makes the focus in

Government to create the sort of environment that we can grow from.

As far as archeological monies are concerned, nobody has sponsored anything like that in Yukon. We just give out the permits.

**Mr. Veale:** Mr. Byblow has talked about the lack of funding. Is there anything that the Minister will be doing, in terms of objectives, to consolidate some of the museum societies that exist? Is the Minister going to somehow provide an overall co-ordination of these private sector activities that are taking place? Is she going to co-ordinate them, or is she simply going to monitor what they are doing? In other words, I wonder whether there is a real focus on the subject, or if that is what the Minister is intending?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The department will hope to have a liaison function, and a facilitating function. For instance, through the Department, we hope that we will have more access to federal money. At the moment, it is more of an expediting function it will have.

As for as the \$30,000, it has been given out piecemeal to museums when they have applied for it. In the future, we hope to have a formula type funding, so that they can plan ahead.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister indicate how the new branch of Cultural Heritage will fit in with the objectives of Parks and Historic Sites, which is so active in Dawson City?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Parks and Historic Sites is a federal department. The Yukon Government has responsibility for some buildings in Dawson, such as the Carnegie Library and the Administration Building, which now houses the Museum. They have expertise that we hope to tap. Our historic sites are included in this Department now.

**Mr. Veale:** Will the Department be establishing a liaison with Heritage Canada, which is not a private organization — certainly government sponsored, I believe — but, what will be the liaison between this new branch and that particular body?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** We have a very good relationship with Heritage Canada and they are a very important organization, partly government sponsored, but run by volunteers. We expect to have a very good relationship with them and interest them more in projects in the Yukon. So, in that way, we will provide the facilitating function, by interesting private foundations and organizations such as Heritage Canada, in the Yukon. They have done one project in the Yukon, so far, that is all, the Yukon Hotel, in Dawson.

#### *On Library and Archives Equipment*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** *Library and Archives Equipment, \$83,000.*

**Mr. Byblow:** This is a substantial increase from last year and I would like to know where the emphasis has been placed in the acquisition of equipment.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The emphasis is on video equipment, and such items as that.

#### *Library and Archives Equipment agreed to*

#### *On Accommodation - Land Titles Storage*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** *Accommodation — Land Titles Storage, \$7,000.*

#### *Accommodation - Land Titles Storage agreed to*

#### *On Carnegie Library*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** *Carnegie Library, \$20,000.*

**Mr. Veale:** Could the Minister give an explanation of how the Carnegie Library is being operated? When it is open? When the actual restoration will be completed? Is that \$20,000 going to be the final amount, or it is going to be an ongoing project that will not be open to the public for some time?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** It is a very interesting project. It is the beautiful old Carnegie Library, which needs redoing completely. When it is finished, it will be a turn-of-the-century type Library with authentic furnishings. It is going to be quite marvelous.

This is just the beginning, really. It is still in the planning stage. I really do not know when it will be completed, the sooner the better, as far as I am concerned.

**Mr. Veale:** Is there any use being made of the building?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** No none.

*Carnegie Library agreed to*

*On Mayo Library*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Mayo Library, \$10,000.

*Mayo Library agreed to*

*On Whitehorse Public Library*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Whitehorse Public Library, \$10,000.

**Mr. Byblow:** In relation to this item and the first, I would like to ask the Minister what the status is, in the Whitehorse Library, in respect to space for these expanding facilities, as well as storage, and public demand?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The Library itself will not be able to expand. The Archives' need is more pressing, so the Archives will be expanding, as they are making some changes in that part of the building. Perhaps Mr. Tracey, who is in charge of space in the building, could tell you a little more about it. I do not think the Library is going to expand in that way at all. We hope to upgrade it, but not in space.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I can probably answer the question in regards to space. We are hopeful that we will also be able to give her some space for Library expansion, because we want to move most of that department out of that area. We have located other space in another building in town. We are presently renovating and we hope that we can move the administration and the Deputy Minister of Heritage and Cultural Resources into the new facilities, and make use of all that space for the Library and Archives.

**Mr. Byblow:** Am I to understand that the entire library function is going to be moved elsewhere, or just the administrative functions?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I was speaking of actual library space. I may have mislead the Member. The office space will be enlarged for the new branch, and the Deputy Head is going to be moving out of the building with some of the staff, but there will be more office space. Perhaps not more actual library space, but the whole Department will have more space.?

**Mr. Byblow:** Is the entire Departmental function moving out of the building and just the library itself staying?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes, that is pretty well it. So it will be library people alone who are left there. The administrative staff will move out.

**Mr. Byblow:** Who is going to move into the vacated space, and what is the building to which the administrative function is moving?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Mr. Overand, the Territorial Librarian, is getting more space for his library staff, and the rest of the people are moving into the Medical Arts Building.

*Whitehorse Public Library agreed to*

*On New Public Library Development*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** New Public Library Development, \$10,000.

**Mr. Byblow:** Who is getting the goodies?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** I am afraid that I do not have that information. I cannot tell you exactly which communities are getting it, although I think it some of the people who have not had a proper library, as such.

**Mr. Veale:** Would the Minister provide the information to us?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes.

**Mr. Veale:** There is a separate line item for the Mayo Library, and I am not clear why that was separated from the general topic of New Public Library Development?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** The item here, New Public Library Development, is for communities that did not have a proper library facility before. Mayo already did.

*New Public Library Development agreed to*

*On Conservation Program*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Conservation Program, \$20,000.

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** This is special equipment for the preserving and conserving of archive material. I think some of it may be sub-zero storage to protect things until they are preserved.

*Conservation Program agreed to*

*On Museum Contributions*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Museum Contributions, \$30,000.

**Mr. McGuire:** I just want to ask the Minister if this amount of \$30,000 remains intact until applications are made from various museums, or is it already proportioned out to the various museums, say the Burwash Museum?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** This money was transferred from the Tourism Advisory Board, and the way that it was done then was that the museum made an application and they were given some money.

In this new department, we hope to be able to have a formula whereby they know how much they are going to get each year. Then they can make plans. It is going to be a much better thing for the Library.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** When I was last in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, I went through a museum building that is an excellent building. It is obviously a multi-multi-million dollar complex, built with federal funds. I wonder if the Minister is negotiating with the federal authorities for a similar building in Yukon?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Well I would really like to be negotiating with the Federal Government over something like that.

I do not know. There is a quandary in the Yukon whether the museums should be as they are now, in different places, or whether there should be one, big Territorial Museum.

It has not worked, in some ways, in the Northwest Territories, but they do not have roads, and so they differ from us. It is something that is being debated by the Yukon Museum Association, and is a question that is much asked.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I think I should point out that the Federal Government, at the same time that they built that museum, which I agree is a beautiful building in Yellowknife, built this Administration Building here in Whitehorse, for the people of the Territory. From that point of view, it was a saw-off. I have been advised that the O and M cost on that building in Yellowknife is some \$650,000 a year.

**Mr. Veale:** It is fortunate that we have been spared that O and M cost.

Is the purchase of museum artifacts something that is going to be left up to the individual museum or is the Government going to be making specific purchase of certain artifacts to be put into sub-zero storage, or whatever?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** No, it will continue the way it has been done, with individual museums asking for artifacts, and purchasing when they can, until this Department has a different sort of arrangement. But at the moment, this seems to be the most satisfactory way of doing it, and through the grants they will have help that way.

**Mr. Byblow:** It seems about a year ago that the Territorial Museums Association was on an active lobby to solicit from the Government, a position respecting museums, and I believe the previous Minister undertook to establish a policy. Out of that, as I recall, evolved the request to establish feasibility monies with respect to new and existing museums, in terms of an inventory, in terms of what ought to be done to upgrade the facilities, in terms of the degree of sophistication necessary to preserve items. I am wondering if, either in this line item, or, in the intentions of Government eventually, feasibility monies will be made available to service this whole area — a full and thorough examination of museums, in the long term, for the Territory?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes, some of this could be feasibility

money. As a Department, we have just had one meeting with the Museums Association, and we have not got to planning with them yet, but this is what we will be doing, and we are going to have a thorough examination of the whole museum situation in Yukon.

**Mr. Veale:** The Minister had, at one point, included recreation in this branch, and it is now in education. Is it possible that recreation would eventually come over to this branch? It seems to me it has a definitive objective at this time. Is it the intention that it remain that way?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Yes. What precipitated the discussion of recreation coming over to this Department, which was then just in the formative stages, was the Kiro Report. Mr. Kiro looked at the Government and suggested that all leisure services should be in one department. He was of the opinion that recreation should come out of education and be put into this department which, if any department in the government is devoted to leisure services, I suppose that this Department that could be said to be. There was much public discussion, as Members will remember, and because we initiated this thorough review of recreation, it was decided that recreation would remain where it was. There was very strong feeling among the sports lobby within recreation to stay with education, so they would have access to gymnasiums and communities and so on. There was a very strong argument for keeping recreation in education. The people on the cultural side of recreation thought they were getting the short end of the stick, as compared with the sports people. It is an ongoing question. As a matter of fact, it has not been settled, and I do not know if it ever will be settled. For the moment, we are allowing the recreation review to discover, for itself, where, in this Government, recreation's real place is. I think that the argument for keeping recreation within the Department of Education is stronger. It is possible that it could come out of this Department, but I really do not think so. We will allow this whole review to discover that.

**Mr. Byblow:** The Minister, previous to answering the question on recreation, said that part of this line item could be feasibility money. Would the Minister undertake to give us a breakdown on how the \$30,000 is being spent, and if it not specifically allocated, what is the procedure to solicit funding in this category for museums?

**Hon. Mrs. McCall:** Perhaps I did not make myself clear on that. This money is the money that we will use for formula funding to a museum so that it can plan ahead. It will be up to the museum what it is used for. It is possible that, with the Museums, a feasibility study will be done which could use some of this money but, primarily, it will be going to each museum in consultation with the department. There will be some sort of liaison to decide how it should be spent, but each museum will know ahead of time how much money it will be getting, so it can make some plans.

*Museum Contributions agreed to*

*Library and Information Resources—Total Authority agreed to*

**Mr. Penikett:** On a Point of Order, prior to adjournment, may we know the Government House Leader's pleasure for tomorrow in respect to Government Bills and Orders.

**Mr. Graham:** It is the Government's intention to proceed with Motions as they stand on the Order Paper, and I would be only too willing to speak with the Members opposite in respect to Motion Number 27, so that we may proceed with it in the quickest manner rather than debating it in open House.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand what has happened to Motions other than Government Orders. I am concerned about Government Orders.

The first question I have is: are we proceeding with the second reading of Bill Number 75 tomorrow, after we have done with backbench orders? If, once we have done the backbench and opposition motions, are we then proceeding with Motion Number 27? Is that the first priority?

**Mr. Graham:** Yes. As I indicated, once the Motions other than Government Motions are finished, Government Bills and

Orders, we will be proceeding as they are on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** At this time I will entertain a motion from the floor.

**Mr. Graham:** I move that you 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.

*Motion agreed to*

*Speaker resumes Chair*

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

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

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

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

*Motion agreed to*

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

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

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

*The House adjourned at 5:22 p.m.*

