



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 57

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Thursday, December 18, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West	Government Leader. Minister responsible for: Executive Council Office; Finance; Economic Development; Mines and Small Business; Public Service Commission
Hon. Dave Porter	Watson Lake	Government House Leader. Minister responsible for: Tourism; Renewable Resources.
Hon. Roger Kimmery	Whitehorse South Centre	Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.
Hon. Piers McDonald	Mayo	Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassi	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

Liberal

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

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

01 Whitehorse, Yukon

Thursday, December 18, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper. Are there any Introduction of Visitors? Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not have a document for tabling, but I wonder if I could rise on a spurious point of order in order to give my colleague, the Minister of Health and Human Resources, time to return to the House with the documents that she planned to table today, but which she discovered that she did not have with her when Mr. Speaker entered the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if you would take this spurious point of order under careful consideration, perhaps, for a moment or two, and perhaps Members opposite would join with me in discussing this point of order. Perhaps the Leader of the Official Opposition might either agree on the point of order to give us unanimous consent or at a later point in daily routine or offer some advice based on his great experience in the courts, Mr. Speaker, it might allow us sufficient time to allow the Minister of Health and Human Resources to come back with the documents that she has gone to get, which are necessary to table today, and which, in fact, she feels obliged to table today.

Laughter

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do invite contributions from other Members of the House on this question, Mr. Speaker, if that is possible. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you might take this spurious point of order under advisement now that it is no longer urgent?

Mr. Phelps: I wanted to rise and say that this is one time when the Government Leader has had a very serious point of order and it is one that I welcome and certainly endorse. I hope that you will ponder it over the Christmas Holidays and come back and table a ruling.

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mrs. Joe: My apologies. I have for tabling the annual report of the Health Services Branch, which includes the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan, the Yukon Hospital Insurance Plan and the Supplementary Benefits Program.

Speaker: Are there any Reports of Committees? Are there any Petitions? Introduction of Bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 79: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 79, entitled *An Act to Amend the Medical Profession Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Justice that Bill. No. 79, entitled *An Act to Amend the Medical Profession Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

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

Are there any Notices of Motion?

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Issuance of Brewer's Licences

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to announce the potential for a new business development in the Yukon. I am referring to the issuance of Brewers Licences, which is now possible as a result of amendments to the *Liquor Act Regulations*.

A Brewer's Licence provides for two types of operations: a "Cottage Brewery", where beer is made locally and marketed through a Liquor Corporation, or the operation of a "Brew Pub", where beer is brewed and sold only through the licensee's establishment.

Small businesses of this sort can provide employment for upwards of three people, and have been quite well received and successful in other jurisdictions.

This initiative will assist in the establishment of Yukon business and will support local investment. There may also be the opportunity to export our beer to other markets.

Mr. Speaker, this measure will enable Yukoners to drink beer that is both brewed and sold locally.

Mr. Phillips: We, on this side, welcome the announcement. I just wonder if the Minister has any plans, or if this announcement is initiated and they are going to award licences to the 14 people who are on the heavy consumptive list at the liquor store.

On a more serious note, we are very pleased to see that this has come forward. Many months ago, we met with several people from Whitehorse and Carcross who are interested in getting into the brewery business, and we think it will be an interesting and, I am sure, successful venture.

Mr. McLachlan: I am pleased to receive this Ministerial Statement. It shows the Minister's heart is in the right place at Christmas time.

Given the fact that during the early days we had a brewery operating in Dawson City, I am encouraged to see that we have again paved the way for this type of enterprise to again operate in the Yukon Territory. I firmly believe that a real Yukon bottle of beer brewed locally in the territory will be an ideal souvenir for visitors to the territory. I sincerely hope that some enterprising individuals will take up the challenge.

I look forward to my first sip of the golden nectar.

Speaker: This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

03 Question re: Land claims, overlap policy

Mr. Phelps: The new federal land claims policy was issued today. We are all pleased to see some of the changes that ought to be constructive and will hopefully assist in the resolution of land claims.

I am concerned about some of the issues on which the statements thus far have been silent. Does the Government Leader have any idea if the federal overlap policy has been changed?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. The Member is quite right that the policy announced today is silent on the question of non-resident claims. Our concern on that score has already been communicated to the federal Minister. I am seeking assurances that that question and other questions that are of great importance to a settlement of Yukon claims is addressed satisfactorily in the Yukon's specific policy, which will not now be forthcoming until the new year.

Mr. Phelps: Is it the Government Leader's understanding that if something is not spelled out in the new year with regard to the instructions for the CYI claims, that the existing policy would simply continue?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: If the Leader of the Official Opposition refers to the existing federal policy, I cannot answer that question. If he is referring to the policy that was embedded into the agreement-in-principle in 1984 that was rejected by the Council for Yukon Indians and which has been subsequently criticized by non-resident groups, that is another matter. I want to emphasize to the Member against that I am going to try to avoid litigation that

would upset the Yukon claims as well as a succession of claims on the Yukon Territory by discussions and meetings with the overlapping claimant groups.

I reiterate that there is no possible way that we can address this question in isolation. In the absence of a satisfactory federal policy, the problem will remain with us and with other jurisdictions that have similar difficulties.

Mr. Phelps: The government has not apparently advised the federal government about how they would like to see the overlap policy changed. Does the government intend to do that prior to the Yukon policy being finalized?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: That is not correct. We have communicated to the federal government on a number of occasions and in a number of ways, to the Minister himself, our perception that this responsibility for settling claims of aboriginal peoples must lie with their home jurisdiction. Federal compensation in lieu of other benefits is probably the most satisfactory way, from our point of view, of addressing their claims. We believe that a common aboriginal position, i.e. common between resident and non-resident groups, if an accord can be reached at that level, that would considerably expedite a resolution of these claims.

Question re: Land claims, overlap policy

Mr. Phelps: Continuing with the communiques we have received with respect to the statements made by the Minister about the new policy, it would seem that, with respect to the constitutional devolution to the territories, the policy provides for and demands consultation with the aboriginal groups, but does not confer a veto of any kind, unlike the Coolican Report.

Does the Government Leader agree with this position?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Neither the Yukon government nor the Council for Yukon Indians is looking for a veto, although both of us have insisted — as did the previous federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs and the present Minister — on consultation on these questions. There has been consultation, and there will be.

Mr. Phelps: I am pleased to hear that. Is the Government Leader prepared to clarify the Memorandum of Understanding, should the federal government think it necessary, on the veto issue prior to signing it?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes. I do not know what privileged communications the Leader of the Official Opposition may have had with people in faraway places on this point recently, but I do anticipate that this, among other things, will be the topic of some communication between this ministry and the federal ministry, as we discuss the specifics of the Yukon claim policy.

Mr. Phelps: Does the Minister believe, or feel, that land claims negotiations can commence prior to the specific Yukon parameters being established for the Yukon negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe that the policy announced today by the federal Minister will allow the Yukon claim negotiations to continue. I would note that, in his press conference in Ottawa this morning, the federal Minister indicated that he believed our 18 month timetable was achievable. I must say that unless the federal government addresses, in its Yukon-specific policy, not only the question of non-resident claims but adequate resource levels for both the federal negotiating team and the Council for Yukon Indians' negotiating team, and deals with some of the other specific points that have been agreed to between YTG and CYI in the Memorandum of Understanding, we will have some problems.

There are some issues, which, of necessity, will have to be, in part, set aside until such time as we have a clear Yukon-specific federal claims policy.

Question re: Yukon Development Corporation

Mr. McLachlan: I have a question for the Government Leader. I am wondering if the Government Leader can advise the Assembly if, in fact, the Yukon Development Corporation is at the moment actively seeking a General Manager/Chief Executive Officer type to run both the sawmill and the power commission?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Yukon Development Corporation, of course, cannot do that until the Act is proclaimed and a Board is appointed, which I would hope to do in the next few days. I

believe, to expedite matters, we may have, in the case of the sawmill, some invitational tenders put out — I am not quite sure if I have the language right — in respect to the management contract, although I would anticipate that the award would have to be made by the Yukon Development Corporation Board in the final analysis.

With respect to the power commission, of course, we have, in anticipation of a final agreement with the federal government, made some commitments as to the management of the power company.

Mr. McLachlan: I am not certain from that answer if the invitational tender for management responsibilities is short term or long term. We have not seen any advertising in this direction. I am wondering if the position for whoever would be running the sawmill would, in fact, be a job advertised through the Public Service Commission or would it be left solely at the behest of the Board of Directors? Would you clarify that?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am not clear on this point. The manager of the sawmill will not be a public servant. We, or the Development Corporation, will be contracting with private sector managers. We will be making some arrangement — I cannot tell the Member the term because I presume that is negotiable — with someone in the private sector who has the necessary experience and management skills to run a sawmill operation. Whether we contract with a firm or an individual, I do not know the answer to that yet. I cannot possibly anticipate the answer, but the person who runs the sawmill will not be a public servant.

Mr. McLachlan: I can remember when the Curragh deal was announced on October 28, it seemed to take forever until all the paperwork was done and the physical activity was actually taking place in the field. Does the Government Leader have any timeframe or any time schedule as to when he feels the mill might be in a position to begin processing logs?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is this government's intention to have the mill operating in January in some form. Let me also emphasize: we are dealing with something that is an entirely different scale from the Curragh deal. We are talking about an acquisition here in the neighbourhood of about \$.5 million; we are not talking about a company that requires \$50 million plus capital to reopen a business. If it were starting anew it might require \$.5 billion capital. Just to give the Member some hint of the complications involved, in the closing of the Curragh deal there were, I am advised, 200 separate lawyers involved. There will be a tiny, tiny fraction of that, if I have anything to do with it, involved in the closing of this deal.

Question re: Human Rights debate, TV filming

Mr. Lang: Was the House Leader aware that the CBC national television crew intended to film the debate on the *Human Rights Act* last night as was scheduled by the government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I did speak to the reporter who indicated such an interest. My recommendation to the reporter was that if they wanted to bring television to the House, they should check with the Clerk's office on the rules that apply.

Mr. Lang: Was the House Leader aware that the CBC national television crew intended to film the debate prior to the House Leader's meeting of 10:30 yesterday morning?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No. My discussions with the reporter took place in the morning. I cannot remember the specific time. It was at the time that they were interviewing the Government Leader that they came into the office.

Mr. Lang: It is very unusual, in view of the fact that we had a rescheduling of times and venue of House business. Why was the order of business that had been scheduled, the Capital Mains, delayed for two hours to discuss the *Human Rights Act*, especially when, the national television crew was coincidentally in town.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The reporter interviewed the Government Leader at 11:30, so it would have been after the House Leader's meeting that I spoke to the reporter. The reporter was waiting to meet the Government Leader when I saw him outside the Government Leader's office.

There was no delay in discussions on Capital Mains inasmuch as the House did not sit last night.

Question re: Human Rights debate, TV filming

Mr. Lang: The Minister did not answer my question. Is the House Leader telling us that he did not have any discussions with the reporter prior to 11:00 yesterday morning?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That is correct. There was no discussion between me and the CBC reporter prior to that.

Mr. Lang: It is a coincidence that the national television crew did show up here at 7:30 last night. Was anyone else in the government aware that, prior to the House Leader's meeting, the CBC national television crew intended to film the Human Rights debate that the government had scheduled for last night?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am not personally aware of anyone else in the government who was aware of that fact.

Mr. Lang: Was the Minister of Justice aware that the CBC national television crew intended to come in to take footage of the Human Rights debate that the government had scheduled last night? Was he aware of it prior to yesterday morning?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Prior to yesterday morning, I was not aware of it at all.

Question re: Human Rights debate, TV filming

Mr. Lang: When was the Minister of Justice aware?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I was aware that a television crew was scheduled to film the debate sometime yesterday, but I did not ask. I was informed that there was a national television crew. I believe it was in the early evening yesterday.

Mr. Lang: We have it from reliable sources that there was going to be some filming of the human rights debate in Committee of the Whole last night. We had an understanding that we were going to do the Capital Mains and, all of a sudden, yesterday morning, I, and the MLA for Faro, were informed by the House Leader that the debate was going to be altered and we were going to do human rights debate in Committee of the Whole. It would be the first time that anything has been filmed in Committee of the Whole.

Why was the business rescheduled?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The rules that govern this institution clearly state that the government has the ability to set the business of the House. In the House Leaders' meetings that we have had in the past, I have made it very clear that the government had not given up that right in determining business in the House. We acted according to the rights accorded to government in determining the business.

If the Member is insinuating that, somehow, a part of the press media can dictate to the House its business, that is not the case. The government determines the business of the House. That is the way it has always been and that is the way it will always be.

Mr. Lang: That is fine for the House Leader to say. It should be pointed out that the national TV crew was in these Chambers the evening before, and there were some active discussions going on with the Minister at least in the House. How much further it went on, I do not know. As a parliamentarian here, I have a concern about the conduct of Members of this House and manipulation of this House by people outside this House. I think I am raising a legitimate point.

Could the House Leader tell us why he rescheduled the business of the House, if that was not the case?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not dictate the business of the House. The government decides the business of the House.

With respect to the question of agreements between the House Leaders, I made it clear to the other House Leaders that we reserve the right to call what business we decide upon.

Question re: Human Rights debate, TV filming

Mr. Lang: There was an understanding between all sides of the House on the conduct and the business that was going to be discussed in this House. At 10:30 yesterday morning we were informed, with no reasons given, that human rights debate was scheduled for that evening. Later on last evening, we were told that the national CBC TV network were doing a piece on human rights. That is pure coincidence.

I think the public has a right to know, because that has to be one of the most controversial issues that has ever been debated in the territory. Why was the business rescheduled, if that was not the case?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The answer is in the rules that govern this institution, that we, as government, have a right to decide to call business when we decide to call it.

With respect to the insinuations and the innuendos that are being levelled in these Chambers this afternoon, no influence was exerted by any member of the media with respect to when we call business. That is the case. The Member can make the charges that he wishes to make, but it is pure speculation on his part.

Mr. Lang: Could he tell this House why we lost two hours of continued debate on the Capital Estimates when his side broke the agreement? The debate was going very, very well and very expeditiously and the mood in the House was such that we felt that business could be concluded.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is now alluding to establish that there was agreement to debate Capital in the Committee of the Whole. There was never such an agreement. The agreement that we had established was that discussions of Capital Mains would be a priority, but I very clearly informed that Member, as well as the Member for the Liberal Caucus, that the government reserved its right to call other business. That is our right and that is what we did.

Mr. Lang: The side opposite asked for cooperation from this side. We extend cooperation and then we see the results. We see an agreement broken that had been agreed to. We have a public statement that was made by the Government House Leader and I quote, "Mr. Porter says that they have agreed with the Conservatives to delay third reading of the Human Rights Bill until after the Capital Budget is covered." Further, he stated, "Capital Projects are always popular in the communities and this is no exception. It is the largest single Capital Budget ever brought before the Legislature and is going to provide hundreds of jobs in the Yukon and they cannot stand in the way of that too long. Christmas is approaching and I think we have a responsibility to show that we are doing something here." That is a direct quote from the House Leader with respect to the agreement and the understanding that had been struck by all sides to expedite the financial matters of the government.

I once again ask the House Leader, why was there a change in the order of business for two hours to accommodate what would appear to be strictly TV coverage and then revert today to the Capital Mains? Tell me how that makes logical sense?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I have stated very clearly earlier, there was never an agreement. I can look him in the eye and tell him that because there was never an agreement that we would only do business concerning the Capital Mains. I clearly told that Member, as well as the other participant in the House Leaders' meeting, that the government reserved the right to call other business and that is our prerogative. We can call the business that we want discussed here.

Question re: Human Rights debate, TV filming

Mr. Lang: Not only did he say it on the record in *Hansard*, that an understanding had been reached by the House Leaders, but CHON-FM has a voice clip of him agreeing that the Capital Budget should go through. Then could I ask the Government House Leader, what worth is it if we do have an understanding? What is the purpose of our meetings, if we go to a meeting and we have an understanding and then it is changed two minutes later?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the story that he quotes from CHON-FM, that story is wrong. I phoned the reporter and indicated that that reporter got the story wrong. That is clearly on record. If he wants to ask the reporter who did the story, he can do that.

There has never been an agreement among House Leaders that we would occupy ourselves with only one item of business. The public statement I made in the Legislature, if he reads it very carefully, will clearly tell him that I had stated that we had agreed that the priority for discussion in Committee of the Whole was discussions concerning the Capital Mains; however, during the House Leaders meeting, it can be verified that I told the Members that the government, however, maintained the right to call other business.

Mr. Lang: If there had not been an arrangement made with a third party outside this Legislature to change the Budget debate, could the Minister tell the public why the order of business was

changed? We have not had one good reason.

Hon. Mr. Porter: There had been no decision made with anyone to change the Budget debate. There are a number of items of business on the Order Paper. There are all kinds of Bills that we have to address. It is our prerogative to decide when and at what time the business on the Order Paper is discussed. That has always been the situation.

Mr. Lang: I have been a Member in this House for 12 years. There has generally been a common consensus and arrangement among all sides in respect to the conduct of business, and how business was going to be called. Once an arrangement or an understanding has been reached, unless something eventful occurred, we would not change the order of business. What was the event that took place that called you to change the order of business for two hours of debate on the *Human Rights Act* last night, then the decision to revert back to the Capital Mains today?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is trying to raise a spectacle that a single event had occurred to cause a change of mind. We, as government, have the ability to make the decisions about what is discussed as the business of the House. We chose to exercise that right.

Question re: Human Rights debate, TV filming

Mr. Nordling: I understand that the government has the right and the prerogative to set the agenda of business for the House, but it does not make sense to me that throughout the week we would be debating the Capital Estimates, and then for two hours on Wednesday night, we would debate the *Human Rights Act*, which we all know we would not get through; then today we would go back to the Capital Estimates. Why can the Government House Leader not give us an explanation why the order of business was to be interrupted with the debate on the *Human Rights Act*? Why can he not explain it to us? I do not need the reason for changing the business, but why can there not be an explanation?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The government has the right to call the order of business as it chooses, and the government has exercised that right. If the Member wants to know why government makes the decision, then he would have to be a part of our caucus to understand those reasons.

Mr. Nordling: I have not had an answer to why the government cannot give us an explanation. Can I take it then that there is not good reason, that the government just decided that was the way it wanted to do business?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Again, for whatever number of times I have reiterated this statement, I will do so again: the situation will not change with this government or successive governments. A government has the right to set the order of business in the House. The reasons for that are discussed internally, and we decided our own priorities. That is the way it goes. No governments in the past have discussed their internal decisions as to how they arrived at putting forth the order, and that is the way it will remain.

Question re: Commission on Indian Education and Training

Mrs. Firth: With respect to the Commission on Indian Education and Training, yesterday the Minister of Education said the former Chairman of the Commission was not teaching at present and assumed he was at home. When the Minister said the former Chairman would begin teaching and would not begin until the beginning of the next term, did he mean the January or September term?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I was referring to the January term. When the former Chairperson of the Commission's resignation was received, he immediately was moved to the department where he was reporting to the deputy minister of public schools, at which time he started preparations for the coming term.

Mrs. Firth: Do I understand then that the money that the former chairman is being paid out of the Department of Education budget is coming out of the budget. If he is not working, what is he being paid for from now until he starts teaching?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The ex-chairperson, now that he is working for the Department of Education preparing for next term, would be paid out of the department's budget. He will not be paid

out of the \$367,000 allocation for the Commission on Indian Education.

Mrs. Firth: Is it the policy of this government to pay teachers for preparation time?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not know what the Member is referring to. He is doing work for the Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Schools. There is work to be done with respect to preparing for the courses and partly for this particular course at FH Collins. It is a course that I am sure the Member for Porter Creek East knows well and he will be the instructor. He is doing work for the Department of Education on education-related matters.

I am told by the department that he is doing useful work.

Question re: Certified Nursing Assistants

Mrs. Firth: Last night, the Certified Nursing Assistants had an emergency meeting. I have had a few calls this morning from some of the CNAs wanting to know if the Yukon territorial government will still be employing the CNAs after December 31 when their licences expire, and will they still be covered legally?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The answer is that they will be employed by the territorial government and by the federal government. The legal position of the licences has not changed from this year to next. I have been in touch this morning with a representative of the Certified Nursing Assistants. The matter is well in hand. There is no reason for anyone to fear for their job or their professional qualification at all.

Mrs. Firth: I was aware that the representative was going to be calling the Minister. I gather from what the Minister has said he spoke directly to the individual. Will he give us a commitment to extend, in writing, to the association the comments that he has made in the House this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The comments I have made are public comments, of course, and will be in *Hansard*. The perceived problem here is a problem that is not very serious and has existed for many, many years. The general problem is that the government, through the Department of Education, has in the past issued a document, which is called a licence, with no legal authority to do so. The practical problem now is to get the legal authority, probably in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to issue those licences. It is something fairly easily achieved.

Mrs. Firth: The problem is serious to the CNAs and I have been asked to make representation on their behalf, and that is what I am doing. I am simply asking the Minister: since all of the CNAs do not read *Hansard*, could he please give a commitment to write their organization a letter so that he can reassure them before the end of the month? This is the last opportunity I will have to make public representation. Could he write them a letter and give them the comments and reassurances that he has said in the House this afternoon? It is a simple request, yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will do more than that. I will write every single individual a letter.

Question re: Reindeer meat sale

Mr. Brewster: My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. Section 47(1)(a) of the *Yukon Act* authorizes the Governor-in-Council to make regulations 'for the sale of reindeer and the slaughter or other disposal of surplus reindeer and the carcasses thereof'. Has the Minister had any discussion with the federal government regarding the sale of reindeer meat?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Section 47(4) does in fact apply to reindeer and the question with respect to jurisdiction regarding the licencing of reindeer is one that is being asked by the Member and as to whether or not I personally have had any discussions with the federal government as to the applicability of the laws of the territory versus the federal government, I have not had any discussion on that. I have been assured by the Department that we, in fact, do have the ability to inspect the reindeer in the Yukon.

Mr. Brewster: Thank you for the answers. Would the Minister confirm that reindeer are domestic animals and, therefore, not under the *Wildlife Act*?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The relevant section is 29(2), which says that if reindeer are considered a live animal, wild by nature, then if

that is the determination, Section 29(2) does apply. It would be based on that particular section that the conclusion would be that the territorial Act would apply to reindeer on the import provisions of the Act as opposed to the export provisions.

Mr. Brewster: We appear to have some more lawyers in the House now.

Can the Minister advise if the wildlife experts within the Department of Renewable Resources recommended that the reindeer be brought into the Yukon prior to the study being completed on these wild animals?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not know if we are lawyers but we sure do talk a good line. At least, it sounds good to me.

With respect to the question of the internal recommendations from the biological staff, the Member did raise a question yesterday that there may have been some difference of opinion on that question and I take that suggestion seriously and have asked the department — maybe that is not the Member for Kluane but certainly the Member for Riverdale North — if in fact there have been any such decisions or expressions of differences and, I repeat again that I have not been informed that the biologists within the Department of Renewable Resources have expressed concern over the importation of reindeer, and have asked for a report on that, and I will report back to the Member.

¹² **Speaker:** The time for Question Period has now elapsed, and we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 21: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. McDonald.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I move that Bill No. 21, entitled *An Act to Amend the Assessment and Taxation Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Community and Transportation Services that Bill No. 21, entitled *An Act to Amend the Assessment and Taxation Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 21 has passed this House.

Bill No. 65: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 65, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. McDonald

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I move that Bill No. 65, entitled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Finance Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Community and Transportation Services that Bill No. 65, entitled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Finance Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 65 has passed this House.

Bill No. 94: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 94, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Penikett.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I move that Bill No. 94, entitled *An Act to Amend the Home Owner's Grant Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government Leader that Bill No. 94, entitled *An Act to Amend the Home Owner's Grant Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 94 has passed this House.

Bill No. 73: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 73, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 73, entitled *An Act to Amend the Legal Services Society Act*, be now read a third time

and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 73, entitled *An Act to Amend the Legal Services Society Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 73 has passed this House.

Bill No. 68: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 68, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Kimmerly.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I move that Bill No. 68, entitled *An Act to Amend the Workers' Compensation Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 68, entitled *An Act to Amend the Workers' Compensation Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 68 has passed this House.

Special Adjournment Motion

Hon. Mr. Porter: I move THAT the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until January 6, 1987, unless it should appear to the satisfaction of the Speaker, after consultation with the Government Leader, that the public interest requires that the House should meet prior to that time, in which case the Speaker shall give notice that the House will be reconvened at an earlier date;

THAT if the House should meet at an earlier date other than January 6, 1987, it shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

THAT, if the Speaker is unable to act owing to illness or other causes, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for the purpose of this order.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader THAT this House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until January 6, 1987, unless it should appear to the satisfaction of the Speaker, after consultation with the Government Leader, that the public interest requires that the House should meet prior to that time, in which case the Speaker shall give notice that the House will be reconvened at an earlier date;

THAT if the House should meet at an earlier date other than January 6, 1987, it shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

THAT, if the Speaker is unable to act owing to illness or other causes, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for the purpose of this order.

Motion agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chairman: Committee of the Whole will come to order. We will now recess.

Recess

¹⁴ **Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole back to order.

Bill No. 7 — First Appropriation Act, 1987/88 — continued
Chairman: We will continue with the Department of Government Services, general debate.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The changes here are relatively few. They are planning for systems and computing services and Supply Services and Public Works are essentially the same as last year with one or two minor changes. In one case, in Energy Conservation,

there was a major change. I will simply explain briefly, before we enter the line items, the two changes that may cause some confusion.

Firstly, under Property Management we normally budget, or it is normally at the level of over \$100,000 a year for minor property management expenditures. The reason for the large amount in 1986/87, \$391,000, is entirely due to the reallocation of space and the expansion of office space as a result of the Touche Ross Report. It is really necessary to look at the supplementaries, which are entirely a result of the moves in office space.

The increase in this case is about energy conservation measures for approximately \$1,600,000, which is a greater expenditure than in previous years, and I will explain. I would expect that a particular line which projects are planned have a costing by community and by building, which I can provide at a relevant time.

Those are the primary changes in the Capital Expenditures, and I will entertain any questions, of course.

Mr. Lang: At the outset I want to express a concern of this side it once again relates to the size of the government. I am sure we will get into that when we are discussing space requirements and the proposed magnitude of the size of government and how it is going to affect our everyday lives. This is a department that has seen a significant increase with respect to person years. The reason I am saying that is in the 1986/87 Main Budget there were 164.2 person years, and in 1985/86 there were 144.5 person years, which made a change of 20 person years for the purposes of executing the responsibilities of the department. I think that is quite significant.

Now before us, we have the consequences of this particular budget. We have been provided with the fact that there is going to be a further 14 person years or term positions, if you like, but the reality of the situation is this: people talk about term positions. I can probably name 90 percent out of 100 that term positions generally become permanent positions. The reality of the situation also is that they are required to have space, vehicles and all the ancillary requirements for these people to do the jobs that you are paying them to do.

¹⁵ From 1985 to 1986, we will have gone from 144.5 person years to 178 person years, effectively. Unless I am wrong, I believe those figures that I am quoting of last year includes the term positions. If it does not, then we have increased the size of the department more so. Perhaps the Minister could comment on this and tell us where these people are going to be housed so that we can find out what we are going to do for office space to provide a place for these people to get out of the cold and the wind and the sleet during the winter months.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The lists provided are what are commonly called capital person years and is 14 for Government Services. That is not 14 new positions. It is three more than we ended up with last year. The term positions, which are commonly called capital person years, for this year will be 14, not 14 new positions. There are three new positions.

We have 11 now, and there will be 14 next year — an addition of three.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate the work that has been undertaken to provide us with this information. The Government Leader provided us with an overall projection of what the cost of implementing this Capital Main Budget was going to be. I appreciate that. We have here the capital person year additions effective April 1, 1987. It says 14 here.

I may be wrong, but I think the inference was put to all of us that this was additional term person years, or person years being provided for the purposes of implementing the Capital Main Budget over and above the commitments that had been made in the past year.

Could the Minister clarify that further?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I apologize because it is misleading. The Member is right in pointing that out. The additional must obviously mean in addition to what may be the O&M person years, but we do not put in the budget listed capital person years. These have existed for years and years. They are term positions. It is estimated that there will be 14 of these positions. We have Management Board's approval for 14.

When we obtained that approval, three of them were new and 11 were extensions of the term positions that had previously existed, or which exist in the current budget year.

¹⁶ **Mr. Lang:** Over and above the person years that were voted in the Main Estimates that totalled 164.2, has there been any further term positions or newly created positions approved by the government for the management of the department?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No.

Mr. Lang: Over and above the 164.2 person years, how many term positions are presently entered into with Government Services? Are there just 14?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am informed that the actual number of people who are working at the moment is 172. The additional eight are what are commonly called the capital person years onstream at the particular moment. These are term positions, and the incumbent in the position changes from time to time. They are positions concerned with particular projects involved in the building of the infrastructure of the government. This is not, in any way, a new practice. It is a practice that has existed for seven, eight or ten years, at least.

Mr. Lang: There has been quite a substantial increase of person years in the department over the last two years. There is some credence to why. I can understand that, to some degree, with the major capital projects that are underway. How does the Minister intend for the department to cope, if there are only three more term positions involved over and above last year, with the magnitude of work that it has to do if they are going to get all the tenders out and all these contracts underway?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We frankly had difficulty last year, but there was an increase in term positions dependent upon the size of the Capital Budget. There is an addition of new projects. The magnitude of the work, almost entirely in Public Works, has increased again. We are anticipating that will necessitate three more people than we had last year. We think that, with those three extra, we can cope with the work. The three are not all in Public Works. Two are, and one is in Systems.

¹⁷ **Mr. Lang:** Systems does not have a direct bearing with respect to the Public Works Program, which we are referring to at the present time. In dealing with the complement of staff, does the Government Services have an architect on staff, and how is that working out?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, we do. I believe that architect was on staff in May of 1985. I am sure he was. I met him at the time. It is the same person now. It is providing a capability in Public Works that was necessary to provide. I am informed he was hired in August of 1984. It is most beneficial to have that kind of expertise. We are now dealing with approximately \$30 million in projects through Public Works in any year, and the use of an architect is extremely worthwhile.

Mr. Lang: I would like to get into the question of space and what we are doing with space. Over the Session we received a document, Office Space to 1990 to 1991. Could the Minister update us as to where they are with respect to the recommendations that were put in the study, which they received in April?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes. The Management Board has approved, in general principle, the recommendations of the Touche Ross Report. A series of moves have occurred and are planned to occur. I will go through them in a moment. We have not decided the question of whether or not the government should build a new building to house public servants. There is a recommendation in the report that we will need substantial additional space and that we should build a smaller administration building that can be added on to in future years.

We are looking to the use of the old Yukon College campus. We wish to decide the future of that building before we actually make a decision about any new building or newer building.

The moves, I can say, that are already done is that the Department of Justice has moved into the Philipsen Building. We have departed slightly from the Touche Ross Report initially in that the Department of Justice are in the first three floors of the building. On the fourth floor, which the Members will know is slightly smaller than the first three floors, we have housed the

administration of Government Services.

¹⁸ At such time as when the Crown Attorneys and perhaps the Mine Safety function are devolved to this government, they will undoubtedly be housed in the Philipsen Building, and we, the Department of Justice, will then occupy the entire building. Those two moves have occurred then.

The Public Service Commission have moved from their existing space. They have, I believe, a small amount of the same space but have moved into additional space where Government Services vacated in order to go to the Philipsen Building. The Department of Finance have expanded their space into where Public Service used to be.

The Department of Health is involved in two major moves. I believe it is the Family Planning — I forget the name of the branch — but it is the Social Workers who deal with families. They are presently in the Royal Bank Building and, I believe, the Health Branch is going to be moved before the end of the year out of this building. The location has not been established as of this moment. There is an additional move contemplated which is recommended in the Touche Ross Report.

The Department of Economic Development will probably be moving in the current budget year to leased space, and that location is not final at the moment. It is being negotiated I understand.

The Department of Community and Transportation Services and the Housing Corporation are over at the Tutshi Building, which was a move. Renewable Resources has extended their space in the Burns Road building. Public Works, in Government Services, have expanded their space into the M&R Building. The Statistics Bureau has been moved into the Main Administration Building to be with the Executive Council Office.

That is the general outline of the moves that have occurred and which are expected to occur. The M&R Building is on Industrial Road, and it is near the Building Maintenance Workshop.

¹⁹ **Mr. Lang:** This is quite a major undertaking for the government. What did the Touche Ross study cost?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The total expense was \$72,000, which I believe includes a few other government expenses. The initial cost was going to be \$60,000, but the total expense has been \$72,000 to establish the plan of moves that we are in the midst of now. It is a very expensive business, as the Member knows. The supplemental for this current year, which is attributable to the moves, is \$281,000. It is a very expensive operation.

Mr. Lang: When the Minister talks about the \$281,000, is that just for renovations? Where is the cost of the square footage rental buried?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The lease costs are all in the O&M Budget, which is an additional cost. It will be identified in the O&M Budget possibly as a supplementary for this year, but certainly as an increased cost for 1987/88.

Mr. Lang: A concern has been expressed to me about the growth of government. The reality of the situation is that nothing of any consequence has been transferred to the Government of Yukon from the federal government, and it is still growing in leaps and bounds to the point where people are beginning to wonder why they need so much government. We have to be careful that the public is not here to serve the government as opposed to the government serving the public.

I am not conjuring this up, but I have had a number of people ask me where government departments are. Quite frankly, I do not know where they are. There are fewer and fewer public functions being done in this building. The public is totally confused. They come to the building to deal with their transactions, and they find themselves having to go elsewhere, like the Justice Building, the M&R Building, the Family Services Building and then the Burns Building.

It gets to be a mix and match to the point where it just leaves anyone who is not inspired to go into government work, but has to, wondering what is going to happen in the year 2000?

²⁰ Can the Minister tell us what their plans are on the capital side to meet the aspirations of the Touche Ross report? I know there are a number of plans contained therein but, obviously, they are looking at building. How much is it going to cost the government with the

moves to the private sector?

I would like a breakdown on the O&M side of the cost of rental of space and what it has been costing with the moves you have taken in the last year. If I do not ask the specific question, it is all buried in the various departments and one never knows. What are the projected costs on the capital side?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: On the O&M side, I will provide a breakdown at the O&M Budget debate. It is relatively easy. I will provide the location and the actual amounts to the penny. There is no problem in providing all of the lease expenditures of the whole government. I would anticipate that at the O&M Budget. Perhaps I will provide it before the debate in a written form.

On the capital side, which is the subject at hand, the sum is \$281,000. That will cover the moves that have already occurred and that are projected to occur to April 1. There are no other moves approved. Consequently, any other numbers are only guesses.

I will respond briefly to Mr. Lang's observation about the size of government. It is not for us now to discuss the philosophy of government. That is a waste of time here. The situation that we found ourselves in back in the spring of 1985 was that the public servants were very crowded, that government had been growing. The government has always been growing. The situations were extremely crowded, to the point that, at the time, the Leader of the Government, Mr. Phelps, requested air quality tests, which we actually continued with. The government changed before the tests were actually ordered. He requested them. We found that the quality of the air in this building was deficient and was caused by overcrowding.

The Member will have noted in the Touche Ross Report, the count of the normal space requirements per civil servants. This is based on the provincial guidelines and the federal guidelines, which are very well established. This building was designed as an open-concept building for a certain number of employees. We had, over the last 14 or 15 years, increased the size of government, we had increased the leased space and the owned space. We were in a situation where we were very overcrowded, but I think we have corrected that very quickly.

²¹ **Mr. Lang:** The Touche Ross provides a great deal of information, although I have not had all that much time to really analyze the results of it. Obviously, there was some thought of looking ahead to 1991, and there is a major projected increase in the size of the bureaucracy in the next five years. The recommendations and the summary portion of the report suggest that we need another building of this size or bigger, the 28,000 square feet, to meet the present resources and the forecasted requirements of 49,000 square feet. That would be a larger building than this one. That does not count the growth in the civil service outside of Whitehorse.

It is a very scary proposition, and I think there is some reason to touch on the philosophy of what we are doing and how far we will go with the size of government. The Minister said that Management Board has accepted the report. Could he indicate to us what recommendations or findings in the summary portion that Management Board actually did agree to?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have three comments. First of all, the acceptance is not just an acceptance of the report. It is an acceptance in principle. It is not accurate to say that we need a new building now. We need to be planning for a new building now to accommodate the space requirements four or five years down the road.

I would be very very careful in saying this. Those projections of increased need for person years and space have not been approved by Management Board. Those are not politically motivated. Those requirements are the advice of the civil servants in the territory. I am very careful to emphasize that in no way has Management Board accepted that there is going to be this kind of growth. The projections are certainly useful and are probably reasonably accurate. There will be changes over the years.

The specific approvals that I was asked for, I have already given. The specific approvals are concerning the moves that I previously outlined. Those are the only specific approvals that Management Board has actually decided upon. We have decided to study very

closely the use of the old Yukon College. It is interesting that in the decision to build a new Yukon College, there was no record of consideration of the use of the old campus.

That question is still an open one. We are looking at the architecture, and we will be consulting with the municipality concerning the traffic patterns, the bus routes and the sewage and water. We are considering the energy efficiency of the building and are looking very closely at a major renovation of that building for a public purpose.

²² Actually it may well be government offices, but that decision has not been reached.

Mr. Lang: When can we expect that decision to be made?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The Engineering and Architectural Studies will take three or four months to complete, at least, so it will be April, May or June, in that timeframe.

Mr. Lang: Who is doing the study? Is it being done internally?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The consultant has not yet been selected.

Mr. Lang: In respect to the buildings that you outlined that are new, the M&R Building, in total the Family Services Building I understand, and some work at the Royal Bank I guess. It is very difficult because I am going off the top of my head. I do not have the schedule the Minister has. Could I ask what the tenure of the lease agreements are? Five years? Ten years? Are they long-term commitments?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: They are generally three years. They are not for five years.

Mr. Lang: Is there any commitment to rent any of the new office space being built on Main Street?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I believe the answer is no, but there is some negotiation which I believe is ongoing. I am certain the answer is no, but I am certain there is investigation and negotiation about that.

Mr. Lang: We can assume that on April 1st we will have a portion of another building, probably. I just want to touch on the projections here, and I recognize what the Minister is saying in view of the size of the staff, and you are saying that is all departmental and bureaucracy's view of growth within the civil service looking at what has happened in the past versus the future and using all the formulas you like. If you take a department like Economic Development, we have gone from three people in a year to, I believe, it is 18. The reflections in the report for 1991 are supposed to be eight person years? Or 12 person years? We are already at 18, and we have only gotten into the first year of the projections and we are five years late. In view of what is happening, maybe we could say that the projections are all real light, and it is all in the eyes of the beholder. I am just using that as an example of what has taken place over the course of the past year. Incidentally, those person years are not reflected, in good part, in the Main Budget for 1986/87. I would ask the Minister, since he is the Minister of Space, or Minister responsible for housing the loyal civil servants, what increase have we seen since this budget was tabled in 1986/87 in person years over and above what was budgeted?

²³ **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I do not know. I would suggest that the appropriate place to ask the question is in the Public Service O&M Budget. It is true that the requests of the bureaucracy for person years have not all been accepted. As a matter of fact, a good number have not been accepted, but some have.

Mr. Lang: With the lease base that has been taken on by the government, has the space that has been rented met the recommendation that there was a needed 28,000 usable square feet, or an increase of 20 percent over existing resources? Does that meet the guidelines accepted by the government for office space?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: By the end of the year, it will have. That is, by April 1 we will be extremely close to that.

Mr. Lang: There were three plans put forward for the possibility of a new building. We talked about the utilization of Yukon College. If Yukon College were to be utilized, would that negate the need for the Plan A, Plan B and Plan C?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It very well might, depending on the number of useable square feet that we get out of the old Yukon College campus. The answer is that it might.

Mr. Lang: Is the government considering purchasing the Lynn Building?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No.

Mr. Brewster: I listened to this with quite a bit of interest. I remember that when I first came to the Yukon, the only three government people were the treasurer and the game department and the superintendent of liquor. The rest were in Dawson City and did not bother anybody and everybody was quite happy.

A 73-year old native lady came in to get a trapline license renewed. She came to this building. They did not know where to send her. They sent her to the Lynn Building. They sent her to Marwell. They sent her back here. She spent the day. She spent the day. She had driven 70 miles in here. She finally got up to the Burns Building and got into that fortress up there with all those long channels and no windows. Being a very sensible woman, she got out of there and went home.

I happened to stop in there that night for tea and she told me this. I said, give me the licence and I will see what I can do. I was able to get it, all right. The big problem was signatures. We had to do a little arm-twisting. I am quite a nice man, so they did it. That is 48 hours for a 73-year old native to get a licence to trap on a line when she has been here long before any of us ever came to the country.

Bureaucrats are moving in and taken over.

²⁴ **Mr. Lang:** The difficulty we have in dealing with the office space situation here is that, I gather, we still have a couple of "maybes" on what the government is going to do. The point I want to emphasize here is the real need for government to assess just exactly what they are doing in overall government programming, and reviewing the government programs in context and not strictly adding to them, but perhaps revising or modifying programs.

I think I am expressing a concern from a large segment of the population when I say that it is becoming alarming when you see the government taking over all the available office space in town in order to meet the guidelines that have been accepted by government so that the people working for government are in a situation that is relatively comfortable and they can do their work. Nobody objects to being able to have the tools to do one's job but I will have to emphasize, and I wish the Government Leader was here to say to him from this side that we want to impress upon you that we feel it is important, and that perhaps in some cases we can do without. Instead of trying to create the perfect world and instead of ensuring that every problem is going to be taken care of, maybe we can leave the people themselves to resolve some of their problems. Maybe that is the philosophical difference to some degree.

I could accept the growth of government from the perspective that there were some major transfers from the federal government, but it has been a year-and-a-half and there has not been anything transferred. I am not talking about the Crown Attorney's office, or something like that, but I am talking major significant transfers like health or things that are a major consequence to the overrunning of government and the additions of responsibilities added thereto. It makes me wonder just exactly where we are going.

The other thing is that the Minister said he added more people to the systems in Computing Services. Last year, we increased that significantly. I do not have the figures in front of me, but if I recall there was a major increase in the size of that particular unit to meet the computer demands of the government. I do not understand why we are increasing even one more man year, and I have to voice my objections to it in view of what we said last year, also, in view of the fact that we are doing away with medicare premiums, which itself was a major responsibility of the computing component of government. I am told by the Minister of Health that all these people will find something to do and I am sure they will, knowing government. Could he explain to me why we are seeing an increase in the Systems side?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will respond briefly to the first comment made by Mr. Lang, and then I will answer the question.

This may come as a surprise to the Member for Porter Creek East, but on some things I agree with him. It is certainly expressed to me by some constituents that they do not like to see fast growth in the government, although they do like the services that government provides.

²⁵ You will see in Government Services, on the O&M side especially, and you will also see it in this budget in relation to the overall increase in the Capital Budget, that Government Services is not increasing. It is staying leaner rather than fatter. That will be apparent in the future, especially with the O&M.

The additional person in Systems is on the computer workstation project. That is a series of smaller projects that provides computer workstations to all the other government departments. The work volume there, in project number and in dollar amount on both tests, has increased dramatically from four projects and \$46,900 in 1985-86 to 15 projects and \$810,073 in 1986-87. This will continue, not only at last year's level, but will increase again. It is part of the computerization of the government and, especially, the use of computer workstations in other departments. This person coordinates that and trains the users of these terminals in other departments.

Mr. Lang: My understanding is that the computers were designed to come in and make the organization that much more efficient and be able to, in many situations, put you in a position to analyze your workforce and either distribute the workforce in such a manner that they are doing something else, or have attrition and, within the year, you do not have as many people doing the work.

What you have just told me tells me it is exactly what I suspected, that the computer programmer is going into such great detail with the computer programming that we are getting to the point now that it has to have its own reason to be existing so we are adding to it. We are adding more money to it.

I recognize that I come from a different era. I still remember Gordie Howe and Bobby Hull, but it does not make sense to me. We are talking millions of dollars here. In the public's judgment, they have not seen an increase in service.

I talk to people within the civil service, and they say they are getting all these forms and all these various policies coming out. It is getting to the point that nobody can do anything anyway, because the decision has to go here and there and has to be ratified on five different levels. Here we are in a situation where it is almost a paralysis within the government.

It is an observation. It is fine for you to come in here and say we are going to splash another \$800,000 against the door and be able to push a button and it is going to tell Roger Kimmerly's past history. In fairness to the public, what is the necessity to going beyond what we have already? We have an ongoing program and now you tell me we are going to escalate it that much more and add another individual. The public does not even know you are doing it.

²⁶ From a political point of view, I do not think that the government is getting a lot of political kudos for all the internal work on computers. I really question this amount of money. I recognize the modernization that has to occur, but I question that we have to pay big dollars for experts. We had a computer that cost us, eight years ago, \$.5 million or \$.25 million, which was sold for \$14,000. 1984 has been here, and now it has passed. The political responsibility on that front bench should really be to analyze exactly what is taking place.

I would like to know about records. We have people using government vehicles for things that they were not purchased to do. We have lists being provided in the liquor store for investigation. I had an intent for a motion last session, which I did not bring forward, but I may later. It concerns the question of privacy and information provided and who is going to make sure that the personal file for the MLA for Klondike was his business and no one else's. I am always speaking for you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to hear from the Minister on that.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I remember Rocket Richard. The issue of computer security that the Member raised in the last O&M Budget, and promised he would raise it again, is complex. What we are doing here should be seen in what is to be seen in coordination with what we are doing in the Department of Justice. We may end up with a Privacy Act to protect individuals, especially, from computer information. That certainly may occur.

I have, largely at the initiation of the Member opposite, paid attention to this question. I have raised it at federal-provincial Ministerial meetings in order to find out what is occurring

elsewhere. Elsewhere there is also a problem. We are probably more advanced than most other places, but we, in Systems and Computing Services, are scheduled to have a privacy policy or a control of information policy by the first quarter of 1987. It should be finalized then.

²⁷ We do now have securities procedures, which are, in fact, contained in the report I tabled in the last Sitting. That work has been accelerated a little bit. We have asked for what is called a security audit, I believe, and the RCMP will, early in the new year, look at our security provisions. Incidentally, that process had occurred in 1981 under the previous administration and it will occur again, essentially an update.

The Department of Justice is looking at privacy legislation. I am very hesitant to bring in privacy legislation without looking at what occurs in other jurisdictions, and other jurisdictions are also looking at it, but I am certain that if we did anything sort of new and different, there would be a debate about the public's right to know and the release of information. It is the flip side of the *Access to Information Act*, in fact. That could be a controversial issue, and I am going to be moving quite carefully in that area, which unfortunately probably means slowly. It is an area that we have looked at closely.

Mr. Lang: I recognize there may be a tie-in with the *Access to Information Act*, but I am talking about the individual and what information the government has about a particular individual. I do not see it as that controversial, especially in view of the position we have taken this far publicly on the issue. We feel it is important, paramount, that the individual's private information be private and confidential. I think that maybe we should be taking the leadership in this area, primarily from that perspective of even a general statement in law.

It always concerns me when we talk about a policy because a policy can be made today and changed tomorrow with no need for public discussion or public debate. I would think that perhaps the Minister should reassess that situation. I think we would be benevolent in the introduction of such a piece of legislation, in that, recognizing that it is new and probably innovative in some degree, we would have to take certain risks in going with the legislation and putting it in place and seeing how it works. If you are going to talk about the *Access to Information Act*, it has not really fulfilled what it was supposed to fulfill. We have had the Minister stand up and tell us he cannot give us information because of it. So much for the right to know and the freedom of information. That went on for two Question Periods, and finally we got the report. I think it is an area that should be looked at a little bit more expeditiously. I want to commend the Minister for taking the comment from this side seriously and obviously in raising it outside in provincial ministerial conferences. Obviously it has been worthwhile debating, in view of the recent news that we had 16 million Canadians's files available to one individual or individuals for a period of time. I think this is an area we will be concerned to pursue.

He did make the offer for us to see the computers. I have not taken him up on that offer. I intend to, I have done it once sometime ago, but I hope to do it again in the course of this coming spring sometime and will arrange it accordingly with his department.

I do not have any more questions on this particular area. Mrs. Firth has one, and then I will move onto another area of general debate.

²⁸ **Mrs. Firth:** Could the Minister follow up on the issue I raised with the Government Leader about the microfiche and the sensitive information that was being accumulated in Economic Development and the Executive Council Office, I believe it was, with respect to businesses. The Government Leader said he did not have the information at his fingertips and that we could perhaps discuss it when we got to Government Services and talked about the security of the computer systems and so on.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I confess I have not paid personal particular attention to business records on microfiche. I have nothing in particular to add. I recognize the concern as a very responsible one in the same context of the statements made by Mr. Lang. I will be sensitive to it, but I have nothing particular to add.

Mrs. Firth: If I could just have some reassurance that either the Government Leader or the Minister responsible for Government Services will come back with an answer. As I said before, I have had businessmen calling me and expressing a concern about the questionnaires that the government was sending out and the information that was requested and what kind of access people within the government would have to some of the information that may not be sensitive to us but was sensitive to the business community that was being asked.

I do not know if the Minister is aware but, as the former government, we had tried to collect information from the business community, and they were very reluctant to provide that information because of the sensitivity of it, in their minds, and the personal information that is required about financial situations and pictures and so on. That seems to be the concern that needs to be addressed.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I can give that assurance that the department will follow every request of the Government Leader.

Mr. Lang: I would like to go into another area. That is the question of custodians. It is an area of some debate in this House. Can the Minister table the report that was requested by the House?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It has absolutely nothing to do with Capital.

Mr. Lang: Correct me if I am wrong, but while we were on general debate, I can question the department in totality. If he wants me to wait for Question Period, and if wants me to wait to get a motion on the floor, if that is the attitude the side opposite is going to take, then we will get a really good debate here. All I am asking for is the report. I did not ask what the rules of the House were. I can tell you what the rules are.

Do you have the report and, if you have it, are you going to table it?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: After the report is received in its final form, it will be tabled. I have clearly committed myself — I believe it was in the motion — that it will be tabled. I can assure both Opposition parties that the report will be tabled in time for the discussion in the O&M Mains.

Mr. Lang: The Minister says final form. Has the report been completed?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There are some drafts, but no, I do not have a completed study.

Mr. Lang: Is the Committee that was struck to review and give recommendations to the government still sitting?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not know. I can check on that.

Mr. McLachlan: Has the Department of Government Services come to any decision on the school crumbling in Faro? We talked about it at last year's capital debate. Has any final decision been made?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, we have not.

Mr. McLachlan: I believe the answer at that time was that Government Services would act upon the direction of the Department of Education. Is that still general policy? If the Department of Education believes it has no longer any use for that building, would it be referred to Government Services?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. McLachlan: I had an opportunity to go through there in September with one of our building inspectors. There was a considerable amount of equipment in the building that is not permanently fixed to the building. Would it not be a logical approach, through Government Services or Education, if some of that was attached. I am thinking specifically about lockers, basketball nets, tumbling nets, fire extinguishers and lighting. If the building is not to be used, could there not be some salvage measures made by the Department of Government Services to get some of that equipment out of there and put into an area where it could be of more use? There must be \$500,000 worth of fixtures in there that are no longer being used.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Absolutely, I totally agree.

Chairman: We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: Committee of the Whole will now come to order. We will continue with general debate.

Mr. Lang: With respect to contracting, is it the intention of the government to take on any major facility in the area of \$300,000 and up, as far as the government being their own contractor? If so, I would like to know which projects?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The department and myself are not aware of any at this time. There are no plans to take on any major project ourselves.

Mr. Lang: There was some discussion some time ago with respect to the concept of project management and what the intentions of the government were in that area. Has the government hired a consultant to analyze the project management type of contracting versus the normal procedure? Was there not a commitment to the Contractors Association, or some discussion, that they were going to have a look at the project management style and what the implications were?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I believe the short answer is no. There were answers to the Public Accounts Committee about the project, which I believe is a different topic. We have an engineering audit of the Philipsen Building that may relate to that, but the short answer is no.

Mr. Lang: What position is the government going to take with respect to the other projects that are going to be taken in the Budget? I should preface my remarks. If I recall correctly, the Minister left it open whether or not the government was going to proceed with further project management or strictly contracting the larger projects out. What is the intention of the government? If the government does not have a position, when does he expect to be taking a position?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We need a position very soon. If all this work is to be done in 1987-88, then this planning has to occur in 1986-87. A final position has not been taken. I believe the largest project is the Dawson school, and it is my expectation that we will tender that to a general contractor, that it will not be on the project management scheme, as the Philipsen Building and the College were.

On Property Management

Chairman: We are on page 43 for the Expenditure Detail.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will give a general explanation. This is for miscellaneous and minor renovation, small equipment purchases such as clamps and signage and related items. It is a minor renovations budget and the drop from \$381,000 to \$150,000 is because last year's expenditures were unusually high because we put the cost of the various moves as a result of the Touche Ross Report into this area last year.

On Whitehorse Facilities

Mr. Lang: I noticed the next line under Property Management is Other Yukon Facilities and we do not have any money for that expenditure. What if you have to do a renovation in Watson Lake or Dawson City? I question the discrepancy because it seems to me we just did \$381,000, which was an increase of something like \$150,000 over the projected budget of last year, counting the supplementaries. Now let us assume we have reached the utopia the Minister is striving for as far as government space is concerned, then why is some of that money not being projected as being spent outside of Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There are no projects specifically identified, so we did not specifically budget any money, but if any come up we will do them in the same order of business as in Whitehorse.

Whitehorse Facilities in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to

On Other Yukon Facilities

Other Yukon Facilities in the amount of nil agreed to

Property Management in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to

On Systems and Computing Services

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I should mention that the Capital Recoveries line relates to this and, as a result of the computerization for Health and Human Resources for Young Offenders, there is a recovery against the federal government under a cost-sharing agreement. I should just mention that.

If you are intending to take this line-by-line, I will explain the

Computer Workstations first for \$564,000. This is to provide word processors and computer terminals and small computers to various departments. In fact, all departments will receive the processing equipment in the course of the year, as most of them do every year. The targets or budgets for this year are: for Education, \$112,000; for ECO, \$109,000; and for Justice, \$91,000. That relates somewhat to the System Development, which I will explain under the next line.

Perhaps I will explain it now, if that is what Members wish. Under System Development, for \$2,358,000, this is a line that has been there for years. It is for development and programming, and the major projects to be completed in 1987/88, which were initiated in 1986/87, are: Justice, to maintain the Court Registry records, and that is \$309,000 — we were modelling the program on the Saskatchewan computerization, and it should enable the Court process to run a lot more smoothly and in fact should speed up the allocation of court time and will certainly enable particularly witnesses and victims to have better information. In fact, we may be able to reallocate at least half a person year as a result of all of that.

³² Under Community and Transportation Services, we are computerizing the driver records for \$106,000. Under Government Services, we are automating the purchasing system for \$170,000. This will enable us to computerize all of the various contracts. Under the Workers' Compensation Board, we are computerizing the assessments, which is a fairly major job. That is budgeted at \$383,000.

The lists of major projects to be approved and prioritized by Management Board for next year are as follows. Community and Transportation Services, the Land Management System is \$175,000. The control of maintenance of highway equipment fleet is \$175,000. The Yukon College Student Information System is \$150,000. The library cataloguing system is budgeted at \$400,000.

In Public Works, a computer-assisted drafting, which is very efficient in some other places, and project management is \$220,000. In Health and Human Resources, young offenders-related activity is \$100,000. In the Liquor Corporation, we are computerizing the inventory for \$200,000.

In the central facility, in the computer room here that is added to every year, to purchase additional disc storage to increase the computer's memory is \$200,000; to improve the communication's capacity with remote fusers is \$140,000. I should emphasize that this is significant. It is now in Dawson City that the public servants in rural areas are getting computer terminals that are connected with the mainframe here. The communication is much easier. To facilitate the sharing of data between application is \$200,000. Shared computer terminal and mainframe software is \$100,000; upgrading of disaster recovery plans and procedures for minor and major failure is \$50,000.

Mr. Lang: Santa Claus was so interested, he left. Does that list add up to \$2,358,000?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It does.

³³ **Mr. Lang:** Following this further, is it not true that we just got a brand new computer here last year at a cost of \$500,000 or something. I am going on memory. Did we not get a new unit here last year or the year before?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We have an IBM computer that has been upgraded very substantially. The technology is such that, primarily, because of the existing database, if we junked our computer and started fresh, it would cost hundreds of millions. We improved the computer that we do have by adding parts onto it. It improves the memory and the capability of the machine.

Mr. Lang: In the outline of what the Minister gave us, I was pleased to hear that the communities outside of Whitehorse were being tied on, at some expense, to the computer. Therefore, access to information, the requirement to wait, all the various other costs attached to not having that service, as before, would not be incurred, — trips to Whitehorse, all those things that are required. At the same time, I see a major increase in the civil service for Whitehorse. We have expressed the principle of decentralization in the House where people can take care of themselves. We have a remote control type of computer model that can tie into the general access requirements of government, as far as information is

concerned. I think it personifies my earlier statement about the size of the civil service.

I find it hard to believe that we are dramatically increasing it, especially in Whitehorse. That is an observation on the question of the O&M of the government.

With respect to the computer workstations and the question of actual equipment that is being provided under that particular line item, are we talking about word processors here? We talked \$109,000 for Justice, \$100,000 for ECO, and whatever. What are we putting in there?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Under Computer Workstations, for the most part they are word processors. Word processors are a computer in themselves but not a very smart computer. We now have computer terminals, which are designed as computer terminals, which are used primarily for information processing.

³⁴ **Mr. Lang:** What equipment is projected to be purchased for the ECO office? There was a lot purchased over the years for that unit. Why are we spending another \$100,000 of taxpayers' money to further automate that department? Is it for administrative or political purposes?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is not for administrative purposes. It is entirely for equipment, and it is primarily in the Statistics Branch. I do not have a dollar breakdown. I will provide it in writing before the end of the year.

Mr. McLachlan: I am interested in what the terminals will do at the territorial agents offices in Mayo, Faro, Watson Lake, Haines Junction and Dawson City. For example, will there be a printing station there. When a press release is issued here in Whitehorse, will it be available instantly at the territorial agent's office in those locations?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: That is an excellent objective, which we have. I do not believe that the plans are to have a terminal at every territorial agent office in this next year. However, we should have those eventually, dollars permitting. Yes, that is one of the aims of this program.

Mr. McLachlan: Can the Minister explain what the terminals will be there for? What will they do?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: At this point, it is the information exchange between the civil servants in departments and among departments. That is the primary use at this point. As the system develops, with the expenditure of more and more dollars, they could be used for access by rural residents to the Whitehorse public service.

Mr. McLachlan: By information exchange, does the Minister mean ordering next week's liquor store inventory? Will it be internal only?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: At this point, it is internal within the government, not within the departments, particularly. It can be used like the telephone, but it has many more features than the telephone in that it has immediate access to the data contained in the Whitehorse computers. It is visual, and can be used in a print mode, as well as verbal.

³⁵ **Mr. McLachlan:** Can the Minister explain if it is there in the figures where the remote terminals are going to go and what is the cost affixed to each installation?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not have that, but again I will provide it when it is available and it may not be available immediately. The projections are available, but I will provide whatever information we do have.

Mr. Lang: Are we still on Central Computing Facility as well?

Chairman: We are in general debate of Computer Workstations.

Computer Workstations in the amount of \$564,000 agreed to On System Development

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I gave everyone the list a moment ago, perhaps I was out of turn.

System Development in the amount of \$2,358,000 agreed to On Central Computing Facility

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Again I gave the list out. This is the improvement of the capability of the existing computer, and I gave a list of various amounts.

Mr. Lang: Perhaps I am confused because I thought in the

figures you gave me for the Systems Development there was \$200,000 to increase the brain thrust of the central computer. Am I wrong or is it the other section?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I gave the list, which adds up to \$2,358,000, on System Development, and I also gave a list under the Central Facility, which I identified, but I did not emphasize that, and I apologize. The list again is: the additional storage, \$200,000; the remote users, \$140,000; the installation of the data base software to facilitate the sharing of data between applicants applications, \$200,000; shared computer terminals, \$100,000; and the disaster recovery \$50,000.

Mr. Lang: What exactly is the disaster recovery?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: If there is a computer breakdown, which occasionally happens, the computerized systems obviously do not work and we need a back up. It is essentially, I believe, the software to use the computer to find the errors. If there is a power failure, the computer system goes down, and this is a recovery plan, because at the time the computer goes down what is not stored in the permanent memory is immediately lost. There is a way, I am told, to recover, but it is expensive.

Mr. Lang: We discussed the question of staff recruitment last Session, and what we were doing to be able to fill the positions with people who were committed and could be trained here. Could the Minister update us with respect to what success we are having and what further we are doing for training, to have people here locally and to be able to provide salaries comparable to the work being done?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The salaries are extremely competitive. We contract out so much work that the private people, I have it on good authority, do very well. The program here, both in Capital and O&M, has lapsed some money in past years. I have personally looked at the reasons for that, and I am absolutely confident that that will not occur this year. We are scrambling to find the money to pay for all the things we are doing this year.

The debate that we had at last year's O&M about training is still relevant. The Yukon College is endeavouring to put on proper training courses. I believe the immediate problem is finding the qualified teachers to teach them. There are lots of students, but we cannot find the teachers. That is a problem for Education, which we are vitally interested in.

There is not anything particular to add to the debate that we had in the spring. It is still a problem, but we are following policies that will promote the generation of local expertise, as opposed to constantly hiring outsiders.

Central Computing Facility in the amount of \$782,000 agreed to Systems and Computing Services in the amount of \$3,704,000 agreed to

On Supply Services

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The first line, Transportation and Motor Vehicles, deserves a little explanation, although it is very simple. Every penny of this is for the purchase of vehicles. It is more than has been the pattern. It has just worked out that eight or 10 years ago, we purchased a whole lot of vehicles and they are being replaced.

The present fleet is 197 vehicles. Twenty-four of these are scheduled for replacement this year, and the entire budget of \$414,000 is for 24 vehicles.

Mr. Lang: That is a lot of money. How many did we purchase last year?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not know. I can provide that in due course.

Mr. Lang: What is the policy on the replacement of a vehicle? What is the mileage that has to be reached?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The policy involves a combination of the mileage and the service record, and it is published. It has not been changed, but I will provide a copy of the policy.

Mr. Lang: We are dealing with \$17,000 per vehicle. That is a significant amount of money. Perhaps they will be parked in front of the Taj Mahal at Stewart Crossing. Do these 24 vehicles take into account the increase in the civil servants in this Capital Budget?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. This is entirely for replacement. This includes pick ups, cars and vans. The vans are very expensive,

and the cars are substantially cheaper. I do not know what we are paying, but the purchasing goes through a tendering process.

Mr. Lang: We are doing \$400,000 worth of replacement, and at the same time we are increasing the civil servants throughout the government. These people, in some cases, are going to need vehicles. What do they do? Rent or use the bus?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is an example of where the politicians can put the brakes on the civil service. There are requests all the time for vehicles, and we are allowing only the replacements.

Mr. Lang: It is real good for the Minister of Government Services to put the brakes on the civil servants, but we have increased the size of the civil service, to include an electrician and employees in the transportation field, and the Minister gives the impression that they might be hitchhiking. What are these people going to do?

This stresses the theme of our discussion. We add one person year and think it is no big deal, but it means more money, more money, more money. Where does it stop? I guess we have to wait until the O&M Mains to see how many rental vehicles we can provide for the new employees before they become permanent positions. Is that what the Minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, it is not. The question here is about the expenditure for motor vehicles and in our budget we are not projecting an increase to the fleet; we are only planning to replace the worn cars and trucks.

Mr. Lang: Has the policy been further broadened with respect to the servicing of these vehicles? Is it the government's position now they will go out, not only for the purposes of new vehicles for service check-ups and the service requirements to the private garages, but is it the intention to go further and put all our vehicles, cars and trucks, out for contract for the purposes of servicing by people in the private sector as opposed to government?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There has been no change.

Mr. Lang: Is the government contemplating the thought of perhaps further broadening the contracts to the vehicles that have exhausted their warranties to look at going to servicing at garages that are privately owned as opposed to government doing it?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: As the Member ought to know, this is an O&M question for Highways. The servicing is done out of the Highways garage and if they are contemplating a change, I do not specifically know, but Government Services is not at the present time.

Mr. Lang: Just to get the record straight, Government Services pays the Highways Department as a user for the purposes of the facilities they are using, and therefore it is part of the discussion for this particular side of the budget. So instead of telling me how I should deal with the budget, since I have longevity in the House similar to the Member opposite, I would just prefer to get an answer to the question as opposed to standing up and telling him why I am asking the question. It is a very correct question, perfectly put, and I expect a yes or a no.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We pay out of the O&M budget for car maintenance, and we will continue to pay that way because that is the government policy. That was the policy. The Member opposite is suggesting that essentially we contract out services, but the position of the government is there will be no change.

Mr. Lang: That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. McLachlan: In the case of the Government Services vehicles that are attached to the rural locations, in tying in with the Member for Porter Creek East's questions, when those vehicles are due for servicing are we driving them all the way into Whitehorse, tying them up for a week and then sending them back, as opposed to having them repaired in the garages in the rural locations?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Our policy is that where the repairs can be made locally, they are made locally.

On Transportation, Motor Vehicles

Mr. Lang: In conjunction with the vehicles we have, how many are leased by the government?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: None in Government Services. Unless a department has leased vehicles, the answer is none. I suspect they have not. I think the answer is no.

Transportation, Motor Vehicles in the amount of \$414,000 agreed to

On Furniture and Office Equipment

Mr. Lang: We notice another dramatic increase here. I guess this is to fit in with the term positions as opposed to the permanent increase in staff within the government. Could the Minister start by telling us who is going to get the \$8,000 to \$10,000 per office suite of furniture? Could he chronologically go through that, and we can find out what the stepping stone and the pecking order within the government and how you apply for this handmade, economically efficient furniture?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not know which particular public servants have the handmade furniture, or the locally made furniture. That is not a decision that I personally supervise.

An explanation of the amounts is as follows. The original 1986-87 estimate was \$566,000, but \$200,000 was spent at the time of the previous year as part of the winter works program. Some items of furniture were warehoused. The increase here is four percent over the 1986-87 amount.

The estimate is based on the replacement of existing furniture and equipment as it becomes unserviceable and an allowance for new positions that is based on past experience. There is no effort in Government Services to project the future need. It is based on past experience. This estimate does not include major projects, such as Yukon College. Members will remember, for the Philipsen Building, there was a separate vote last year.

On locally manufactured furniture, the department is still reviewing the policy and the economic impact. There is no formalized policy as of this date.

Mr. Lang: I do not know how the Minister manages to do it, and I do not mean any offense, but I am sure glad that he is not in charge of my books at home. I have never seen so much financial voodoo in my life as the Minister explains that this is only a 4 percent instead of a 100 percent increase.

Perhaps it is time to change the format of how we project who needs what furniture. To accept what has happened in the past as the premise for the replacement fund may mean that it time to reassess that policy. Whose desk is worn out? Is it possible for the Minister to tell us which desks are worn out and have to be replaced? I would like to have a look at a few of them. When I was on the floor upstairs, I had a perfectly good desk. The only reason I did not ask that the desk be moved down here is because it would not fit in the smaller office in the basement. Otherwise, it would have come down with me. I see that desk that was not good enough for the side opposite replace by about \$10,000 worth of furniture so that the Members opposite can work in the surroundings that they were accustomed to prior to coming to office.

Would the Minister be prepared to ask for a projection of what office desks are going to be replaced? Where are they going to be replaced? Why are they going to be replaced? It sounds as if these desks are only lasting for five years. They are not good enough for civil servants, but they are good enough for the public. I could go on for another couple of minutes on this. This does concern me, and I would like to hear what the Minister has to say about it.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will enjoy answering this question. I invite Mr. Lang to look at the furniture that we sell through the board of survey that is no longer useful. I ask him if he would like to use such furniture. It is true that the furniture that we have been purchasing over the long term is wearing out. That is because the standards of the commercially manufactured furniture are very, very poor.

We used to buy junk, and we now have a better policy of buying quality goods. I am absolutely confident that the locally manufactured furniture will last substantially longer. I will be even more specific. I will predict that it will last in excess of twice as long.

I move that the Chairman report progress of Bill No. 7.

Chairman: Order. Before the Member rises to put forward the Motion I would like to read into the record an important note from the ever important people of *Hansard*: "We would like to wish each and every one of you a very Merry Christmas, Happy New Year and a safe drive home to all out-of-town MLAs. See you, all full of

cheer in the New Year!"

Applause

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

Chairman: Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Mr. Webster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 7, *First Appropriation Act, 1987/88*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report received.

I wish to inform the Members of the Assembly that we will now receive the Commissioner in his role as Lieutenant Governor to grant assent to Bills that have passed this House.

Mr. Commissioner enters the Chamber announced by the Sergeant-at-Arms

Commissioner: You may be seated.

Speaker: Mr. Commissioner, the Assembly at its present Session passed a number of Bills to which in the name and on behalf of the Assembly I respectfully request your assent.

Clerk: *Municipal and Community Infrastructure Grants Act, Fifth Appropriation Act, 1985/86, An Act to Amend the Assessment and Taxation Act, An Act to Amend the Municipal Finance Act, An Act to Amend the Homeowners' Grant Act, An Act to Amend the Legal Services Society Act, An Act to Amend the Workers' Compensation Act*

Commissioner: I hereby assent to the Bills as enumerated by the Clerk.

Mr. Speaker I would like to take this opportunity to wish everyone the compliments of the season and also to invite you and your families to join me and my family in my first levy as Commissioner and also the presentation of the Commissioner's Awards on New Years Day in the foyer of this building. Merry Christmas to all of you. Thank you.

Mr. Commissioner leaves the Chamber

Speaker: May I have your further pleasure.

Mr. Phillips: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North that the House do now adjourn. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. January 6, 1987.

At this time I would like to wish each and every one of you a very, very merry Christmas and a very Happy New Year.

The House adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was tabled December 18, 1986:

86-3-92

Annual Report, Health Services Branch, April 1, 1985 - March 31, 1986 - Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan, Yukon Hospital Insurance Plan, Supplementary Benefits Program (Joe)

