



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 65

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Monday, January 26, 1987 — 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 Penkett	Whitehorse West	Government Leader. Minister responsible for: Executive Council Office; Finance; Economic Development; Mines and Small Business; Public Service Commission
Hon. Dave Porter	Watson Lake	Government House Leader. Minister responsible for: Tourism; Renewable Resources.
Hon. Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre	Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.
Hon. Piers McDonald	Mayo	Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

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

Liberal

James McLachlan Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

01 Whitehorse, Yukon**Monday, January 26, 1987 — 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: Introduction of Visitors?
Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

TABLING OF RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I have for tabling two Legislative Returns. The first relates to child insurance for school children; the second to the Department of Education's cultural awareness program.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have for tabling responses to questions from the Member for Riverdale North, the Member for Riverdale South, the Member for Hootalinqua and the Member for Kluane.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have a return that is a response to Petition No. 6.

02

Speaker: Are there any Reports of Committees?
Petitions?
Introduction of Bills?
Notices of Motion for Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion?
Ministerial Statements?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT*Ministers' Meeting on Aboriginal Rights — Halifax*

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I wish to report to the Legislature today on our recent meetings in Halifax to discuss possible aboriginal rights amendments to the Canadian Constitution.

As you are aware, the last of the First Ministers' Conferences on Aboriginal Rights will be held this spring. The meetings in Halifax with the Ministers responsible for aboriginal affairs was convened to lay the groundwork for that final conference.

These issues, as all Members know, are extremely complex and affect all Canadians. A fair resolution is not a simple matter. Any amendment will require seven provinces representing 50 percent of the population plus agreement from the major aboriginal organizations, the Assembly of First Nations, the Inuit Committee on National Issues and the Metis and non-status groups. All of that makes the agreement, as you will understand, that much more difficult.

I must report that progress was extremely slow and that the participants in the Halifax session recognized the need for another meeting prior to the First Ministers' Conference. This must occur in the next few weeks, and there is a possibility that it will be held here in Whitehorse.

In spite of our slow progress, new recognition was given to the possibility of providing for both bi-lateral and tri-lateral agreements. Previously, many parties had concentrated on satisfying the demands of all parties in a single process that provided for tri-lateral agreement. Now some of the participants are suggesting smaller local or regional aboriginal rights agreements rather than a single comprehensive agreement. This would require negotiating separate packages between aboriginal groups and Ottawa, and others between the federal and provincial and aboriginal groups.

The issue of financing self-government has also proved difficult. Our government believes Indian people are entitled to the same level of services as other Canadians, but they are not getting that now. The meeting estimated they may be getting about 60 percent of the value of services that are going to other Canadians. If services are brought up to the same level, whether they are

delivered by an Indian government or whether they are delivered by the national government, it is still going to cost more money.

Working out these financing arrangements will require much more discussion, although I can report there is a strong desire to come to grips with the problems.

In Halifax our government reaffirmed our belief that the process of defining the issues and settling the issues in an area like the Yukon has to be done at the land claims table. This is the process by which we will put the specific agreements about self-government and resources in place. We expressed the hope that the process nationally will mandate the kind of regional negotiations that are going on here and elsewhere to reach a conclusion.

Our government remains deeply committed to the amendment process. We will continue our involvement in a process that requires the commitment of all parties if these difficult issues are to be resolved.

03

Mr. Phelps: I would like to thank the Government Leader for his statement today. We are pleased that this government is reaffirming its belief that the process of defining and settling the issues in an area like Yukon has to be done at the land claims table. That has certainly been a policy we have always been committed towards and tried to further. I am pleased that this government is making progress in this regard. We, on this side, hope that the final process of all parties in March will bear fruition for the native people of Canada.

Mr. McLachlan: I would also like to thank the Government Leader for the update on last week's conference, which I am sure all Members of this Assembly were following and were very interested in.

It is unfortunate that some of the negotiations are only at the stage that we saw them as we viewed our TV screens, and that decisions are being held up because of that age-old argument of who pays. I know that a lot of native people have been hoping that some definite steps toward self-government would be made at this conference.

I do not have a lot of optimism that the large national native organizations will be able to resolve a lot of their outstanding issues quickly enough to make a difference to the land claims process as we know it here in the Yukon. Those issues are just too big and too diverse on a national issue to reach a speedy conclusion and resolution.

I believe that, in the absence of any clear direction at the federal level, the process of regional negotiations that are currently being followed by Yukon is the best to date.

I am wondering if the Government Leader can advise us as to the exact date of the First Ministers Conference and when the next meeting, subsequent to last week's meeting in Halifax, will be held?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The specific date has not been set yet for the final First Ministers Conference. There is an April deadline, but the federal government has indicated that they would like to look at a date in late March. However, they may want to review that decision following the conclusions of the Halifax meeting. Because, clearly, if we are going to have one more ministerial meeting between the First Ministers meeting and that, it only leaves the month of February and the first part of March, if it is to do any useful work. That is as much of an answer as I can give the Member. He will understand that the first meeting will be at the call of the Chair, which is the Minister of Justice, Mr. Hnatyshyn, and the First Ministers meeting will be at the call of the Prime Minister.

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

QUESTION PERIOD**Question re: Animals at large**

Mr. Phelps: I am very pleased that the House is going to move ahead with some important business this afternoon when we move into Committee of the Whole. One of the Bills that remains outstanding in Committee has to do with animals at large.

I would like to ask the appropriate Minister whether or not the government has developed a grazing policy and, if so, how soon we can expect to have the details?

⁰⁵ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** In my meeting with departmental officials this morning, I was informed that there is a draft that has been completed, and there will be a meeting with APEC shortly — as early as possibly this weekend.

Mr. Phelps: Does that mean that we can expect the issue of grazing policy and lands for grazing to remain in the Department of Renewable Resources?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, the Member is correct. It is the intention of the government to leave that responsibility within the Department of Renewable Resources.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Minister advise whether or not any grazing lands have been identified? If so, at what stage is the process to obtain the land? Has it gone through FETLAC?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member is asking for an update as to the question of review of suitable lands for grazing and the progress in terms of whether or not there are any grazing lease applications before FETLAC, I will take that question under advisement and report back to the Member.

Question re: Federal commercial leases

Mr. Phelps: Again, to the appropriate Minister, with respect to federal commercial leases. There are a lot of business people in Yukon who have federal commercial leases. I would like to know whether or not this government is going to ask to have those leases transferred to the jurisdiction of Yukon in the near future?

⁰⁶ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** That particular class of land is incorporated into general classes of land in the process of transferring land on the basis of immediate need. That particular class would be included with the others, if the person leasing the land thought that it was to their benefit to seek a territorial lease or purchase arrangement rather than a federal lease.

Mr. Phelps: There are constituents of mine and constituents in other parts of the territory who are quite concerned that they be given an opportunity to purchase their commercial leases as soon as possible. I would like to know whether or not this government has any policy with regard to (a) the transfer, as soon as possible, to this government, and (b) a policy regarding what a fair price would be to ask for the leases once they are obtained?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As I have just mentioned, the transfer of land on the basis of immediate need is a request for transfer of properties as quickly as possible.

It would be based on a pricing arrangement that we would hold for commercial territorial Crown lands — Commissioner's lands.

Mr. Phelps: That last answer is of deep concern to me. The previous government, when it obtained recreational land and cottage lands from the federal government, sold them to existing holders for some 29 percent of the market value. My question to the Minister is: is this government going to have a similar policy, which would be fair and take into account the fact that many of these commercial lease holders have held the land for a long time and the market has gone up during that time? They have never had the opportunity of purchasing the land outright.

⁰⁷ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I do not have the details with me, but I do know that the timeframe for which the persons have been leaseholding land is taken into account in the purchasing of the properties. I can check on the specific arrangements for the Member.

Question re: Rural and Native Demonstration Program

Mr. McLachlan: On January 8, I asked the Minister of Community and Transportation Services about changes to the Rural and Native Demonstration Program. The Minister assured me that there was no confusion whatsoever surrounding the changes in the program and that people currently in it would not be affected.

Subsequently, last week in a meeting with a number of these people in the community of Carmacks, I was advised the following week that officials of the Minister's department met with those affected people, first together and then individually, and proposed to them that they sign for a 25-year amortization period so that

everyone could live happily ever after. Why is the Minister advising this Assembly of one process and then instructing the officials of the department to go into the community and meet with people on an entirely different basis?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The case that the Member states is a little misguided because the policy, as I stated it, was that the arrangement made with the individuals for last year's program were contractual ones. We were in no position, nor would we want to be, where we would force a change of the terms of their agreements.

We also indicated that if those people voluntarily decided that they would like to meet new criteria and sign their agreements for this year under the proposed criteria, they could do so. A number of them indicated that they would voluntarily change criteria. We offered them that opportunity last week. I do not know the number of people who volunteered to change criteria, but I understand that some of them are willing.

There are two different issues here. The first is the allegation made by the Member that we are forcing the people in Carmacks to change criteria, which we are not. The second one is whether or not we would be prepared to ask them if they would prefer the new criteria, which we have.

Mr. McLachlan: The use of the word "voluntary" is somewhat muted and disguised when officials of the department meet in private behind closed doors and make the suggestion. I hardly believe that that is a voluntary gesture.

Can the Minister confirm that the same officials of the department asked those people to have a decision for him in one week from the week of January 12? Were they given only one week to make up their minds as to which option they wished to pursue for the repayment schedule?

⁰⁸ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** I do not know whether officials indicated that one week was the deadline. That is not a deadline that I am familiar with. I can say that the question put to the people was whether or not they would voluntarily wish to change the criteria. That is the position of the government. That is the position that has been expressed to the people in Carmacks. It was purely a voluntary measure. Nobody was forcing anybody to do anything. We did recognize that the new terms of reference would be preferable in the long term benefit of this particular program. That is the way we put it to the people in Carmacks.

Mr. McLachlan: Benefit to whom is the question I would like the Minister to answer. Benefit to the people of Carmacks or benefit to the Government of Yukon?

The issue is simply that somebody has messed up good. Now, people in the department want the residents in the program to take them off the hook. Beneficial to whom?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: It is beneficial to the people in Carmacks and to the health of this particular program. We stood in this Legislature and agreed, unanimously, that we would make some changes to the criteria of this particular program for the long-term good of the program. The Member, himself, agreed to those changes.

We did make some changes, in conjunction with the senior partner in this equation, the CMHC, for the future allocations. In the interest of fairness, we sought whether enough people in Carmacks would voluntarily agree to change the criteria for the agreements for this particular existing year.

I indicated that there was a contractual arrangement that we had made with those people, and we were not going to break that contractual arrangement. If they wished to voluntarily change the criteria, then that was the decision of their choice, and their choice alone.

Question re: Government contract positions

Mr. Lang: There is an outstanding issue here that continues to concern this side. That is the question of the size and growth within the civil service of the Yukon Territory.

As you know, last week we were informed that there was going to be over \$250,000 spent on new office space on Main Street, in conjunction with renovations. We were informed that a large portion of a new building has been rented by the government on Burns Road, and numerous other accommodations as well, for the

purpose of housing the civil service.

We have been provided with a document that the government has released with their statistical review, where the population of Yukon has gone up by 995 people and, at the same time, the civil service has increased by over 400 employees, according to the review we have here.

It looks like we are getting into a situation that for every new resident we need one new civil servant. Does the statistical review also include, in total, the up-to-date number of contract positions that the Government of Yukon Territory presently has on staff?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The number includes the summer casuals and auxiliaries, and that is the reason for the large increase. There will be a subsequent report that will show a consequent decrease, I hope. The previous statistical report included, and there was some question of this in the Economic Council, people who were employed in government construction jobs who were not government employees at all.

The question, after we had the usual preamble that had nothing to do with the question, was about contracts. As you know, this government has decided to reform the abuse of contract and casual employees, which has gone on for a number of years. There are Bills before the House that will legitimize the possibility of bargaining rights for the casual or auxiliary employees, but the practice of subverting the person year control by using contracts and casuals has been effectively ended by this administration.

Mr. Lang: Maybe somebody else should answer my question. Does the statistical review information provided to us, showing an increase of over 400 person years in the civil service, include contractual positions within the Government of the Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As I just answered, we do not have contracts anymore. We either have term positions or indeterminate positions, or we have auxiliary positions. We are not permitting people to hire casuals by contracts anymore. We have service contracts. I am sorry that the former Minister, the Member opposite, is giggling merrily. I did not know I was so amusing this afternoon. We have reformed the long-standing abuse. We will now for the first time, in the Estimates of the new year, be able to provide a true count of employees to this government, which will be the first time this has ever happened.

Mr. Lang: Maybe somebody else wants to answer the question. Does the 400 personnel increase in the civil service include contractual term positions? Indeterminate positions? Or all the different types of terminology positions that the Minister now has at his fingertips? Does that 400 figure include those staff positions?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I apologize, but the Member is now conveying his confusion in the House. He is now muddying up "contract" and "term". I am telling you, we do not have contract employees anymore; we do not permit that anymore.

Question re: Government contract positions

Mr. Lang: We have an increase of 400 person years. My question to the Minister was: does that particular figure include also the contract positions, for example in the Executive Council Office or in the Department of Community and Transportation, or are those people employed over and above the staggering increase of 400 person years?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will say it slowly and maybe it will reach the Member. It is quite simple. The 400 positions refer to the summer casuals. There are not 400 new person years. Let me make that clear. There are not 400 new term positions. These are people who are largely auxiliaries and casuals who have been employed every summer by the government even in the days when the former Minister was involved. Every summer this government takes in large numbers of people who work on highway crews and in Renewable Resources and in other departments. I am advised that that is what this number represents.

Mr. Lang: The Government Leader has been the government for two years. We have seen an increase in permanent man years of over 140 or 150. Over and above that there are other methods by which the government hires people to do certain work for certain periods of time. It is no secret that there are quite a number of

people on a contractual basis with the Government of Yukon, consulting contracts or whatever the term. How many people work for the government in a contractual, term or indeterminate position, depending on what his terminology is? Perhaps in a consulting basis? I think it is a fair question. I do not want to raise the ire of the Government Leader. I would be the last one to do that.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am afraid the Member does not have my ire or even my amusement. He ought to know, from his days in government, that one of the ways the previous administration used to hide the true nature of the size of the public service was with the use of casuals, the use of contract positions, which did not show up in the person year count.

Those positions, casuals or contractors, who we decided were doing permanent work and were justified, were converted. The numbers will show up in the Estimates this spring. Those people who are doing work that is of a temporary nature, and there is a large number of those associated with Capital Budgets, will be term positions, not indeterminate positions. Casuals will now be used as they are supposed to be used, for temporary short term assignments.

People who come back every year will show up as auxiliaries, and we will be trying to report that accurately to the House. It has never been done before. We will not have employment contracts anymore.

Mr. Lang: I guess I will go on a different tack since I do not seem to get an answer from the Government Leader. Could he provide this House with the number of people who are in contractual positions in the government for the purpose of debate on the O&M budget?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As I have said, we are winding up the use of contract employees. In the Estimates this spring, there will be a documentation of the number of indeterminate positions and the number of term positions in this government, including a report of the conversions that we have done from the people who were previously hidden in the the public service by the previous government. We will hopefully be able to give an indication of the number of auxiliaries that we have. The true casuals will be a separate category.

Question re: Statistical review

Mr. Lang: I can see why the Minister is embarrassed to give me the statistics in view of what we have here. Does this statistical document that we have here include, for an example, the increase of the 33 person years that are going to be required to administer the Capital Budget?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I wish the Member would read a document like this before he asks questions. This is a review of the third-quarter statistics for the performance of the Yukon economy, an economy that is growing faster than any other economy in the country, creating more jobs on a per capita base than any other jurisdiction in the country. Instead of taking pride in our economic performance, he attempts to raise red herrings, introduce false information into this House, about the growth of the public service.

These numbers are for the third quarter of 1986, not about the Capital Budget for 1987 and 1988.

Mr. Lang: I got my answer. It is not included, so there are 33 new person years over and above the statistics that are here.

They are not person years? They are people, I guess. It depends on your terminology.

Over the course of the year, numerous decisions have been made by Management Board with respect to the increasing of person years that have not been reflected in any vote, until we vote in the O&M Budget. Could the Minister tell us what was the increase of person years over last year's budget?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: When we bring the spring budget, we will have a complete record of such information. I am quite prepared to take the question as notice. Once you take into account the conversions of people who were hidden in the public service by the previous government, our record on managing person years growth, according to the growth in our economy, is excellent as compared with our predecessors.

Mr. Lang: He talks about being hidden in the public service. The point is, they have been the government for two years. The

government has to start taking some responsibility for their decisions.

Could the Minister also undertake to state the number of people, either in a permanent person year category or in an indeterminate position, in a term position and all the other categories, so that we have a clear understanding of how many people, in no matter what category that they are employed in, are working and drawing a paycheque on behalf of the people of the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am continually amazed that, after all these years, the Member opposite gets simple facts wrong. We will have been in office two years May 29, which is few months away. I know the Member opposite plans for us to be sitting all that long, but it is not quite two years yet.

He asks us to take some responsibility in his preamble. Of course we take responsibility. We have reformed the horrible abuses that were going on before in hiding the contract employees and the misuse of casuals. The Member laughs because he is embarrassed and ashamed, and he should be.

He asked if we will give some accounting of the people who are employed in this government. We will be pleased to do that in the Estimates debate and when we bring down the budget in the spring — if we ever get to that point, which will be before we reach our two year mark. I will be more than happy to provide that information which, I will proudly say, is the first time this House has been shown the courtesy and respect of being given that information. We were certainly never given it under the previous administration.

12

Question re: Employment statistics

Mr. Nordling: I have a question for the Government Leader with respect to employment as opposed to government growth. The employment statistics indicate that in September 1986, government employees made up 35.7 percent of full-time employment. In looking at the growth of government, does the Government Leader expect this percentage level to remain the same? Does the government have any policy with respect to limiting or maintaining a specific percentage?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In answer to the last question first, no, we do not have a specific percentage target, but, obviously, because of actions this government has taken in the last year-and-a-half, there are many more people working in the private sector than there were before, so the relative number of people working in the public service ought, over time as our policies continue to be successful, to shrink relative to the size of the private sector.

During the recession, which was presided over by the previous government for a period of three years, the number of people working in the private sector was down considerably and the public service continued to grow, even during the middle of a recession, at an enormous rate. I think we had 12 percent on average over those three years. We would want to improve on that situation considerably. We have been improving on it, and I hope we will continue to do so.

Mr. Nordling: Could the Government Leader tell us whether any of those 403 positions were as a result of the Yukon government assuming more responsibility from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am sorry, I will have to apologize because when he asks me an administrative question like that, I did not do the count of the 403 people. The Statistics Branch do that in their mysterious methods.

If the Member wishes an answer to a question like that, I will take it as notice, or he can give me a detailed written question, which I will be happy to answer as well.

Mr. Nordling: The Government Leader had said earlier that most of these 403 people were as a result of casual employees who worked for Highways. I thought he may have more information. The reason I asked the question is that the statistical review also shows that federal government employment in the Yukon fell by 48 people. Were any of these jobs absorbed by the Yukon government?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: It is true that the federal government is cutting back on jobs and spending. There have been some cutbacks in federal services north of 60 and in this territory. As to whether

any person years or positions have transferred as a result of these changes to us and are included in that number, I would have to take that question as notice.

Question re: Human Rights, equal pay for work of equal value

Mrs. Firth: My question is for the Minister of Community and Transportation Services.

Could the Minister tell us if it is the policy of this government to have the municipalities, through their elected officials, make their own financial and management decisions?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: With respect to managing municipal projects, we have already indicated that it is desirable for municipalities to take over control of those projects. It is an evolutionary process, and the Capital Block funding was one step in that evolution.

Mrs. Firth: That sounds very positive, but why is the Government of Yukon forcing equal pay for work of equal value on municipalities and not allowing them to make their own decisions, if that is the case?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We spent a day and a half two weeks ago discussing pay equity. It is clear that the view of the municipalities, as expressed by their councils, is divided on that issue. Some are in favour, some are not. The policy of the government is contained in Bill No. 99, and it was debated extensively in the past and will be again in the future. That is obviously the appropriate forum to discuss this issue.

Mrs. Firth: Whoever wants to answer can answer the final supplementary. It seems that we have two policies here within the same government. One policy is saying that the municipalities are going to make their own decisions; the other is saying, no, they are going to do this.

From the news report this morning, I understand that the municipalities have some concerns about equal pay for work of equal value. There is some confusion in that concern, and there is no doubt when we have two different policies coming from the government.

Now I would like to ask my question. I thank the Minister of Health for reminding me. I will put my final supplementary to whomever wants to answer it. Is the government going to make representation to the municipalities regarding equal pay for work of equal value as it applies to the municipalities, and take it out of the Human Rights Bill and allow the municipalities to make their own decisions regarding this management and financial matter?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Again, this is the use of Question Period to repeat the debate that is going on about human rights, and that debate will continue. In specific answer, the municipalities were all consulted widely. I travelled and met with all of them. The statement about substantial misunderstanding is accurate, and it remains accurate. There is substantial misinformation stated about pay equity primarily by the Members of the Conservative Party in this House.

14

Question re: Human rights, equal pay for work of equal value

Mrs. Firth: I do not appreciate a lecture from the Minister of Justice about what Question Period is for. Question Period is to ask the government questions regarding policy matters. That is the question I asked, and I got two different policies from this government.

The Minister says that he has had adequate correspondence with the municipalities. Is he prepared to table all the correspondence he has had with the municipalities with respect to equal pay for work of equal value, and what their positions are?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No.

Mrs. Firth: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have absolutely no problem with the public discussion of the municipalities' position. They are perfectly capable of making their positions public, as they choose. I believe the Town of Watson Lake sent a letter to me with copies to the Leader of the Official Opposition. I believe that is the case, and the two other communities did not.

Should the communities wish those communications to be public, I have no particular objection, but they have not so indicated.

Mrs. Firth: To the Minister of Community and Transportation Services: is it the policy of this government to allow the municipalities to make their own decisions with respect to financial management? Is he going to allow this conflict and dual policy matter to continue?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The conflict that the Member perceives is in the Member's mind only. As a regular course of its duties, the government passes laws that affect municipalities and control the activities of municipalities, both in their financial operations and their general managerial operations.

In recent history, we have dealt with such things as the *Municipal Act*, *Municipal Finance Act*, *Municipal Infrastructure and Grants Act*. We pass health and safety laws; we pass employment standards laws, which the municipalities are not entitled to breach. We pass a series of laws, as a Legislature, which control the activities of all the population to an extent, including municipalities. Municipalities operate within those regulations.

We do like to improve on our record of transferring authority and control to the municipalities, and our record has been very good in that regard.

Question re: Daycare facilities in rural areas

Mr. McLachlan: During my travels around rural Yukon, I have run into a number of situations where people would very much like to have daycare facilities in those towns, but are unable to either because they do not exist or because a subsidy program is not available.

Is it the intention of this government to extend daycare facilities and subsidization into other parts of rural Yukon?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Yes, it is. We have let it be known in the communities that we are available to come and speak with any group that would like to talk about setting up a daycare facility. Subsidies and all other things that are available now to existing daycare centres would be available to anyone else who met the criteria.

Mr. McLachlan: I believe that the particular line item we discussed in last year's O&M Budget was in the area of \$100,000 for daycare subsidies, of which I believe is extended to rural Yukon in only three locations, Faro, Watson Lake and Dawson City. Can the Minister advise that when the calculations were done for that \$100,000, if those were the only rural communities to which the subsidy would be applicable, or was a wider, broad-base calculation done that would see it extended even further beyond those three rural municipalities?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We were looking at the possible expansion of daycare facilities in other communities. We hoped that individuals would have come to us. We had an idea about which of the communities were interested in setting up a daycare, but they would have to be licensed, and there are a number of other things they have to meet in order to open a daycare facility.

Mr. McLachlan: Is it the intention of the Minister then to make a major announcement tomorrow night in Carmacks regarding the provision of daycare for that community?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Some individuals in Carmacks were interested in finding out what could be available to them in terms of daycare facilities and transition homes. They had asked if I would attend a meeting to speak to them about it. I agreed to do that. I do not have any major announcements to make except to give them information that they have been asking for.

Question re: Human rights, equal pay for work of equal value

Mr. Lang: I have a major announcement to make. It is my understanding that the concept of equal pay for work of equal value is going to cost the City of Whitehorse \$200,000 or an increase of three percent tax increase to every property owner in the territory, which is of no consequence to the Member for Faro.

I would ask the Minister of Community and Transportation, in view of the fact that he works so closely with the Association of Yukon Communities, and has, up to this point, not brought

anything forward, could the Minister table any document that the AYC has written to the Minister asking for the imposition of equal pay for work of equal value to be imposed upon the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There is so much of a preamble that is worth responding to. Let me say, without trying incite debate, that the AYC has, I believe, made representation to the Minister of Justice on the subject of equal pay for work of equal value. I do not know if it was written or verbal. I have indicated to the Association that the government does support the concept of equal pay for work of equal value, but the details for the proposal have been discussed with the Justice Minister.

Mr. Lang: Maybe the Minister of Justice has a major announcement to make along with the major announcement that I made today regarding the \$200,000 increase in the tax bill for the City of Whitehorse. Could the Minister tell us which two communities corresponded with him regarding equal pay for work of equal value?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have previously answered that question twice. For the third time: they are Watson Lake, Faro and Whitehorse.

Mr. Lang: In view of the fact that the cost of initiating equal pay for work of equal value will be borne by each municipality and that it is an additional cost that neither the Association nor the municipalities have asked for, is it the position of the government that they will pay the difference of the costs that will be a burden on the taxpayers in those communities?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The position of the government is that female employees of municipalities should be paid on a fair and equal basis to male employees. That is what the concept of pay equity is. That is what we stand for. That is what we are doing.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

17 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chairman: Committee of the Whole will now come to order. Before we continue with Bill No. 18, we will recess for 15 minutes.

Mr. Lang: Could you inform the Members of the House and anybody else who might be interested just exactly what the order of business is? There has been a major change of business.

Chairman: We will be proceeding with Bill No. 18 followed by Bill No. 7. The Supplementary Estimates is Bill No. 18; Capital Mains is Bill No. 7. That is for the foreseeable future.

Would you care to recess now?

We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

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

Bill No. 18 — Fourth Appropriation Act, 1986-87 — continued

On Community and Transportation Services

Mr. Lang: Last time we left off this particular portion of debate, we were in the situation where the Minister of Community and Transportation Services made statements with respect to this program.

Since that time, the government has found that they have not been

able to obtain financing over the course of the winter months with respect to the *Financial Administration Act*.

In their weekly meetings, have they got to the point that they have expended all this money?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I want to make one point clear before I answer the question, and that is that the funding, this early in the year, is quite often not expended, but is committed.

With respect to the commitment, we are very close to committing full program amounts. It is over \$2 million in any case. I would have to check for the exact breakdown. The funding would be spent straddling two fiscal years. The initial upfront payments would be made in this fiscal year in most cases, unless a project was scheduled to start after March 31st. The final payment would be made next fiscal year. I am sure it is over the \$2 million mark, in terms of funding committed, not spent.

Mr. Lang: When is the final deadline for the remaining amount of money to be allocated?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We have scheduled the dates of January 30 and 31, 1987 for receiving applications. I would hope we would be able to wrap up the program itself within two weeks; probably by February 13 or 14, somewhere around there.

Mr. Lang: Just to clarify then that there is no problem; the program is advancing as per our last discussion? It is proceeding accordingly up to a maximum of \$3 million?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Yes, the program is advancing. I am informed that the Department is feeling very tight pinched at the present time and would obviously like to see this budget and line item passed in the very near future, and we have no reason to not expect this to be the case.

I was informed that by the third week in January or so things would be getting very, very tight, and I understand that that is the case now. I think we still have time to pass the budget without affecting the public if it is done next week.

Chairman: Anything further on Community and Transportation Services?

Mr. Lang: There are a couple of general questions that I have. If we have exhausted the question on the LEOP, I would like to go to the total and then perhaps I could advance at that stage. I have questions about procedure. Basically, I have questions overall on Community and Transportation Services, so do you want me to put them now?

Chairman: This is dealing with just the Local Employment Opportunities Program, this \$3 million.

Mr. Lang: Yes. We passed that particular section and then the total. I guess I can ask some general questions, can I not on the principal of Community and Transportation?

Chairman: Proceed.

Mr. Lang: I assure you I will not go on for any length unless the Minister requires me to. I would like to ask a general policy question on studies and what is done. My understanding is that there has been a study done on lotteries. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Yes, but the study was paid for out of O&M funds not Capital funds. I believe McKay & Partners were contracted by the Lottery Commission to do a study on lotteries.

Mr. Lang: I have further questions on that particular area, but what concerns me is that there are studies being released, I understand, to various groups that could be affected by changes or proposed changes or alternatives with respect to programming and how it has been set up. I refer specifically, for the case of this debate, to the question of the Lottery Commission Report. My concern is this: we find out going down the street talking to somebody, or somebody comes into complain and they provide us with a copy of the study.

My concern is as a Member of the Legislature, with respect to the House and all Members here. It would seem to me that I would like to see the government adopt a policy that, when they have completed a study, those studies be made available simultaneously to the interest groups receiving them, as well as the media, so we have the ability to read them. I would like to hear the Minister's comments on that as well and, perhaps, the Government Leader's because it is an overall government policy. We are in the midst of numerous studies, and I think it puts all Members at a disadvantage

if we do not receive this information and are not informed on the subjects the government is studying.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I may have a reputation for some things, but it not for being stingy with information. If any notice of a study is received by the Member at any time and is announced in this Budget, I would be more than pleased to make those available to the Legislature, in general terms. There is hardly anything secret about it unless the study directly contributes to a specific Cabinet decision, which will have to determine whether or not the study would be made public, depending upon the character of the study.

In most cases, studies, such as the Member mentions, are public information. There are a number of studies being undertaken at any given time. Sometimes they are in the draft stages, and sometimes they are in the completed stages. If the Member has any questions about them, I would be more than happy to make them public.

Instead of just simply making everything public that I can possibly think of on an ongoing basis, I think it is incumbent upon the Members to do a little research themselves and ask questions. I do, unsolicited, provide a lot of information to the Legislature, not all of which is mandated through legislation, but I do try to provide it as quickly as I can. If Members ask questions about a report, they not only get answers, but they can also get the report.

Mr. Lang: That was a very convoluted answer to the question. It could be interpreted in any way. I will use the Lottery Commission Report for an example. The first we heard about it was when it was being discussed by the Chairman of the Lottery Commission on the airwaves. We were not even aware that a study had been undertaken. If we do not know that a study has been undertaken, we cannot ask questions about it or ask for the report.

Would the Minister table studies as they have been completed, it will be released, unless it is a Cabinet document? Therefore, we will have been notified that there was a study done. I cannot ask questions if no one informs me that a study has been undertaken. Will it be the policy of Community and Transportation Services that those reports and studies will be made available when released to interest groups for public consultation? If it is going to an interest group, it does not come under the Cabinet proviso.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As a matter of general policy restricted to the Department of Community and Transportation and, perhaps, even Education, I will undertake that when a study has been completed and it is out for public consultation, I will pass it over to the respective critic and to the Member for the Liberal Party. I will try not to forget any particular one, but I will certainly try to make that a general policy.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate the undertaking by the Minister.

With respect to reports that have been done, has the report reviewing the *Motor Vehicles Act* been completed, or at least a portion of that report?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No.

Mr. Lang: Have there been documents sent out for public consultation with respect to that particular report?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I believe that the person who is managing the discussions, which are going to lead up to changes in the *Motor Vehicles Act*, has been discussing various subject areas with various interest groups around the territory as part of the initial stages in the consultation process. I do not know whether the person has sent out a letter or sent out a document of any kind. I do not know if that is the case.

In any case, the information that is being sought is just note-fashion, at this stage, by this particular person. That is as much as I can give the Member right now. I will undertake to get more detailed information if the Member wishes.

Mr. Lang: I would appreciate that.

I used some of the valuable time in Question Period on my next question, and perhaps could follow up on it here. That is with respect to the question of a sanding truck for the stretch between Fraser and that portion of the Klondike Highway. I just want to report to the Minister that I have had, once again, numerous calls with respect to the question of safety in that area, primarily by truckers, where they feel that if a sanding truck is made available for the pass at certain times, depending on weather, it may well prevent a major accident.

The response the Minister gave me was that we were utilizing the sanding truck that was in Carcross. As the Minister knows, we are approximately 40 or 50 miles away from Carcross. Even if it is sent up there, the time utilized by the truck is primarily spent in travelling to and from.

Would the Minister re-evaluate, once again, the question of providing a truck for the purpose of making it available to the Fraser Camp — have one located there — for the purposes of meeting the all-weather situation that is predominant there, with changes on the hour?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I have heard about the ice conditions on the stretch between Fraser and the border. I am presently investigating that.

With respect to the use of the sanding truck, I have been assured that the sanding truck can meet its commitments on the Carcross-Skagway Road through to the border. There are highway camp operations around the territory whose sphere of influence is, in some cases, over 100 miles of highway. This will be no exception. The responsibility for the Carcross Camp is for the cutoff point between Whitehorse and Carcross, right down to the border.

The reason the Fraser Camp exists at all is because of the heavy snow conditions, which have to be met regularly on an immediate basis. I have been assured by Highways engineers that a sanding truck at Carcross will still meet sanding needs through to the border if the truck is delegated for that purpose.

Mr. Lang: It is fine for the civil servants to say, "Yes, in theory, on paper, it can provide that kind of service." I agree, on paper, they can. The Minister pointed the problem out himself. The reason Fraser Camp exists by itself is because of the pass, otherwise we would not need it. To equate that to 100 miles of road, for example from Stewart Crossing and Dawson City as opposed to the Carcross section, there is no comparison. I think the Minister would agree with me. I am not trying to be cantankerous here, nor am I trying to raise the ire of the government. I am making an observation and bringing it forward on behalf of the people we represent, primarily the truckers going through there. There is a concern being expressed, by very experienced people who have spent many years travelling the highways, that maintenance is not what it should be on an almost instantaneous basis. In the interim period, after contacting Carcross for a sanding truck, you may have 10 trucks through there, as the Minister well knows. My concern is that we be able to meet that need in view of the fact that the weather there changes by the hour, not just by the day. We have to do our utmost as far as safety is concerned.

I am not going to belabour this point, but I want to make representation to the government that there is a stage where maybe you will have to alter priorities, and that is one that should be seriously looked at and met.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Of course, the government is very interested in preventing major and minor accidents along the entire system. It recognizes clearly the traffic flow between Faro and the border and is trying to meet those requirements. One of the reasons why Fraser Camp is located where it is, is because of the heavy snowfalls that come regularly. One of the concerns the truckers have made is that when the snow stops and the road ices up, there should be some sand put on the highway to prevent sliding. Those icy conditions do not happen that often, but what happens more often is the heavy snow conditions. We have a camp at Fraser that looks after those heavy snow conditions. I have already indicated to the Member that I have asked the department to report on the icy conditions between Fraser and the border, as a result of complaints I have received. If, upon reflection, they feel they cannot meet the demand, then the relocation of trucks is something that will have to be considered. I would like them to report to me if they have been unable to meet the demand and what their story is. They, too, have been involved in the maintenance of the highway system for many years, and I respect their advice as well as the reports from the truckers.

Mr. Lang: When are they due to report to the Minister? What timeframe are we looking at?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I would hope that they would report in the next day or so. They are usually fairly fast.

Mr. Phillips: I would also like to express my concern over that one section of road. Over the Christmas season, I have had the opportunity to travel to Skagway and return. I can tell the Minister that, on that particular section of road just past Fraser, there were two Yukon Alaska Transport trucks spun out on the hills and in the process of chaining up. After talking to a couple of truckers, there were also reports that some truckers have spun out after stopping at Canadian Customs on the flat and were unable to get going on the icy conditions.

We get weather where, especially in a winter like we have had this year, we have fairly mild conditions through those mountains, and it is not always snow that comes down; it is freezing rain. It is going to be a little too late to wait until we have an accident there. I did find the rest of the road from the Yukon border to Whitehorse in very good condition and well-sanded. I felt that there was a section of the road there that was quite icy. Tutshi Lake is open, as the Minister knows. With the moisture rising out of Tutshi Lake, it has made that section of the road very treacherous. It is rising and falling onto the road there and you do not need rain or snow there; it is just the moisture in the air.

I think the Minister should seriously look at it. I hope these officials make the decision in the very near future.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not want to minimize the Member's concerns at all. I have already expressed the desire of this ministry to resolve the problem. I have already investigated it once and received certain assurances. In the interim, between those assurances and today, we have received some complaints. I am investigating it again. We are not waiting for an accident to happen. We are still responding to the situation. We want to make sure that the road is not only safe, but that the maintenance of those roads is done in a cost-effective manner. We want to blend those two priorities as much as we can. Certainly, safety comes first.

Chairman: Any further general debate on Community and Transportation Services?

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell me how many person years the total budget represented in his department, the part of which we are debating now in the Supplementaries? How many term person years it represented and if any of those term positions happened to have been made into permanent positions?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is a Capital Budget, last year's Capital Budget. I provided information, and I do not have that information here because we have already done the Capital Mains for next year. I provided information on the person years for last year as well as the increase for next year. I believe that there was even a government handout that indicated the capital person year increase that would be necessary to handle the budget for next year. That was done already in the House just before or just after Christmas.

Regarding this program being debated today, there are two term positions that are scheduled to be finished when the program is completed for this year. One is a secretarial-accountant position, and one is the project manager. That information was also given when we first dealt with LEOP and this line item before Christmas.

Mrs. Firth: We are dealing with the whole 1986/87 Capital Budget when we debate the supplementary that is brought forward in the Legislature. I want like to know the total of person years for the department for the 1986 Capital Budget. All I want to know is the term positions that were identified under Community and Transportation Services and whether or not any of them have been made into permanent positions,

I recognize that there was a document tabled with the person years for the 1987/88 Budget, but I know that I never asked for one when we debated the 1986/87 Capital Budget. We had some debate about person years. I would like to tidy up those loose ends now and see how many term positions were identified in the Minister's total department for the 1986/87 Capital Budget and if any of them have been made into permanent positions.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member may not have asked for it, but it is one of those situations where I provided the information anyway. I will provide the *Hansard* extraction as proof of that. The positions associated with the Capital Budget are charged to the capital projects. They are not considered to be indeterminate person

years in the same manner that the O&M Budget inderminate person years are determined. They are charged against Capital Budgets that have a finite life. I know I delivered these figures before, and I will deliver them once again.

Mrs. Firth: When the Government Leader tabled the figures that accompanied the Capital Budget, he talked about the ones that were attached to the 1987/88 Budget. There were 33 positions, three of which were full time and 30 of which were term positions. I recognize what the Minister is saying about term positions being attached to the Capital Budget. I am simply asking if any of the term positions that were attached to his 1986/87 Capital Budget, and now that we are closing off the 1986/87 Budget with a final supplementary, were made into full time positions? The Minister still has not answered that for me. He does not have to bring a detailed chart; I just want to know if any of them were made into permanent positions.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Let me put it this way: if the Member is asking if there were any ongoing contract persons associated with capital projects that have been made into permanent positions associated with capital projects, the answer is no.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister then tell me the salary dollars that were attached to the two term positions the LEOP had? Did they come out of the Local Employment Opportunity Program money or out of the departmental monies?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not think I have the individual salaries before me. They do come out of the program itself; they do not come out of the department's budget.

Chairman: Anything further on general debate?

*LEOP in the amount of \$3,000,000 agreed to
Community and Transportation Services in the amount of \$3,000,000 agreed to*

On Department of Education

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is a supplementary to perhaps regularize some of the significant projects that have come either under or over budget during the last year. Some of these projects are still ongoing. Some of them have been completed, but require regularization by the Legislature. If Members have questions about individual items, I will answer questions to the extent that I can. If they have questions about other capital projects, perhaps I can give Members updates on what is happening with those.

Mrs. Firth: Perhaps the Minister could start with the Del Van Gorder School Rebuilding and tell us what that \$179,000 is for.

Chairman: Are we in general debate, or are we on the line items?

Mrs. Firth: We can go to the line items.

On Del Van Gorder School Rebuilding

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The initial estimate that we received for the work that was going to be scheduled for the Del Van Gorder School was slightly over what we required. That overage was \$179,000. The work was to demolish the old gymnasium and resurrect what we had from the old gymnasium for the rec centre, and to undertake the flooring for the gym and work on the washrooms and change rooms, et cetera.

If that work is not completed already, I hope it will be completed in this fiscal year. There may be some requirement for a revote on the demolition of the old gymnasium, if that cannot be undertaken between now and the end of the fiscal year. There was an overage of \$179,000, which we are turning back in.

Mrs. Firth: There was only \$1.00 identified in the 1986/87 O&M Budget for that rebuilding of the new wing. Was that \$900,000 voted to date for the project the cost of the whole construction project? Does it take into account all the things the Minister mentioned to bring the project to the completion phase?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This \$721,000 is not for building something new, but for renovating something that exists, which is the interior of the rec centre. The changerooms and the gym floor were the major items that were incorporated into this vote, as well as the demolition of the new-old gymnasium. This \$721,000 should complete the work. I am not sure whether it can all be spent if the demolition of the new old gymnasium cannot be effected prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Mrs. Firth: I am not sure whether it is valid for the debate, but if you will bear with me, I see it as a valid point, because we have already done the 1987/88 Capital debate for Education. I did not notice anything in it for the Del Van Gorder School, yet the Minister has just said today that he expects that there may be some more capital costs for the Del Van Gorder School. Does that mean that they are going to be coming back with another supplementary to the 1987/88 Capital Budget for it?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If the demolition of the new-old gymnasium cannot be done between now and the end of the fiscal year, it will require a revote under a supplementary, for technical purposes. That is all that will take place. There will not be, as a result of the situation, a request for additional monies beyond what is voted now. It may require a revote, because it will be traversing fiscal year end and fiscal year beginning.

Mrs. Firth: The concern I have is that in the 1987/88 Capital Budget, there was no line identified for any expenditures for the Del Van Gorder School. Will it be a supplementary to the 1987/88 Capital Budget?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is the second supplementary. There was a Supplementary No. 1, at which time the \$900,000 was voted. This is Supplementary No. 2 that says that we do not need \$900,000, we only need \$721,000. There may be a Supplementary No. 3 that says that of that \$721,000, we could not spend the money required to demolish the gymnasium, therefore we might need vote authority in the next fiscal year to complete the project.

Mrs. Firth: I gather then that it will come in the form of another supplementary to the 1986/87 Budget if all funds have not been expended. There is nothing identified in the 1987/88 Capital Budget for the Del Van Gorder School so nothing would be done under the 1987/88 Capital Budget. I am referring to the printout sheet that the Minister gave us, and there is nothing about Del Van Gorder School on it.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That is right. The Member's understanding is perfectly correct.

Mr. McLachlan: The line item says that the school is not being rebuilt, that someone else's premises is being rebuilt. Does this mean that the Department of Education, as part of the lease agreement with Curragh Resources and/or the Town or Faro, for a specific time period between Monday to Friday, is leasing that premises for this cost — \$721,000 plus a monthly lease cost? The price of using the gymnasium in the Town of Faro's building is not just the cost of upgrading? There a continuing cost that will be paid to the Town of Faro by the Department of Education for the use of this newly renovated area? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That is correct.

Mrs. Firth: Perhaps the Minister could give us some comments on the safety conditions now because that was quite a significant factor before all of the reconstruction occurred. What is the status of it and what reassurance has been given to the school committee regarding the safety of the building?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If the Member is referring to the safety of the rec centre, the monies we have identified here are meant to improve the sprinkler system and the fire alarms.

The old-new gym area has been securely sealed off. While it is not stabilized, it is certainly moving very slowly, and there is no imminent danger of collapse. As Members know, sometime ago as a safety precaution, just to be perhaps overly cautious, that wing was closed. In any case, there is no sense among the engineers that the building is going to implode or collapse upon itself. There is the feeling that there is sufficient time to demolish it in the proper manner.

Mrs. Firth: Is someone monitoring that on a regular basis? Is someone keeping check on it regularly?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Yes. I believe Government Services is watching the old-new Faro gym. They are also looking at the Dawson School movement.

Mrs. Firth: How often do they do that, and when was it last done?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not know. I will check for the Member if she would like me to.

Del Van Gorder School Rebuilding in the amount of a reduction

of \$179,000 agreed to.

On Reference Room

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There was a feeling this year that \$30,000 would not have to be spent in this area. We did reserve \$10,000 for the general upgrading of the section, with the removal of Land Titles to the Justice Building. There will more than likely be some upgrading for next year as I believe it is in the Capital Budget, which should cover archival facilities until such time as a new archives is constructed.

Reference Room in the amount of a reduction of \$30,000 agreed to

On Yukon Hall

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is broken out into general renovations, painting repairs, et cetera, for \$25,000. There was a need for furniture and general equipment to equip classrooms and the dormitory. That was for \$67,300. These are the Capital improvements for this particular building, some of which will be removable to the new facility, some of which are the leaseholder's responsibility.

Yukon Hall in the amount of \$92,000 agreed to

On Departmental Relocation

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As Members will know, the Education Council and the Whitehorse School Committee and the Ecole Emilie Tremblay School Committee have all made recommendations that all non-school related functions be removed from Whitehorse Elementary School. Not only is Whitehorse Elementary School facing some space problems, but there was also the ongoing feeling that the non-school related activities interfered with normal public school life. They requested that the learning resource centre and the audio-visual centres be removed to some other location, which this money is meant to accommodate.

The money was voted to relocate those two centres to 10 Burns Road, and also to renovate the basement into classroom space in Whitehorse Elementary School.

Mrs. Firth: Has the native language program been moved out of Whitehorse Elementary yet?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No, that has not moved out. I would not anticipate the removal of that program until such time as they move directly to the College.

Mrs. Firth: So, the native language program will stay there. Are they getting any extra rooms of the five new ones that are being built, or are they to be used specifically for French or French Immersion?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I believe the Native Language Centre will not be receiving any of those five rooms. The five rooms will be primarily for French Immersion, and perhaps something for EET. I am certain it is largely for French Immersion.

Mrs. Firth: The native language program has been growing. What would the Minister see as the expected time that they were going to be moving over to the College site? Have the program participants been consulted at all in their relocation and what kind of facilities they would like to see in the future and in the new College?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Yes, they have. Some considerable time was spent in the summer of 1985 consulting with the various user groups of the College, and some changes were made in the designing and the interior layout of the College. The Native Language Centre was involved in designing, in part, its area in the new College, which would be referred to as the Commons Wing, upstairs to the right as you go in through one of the main doors in the College. It is a fairly large area — larger than it now has in Whitehorse Elementary.

At the new College, they have also asked for and received some area for display of artifacts. They have been consulted and are looking forward to the move.

Mrs. Firth: Does the Minister see the native language program, in the future, being turned over to the native people, being run by them and the authority being given to them either through the CYI or contracting it out to the native people for them to administer and control themselves?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Native Language Centre is funded almost exclusively by the Yukon government. The administration of

the language centre is done through the Department of Social Programs at CYI. We do not bear any of the administrative responsibilities for the program, nor do we anticipate us doing so in the near future.

The program, as it is now designed, is run essentially by the director, Mr. Ritter. He is responsible to the vice-chair of social programs. I have heard nothing of significance from any player in the equation that there is a desire for a change beyond what exists already.

Mrs. Firth: I am aware of how the program is administered presently. I have heard some concerns that the native people would like to feel that they are more in control of the program. I know that sometimes the Bands do not feel that they have enough input into what is happening in the program and so on. I would see that as a communication between the administrative body of CYI right now and the Bands.

Does the Minister feel that, in the future, there would be more control of the native language program by the Indian people themselves, and they would determine their own destiny in the program as opposed to the perception being that because YTG assists with the funding that we tell them how the program is going to be, that they have to meet certain standards and tell them in which direction they are going? Is this something that the Commission on Indian Education and Training will be looking at?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Undoubtedly the Commission on Indian Education and Training will comment on the status and the structure of the Native Language Centre. The T'len Report also commented on that subject. The Yukon government does provide a no-strings-attached lump sum quarterly or bi-annually that is meant to fund the program. We do try to keep communication links open because we do second teachers whom they have requested. We do not, in any way, tell them what to do, what to study or anything of that sort.

They set their priorities. They make requests for funding and for the increases. Essentially, we trust their judgment completely regarding whether or not the priorities CYI has chosen are the priorities of all native people. We are pleased to have seen significant results from the Native Language Centre. Last spring they graduated the first class of certified language teachers, and that was quite an event for the Centre. It is a reflection of its growth and maturity.

We do not tell the Centre what to do. I have, from time to time, heard complaints from various Band leaders and people in the community that they do not know enough about what is happening at the Centre. I have passed those concerns on to CYI and to the Native Language Centre, and their response time is usually fairly good. If the Commission on Indian Education and Training makes some recommendations for changes, then those changes would have to be agreed upon by CYI and the Government of Yukon for the betterment of the delivery of the program.

Mrs. Firth: I suppose I see the day when there is a more perceived feeling of independence and control on behalf of the Indian people over their language program. In the event that they do become more independent financially and have their own financial resources, they could be in charge of the program and contract the services back to the government so that we are being perceived to be buying service from them as opposed to just paying the bill. I do not think the Minister would disagree with that. One could say that that is almost what we are doing now. However, I think it could be profiled a little higher that it is really the Indian people who are starting to have control of their program now.

I know that when the program was first established, there was a very heavy influence of the Yukon government being involved in it, and I think it is time we moved away from that and allowed the Indian people to assume more responsibility and independence with their program. I do not think that the Minister will disagree with that.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No, I do not disagree with that at all. I can state clearly that, perhaps, there is a perceptual problem that the government does, in some way, manipulate the program. It is only a perceptual problem, because we do not in any way inflict any kind of direction on the Native Language Centre, period. That is done through the auspices of the Council for Yukon Indians as a

centralized coordinating body. It would be better for everyone if they understood who was in charge and made clear that YTG is not in charge when it comes to the direction for the centre, even though it does fund in major part the operation of the centre.

Departmental Relocation in the amount of \$209,000 agreed to On Ross River School Upgrade

Ross River School Upgrade in the amount of \$8,000 agreed to On Christ the King High School Renovations

Mrs. Firth: Does this finish all the renovations, or are there more that are going to be going on?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As Members will remember, there is some funding in next year's Capital Budget for renovations to the library. The following year, there may be renovations to the science lab, which is an aging facility, to say the least. This \$10,000 is meant to be the planning for both of those projects.

Mrs. Firth: In the Capital Estimates for 1987/88 for Christ the King, there is \$90,000, so this Christ the King Renovations is for the library, and this \$10,000 will be to study the library renovations, as well as the science facility renovations. I take it from that that we are going to be continuing to renovate Christ the King High for probably a long time.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: For at least this year and the coming year.

Mrs. Firth: Has this evaluation been done yet, or this study, regarding the renovations?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am not sure whether the work has been done, but I can check on that.

Mr. Lang: Maybe we could have a brief summary of how the money has been spent to know what the implications of the results of these studies are going to be. I am assuming they have been finished because you have asked for the money and you have spent the money.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The studies are not to determine whether or not we want to upgrade the library or the science classroom. We are going to be upgrading the library and the science classroom. There is the question of the design of the upgrade which has to be done. This funding is to provide for the blueprints, et cetera, for the upgrading of those two classrooms.

Christ the King High School Renovations in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to

On Teslin School Flooring

Teslin School Flooring in the amount of \$5,000 agreed to

On Tantalus School Interior Upgrade

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The work to be done here is essentially the upgrading of the washrooms, staff room, some carpeting for the library. I do not know if Members have been down to the library. I have not been down there for a couple of years, but I remember that it was in pretty sad shape the last time I was there. Carpeting in classrooms, and replacing the northwest entrance door and doing some renovations to the existing stairway.

Mrs. Firth: Has this project been completed?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No, my understanding is that the work has not been completed. The work would still be scheduled to be completed during the course of this fiscal year; the major work during the spring break and the other work after school hours.

Mrs. Firth: Is the Minister saying that part of the work is done and part is not done. They are going to do some in the spring break, like this spring break?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This spring break. I do not know what portion of the work has or has not been done, but, if that is important, I can bring that information back.

Mrs. Firth: This is my concern: there was nothing identified in the 1986/87 budget for most of these projects. There was nothing voted to date for the project, and these have all been added in the form of a supplementary. I usually interpret the supplementaries as being things that either were in the budget and the project was not completed, and we are revoting the funds, or it is an emergency or something. Where did all these projects come from? Is there some immediacy to these things being done? If that is the case, why is this project not finished? Why has the money not been spent?

First of all, where did all these requests come from? If the Minister could find out how much is spent, I would like to know

that.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not know how much has been spent. I do not know how much of the work has already been completed, if any. The projects came through the normal channels through school committees and through the department. We are trying to respond to these project requests based on their relevancy and their urgency. In a couple of lines down, there is a facility study for the rural areas that, I hope, would address this matter on a more systematic basis.

Traditionally, improvements to facilities have been done in this manner. Requests are made for various projects, they are weighed out in the minds of department officials, and the most urgent requests are met first. It is a project like other projects. If Members are trying to suggest that this is an election gimmick, I can assure them that it is hardly a gimmick at all. It is responding to a real need. The projects that are identified here were identified before the seat in this Legislature became vacant. The projects are real projects, and they require attention.

Mrs. Firth: The Minister is so paranoid and suspicious. Whoa! I was asking a perfectly legitimate question. The Minister just went into a tirade about electioneering and buying things. I never even hinted at that. The Chairman has been listening to the debate, and I simply asked where these projects came from. I am not just picking out one project. We start at Yukon Hall. They were not even identified in Supplementary No. 1.

I simply asked the Minister where these came from. Obviously, they have been all Management Board decisions for allotments of funds. In the 1987/88 Budget, there is nothing identified for Teslin School, Tantalus School or Eliza Van Bibber School. How were these decisions made? Was there some immediacy to these things being done? Where did the requests come from, and why?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If there was not some immediacy for these things being done, I would not bring them forward to the Legislature for approval. There are other things upon which we could spend our money. The last supplementary that the Member is referring to was last spring. This is the so-called fall supplementary that has been held up, essentially, until the spring. That is almost a year. Things do change in that 10-month interim.

We did identify a need for dormitory facilities at Yukon Hall for students from rural areas. We identified a need to do the things I suggested for Tantalus School. I already mentioned the upgrading of washrooms, the staffroom and recarpeting the library, et cetera. We did identify these as things that were necessary early last fall when the supplementaries were being developed.

This project and the other projects are ones that we feel will be necessary to maintain the good health of the school facilities around the territory. That includes Jack Hulland School, the Elsa School, the Teslin School, the Ross River School, Christ the King, Eliza Van Bibber and all of the schools. I have been informed that for this school, the general engineering survey has been completed, and the contract is out to tender now. It is scheduled to be completed by the end of the fiscal year, by March 31.

Mrs. Firth: It might be considered a winter works project. It is an identified need that has come through the system in the traditional method. I would hope that the facilities studies, both urban and rural, will help us determine the needs and, perhaps, a more scientific method with more consultation, a more global consultation than just specifically with the separate school committees.

Right now, the facilities studies are incomplete and consultation is not complete. Therefore, there still has to be some response to the needs of the various schools. We are doing that.

Mrs. Firth: The more the Minister speaks, the more it sounds like electioneering. He was the one who raised it, not me.

I appreciate the position the Minister is in. I recognize that the 1986/87 Budget for \$80 million had some huge amount of lapsed funds — I remember the Government Leader saying something like 20 or 22 percent — and that they had an excess of money. I know how tough it is when you have so much money that you do not know where to spend it anymore; you will have to start looking for projects everywhere.

I would like to know how much of that money has been spent. The Minister has said he will bring that back. I want to know when they expect the project to be finished, and whether this is going to

be enough to cover the total cost of the project?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The implication that we are going out there looking for ways to spend the money is not accurate. We are looking at ways of meeting identified needs. The needs that are listed on page eight of the Budget book are what we consider to be identified needs. If the Members have different views of them, they can say so.

I do not know what the cost of the general engineering survey is. I indicated that that is the amount of work that has been completed. I can provide the information on the cost of that general engineering survey.

With respect to whether or not this figure is sufficient to meet the demand, we have heard no indication from either the contracting agency, through Government Services, or from Government Services engineers themselves that there would be any need to change the voted amount. When the tenders come in, we will know with some certainty whether we will meet the needs.

Mrs. Firth: I know a Management Board decision would have been made with respect to the spending of the money for these projects. Can the Minister tell me when that would have been? I get the feeling it was made a long time ago, yet, there is some urgency attached to the project, and it has not been completed. What kind of time period are we looking at here? If urgency is the matter, why is the work not done yet?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: When we engage in capital works generally, we normally pass a budget in November or December of a given year so that the projects can be undertaken and constructed the following spring or summer. It leaves four or five months of planning and leaves four or five months of construction time to complete most of the projects, except for some of the roadwork which is done in the fall, as well. I would suspect that the Management Board decision was made some time in September to proceed with this particular project, and the design and specs have all been done. The engineering analysis has been done, and it is out to tender now and is still scheduled to be completed by March 31. It is not an insignificant sized project; it is \$100,000. So, I would suspect that the timing is reasonably onstream as Capital Budgets go.

Mrs. Firth: I do not want the Minister to lose sight of the fact that I am talking about all of the projects. I recognize that one \$100,000 does not seem to be that much to the Minister, but it is to me, and \$500,000 is even more. I am talking about all of the projects, not just one individual project.

I do not want to hold up the debate because of this. I am prepared to move on, but the Minister has given me a commitment that he will bring back a more detailed report on the progress of the project. I would ask that he do that for any other requests that I may have regarding those items that were added after the budget was prepared.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Firstly, I would like to respond to the insinuation that I feel the \$100,000 is an insignificant amount of money. It is not an insignificant amount of money, it is quite a bit of money. It is an important project. We do take the responsibility for managing these funds very, very seriously.

With respect to provision of information, I have already indicated to the Member that I will provide the information that she requests, no matter how minor it might be. If she thinks it is important, then it is important to me.

Tantalus School Interior Upgrade in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to

On Takhini School Interior Upgrade

Hon. Mr. McDonald: This is for laying carpet on the second floor of Takhini School. I can check to see if that has been completed. That is complete: the contract was awarded to Beaver Lumber, and they have completed the work.

Takhini School Interior Upgrade in the amount of \$40,000 agreed to

On Facility Study Rural

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The principal is the same as the demonstrated need for the assessment of Whitehorse facilities was. This is approximately \$40,000 more than the Whitehorse Facilities Study cost. That is largely because there is a significant amount of

travel for people to go to every single community in the territory where there is a school, or a need for a school. They will have to do the demographics in each and every community to determine student population projections. They have to do an analysis for each and every single school, as well.

The contract has already been awarded to Boreal, again. They won the contract. I would suspect, with all things being equal, the final report will be submitted by the Ides of March this year.

Mrs. Firth: We have another facilities study being done. Is there going to be another telephone poll done, or is Boreal Engineering going to go to each community and spend time in the community gathering demographic information?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am not sure whether a telephone survey will be done as part of the ongoing process to determine the needs and the desires and wants within the government's financial limitations of the people of the territory.

As was the case with the Boreal report on Whitehorse facilities, it was the first stage of the consultation process, which has been discussed innumerable times in this Legislature already. I would suspect that the baseline data and recommendations that would emanate from that would come by March of this year. I would suspect, as well, that there would be a full consultation process, not only with the Education Council, but with the School Committees and with the municipal authorities in each communities. There may be recommended changes to the school facilities. I would suspect that that would be something that would be ongoing over the course of this calendar year. I would hope that some preliminary recommendations could be made in time for the Capital Budget for 1988/89.

I have already indicated what is happening with the Whitehorse facilities study. It is essentially the same process that will be undertaken, though I am not sure about the telephone survey. The same process will be undertaken with work facilities.

Mrs. Firth: When the Whitehorse facilities study was done, the telephone poll that was done by Criterion brought forth some additional costs. It was another, I believe, \$26,000. Is the Minister anticipating that there could be additional costs to this \$100,000, in the event that there was a telephone poll done, or some considerable travelling to the communities that would require someone to be interviewing people within the community to gather the demographic information?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No. The cost to Boreal would be within the allotment here. If there is any telephone survey work that may be required, that could be done within this budget as well. If there are further consultations, and there will be, with the public and school committees, those would be done independently in this budget. I would suspect they would not only be performed this coming year, but would be performed on an ongoing basis. We will simply continue to update our plans for construction activities for the capital component of our budget on a year-to-year basis. We will be consulting with all the school committees and the Education Council on a regular basis, as well.

Mrs. Firth: Has the study been started yet?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I think the contract has been awarded. They do have a timeframe. I hope that they are underway. I believe the timing now allows them approximately seven weeks, so I hope they are underway.

Mrs. Firth: I would like the Minister to find out if they are and which communities they have been in so far. I would appreciate that. The recommendations that came forward from the Whitehorse Facilities Study and the Criterion Phone Survey were referred to a committee. The Minister said that the Facilities Study was going to be analyzed and that there are some recommendations to be made. I believe that was to happen at the end of December. The Committee consisted of representatives from the City, the Economic Council, and department officials, and I was wondering if the set of recommendations has been turned into the Minister yet? Is he prepared to make that available to the Opposition Members?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The city planners have indicated what their preferences are. There has not been a meeting of minds on what the overall recommendations ought to be that will be going out to the public. That information would be done in short order

although I do not know exactly when. It a regular item on the agenda for meetings between the Education Council and myself. We would like to ensure that the consultation process that proceeds from here will include all school committees. Further to that, that the recommendations that are made within the general financial capabilities of the government — although the caveat is always there that the government will make decisions on a year-to-year basis on whether or not any major projects will proceed.

I hope that within the next few weeks we can not only define the consultation process that is acceptable to the school committees, but also come forward with recommendations that are considered a best guess of what would be acceptable from everyone's point of view.

Mrs. Firth: I understand that those recommendations from that committee composed of the Government of Yukon officials, the city officials and the Education Council were to be completed by the end of December. I am not quite clear if it is completed, partially completed, or if someone else has to look at the recommendations. I believe the Minister gave us a commitment that that would be made available for the public to discuss. Can the Minister confirm or deny that he made that commitment and tell us if the recommendations and the report have been turned in yet?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The commitment stands to make the recommendations public. As I said in my answer the first time, there was supposed to have been, by the end of December, a set of recommendations on the improvements to Whitehorse facilities that would include not only new construction but renovations and a commentary on allocation of programs that would meet the needs of both the city planners, the Education Council and the Government of Yukon.

³⁷ What we received by that date instead was a listing from the City Planning Department as to what they felt, sort of unilaterally, ought to take place. It fell short of my expectations, because I wanted to see a combination of the views of the Education Council, the city Planning Department and the Government of Yukon through the Department of Education, which could then be put out for refinement, for change and discussion. Because I did not receive that meeting of minds, I was not in a position to make anything public because there was nothing to be made public.

When I do receive the overall picture and the recommendations that are being made, those will be put out to the public for public discussion. There will be a very thorough analysis done in the public of those recommendations. Hopefully at least the recommendations will meet the needs of the city Planning Department and the Education Council — those individuals, at least, in the sense of where the public is going.

Those recommendations can then be changed or modified in ways, through public consultation. I would hope that that could be done in short order, but I am hesitant to provide a deadline because I am not sure whether a deadline can be met. Certainly the one deadline I aspired to, which was the end of December, was not met. I am not going to force feed the public when the proper thought and internal consultations have not taken place.

Mrs. Firth: My concern is that all this information has been collected, this money has been spent, probably close to \$93,000 or thereabouts, on the Boreal Study of the Whitehorse Facilities and the criterion report. I was of the impression that something was going to happen with this to give us some immediate recommendations before all this information becomes outdated, and we will be doing it all over again. I would like to ask the Minister, since it is a month now that the report has been overdue, how long has he extended the time allotment to the committee for bringing forth recommendations? I do not want a specific date, but has he given them another month, or four, or has he said whenever they get the urge they should bring it back? Has he given them some specific instruction that he would like to have it by a certain time?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I can assure the Member that something is going to happen as a result of this particular study and the consultation that will result from it. There is an identified space need in the Whitehorse Schools. There is a sense that the space requirements are only going to be greater as the population increases. We see no sign that it is going to decrease, only that it will increase. Clearly, in the next capital budget we are going to

have to, in some part, address the space requirements for the City of Whitehorse and ultimately for the territory. The information will hardly be outdated if it is responded to for the next capital year. That is the general target we have set for ourselves, in any case, so we can respond and start capital deliberations at the end of the summer and ultimately through concrete physical construction or renovation the summer after this coming summer. That was what was in the cards in the first place.

³⁸ Many of the problems have been exacerbated over time — in some cases over a decade. I hardly think the delay of a month is going to exacerbate that beyond reasonable bounds. I have indicated to the Member that I do not have a specific deadline. I have already indicated to the Legislature that I would like to see it happen as soon as possible — I would say within the next month or so. I would like to see a joint statement coming from the three involved parties for the development of the recommendations that will go out to the public. I am hesitant to provide deadlines because parties over whom we have no control, namely the public, the Education Council, the city planning department, do not feel necessarily bound by any deadline that I might try to inflict.

I am interested in receiving that joint agreement. I would like to encourage them all to achieve that joint agreement as soon as possible.

Mrs. Firth: I am not talking about the public consultation process. I am talking about the report that was to be turned into the Minister that was to be done by those three groups. The Minister has gone on about the public consultation process and how long that can take. I would like to know if he has given those three representative bodies any time period to get the report in to him with the recommendations of what should happen with the Whitehorse facilities study.

I am talking about the group that was organized, with the Education Council on it, the city planners and YTG. I am not talking about that further going to the public. What deadline has he given that committee to come back with something?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: My interpretation of consultation includes consultation with the Education Council and the planning department of the City of Whitehorse. I indicated that I had asked that there be an agreement struck between those three groups and some recommendations that might be put out for public discussion. I indicated that I would like to see that agreement struck prior to the end of December. They did not respond to my deadline in the public consultations, — “public” being anything beyond the department. They did not respond to the deadline. They were interested in the subject area. They wanted to participate, but they could not meet the deadline that I had asked them to meet.

That is the consultation that I am referring to. I am not referring to the consultation that extends beyond that sort of internal group's discussions: the city planning department, the Education Council and the Department of Education.

I would like to get a response as soon as possible. I would like a response in a week. To be realistic, I would ask them to respond within a month. I have indicated that much to them. I realize that they will respond according to deadlines that they feel are significant. I have not made the decision, because they have not responded to my deadlines, to cut them out of the consultation process. I feel that it is very important to keep them in the consultation process. When they respond jointly, then we can proceed to the next step, which would be the discussion with the school committees.

³⁹ **Chairman:** Are there any further questions on this line item?

Mrs. Firth: It was the Minister who brought up the Whitehorse Facilities Study. The rural one is going to have to do with the Whitehorse one. I am just reading the comment in the newspaper where “The Committee that was made up of representatives of the department, the City of Whitehorse Planning Branch, Territorial Education Council has been struck to study both reports and set out recommendations for McDonald.” Now he is telling me that they have not complied with that and he does not know when it is going to come forward. I am prepared to leave it if the Chairman does not think it is relevant to the debate. I will ask the Minister in Question Period or some other area when he is expecting to get that report.

The Minister talked about the anticipated growth of the population. Can he tell me if the pupil numbers are going up, and if they are going up in a remarkable fashion, since there is such a demand for space?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Of course I will respond to the questions in Question Period or right here on the floor.

With respect to student projections, they have gone up approximately 400 students this year and we would expect that to increase again next year. We do not know specifically how many students there will be. Prior to this year, there were certain space problems in most of the schools in Whitehorse — not undue overcrowding, but there were situations where the classrooms were getting fuller. With the new programming being initiated, there was a requirement for more classrooms. That was compounded by the fact that approximately 400 new students entered the system. It turns out that many of those students can be incorporated into existing classrooms and the space problem was not as dramatic as it could have been if the demographics had been different.

We do expect that with the economy in the shape that it is there will be more students entering the system. We do not know how many, but we suspect there will be an increase.

Chairman: We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: The Committee of the Whole will now come to order. Facilities Study Rural, continued.

Mrs. Firth: I would like the Minister to tell me what population figures he is talking about when he mentions the enrolment increase because, according to his department's figures, I see the enrolments declining, not increasing. In other words, the enrolments in September, 1986, as compared to December, 1986, have actually dropped in the urban and rural schools.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I was referring to this September over last June.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister be more specific? Can he give us some numbers or percentages or something? He seemed to have that answer so quickly, does he have the numbers to substantiate it?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not have all the figures for the whole department, otherwise this room would be filled with ledgers, books and the works. My understanding is that the enrolment has increased this school year over last school year by approximately 400 students. I do not have the exact number, but, if the Member wants that information, I can provide it. I am sure the Member has it, because I normally I give out the student enrolment figures. If she wants me to provide it again, I will do that.

Mrs. Firth: I wish the Minister would stop being so combative. I am asking the questions, I hope, in a responsible way. If he does not feel that, I am really sorry, but I understand now where he made his predictions, and he gave the number of 400. I see the enrolment as going down from September, 1986 to December, 1986 of some 120 students. I am assuming that the government will be predicting enrolment increases for the new 1987/88 O&M Budget to be more than that 400, then? Can the Minister give us any idea of what the estimated enrolment increases will be?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The department suspects that the enrolment will climb over the course of the coming year. I am not sure by what number it will climb. I have indicated that between June, 1986 and December, 1986, there was an approximate difference of 400 students. If there has been a slight decline in that number, I am not sure of the reasons for that, but we still expect the student enrolments to continue to climb.

I also mentioned that there were some programming pressures. As we entertain new programs it puts some pressure on the available classroom space. There are schools in Whitehorse, in particular, that are facing space problems, and we are trying to accommodate those space problems. We will, ultimately, over the course of the next few years, I am sure, if student enrolment levels off or declines, take that into account on our capital projections. I do not know what more I can say.

We have not done any scientific analysis of specific numbers that would provide with any degree of accuracy the conclusion that

numbers would decrease by a specific number. We do feel that, because the economy has gone the way it has and because the numbers have increased, there is a correlation between those two. We project that the economy will grow, and we project likewise that there will be an increase in enrolments. We do not know by how many. We do not know how many until the students are actually enrolled in September, 1987. When that time comes, we will know with some degree of certainty how many students we will be expected to handle during the school year.

« There is nothing more to add to that.

Mrs. Firth: I understood from previous debates when we talked about some of the questions that were asked in the Criterion Phone Survey that it would make it a bit easier for the department officials to predict enrolments and to know how long children were expected to be in school, and so on. There is no point in belabouring the debate. I will wait until the O&M Budget comes, then I can find out in more detail how the predictions of students are made.

*Facility Study Rural in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to
On Eliza Van Bibber Expansion*

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There are three teaching stations in Eliza Van Bibber School. This project is to expand the administration and classroom area underneath the overhang that is currently the entranceway to the school. They will put in two walls and a new door and expand the principal and vice principal's office area and add another classroom. There are currently only three teaching stations in the school.

Mrs. Firth: What is the purpose of that? Was it a request that came forward from the school committee or the teachers? I am taking it that these are some matters of urgency and importance and that is the reason for this funding being given. Where did the request come from?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: It came from the staff and was discussed with the school committee. That is my understanding, but I can check on that particular matter. I know that the school committee is supportive of this particular expenditure. We have discussed it to that extent. There has always been the concern that, in the Eliza Van Bibber School, the number of actual teaching stations is limited to three. That has been an ongoing problem. There were projections that the problem will be exacerbated this year or in coming years. We would like to respond to what we perceive to be problems and to add a classroom to the school.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell me if the project is completed or not?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I know the project is not completed. The tender was to close four days ago. I do not know what the actual status of the project is at this present time. I assume that if the award has not been given to some contractor it will soon be given.

« **Mrs. Firth:** Is that being done by local people, or is it being done by people from Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not know who the contractor will be. It was a public tender offering. I would presume the lowest tenderer who is capable of doing the job will do the job.

Mrs. Firth: It has not been awarded yet? The Minister is shaking his head saying no.

When does the Minister expect the project to get going?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I would expect it to get going as soon as possible. I do not know specifically when there will be people on the site, but I will find out who received the successful bid, where they are from, what their qualifications are and when they plan to move onto the site. I presume that when the award is made, they will move onto the site as soon as they can, perhaps in a few weeks or so, once they mobilize, et cetera, and they will undertake the work. We have been assured by the school committee that they have no problems with this construction taking place during the school year so it can take place, as far as the staff is concerned, while the school is in operation.

*Eliza Van Bibber Expansion in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to
On Jack Hulland Carpet*

*Jack Hulland Carpet in the amount of \$35,000 agreed to
On Elsa Library Conversion*

Mr. Lang: This has to do with Elsa and the Education Department. I just noticed in the ad that there has been a notice

given about three or four times basically stating that all the work is completed on the Elsa School Teachers' Residence that is owned by United Keno Hill Mines. Was there any government money spent on that?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Let me explain it this way: the Yukon Housing Corporation, as Members know, has a budget to construct a staff unit in Elsa for a teacherage. The Housing Corporation contracted with the mine to build a house and hook it up to their municipal works, the utilidor system. That house has been constructed and will be turned over to the government, once the building inspections are completed.

Mr. Lang: Why was the contract with United Keno Hill Mines not a normal tendered building, just like any other building? Why was it necessary to go through United Keno Hill Mines for the purpose of building a teacherage for the Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: To be perfectly frank, there is a feeling — not unfounded — that the mine could build the house much faster than could the government. There was an understanding that the mine would do it at an attractive rate. I do not know how much it was. I believe it was in the neighbourhood of \$100,000. It has not been transferred.

Mr. Lang: Why does he think the United Keno Hill Mines could build a building better than, for example, Klondike Enterprises or General Enterprises or Turner Construction or any of the other large construction firms in town who specialize in building buildings?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: They have the understanding of the site; they had contractors in place already who were doing work for the mine. We contracted with them to provide the project.

Mr. Lang: I asked a question in this House a number of times whether it was the intention of the government to continue to follow normal contracting procedures. Now, stumbling through debate, we find out there is a \$100,000 teacherage that has been contracted out, willy-nilly, on a handshake by the Minister.

Did the Minister make the decision by himself that it would just go through United Keno Hill Mines and would not go out to public tender?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The project was not contracted on the basis of a handshake with the Minister. There was a desire to build the project post-haste, and we undertook with community agents to build the house. The house has been built.

Mr. Lang: Do they have a contractors licence?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The contractor who built the house had a contractors licence.

Mr. Lang: Who was the contractor? He just told me the contractor was United Keno Hill Mines.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The contractor working for United Keno Hill Mines was Schultz Construction, I believe.

Mr. Lang: Was it tendered out? Was there any opportunity for any other contractors in the territory to bid on this miniscule contract of \$100,000? How was the contract levied?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not know the details. I will check on the details, but I can say to the Member that the arrangement was made between the Yukon Housing Corporation and United Keno Hill Mines.

Mr. Lang: I do not accept the fact that it was done by the Yukon Housing Corporation if it is arm's length from the Minister. You may think that you are looking at the guy who went down the Yukon River on a bicycle. I know how the Yukon Housing Corporation works. The Chief Executive Officer is the Deputy Minister for Highways and Public Works, from Community and Transportation Services. With that statement, the Minister is implying that he did not know anything about it or his involvement was at arm's length. I do not accept that.

Here we go again, back into the contracting again. Why do you not just follow the contract regulations and let everybody get a fair shake at it instead of shaking hands with a friend of a friend because it happens to be the MLA's riding. I resent it.

I want the Minister to tell me, or the Minister of Government Services to tell me, why it was not tendered out through the contract regulations, the policy directives that the Minister of Justice stood up here and said would solve all our problems. Here

again is the perception of the government getting their hand in the cookie jar and there is no need for it.

I want the Minister to tell me why it did not go through the tendering procedures that are laid down by law.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As I have indicated, first of all, the insinuation that somehow the Minister had his hand in the cookie jar is completely unfounded. Secondly, the government required a house. Our first thought was to purchase a house from the mine in Elsa. They indicated to the Housing Corporation that there was no house to be purchased. We then went through Government Services to look at the construction of a unit in Elsa. There were indications that the construction of a unit would take a considerable time and we wanted the unit constructed this year. The mine indicated to us that they could have a house for us to purchase within a certain timeframe. We indicated to them that we would be interested in purchasing a house if one could be provided to us within that timeframe. We indicated to them what our best purchase price could be, and we indicated to them that if they could provide us with a house in that timeframe, we would be interested in purchasing it.

Mr. Lang: That is another new tendering procedure. Was that money voted by the Legislature last Capital Budget — is that not correct — the Capital Budget that was tabled in November a year ago?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That is correct. I will remind the Members, with respect to Housing Corporation's Capital Budget, that the money is not only for the construction of units, it is also for the acquisition of existing units.

Mr. Lang: Why did it take so long? Why was that unit not tendered out through normal contracting procedures in the spring of last year? The money was voted a year ago in November.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I will have to check on all the details. I do not have all the details at my fingertips, but I can say this: there was the desire to purchase a unit, and there was some indication that a unit could be purchased for some months last year. After deliberations internally in Elsa, they decided that they did not have a unit that was available, so we looked at our other options. The other options included: constructing a house through Government Services, or purchasing a house, perhaps, at a later date through United Keno Hill Mines. They indicated that they could have a house ready for us to purchase by a certain date. We indicated to them that that would be preferable because construction through Government Services, we felt, would take an undue amount of time.

Mr. Lang: What is an undue amount of time? Is it the three weeks required for tendering procedures? Maybe the Minister of Government Services, the Minister of Justice, who is supposed to be here administering justice and is not only being fair, but perceived to be fair, could tell me why other people in the territory did not get an opportunity to bid on it. It is \$100,000 of taxpayers' money, not the Minister of Community and Transportation Services.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I would briefly point out that the topic of discussion is the Elsa Library Conversion. All else is out of order.

Mr. Lang: I have got no problem. We will clear this section. I have got other forums I can take this in. You had better get your homework done. To sit up there and just say that we just operate on a handshake because somebody else can do a project quicker than somebody else: I mean, talk about putting the government on question.

Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Chairman....

Chairman: Order, order please. The Member is quite right. There are other areas where this unrelated topic could be more appropriately addressed. We are on Elsa Library Conversion in the amount of \$20,000. I would like to remind Members that, according to Standing Order 42(2), speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Mr. Lang: I respect your decision regarding this subject. As we go through these budgets, we get words from the other side committing themselves to such things as the contract regulations and how they will be administered and everything else, and then

stumbling through the debate here, the Minister offhandedly says we made a deal in the back door. We will follow it up. Guaranteed.

46 **Chairman:** Anything further on the Elsa Library Conversion?

Elsa Library Conversion in the amount of \$20,000 agreed to Department of Education in the amount of \$510,000 agreed to

On Department of Government Services

Chairman: General debate?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We have already gone through the Capital for next year concerning these items. The items are all in one line. The supplemental is all for the Capital expenses around office space. It has previously been outlined in the Capital Budget. Briefly, again, I will break the expenses down by department.

In Education, \$13,000; in Government Services, \$3,000; Public Service, \$15,000. They moved into the space vacated by the Administrative Branch of Government Services. In Health, they have moved into the Royal Bank Building. There is an additional move that is presently unknown as to location. Economic Development has previously been identified. That lease is now let. Community and Transportation, Policy and Planning have moved into the Mainstele. That is completed. Community and Transportation Housing have moved into the Tutshi Building. That is completed. The Department of Finance expanded their space here. Systems and Computing Services are also expanding their space in the main Administration Building. Renewable Resources has expanded space in the Burns Road building.

The Public Works Branch of Government Services have moved from the Prospector Building where they used to be. They are now in the M&R Building. The Executive Council Office, Bureau of Statistics, will be in this building. Those moves are all identified in the Touche Ross Report. I have previously identified the moves and that accounts for the total of this expenditure.

47 **Mr. Lang:** You come in here and expect us to *carte blanche* \$218,000. I recognize it is not a lot of money to the other side, but it is a lot of money to this side — and also the fundamental underpinning of principles of why these things are being done. Here we have \$281,000 for the purposes of expansion and the moving around of government offices. That is basically what it is. The other day, the Minister stood up — because we once again happen to ask the right question — and informed the House there is another \$250,000 going into taking the top two floors of the brand new building on Main Street for the expansion in government. Now we have the Government Leader standing up saying that there are not 400 person years, they were all hidden.

That is not true. The government has all these programs and are setting out to make a number of major moves and major increases in the size of the civil service to the point where it will be one-to-one. As I said earlier in debate, and I will repeat it again, the public is getting to the point now they are serving the government, the government is not serving the public, because of the size. That is of major concern to this side.

I would ask the Minister if he could give us a concise breakdown of the \$281,000. He gave us four figures, \$15,000, \$3,000 and \$13,000. It is very difficult to be sitting here writing figures. I do not understand why he could not follow, and I will give the credit to the Minister of Community and Transportation Services, who provides the statistical information that he feels is relevant to the debate so we do not have to sit here scribbling everything down hoping we have not missed anything. Will the Minister undertake to copy the information that he provided the House so we can go through it for the purpose of seeing just exactly how this money is being spent?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes.

Mr. Lang: I would appreciate that, because I think it is relevant to the debate here. I think there are a lot of things which bear scrutiny. I am proposing, at least in part, to perhaps continue the Touche Ross debate and the elements of that particular area, as part of the debate for the purposes of what has been accepted in the Touche Ross Report. We are finding it very disconcerting in listening to the government side saying they have not accepted the principles of the Touche Ross Report. They have received it and are reviewing it, yet the Minister stands up today and says these are as

per the recommendations of the Touche Ross Report. It was very confusing for myself, as the critic, and for the public I can assure you, to find out just exactly what the intentions of the government are. I recognize the government has a lot of money to spend. It seems to me that where we are going and what we are doing is going to bear some terrible dividends down the road for those of us taxpayers who choose to stay here.

For an example, I want to start with a question about the contract for renting the new Taj Mahal on Main Street for \$250,000. Is that a three-year lease or commitment?

48 **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The government has no lease to rent Taj Mahal. The Member opposite persists in making these political speeches about the size of the government. He is using the Touche Ross Report, in part, as a basis for that.

The situation is that the government has recognized and accepted that, as of approximately six or eight months ago, the government is substantially overcrowded. In the short term, we need more space to accommodate the people and the programs that we have. That does not involve a growth in the government. It is a recognition of overcrowded conditions. We have accepted a plan of moves, which are all identified in the report, which solves the immediate crisis in the short term.

The report also makes a projection of the needs for space in the future. That projection is based on devolution of federal programs and growth. Those are projections that have not been approved, if you will, by the Management Board. We are solving the immediate crisis — or what was a crisis of eight or nine months ago or so — and we are planning for the future.

The report talks about various options about a lease-build option. Before we make any decisions to build any buildings, we will thoroughly analyze the potential uses of the old Yukon College site. That process is not complete.

49 I expect the Member for Porter Creek East to continue to make his political speeches about the growth of the government; however, in this case, all we are doing is solving the overcrowding problem. We have used standards for office space that are clearly identified and accepted by private industries and other governments. The money here is entirely for those moves, and I will provide a list of the moves and the amount of money. I could read it out, but I will provide it as I was asked.

Mr. Lang: I appreciate the Minister providing us with that information. It is something that we will get into detail about. I get a kick out the Minister. It is as if I am not supposed to raise these political questions. It is as if we are in a little forum where we are just supposed to discuss what we are going to have for coffee and where we are going to buy the coffee.

There has been an expansion in government. They stand up like a bunch and say that there is no expansion, it is just overcrowding. Permanent person years in the last two years, the last two budgets, is 140 people. That does not include what the Members opposite have told us about the Capital Budget. That is another 33, but the Minister says those are indeterminate or term positions. I was scolded in Question Period by the Government Leader about that. There is the Yukon Development Corporation and the Human Rights Commission. The list goes on.

The Minister says that this amount is just for overcrowding, that it has nothing to do with us. They say that they need to rent all this space. They have to rent the space because they have expanded the size of the bureaucracy.

50 To sit there and try to hide it, you must think the public is stupid. The reality of the situation is we have \$281,000 in the past year spent for the purpose of these moves, which you went through so fast that everybody was confused where the Department of Renewable Resources was moving to.

I do not know where these departments are any longer. If we do not know — we are supposed to be the legislators, we are supposed to be the ones who are knowledgeable with respect to the running of government and general policies — what is the guy in the street thinking?

We need a monthly directory of the moves of the Government of the Yukon Territory, so the public knows where they can go to get the necessary service from whatever government department they

are dealing with.

With respect to the Touche Ross Report and the projections, the Minister said that was a civil service projection, and I accept that. I recognize how the government works. I would suspect that it is a conservative projection with respect to what the government could foresee.

The Minister is shaking his head. Then tell me why, in this particular document, it was projected that the One Stop Business Shop would have 12 people by 1991. In one year, we have gone from three to 18. It must be conservative with respect to the size and the increase in the civil service.

The argument is going to come back this way that there was an increase in the civil service in the previous administration. I am not going to argue that. In some areas, I question why it was done. I am expressing a frustration of the public, who we are here to serve.

They see the government encroaching every which way. We see a government who, in fairness, has said that they are for the principle of decentralization and, in some cases, they have taken steps to meet that objective. I would think that if we are giving more responsibility to the municipalities, then we should, in theory, need less services in Whitehorse to administer the rural communities. I do not understand why we are increasing the size of the bureaucracy in Whitehorse when all Members of the House are espousing the principle of decentralization. I would like to put the Minister on notice that I intend to pursue this area during the debate that will ensue on Government Services in the proposed 1987/88 Mains. I think it has to be highlighted and raised. I give the government a cautionary note that people are watching this and really questioning how much government they need, regardless of the good intentions of the side opposite. I think they should be listening to the taxpaying public who is asking what is being done.

The disturbing aspect of it is that the size of the federal government went down by 3.7 or 4.0 percent, and we went up a total of 18 percent. There has been an increase, and there has not been any devolution to the Government of the Yukon. I request that we get the information so that we can continue this at 7:30. Perhaps we could continue the debate at 7:30.

Chairman: The House will recess until 7:30.

Recess

Deputy Chairman: Committee will now come to order.

Mr. Lang: The Minister was going to provide us with that breakdown; run off copies and distribute them. That was my understanding when we recessed.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will provide the information. I made no commitment to provide it for 7:30. I can read the list now, but it is better to get it neatly typed. It is not in a typed form now, but will be for tomorrow.

Mr. Lang: I am having difficulty and am at a loss with respect to how we will proceed. Maybe the way to do this is to set this aside and go onto the other budgets, see how expeditiously we get through them and then maybe we could go back to this with the information that the Minister requires. I was under the understanding we would have it by 7:30.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. The information is extremely simple, and all it is is the moves that were planned to occur and the expenses beside them. It is in the nature of administrative detail. I can provide it at any time, but there is no need to stand over this item at all.

Mr. Lang: I guess it depends upon your point of view. Maybe that side thinks there is no point in even discussing the budget. It is just an administrative detail; it is just a bunch of money; who cares? I asked for the information. I was led to believe that it was just a question of running 16 copies of whatever notes the Minister has so I could run through them and ask some specific, detailed questions about some of these buildings.

The Minister may not think this is a political question. I defend the Minister's right to think that. I defend my right to tell you that I believe it to be a political problem for him. I want to discuss it. In view of the fact that the government is in charge of the business, I

do not understand what would be wrong in setting this aside so he can provide it tomorrow. We have a couple hours more work in the budget, obviously. If we do not, we can come back to it prior to 9:30. I think it is important that that information be known to the public.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: To set the record clear, I did not imply any such thing about 7:30. That is clear. If the Member reads *Hansard*, then he will see that.

In any event, the problem is an extremely tiny one. Let us set it aside, and I will provide the information tomorrow.

Deputy Chairman: If there is no further debate we will proceed to Health and Human Resources.

Department of Government Services stood over

On Department of Health and Human Resources

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The capital funding for this \$52,000 is to complete design for facility upgrading and commence interior renovations of three Whitehorse child welfare group homes in order to improve their suitability as group homes for children in the care and custody of the department.

The group homes involved include 52 Liard Road, 502 Lowe Street and 16 Klondike. Energy audit studies were completed in December by the Department of Government Services on all three facilities. These projects will continue into the 1987/88 fiscal year and will be contained in the 1987/88 Capital Estimates.

The project will include detailed drawings of required upgrading and renovations. Renovations will include improvements in living areas, installation of energy conservation features, upgrading to new Building Code requirements for emergency lighting, electric smoke alarms and electrical services.

Part of this will be completed in the next fiscal year. In 1987/88, exterior renovations will be completed as required, together with landscaping and fencing improvements. The Supplementary Estimate of \$52,000 includes \$19,000 for the Liard group home, \$19,000 for the Lowe Street group home and \$14,000 for the Klondike group home.

Mrs. Firth: Does that involve the work on the project or is just to do the studies to do with the work?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It includes the energy audit studies that were already done and would include part of the work as well.

Mrs. Firth: Are the group homes government houses or are they privately owned houses?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I believe they are all government-owned homes.

Mrs. Firth: If they are government owned, would the energy audits not be done by the government? Was the Minister saying that is something the department has to pay for out of this fund?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It is contracted out by government services to private individuals to do that.

Mrs. Firth: Does that mean that there is no one within the government who does energy audits any more? I thought they had their own resource to do energy audits? I believe it was someone within Economic Development who went around and did some assistance with the businesses. I assumed they could do their own energy audits on government buildings as well. Could the Minister of Government Services assist with the answer?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There are two capacities. One is in Economic Development around the SEAL project. The government has no capacity to actually perform an energy audit under that program. It is administered under that program, but it is carried out by the private sector. There is also a capacity in Public Works as an energy advisor or coordinator.

Group Home Renovations in the amount of \$52,000 agreed to

On Department of Justice

Deputy Chairman: Department of Justice, general debate.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: All of this is in one program, and it is to improve the facilities where the rural courts are held; that is the circuit courts. The consideration was that we have recently established a facility here at a great expense and the facilities should be more conducive to court proceedings in all of the communities.

This involves, in some cases, doing renovations to community-owned buildings as well as government buildings, and they are improvements to lighting or ventilation or things like adding a room within an existing building to be used as an interview room on the circuit.

The Legislature previously voted money for a study to identify these concerns. This is the program to actually build them. It is designed as a winter works for this winter.

I can identify the programs both by community and by the nature of the expenditure. For stove installation or improvements to the stoves, that was scheduled for Pelly Crossing and Ross River at \$8,000 each. Fan installation improvements to the circulation at Pelly Crossing, Haines Junction, Ross River and Teslin for \$3,000 in each of those four communities.

os The washroom installation at Pelly Crossing for \$20,500; for lighting installation in all of Faro, Haines Junction, Mayo, Pelly Crossing, Ross River, Teslin and Watson Lake for \$2,000 each for a total of \$14,000; for improvements in the buildings — that is, to provide for interview rooms — Carcross, \$50,000; Teslin, \$38,000; Watson Lake, \$3,500; Pelly Crossing, \$40,000; Ross River, \$40,400; Carmacks, \$40,000; and Old Crow, \$100,000; and Dawson City, a figure to purchase the furniture. We are talking about the reproductions of the old desks and the furniture — \$110,000; and administration, \$63,000, for a total of \$548,000.

Those were the plans identified at that time. There is concern now about Pelly Crossing. The reason for that is we had identified substantial monies for Pelly to accommodate the court there; however, as Members all know, we later made a decision concerning a new community hall. It was too late to change this estimate at the time. That is presently under review. That is the planned expenditure for the rural court in Yukon.

os **Mr. Phillips:** Could the Minister tell us if, after these additions are built onto the community centres, there will be any O&M costs? What are the anticipated O&M costs, and who will pick up those costs?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There is no O&M at all. The courts are sometimes in government-owned buildings. That is the case in Dawson, Watson Lake, Haines Junction and Mayo. In some other places, they are in community halls. These renovations are essentially a donation to the owner of the community hall. There is no continuing O&M at all. The government pays rent on a daily basis to community halls as a rule.

Mr. Phillips: I am a bit confused. Maybe the Minister could help me out. If we install a new fan and lights in a community hall or if an addition is built on, it has to be heated, lit, and it has to be cleaned. There have to be O&M costs attached to this. Who pays for this?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The buildings are already lighted and heated by the owners of the building. In the case of the government-owned buildings, the government lights and heats them. There is no additional O&M associated with these capital expenditures at all.

Mr. Phillips: If we added a half dozen more lights in these Chambers and turned them on, there would be an added O&M cost. Who is going to pick up the added O&M costs? I am talking about the community centres. Will the community centres foot the bill for the O&M costs for the heat, light and cleaning?

os **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** The present situation is that the government rents the hall for a day, and I believe the figure is approximately \$100 per day. It varies in the various communities. That situation will continue. If we are improving the lights, I would suppose, marginally for that day, the electricity bill may be slightly higher, but the rental fees that we pay should not be any higher.

The concern is that these buildings were not built for court purposes, and it is far cheaper to provide a few renovations for existing buildings than to build a court in every community. That is the concept. The community club will not be going to the expense of providing interview rooms and extra lights and things like that, obviously, so this is the most economical way to achieve a setting suitable for a court. It is an improvement on the facilities welcomed by the owners of the facilities, obviously. There are no private individuals who are receiving any benefit from this program.

Mr. Phillips: I appreciate the fact that we have to improve some of these facilities and they are much needed. The Minister stated that they only use them maybe once a month, or once every two months. Unfortunately if an addition is built onto a building and the heat is turned on, the heat cannot be turned off from that one room for the rest of the month you are not there. That room has to be heated with the rest of the building all the time. When the light switch is turned on, all the lights in the building come on, so there will be added O&M costs.

Is the Minister telling us they did not do any cost analysis at all to determine how much it would cost the community clubs on an annual basis? Has this been okayed by the community clubs themselves? Are they quite pleased with this arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: These arrangements are only done in the non-government-owned buildings on the consent and agreement of the owners of the buildings. They are extremely pleased to get these improvements free of charge to them. It can only occur with their agreement and consent.

os **Mr. Phillips:** With respect to the different areas, could the Minister tell us how far along the improvements are on these projects? Are they complete? Are we just starting them?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: They are not started. I believe they started the planning process and architectural drawings right after Christmas, but there has not been any work actually performed to date.

Mr. Phillips: With respect to the interview rooms that are being built on to some of the community centres — I think the Minister mentioned Carcross, Pelly and Ross River — \$40,000 to \$50,000 for an addition of one room onto a building seems rather high. Could the Minister explain? You could build half a house, in most places in the Yukon, for \$40,000. How big are these rooms we are talking about? Is it a 20 by 40 room or 10 by 12?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The estimates here are only estimates and the architectural drawings are not complete, so it is impossible to say. These are estimates, at this point. After the drawings are made, it will be possible to answer that question specifically. I can provide it after the drawings are made.

Mr. Phillips: Were the architectural contracts tendered or given to one firm? Which firm were they given to?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The facilities assessment was done by Carlberg Jackson, and it was tendered. The normal procedures for tendering will apply on all the drawings and the work.

Mr. Phillips: Is that the CJT report on court facilities that the Minister is talking about? Would the Minister table that report in the House and tell us what the costs of that report were?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will send a copy over to Mr. Phillips immediately. The costs are not identified. They are in some of the cases, but the assessments did not identify the cost specifically. The approvals to proceed and the nature of the improvements must be made first. It is now made and is acquiring the necessary legislative approval. The specific costing will occur then.

os **Mr. Phillips:** Could the Minister tell me how elaborate the planned constructions are for these interview rooms? Does he have that information? He must have some kind of information if he can come up with figures like \$50,000, \$40,000 and \$40,400. They must have an idea of what they are going to build. Could the Minister elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The figures are an estimate. They are strictly an estimate based on the recommendations of the architectural study that I sent over. The drawings are not made, and I can give the Member my assurance that they will not be elaborate. They will be necessary to accommodate the function.

In many cases, an interview room can be actually placed inside the outer walls of an existing structure. In one or two places, it may be necessary to actually build on to a structure, which is the case in Old Crow, I believe. The drawings are not yet made.

Mr. Phillips: I understand that the interview rooms, first of all, have to be soundproof so that the lawyer can speak to his client confidentially. I remember the interview rooms that we had in the old court building, which were not very adequate but were 8 feet by 10 foot rooms in some cases. The new interview rooms in the new court building are not much bigger than that either.

It seems to me, if we are going to build an interview room within the existing wall, that \$40,000 is way out of line. I find it incredible that the Minister responsible for the budget just accepted these figures of \$40,000, \$50,000 and \$40,400 as being fine by him. It scares the death out of me. When we think about it, it does fall into line with the \$180,000 homes that are being built in Stewart. On a square footage basis, I guess it falls into line with that. Does the Minister really believe that it would cost \$40,000 to build one room within an existing building, especially in communities along the highway.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, I do not.

Mr. Phillips: Would the Minister then tell us what he thinks would be a reasonable figure. Are we talking about a room that basically just has to be soundproof within an existing building? It would not have any washroom facilities in it, probably just a desk and a couple of chairs. What does the Minister feel would be reasonable for such a facility?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It makes far more sense to ask the experts. If a drawing comes to me for approval to build a partition in an existing structure, I would expect in the neighbourhood of \$5,000 is right, but I do not know specifically. Those drawings and the discussions with the community hall owners must proceed first.

Mr. Brewster: I find it very strange. We are talking about building a couple of rooms inside another room for \$50,000, \$45,000, yet Yukon Housing and CMHC allows complete homes and they only allow \$53,000 to build those over in Carmacks. Somebody has their wires crossed here somewhere. This does not make sense. Those are complete homes over there they are supposed to build for \$53,000 with electricity in them, with insulation in them, with plumbing in them and septic tanks. You are building a soundproof room in a community hall and you want \$50,000. I just do not understand it.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Let me set the record straight. I am not asking for that money for those purposes. The estimates are made as estimates and the drawings or the specific costing and tendering is not all done. After the tenders come in, the figures are fairly exact. Before that, it is simply an estimate and essentially an approval for the program. The specific drawings are the important things, and we have not proceeded in advance of Christmas. We were waiting for the legislative authority to proceed, so these numbers are simply estimates and the scope of the work may change in any of the cases.

Mr. Phillips: I have not been in the Legislature for very long, but I would think, when a Minister who is responsible for something like this comes into the House with a budget, it is incumbent upon the Minister to come in with responsible estimates. The Minister himself has just stated that he thinks that \$40,000 or \$50,000 is excessive for these types of rooms. Why did he put it in the budget if he thinks it is excessive?

If the Minister put in \$5,000 and had to come back later with a supplementary to justify it, I can see something like that, but why do we not just give the Minister a blank cheque and he can build whatever he wants in the community. That is what he is asking for, \$40,000 to build one room with absolutely no facilities in the room but possibly a light switch and four walls.

Mr. Brewster: I never did get an answer to my question as to why CMHC and Yukon Housing Corporation allows only \$53,000 to build a house with complete roofing, insulation, wiring and plumbing. You are going to build a room inside some other rooms and there is only a difference of \$3,000. I would like an answer as to how you justify that?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The justification is this: we spent \$13 million on a building in Whitehorse. It is two buildings, but \$6 million or \$7 million on the facilities in Whitehorse. That, to me, seemed inequitable at the time. When I was in Opposition, I criticized it. I knew, from past experience, that the severest lack of facilities occurs in the communities. It is a policy of the government to improve the facilities in the rural Yukon. I am not ashamed of that policy at all. In addition, this building can be performed over the winter as a winter works to improve the unemployment situation over the winter. It is an entirely justifiable expenditure to improve the facilities in the rural Yukon.

We had estimated the expenses in the various cases. It is

impossible to be precise about exactly what the building will, in fact, incur because it is necessary to actually do the drawings and consult with the owners, although in the government-owned building, which is more than half of this, it is easier. Those are the estimates that the public servants in the area come up with.

The program here is an entirely sound one. The facilities for courts in the rural communities should be improved very substantially.

Mr. Phillips: I think it should be on the record that we on this side are not opposed to improving court facilities in rural Yukon. What we are questioning here is the accountability of the Minister. The Member for Kluane has raised a good point. The CMHC gives people \$53,000 in a program to build a whole house. You have budgeted \$50,000 in Carcross to build one room; \$40,000 in Pelly to build one room; \$40,400 in Ross River to build one room — not with washroom facilities, nothing else included. This is just for one closed room: four walls and a door and a lightswitch and possibly a desk.

The Minister, himself, expressed that he thought it was excessive, yet he comes in and puts a budget in front of us and expects us to just stamp it. When is this government going to be responsible?

This is incredible that we be spending this much money on these little rooms. I realize we have to improve it, but we do not have to go overboard. We could build pyramids in all the communities, too, and we could make all kinds of make-work for people.

Mr. Brewster: I get a little tired of people saying that we have to build in these communities to help to put people to work. There is no problem. We all agree with that. I get a little sick and tired of the other side saying that we do not want people on the outside working. I happen to live out there, and I do. I do not think there is one community outside of Whitehorse who wants a white elephant in five years, a \$50,000 room.

I do not think that the Minister could go to any community in the Yukon where they would think that is right. If that is the best that we can do in the estimates, to build one room, we had better get someone else to do the estimates because someone is wrong. I am not too smart, but I can build it a lot better than that and a lot cheaper.

Mr. Phelps: We are getting at the issue of these estimates, and it seems to be a major problem. It is a topic that is going to have to be canvassed in some detail as we proceed through the Capital Budget for the next fiscal year. My concern is very simple. Where are these estimates coming from? Just recently we debated a situation in the House about a pumphouse in Carcross where the engineer told the low bidder that the estimate was \$93,000, and he refused it when it was \$108,000. If that estimate was as vague as this one, and I am sure it was, then the engineer in question does not have a leg to stand on.

The problem with us being asked to authorize these kinds of expenditures is that we very quickly wonder about the credibility of the budgets that we are asked to look at. We also wonder about what kind of damage is being done. Is it felt by architectural firms, and by the engineers in the Department of Community Affairs, that there is no problem at the political level with us passing budgets that would seem to be out by a matter of tenfold? Most people could build quite an adequate room in an existing facility for \$4,000 — in fact, a lot less than that.

I am involved in this kind of thing in the private sector, and I am getting bids for changing rooms and so on. If it were \$12,000 for a room, we could say that that was two and a half times as much as is needed, and we might still question it. The cost of \$40,000 for four walls, normally only three unless it is in the centre of an existing building, sounds absolutely ridiculous as does \$180,000 for 900 square feet of housing at Stewart. It just does not wash.

What is the impact? Maybe it is not something that we will get answers to here, but maybe it is something that ought to go to the Public Accounts Committee. What is the impact on the bureaucracy? What is the impact on spending? We are getting these absolute ridiculous quotations. No contractor in the Yukon is going to do anything but either laugh or phone up his banker to say that he is in the chips because these guys are budgeting 10 times what a good room would cost.

This is not something that is a silly kind of concern being raised by my colleagues. This is something that goes to the very heart of how government spends money. It goes to the very nexus of how the bureaucracy views this Legislature and views the manner in which we see how the taxpayers' money is being spent.

13 It is of grave concern to me. Not on a partisan basis. I think we all, as Members of this Legislature, have a duty to look at these things, and those of us who have some experience with the private sector and some idea of what it costs to throw up four walls, however nice, or three walls in an existing structure, or maybe two in a corner, I think we have a duty to question these things. Somebody is pulling the wool over somebody's eyes. I, for one, certainly do not want to go down as agreeing with it, because I feel this is the kind of thing that results in the needless squandering of money. You do not need an architect to design two or three walls for a room. You very seldom need an architect to add on a lean-to structure or a building that is adjoining an existing structure.

I just want to register what I see here as a very grave concern, and it is not the first time. It is not the first time that we have looked at these things and just could not see how they could possibly be justified. I cite the example of the accommodation at Stewart — \$180,000 for a 900 square foot house is absolutely ridiculous. It is certainly not 10 times as much as one ought to think reasonable. In that case it was only 300 or 400 percent over.

I think the Minister ought to address these concerns and tell us whether or not he is going to go back and find out what on earth has been happening, or has the money been spent?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not disagree with that concern as it is expressed in its general sense. It is a concern that I also have, and I am paying particular attention to estimates in exactly that way.

The final accounting for this program will be very interesting, and it is certainly not my intention, and I believe the wrong impression has been circulated here to pay \$40,000 or \$50,000 for an internal addition on an existing building. I understand the concern about these estimates, and I will report at the conclusion of the program as to exactly what was spent where.

14 **Mr. Phelps:** The issue has to be with control on spending. The first issue is this: is the architectural firm going to be paid a percentage of the cost with regard to drawings submitted and accepted by government? Is the fee based, as it usually is, on a percentage of cost, because if you want me to design you a \$180,000, nine hundred square foot building, I can do it. I can do it, believe me. Or do you want a million?

What I want to know is are the architects being paid on the basis of a percentage of the overall cost?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, not generally, but for some of the programs that may be. The total estimate for architectural drawings is \$42,000 of this total program, which comes out of the figure for administration that I previously gave as \$63,000.

Mrs. Firth: I have had a chance to look quickly through the Yukon Territorial Circuit Court Facilities and Architectural Assessment, March 26, 1986, that the Minister passed across the House for us to review. We asked the Minister some questions about some ongoing O&M costs. I see that for Carmacks, the architectural assessment says that they will be requiring a maintenance person. Attached to that will be a maintenance salary. Also for the community of Faro, they mentioned that if either the Union Hall or Legion are used that they will require maintenance staff, and they are saying heat and janitor salary and improvement costs will amount to approximately \$5,000.

I want to ask the Minister again, is the community going to have to pick up the ongoing O&M costs that are attached to the improvements?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. We are not asking for approval for those costs. That is advice to the government in that study. We have absolutely no intention of paying janitors and maintenance people in this area. We do not pay the people now, and we will not be in the future. That is a recommendation that the government do this. We have rejected that recommendation. It is not necessary to hire janitors or maintenance people for the court circuits.

15 **Mrs. Firth:** Maybe we could get down to be nitty-gritty here and find out exactly what the government is going to do.

In this report, there are various solutions proposed. I have not heard the Minister say exactly what these figures represent: \$100,000 in Old Crow; \$40,400 in Ross River, and so on.

The solutions that were presented were solutions A, B and C. They had specific costs attached to them. The solution A talked about trailer units of varying sizes and how standard units come in various sizes and are often available as used units. Prices could vary. They talked about new units being approximately \$20,000 to \$24,000 and setup costs could be \$5,000 to \$6,000.

Solution B talked about renovating existing facilities to provide appropriate court facilities. The costs here could be anywhere from \$3,450 in Watson Lake to approximately \$28,000 in Pelly Crossing.

Solution C was to build a new facility for court, and that it would only apply to Pelly Crossing. They said it would be required to bring it up to a barely acceptable state. The cost of this new facility would be between \$225,000 and \$250,000.

I do not see anywhere in the report where it says what solution the government accepted. What are they going to be doing? Are they going to build new units? Are they going to get trailer units? What do those allotments of money represent?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We are not going to be building any new buildings. We are not going to be buying or installing any trailers. The policy decision is to renovate, or to supply improvements to the existing buildings that are now used in the rural areas.

That information is simply advice to the government. The government has not specifically accepted any of it. Based on that kind of information, we have developed a plan, which I have briefly outlined, as to the communities and the renovations, which includes small items like improved lighting and larger items like additions to buildings.

16 **Mrs. Firth:** If they did this assessment and it was not used, I still do not know what we are building for the \$40,000 and \$50,000. How much did this cost that we did not use? How much was the Yukon Territory Circuit Court Facilities and Architectural Assessment? What is the price tag on this little book?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not know specifically. I will provide that information. It was in the previous year's Capital Budget. I will find out.

Mr. Phelps: When did the Minister realize that \$40,000 or \$50,000 for an interior interview room was far too high, many many times too much? When did he first make that judgment?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: There is not an estimate of \$40,000 or \$50,000 for an interior interview room. That is a misconception that is perpetrated by Members opposite. I have explained the expenditure by community. I have not explained the precise nature of the expenditure because I do not know it. The specific drawings and specific plans are not yet made. These are estimates for what is possible.

Mr. Phelps: Who makes these estimates?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The government.

Mr. Phelps: Which department makes the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: These were made by the Court Services Department on advice or in consultation with Government Services.

Mr. Phelps: Could we be told which communities are supposed to get interior rooms? How much is the cost for each community? We have been provided with the breakdown by community. Could the Minister go through that and tell us which are interior rooms?

17 **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** I will provide that, if it is possible. I do not have that specific information with me.

Mr. Phillips: When the Minister is providing that information, could he give us a very detailed description of what a witness room will involve: what facilities will be in the witness room. As I understand it, there would be a desk and a couple of chairs or a couch and four walls and a door. Is there anything special that would be in that room that would warrant the absolutely excessive cost of these rooms?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will provide what information is available.

Mr. Brewster: If you are going to build an inside room in one of our community clubs — say it is 12 by 14 — you have taken this much space out of our community club. You would probably be

there three times a year. You are going to pay \$100 each — say you are there two days each — that is \$700. The community club has lost all this space, and you mean to say the community clubs agree with situations like that?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have previously said that any improvements to community clubs or community halls would only occur after consultation with those community clubs. Those consultations have not yet occurred. We were waiting for the legislative approval of this program before expending money and proceeding with it.

Mr. Brewster: I do not know why the Minister does not answer the question. You have taken this much space out of a community club, and these community clubs only have so much space for dances and for other activities. You have isolated this for seven to eight days a year. They are getting approximately \$100 each. They may get \$1,000 at the most. They have lost all this space. If this is an inside room, they have taken it right out of your place. Does the Minister think that is practical?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: If the community club does not agree — if they do not want the improvements — we will not do them.

Mr. Brewster: Pretty soon, I will not be able to go to an outfitter's ball anymore, because I will have to jump around a court hearing room. Maybe that is where I should be, inside getting the drinks. I cannot see how we are improving the community club, when we take off all this floor space from the community club. I do not see what the community club is gaining on this. I must live in a different world. I cannot see where this was ever dreamed up.

Mr. Lang: I just wanted to get it clearly on the record. Did the Minister say that we paid an architect \$48,000, or are prepared to pay an architect \$48,000, to design these rooms or structures with respect to the outline that he gave us for the dollars involved?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, the estimate for architectural drawings to do all of the work, which will include the lighting and fan installation, and all of those things, in total, all of the projects, is \$42,000. We have not expended that money.

Deputy Chairman: Is it the Committee's wish to take a break at this time?

Some Members: Yes.

Deputy Chairman: The Committee will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: I will now call the Committee back to order. We will continue with Justice, general debate.

Mr. Lang: I have just had a chance to look at this report, and I do not understand what is going on here. We had a thorough examination by what I would deem to be technical expertise that obviously the government had some faith in and obviously paid good money to have the report done. I am led to believe that there was \$100,000 spent, or projected to be spent, in Old Crow, for the purpose of the court there. Is my figure wrong? How much is being spent in Old Crow for the improvements?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The estimate in Old Crow is \$100,000, which is an improvement on the building that court is held in. I will provide more detailed information about exactly what improvements are planned and estimated for these major expenditures here — Carcross, Carmacks and Old Crow specifically.

Mr. Lang: I find it rather surprising that the government has chosen to allocate \$100,000 for such a project when we have a report that states as follows in general description, "Court is held in the Indian Band Hall, which is a nice octagonal-shaped log facility, however, the hard surfaces do create acoustical problems, areas available for the judge to retire and there is some space for lawyer interview." Then it goes on about accommodations being non-existent and should be looked into. That is a separate facet for people to reside in, I would imagine.

There are three sittings a year of three days each for a total of nine days. The architectural assessment says that the acoustical problem, because of hard finish and noisy furniture, and expects a sound system to be of help. There would be no improvement cost involved.

Electrical assessment says that lighting is acceptable and there would be no improvement cost involved.

Mechanical assessment says that HVHC is acceptable; however, furnace is noisy and the hall is also drafty. There would be no improvement cost involved.

Today we have the Minister standing up saying they are going to spend \$100,000. Could the Minister explain to me what other report he had to warrant the \$100,000 expenditure in view of what obviously was a technical assessment asked for by the government and paid for by the government within six months of making this decision?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes. I have already answered that I will provide details of the projected work and the way that estimate was made.

Mr. Lang: The terms of reference for this report were pretty clear. It was brought to the government's attention. It is surprising that we did not get a copy of it until today, in view of the fact that it was completed quite some time ago.

In order to make the decisions that the government has made, do they have other reports or assessments done to refute what this particular report contains?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I will provide the scope of the work and the estimate on those specific amounts.

Mr. Lang: What is the justification for what you are planning in the community of Old Crow? Is it just strictly for make-work and that is a good way to spend the money? What justifications do we have?

The government sets the business here. We came here to debate the Budget, fully prepared to pass it very expeditiously, and all these things started to surface that we have a responsibility to question. As an experienced Member of the House, it appears to me that the more we analyze these dollars — and I know that we get some sarcasm from the side opposite that we are filibustering and holding up the House and not passing things as expeditiously as we should — to follow up on the observation that the Leader of the Official Opposition made about who prepares these estimates and brings them forward in the manner that they are brought forward. I have heard the Minister give us a lot of double talk, but he is really unprepared this time.

We have either two things happening here. We either have a civil service that is out of control and given a bunch of figures and nobody has cross-examined them in the process of preparing the budget, which is one option. The other option is that they have intentionally brought inflated prices here, thinking that all Members of the House would sit back quietly and pass them, with no regard to the taxpayers' dollars and not taking our responsibilities as Members seriously. Since they are inflated prices, they would be able to come back with lapsed funds at the end of the year.

If that option is being accepted, two things are happening. It means that the public is being told that there is X amount of dollars for the purpose of municipal, community and territorial works, knowing full well that there is going to be lapsed funds of \$10 million or \$20 million in a budget of \$90 million or \$100 million. At the end of the year, you come forward and say that you saved all this money.

If that scenario is correct, the tragedy of this is that we have a bureaucracy that the political level has no control over. They can do anything they want with the dollar amounts that they have been allocated. That is dangerous.

I have all the faith in the world in the civil service of the territory. I think we have a very good civil service. On the other hand, no Member in this House has the right, nor does he or she have the liberty to give a blank cheque. The revelations that we have heard in the last three hours with respect to just going through this particular portion of the Budget, which I thought we would get through in the space of a day or half a day, have been startling.

In the space of three hours of examination we have found out that there was \$100,000 of taxpayers' money allocated at arm's length to a company that did not tender out the project. That is contrary to all of the discussions that we have had in this House on the allocation of monies. We proceed a little further and find out that we are building rooms for \$40,000 a crack.

The Members are asking what the problem is, that we should not be questioning this. I recognize that we cannot vote down the budget, but we do have a responsibility to expose what is deemed to be financial mismanagement. The government is saying that the reason this money was allocated was to provide jobs in the rural community and if we disagree with it, we are opposed to jobs in the rural communities. That is misleading, devious and it takes away from the examination of the financial responsibilities of the government.

In view of the fact that the Minister does not have the information that is required to deal with this area, we should set it aside, let the Minister get prepared and deal with it tomorrow in Committee.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have no objection to that.

Chairman: Is it agreed that the Department of Justice be stood over?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Department of Justice stood over

On Department of Renewable Resources

Chairman: Vote No. 14, Renewable Resource. Details are on page 17, general debate.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The budget that we have here concerns the Parks Systems Plan Inventory; the Heritage Rivers Systems Plan, which was debated at length the last time we debated the budget; the Dalton Post Construction; COPE, we have already dealt with the implementation of the COPE Agreement under the O&M section. This is the provision of the capital funding to purchase necessary equipment, do some renovations of buildings on the island, costs for travel related to the expenditure capital. The Bison Compound Capture Facility where we are looking at constructing a capture facility at the site in the Nisling River area to do the necessary work in terms of taking samples from the animals, which would be done with local labour and material. I am prepared to go through the line items and respond to specific questions.

Mr. Brewster: I really have no general debate. Maybe if we could just go line item by line item.

Mr. Lang: I have a question on parks and where the Yukon is going and exactly what the policy position of the government is. It has to do with the question of international biological parks. Has the government been approached about identifying or designating international biological parks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Recently there has been no specific activity. I am not aware that we have declared any sites under that particular program. I remember there was a site identified on the Dempster, and, of course, Kluane has been a site identified previously. So, in terms of whether or not recently we have set aside any particular area under the international program, I am not aware of any.

Mr. Lang: I did not ask if you had set any aside. My question was whether the government had taken a policy decision of whether or not there should be any more international biological parks per se, and I do not believe there have been any identified in the Yukon, nor set aside. I am going on memory.

Some years ago, the Government of the Yukon Territory was approached because it is a requirement to have either the provincial or the territorial governments' concurrence in matters of this kind. The then territorial government took the position that they did not need another federal presence in the territory, and, therefore, we felt that if we wanted to designate a park, the territorial government would do it, but we did not need the international or national organizations that always attempt to get a good piece of your real estate without being land owners.

Has the government taken a policy position whether or not international biological parks would be, or should be, designated in the Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is correct inasmuch as there have been no sites allocated as such, including Kluane. There have been sites identified in the Yukon for potential designation. We have not acted on any of the proposed sites.

Mr. Lang: I do not want to belabour this, but I want to ask the Minister this: I know there have been people in Ottawa and Ontario and wherever, who, when they have nothing to do with their time, play with the map of the Yukon Territory and designate areas for

what they would like to play in. Quite frankly, I am opposed to it. The government of the day was opposed to it and made it very clear they could designate and try to picture these little marks all over the map on their behalf, but we were not going to have any part of it. Is that policy being maintained?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It would be safe to say that because of inaction on this particular question, the status quo remains. I have never raised the issue myself, personally. No one in the department has ever approached me to move this along in a policy level, or to ask Cabinet to make a policy decision on it.

The correct answer is that, because we have not pursued this, the position of the government has not changed from the previous government.

Mr. Brewster: I feel I should bring this up before we go into line-by-line item. Could the Minister tell me what status the Kluane Game Sanctuary and the McArthur Game Sanctuary are now, and what status they will be in?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Kluane Game Sanctuary still remains a sanctuary. There has not been any agreement internally with the government to change its future designation. My understanding is that the Bands in Champagne/Aishihik and in the Kluane Tribal Brotherhood have stated that they want to discuss the issue at the land claims table. I am sure, as they move along to the individual Band negotiations, that it probably will be discussed at the land claims table. As to whether or not its designation will change, I cannot predict that question.

Mr. Brewster: You did not mention the McArthur Game Sanctuary.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The McArthur Game Sanctuary is still designated as a game sanctuary. In all probability, the Mayo Band will want to have something to say about its future. In the past, they have had some ideas on McArthur Game Sanctuary and development there.

Chairman: Any further general debate?

On Parks System Plan Inventory

Hon. Mr. Porter: Under the Parks legislation, we do have the ability to create parks. The kinds of parks are laid out in legislation. The public consultation process is contained in section 10 of that Act. We developed internally in the department a desire to go out and look at a specific area of the park development. We develop a plan by consultation of the public, then we move to adopt the plan once we have reached the necessary consultation level.

With the expenditure of these dollars, we are planning to begin an inventory program. The inventory program will have three features to it. The first is a natural features inventory, which would identify unique or representative landscape features. The second part would be a recreational features inventory, which would identify specific areas of the Yukon that would be suitable to various recreational activities.

The third would be a bio-physical inventory that identifies and describes the habitat regarding the biology and the physical outlay of the specific spot. Some examples under the natural features inventory is identification throughout the Yukon of rare plant life. We talked about the Coal River Springs as a unique area in the Yukon, and in Canada, in terms of plant life.

Included in the inventory will be rivers, mountains, geothermal or coolsprings, caves, waterfalls and volcanic features such as glacial features. In the recreational inventory, we would be looking at sites that would be good for hiking trails, skiing trails and other areas like tobogganing, campground development, kayaking and all of the activities that many of the people in the Yukon enjoy.

We hope, through this process, in our parks development system, to develop a general inventory of the Yukon in terms of its unique features and also the potential recreational site development. We would like to have this available so that when there is a need for some development for recreational trails, for example, that information will already be catalogued.

Mr. Brewster: I agree with parks planning. I have been in the government for four years, and I have been here a long time. Every year we start out with another parks plan. I would think that by now we would have a system that was going. The Minister talks about

the Coal River Springs. If they are not planned now, I do not know what we are going to do. We have been spending hundreds of thousands of dollars there. If we do not have a plan, why have we been spending all this money for?

We keep going back to planning over and over. Every time a new person comes into that department, we start planning again. How many person years are in this planning system?

25 Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member stated that we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the Coal River Springs. We did spend some money, but I do not have a specific amount as to how much we spent on Coal River.

When I came to office, the original management plan would have led us to a great deal more expenditure. I asked for an estimate as to what the cost would be to construct a road into the area to give access to the people of Yukon and the residents of Watson Lake, and the tourists. I got a reply that it would be a couple of million dollars to bring a road access to Coal River Springs.

As a result of that information, I asked the department to hold off on any further development. Since that time we have realigned our thinking on Coal River. The original park concept was 33 square miles, and we have agreed to shrink the area of the park, and we will not be building a road into the Coal River Springs. The planning for the project has been cut back severely.

We are planning to build a trail system. There is a series of lakes as you move to Coal River that are nicely laid out in a valley so that if somebody wanted to pack their canoe for a couple of miles after every lake, they could do that. We are going to build a hiking system to allow portaging throughout the lakes. The last one is going to be three kilometres to get to the river. Once you get to the river you still have to cross it to get to the site.

It is going to be a very difficult site to gain access to, but if somebody really wanted to see it, it could be possible.

We are, of course, going to move to protect the Coal River Springs. We are going to do minimal development. We are going to construct a skid pad for choppers to come down and build walkways around it so people do not end up walking in the area.

Last summer the department put in a wooden culvert to drain the dam from the busy beavers there. As a matter of fact, when I was at the site, we had to take some of the logs that the beaver had jammed up against the culvert. The water is flowing again, the culvert system is working, the pools are receiving the water.

That is an update on Coal River. It is not here, but it was mentioned.

The second part of the question was how many planners are in the parks planning staff. At the present time we have three planners in parks planning staff.

26 Mr. Brewster: I have a little problem. Here we are creating another Kluane Park for only those who can afford a \$250 an hour or \$500 an hour helicopter to get it. Tourists who spend all the money up and down the highway cannot go in because they cannot possibly afford it by the time they get up here.

I also have a problem with the \$2 million for a road. I recall seeing those plans when I was there. There was a mining road that went within a very short distance. There was a big spat to try and get that out of there, which I agree with and had no problems with. That road was passable because they were going by there to mine. It should not have been \$2 million to fix that road up so people could get in there.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the Sulpetro Road that was initiated by mining interests, the road was in very bad shape last year when I went in. The latter part of it is not passable. It has not been used for quite some time, and was in a very deteriorated state. You needed a good four-by-four with a good 8,000 pound winch to get in and out of there.

When we talk about road construction, we do have a standard of road. The Member for Porter Creek East would be quite familiar with that. The reason the previous government did look at development of this area as a park was because the initial costs were low. When we asked for the cost estimate, the amount was \$2 million. For \$2 million, I was not going to continue with the park concept.

27 Mr. Lang: I rise to the bait on this one — \$2 million. No one

in this House is asking for the Trans Canada Highway. There was no intention of the previous government, nor this government, to request that. The Minister talked about standards. We asked about standards in this House, and the Minister of Community and Transportation Services indicated that, by policy, there are four or five different standards under the program of Roads to Resources. That is perhaps one to look at.

I submit that the only people who would get to see Coal River Springs are either going to have to be on unemployment insurance, welfare or both. It sounds as if a person will need three weeks to get in there. If a person is over 65, they will not be able to make it on these so-called designated trails. If that is the case, if only 10 people are going to visit this area in one year, I recommend that we spend no money and leave it the way it is. We are going to have those types of individuals visiting, and we will have the civil service. A pad will be needed for the chopper to fly in.

It seems as if we have defeated the whole purpose. The management plan was to make a unique feature in the Yukon available to people of the territory as well as visitors. I appreciate the Minister's intent when he talks about these trails for portaging that move from lake to lake. I can guarantee, and I think it is representative of the Yukon — God bless the Yukon — that there will not be one person in this room who will make that trip in the next 10 years. Perhaps that money could be spent elsewhere.

Has the \$53,000 for the Inventory Study been spent?

28 Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the Member lamenting the fact that nobody goes into Coal River. I will go this summer if he agrees to come along with me, and we will do the trip together.

With respect to the question of the dollar allocation, it would be our position that, if at all possible, we open access to the particular parks so that people can view them. If it is going to cost a lot of money, then the situation is that it is not good management to spend the kind of money that is being asked for, in this instance. We would not realize, in my estimation, any real immediate returns. There is no question that the site is of such significance that it has to be protected. It is rated number four of the 119 springs identified in Canada. Having been to the site, I think we have a real obligation to set that site aside and do what we can to ensure that people are going to go to it. It is known. It is on calendars. You see it all over. It is being promoted as a unique site in Canada. Eventually, people are going to go out to the site.

It is our responsibility to protect that part of the Yukon's heritage, and to limit access and control the site and make sure that people do not damage the site.

With respect to the specific question as to how much of the \$53,000 has been spent, my understanding is that there has been a contract awarded for \$36,840.

29 Mr. Lang: To whom?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Paish and Associates.

Mr. Lang: Was that put out for tender and proposals?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Mr. Lang: Why are we spending \$36,000 for a consultant firm to do a study when we have three park planners on staff?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The situation is that the people we have employed in parks are not able, with the workload they are currently involved in, to do studies of this nature. So that is why we have to seek the necessary expertise.

Mr. Lang: What other parks are the parks planners planning, over and above what we already have?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The most immediate park is Herschel Island. As the Member is aware, we will not have any funding from the Government of Canada until we have struck an agreement with the federal government and we have \$250 allocated for capital for that park, so we have been utilizing our own personnel and monies to be able to continue with the discussions on Herschel Island and the park planning that is related there.

As well, a large part of their time is taken up with campground planning throughout the Yukon. We have a large network of campgrounds. There was work related to the trails, natural features and the planning sites. For example, the Snafu/Tarfu area. In terms of that particular area, discussion centered around whether or not we should continue to upgrade the campground services there or

reconstruct a new campground.

Mr. Lang: Last year, during the Budget Debate, we were informed by the government that they were not planning any more quotations for campgrounds. Maybe there would be an expansion to one or two, but it would be limited except for the Dempster Highway. That has been done. I do not understand why we have three parks planners on staff. Some time is being given to Herschel Island, the Snafu/Tarfu area, and that is taking all of their time.

It seems that we are almost allocating dollars just for the sake of allocating them, when we have consultant's fees for \$36,000 to do an inventory of our parks. Could the Minister be more specific on which campgrounds he is talking about? Are we looking at new campgrounds and, if so, where? Have plans been developed over the past year? Or, are we looking at expansion for any of the existing campgrounds?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, we are not looking at constructing any new campgrounds. For example, regarding Tarfu/Snafu, the discussions involved doing rehabilitation work on that campground. There is a dust problem, although I have never personally been to the site. Specific recommendations, however, have come back that the campground is run down, the site is dusty and that there could be a better location.

Another area that I am aware of is the campground at Fish Eye Lake by Faro. That is one of the sites designated for major rehabilitation. Another is at Big Creek on the way to Watson Lake south of Teslin. That is a major campground, one of the busiest in the entire Yukon. They have some problems there because of all the activity of the tourists, the overburden that is there has been virtually destroyed and stripped down to the clay on the bank. There are some serious problems of potential erosion of the bank, and once we get into that situation there may be some problems where tourists may be having a meal and are suddenly in the creek.

There are a number of places, and we will continue this discussion tomorrow. I recognize the time. I ask that the Chairman report progress on Bill No. 18.

Motion agreed to

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

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

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

Chairman: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 18, *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1986/87*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare that the report has carried.

May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government Leader that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The following Legislative Returns were tabled January 26, 1987:

87-3-32

Child insurance for school children; Oral, Hansard, p. 448 (McDonald)

87-3-33

Department of Education Cultural Awareness Program; Oral, Hansard, p. 377 (McDonald)

87-3-34

Young offenders to Willingdon/B.C./Alberta; Oral, Hansard (Blues), p. 475 (Joe)

87-3-35

Inclusion of drugs for AIDS patients; Oral, Hansard (Blues), p. 475 (Joe)

87-3-36

Overhead or administrative costs of Federal Chronic Disease Program; Oral, Hansard (Blues), p. 474 (Joe)

87-3-37

Homecare Program; Oral, Hansard (Blues), p. 476 (Joe)

The following Sessional paper was tabled January 26, 1987:

87-3-99

RCMP in Destruction Bay/Burwash area (Response to Petition No. 6 which did not conform to the rules and was ordered "not received.") (Kimmerly)

