



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 66

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, January 27, 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 Kimmery	Whitehorse South Centre	Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.
Hon. Piers McDonald	Mayo	Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassi	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

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 Foltwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Hansard Administrator	Dave Robertson

01 Whitehorse, Yukon

Tuesday, January 27, 1987 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: I will now call the House to order. At this time, we will proceed with Prayers.

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper. Introduction of Visitors?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: On a question of privilege I would like to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that two Members of the House are enjoying birthdays today: the Member for Riverdale South and the Member for Whitehorse South Centre. They may be joined in this respect only, but I am sure we wish them both many happy returns.

Speaker: Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling? Are there any Reports of Committees? Are there any Petitions?

02 Introduction of Bills?

Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion?
Ministerial Statements?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Empty Liquor Bottle Return System**

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is my privilege today to be able to announce that I have been advised by the Yukon Liquor Board that the Liquor Corporation will implement an "Empty Liquor Bottle Return System" as of April 1st of this year.

The refund system will reduce bottle litter in the Yukon. The \$.25 per bottle refund will provide an incentive for the public to return their liquor and wine bottles rather than litter. This program is an extension of the existing beer bottle return system that has a 94 percent return rate.

As you know, the City of Whitehorse and some municipalities have requested a liquor bottle refund system to control litter throughout the Yukon. The system also complies with a recent recommendation made by the Legislative Assembly's Select Committee on Renewable Resources.

Litter in a beautiful wilderness area such as the Yukon is a deplorable eyesore. Tourists perceive the Yukon as scenic and pristine, a perception that can quickly be destroyed by the sight of litter. I believe this refund system will provide some incentive to help clean up the problem.

03 Mr. Brewster: I am very pleased to see that the government has already started taking the recommendations of the Select Committee. That is a start. I imagine there are a lot of other recommendations that we would like to have adopted. Our recommendation was that a \$.20 deposit on wine and liquor bottles should be introduced, but the government has raised it by a nickel. We have no problems with that.

I would also, while I am on my feet, suggest that the other recommendation of the Select Committee on litter was that the Government of Yukon should launch an educational program promoting a litter-free environment. I would hope that that is the next of many, many recommendations that are accepted by the government.

Mr. McLachlan: I would like to commend the Minister for his announcement today. I believe it is long overdue and should go a long way toward giving a general brighter and cleaner appearance to the territory. Nobody wants the mess we are left with, and I know that the campgrounds are often quite a mess to behold.

I am wondering if the Minister can advise of the projections that

the department made as to what this program might cost the territory.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The cost is essentially in the increased labour in collecting the bottles. It is not proposed to crush the bottles unless that becomes an economically feasible or attractive program in the future. The total cost will be less than \$100,000.

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

QUESTION PERIOD**Question re: Land leases**

Mr. Phelps: I would like to commence with a follow-up question from yesterday with respect to federal commercial leases. Does the appropriate Minister have an answer with respect to the price at which commercial leases would be sold to existing lease holders? I am talking about the federal ones that might be transferred. I am asking that today because of my motion tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As the Members will remember, the agreement that was struck between the federal government and the Yukon government with respect to the sale of the recreation leases incorporated a sale price, which recovered development costs. That sale price was fixed at 29 percent of the entire package.

The sale price for commercial leases will also reflect development costs. That is the general policy of the government and has been the general policy of the government. There is no intimation that we would try to profiteer by selling for market value. We would sell it for development cost.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Minister advise when there will be a firm policy about pricing, so that people in the Yukon can start making up their minds whether they want to try to purchase their commercial leases?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There already is a policy that was developed this last spring called the Affordable Lands Policy. That policy did incorporate a number of classes of lands. What we are developing now is a policy that will incorporate all classes of land to regularize them, including all the various classifications, including lot enlargements, squatter-homesteader properties, et cetera, to ensure that there are no contradictions.

With respect to the sale of commercial lands, the policy would be that we would recover any development costs, which might be accrued as a result of the transfer and the subsequent disposition. That is the policy. It would depend on the character of the existing lot and what development work was done in terms of surveys, et cetera, which were done subsequent to the transfer. That is what we will recover, as a government.

05 Question re: Yukon Development Corporation

Mr. Phelps: Can the Government Leader tell me if the Yukon Development Corporation has taken over responsibility for operating the Watson Lake Forest Products, or is the government, through the Economic Development Branch, operating it?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. The Yukon Development Corporation Board was in Watson Lake on December 16, the day after the tenders closed for the logging, and make a decision with respect to two of the leases that were put out for tender. I believe they have advised the people who submitted tenders of the results.

Mr. Phelps: I take it then that in the government's mind the responsibility belongs to the Yukon Development Corporation. Do the contract directives apply to tendering processes for the Yukon Development Corporation in matters such as this?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Yukon Development Corporation was given by Management Board exemptions from contract directives under the *Financial Administration Act* so that the Development Corporation could operate in a business-like manner and, for example, not have to tender every sale of its products, which it would have been required to do under the *Financial Administration Act*.

These are similar to the exemptions that other Crown Corporations, such as the Liquor and the Housing Corporations, have had

given them by previous governments. It is our view that the YDC, in terms of its business operations, should be governed by the Board of Directors, and they should make their decisions in a commercial environment.

Mr. Phelps: It is interesting. I am wondering whether the Government Leader is in a position to table whatever documentation he deems to bring that corporation out from under the contracts directive. I am speaking particularly of Clause 4(6), which reads, "This directive shall be construed solely as a directive to employees of the government, the purpose of which is to instruct them in the scope of their authority with respect of the content of contracts and the procedures for making and administering contracts, including any contracts for work or service performed on behalf of any corporation or agency of the government."

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In answer to the question, not the specific quotation, I would be quite happy to provide the Member opposite, and the House, with a report on the decisions made by Management Board with respect to the operations of this corporation. I hope the Member will understand that I cannot cite chapter and verse of the exemptions and the particular clauses on my feet, but I will undertake to come back with that information.

Question re: Northern Canada Power Commission

Mr. McLachlan: I have a question for the Minister of Government Services or the Government Leader.

Over the past month-and-a-half the government has remained silent on the efforts to take over the assets of the Northern Canada Power Commission. One of the street rumours is that the deal is essentially completed and the government is already in the final stages of paperwork. Can the Government Leader confirm that it is a fait accompli and the government is only dotting the i's and crossing the t's at this moment?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As the Member opposite may know, dotting i's and crossing t's can be quite a controversial matter sometimes. I think all I can probably say at this point is that we hope to be making an announcement very, very soon.

Mr. McLachlan: Is there a particular deadline that the government is working toward? Can we expect it within the next week or two weeks, or are we talking March 1st?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The transfer of the assets has to be completed, in our view, by March 31st. If you work backwards from that deadline, an Act of the federal Parliament would be required, which is no small undertaking, and a number of administrative and legal matters would have to be sorted out. Therefore, there is some urgency and some considerable pressure on both parties to conclude the negotiations.

Mr. McLachlan: With respect to the devolvement of the particular union employees in the Northern Canada Power Commission into the Yukon Government Employees Union, can the Minister advise if those particular job classifications out of the Public Service Alliance of Canada will be re-evaluated by the PSC when these particular employees are transferred over to YTG authority?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, not exactly. I understand that the Yukon-based employees we are talking about, who will be given job security, will become employees of the manager of the asset. Their union and their representatives have been involved in discussions with the prospective employer to satisfy themselves that all the benefits that they now receive in their present positions will be maintained in their new positions. That has been our position from the beginning. I have had no reason to have any concern on that score throughout the negotiations.

Question re: Tendering procedures

Mr. Lang: I would like to follow up on a comment that was made by the Government Leader earlier with respect to the questions of exemptions for the purposes of following tendering procedures for the corporations of the government. He referred specifically to the Liquor Corporation and the Housing Corporation. Would the Minister be prepared to table the specific exemptions that he referred to with respect to making these corporations exempt from following the public tendering procedure?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The example I gave was with respect to the selling of their products. There are very strict rules that govern us if we were to sell the assets of the government. There are committees and Management Board. Before the Liquor Corporation sell their product, they do not have to go through that procedure. It would be ludicrous if they did. That was the example I was giving.

In answer to the specific question about information about the exemptions that these corporations and the Development Corporation have been provided, I have already indicated to the Leader of the Official Opposition that I will come back to the House with that information.

Mr. Lang: There is a great cause of concern on this side of the House with respect to the comments made thus far. There has been an obvious deviation in policy with respect to the requirement for the public tendering of public projects with respect to all facets of government.

When the Minister brings that information, could he also identify which particular section of the regulations and policy directives permits any government to exempt any corporation or commission or government department from following, in general, the policy directives that are now in place?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Three points were contained in the Member's preamble and his question, one of them about a deviation from previous policy, which I do not think is grounded.

Secondly, I think the answer to the question of where the authority is contained is in the *Financial Administration Act*.

Thirdly, I will again say that I will come back to the House with the information requested by the Members.

Question re: Watson Lake Timber Products, timber contracts

Mr. Phillips: I have a question to the Government Leader regarding the recent award of the timber contracts in the Watson Lake area. Can the Government Leader explain why K. Peters Contracting Limited, the low bidder of the timber cutting contracts awarded by the Government of the Yukon for the Watson Lake Forest Products Mill, was not awarded the contract, and why the contractor was not extended at least the courtesy of an interview to explain why his bids were unacceptable?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The block two contract, which I understand is the subject of the Member's question, was awarded to the North Contracting Company, the principal of which is Mr. Roger Reems of Watson Lake, who I understand is an experienced and respected operator in that area. I do not know all the detailed considerations that went into the Board's decision, but I am advised that their decision was based not only on the bid price but their confidence in the bidder's capacity to deliver, and the initial and spin-off benefits to the community, and on the advice they received from the Watson Lake Community Advisory Group, which we established — I believe I have described it previously in the House — with whom the Board met before they made their decision. Beyond that I cannot replicate for the Member — and do not have the means to — the nature of the discussion inside the Board.

Mr. Phillips: The Member mentioned that the company in question that received the contract was a resident of Watson Lake. I can tell the Government Leader that the other party has been in Watson Lake for over 20 years and is a family business in Watson Lake and also is a very reputable businessman, and has done work for the Yukon Government.

Can the Government Leader tell me why he was not afforded the courtesy of even a phone call — there is a \$34,000 difference in the bids — as to why his bid was unacceptable?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I apologize to the Member. I do not dispute any of the assertions he made about the gentleman in question. As to the reasons why he did or did not receive a phone call, or notice of information, or advice about the result of the tender, I do not know, but I will ask how he was advised or informed, and whether the method used was at variance with normal business practices in such cases.

Mr. Phillips: In a telephone conversation yesterday between K. Peters Contracting Ltd. and the Deputy Minister of Economic Development, Shakir Alwarid, Mr. Alwarid told Mr. Peters that he

was not awarded the timber contracts because his company was not qualified. Yet, later in the same conversation, the Deputy Minister said that this contractor could stand a good chance of getting some other contracts that would be let in about three weeks time.

Can the Government Leader explain to the House, and this contractor in particular — and other contractors — why he will be qualified three weeks from now when he is not qualified now?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I think it would be unwise of me to comment on a third-hand report on a telephone conversation without having heard from my Deputy Minister his version of the conversation. I will take the question that the Member has put as notice. Let me make it quite clear, however, that I do not intend to second guess or overturn or even revisit the decisions of the Board, but I will provide the information that the Member has requested.

Question re: Watson Lake Forest Products, timber contracts

Mr. Phillips: In the same conversation yesterday with the Deputy Minister of Economic Development, the contractor was advised that as soon as there is a private manager involved with Watson Lake Forest Products, there will no longer be a need to go to public tender. Is it going to be the policy of the government that it will not publicly tender any of the work of the Yukon Development Corporation? For example, NCPC right now is a Crown Federal Corporation, which has public tender procedures: will this government be deviating from that?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am afraid I will have to take the question as notice. The Member puts the question, as is his right, in its most provocative manner. I have already indicated that I will be providing information to the House about the policy direction and the specific guidelines that we will be giving to the Corporation. Beyond that, the Corporation will be establishing for itself, as the Liquor Corporation does, some rules, procedures and methods of operation.

I can only hope and presume that they will be businesslike, proper and fair in the conduct of their business. Whether or not they will be tendering every purchase, I do not know. I also do not know all the considerations that may go into making that decision.

Mr. Phillips: As a result of the conversation yesterday with the Deputy Minister of Economic Development and all of the initiatives that the Deputy Minister is taking, can the Government Leader tell us who is presently running the Watson Lake Forest Products? Is it Shakir Alwarid of the Yukon government or the Yukon Development Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Yukon Development Corporation is running the company and is in the process of retaining private sector management. Mr. Alwarid, as Members will know, is a Member of the Board. He is very capable and a very hard working public servant in this government. Until such time as we have the staff and the management to be able to assist the Board in the conduct of its business, the burden of this work will inevitably fall to the small staff that we have available to assist them.

Question re: Watson Lake Forest Products, timber contracts

Mr. Lang: This does cause concern. My understanding is that those contracts were advertised under the auspices of the Government of Yukon. With that understanding in mind, I would like to point out to the Government Leader under Tendering, General, 26(4), "the contracting authority after discussion with the contractor concerned may recommend to Management Board bypassing a tender for reason of unavailability of the necessary equipment to undertake the work, previous poor performance record with the government or the applicaiton of any northern preference for local hire policy of the government". Did Management Board make the decision to bypass the low tender respecting to awarding the timber leases in the Watson Lake area?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As I previously said, Management Board made a decision to provide the Development Corporation with certain authorities, including exempting them from some provisions of the contracts directives.

As I previously explained in this House, we were under a great deal of time pressure if we were to do something to get that mill working and get people working in Watson Lake this year. That is

why we took the initiative of putting out the tenders very quickly. That is why we appointed the board and proclaimed the Act and commissioned the board as soon as we could, so that they could make the decisions about the award of those contracts and, subsequently, make the decisions they will be making about the manager, or the management company, for that operation.

We did this out of consideration for the needs of the community of Watson Lake. If we went through the normal kind of government procedures, we would have taken a much longer period of time to get things operating there. We wanted to get the mill under the authority of the Development Corporation as quickly as possible and get people in Watson Lake working as quickly as possible. That has been the need that has determined our decisions.

Mr. Lang: We are talking about justice; we are talking about fairness; we are talking about a reputable contractor from Watson Lake, raised in Watson Lake, who put a tender in in the time constraints that were issued by the government — I agree that time was of the essence — who was \$40,000 lower in price, and he was not awarded the contract.

If the lowest tender is not to be accepted, it is the Cabinet and Management Board of the day that is going to make that decision. Why would the Government Leader and the Cabinet give any corporation the decision to bypass the lowest tender when it is very clear and very specific in the policy directives that that authority lies with the politician?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In the case of the Development Corporation, that authority does not lie with the politician. Those decisions are, and will be, the responsibility of the Development Corporation Board. The tenders we are talking about, as do all tenders, make it very clear that the lowest bid is not necessarily accepted. I previously said that I am advised by the board that the consideration of the matter is based on a number of factors, not only including bid price, but the confidence in the bidder's capacity to deliver, the spinoff benefits, the initial benefits to the community and the advice of the Watson Lake Community Advisory Committee.

The board has made its decision in good conscience. I can only respect their decision.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation, Elsa house

Mr. Lang: This is a new question and has to do with contracts as well. It seems that the Legislature spends quite a bit of time involved in the question of contracts and how they are administered, which really brings into question what the government is doing.

I have a question to the Minister of Government Services with respect to the \$100,000 teacherage project in Elsa that was just completed, were the contract policy directives of the government followed to ensure that all Yukon contractors got the opportunity to bid on this particular project?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: As is obvious, that project was undertaken by the Yukon Housing Corporation and was not undertaken by the Department of Government Services, as the Member opposite well knows. It is not within my Ministry.

Mr. Lang: Perhaps the Minister of Government Services could explain to the House why the \$100,000 teacherage that was built in Elsa was not publicly tendered so that all Yukoners, contractors and the public had a fair opportunity to bid on the project?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: That question was asked yesterday in the House and was answered by the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation. As the time of Question Period is used to repeat the question, I will also repeat the answer as I heard it.

There was a very substantial time pressure in order to use and occupy that house by a teacher stationed in Elsa before the winter. The Yukon Housing Corporation accomplished that within the timeframe. As the Minister explained yesterday, the way they accomplished that was to purchase a house from the mine.

Mr. Lang: As the Minister knows, the money for that project was voted a year ago last November. The reason for voting it at that time was to give time to get the design and to tender the project. Was this project taken to Management Board of Cabinet for a decision to proceed since the contract directives were bypassed?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I do not accept the assertion in the

preamble to the question at all. The situation is that the Department of Government Services did not administer this transaction nor did they apply to Management Board or Cabinet in any way. That is obvious, as we were not administering this project.

12

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation, Elsa house

Mr. Lang: I guess this is to the Minister of the Housing Corporation, did the Minister approve this method of building the structure, and did he take it to Management Board to ensure that the policy directives were not going to be utilized for such a project?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I was informed, some time in the fall of this year, that the Housing Corporation Board had decided to proceed to acquire a unit in Elsa and, as it was their decision to make, of course, I did not take it to Management Board. I believe it was their responsibility to inform me as to what they do on an ongoing basis. As the Members hopefully should know, the situation with Yukon Housing Corporation is very similar to the situation with the Yukon Development Corporation, as it effects the relationship between the government and the individual corporations.

The Member for Porter Creek East laughs loudly, but the legislation speaks for itself.

Mr. Lang: Perhaps to the Government Leader: If the Housing Corporation and the Yukon Development Corporation and the Yukon Liquor Corporation, all the corporations, obviously, in the eyes of the government, are exempt, and should be exempt from the process of public tendering of projects, would the Minister of Government Services tell me this: Why, in the Policy Directives that he is so proud of, does it state the following, "This directive shall be construed solely as directives to employees of the government, the purposes of which is to instruct them and delineate the scope of their authority with respect to the content of contracts and the procedures for making and administering contracts, including any contracts for works or services performed on behalf of any corporation or agency of the government."

Why are Corporations then included in the Policy Directives if it is going to be strictly no public advertising of projects?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: As the Member opposite surely knows, the reason for that provision is that under the old regulations, which preceded those directives, there was a Regulation that clearly would bind people in the private sector by regulation of the government. There was no enabling legislation to authorize that, and the proper legal course of action was to clean up that mess, which was done through the *Financial Administration Act*. The *Financial Administration Act* gives authority to pass directives to bind civil servants, not people in the private sector, and the Directives clearly state the authority that they have. That is the reason for that section of the Directives.

Mr. Lang: The Minister of Government Services went on at great length with respect to the reasons for the contract regulations. The reasons are very clear. It is to have a tendering procedure that is not only fair, but that is perceived to be fair, to ensure that the people of the territory are not subjected to porkbarrel politics for the purposes of getting contracts. If you follow the procedures, we are not going to ask you any questions.

Day after day, month after month, we have to raise questions on how they authorize contracts.

Was the Contractors Association, which represents the contractors throughout the territory, informed that this particular project was going to be undertaken in this matter, and the policy directives that the government was so proud of and tabled in this House were going to be bypassed?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The contract directives and, specifically, the section that was read out in the preamble of the question, were thoroughly discussed with the Contractors Association — an improvement in the procedures initiated by this government, for which the Contractors Association were extremely pleased.

I do not foresee the day when the specific plans concerning specific contracts are discussed with the private sector interests. The public interest in that respect is covered by the directives. The Contractors Association is content with that procedure.

Question re: Yukon Housing Corporation, Elsa house

Mr. Lang: We have a situation here where, once again, integrity of the public tendering process has been bypassed and called into question. I asked the Minister of Government Services a very simple question. I would like a very simple answer: a yes or a no.

For the purposes of bypassing a public tendering process for the \$100,000 teacherage built in Elsa, was the Contractors Association consulted with respect to that particular project?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The Member for Porter Creek East says he is asking a simple, straightforward question but, in fact, he is attempting to make allegations of something like pork-barreling, which he has mentioned totally irresponsibly. I would point out to him the definition of government on page three of the contract directives, which is clearly stated, and is contrary to his political arguments.

The government discusses these rules with the Contractors Association. That is the procedure that we have followed in the past and will follow. We do not discuss the specific plans for specific contracts.

Mr. Lang: Once again, I asked a very simple question, and the Minister of Government Services denies that they bypassed the policy directives for tendering projects paid for by taxpayers' money. I just want a yes or a no so that I do not have to go back to *Hansard* and try to decipher how many interpretations he made of the question I am asking. I would like a yes or a no. Did the Minister of Government Services advise the Contractors Association that it was not the intention to publicly tender that \$100,000 teacherage in the Community of Elsa?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The Contractors Association did not ask, and I did not state anything about a particular contract in Elsa. I have never spoken to the Contractors Association about any contract of any kind in Elsa.

Mr. Lang: Now that we have on the table that through the various arms of the government we can do anything we want with public money regarding the issuance of contracts and that we can get threats from Deputy Ministers and various other things, could I ask the Minister of Government Services how many other projects, paid for by taxpayers' money, have not gone out to public tender so that people are aware that the projects exist?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We have in the preamble a statement that the government does anything it wants and issues threats. That is totally irresponsible.

Question re: Calcium chloride substitute

Mr. McLachlan: I am aware that one of the provinces, Manitoba or Saskatchewan, uses crushed glass as a substitute for calcium chloride on highways. The glass is ground to such a fine powder that it does not cause any problems with tires. Its benefit to the Department of Community and Transportation Services is that glass does not corrode car bodies as the salt does.

Up until today's announcement, there has never been a source of glass collection until April 1 of this year. Could the Minister of Government Services, especially now that money is provided under an EDA for a manufacturing and processing industry, investigate the cost of purchasing a glass crushing machine and some measure of the yield of the machine under this system to see if there is a viable alternative to crushing the collected glass here in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I thank the Member for Faro for that question. The Liquor Corporation had initially planned a glass crushing operation in connection with a proposal to collect bottles. The total costs were in the neighbourhood of \$400,000.

I specifically asked the Liquor Board, through the Chairperson, to look at the commercial viability of crushed glass and bottle collection. We specifically looked at the possibility of contracting to a private operator to do this work. We looked at the possibility of doing it ourselves and the possibility of combining the soft drink bottle and the liquor bottle concerns in order to maximize the market and the product.

I was advised that that is not economically feasible. However, now that the bottles are to be collected.....

Speaker: Order please, would the Minister please conclude his answer.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, I will.

Mr. McLachlan: That is fine, as far as the Minister has been able to answer. Is the Minister saying that the cost of the glass is much greater, produced in this fashion, than the cost of the calcium chloride would be?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Specifically to use crushed glass as a substitute for calcium chloride on roads, I believe that has not been investigated, and it will be.

Speaker: Time for Question Period has now elapsed. May I have your further pleasure?

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Before the break, I would like to table a list of the moves of the government departments and a brief description of them and the costs, as I had promised to do.

Chairman: We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order.

Fourth Appropriation Act, 1986-87 — continued

Mr. Lang: I wanted to follow up with respect to the inventory study. The Minister talked about trails. Is it not true that we voted \$156,000 last Capital Budget for the purpose of getting a plan for trails throughout the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not have the specific figures in hand, but, yes, we did vote capital dollars for trail development.

What we are talking about here in the inventory process is that we are not proposing to develop the trails per se but simply through the process of the inventory establish whether there are trails, in fact. It would be just another piece of information that would become part of the overall inventory.

Mr. Lang: I go once again to what seems to be, in all appearances — and I do not say this in a cynical manner — that maybe we should all resign as Members of the Legislature and get into the consulting business. It seems to be fairly lucrative these days and appears as it will go on for the next year or so and would put a person in a pretty good financial position.

I want to go to Coal River Springs. In the 1986/87 Mains, we voted \$225,000 for the planning and construction of that particular site. We discussed it at quite some length last night. The Minister stood up and said how prudent he had been in that he had cancelled the whole project after all this money had been spent because he was going to spend \$2 million on a road.

I agree with the Minister that if he is required to spend \$2 million on a road we should not proceed with the project. I want to get that clear. I want to say to the Minister that, from our perspective, we feel there can be access into that particular unique area, which could afford the people of the territory with a very different kind of park on behalf of the tourists and the people of the territory who are interested in going there and taking up that kind of recreation. I recognize there is a cost attached to it. You have to have somebody there and all that kind of thing. I am not arguing that. I want to say that we would see that as a part-time or casual situation for, perhaps, a student.

We have \$3 million in LEOP. There are numerous federal programs for summer employment for students. There is no reason why that type of project could not come under there without having to increase the overall O&M cost of the budget.

The other thing I understand, from private conversation with the Minister, is that you have to cross the Coal River. I understand that it is not that big a river, not like the Yukon River, but in Yukon terms a stream. I gather it is not that big a stream as far as width is concerned.

¹⁷ Perhaps some thought should be given to a Bailey bridge or a pile driven bridge for crossing one way. It would be very limited, but the traffic pattern would not be like that on the Trans Canada. It would be an interest park that people would have to go out of their way to visit. Otherwise, I do not see the point in spending any money in there at all. If we do not have access, the general public will not be walking through, other than civil servants who can go in by helicopter or the unemployed people who have the time and energy to portage the numerous lakes that the Minister refers to.

We would like the government to reassess that situation and have a further examination from a practical point of view. Maybe they could send someone out there who has built a road to see what kind of costs they can come up with using the existing Sulpetro Road that comes in close proximity. There is no point in reinventing the wheel. If that were brought up to the standard of the Chadburn Lake Road, it would be quite sufficient knowing that one has to go slow because they are not driving a first rate highway.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We will respond positively to the Member's request for a reassessment. In that process we will, again, talk to the mining interests in the area regarding joining capital dollars towards construction of a road. Once we have done that assessment of the costs again, we will make that information available to the Member.

Mr. Phelps: I did not want to let this item go by without ensuring that discussion on the Tarfu/Snafu area was simply about the work of some planners. I understand that any work contemplated for next year would be in the Capital Mains. I would like confirmation of that as I am sure the Minister is aware that there is a very heavily weighted sentiment against developing the Snafu and Tarfu area in the Yukon. I would like to get into that at some length when we discuss the appropriate money.

¹⁸ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes, the Member is correct. If we were going to proceed with development of the Tarfu/Snafu area, the monies for that would have to come from the budget that will be debated shortly in the Legislature.

He is also correct that there is a sentiment expressed by residents in the area concerning any large scale development in that particular area. The trapper who holds the area has been in my office and made his views known quite clearly as to how he feels about development generally. I think that there may be some sawoff in terms of not promoting new development by building new trails and a whole new infrastructure in the area but, rather, simply rehabilitating the site that we have, or maybe move the site. That is a possibility. What we are doing toward that end is that we have a discussion in the public on the issue. Meetings were scheduled December 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the communities of Whitehorse, Teslin, Carcross and Tagish.

The Tagish meeting had to be cancelled, and the Teslin meeting was also cancelled. We are not done with the public process. We will continue the public consultation. Once we have had the benefit of the public consultation, we will make a firm decision as to whether or not we will proceed with any development in the area.

Mr. Phelps: It is probably an opportune time to mention that the resistance is not only from the trapper who lives in Tagish. It is very strong from people such as Mrs. Barbara Currie and her neighbours, who were quite upset at the prospect of any kind of development.

Mr. Brewster: I missed part of this, because I was on the phone with a woman. When you get on the phone with a woman, sometimes you cannot get off. I apologize if I repeat some things here.

I have a problem with the whole concept of what we are doing in the Yukon, not just territorially, but federally. We have the Klune

National Park, which has taken up 8,000 square miles; we have a northern national park, which takes out a bunch more; we have Herschel Island, which takes up more. Now, the territorial government is going into the Coal Springs. I agree with protecting things. I have no problem there.

The select committee talked to a lot of people all over the Yukon. You are doing the same work that we did. We went around unbiased. Their recommendation was very strong. There was one clause that we passed out that we should promote the purpose of parks. This takes a lot of the pressure off you, having groups fighting, because you should be able to work all the groups in.

Mr. Chairman worked very hard with us on this. He was a very good chairman. I would hope that this recommendation also follow along. It is not unreasonable. I hear the arguments that we cannot get into Coal Springs and have to build a \$2 million road. I live in an area where \$2 million is an awful lot of money. I do not believe some of these things the government people are talking about.

I am going to bring a suggestion up here that I brought to the National Parks and Kluane Park. I was born in a national park when they had absolutely nothing. I can recall we used to go out and hit a deer between the eyes to live. This is not a story. This is the absolute truth. This is the way we lived in Banff National Park. As we grew up they all put us into the army because we would get something to eat and grow up. When I came back to Banff National Park, I can remember as a young boy if they got 5,000 people through the gate a month they were lucky. Now they take 40,000 to 50,000.

I do not think that I ever dreamed this would happen up here. It is not going to happen in our lifetime, but it is coming. What they did there was put little roads in. I have fought with the Kluane National Park up here, and I am going to throw this out to you people. If they are going to put in these big million-dollar buses then one company gets control of this and they take only their passengers and nobody else. Naturally, that is business, and I have no problem with this.

Why do you not build small gravel roads, put a toll gate on to take it off the taxpayers. People will pay \$5 or \$10 to go off down these roads. You have lots of conservation officers; you can put your young students to work patrolling these roads so they do not litter, and let the public pay for this instead of always the taxpayer. Instead of having it all to yourself and all just for the civil service or those who can provide \$500 for a helicopter to go in and see it, let the older people travel.

The Minister of Renewable Resources and Tourism knows very well that the big percentage of our tourists are older and older people who cannot hike into these places. They cannot do these things, but they are the ones who are spending the money. Start taking this away from the government and let the taxpayers pay for this as something they enjoy. I do not mean the taxpayers of the Yukon. I mean the taxpayers and people all over the United States, Europe and everywhere who would come and pay to go through these toll gates. It works. It has worked in Banff.

Another thing I would bring up is that you say mining cannot work with that. In Banff National Park and in Yoho National Park there was a silver mine that was there long before the park that is still working to this day. It has not hurt that park one little bit. It has created an industry. I think we have to quit being into one narrow little thing where we are going to protect things.

The question I used to ask the National Parks Superintendent, and I am going to ask the Minister here, is that we keep saying we are saving this for future generations. It is quite simple for me to say: which generation are you talking about? We have a generation right here in Whitehorse that has never seen Kluane National Park, has never seen Coal Springs. So which is going to be the privileged generation that we are going to open this up for?

Let us open it up for the people now and let us let the people and the tourists come in and start paying for some of this now.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In response to the many points raised by the Member, starting with the Kluane situation, I agree with his sentiment that there is very little use being made of that park and very little appreciation because for the most part the tourism sector simply looks out of the window of their car vehicle as they whiz by

at 55 miles per hour. That is about the only enjoyment they get unless they stop and see the slide show at the Visitor's Reception Centre in Kluane.

To that end, we have made representation to Parks Canada to try to open up development in the park to allow for greater access. Remember that the road construction costs relative to those discussions were in the neighbourhood of \$4 million. This was work that Parks had done. Basically we were told at that time that Parks Canada does not have the money to proceed with the development of Kluane National Park.

On the question of the private involvement of a firm, there was some discussion but I understand that those discussions are no longer on the table for that private firm to be able to go in with the huge all-terrain buses the Member for Kluane spoke about.

On the concept of a multi-use park, that is an area of development that I would support. The park development scenario for the future has to be flexible. There are some areas that, because of their uniqueness to wildlife habitat, may have to be left in pristine conditions. There are other areas where we could have a multiple use and have recreational areas and even some areas of development along with some sort of park designation. On that particular score there is very little difference.

There may also be a way in which we can go about protecting critical habitat areas without having to move to the whole-park concept.

I would like to discuss this further with the Member. I propose that when we look at redoing the *Wildlife Act*, and judging from the interpretations of the law that we have received recently, we are going to have to do that very soon. Work is proceeding on redoing the *Wildlife Act* to bring in amendments.

I had hoped that after the receipt of the select committee report that that would be seen as a vehicle to push some amendments. Obviously there is room for that. I think that in the fall we will be talking about amendments to the *Wildlife Act*. The concept that I would like the Member to think about at this point, which I would like to bring forward for discussion in the amendments, is to look at the legislative ability of the government to be able to set aside and designate critical wilderness habitat so that we do not basically withdraw huge blocks of land, but we are withdrawing specific areas.

Ducks Unlimited has been working with us to identify certain areas that are critical to that species, and that work will continue. I throw that out as a suggestion for the Member to think about. I do not expect an immediate response, but if he has concerns or anything to add to that idea, I would appreciate hearing from him in the future.

Mr. Brewster: I am not going to carry this on any further. I think the Minister and I agree on most of this. However, the Kluane National Park does not have the money, and that is quite correct. Like any government, the federal government cannot do it feasibly and practically so that it pays.

They offered it to private business but when private business looked at it, the National Parks wanted them to spend their money, and National Parks would make all of the profit. That is the government's attitude — we own it; you come in and we will take your money. They talk about millions of dollars to put a road in there. I talked with people in the Department of Community and Transportation Services, Highways Branch people, and they did not quote millions of dollars for the type of road I am talking about.

These buses run at about \$1 million to \$1.5 million. Every person who goes in there would pay \$3 or \$5. That is not the taxpayers' money. The \$3 million is the taxpayers' money. What about the campers and the cars that have no way to get up there? Naturally the businessman is going to book his own passengers and keep his own buses. I hope that this government does not get into a mess like that.

Mr. Lang: The Minister said that the \$36,000 contract for the parks system plan inventory had been publicly tendered. When was it tendered?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Late November.

Mr. Lang: If he could provide me with the documents, I have had a number of people make the observation that they never did

see the tender or public advertisement. Whether it was their fault or not, I do not know. It is something I felt I had to ask on their behalf.

So, that is \$36,000. We have another \$17,000 there that we are going to plan and study some more. I would like to know how we are going to spend that money or if we have spent it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In addition to the \$3,600 to be able to carry out the study, an additional \$7,100 was paid to Energy, Mines and Resources for maps of the area.

Mr. Lang: It was \$7,100 for maps, and where was the other \$10,000? I did not catch the first part.

Hon. Mr. Porter: That is correct. It was \$7,100 for maps and air photos. There has been no expenditure planned for the \$10,000 at this point.

Mr. Lang: I feel like I am a used rag. I am dealing with an appropriation here. It is a supplementary to a Bill. I am being asked to vote money that, in good part, has been spent. Yesterday, we were subjected to a financial analysis of a department that told us, and the public of the territory, that we are going to spend \$40,000 to \$50,000 to build three partitions and a window. Now, I am told there are no plans for the other \$10,000, but just asked to vote for it.

Once again, is there a preconceived plan to inflate the budget with figures so it appears we are spending X dollars to give the impression to the public that all these projects are going ahead, and there is X dollars and, at the end of the year, we have \$10 million or \$20 million left and we can say we were good managers?

What are we doing this exercise for, if we are not given a technical and expert analysis of our financial needs? What is the other \$10,000 going to be used for?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Responding to the Member's accusations with respect to budgeting, I can only respond on a common sense basis. I have never met anybody in government who could, in 100 percent of cases, predict expenditures to the last penny. That is the nature of any government. You are going to deal with estimates that are made, budgets are produced, tenders are called for. To give a prime example, we estimated so much for one particular budget item that we dealt with last year; we went to the private sector and called for tenders. Every one of the tenders came in over what was budgeted.

We cannot be 100 percent accurate with respect to the projections of what the cost would be to carry out the work. There will be instances where projects will be estimated in terms of expenses. The receipt of tenders will not always match what is estimated.

The \$10,000 we are talking about will be used to do some in-house work on the recreational features aspect, development of the terms of reference and possible further contract work.

Mr. Lang: I take exception to the Minister's comments with respect to what we are just projecting. First of all, we have the Capital Estimates for 1986-87. We are discussing the Supplementaries to 1986-87, which means that we have identified, even more finely, the cost of doing business for the purpose of the Capital Budget for 1986-87.

The Minister stands up and tells me there is a 20 percent inflated increase here that we could not really budget for. Then he told me he did not know what the \$10,000 was going to be spent for. Now, out of the clear blue, it is going to be for recreational features. What are recreational features?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I told the Member yesterday, recreational features would be identification of existing or potential hiking trails, historic trails, campgrounds, parks, kayaking routes, canoeing routes, rafting routes, climbing routes, photography opportunities. Those are all recreational uses.

Mr. Lang: Did we not vote \$156,000 last year for an inventory of trails and park trailways and whatever? Now you are asking for another \$10,000 for that? Could you table what we have so far, so if I do get lost in the bush, I have a trail to follow?

Does he have a report to justify another \$10,000 for this grandiose scheme when the Minister is retired by his own initiative or other people's initiative, so that he has a place to follow along the riverbank. He seriously cannot be asking me to say, here is \$10,000 when you have already spent \$156,000 and we do not have

anything to show for it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member's comments would obviously have merit were they accurate. However, the situation is that we are not simply looking at trail identification. We are talking about other uses, such as kayaking, canoeing, rafting — areas that can be opened up to the public — climbing areas. There is a multiple use of the environment that many people in the Yukon engage in. We would like to continue to encourage that. We think it is a healthy activity to be out in the bush and utilizing our wilderness. With respect to the question as to whether or not, in fact, we are spending this additional money only on trails, that is not correct. It is also on developing other aspects of recreational use.

Mr. Lang: I guess I am not grasping something here. First, one question: I am going on memory now; I believe it was \$156,000 that was spent for studying trails last year. Do you have a document that you can table in this House to give us an idea when we are lost where that trail will be?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My information is that, at the present time, we do not have a report for public consumption.

Mr. Lang: Do we have a draft report for the Minister's consumption as opposed to the public's consumption?

Hon. Mr. Porter: They are internal department reports that have not been compiled into final form for distribution.

Mr. Lang: If the public, who is paying for this, happens to be lost this winter they are out of luck to get where that trail is. When are we going to get all this stuff together from internal consumption so that if it is the civil service who are lost, they will find that way, so that we can provide that information to the public so that the truck driver, on a weekend off, walking in the bush knows where the trail is?

Hon. Mr. Porter: For Member's like the Member for Porter Creek East who does lead one to believe that he is lost in this area, I would suspect that it probably would be of beneficial use to be able to give him some information as to the location of trails.

Some Member: The sun rises in the east.

Hon. Mr. Porter: And the moss grows on the north side of the tree. To that end, when I have received the compilation of the work that has been done, and I have reviewed it, and it is ready for consumption, I will let the Member know so that he will have some vague idea of where he is in the Yukon.

Mr. Lang: If it ever comes to pass where the MLA for Watson Lake, for the short tenure that he is there, and the MLA for Porter Creek East happen to be in the middle of nowhere in the Yukon Territory — if I was a betting man, I know who I would bet on getting out.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This guy.

Laughter

Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lang: You notice that I did not include the MLA for Whitehorse West.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would like to get back to the ten grand. Why would the \$10,000 be spent on kayaking? How is the study on kayaking and hiking going to be done? Who is going to be the recipient of this ten grand?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We will do an inventory of all of the routes at all of the sites. For example, the Blanchard River is a very popular kayaking river. That would be folded into the inventory. Assessments would be made on other rivers that would be used. Anyone who lives in the area knows that the Liard River cannot be kayaked or canoed, but a person could raft it.

That kind of information is being asked for in today's society, and people are experiencing more enjoyment from the wilderness. We have a population that is more environmentally conscious. People would like to pursue wilderness activities so we are responding to that need. We are developing the necessary information to be able to give them an assessment of the wilderness possibilities in the Yukon.

Mr. Lang: I really have sympathy for the Minister attempting to justify this \$10,000. It is kind of ironic that he is talking about kayaking and is looking at rivers and the next line item is Heritage River System Plan for \$70,000. We are dealing with inflated dollars. I have made a mental note of this and, as the Minister

knows, I do not forget things — I have not quite gotten to that age yet — and I hope the report on the location of Yukon trails does not get lost.

Parks System Plan Inventory in the amount of \$53,000 agreed to On Heritage River System Plan

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I have reported to the Legislature in great detail, there is a program called the Canadian Heritage River Systems Program. The general points of consideration for this program is that the first step is to do the inventory of potential rivers, the assessment of the rivers that would be nominated to the CHR system and preparation of management plans for the nominated rivers.

We have done step one previously under the Capital Budget where we have done an inventory of all of the rivers in the Yukon. There were 66 rivers included in that study. We will be continuing the background research on the rivers with the money that we are asking for here. One of the areas that has had no work done on is the aboriginal historic use of rivers in the Yukon, identification evaluation of the recreational values of rivers previously not evaluated, and research and mapping of potential resource uses on and adjacent to those rivers.

Mr. Brewster: Here we go again. I just got through protesting parks and parks and parks taking away most of the Yukon and now we are going to take all the rivers.

I would like someone to explain to me just what a heritage river is, just what happens to the placer mining people on it, what happens to the world-class mine that can employ 5,000 to 6,000 people on the Tatshenshini. The kayak people go down and complain that there is a little bit of mud in the river, which, of course, is ridiculous. There is mud in all these rivers. It was not created by man; it was created by the good Lord.

The other thing that bothers me about these world heritage rivers — we can think and dream all we like. We are being controlled from outside; we are being controlled from Ottawa; we are being controlled by the do-gooders in eastern Canada who are running around telling us to put these heritage rivers in. They do not have to live here; they do not have to have an economy here. We have to have this. We continually isolate and take away country so placer miners, miners and even outfitters cannot go into it. We are protecting it for a very small population that spends very little money. I challenge anyone in this area to produce the money that these type of people bring in compared to tourism, compared to placer mining and compared to mining.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The main thrust that I get from the Member is that he is concerned that once we have designated these rivers to be heritage rivers that there could not be any development other than setting them aside. The program, as I understand it, does allow for the management plan, and that is the key element when you get to the stage prior to a river being nominated for consideration to have a river set aside as a heritage river. A management plan has to be developed. If there are developments already occurring in that management plan process, those developments could conceivably be allowed in the management plan.

Mr. Brewster: There are 66 rivers there. I guess I will not be around when they get through with that management plan. They cannot even get their management plan done on the northern parks, Kluane Park and a few others, so I guess I had better not wait too long for that one.

I would think that if someone laid down some terms of reference the placer miners, miners and people like this would have a little bit of ease in their minds as to whether they are going to be run right out of the country or whether they are going to be able to stay. They keep our economy going. I do not think that anyone in this place can deny this. I am not for miners running around working everything over, but we are completely isolating this country completely to the point where the people with money are leaving. They are not going to be able to stay. It is going to be a fact of life. I think if you looked at the select committee report, the people in the Yukon are saying that these things have to be multi-purpose. Now you are saying that these heritage people are going to put together a management committee.

Let us get these things done before we start. It is no good to get a

management committee together after you have already taken all these rivers out of service.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Prior to agreeing on a designation for the river, the management guidelines that will be established will be made so that, for example, if there is a placer miner who is operating on a river that is being looked at for nomination, that placer miner would be involved in the discussions toward the development of the management plan. The guidelines do allow for continued use. Say, for example, that we did come to a river that was looked at to be designated, I would think that common sense would be that you would allow the present operator to continue to use that particular area that they were engaged in, for example, as a placer miner. In all probability, they would allow the use and probably grandfather the right.

Mr. Brewster: It says the present operator, so if someone finds a mine after that, I guess he is out of operation. The Minister is living in a dream world if he thinks it is not just the same as the groups who ran the people out of sealing, or trying to run them out of trapping. They have a lot more money than any of these other groups. They are now moving into this area, not completely isolated so they can come up in the summer. They are not interested in the winter, or anything else. A good example is the Tatshenshini where the strong logging groups are trying to prevent a bridge across the Tatshenshini because they would have to go under it with their boats. Yet, there is a world-class mine, and I am talking about a world-class mine. These groups are lobbying and they are winning all over B.C.

This government did not help very much to stop that, yet we would get the spinoff greatly here. We had better be looking at what we are doing.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the comments by the Member on the trapping issue, the Member would appreciate that the views of this government have been made known very clearly. Our record on that issue is there for the public to read.

On the question of the fact that if we removed the designation of river under this program, that action may withdraw that particular area from other use, that is not the case. We are not talking about a legislated designation. We are talking about an agreement between ourselves and the federal government.

If the Member poses the question, "what if", and we do have a situation where a valuable deposit of gas or minerals were located, then I would suggest that it would be very possible for the governments to structure the agreement for the management of that particular area to agree to amend the management plan to develop that particular deposit, if that is the wish of the governments of the day.

Mr. McLachlan: The Minister referred to 66 rivers earlier in his dialogue. Who picked the 66 rivers? Was it a committee in Toronto or someone here within the Department of Renewable Resources? The number seems unusually high. Why was it not 26 or 16? Is there anything left if the number was 66?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We have debated this issue at length in the previous Capital Budget. The information that I gave to the Member at that time was that it was a consulting firm of Piridue, Gerand and Associates that conducted the study and put together the inventory that brought forward the number.

Mr. McLachlan: In some cases, such as the one as the Member for Kluane is referring to, it may take as much as 10 years to assess the mineral potential. I have some concern that in the first year, for example, of exploration when the mineral deposit is identified, it is some number of years before it is judged to be a potential economic producer.

Is there an appeal system? I am worried about the designation of a heritage river being made and stopping any further interest in mineral exploration in the area. Is there an appeal procedure by which the committee or the designation could be reconsidered if deposits increased? I am worried about terminating it before it even gets started.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member has raised the concern that we are going to be designating rivers throughout the Yukon and withdrawing them from development. That is the underlying sentiment that we get from his point of view. That is not the case.

There has only been one river that has reached the level of designation, and that is the Alsek. There is no other river, and the Alsek has not been designated as yet, either. The 30 Mile River has been raised as a question, and that has not been designated. We have not yet proclaimed the Alsek River.

There is no fear here that we are running rampant through the Yukon and freezing rivers from development. That is unfounded, based on the evidence that we have before us.

With regard to the question as to whether a withdrawal can be appealed, it is not legislated, and therefore it would end up being an agreement between the two governments. I would suggest that if the Member knew of such a situation where there was a mineral deposit, he would have the responsibility to lobby the government as a party to raise that issue. Should the Member be successful in convincing the government to withdraw that nomination, the government could stop it.

28 Mr. McLachlan: I think any Member on this side would take that up with the government if they saw it as a potential chance of success. I am worried about the direction. If it is seen to be, or identified to be, I am scared that it will not even get to that point. Once the designation is there, the exploration dollars flow the other way. We have debated the whole issue of the flow-through shares in this Legislature on Opposition Day and what a great idea that was. This seems to be the other side of the cudgel.

I have some problems with the idea of the designation and the numbers that the Minister has referred to. I take some exception to the mineral potential being eliminated. I know there are other Members of the Legislature who have some strong feelings about that.

I urge the government to proceed slowly and consciously on this one. The Minister has said there is only one river. Next year, there might be two. In 1989, there might be three. I have a number of reservations about the speed at which the government is proceeding on designation of heritage rivers.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The fact that 66 rivers have been identified in an inventory should not lead one to believe that there will be a proliferation of development toward designation under this program.

I take the Member's point of view that, in the future, that situation may change. I would suggest that this would be of concern if you simply took an exclusive viewpoint of how we develop our territory: that it was either mining or was no mining and simply environmental protection. I do not think that is the reality of the world. The world in which we live dictates certain needs and standards. What we have to do is to try to foster some sort of compromise between both aspects: the development that we want to pursue and the non-renewable basis to meet our needs as people and, at the same time, do it in such a fashion so that it is sustainable and does not, in any way, negatively impact the environment to such a degree that we lose our environment.

That is the philosophy that I would espouse to. For the most part, that is the philosophy that this government operates under.

Mr. McLachlan: Would the Minister be in a position to be able to table the list of the 66 rivers for the Members of the Legislative Assembly? The second note of caution I would like to add is that that particular Minister sitting on this Minister's right is the Minister responsible for Economic Development: Mining and Small Business, who has gone to great lengths to develop a number of mining programs and encourage exploration. I express the fear that the two are in direct competition, despite the Minister's assurances that it is a slow process and not to worry.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am taking the last point first, with respect to the competitive nature of government, internally. That is always going to be a concern. That is always going to be a reflection of life as it exists. There are those interests. Some are expressed in the extreme. Hopefully, in the processes you make the decisions that are not extreme in their ramifications, and you legislate and develop policy that accommodates a reasonable approach to development and to environmental protection.

29 I believe that the first part of the question asked if I would table the inventory that contains the 66 rivers and, yes, I would do so.

Mr. Phillips: I am encouraged by the Minister's comments

about multi-use parks or multi-use development in the future. I suppose most of us who have been in the Yukon for a long time can only go by recent experiences. The Yukon right now has more protected area than any other area in Canada, by ratio. It seems to be heading a little more in that direction. There is a valid concern by a lot of people out there. We have all kinds of groups running around the territory planning parks and heritage rivers.

The question I have for the Minister is about another group headed by Ms. McPherson that is doing a study on protected areas in the Yukon. Is the Yukon government at all involved in that study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The question that the Member asks is not specifically related to this line item, but I will not pull up stops and not answer simply because it is not an item on the budget. I would confirm to the Member, yes, there is work that is a follow-up from the Northern Task Force that he sat on.

Mr. Phillips: I think the Minister is wrong. I think it does relate to what we are talking about. I would suppose that some of these protected areas would be on the rivers of the Yukon, on the heritage river system. Some of these areas that they would plan to protect or whatever they do would be on these systems and they would have to be working with this group.

Is the Yukon Government paying any money for that study, are they involved, and if so in which way are they involved?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My information is that the funds that are being spent in this area are being provided by the Government of Canada.

Mr. Brewster: In the first place, where did the first idea of these heritage rivers come from? Who really starts the designation of these, such as the 30 Mile River? Who started the first brochure on that?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Responding to the 30 Mile River question, that was in process and was initiated by the previous government. The previous Minister of Renewable Resources signed an agreement with the Government of Canada to begin that process. I am not talking about the Member for Kluane when he was the Minister; in this case the Minister who initiated the process was the former Member for Tatchun who sat as the Minister for Renewable Resources.

30 Mr. Brewster: I believe that the federal government started this. I recall, when I was Minister, when we talked to the national parks, they continued to bring this up. I did not have enough information to look at it. It looked very nice in the study that was made.

It was my impression that the federal government was doing most of this work. The Minister pointed out that the Alsek is not a heritage river. I have, on file, letters from one Minister in Ottawa that says that it is a heritage river. I have another letter from another Minister that says that it is not. It is therefore quite apparent that the federal government and everyone else are making their own decisions and they are all going their own way. This bothers me. If, before they started these heritage rivers, they laid down some rules and regulations, I could probably look at this with a much more peaceful mind than I can now.

The explanation was made that if one of these rivers is declared a heritage river, and there was mine or a potential mine in that area, it was the government's duty to try and stop this. Anyone who knows about prospecting or mining knows that they would work in an area of about 10 square miles, and they might be there for five years before they developed it. Now we are talking about those people running around trying to find all the minerals in 66 rivers. That is ridiculous. There is no way it could be done.

Some minerals will not be discovered for years and years. I recall hearing that there was a little mine found near the highway just south of here. I have been here for 36 years, and no one knew that was here. They found a mine that looks like it is going to be very prosperous that is going to take in most of the mountain. If the miners do not protect this area before the heritage rule goes into effect, then that is tough bananas. That is ridiculous.

Mr. Lang: Has the \$70,000 been spent? If it has been spent, has it been spent on consultants? If so, who? If it has not been spent, who will it be spent on and how will it be spent?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The contract for this area is in the process of being let now.

Mr. Lang: It is in the process of being let. Have proposals been called for by consultants? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Heritage River System Plan in the amount of \$70,000 agreed to On Dalton Post Construction

Hon. Mr. Porter: Some of the funding for this area has already been spent as the Member for Kluane will know. We spent \$2,466 for a local contractor in Haines Junction to enlarge and gravel the parking lot. A brush clearing contract was let to the Champagne/Aishihik Band for \$5,000. Other expenditures are \$2,500 expenses for the crew for sign materials; recreation user survey was done for \$2,500. We expect to spend \$2,000 on tabulation of the survey results.

³¹ **Mr. Brewster:** Has an agreement been reached with the Champagne/Aishihik Band that this is not aboriginal land?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am informed that there has been no agreement reached with the Champagne/Aishihik Band with respect to the land designation.

Mr. Brewster: Then what you are telling me is that we spent \$20,000 on a piece of land that quite possibly will not even belong to the people of the Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The way in which I would respond to that is that this is a very popular area for many people in the Yukon. It is being actively used now. There are days when there are literally hundreds of people in the vicinity when the fishing is good. There is a clear need to upgrade the facilities that do exist there. At one time, there were not any toilets up there, and you had a very bad scene with respect to people using the bush in the area. That has been rectified. New garbage bins have been installed: something that the bears cannot chew through. They are all made out of steel.

I would say that, given present use, we do have a responsibility to do some work in the area. With respect to the future designation of the area, I do not know what the claims negotiations results are going to be, so I cannot predict whether or not we are spending this money now to enhance some future proprietor's rights.

Mr. Lang: In view of the list the Minister gave us — once again, we are asking for more money — what has been expended? We are talking \$15,000. It is only \$5,000, but there is another 25 percent overinflated price, in view of what he has outlined it is going to be spent on, unless I missed some figures.

Why are we projecting 20 or 25 percent more on a line item when you know how it is being spent?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There may be further work considered for the site than has yet been decided.

Mr. Lang: This Budget was put together in November. Are you trying to tell me that work would be done prior to April 1? This is for 1986-87. I asked the Minister not to think of ideas on his feet. Surely, you can give this side some credence. Let us face it: you do not build campgrounds in the winter. Why are we asking for 20 or 25 percent more than what is budgeted? If it is a slush fund, it is a slush fund and tell us it is a slush fund.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to charges of slush funds, that is a political charge that the Member may have made lightly. If he makes the charge, he should do so on the basis of fact. If he knows of a situation where funds are being spent as political slush funds, then he should substantiate those charges. Otherwise, I would ask that he not make those kinds of charges. In this instance, there is no relevance to the charge, and I doubt if he could substantiate it.

³² **Mr. Lang:** Could he tell me why he is budgeting 20 to 25 percent more for this line item, like all other line items; why is he asking for more money than he needs? That is my only question.

Hon. Mr. Porter: When the programs were being proposed for this area, the estimate was that we would spend \$20,000. The actual is that at this present time we are looking at spending \$5,000 and there may be a further expenditure of an additional \$5,000.

Dalton Post Construction in the amount of \$20,000 agreed to On COPE

Hon. Mr. Porter: This is related to the O&M sector that we have already discussed. The breakdown for the capital portion of COPE development is for employment of two park planners and

heritage planners for the summer months, basically, and costs of travel to Herschel Island. By the way, the cost of the personnel section of this is \$44,500. The travel section included here is \$22,000.

A large bulk of the money is going to be spent on the buildings themselves on site, and related archeological work. There will be \$35,000 spent with respect to aircraft hauling equipment and materials, an additional \$12,000 for a communications system, and \$31,000 for additional equipment and contingency.

Mr. Lang: Are the two parks planners the parks planners we have on staff or are those additional parks planners?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As the Member will remember from yesterday, when we talked about COPE, we have been spending money from the government's other budgets in trying to work on the COPE implementation. The park planners who worked in the past on this have largely come from this government's general revenue fund.

What we have achieved here is an agreement with the federal Government of Canada so the federal government is paying for the implementation of the COPE agreement as called for in the legislation. All these monies spent here will be recoverable from the federal government and the park planners whom we will hire under this program would be in addition to those already on staff and would be specifically dedicated to Herschel Island.

Mr. Lang: That brings me back to my point. I feel I have been misled to some degree because yesterday that is why I specifically asked the question. Yesterday I was told the reason we had to do the inventory is that our parks planners were busy planning other parts of the Yukon Territory, for example, Herschel Island and Snafu and Tarfu, and obviously a lot of people are starting to question the need for it. My question is: what are these people going to be doing? Why did we go into a \$36,000 contract up here when obviously we are going to have parks planners available from the department, three staff members?

³³ I ask that question in view of the comments the Minister made that these are going to be additional people who will be working on Herschel Island.

Hon. Mr. Porter: That is correct. The people we are talking about under this allocation — the park planners who will be hired — will be solely dedicated to the development of the management plan for the operation of the park and personnel.

Mr. Lang: It seems like there is no control and no thought of administration, no responsibility as far as who is doing what with respect to the government. We have these consultants running around. In some of these areas, I do not know why we are blowing money on consultants when we have capable people hired within the civil service for specific purposes.

Yesterday we were informed we have three parks planners within the Government of the Yukon Territory. I should add that quite a number of them have done an excellent job, when you take a look at our campground facilities through the territory. Here we are being asked to rubber stamp a \$36,000 contract when we are told the three parks planners involved will not be involved in Herschel Island this coming year, nor will they be involved in the Tarfu/Snafu area as it will, in all likelihood, be rejected. What are they going to be doing? The civil service must be at a loss as to what is going on with all these consultants running around doing all the work that, in good part, the civil service was asked to do and is getting paid good money for on the O&M side of the budget.

I am not going to proceed after the Minister. There does not seem to be any control or any real feeling across the way that they have a responsibility to give some direction. It makes me ill.

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the position taken by the Member, I think he would be justified if we had a government of civil servants who were sitting around doing nothing. That is not the case. The people we have working in the civil service, I am sure he would agree, for the most part are very hard-working people. I do not go around telling people how hard my staff in both departments work, but that is a fact of life. They are putting out.

With respect to the specific comment that we are spending money in this area on consultants, we will not be hiring consultants to do the work. The work will be performed by casuals the government will hire.

Mr. Lang: I am referring to the other line item. Did we not enter into a contract for the purposes of patient consultants, or whomever it was, for the purposes of the \$36,000 inventory?

I am referring back to both, because they do work in conjunction. We were led to believe that the people on staff were totally immersed in the Herschel Island project and would not be available for doing other projects. I recognize it is a minor issue and really of no consequence.

** COPE in the amount of \$250,000 agreed to
On Bison Compound Capture Facility*

Hon. Mr. Porter: We are going to be building a chute in the bison compound that is called a squeeze chute. The Member for Kluane knows all about it and has probably built a few in his day. The costs that we expect for this are \$25,000 for employment of foreman and labourers. The post hole drilling will be \$6,000 and \$5,000 for road maintenance; \$4,000 for vehicle and equipment rental; \$2,000 for miscellaneous materials, lumber, wire, nails, et cetera; \$4,000 for purchase and installation of a squeeze chute.

Mr. Brewster: I am glad that I got those figures. I thought maybe the squeeze chute that is being made to hold a little buffalo was made out of gold. I think it is ridiculous that it takes \$25,000 in wages to build a chute when there is timber all around there. A squeeze chute could be built with a power saw very easily by the people who are there watching the buffalo.

I have been through a lot of this with elk in Banff National Park, and the Minister tell me it is going to cost \$46,000 to build a squeeze chute. Boy, someone should have their head looked at.

Hon. Mr. Porter: A squeeze chute is part of it. There is going to be a larger capture facility. We will be cutting wood, cutting and sinking the poles as well, using local material.

Mr. Brewster: I am fully aware of that. I probably built more than the Minister has ever seen. I realize a wing has to be built for the bison to get them into the squeeze chute. The wings goes out 50 feet then narrows down, and there is a gate that simply shoves them in, you have them in there, vaccinate them and turn them loose. To spend \$46,000 on this makes my head swim.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would concede that the Member does have working knowledge of this area. I will not argue the fact that he is more qualified in the discussion.

Mr. Phillips: It seems here that the person who has designed the squeeze chute is the same person who designed our one-room witness rooms. It looks like we have the same architects planning the same types of facilities here.

Maybe the government might take a drive out to a local game ranch and see an squeeze chute that has been built there. I can assure the Members that that squeeze chute did not cost \$46,000. Maybe the government should look at that design. They do not need to reinvent the wheel and bring in some big fancy squeeze chute from down south. These things can be very simple and work very well. Various people have used this type of thing for years, and maybe the government should be looking at spending this money a little more wisely, because \$46,000 is incredible for one chute. The Minister mentioned \$5,500 for vehicle rental for this project.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The figure was \$4,000 for equipment rental.

Mr. Phillips: Has the government run out of trucks, or do we not have trucks in Renewable Resources that can go out and carry out this type of job? Do they need specialized vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My understanding is that the vehicle would be utilized to bring in the labourers and crew who will be probably residents of Carmacks to the site.

Mr. Phillips: How long is this project expected to take? A week, ten days or two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The length of project will be 39 weeks.

Mr. Phillips: Did I hear the Minister right? 39 weeks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: 39 weeks is correct.

Mr. Phillips: What are they going to do for 39 weeks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Dig post holes.

Mr. Phillips: If I could not build a chute like that in four days there would be something wrong. Could the Minister please give me a detailed breakdown of what they are going to do? How many people are going to do this for 39 weeks? Is this one person for 39 weeks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am sorry that the Member is getting agitated. I would hope otherwise, but the estimated employment factor is 39 weeks. We are talking about four to five people. The actual weeks on a job will be approximately four to five weeks.

Mr. Brewster: I wish someone would show me the blueprints for this thing. This must be something. I guess a king could walk through this thing by the looks of things. I have a real hard time understanding the philosophy of this government.

Last year we wanted the Canyon Creek Bridge done, which is world famous. They turned around and wanted to put their own crews on it because they could do it cheaper. They have these same crews, in fact my nephew happens to work on one and runs all over the country doing this work, and here is a job that should not take more than four or five days. He has been up there and put most of the posts in. He knows a little bit about it so now we are going to run around and get a whole new crew and be what, 39 weeks? Why?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I think the Members have misconstrued the statement. The people are not going to be there for 39 weeks, the employment factor is 39 weeks. The job, we expect, will take four to five weeks.

Mr. Phillips: Four to five weeks for four to five people to build one chute; is that what the Minister is telling us?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We will have four or five parks crews. We also will have additional people to cut the wood. We will probably be bringing in four additional people in the community to cut the timber.

If the Members really think this is hot stuff, that it is big political news and there is real mismanagement going on, I would be more than prepared to take the original budget from the previous government with respect to expenditure here and what they projected the cost to be and what they actually spent by seeing the numbers. It is embarrassing. If that is the intent of the Members, we can continue along that line.

Mr. Phillips: That is fine for the Minister to say, but we also have a government across the way that has been there for two years. This is your project. This is what you are doing.

When the government goes out and has a look at an elk ranch that it has commissioned on the Mayo Road, that has not taken 39 weeks to complete. He has fenced 300 acres and has built all his pens. It seems absolutely and totally out of line. I know the Member from across the floor personally, and not as a Minister. He has to be a reasonable man. He has to sit down, when someone presents a budget like this, and say there is something wrong. Surely, he does not really think that it would take four to five weeks for five people to build a squeeze for a buffalo.

Somebody is getting a buffalo here, and it is the people of the Yukon.

Mr. Brewster: There is something wrong. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, where they make chutes for bucking horses and everything else, they can bring them in, I would suspect, for less than \$10,000 and land them here, steel stuff. They are going to go out and put all this work in here and it is just right out of this world what they are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is probably correct. If you went outside and bought a prefab steel chute, it would probably be a lot cheaper, but we decided to build the project in the Yukon, utilize local material and employ local people in the area.

Mr. Brewster: That shows us how responsible this government is. I do not think anyone on that side of the House can say that I am not in favour of Yukon hire. It is, however, irresponsible for the government to admit that they could bring in outside help for thousands of dollars less but they are going to do it here to blow the money because it is there. That money can be used in other places. When these chutes are brought in, they will have to be put up, and that will be more work. At least, the work would be done at less cost.

Mr. Lang: This side wanted to go expeditiously through this portion of the Budget. As we go through the line items, we find that there is more money than is needed being budgeted. The reasons for doing the projects are very questionable to the point where some Ministers have had to get more information before discussing the

Budget.

It is very frustrating for this side. I do not understand why the government would not be paying attention to some of the observations being made by this side.

The Minister talks about the previous government. I, for one, feel that a lot of money is being spent on this thing, and I really question if all of it is warranted. A lot of it was supposed to come from the Canadian Wildlife Service, which is a proponent as well as the push behind getting this project going. The Minister has told this House that, and it was done by the previous administration.

It is not a question of whether or not the previous government spent too much money. That is not what we are debating here. We are debating whether or not it is justified to spend this amount of money in the manner that the Minister has indicated. We got on to the question of pre-fabricated steel squeeze chutes versus home-made ones. It is a lot of money to build a chute for \$46,000. Does the Minister not see that as a lot of money?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member says that \$46,000 is a lot of money. We have been looking at the numbers, and there was a look at the cost of bringing in a steel chute from the south and erecting it with local labour. The costs from the southern steel material would be \$44,000. Using Yukon material, it would be \$46,000. Which would the Member choose?

Mr. Brewster: Maybe if he told us what he was building. It is impossible for me to believe that to put a runway into a squeeze chute would cost that much money, unless we are going first class and it is all plated in gold or something, and maybe it will be.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The technical description is a lead-in wing, sorting pens and the chute as well.

Mr. Phillips: The Member said that they are going to be trucking the workers to the project. Is this on a daily basis? Do they live in Carmacks and are trucked in from Carmacks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No. The plan, as I understand it, is they will bring them to the site and they will be living there and working probably five days a week, and be brought off site. There will be a need for a vehicle to go and pick up equipment and what-have-you.

Mrs. Firth: I understand from listening to the debate that for this amount of money the Minister wants to have a job creation project within the community of Carmacks to employ four to five people. There is \$3 million in the Local Employment Opportunities Program. Surely they could have found this fund. It is a community-related project. Surely they could have found this amount of money in the LEOP and accomplished the same goal instead of coming in with a Supplementary Estimate for \$80 million Capital Budget and ask for a further \$46,000 for a job creation project. It does not make sense to me.

Hon. Mr. Porter: What can I say? We can go around and around on this one and spend all the time we want. We looked at importing the stuff from down south and putting it up was \$44,000. Doing it locally was \$46,000. If it is your position that you prefer that we buy the material down south and ship it up and install it at that cost, then fine. We have decided to spend our money in the Yukon to employ local people and to use local materials.

Mrs. Firth: Look, there is no point in getting ridiculous with the debate. I asked the Minister a perfectly legitimate question.

Now the Minister of Health and Human Resources chuckles and laughs and is being silly.

It is a serious question. This is a Supplementary Estimate. The Minister of Community and Transportation Services said yesterday that there were urging and pressing things that needed to be done. Why are we, and the public and media, not to expect that the government is looking like they are just trying to find projects to spend money on. When I asked the question about LEOP, there is \$3 million there that is to be identified specifically for use in the communities. I will give the Minister a chance to have a conference with the Minister responsible for the program. Out of \$3 million, this is a legitimate job-creation project that they build a bison chute, and they employ four or five people from the community of Carmacks so that they have some work for the winter works program. Why could this not have been identified under the LEOP, and the funds spent from that program as opposed to coming and asking for \$46,000 more from the Capital Budget? Why could it not

have gone under that program?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The government-initiated projects are not eligible to be funded under LEOP.

Mr. Lang: I want to make a point for the record, because it is not going to be identified and I feel it is important that it be identified.

The Minister has indicated that their reason for the \$46,000 was to have it all done locally, as opposed to \$44,000 for outside work. That was fine, but he was just informed by the deputy minister that that had been costed out. He did not know that prior to the deputy minister telling him. He found out in the course of debate.

There does not seem to be any rhyme nor reason nor thought given to how we are spending other peoples' money. When this bottomless pit comes to an end, it is going to be quite an awakening for all the people in the territory. I think that the Minister, and then all of us, have a responsibility to analyze these dollars and say how we are spending them.

I bow to my good friend, the MLA for Kluane, who the Minister of Tourism has often stood up and said has a great deal of expertise and background with respect to the outdoors and that particular area of concern to the people of the territory. As the MLA for Kluane said, from his own experience dealing with livestock, it is incredible how government can spend money, and blow money, but if you were to do it privately, you would do it for about one-eighth the cost.

What the Hell, go ahead, pass it.

Bison Compound Capture Facility in the amount of \$46,000 agreed to

Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$439,000 agreed to

Chairman: Any comments on the Capital Recoveries?

On Capital Recoveries

On COPE

COPE in the amount of \$250,000 agreed to

Capital Recoveries in the amount of a recovery of \$250,000 agreed to

Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$439,000 in expenditures and \$250,000 in recoveries agreed to

Chairman: The next Capital vote is the Department of Tourism. Before we get to that we will recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

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

On Department of Tourism

Chairman: General debate?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The funds that are called for here are for Visitor Reception Centres, Visitor Reception Centre Equipment and Landscaping. We have frozen expenditures there. We have taken the money and transferred it to the Visitor Reception Upgrading further on down in the vote. We have carried over money for the Yukon Pavilion. We are budgeting \$586,000 for disbursement at this time. As we go through it, I will explain further the numbers that were moved around there.

Art Gallery Renovations and Visitor Reception Centre Upgrading is for Watson Lake and Dawson City. Kluane Museum Retrofit is for the problems in the museum in terms of the heating costs, humidity control for the artifacts there, so that work is being done there.

Exhibit Case Construction is fairly straightforward. Stabilization will involve the trains in Dawson and Whitehorse.

Mr. Lang: With respect to Tourism generally, there is a concern with relationship to the Yukon Visitors Association. It has come to my attention that there has been at least a tentative agreement, through the cooperative marketing process, that the information that has been disseminated in the past vis-a-vis the booklet that was sent out to people who were interested in coming to the Yukon Territory will not be sent out unless there is a kind of

tear-out coupon that is sent to the government. I understand there has been a major change with respect to the initial information that is made available to prospective travellers to the territory because of the financial situation.

I do not know that much about it, but I just want to register a concern to the Minister. If we are changing our format in this particular case, as far as encouraging people to come to the territory, perhaps he could make a general observation with respect to the change and the financial significance of the change. Why are we changing, in view of the fact that I do not think anybody will argue that we have been very successful in the past years?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I was not fully aware of the situation until the Member raised it. My understanding is that the Committee has made a decision and endorsed what the Member speaks about.

Mr. Lang: Was the change brought about because it was a finite amount of dollars, and they had to make a decision within that amount of dollars and that is why the decision was made? It was not necessarily made by the cooperative committee because they wanted to, is that not correct? If so, I would like to know the difference in dollars.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The decision was made on the basis that there was not the level of funding. What happens in cooperative marketing, as the Member knows, is the yearly allocation is made available and basically the then industry and government make a collective decision as to how that money is spent.

Mr. Lang: I would like to know what the difference in dollars is? I am very concerned, and I am flagging this. I am surprised the Minister did not know about this until I raised it with him. Does he not talk to his officials? That is very important to the tourism industry.

Chairman: Order, please. The line of questioning has nothing to do with the Budget at hand. It would be better addressed in the Capital Mains Budget. That perhaps explains why the Member is not prepared to speak to it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will undertake to get the relevant information and make that available to the Member.

Chairman: Any further general debate?

On Visitor Reception Centres - Landscaping

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I explained earlier, we will be moving this money to the Visitor Reception Centres Upgrading.

Visitor Reception Centres - Landscaping in the amount of a reduction of \$29,000 agreed to

On Visitor Reception Centres - Equipment

Hon. Mr. Porter: Our intention here is to take the \$11,000 and move it to Visitor Reception Centres - Upgrading. The remaining \$14,000 will be spent on updating the audio-visuals, and repairs to the VCRs. Repairs to displays at Watson Lake, servicing of equipment and replacement of recording equipment at Watson Lake and purchasing additional displays for Carcross.

Mr. Lang: If we are transferring the money to Visitor Reception Centre, why are we leaving \$1,000 for revised vote for the project?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The \$1,000 was spent on some flowers for the centres.

Visitor Reception Centres - Equipment in a reduction of the amount of \$11,000 agreed to

On Yukon Pavilion - Expo '86

Hon. Mr. Porter: This is a very complicated area. We budgeted \$2 million in 1985/86, and the actual expenditure was \$1.6. We are now revoting the \$391,000. We had also looked at \$100,000 in the Main Estimates for 1986/87 for demolition. We have really spent \$256,000 of the \$391,000, as of yesterday. The problem with this process is that these are targeted in July and August, and we do not really get to debate them until now. The expenditures are ongoing.

The information that we had yesterday is that the outstanding commitments for various contracts was \$256,000. An additional \$56,000 has been spent on converting the 18-projector show. We have taken the 18-projector show and have redone it to bring it down to six projectors. We actually filmed that show with video equipment so we have transferred from 18 projectors to six projectors onto video. That process cost \$20,000, and of that expenditure, \$10,400 comes out of here.

The pre-show is extended from five minutes to 18.5 minutes because of the gap in time in moving people from the pre-show to the main audio visual. Two copies were made for the cost of \$15,000 there. The final payment for the 12 minute audio visual was made during the fiscal year at \$5,900. Two complete copies of the 18-projector slide show were done at a cost of \$23,000. We have taken the entire 18 projector slide show and made duplicate slides for that. I do not pretend to understand the process but apparently, it is very costly and they had to physically take slides apart and do an elaborate cut and paste job. We were told that if we wanted copies for the future and did not commit at that time to make the additional ones, it would cost us more to bring the original slides back.

There were other expenditures of \$2,000.

Of the \$100,000 that was budgeted for the dismantling of the pavilion, we chose to go for demolition that cost \$12,000. Moving artifacts back to the Yukon was \$11,200, and an additional \$1,800 for individuals who loaned artifacts to the pavilion. In this area, under Expo '86, we are looking at a surplus right now of \$153,000.

Mr. Lang: On the Capital side, is the overall cost of Expo — now that it is completed and everything has been dismantled and done as far as coming to conclusion of that particular program — going to be the projected \$3 million?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The cost will be less than that.

Mr. Lang: How much less?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Our guess as to the final figure would be around \$2.1 million, so approximately \$900,000.

Mr. Lang: We did project \$3 million cost for the Capital project, did we not, or was it \$2 million? Could the Minister refresh everybody's memory as to exactly what the projected costs were.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Sorry, I took the \$3 million as fact. The actual figure was \$2,251,000 for Capital. As we stated, we expect to spend \$2,100,000.

Mr. Lang: What were our ballpark costs on the O&M side? Were we within budget in that particular area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The original budget for O&M was slightly over \$2 million. We are going to spend about \$1,700,000, so we are underbudget on the O&M side as well.

Mr. Lang: Further to that, I would like to go into the video copies. I want to express that we are pleased to see that the work has been done with respect to making every effort to ensure that the show that was there has come back to the Yukon and can be used in other ways.

Are the video copies going to be similar to a vignette that could be sent across nationally and internationally, for the purposes of promoting tourism on TV networks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of promotion, yes. These videos would be ideal for promotion. If we want to extract portions of the video to produce a vignette, which is even shorter, then we could do that as well. We have the material.

Mr. Lang: Is that the intention of the government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes. When we move to the Capital Mains discussion, that will become clear.

Mr. Lang: I do not quite understand the purposes of scaling down the show from 18 cameras to six cameras. Is this because in some buildings here at the College we are only going to have six cameras versus 18? Is that the reason? Perhaps he could explain that further.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We wanted a reproduction of the original show that you can have on video cassette. It becomes very marketable and easily transportable. To be able to have the video cameras shoot it, we had to go to six projectors because that meant that you decrease the width of the screen in which the original show was projected. The screen was too wide so you would not be able to get a good camera shot of it, if we continued with 18 projectors. We will still have a replica of the show complete with the ability to use 18 projectors. That is the further cost.

Mr. Lang: What happened to the 18 projectors?

Hon. Mr. Porter: They are back in the Yukon.

Mr. Lang: Is it the intention to set it up somewhere, and if so where?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We have not made a decision as to a

permanent location, but one of the things we talked about earlier when we announced the results of the conversion study is that we will be attempting to put together a formal public meeting where we allow the people of the Yukon to come to a large building, probably in Whitehorse, and view the original 18 projector production.

Yukon Pavilion — Expo '86 in the amount of \$391,000 agreed to On Art Gallery Renovations

Hon. Mr. Porter: The expenditure in this area is for an electronic check-point security system that has been planned and Members will remember that there were some problems with thefts from the Art Gallery. This will hopefully deter future thefts.

Art Gallery Renovations in the amount of \$12,000 agreed to On Visitor Reception Centre Upgrading

Hon. Mr. Porter: In Dawson City we are expecting to spend \$79,440 with an additional \$10,000 for as-built drawings. We are going to respond to the detailed reports put together that showed the architectural problems with the structure of the building. Also there have been mechanical and electrical deficiencies. We are going to spend money on the mechanical renovations, ventilation and heating system, electrical renovations to upgrade to code, exterior and interior renovations, to partitioning fire doors, stairwells, flooring repairs and insulation.

In Watson Lake, again there is an examination of that particular program. We are going to be spending \$46,500, which is the projected cost. These are material renovations to partitioning fire doors, stairwells, flooring repairs, mechanical renovations, ventilating and heating system, minor electrical and plumbing renovations.

Mr. Lang: I have to rise again with respect to what we are doing with this money. The Watson Lake Reception Centre was just finished about two years ago, at a good cost. It was duly inspected by the government inspectors. Why would we be putting in another \$45,000 into a building that met the Code? I know for a fact it is in pretty good shape.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Maybe at one point they were in good shape. The present situation is that there are some major difficulties with those centres. For example, Dawson did cost \$780,000 to build. I do not remember the specific figure on the Visitor Reception Centre in Watson Lake, but it would probably be similar.

I do not really have an appreciation for all the problems but, if the Member wants, there are assessments, breakdowns and letters from the architects and engineers that I can make available if he wants. They explain in great detail the numerous problems that have been uncovered in those two buildings.

Mr. Lang: This is a major concern. These particular projects were undertaken with the blessing of the Legislature within the last five years. Now, we are being asked, on the strength of engineering studies, to spend \$136,000 rectifying jobs that were done and met the Code and were duly inspected by the government. It seems to me that here we go again, blithely saying somebody made a mistake, so we will just throw some money into it. The question is: who is responsible for being paid good money to ensure these buildings meet the Code and meet the projected costs that are going to be incurred for the next 20 years?

The Minister of Government Services may want to make some comments on that. I recognize the Minister of Tourism is strictly voting the money. It seems to me that for us to sit in the House and not question why we are putting so much money into brand new buildings would be irresponsible on our part.

The Minister of Government Services may have some comments to make with respect to the process that is going to be undertaken to find out why and try to identify why we are being put into this position. There has to be a responsibility centre that made decisions that have put the Minister in a situation that he is coming for \$136,000.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have a whole series of reports from mechanical technologists, fire marshalls and from engineering. In the Dawson building, a complete examination of the facility was undertaken by a consultant, Public Works staff, Government Services project inspectors and the deputy fire marshall. Detailed reports have been compiled covering architectural problems with the structure of the building, together with numerous mechanical and electrical deficiencies. They then make the explanation as to

what the cost of rehabilitating the building would be.

If the Member wants, and is concerned, to substantiate the necessity for the money, I am prepared to make available to him all of the relevant information. It is an unfortunate situation where relatively new buildings are, at this point, being discovered to have serious problems. I think that we have a responsibility to make sure that the buildings are up to standard and are safe for public use.

Mr. Lang: I am going to take the Minister at his word. I am not going to ask for copies of letters and other things. I respect the fact that he is prepared to provide those. That, however, is not the point I am making. The Government of the Yukon Territory went into two major projects with taxpayers' money. Within the realm of the civil service, there were contracts tendered, plans drawn up and all the various other requirements that were to be met.

The Members of this House voted for that money. There was approximately \$700,000 for the project in Dawson. There was \$400,000 for the one in Watson Lake. Those were policy decisions. Is anyone questioning the government why we are being put into the position of having to spend this money? This goes back to what happened with the Faro gymnasium. Nobody intended to have that fall apart. Are the same people revising the plans that were submitted in the first place? If that does not bother the government, I guess we can say, "who cares".

If it was my house or my business, if I had a tender and a contractor build it, if within two or three years I am looking at a major expenditure, I would really question exactly what workmanship was done and why it was done. Maybe the money has to be spent, but I think the government should start looking at what they are doing and why they are doing it to ensure that this does not happen again.

⁴⁷ What can I say? Who cares?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The difficulty about this debate is that it is a situation where we inherited the buildings. The reality is that those deficiencies have been brought forward to our attention, and we are now responding and trying to correct those deficiencies by the upgrading of the centres.

Mr. Lang: The Legislature inherited, and you were a Member of the Legislature. You voted, like I voted, for those projects, in good faith that they would be done properly and we would have nice facilities to service the tourism industry.

That is not the point. I am not blaming you. I am not blaming past Ministers of Tourism. I am not blaming anybody in this House. I am only saying that we have a situation where major deficiencies have been identified within a couple of years of these projects being completed. I am questioning why there are those deficiencies to that extent? Who is responsible for us being put into this situation of us having to go out and ask the taxpayer to put more money in? That is what I am asking.

Blaming it on the past government is not the purpose of the debate I am entering into. I do not see this as a partisan debate. I see it from the perspective of trying to investigate the system so it does not happen again. Like I said before: who cares?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member wants me to respond that I will check with the Minister of Government Services and ask that they look at it, certainly. If we want to go back further into the history of these projects, we can show that there were decisions made in the past where the bureaucrats recommended against occupation of the building. I believe it was the individual from Protective Services.

The building was not up to Code, but the premature opening was pushed. I think if we go further into this issue, we can bring out all the details of what surrounded these projects and go back to inspection reports and the whole works. The question of allowing these buildings to be built to a standard that is not acceptable is wrong. If the Member would like, I will make a personal request to the Department of Government Services to report on these two buildings and make that available. I would provide the Member with a copy of that, if he would like that.

Mr. Lang: Obviously the Minister is not interested to find out why we are in a situation where we had plans that obviously for whatever reason did not meet code. I do not recall an early opening or anything like this. Maybe it did not meet the fire code at that

time. If it did not, it was because of the amount of money available, I would assume. My only concern is that obviously the design and all the things that were done were done in such a manner that here we are needing \$136,000. Obviously with the attitude the Minister has taken, forget it, do not waste your time.

Visitor Reception Centre Upgrading in the amount of \$136,000 agreed to

On Kluane Museum Retrofit

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have described this particular area of expenditure earlier. The problem is related to the Kluane Museum of Natural History. We are doing a retrofit there. The description of the work is that the building will be enveloped, the interior of the building, and an additional heating system will be put in. The cost breakdown is \$30,000 for materials, \$10,000 for equipment, ceiling fans, hemostatic control, control for the furnace and labour at \$60,000.

Kluane Museum Retrofit in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to On Major Artifacts Stabilization

Hon. Mr. Porter: The cost breakdown of \$10,000 for three trains in Dawson City for a total of \$30,000; the McBride train here in Whitehorse \$10,000; and other projects, an additional \$10,000. What has happened is that there has been a deterioration of the trains. They have been sitting in the open and basically open to the elements. There are rusting problems and pieces are coming off. There is a concern for public safety. Children can be climbing on these things and maybe become injured and, therefore, we would become liable. All of the trains are going to become stabilized. Some of the wood that has gone into original construction is going to be redone as well.

Major Artifacts Stabilization in the amount of \$50,000 agreed to On Exhibit Case Construction

Hon. Mr. Porter: The cost here is to construct 10 additional cases for the Teslin, Keno and Burwash museums. These cases are to house artifacts, and there is a special prototype that has been developed in the Yukon for these. They are very expensive, and the quality of work that has to go into these cases is of the highest standard. We are looking at 10 cases at \$5,000 apiece.

Exhibit Case Construction in the amount of \$50,000 agreed to Department of Tourism in the amount of \$699,000 agreed to

On Department of Government Services

Chairman: Vote No. 16 was stood over. Details are on page 11. This information was tabled.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have provided the information, which is the capital cost of the particular moves that have occurred and in one or two cases, those that are about to occur.

Mr. Lang: I would like to thank the Minister for providing the information to the House. Is there anything in the leases where if we decide to not renew the leases, is the money dead money or do we recover any of the costs that have gone into the upgrading of a private facility?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I could only answer in a detailed way about each individual move. Generally there are some recoverable items, but we do not recover anywhere near the expense. To tear down a wall is obviously not cost effective, but to move some things, like built-in counters, is effective. Generally, we recover something, but a small fraction of the expense.

Mr. Lang: On the information provided under Health and Human Resources Social Services, it says in brackets, "not determined", \$39,000. Can he explain to us what that means?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: That move has not occurred. The future location is not determined. I am unaware of the possibilities. The department is looking for suitable space for the Social Services Branch.

Mr. Lang: Where are they now?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: On the second floor of the Administration Building. The entire department was in one area. Community and Family Services has moved. The Young Offenders Unit is in the process of moving to the Tutshi Building, and the Social Services Branch is not determined, but scheduled to occur before April 1. The Department of Education will move into the space vacated here.

Mr. Lang: With respect to the moves and what we are doing now, does the Minister have an exact figure, per year, of how much it is costing to rent the private space that the government now requires, in total?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, but I do not have it with me. I can provide it. In any event, in the O&Ms, it can be broken down to the penny. It is in excess of \$1 million a year in the total government. I can provide that, yes.

Mr. Lang: If we could have that for the purpose of the debate in the capital appropriations, I would appreciate it because I think it would be of interest with respect to the Capital Budget when it is before the House.

Is the government considering purchasing the building up by the Chalet, the building that houses Renewable Resources?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: We were. We negotiated with the owner; however, his price has escalated in the last year or two. He is obviously asking far too much, and we will quite possibly be moving out of that building in the future, although that decision has not been made.

Mr. Lang: Does that mean that the Minister is indicating there is a strong possibility they will be building a building on behalf of the Government of the Yukon Territory to house these people?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. That is one of the options for the occupancy of the old Yukon College Campus, but that is a possibility at this point.

Mr. McLachlan: Is the government, if they are not considering an additional building for the reasons just stated, considering purchasing additional land anywhere in this city for a potential site for government buildings?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No, not at the present time.

Mr. McLachlan: What is the reason that Social Services is leaving this building? They are going, and we do not know where they are going. Why are they going?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: That department was the most overcrowded of all of the departments in the government. It is a matter of leaving the administrative unit of that department in this building, and the other units are moving out. The reason is simply the past overcrowding of this building.

Mr. McLachlan: If I interpret the Minister's remarks correctly in answer to the previous question about the somewhat over \$1 million per year for rental for private space in the city, will this shove it up some more?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. The total figure in past years was a substantial amount. I think it was approaching \$500,000, but those figures are very general. At the time of the O&M debate, I will provide the figures.

Mr. McLachlan: It is not apparent, the way this document is drawn up, but when we have a large unit, like Economic Development, moving out of the Tutshi Building, unless there is a lease that has expired at the time of the move, can I assume that Juvenile Justice moves into the space occupied by Economic Development and, thus, there is no loss to the government of having a lease and no one to put in there?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, exactly. We are terminating some leases. We have terminated leases in the Mainsteel Building and the old Prospector Building.

Mr. McLachlan: Is there a government policy that states that the government will not enter into a lease beyond a certain period of time? Will you go 10 years?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, there are Management Board directives on that point. It is necessary to get specific authorization to go beyond three years.

Mr. Lang: It is interesting how we are going back to the policy directives. I guess we have to adhere to them in this case, but in other cases, I guess we do not.

I had given a question to the Minister to do with the janitorial contractor report. I received from the Minister in writing that it was going to be on my desk Tuesday of last week. I would ask if the Minister could provide it to me tomorrow morning. I was under the impression I was supposed to have it last week.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I supplied the Member with a memo addressed to me saying that the report would be delivered to me last

week. It was, and I will be tabling it very shortly.

Chairman: Anything further on Government Services?

Department of Government Services in the amount of \$281,000 agreed to

Chairman: Department of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: In view of the time, I would move you report progress on Bill No. 7.

Motion agreed to

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order. May the House have a report from the Chairman of Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Webster: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 18, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1986-87*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I move the House do now adjourn.

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

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 5:27 p.m.