



YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

VOTES & PROCEEDINGS

22ND WHOLLY ELECTIVE COUNCIL

1974 SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 1

SPEAKER: MR. R.A. RIVETT

INDEX TO VOLUME 1  
1974 SECOND SESSION OF 22ND COUNCIL  
MARCH 20 - APRIL 2  
PAGES 1 - 364

BILLS	#	FIRST READING	SECOND READING	DEBATE	AMEND- MENTS	THIRD READING	ASSENT
1ST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE 1974-75	3	48	48	263-279; 295-331			
5TH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE 1973-74	2	48	48	56-76; 102-123		139-147	250
FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE 1974	4	49	49				
INTERIM SUPPLY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75	1	47	47	129-130; 178-200; 206-219		248-249	250
LOAN AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, No. 1, 1974	5	49	49				
MUNICIPAL GENERAL PURPOSES LOAN ORDINANCE	6	49	49				
ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE	13	16	16	17-30	226-232; 249	249	250
ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE FAIR PRACTICES ORDINANCE	17	294	294				
ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE MINING SAFETY ORDINANCE	18	294	294				
ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE	7	49					
ORDINANCE RESPECTING THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION	12	336	336				

MOTIONS	#	MOVED	DEBATE	AMEND- MENTS	RESULTS
ACCIDENT PREVENTION REGULATIONS BE INSTITUTED REGARDING AIRBORNE CONTAMINATES	14	288			
AMENDMENTS TO LIQUOR ORDINANCE RESPECTING DRINKING IN PUBLIC PLACES	5	77	233-237		CARRIED
BILL C-9 OF HOUSE OF COMMONS BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	2	35	35-36		CARRIED
BILL C-11 OF HOUSE OF COMMONS BE GIVEN UNANIMOUS SUPPORT BY COUNCIL	3	36	36-38		CARRIED
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION EXPAND POLICY TO INCLUDE YUKON	15	289	289		CARRIED
ELECTORAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION LEGISLATION BE BROUGHT FORWARD	6	79	79-85	81	CARRIED AS AMENDED
ELECTED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT	16	334	334		CARRIED
LEGISLATIVE RETURN #12 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	10	175	175		CARRIED

MOTIONS	#	MOVED	DEBATE	AMEND- MENTS	RESULTS
LEGISLATIVE RETURN #13 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	13	288	288		CARRIED
LEGISLATIVE RETURNS #17, 18 AND 19 TO BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	11	202	202		CARRIED
LEGISLATIVE RETURN #20 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	12	247	247		CARRIED
MOTION IN COMMITTEE RE: BILL C-9		176	<del>147-172;</del> <del>176-177</del>		CARRIED
MOTION IN COMMITTEE RE: COUNCIL DELEGATES TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS & NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT		177	<del>147-172;</del> <del>177-178</del>		CARRIED
N.C.P.C. MARSH LAKE APPLICATION AND MAJOR HYDRO SITE	7	85	85- 90		CARRIED
SESSIONAL PAPERS #1 AND 14 AND LEGISLATIVE RETURNS #1, 3, 4, 7 AND 12 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	1	35	35		CARRIED
SESSIONAL PAPERS #2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12 AND 13 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	4	77	77		CARRIED
SESSIONAL PAPER #8 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	8	132	132		CARRIED
SESSIONAL PAPER #14 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	9	175	175		CARRIED
SESSIONAL PAPER #15 BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE	10A	202	202		CARRIED

MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS	#	MOVED	RESULTS
INFORMATION ON PROPOSED CAMPGROUNDS AND RECREATION AREA	1	35	L.R. #15
PLANS OF PROPOSED WATSON LAKE HOSPITAL	2	287	

SESSIONAL PAPERS	#	TABLED	DEBATE
B.L.A.D.E. PROGRAM	9	35	
COMMISSIONER'S BUDGET MESSAGE	2	35	
COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS	1	3	
COMMUNITY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	12	35	
COSTS OF P.S.A. NEGOTIATIONS	4	35	
ECONOMICS OF YUKON WILDLIFE	16	35	
E.M.O. TRANSFER	5	35	
EMPLOYEES' HOUSING BUY-BACK SCHEME	3	35	
FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORTS POLICY	17	77	346-352
GAME HARVEST	20	77	
GRANTS, LOANS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	15	175	
HEALTH AND WELFARE REGIONAL OFFICE	8	35	



SESSIONAL PAPERS	#	TABLED	DEBATE
HOTEL-HOTEL ASSOCIATION BRIEF ON THE LABOUR STANDARDS ORDINANCE	18	35	
KLONDIKE '73 REPORT	7	35	
LEGAL AID	14	3	
MEDICARE CHANGES	13	35	206-219
METRIC CONVERSION	11	35	
NORTH COAST PROGRAM (KOMAKUK BEACH)	6	35	
REMEDIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM	10	35	

LEGISLATIVE RETURNS	#	TABLED	DEBATE
ADVISOR FOR CITY OF WHITEHORSE	10	3	
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, APPOINTMENTS	4	3	
AGENCIES SERVING ONE FAMILY	13	3	
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, AUTHORITY FOR	3	3	
BOTTLE CONTROL	12	3	250-254
CAMPGROUND AND RECREATIONAL AREAS PROPOSAL	15	175	
CARMACKS, RESERVE LAND	21	246	
C.N.H.C. MORTGAGES IN PORTER CREEK	9	3	
COMMITTEE REPORT REGARDING MOTION #9 OF 1972	7	3	242
CONSUMERS PROTECTION ORDINANCE, ENFORCEMENT OF	11	3	
CONTRACT AMOUNTS OF MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT FIRM FOR SOCIAL WELFARE BRANCH	2	3	
DAWSON AIRPORT, POWERLINE	8	3	
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENTS	19	175	
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MINISTER'S INSTRUCTIONS	18	175	
FALL SESSION OF COUNCIL	22	246	
FARO, MUNICIPAL AID TO	25	333	
FIRE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	6	3	
FLEMING, MR., TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT	20	202	
HIGHWAY SIGNS, CONTROL OF	5	3	
MILLER, MR., APPOINTMENT	14	77	
N.C.P.C. MARSH LAKE APPLICATION AND GENERATING FACILITY	16	175	
OLD CROW RIVER BANK EROSION	1	3	241
REVENUE FROM CORPORATION AND INCOME TAX	24	333	



LEGISLATIVE RETURNS	#	TABLED	DEBATE
ROBERT CAMPBELL BRIDGE, CONTRACT	17	175	254-262
ROYALTIES ON PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS EXPORTS	23	333	

WRITTEN QUESTIONS	#	ASKED	REPLY
PATIENT CASE-LOADS OF WATSON LAKE COTTAGE HOSPITAL	5	<sup>247</sup> 175	
REVENUE FROM CORPORATE AND INCOME TAX	3	175	L.R. #24
REVENUE FROM PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS EXPORTS	4	175	L.R. #23
ROYALTY REVENUE FROM EXTRACTIVE RESOURCES PRODUCTION	2	175	
QUESTIONS REGARDING MR. FLEMING'S TERMINATION	1	136-137	

ORAL QUESTIONS	ASKED	REPLY
AMENDMENTS TO LABOUR STANDARDS ORDINANCE	13	14
AMENDMENTS TO LAND TITLES ORDINANCE	138	138-139
AMENDMENTS TO LEGAL PROFESSION ORDINANCE	46	47
AMENDMENTS TO LIQUOR ORDINANCE,	12	12
CONTROL OF PUBLIC DRINKING	44	44
AMENDMENT TO MINING SAFETY ORDINANCE	203	203
AMENDMENT TO MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE	293	
ARCTIC WINTER GAMES' FUTURE	44	44- 45
ASBESTOSIS COVERAGE IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION	8	8
COMMISSIONER, ACCESS TO	99	99
LEGAL ADVICE TO	132	133
COST OF HOSPITALITY SUITE DURING ARCTIC WINTER GAMES	15	
COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS, AS PUBLIC DOCUMENTS	93-95	93- 95
AUTHORITY FOR C.O. 1970/2		L.R. #19
C.O. 1974/19	8- 9	
COUNCIL DELEGATES TO STANDING COMMITTEE, EXPENSES	335	335
DIRECTORY OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES TO COUNCILLORS	101	101
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS	42	
ELECTORAL DISTRICTS REDISTRIBUTION LEGISLATION	247	247
ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD, 1973-74 ACTIVITIES	13	
ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT OF	335-336	

ORAL QUESTIONS	ASKED	REPLY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MINISTER'S INSTRUCTIONS	41	L.R. #18
FALL SESSION OF COUNCIL	175-176	L.R. #22
LEGISLATION PLANNED FOR	247	247
FARO SUB-SOIL CONDITIONS	43	43
MUNICIPAL AID BASIS	130	L.R. #25
FLEMING, MR., TERM OF SERVICE	203 291 334	291 334
FUEL EQUALIZATION, NEGOTIATIONS	203-204	203-204
HERSCHEL ISLAND COORDINATING COMMITTEE	293-294	293-294
ISOLATED POST ALLOWANCE, REMOVAL OF	15	
LABOUR STANDARDS ORDINANCE, AMENDMENTS	13	14
LAND CLAIMS PROGRESS	10	
LAND TITLES ORDINANCE, AMENDMENTS	138	138-139
LAND RESERVE IN CARMACKS AREA	91	L.R. #21
LAND USE REGULATIONS, APPLICATION	41	
LEGAL PROFESSIONS ORDINANCE, AMENDMENTS	46	47
LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR VEHICLES ENTERING TERRITORY	248	
LIQUOR ORDINANCE, AMENDMENTS	12	12
MANAGEMENT CONSULTING FIRM RE: SOCIAL WELFARE BRANCH, REPORT OF	9- 10	
EXPENSES OF	10	
MEDICAL PROFESSION'S AGREEMENT WITH HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN	44	44
WITH COMMISSIONER	45	45
MEDICARE PREMIUMS, REDUCTION OF	205	205
MILLER, MR., APPOINTMENT OF	38	38
MINING SAFETY ORDINANCE, AMENDMENTS	203	203
APPOINTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTOR	335-336	
M.O.T. FORECAST FOR TERRITORY	335	
MOTION #3 FORWARDED TO MINISTER	92- 93	92- 93
MOTION #7 FORWARDED TO MINISTER; REPLY TO	92- 93	92- 93
MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE, AMENDMENTS REQUESTED	293	
N.C.P.C.: MARSH LAKE PROJECT	11 334	
STUDY OF HYDRO REQUIREMENTS	12	12
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING, COMMISSIONER'S ATTENDANCE	289	289-290
LOCAL RATES	289	289-290
NORTHERN PIPELINE PROPOSAL; SUMMARY	42	
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES' COUNCIL, JOINT MEETING OF COUNCILS	39- 40	40
OUT-PATIENTS OF HOSPITALS AND NURSING STATIONS, BILLING	38	39

ORAL QUESTIONS	ASKED	REPLY
PARAMUTUAL BETTING DURING RENDEZVOUS	16	16
PLEBISCITE RE: MAIN-STEELE LOTS	13	
POLICE SERVICES IN TERRITORY, CONTROL OF	16	16
POLICY MANUALS TO COUNCILLORS	9	9
REAL ESTATE AGENTS, LEGISLATION FOR	45- 46	46
ROBERT CAMPBELL BRIDGE, CONTRACTS	12	L.R. #17
ROSS RIVER: MONIES FOR YUKON ELECTRIC FACILITIES	40	40
RADIO AND T.V. FACILITIES	39	39
ROSS RIVER SCHOOL: CONSTRUCTION DATE	91	92
SMALL BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM: REPORT	291-292	
AUTHORITY FOR	292	292-293
REGULATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS	90- 91	90- 91
TEACHERS' SALARY NEGOTIATIONS	10	10
COURT CASE	132	132
TERRITORIAL PARKS, POLICY	8	8
TERRITORIAL REGULATIONS RE: DISCHARGE OF SEWAGE	133-135	133-135
WHITEHORSE AIRPORT RENOVATIONS	335	
WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD, MEETINGS OF	15	15
Y.T.G. NEWSLETTER, MAILING LIST	138	
YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION: PROFITS OF	135	136
REPORT OF	9	9

WITNESSES	BILL	PAGES
Mr. MILLER	1	129-130; 179-200; 206-219
Mr. MILLER, Mr. HUBERDEAU	2	50- 76; 102-123
Mr. MILLER, Mr. HUBERDEAU	3	263-363



VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1974

THE SECOND SESSION OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1974, BEING THE TWELVTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WHOLLY ELECTIVE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, WAS CONVENED IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT 3:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1974.

THE MEMBERS PRESENT WERE:

Mr. NORMAN S. CHAMBERLIST, WHITEHORSE EAST  
Mr. MICHAEL G. STUTTER, DAWSON  
Mr. DONALD E. TAYLOR, WATSON LAKE  
Mrs. HILDA P. WATSON, CARMACKS-KLUANE LAKE  
Mr. J. KENNETH MCKINNON, WHITEHORSE WEST  
Mr. CLIVE TANNER, WHITEHORSE NORTH  
Mr. RONALD A. RIVETT, MAYO

THE CLERK READS THE PROCLAMATION.

Mr. SPEAKER ENTERS THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS,  
ANNOUNCED BY THE SERGEANT-AT ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: PLEASE BE SEATED. MADAM CLERK  
IS THERE A QUORUM PRESENT?

MADAM CLERK: THERE IS, Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I WILL NOW CALL THE COUNCIL TO  
ORDER. THE TWELVTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-  
SECOND WHOLLY ELECTIVE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON  
TERRITORY WILL NOW COME TO ORDER.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. SPEAKER, I RISE ON A POINT  
OF PRIVILEGE AND I WAS SO ANXIOUS TO SAY THIS  
I ALMOST GOT UP TOO SOON Mr. SPEAKER. I THINK  
I'M EXPRESSING THE FEELINGS OF ALL MEMBERS IN  
THE HOUSE IN SEEING Mr. SPEAKER BACK IN THE  
CHAIR. I THINK ALL MEMBERS, MYSELF PARTICULARLY  
HOPE HE ENJOYS GOOD HEALTH AND WE LOOK FORWARD  
TO A LONG AND HAPPY SESSION WITH Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR  
REMARKS. I HOPE I DIDN'T GET OUT TOO SOON.  
MADAM CLERK, WILL YOU PLEASE ASCERTAIN IF THE  
COMMISSIONER NOW WISHES TO GIVE HIS OPENING  
ADDRESS TO COUNCIL?

MADAM CLERK LEAVES THE CHAMBERS TO CONFER WITH  
THE COMMISSIONER, AND RETURNS.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. SPEAKER, THE COMMISSIONER IS  
READY TO GIVE HIS OPENING ADDRESS IN THE  
SUPREME COURT.

Mr. SPEAKER: COUNCIL NOW STANDS ADJOURNED TO

HEAR THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS.

Mr. SPEAKER AND THE MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ARE  
ESCORTED TO THE SUPREME COURT BY THE SERGEANT-  
AT-ARMS.

THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, Mr.  
JAMES SMITH, IS USHERED INTO THE SUPREME COURT  
BY HIS AIDE-DE-CAMP.

Mr. COMMISSIONER GIVES HIS OPENING ADDRESS  
(SET OUT IN SESSIONAL PAPER No. 1).

Mr. SPEAKER AND THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL RETURN  
TO THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER,  
AND I WISH TO ADVISE YOU THAT I HAVE A COPY OF  
THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS. WHAT IS  
YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE AT THIS TIME?

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE THAT  
THE OPENING ADDRESS OF THE COMMISSIONER BE  
TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION ON THE DAY FOLLOWING.

Mr. TANNER: I SECOND THAT.

Mr. SPEAKER: MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER  
FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE  
MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT THE OPENING  
ADDRESS OF THE COMMISSIONER BE TAKEN INTO CON-  
SIDERATION ON THE DAY FOLLOWING. ARE YOU  
PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

Mr. SPEAKER: ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

Mr. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

Mr. TANNER: Mr. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE, I BEG  
TO MOVE, SECONDED BY Mrs. WATSON, COUNCILLOR  
WATSON FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE A BILL ENTITLED  
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC  
UTILITIES ORDINANCE, BILL No. 13.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF THE  
HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL ALLOW MEMBERS TO HAVE  
THE BILL BEFORE IT IS INTRODUCED? IT IS VERY  
STRANGE THAT THIS SHOULD HAPPEN IN THIS MANNER.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, THE BILL WILL BE INTRODUCED AT FIRST READING,

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WITH RESPECT, MR. SPEAKER, LETS STICK TO THE RULES. THERE IS A REQUIREMENT IN THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL - TO PRODUCE THE BILL IN THE HOUSE AND THAT THERE IS NO BILL HERE, THERE IS NOTHING TO INTRODUCE. SURELY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, BY NOW, AFTER THREE AND A HALF YEARS SHOULD HAVE LEARNED SOMETHING ABOUT PROCEDURE IN THIS HOUSE.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY WE HAVE A COPY OF THE BILL DISTRIBUTED TO ALL THE MEMBERS.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: I NOW CALL COUNCIL BACK TO ORDER.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, HOW WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO PROCEED? DO YOU WANT ME TO INTRODUCE IT AGAIN? ON A POINT OF ORDER MR. SPEAKER, I BEG TO DIFFER WITH THOSE MEMBERS WHO HAVE SAID THIS CAN'T BE DONE. I THINK THEY WILL FIND THEY CAN. HOWEVER, I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO A PROCEDURAL WRANGLE.

MR. SPEAKER: INTRODUCE THE BILL AGAIN.

MR. TANNER: I WILL MR. SPEAKER. MR. SPEAKER, I BEG TO MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE A BILL INTITULED AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, BILL No. 13, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL No. 13 INTITULED AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. I BEG YOUR PARDON, I WAS A LITTLE HASTY. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL NOW STAND ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW MORNING.

ADJOURNED



FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1974

MR. SPEAKER READS THE DAILY PRAYER.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM SPEAKER, IS THERE A QUORUM PRESENT?

MADAM CLERK: THERE IS, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I RISE ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE AT THIS TIME. MR. SPEAKER, IT IS NOW UNUSUAL FOR THERE TO BE AREAS OF MISTAKES IN VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AND SOMETIMES THE STAFF OR INADVERTANTLY, THEY DO MAKE MISTAKES, HOWEVER, THERE IS ONE MISTAKE I FEEL THAT I SHOULD BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE ON PAGE 54, OF THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THIS YEAR. IT READS AS FOLLOWS, "WHEN I WAS MAKING REFERENCE TO AND REMINISCING RE: MY POLITICAL LIFE IN THE YUKON, I SAID THAT I FIRST CAME HERE EARLY IN '51 AND THEN IN '52 AND MY FIRST MUNICIPAL ELECTION WHEN I SAW IN THE PARISH HALLS, SIX CARD TABLES SET UP AND PEOPLE SITTING DOWN AT THE TABLES, FILLING OUT THEIR BALLOTS, AND THERE IS AN ERROR. IT NOW READS, "I FIRST CAME HERE EARLY IN '51 AND THEN IN '52. AT THE FIRST MUNICIPAL ELECTION, WHEN I SAW IN THE PARISH HALLS SIX CARD TABLES SET UP AND PEOPLE SITTING DOWN AT THE CARD TABLES, FANNING OUT THEIR BUTT-OCKS." MR. SPEAKER, I AM SURE EVEN THE MEMBERS OF THE SECRETARIAT ARE TRYING TO GET TO THE BOTTOM OF WHAT IS GOING ON IN THIS PLACE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY DOCUMENTS OR CORRESPONDENCE TO BE TABLED?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE THE TABLING FOR SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 1. THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS, SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 14 ON LEGAL AID, AND I BELIEVE MR. SPEAKER, FOR HONOURABLE MEMBERS' INFORMATION THERE IS SOME MORE INFORMATION TO COME ON THE LEGAL AID, AND LEGISLATIVE RETURNS 1 - 13.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE THE TABLING FOR REGULATIONS MADE SINCE THE LAST REGULAR SESSION OF COUNCIL, PURSUANT TO SECTION 37 OF THE INTERPRETATION ORDINANCE. THE FOLLOWING REPORTS PREPARED ACCORDING TO ORDINANCE, REPORT OF ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD FOR 1972-1973 PURSUANT TO SECTION 18 OF THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1972

PURSUANT TO SECTION 8 OF THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES ORDINANCE, REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION FOR 12 MONTHS ENDING JUNE 31, 1973 PURSUANT TO THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE, SECTION 6, TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 26 (1) OF THE YUKON ACT, TRANSPORT PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD REPORTS FOR THE YEARS 1972 & 1973 PURSUANT TO SECTION 19 OF THE TRANSPORT PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION REPORT FOR 1972-1973 PURSUANT TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION ORDINANCE, SECTION 19, REPORT OF THE YUKON PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE 1972 - 1973 FISCAL YEAR PURSUANT TO SECTION 102 OF THE YUKON PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS ORDINANCE, YUKON HISTORIC SITES & MONUMENTS BOARD REPORT FOR 1972-1973 PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 OF THE HISTORIC SITES & MONUMENTS BOARD ORDINANCE, REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CHILD WELFARE PURSUANT TO THE CHILD WELFARE ORDINANCE, SECTION 5 (E), (CONTAINED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE ANNUAL REPORT 1972-1973), REPORT OF THE HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN FOR THE YEAR 1972 PURSUANT TO SECTION 7 OF THE HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN ORDINANCE, REPORT OF THE CHIEF ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR FOR THE 12 MONTH PERIOD ENDING JULY 31, 1973 PURSUANT TO THE ELECTRICAL PROTECTION ORDINANCE, SECTION 15. THE FOLLOWING CONSULTANT STUDIES COMMISSIONED BY DEPARTMENTS DURING 1973:

- (A) CITY OF WHITEHORSE TRAFFIC & TRANSIT STUDY
  - (B) COMMUNITY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT STUDY
  - (C) CARMACKS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
  - (D) CARCROSS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
  - (E) TESLIN GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
  - (F) CITY OF WHITEHORSE ENGINEERING STUDY.
  - (G) POLLUTION ABATEMENT IN YUKON COMMUNITIES.
- MR. SPEAKER, MR. COMMISSIONER HAS AN ADDRESS ON THE BUDGET TO PRESENT AT THIS TIME.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM CLERK, WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF THE COMMISSIONER IS AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME? WE WILL HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

#### RECESS

MR. MCKINNON: IT'S BEEN 15 YEARS SINCE I WAS FIRST ELECTED TO THIS HOUSE AND AS FAR AS I CAN RECALL, THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT WE ARE GATHERED TO HEAR A BUDGET ADDRESS FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. I KNOW ON PAGE 2 OF THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS, THE STATEMENT THAT THE IDEA THAT YUKONERS SHOULD CONTROL THEIR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC POLICIES IS GAINING MOMENTUM. THEREFORE, WE



MUST HAVE SOME SENSE OF WHERE WE ARE TRYING TO GO, WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO AND WHAT THE TERRITORY MAY LOOK LIKE IN A FEW YEARS FROM NOW. AS WE MOVE INTO THIS ERA OF CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION, YOU AS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, WILL BE CALLED UPON TO SHARE THE EXCITEMENT, FACE THE CHALLENGE AND HELP CHART THE DIRECTION IN WHICH THE TERRITORY WILL MOVE. FURTHER, MR. SPEAKER, ANNOTATION 233 OF BEAUCHESNE'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES AND FORMS IS ONE OF THE OLD STANDING PRINCIPLES OF OUR CONSTITUTION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS SHOULD CONTROL THE FINANCES OF THE COUNTRY. THAT IS THE RIGHT, PRIVILEGE, AND DUTY OF THE HOUSE. IT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED BY MEANS OF STRUGGLE LASTING THROUGH CENTURIES, BEGINNING FROM THE 14TH CENTURY DOWN TO THE 17TH CENTURY, WHEN IT WAS FULLY CONFIRMED, AND SINCE THEN IT HAS NEVER BEEN DISPUTED. THE FINAL PRINCIPLE ON WHICH THE WHOLE OF OUR FINANCIAL SYSTEM IS BASED, IS THAT OF PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL. AND BY THIS, IT IS UNDERSTOOD NOT THE CONTROL OF PARLIAMENT IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL SENSE, BUT CONTROLLED BY THE COMMONS ALONE. MR. SPEAKER, IT SEEMS THAT WE ARE MAKING A RETROGRADE STEP IN THIS RESPECT RATHER THAN ADVANCING TOWARDS ANY SORT OF CONSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION. WHEN THE SPEAKER, WHO IS DIRECTLY UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, HE SAID TO COME TO THIS HOUSE, TO THE COMMISSIONER AND MAKE AN ADDRESS CONCERNING THE BUDGET WHICH SHOULD BE IN THE PROPER ORDER OF THE SOLE CONTROL, OF THIS HOUSE AND POLICIES OF PRIORITY SHOULD BE THE SOLE CONTROL OF THIS HOUSE. IT WOULD SEEM TO BE MUCH MORE IN THE SPIRIT OF ANY TYPE OF EVOLUTION THAT WE ARE MOVING TOWARDS, THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SHOULD BE THE PERSON WHO IS GIVING THE ADDRESS ON FINANCES TO THIS HOUSE. OF COURSE, WE ALL KNOW HOW THE PROVINCIAL AND THE FEDERAL HOUSES WORK, THAT AFTER THE OPENING ADDRESS BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR, THEN THE BUDGET ADDRESS IS GIVEN BY AN ELECTED MEMBER, BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE OF THE PARTICULAR PROVINCE OR OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. OF COURSE, THIS IS THE RIGHT AND PROPER WAY, BECAUSE WHEN ONE CONTROLS THE PURSE STRINGS AND ONE SETS OUT THE FINANCES OF THE JURISDICTION, THEN WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MEANINGFUL CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM. I JUST MADE THE POINT, MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT ALL MEMBERS SHOULD AGREE THAT IT SHOULDN'T BE THE COMMISSIONER'S PEROGATIVE TO BE MAKING THIS ADDRESS. THAT, THIS ADDRESS SHOULD BE IN THE HANDS OF AN ELECTED MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL AND NAMELY, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER,

I THINK THAT THE COMMENTS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MADE, ARE VERY VALID, BUT I AM SURE THAT EVERY MEMBER OF THIS HOUSE AGREES WITH HIM. HOWEVER, THERE IS A REQUIREMENT UNDER THE YUKON ACT AND FOR THAT REASON, THE COMMISSIONER IS HERE WITH THE BUDGET ADDRESS THIS MORNING. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT HE BE ALLOWED TO PROCEED WITH PRESENTING THE BUDGET ADDRESS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE POINT OF ORDER AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD INDICATE UNDER WHICH SECTION OF THE ACT, THERE IS A REQUIREMENT FOR THE COMMISSIONER TO STAND UP IN THIS HOUSE, AND GIVE A BUDGET ADDRESS, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW. PERHAPS SHE HAS SEEN SOMETHING THAT I AM NOT SEEING THERE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. COMMISSIONER, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS FULL WELL, IS THAT THE BUDGET MUST BE INTRODUCED BY MESSAGE OF THE COMMISSIONER AND IT IS ALSO QUITE OBVIOUS, THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER REPRESENTING WHITEHORSE-EAST, WAS QUITE WILLING TO HAVE THE COMMISSIONER GIVE THE BUDGET ADDRESS WHILE HE WAS A MEMBER OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE. ALL OF A SUDDEN, HE HAS CHANGED HIS VIEWS. I THINK THAT THE COMMISSIONER BE ALLOWED TO PROCEED AND GIVE THE BUDGET ADDRESS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. WHEN THE COMMISSIONER SPOKE THE LAST YEAR, HE GAVE, HE DID NOT GIVE A BUDGET ADDRESS, HE INTRODUCED THE BUDGET. THERE IS A LOT OF DIFFERENCE, IN THAT THIS WAS THE MESSAGE. IF THE INTENTION IS, THAT A MESSAGE TO INTRODUCE THE BUDGET IS FORTHCOMING, THAT'S ONE THING, BUT NOT TO ATTEMPT TO USE THE COMMISSIONER AS THE MINISTER OF FINANCE, WHICH HE IS NOT.

MR. SPEAKER: LET US PROCEED. MR. COMMISSIONER.

MR. SPEAKER: THANK YOU MR. COMMISSIONER. WE WILL NOW RETURN TO ORDERS OF THE DAY. ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEES? ARE THERE ANY BILLS TO BE INTRODUCED?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, UNDER REPORTS OF COMMITTEE.

MR. SPEAKER: I BEG YOUR PARDON?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, UNDER REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, THERE IS A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE. MAY I KNOW WHO IS THE, IF INDEED THERE IS ONE, CHAIRMAN OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL. MAY I BE SO INFORMED MR. SPEAKER?



Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have an official chairman of the Financial Advisory Committee.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, to further my question of privilege, could Mr. Speaker determine from the members of the Financial Committee of this House, as to when they will appoint a chairman and when the House will also have a report of that very important committee of this House.

Mr. Chamberlist: On that same point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to point out that the Advisory Committee on Finance is a Statutory Committee. No Committee can operate without there being a chairman of that Committee. If the Honourable Members who are members of that Advisory Committee on Finance are acting without a chairman, I would suggest the Committee is inactive.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps they are all chairmen.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Honourable Member from Whitehorse East and the Honourable Member from Watson Lake. I acted on the Financial Advisory Committee with these two other members when there was no official chairman.

Mr. Speaker: May we proceed with Orders of the Day?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chamberlist: With respect of the point of privilege Mr. Speaker, and this is something that I insist on. That, Mr. Speaker, this House has got to be guided by the Statutory requirements of the Yukon Act. If Mr. Speaker suggests that we continue with the Orders of the Day and leave out a very important point of privilege that has been raised by the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, then the position was quite clear that previously there has always been a chairman of a Finance Committee and the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, while he was sitting in the chair in your absence, agreed that there was a chairman of the Finance Committee while I was a member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest with respect, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Speaker do not pass this important point over, but indeed request of the members of the Advisory Committee on Finance that they get together for the purpose of appointing a chairman of the Advisory Committee on Finance as no Committee can be in existence and operative unless there is a chairman there.

Mr. Tanner: Instead of Mr. Speaker answering, could I speak on the point of privilege or order or whatever it was, one of ----

Interruptions --

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Speaker, if this House expects a report from the chairman of the Financial Advisory Committee, why hasn't there ever been one in the past and why wasn't there one in the past three years?

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I have just rose on a point of the chair. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you not to be hood-winked by the attempt that is being made now. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is your responsibility, as speaker of this House to advise the members of this Council of the Yukon Act and the sections dealing with the Advisory Committee on Finance, must be complied with because it is a Statutory requirement. It is just a simple thing I am asking of you, Mr. Speaker, is that you suggest to these members that they get together for the purpose of appointing a chairman of that Committee.

Mr. Speaker: We will look into the matter and report later.

Mr. Chamberlist: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, are we at introduction of Bills?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Are there any Bills to be introduced?

BILL NO. 1 INTRODUCED

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Councillor Tanner, for leave to

INTRODUCE BILL NO. 1 INTITULED THE INTERIM SUPPLY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 1 INTITULED THE INTERIM SUPPLY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE CAN'T VOTE ON IT UNTIL WE HAVE THE COPIES OF THE BILL IN FRONT OF US, OTHERWISE WE WON'T KNOW WHAT WE ARE VOTING ON.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM CLERK, DO YOU HAVE THE BILLS THAT ARE TO BE INTRODUCED?

MADAM CLERK: YES, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.

BILL NO. 2 INTRODUCED

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I BEG TO MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 2 INTITULED THE 5TH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 2 INTITULED THE 5TH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.

BILL NO. 3 INTRODUCED

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I BEG TO MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, FOR LEAVE TO

INTRODUCE BILL NO. 3 INTITULED THE 1ST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 3 INTITULED THE 1ST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, ON A MINOR POINT OF PROCEDURE, THE CLERK CAN'T RUN AROUND THE HOUSE THAT FAST. PERHAPS, IF MR. SPEAKER COULD, FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE HOUSE, JUST TAKE IT SLIGHTLY MORE SLOWLY, IN ORDER TO GET THE BILLS OUT BEFORE THE MOTION IS CALLED.

MR. SPEAKER: CERTAINLY.

MR. TAYLOR: ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. SPEAKER, I WAS THIS MORNING TRYING TO DETERMINE WHY WE CANNOT GET SOME OF THESE BILLS ON PUNCH PAPER SO THAT THEY CAN GO IN THEIR BINDERS AND WE CAN KEEP UP WITH THIS RAPID PACE OF PRESENTATION. I WAS INFORMED THAT THERE WAS A BUDGETARY PROBLEM, TO WHICH THEY COULD NOT FIND PUNCHED PAPER IN THIS GOVERNMENT ANYMORE AND I AM WONDERING IF MR. SPEAKER, IF YOU COULD TAKE IT IN LINE WITH YOUR OFFICE TO SEE IF POSSIBLY WE COULD CANCEL THE COMMISSIONER'S PARTY OR SOMETHING, IN ORDER THAT WE COULD PROVIDE THIS FACILITY TO FURTHER FACILITATE THE OPERATION OF THIS LEGISLATURE.

MR. SPEAKER: THAT WILL BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.

BILL NO. 4 INTRODUCED

MRS. WATSON: I BEG TO MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 4 INTITULED THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED



BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH,  
FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 4 INTITULED  
THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, 1974.  
ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.

BILL NO. 5 INTRODUCED

MRS. WATSON: I BEG TO MOVE, SECONDED BY  
COUNCILLOR TANNER, FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE  
BILL NO. 5 INTITULED THE LOAN AGREEMENT  
ORDINANCE, 1974 No. 1.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HON-  
OURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED  
BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH,  
FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 5 INTITULED  
THE LOAN AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, 1974 No. 1.  
ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.

BILL NO. 6 INTRODUCED

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I BEG TO MOVE,  
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, FOR LEAVE TO  
INTRODUCE BILL NO. 6 INTITULED THE MUNICIPAL  
GENERAL PURPOSES LOAN ORDINANCE.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HON-  
OURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED  
BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH,  
FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 6 INTITULED THE  
MUNICIPAL GENERAL PURPOSES LOAN ORDINANCE. ARE  
YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.

BILL NO. 7 INTRODUCED

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I BEG TO MOVE,  
SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, FOR LEAVE TO  
INTRODUCE BILL NO. 7 INTITULED AN ORDINANCE TO  
AMEND THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOUR-  
ABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE  
HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, FOR  
LEAVE TO INTRODUCE BILL NO. 7 INTITULED AN  
ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE. ARE  
YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE LEAVE GRANTED.  
ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD GIVE  
NOTICE OF MOTION THAT SESSIONAL PAPERS NO. 1 AND  
NO. 14, PLUS LEGISLATIVE RETURNS NO. 1, NO. 3,  
NO. 4, NO. 7 AND NO. 12 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE  
OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, EXCUSE ME, COULD THE  
HONOURABLE MEMBER REPEAT THE NUMBERS OF THE  
LEGISLATIVE RETURNS AGAIN PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, NO. 1, NO. 3, NO. 4,  
NO. 7 AND NO. 12.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES OF  
MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE  
NOTICE OF MOTION, RE: BILL NO. C-11 AND NOTICE  
OF MOTION RE: BILL NO. C-9.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, COULD THE HONOUR-  
ABLE MEMBER INDICATE C-9 AND C-11 AS BEING  
FEDERAL BILLS?

MR. MCKINNON: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES  
OF MOTION? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION  
FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS?

MR. TAYLOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO  
GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF

PAPERS THAT THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WITH ALL INFORMATION RELATIVE TO PROPOSED CAMPGROUND AND RECREATIONAL AREAS THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY AS REFERRED TO IN THE FEBRUARY NEWSLETTER, TO COUNCIL, INCLUDING THE SIZE AND LOCATION OF SUCH AREAS.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? AS THERE ARE NO MOTIONS, WE COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. MADAM CLERK, WILL YOU ASCERTAIN THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS AVAILABLE? WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

#### RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: THE COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

#### QUESTION RE: ASBESTOSIS

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, MY FIRST QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER IS BASED ON THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ORDINANCE AND HAVING TO DO WITH THE MATTER OF ASBESTOSIS. I HAVE CIRCULATED TO ALL MEMBERS, A PIECE OF LITERATURE I HAD PICKED UP OVER THE COURSE OF THE PAST SEASON ON THE SUBJECT AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. COMMISSIONER IF IT IS THE INTENTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO DEAL WITH THE MATTER OF ASBESTOSIS AT THIS SESSION IN THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ORDINANCE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THERE IS NOTHING PROGRAMMED ALONG THESE LINES. MR. SPEAKER I HAVE FURTHER QUESTION,

#### QUESTION RE: TERRITORIAL PARKS

MR. TAYLOR: I WILL THEN DEAL WITH THE MATTER IN ANOTHER MANNER. MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A FURTHER QUESTION OF MR. COMMISSIONER, THIS MORNING AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK HIM IF HE IS NOW PREPARED OR HIS ADMINISTRATION IS NOW PREPARED TO LAY BEFORE COUNCIL THE LONG AWAITED POLICY AND INFORMATION PAPER ON TERRITORIAL PARKS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ANSWER IS IN THE NEGATIVE. WE HAVE NOT COMPLETED THIS AT ALL. WE ARE USING THE REPORT THAT WAS GIVEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS HERE APPROXIMATELY FIVE YEARS AGO. THIS IS THE BASIS OF IT, BUT IT IS CERTAINLY NOT READY AT THE PRESENT TIME.

MR. TAYLOR: IS THE ADMINISTRATION, MR. SPEAKER, SUPPLEMENTARY, IS THE ADMINISTRATION GIVING CONSIDERATION TO REMOVING ALL THE AREAS IN THE TERRITORY RESERVED FOR TERRITORIAL PARKS UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THEY ARE PRE-

PARSED TO ESTABLISH A POLICY AND DELINEATE A POLICY IN RESPECT OF THEM?

MR. COMMISSIONER: NO, THE ANSWER IS IN THE NEGATIVE THERE, MR. SPEAKER. THE RESERVATIONS, THE PARK RESERVATIONS, ARE SIMPLY MAP RESERVATIONS AND THAT IS WHAT THEY ARE DESIGNED FOR IS TO RETAIN THAT LAND FROM DISPOSAL UNTIL SUCH TIMES AS COUNCIL CAN ACCEPT OR REJECT OR MODIFY OR DO WHATEVER THEY WANT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY AND THE ACCOMPANYING LEGISLATION THAT WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: I WILL RAISE THIS QUESTION AGAIN AT A MORE APPROPRIATE POINT.

#### QUESTION RE: COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, THIS MORNING WERE TABLED THE REGULATIONS. A VERY GREAT MULTITUDE WHICH SEEMED TO EMANATE OUT OF THIS ADMINISTRATION, THIS LEGISLATION BY REGULATIONS BUSINESS. I HAVE A QUESTION RELATED TO THREE OF THESE. ONE IS THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES ORDINANCE, COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1974/18 WHEREBY THE ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES FOR EACH CALENDAR YEAR SHALL BE FILED WITH THE COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE. THE REPORT SHALL BE TABLED IN COUNCIL AT THE ENSUING SESSION OF COUNCIL. THE COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1974/17, YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION ORDINANCE, AN ANNUAL REPORT. AGAIN, THIS SHALL BE TABLED AT COUNCIL AT THE NEXT ENSUING SESSION OF COUNCIL. AND THE ONE THAT INTRIGUES ME THE MOST IS COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1974/19, RESPECTING THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN ORDINANCE AND IT STATES THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN FOR EACH YEAR ENDING MARCH 31ST SHALL BE FILED IN THE COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE NO LATER THAN DECEMBER 31ST OF THAT YEAR. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHY THE ADMINISTRATION, MR. SPEAKER, DO NOT WISH THE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY TO HAVE THIS INFORMATION BEFORE THEM AS IN ALL THESE OTHER AREAS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I AM NOT AWARE OF ANYTHING, ANY REASON WHY WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE THEM. I THINK THESE, I THINK THAT YOU HAVE THIS ONE TABLED HERE TODAY, MR. SPEAKER. THE REASON FOR THESE ORDERS IS THAT IN SOME OF OUR ORDINANCES IT CALLS FOR THESE REPORTS BUT IT DOESN'T CALL FOR A DATE. IT DOESN'T SAY WHETHER TO COVER A FISCAL YEAR, A CALENDAR YEAR, A SCHOOL YEAR. IT DOESN'T SAY WHEN THEY ARE TO BE MADE AVAILABLE, AND SAYS NOTHING AT ALL ABOUT TAILING HERE IN THE COUNCIL AND THIS WHAT THESE ORDERS ARE REQUIRED TO CORRECT, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY, I STILL HAVEN'T GOT MY QUESTION ANSWERED. IN THE CASE OF THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES ORDINANCE, THIS MUST BE LAID BEFORE COUNCIL AND BY REGULATION. WHY THEN IN THE SAME REGULATION, ON THE SAME DAY, SIGNED BY



THE SAME COMMISSIONER, DO WE EXCLUDE THE COUNCIL FROM MATTERS AS FAR AS THEY EFFECT THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN, MR. SPEAKER?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE COUNCIL IS NOT BEING EXCLUDED. THEY ARE TABLED RIGHT HERE TODAY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION. MR. SPEAKER TO MR. COMMISSIONER. THE POSITION AS I SEE IT, FROM WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SPOKE, IS THAT TWO COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS ARE WRITTEN IN A MANNER THAT REQUIRES THAT THE COUNCIL BE THE RESPONSIBLE BODY WHERE THOSE REPORTS WOULD BE TABLED. ONE OF THE ORDERS READS THE COMMISSIONER. NOW THE QUESTION I THINK ALTHOUGH THEY HAD BEEN TABLED IN COUNCIL, THE QUESTION REMAINS, AS WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSIONER ISSUE ORDERS WHICH SAY "COUNCIL" IN TWO AREAS AND "COMMISSIONER" IN ANOTHER AREA. IS THERE A MISTAKE? IF THERE IS A MISTAKE, I THINK YOU SHOULD SAY SO.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY ERROR IN THE MAKE-UP OF THESE PARTICULAR THINGS. I CERTAINLY WILL TAKE A LOOK AT IT. BUT I WANT TO MAKE ABUNDANTLY CLEAR, MR. SPEAKER, THESE ARE NOT DESIGNED TO REMOVE FROM THE COUNCIL THIS INFORMATION. THEY ARE SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO SET DATES WHEN THEY MUST BE MADE AVAILABLE SO THAT THEY CAN'T BE MADE AVAILABLE AT COUNCIL. I AM QUITE PREPARED TO LOOK AT THE ONE THAT DOES NOT REFER TO COUNCIL. IT MAY WELL BE THAT THERE IS REFERENCE TO THE ORDINANCE ALREADY. I AM NOT TOO SURE, MR. SPEAKER.

QUESTION RE: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE YUKON HOUSING ASSOCIATION

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, WHILE WE ARE ON THE SUBJECT OF THESE REPORTS. I DO NOTICE THAT THIS MORNING WE HAVE THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION AS PER THE REGULATION. IT CONSISTS OF ONE PAGE. THERE IT IS. THAT IS THE WHOLE REPORT OF PROBABLY ONE OF THE MOST CONTROVERSIAL, SO CALLED CROWN CORPORATIONS, IN THE TERRITORY. I AM JUST WONDERING, IT SEEMS SO OBVIOUS TO ME THAT MAY I HAVE THE ASSURANCE OF THE COMMISSIONER THAT THERE WILL BE A FULL REPORT COMING ON THE ACTIVITIES ON THIS DEPARTMENT FOR THIS PARTICULAR CROWN CORPORATION?

MR. COMMISSIONER: IT IS GIVEN TO YOU.

QUESTION RE: POLICY MANUALS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, A QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. IN THE LAST SESSION, I REQUESTED THAT POLICY MANUALS BE GIVEN TO MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL AND BECAUSE THERE ARE CERTAIN POLICIES THAT MAY COME INTO QUESTION DURING THIS SESSION, CAN THE COMMISSIONER ASSURE THE HOUSE THAT POLICY MANUALS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS FOR THIS SESSION?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THEY ARE IN THE PROCESS OF BEING PUT TOGETHER AT THE PRESENT TIME. I AM SURE THAT THEY WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE AS QUICKLY AS IS POSSIBLE TO DO SO.

MRS. VATSON: MR. SPEAKER, THERE IS A COPY OVER THERE IN THE CHAMBERS AT THE PRESENT TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS THE MOST RIDICULOUS, MR. SPEAKER, STATEMENT TO MAKE. SEVEN PEOPLE CAN'T BE READING THE SAME POLICY MANUAL AT THE SAME TIME. I APPRECIATE WHAT MR. COMMISSIONER SAYS THAT IT WILL BE DONE. BUT I AM JUST MAKING REFERENCE TO THE INQUITIOUS TYPE OF MANNER IN WHICH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE WOULD RAISE IN A SERIOUS QUESTION OF THIS NATURE.

MRS. VATSON: MR. SPEAKER, A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. THE POINT WAS MADE UNTIL THE SEVEN ARE COMPLETED. THERE IS ONE COPY IN THE CHAMBERS AT THE PRESENT TIME IF YOU SHOULD WISH TO USE IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DOESN'T REALLY KNOW WHAT SHE SAID BECAUSE SHE SAID THERE IS ONE IN THE CABINET AND THAT IS ALL.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER.

QUESTION RE: MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS OF WELFARE BRANCH

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, A QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. THE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT'S EXAMINATION OF THE WELFARE BRANCH HAS, I UNDERSTAND, BEEN COMPLETE. HAVE YOU RECEIVED A REPORT? WHAT WAS THE RESULT OF THE EXAMINATION AND WHAT ADVICE HAVE YOU RECEIVED?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVEN'T RECEIVED A COPY OF THE REPORT AS YET. I AM NOT SAYING THAT IT HASN'T BEEN DELIVERED TO THE GOVERNMENT, MR. SPEAKER, BUT I PERSONALLY HAVE NOT



RECEIVED IT AS YET. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO LOOKS AFTER THAT DEPARTMENT MAY HAVE SOMETHING FURTHER TO WHAT I HAVE TO SAY.

MR. TANNER: I DON'T KNOW WHAT WAS SAID. WOULD YOU ASK THE QUESTION AGAIN, PLEASE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WON'T ASK THE SAME QUESTION AGAIN BUT I'LL ASK MR. COMMISSIONER IF HE CAN INDICATE WHETHER ANY OF HIS ADMINISTRATIVE PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY ONE OF HIS ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS, HAVE RECEIVED A REPORT FROM THE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS ON THE EXAMINATION OF THE WELFARE BRANCH?

MR. TANNER: NO, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION. WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER INDICATE WHETHER THAT REPORT IS TO BE EXPECTED DURING THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL AND PRIOR TO THE DISCUSSION OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE BRANCH ITEM AND IF THAT REPORT IS AVAILABLE PRIOR TO THAT TIME, WILL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL RECEIVE A COPY OF THAT REPORT? THIS IS A QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD ASK, IF I COULD, DEFER THE ANSWERING OF THIS QUESTION TO COUNCILLOR TANNER, PLEASE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WITH RESPECT, MR. SPEAKER, IT IS A PURELY ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION THAT I HAVE PLACED TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER. THE REPORT WILL BE SUBMITTED TO HIM. I WANT TO ASCERTAIN FROM HIM WHETHER OR NOT A COPY OF THAT REPORT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE, MR. SPEAKER, TO MEMBERS OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL? HE SHOULD EITHER SAY YES OR NO OR "I DON'T KNOW". THIS IS WHAT I WANT TO GET FROM THE COMMISSIONER. IF HE IS NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER IT, IT'S ANOTHER MATTER IN WHICH HE IS SAYING, "I HAVE NO RESPECT FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL SO THEREFORE, I WON'T ANSWER IT."

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL HAVE TO FIND OUT THE ANSWER. I JUST DON'T KNOW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER. AT THE LAST SESSION, I RAISED A QUESTION ABOUT THE BREAKING UP OF MEETINGS OF THE TEACHERS' SALARY NEGOTIATING TEAM UNDER SECTION 984 SUBSECTION 4, OF THE SCHOOLS ORDINANCE. HAVE ANY NEGOTIATIONS BEEN COMPLETED SO THAT YOU WERE ABLE TO COMPLY WITH SECTION 984 OF THE SCHOOLS ORDINANCE AND GIVE CONSIDERATION TO THOSE NEGOTIATIONS BEFORE THE PREPARATION OF THE ESTIMATES FOR THE YEARS 1974-75?

MR. COMMISSIONER: THE ANSWER IS IN THE NEGATIVE MR. SPEAKER. IT IS SPECIFICALLY NOTED SO IN THE BUDGET MESSAGE THAT I PRESENTED TO COUNCIL THIS MORNING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SUPPLEMENTARY, MR. SPEAKER. IS MR. COMMISSIONER AWARE THAT THERE IS A MANDATORY REQUIREMENT IN THE LEGISLATION THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO THE PREPARATION; BE GIVEN TO THE NEGOTIATIONS TO TEACHERS' SALARIES PRIOR TO THE ESTIMATES BEING BROUGHT FORWARD?

MR. COMMISSIONER: YES, I AM WELL AWARE OF THIS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AND DOES MR. COMMISSIONER ADMIT AT THIS TIME THAT THERE IS A BREACH IN THE ORDINANCE BY NOT CARRYING OUT THE REQUIREMENTS OF THAT SECTION?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I DON'T KNOW WHAT OR JUST EXACTLY HOW TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION, BUT THE FACTS ARE, THAT NEGOTIATIONS HAVE BEEN IN RECESS OR HAVE BEEN PUT IN RECESS UNTIL APPROXIMATELY LATE JUNE OR EARLY JUNE. THESE ARE THE FACTS OF THE MATTER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE ANSWER, MR. SPEAKER, I DIDN'T GET AN ANSWER IF THERE HAS BEEN A BREACH OF THE ORDINANCE AND THIS IS THE ANSWER HE MUST EITHER SAY YES OR NO BUT IF HE DOESN'T SAY YES OR NO, WE MUST SAY THAT THE ANSWER MUST BE YES. HOWEVER, WE WILL GO ON TO ANOTHER QUESTION.

QUESTION RE: REPORT ON THE INDIAN LAND CLAIMS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I ASKED MR. COMMISSIONER, AND MR. COMMISSIONER I WILL REPEAT THIS AGAIN, I ASKED YOU TO BRING FORWARD A REPORT ON THE INDIAN LAND CLAIMS AND I HAVE NOT SEEN ANYTHING BROUGHT FORWARD TO DATE. IS THERE ANYTHING COMING ON THIS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I AM GRATEFUL TO MR. COMMISSIONER. THIS IS THE FIRST STRAIGHT ANSWER HE HAS GIVEN TODAY.

QUESTION RE: EXPENSE SHEET FOR MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER, THE VALUE OF THE CONTRACT FOR MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT HAS BEEN INDICATED IN A LEGISLATIVE RETURN AT \$8,000. WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER PREPARE ALSO, THE EXPENSE SHEET FOR THIS MANAGEMENT



CONSULTANT, SO THAT THIS CAN BE DISCUSSED NOW THAT THIS PARTICULAR LEGISLATIVE RETURN HAS BEEN MOVED INTO COMMITTEE.

MR. COMMISSIONER: YES, BUT MR. SPEAKER, I WILL HAVE TO GET IT FIRST. WHEN IT IS AVAILABLE TO ME, I WILL MAKE IT AVAILABLE YOU.

QUESTION RE: NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION  
POWER PLANT

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT A QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER ABOUT ONE OF THE PARAGRAPHS IN HIS OPENING ADDRESS. I THINK IT IS PROBABLY ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT PARAGRAPHS IN THE ADDRESS THAT HE GAVE YESTERDAY. IT IS ON PAGE SEVEN, "IN THE FIELD OF ELECTRICAL POWER, THE TERRITORY HAS RECEIVED INFORMATION THAT THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION IS INITIATING A MAJOR POWER STUDY TO ASSESS THE POTENTIAL AND PLAN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUITABLE SITES TO MEET YUKON'S POWER NEEDS OVER THE NEXT TWO DECADES." I WONDER, MR. SPEAKER, WHETHER MR. COMMISSIONER IS WILLING TO GIVE DATES AND TIMES AND WHAT SIZE OF POWER PLANT THAT THE N.C.P.C. IS LOOKING FOR, HOW LONG THEY FEEL IT WILL BE UNTIL A MAJOR POWER DEVELOPMENT IS DEVELOPED, WHETHER THERE IS ACTUALLY A COMMITMENT NOW FROM N.C.P.C. TO FIND A MAJOR GENERATING FACILITY IN THE YUKON THAT WILL SUPPLY THE YUKON'S NEEDS IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THE PROPER WAY TO ANSWER THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S QUESTION IS FOR ME TO SEEK A CLARIFYING STATEMENT FROM THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION WHICH I WILL PROCEED TO DO. I THINK THAT SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS RAISED . . . IT MAY WELL BE SOMEWHERE DOWN THE LINE THEIR STUDIES BEFORE THEY WILL BE ABLE TO GIVE A FIRM ANSWER ON THESE THINGS. BUT CERTAINLY THE MAJOR PORTION OF THE QUESTION RAISED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS ANSWERABLE BY THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION AND I WILL PROCEED TO GET A CLARIFYING ANSWER FROM THEM.

MR. MCKINNON: IS THERE ANY INDICATION, MR. SPEAKER, THAT WITH THIS RATHER FORWARD-LOOKING PHILOSOPHY FOR THE FIRST TIME FROM N.C.P.C. THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE A MORATORIUM ON THEIR ASSININE APPLICATION TO RAISE THE WATER LEVEL AT MARSH LAKE TO THE HISTORIC HIGH LEVEL MARK?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT THAT WILL CONTROL THAT, MAYBE THAT IS NOT THE RIGHT WORD, BUT AT LEAST WHO WILL

SANCTION IT OR NOT SANCTION IT, IS THE YUKON TERRITORIAL WATER BOARD AND WHILE I CANNOT SAY THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE A MORATORIUM, THIS IS THE INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT TO WHICH OBJECTIONS TO THIS PARTICULAR PLAN HAS VOICED IN NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION SHOULD BE MADE. THIS COUNCIL HAS THREE APPOINTEES ON THAT BOARD AND I AM QUITE CONFIDENT THAT HONOURABLE MEMBERS WILL BE ABLE TO MAKE THEIR WISHES KNOWN THROUGH THESE MEMBERS.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. COMMISSIONER WHETHER HE WOULDN'T USE HIS CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE WITH THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT TO ASK IF PERHAPS N.C.P.C. WITHDRAW ITS APPLICATION BEFORE THE YUKON WATER BOARD BECAUSE IT IS JUST GOING TO LEAD TO A POINTLESS AND USELESS CONFRONTATION. IT CAN BE SOLVED BEFORE REACHING THE WATER BOARD AND N.C.P.C. HAS INDICATED THAT THEY ARE CHANGING THEIR PHILOSOPHY TO LOOK FOR A MAJOR POWER DEVELOPMENT. THEY WON'T HAVE TO BE GOING TO THESE AD HOC MEASURES ALL THE TIME THEN WHY EVEN GET IT TO THE POINT WHERE IT HAS TO GO BEFORE THE WATER BOARD AT A CONFRONTATION BEFORE THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON AND THE N.C.P.C.?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IT IS NOT UP TO ME TO SUGGEST TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS HOW THEY SHOULD POSSIBLY DIRECT THEIR WISHES BUT CERTAINLY THE MOTION FROM THIS COUNCIL TO THE EFFECT THAT WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS SAYING HERE RIGHT NOW DIRECTING ME TO PUT THIS WISH OF COUNCIL IN MY MINISTER'S HANDS WOULD CERTAINLY APPEAR TO ME TO BE THE IMMEDIATE ROUTE TO FOLLOW TO GIVE EFFECT OF EXPRESS DESIRES OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD I ASK A SUPPLEMENTARY, MR. SPEAKER? THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE-YEST HAS RAISED THE QUESTION VIS-A-VIS, N.C.P.C. AND YOU, MR. COMMISSIONER, WILL BE BRINGING SOME INFORMATION FORWARD, WOULD YOU BE BRINGING THIS INFORMATION FORWARD DURING THIS SESSION BY SESSIONAL PAPER SO THAT THE MATTER CAN BE FULLY DISCUSSED?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, VERY OBVIOUSLY, I AM SUBJECT TO THE ELEMENT OF TIME. I WOULD HAVE TO REQUEST THIS FROM THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION AND I AM SURE THAT IT WOULD BE FORTHCOMING PROMPTLY. I WILL COMMIT MYSELF, AS SOON AS I HAVE IT, I WILL BRING IT FORWARD TO THESE CHAMBERS.



Mr. Stutter: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Mr. Commissioner could give any indication as to whether this study is being undertaken by N.C.P.C. is as a result of the point that was raised, as a matter of fact, by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse-West during a brief visit from Minister Chretien. It did seem to me at that time, and I hope that I am not violating any confidential information of a private meeting, but it does seem to me that certainly Digby Hunter is not aware of any undertaking or any major undertaking that is being done by N.C.P.C.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, the commitment to undertake the study was made prior to the meeting that the Honourable Member referred to.

Mr. Chamberlist: A supplementary to Mr. Commissioner. Mr. Commissioner, are you aware that there has already been a complete report excluding one or two specific areas carried out by the Ingeldown Associates Limited, and the terms of reference for that report was sent to the Ingeldown Associates Company on April 28th, 1967. Is it a repeat of the same information that was being requested?

Mr. Commissioner: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member who asked the question is far more versed on the technicalities of this particular type of study than I am but, and I stand to be corrected, it is my understanding that the study referred to by the Honourable Member, done by Ingeldown, was to be for potential power sites. The study now being done is an examination of the actual development of some of these potentials.

QUESTION RE: SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 1

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Commissioner, this question is with reference to the Robert Campbell Bridge. Sessional Paper No. 1 First Session, last sentence, Mr. Commissioner stated if .... in this project become apparent, the City will be informed before contracts are signed. During the discussions on the Campbell Bridge on the fourth session, Mr. Commissioner indicated that that last sentence would be the sentence he would be guided in before signing any contract. There is another fact - I assisted him because I think it has always been said ... Now, what I want Mr. Commissioner is whether or not you consulted with the City of Whitehorse and did you get agreement from them before you signed a con-

tract which now raises the City in the position of having to come up with that they didn't agree to with the Territorial Government.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, to the very best of my knowledge, all the consultations which we were committed to have been carried out. I say this to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Chamberlist: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, before the signing of the last contract, did you consult with the City of Whitehorse in this matter. The information I have was that you advised the City of Whitehorse that you had signed the contract. Now, is that correct or is that incorrect?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I will have to examine all the correspondence in order to determine this question.

QUESTION RE: CHANGES IN LIQUOR ORDINANCE

Mr. Chamberlist: I wonder if Mr. Commissioner would be bringing an answer to a question that I have. Now, Mr. Speaker, a question to Mr. Commissioner that there has been much concern felt in the Municipality of Whitehorse with reference to the drinking on public streets. There have been strong suggestions made re amendments to the Liquor Ordinance relative to this particular subject. Does the Commissioner know that I have myself asked for something of this nature to be done for some considerable time. Will the Commissioner bring forward legislation that will amend the Liquor Ordinance to comply with the wishes of the people of the City of Whitehorse?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, any changes proposed to the Liquor Ordinance would be as a consequence of guidance and suggestions that come forth from this particular chamber. The debates that took place in this Council Chambers were prior to the section of the Ordinance that the Honourable Member's question refers to. It was such that I would think it very presumptuous on the part of my administration to be bringing any changes that in the first instance were not dealt with by consensus around this table on this particular point the Honourable Member raises and I would verify that I am aware of the concern that has been stressed to me by the Honourable Member, both publicly and privately in connection with the particular matter that he raises.



MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I AM SURE THE COMMISSIONER WILL AGREE THAT LEGISLATION COMES BEFORE THIS HOUSE THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL REQUIRE LEGISLATION BEFORE THE HOUSE. BUT AT LEAST, IF THE COMMISSIONER WOULD BRING THIS TYPE OF LEGISLATION FORWARD THEN THE HOUSE CAN CONSIDER IT. OTHERWISE, PERHAPS A PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL MIGHT BE THE ONLY ANSWER.

RE: MAINSTEELE LOTS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER, THE MAINSTEELE LOTS HAVE BEEN UNDER DISCUSSION NOW BY BOTH TERRITORIAL AND CITY COUNCIL FOR SOME TWO YEARS. IT WAS UNDERSTOOD, WHILE I WAS AT A MEETING, SITTING IN ON A MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL, THAT RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL THAT MR. COMMISSIONER DOES NOT APPROVE THE BY-LAW BUT RECOMMENDS THAT HE TAKES THE POSITION THAT A PLEBISCITE BE CALLED. THIS IS A PREROGATIVE OF THE COMMISSIONER. WOULD THE COMMISSIONER INDICATE WHETHER HE WILL COMPLY WITH THE WISHES OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE AND HAVE A PLEBISCITE ON THIS PARTICULAR MATTER?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF I COULD GET THE MATTER BEFORE ME BEFORE I COMMIT MYSELF TO AN ANSWER. I WILL GIVE COUNCIL MY ANSWER AS SOON AS I HAVE IT.

REPORT OF ELECTRIC PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A COUPLE OF ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS, I THINK. ALSO, I HAVE BEFORE ME AN ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ELECTRIC PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD AND IT AGAIN TELLS US NOTHING ABOUT THE ACTIVITY OF THE BOARD IN A REAL SUBSTANCE. I'M JUST WONDERING IF MR. COMMISSIONER WOULD CONSIDER GIVING US THE FULL ANSWERS UNDER THIS BUSINESS. THE FOLLOWING COMPLAINTS REGARDING THE RATE STRUCTURES RECEIVED AND DEALT WITH: (A) DAWSON CITY - THE FINDINGS OF THE BOARD WERE TRANSMITTED TO MR. M. STUTTER, AND (B) TESLIN - MR. R. FLEMING WAS ADVISED THAT REQUIREMENTS OF THE ORDINANCE MUST BE COMPLIED WITH PRIOR TO FURTHER ACTION BY THE BOARD. I AM WONDERING IF I COULD FIND OUT JUST WHAT ADVICE WAS GIVEN BY THE BOARD? SECONDLY, I AM WONDERING IF MR. COMMISSIONER WOULD CONSIDER PROVIDING MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WITH NO. 6 - IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE ORDINANCE, IN PARTICULAR, 23(1)(B) WHICH COVERS THE RATES, THE FIRING OF RATES BY ALL UTILITIES AND 32(1) WHICH AFFECTS THE MANNER IN WHICH PEOPLE APPROACH THE BOARD

HAVE BEEN UNDER ACTIVE STUDY. COULD WE FIND OUT THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY BECAUSE, INDEED, THIS IS WHAT REPORTS ARE SUPPOSED TO BE ABOUT IN THIS LEGISLATURE, I BELIEVE. WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER BE AMENABLE TO THAT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THERE WERE SOME THINGS THAT THE LEGISLATION SPELLS OUT THAT ARE REQUIRED BY THE ADMINISTRATION OR THE TERMINOLOGY THE COMMISSIONER IS TO DO, AND WHEN WE IN LEGISLATION, THESE BOARDS ARE SET UP AND IT INDICATES WHAT THEY ARE TO DO, IT IS UP TO US TO GO AHEAD AND DO THESE THINGS. I DO NOT MONITOR WHAT THE PUBLIC UTILITIES, THE ELECTRIC PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD DOES, AND I DID NOT WRITE THIS REPORT. THEY WRITE THIS REPORT THEMSELVES. IF BY MOTION, THIS COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO SEE THESE REPORTS EXPANDED I WOULD BE VERY PLEASED TO PASS THE COUNCIL'S WISHES TO THESE PEOPLE, BUT I CONSIDER IT TO BE A VERY, VERY UNWISE THING FOR MYSELF OR MEMBERS OF MY ADMINISTRATION TO, LITERALLY, TELLING THE BOARD WHAT IT SHOULD DO OR PUT IN ITS REPORT.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I BELIEVE MR. COMMISSIONER HAS VERY EFFECTIVELY GONE AROUND THE MULBERRY BUSH AS USUAL ON THIS ONE. I HAVE ASKED HIM IF HE WOULD CONSIDER BRINGING BEFORE COUNCIL THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS I RAISED, ARISING OUT OF THIS REPORT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL GLADLY PASS ON THE QUESTION TO THE BOARD AND IT'S UP TO THE BOARD TO ANSWER THE QUESTION.

MR. TAYLOR: WILL THIS BE DONE, MR. SPEAKER, WILL THE COMMISSIONER DO THIS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. COMMISSIONER WILL PASS ON THE QUESTIONS.

RE: YUKON HOTEL/MOTEL ASSOCIATION

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, FOR SOME TIME IN THE TERRITORY THE CANADIAN RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION AND THE YUKON HOTEL/MOTEL ASSOCIATION HAVE STRIVED TO GET BEFORE THIS HOUSE, LEGISLATION TO RESOLVE TWO QUESTIONS - 1. THE RATES OF PAY TO THOSE UNDER SEVENTEEN YEARS OF AGE UNDER THE LABOUR ORDINANCE, AND THE OTHER IS A MATTER RESPECTING GENERAL HOLIDAYS IN THE YUKON. COULD THE COMMISSIONER ADVISE IF INDEED THIS LEGISLATION HAS BEEN PREPARED AND WILL BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE AT THIS SESSION?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, LEGISLATION HAS NOT BEEN PREPARED BUT A PAPER IS COMING TO



COUNCIL SEEKING THEIR ADVICE ON THESE TWO MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN A SUBJECT OF A BRIEF PRESENTED TO THE ADMINISTRATION AND TO EACH MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL. BASED ON THE ADVICE THAT COUNCIL GIVES, WE WILL PROCEED ON THIS.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, SUPPLEMENTARY TO THAT. IS IT THE INTENTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO GIVE SOME URGENCY TO THIS MATTER IN ORDER THAT AS A RESULT OF AN EARLY COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON THIS SUBJECT, THAT LEGISLATION CAN BE PREPARED FOR THIS SESSION IN ORDER TO MEET THIS URGENCY.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I'M NOT GOING TO COMMIT MYSELF TO THIS SESSION IN THE PREPARATION OF LEGISLATION BUT THE FIRST THING THE ADMINISTRATION HAS TO HAVE, IS GUIDANCE FROM THE COUNCIL AS TO WHAT THEY WISH WITH REGARD TO THESE TWO QUESTIONS. NOW, WE COULD GET COUNCIL ADVICE ON THIS AND I DON'T KNOW WHEN THIS PAPER IS AVAILABLE AND I THINK IT IS READILY AVAILABLE. IF COUNCIL COULD LET US HEAR WHAT THEY WISH THEN WE CAN ANSWER THE SECOND PART OF THE ARGUMENT.

RE: COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS

MR. TAYLOR: JUST ONE FINAL QUESTION MR. SPEAKER. ON PAGE 15 OF THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS, THERE IS A STANDARD PHRASE WHICH IS IN ALL OF COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS - "I TRUST THAT THE MATERIAL PLACED BEFORE YOU WILL ENABLE ME TO CARRY FORWARD YOUR DELIBERATIONS IN A MANNER THAT WILL MEET WITH YOUR APPROVAL. MY OFFICERS AND I STAND READY TO ASSIST YOU IN ANY WAY WE CAN TO MAKE THIS A PRODUCTIVE SESSION FOR THE YUKON." WILL THE COMMISSIONER, INDEED, REMEMBER THAT WHOEVER WROTE THAT SPEECH, PUT IT IN THERE AND HE DID UTTER THE WORDS AND WOULD HE CONTINUE WITH THIS POLICY FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS SESSION.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THAT HAS BEEN MY POLICY SINCE THE DAY I WAS MADE COMMISSIONER IN 1966 AND IT WILL BE MY POLICY UNTIL THE DAY THEY FIRE ME.

MR. TAYLOR: WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER THEN REVIEW THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS TOMORROW OF THE QUESTIONS OF TODAY?

MR. COMMISSIONER: OH WELL .....

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE QUESTION RE THE LABOUR STANDARDS ORDINANCE, I WONDER IF MR. SPEAKER WOULD TABLE THE TWO BRIEFS

SUBMITTED TO MR. SPEAKER AND THE OTHER MEMBERS SO AT LEAST WE HAVE THOSE TWO DOCUMENTS IN THE HOUSE. THIS COULD BE DONE TOMORROW.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THEY WILL BE ATTACHED TO A COVERING SESSIONAL PAPER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, A QUESTION FOR MR. COMMISSIONER. THIS IS RE THE STATUS OF YTG IN RELATION TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. DO YOU AGREE THAT YTG IS AN AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: WELL, I WILL AGREE THAT IT IS A CREATURE OF THE FEDERAL PARLIAMENT OF CANADA BECAUSE THEY CREATED IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WOULD YOU AGREE THAT IT IS AN AGENCY? THIS IS THE QUESTION.

MR. COMMISSIONER: I REFER THAT TO THE LEGAL ADVISER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD HATE TO HAVE TO POINT OUT THAT MR. COMMISSIONER, MR. SPEAKER, THAT HE HAS ALREADY RAISED AN ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION, BUT I WANT HIM TO ANSWER IT HERE. DO YOU AGREE THAT IT IS AN AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: NO MATTER WHAT I DO, ALL I DO IS DIG MYSELF IN DEEPER ... BECAUSE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS ASKED THEM UNDOUBTEDLY SPENT VERY MANY HOURS RESEARCHING THIS AND TAKING A LOOK AT COURT CASES THAT DO A LOT OF WORK FOR WHICH I HAVE NOTHING BUT THE HIGHEST RESPECT FOR THE AGILITY OF HIS BRAIN TO GRASP THE INTRICACIES OF AND I STILL THINK THE LEGAL ADVISER SHOULD BE THE GUY TO HANDLE THIS ONE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT IF YOU WILL VIEW IT IN A FEW SHORT WORDS, PERHAPS THE LEGAL ADVISER WILL THEN ANSWER. DO YOU AGREE THAT YTG IS AN AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: MR. SPEAKER, SOMETIMES YES AND SOMETIMES NO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT, THEN SUPPLEMENTARY TO THAT QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, IS THE COMMISSIONER OR THE LEGAL ADVISER - DO YOU AGREE THAT THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE YUKON ACT DOES NOT ALTER THAT STATUS? AND IF HE SAYS SOMETIMES YES AND SOMETIMES NO, THAT IS GOING TO BE A DIFFICULT ONE TO ANSWER. CAN THAT BE ANSWERED?



MR. LEGAL ADVISER: I DON'T THINK THE STATUS IS CHANGED BY THE PRESENT AMENDMENTS. IT HAS NOT YET BEEN PASSED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, HAVING ATTEMPTED TO OBTAIN AN ANSWER FROM MR. COMMISSIONER FOR SOME YEARS, WHAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES ARE WITHOUT ANY SUCCESS AND BEFORE LEAVING YOUR POSITION AS COMMISSIONER WHICH MAY COME SOON, THIS MIGHT BE YOUR LAST REGULAR SESSION OF COUNCIL THAT YOU WILL BE ATTENDING - HAVE YOU BEEN ABLE TO COMPILE SOME OBJECTIVES AND IF YOU HAVE, CAN YOU LET COUNCIL KNOW SO THAT YOUR EIGHT YEARS OF COUNCIL WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED AN ENTIRE WASTE.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, AFTER ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST FOR THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS, THERE IS NO WAY THAT ANYBODY COULD CONSIDER MY TERM AS COMMISSIONER TO BE A COMPLETE AND TOTAL VACUUM, LET ME ASSURE YOU. I WILL SEE WHAT I CAN DO BEFORE THIS SESSION IS OVER CONCERNING THE QUESTIONS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS ASKED.

MR. SPEAKER: THANK YOU.

QUESTION RE I.P.A.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER, THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVANTS, NORTHERN ALLOWANCES HAVE BEEN OF CONSIDERABLE INTEREST TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER INDICATE WHETHER HE HAS, ON BEHALF OF HIS ADMINISTRATION, MADE A STRONGER PROTEST TO THE TREASURY BOARD AS THE RESULT OF THE PROPOSED REMOVAL OF THAT PARTICULAR ROUTE.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THIS HAS BEEN DONE THROUGH THE POSITION THAT I HOLD AS A CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE HERE IN WHITEHORSE. ON BEHALF OF ALL THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES THAT OPERATE HERE IN THE YUKON, IT WAS DONE MANY MONTHS AGO IN THE FORM OF A BRIEF AND LIKEWISE IN A REPRESENTATION THAT WAS MADE BY A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TREASURY BOARD AND I BELIEVE, OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS WERE SENT HERE FOR THAT SPECIFIC REASON, ON EXAMINING THE QUESTION OF ISOLATION POST ALLOWANCE. SO THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE AND THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR MANY MANY MONTHS PRIOR TO THE PUBLIC'S AWARENESS OF THIS PARTICULAR PROBLEM.

QUESTION RE: WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER. IS MR. COMMISSIONER AWARE THAT THERE HAS NOT BEEN A MEETING OF THE WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD FOR SOME SIX MONTHS AND WHAT STEPS WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER TAKE TO SEE THAT THIS COMMITTEE WHICH HAS BEEN OF SOME GREAT VALUE WILL CONTINUE TO EXIST.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, FORTUNATELY, YOU KNOW, I AM ONE UP ON THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ON THIS ONE. I WROTE TO DR. MORELL APPROXIMATELY TWO OR THREE MONTHS AGO ABOUT THIS MATTER AND HE HAS SINCE THEN INFORMED ME THE DIFFICULTIES THAT HAVE ARISEN AND THE CONTINUATION OF THE HOSPITAL BOARD MEETINGS AND THE VARIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS HE HAD. I BELIEVE THAT LIKEWISE, THAT A NEW SET OF BY-LAWS; MAYBE I'VE GOT THE WRONG TERMINOLOGY HERE, IN CONNECTION WITH A NEW FORMULATION OF THE HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD, WHICH I BELIEVE IS, OR HAS BEEN, IN THE PROCESS OF BEING CIRCULATED TO THE PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. ONCE THEY HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY REVIEWING THE BY-LAWS THEY WILL BE MEETING - A MEETING WILL BE CALLED OF THE PRESENT BOARD TO GET THEIR AGREEMENT TO THE RE-CONSTITUTION OF THE WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD UNDER THIS NEW SET OF BY-LAWS.

QUESTION RE: COST OF HOTEL SUITE - A.W.G.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE LAST ONE FOR THE DAY FOR ME. MR. COMMISSIONER, WOULD YOU ADVISE COUNCIL WHAT WAS THE COST OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SUITE PER DAY AT THE ANCHORAGE HOTEL DURING THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I HAVEN'T GOT A CLUE, MR. SPEAKER. ALL I CAN TELL YOU WAS IT GAVE A GREAT VIEW OF THE HARBOUR, THAT'S ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, SUPPLEMENTARY, WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER NOT EVADE THE QUESTION ON THAT BY SAYING HE IS PREPARED TO BRING FORWARD THE COST OF THAT PARTICULAR SUITE PER DAY?

RE: COMMISSIONER'S BUDGET SPEECH

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, JUST ANOTHER QUESTION I HAVE NOTED AND OVERLOOKED. IT IS PROBABLY, WELL IT IS A VERY SERIOUS AND IMPORTANT QUESTION ALTHOUGH I DON'T HAVE A COPY ON HAND OF THE



COMMISSIONER'S BUDGET ADDRESS WHICH HE GAVE IN THE HOUSE A SHORT WHILE AGO. HE DID STATE, AT SOME POINT IN TIME, AT THAT BUDGET ADDRESS THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY OR HIMSELF AS COMMISSIONER HEADING THAT GOVERNMENT, ONE OR THE OTHER HAVE WHOLE CONTROL OVER THE POLICE SERVICES IN THE YUKON. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE COMMISSIONER IF THIS IS INDEED CORRECT AND IF SO TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE WE GOT CONTROL OVER THE POLICE SERVICES IN THE YUKON,

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, CAN I SUGGEST THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER GET A COPY OF THE BUDGET ADDRESS AND STUDY IT. I DID NOT SAY THAT AT ALL. WE DO NOT HAVE CONTROL.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, IF I COULD BE ALLOWED TO ASK A QUESTION BEFORE WE BREAK. I WAS WONDERING WHAT THE GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE WOULD BE OR THE REACTION WOULD BE TO THE REQUEST FROM THE YUKON SOURDOUGH RENDEZVOUS COMMITTEE TO SET UP A SYSTEM OF PARAMUTUAL BETTING ON THE DOG RACES AT THE SOURDOUGH RENDEZVOUS.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ONLY THING THAT I HAVE SEEN ABOUT THIS IS WHAT WE HAVE SEEN IN THE PRESS AND I HAD A VERY SHORT TERRITORIAL CONVERSATION WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SOURDOUGH RENDEZVOUS COMMITTEE. MY SUGGESTION TO HIM WAS, THEY OUTLINE WHAT THEY PROPOSE TO DO AND GET IT INTO THE HANDS OF THE COMMITTEE SO THAT WE CAN TAKE A LOOK AT IT. I'M RATHER SYMPATHETIC TO THE COMMENTS OF THE SOURDOUGH COMMITTEE THAT THE FUNDING OF THE EVENT; I BELIEVE THE MAINSTAY OF THIS FUNDING IS THE SALE OF QUEEN CANDIDATES TICKETS AND THIS IS JUST NOT PROVING TO BE A PARTICULARLY EASY THING TO CARRY ON WITH. WHILE I CANNOT SAY, AT THIS TIME, EXACTLY WHAT THE OUTCOME OF THE REQUEST FOR THIS WOULD BE, I WOULD SAY THAT, ALTOGETHER, I WOULD GIVE A SYMPATHETIC LOOK. REMEMBER THAT MANY OF THESE THINGS THAT LOOK SIMPLE ON THE SURFACE BUT WHEN YOU GET RIGHT INTO IT, YOU FIND OUT SOME OF THE COSTS THAT ARE INVOLVED IN ORDER TO GIVE EFFECTIVE SERVICE WOULD MAKE IT PROHIBITIVE. I WOULD LIKE TO FEEL THAT THE SOURDOUGH RENDEZVOUS COMMITTEE OR ANY OTHER INTERESTED ORGANIZATIONS, ALONG WITH THE TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION WOULD TAKE A LOOK AT JUST WHAT EXACTLY SHOULD BE PROPOSED. WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT? IT WILL GET A PRETTY SYMPATHETIC HEARING AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED.

MR. SPEAKER: WE WISH TO THANK MR. COMMISSIONER FOR HIS ATTENDANCE. AS THERE ARE NO PRIVATE

BILLS AND ORDERS WE COME TO PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS.

BILL NO. 13

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT FIRST READING BE GIVEN TO BILL NO. 13, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT FIRST READING BE GIVEN TO BILL NO. 13, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR THE SECOND TIME?

*MOTION CARRIED.*

MR. TANNER: NOW, MR. SPEAKER, I MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON, THAT SECOND READING BE GIVEN TO BILL NO. 13, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT SECOND READING BE GIVEN TO BILL NO. 13, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, BEFORE THE QUESTION IS VOTED ON, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT ON SECTION 3, I THINK IF THEY COULD MOVE FORWARD; I THINK THAT IT'S BETTER THAN WHAT WAS ASKED FOR AND I'M SURE THE PEOPLE IN THE OUTLYING AREAS WOULD APPRECIATE THAT. MY OBJECTION, MR. SPEAKER, IS TO SECTION 1 AND THIS IS WHERE I SPEAK AGAINST THE PRINCIPLE. BECAUSE, IN THIS PART

HERE, THE BOARD IS GOING TO BE PERMITTED TO GRANT AN AUTHORITY WHERE IT ISN'T PERMITTED, RATHER AN INTERIM AUTHORITY, WHERE IT IS NOT PERMITTED IN THE ORDINANCE TO GRANT AN AUTHORITY. NOW, ALSO THAT THERE IS NO INDICATION AS TO WHAT LENGTH OF TIME THAT THE INTERIM AUTHORITY IS GOING TO BE FOR, AND WHEN THIS IS DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE IF THIS ISN'T CHANGED I WILL NOT SUPPORT IT, AND I FEEL SORRY THAT I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO SUPPORT THE BALANCE OF SECTIONS 2 AND 3 WHICH ARE QUITE SATISFACTORY.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION TO BE CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE TAKE A NOON RECESS AT THIS TIME. ALRIGHT, I MOVE THAT THE SPEAKER NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR AND COUNCIL RESOLVE INTO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING PUBLIC BILLS.

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. STUTTER: I SECOND IT.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE AND SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON CITY THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSE OF MEETING IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS BILLS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE

WILL PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COMMITTEE STANDS IN RECESS UNTIL 2:00 O'CLOCK THIS AFTERNOON.

*RECESS*

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE WILL COME TO ORDER. FOR US AT THIS TIME IS BILL NO. 13, NAMELY AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO READ THE EXPLANATORY NOTE. THE PURPOSE OF THIS BILL IS TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ELECTRICAL CONSUMERS OUTSIDE A MUNICIPALITY WHO MAY FILE A COMPLAINT WITH THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD TO ADMIT ELECTRICITY TO BE SOLD IN AN AREA COVERED BY A FRANCHISE, AND TO CLARIFY AN APPARENT INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THIS ORDINANCE AND THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: PROCEED WITH SECTION NO. 1, SECTION 19 OF THE SAID ORDINANCE IS AMENDED BY ADDING THERETO THE FOLLOWING NEW SUBSECTION: "19.(2) NOTWITHSTANDING SUBSECTION (1) WHERE, IN RESPECT OF ANY AREA OF THE TERRITORY, NO FRANCHISE HAS BEEN GRANTED, THE BOARD MAY, SUBJECT TO ANY CONDITIONS IT MAY IMPOSE FROM TIME TO TIME, GRANT AN INTERIM AUTHORITY TO A PERSON TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY." COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I THINK MR. LEGAL ADVISOR WILL AGREE WITH ME ON A SPECIFIC POINT. THERE IS A VAST DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE GRANTING OF A FRANCHISE AND THE AUTHORITY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. I BRING THIS POINT BECAUSE THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE, AND I'VE JUST NOTICED THIS, IS AN ERROR IN ONE PARTICULAR SECTION. REALLY, I HAVE TO REFER TO THE SECTION 2 OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IS BEFORE US AS WELL AT THIS TIME. IN SECTION 1, REFERENCE IS MADE TO THE GRANTING OF AN INTERIM AUTHORITY TO A PERSON TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. THE ORDINANCE ITSELF, IS AN ERROR, AND I AM SORRY I DIDN'T PICK IT UP WHEN WE DELT WITH THIS ORDINANCE IN 1972, THAT IT HAS A WEAKNESS. THERE IS NO AUTHORITY UNDER THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. IT IS AN ERROR THAT HAS BEEN LEFT OUT. I THINK THIS



SHOULD BE CORRECTED. THE ONLY AUTHORITY THAT IS GIVEN UNDER THE POWERS TO THE BOARD, IS IN SECTION 14 (1), WHICH READS, "THE BOARD MAY AUTHORIZE A MEMBER OR ANY OTHER PERSON TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON ANY QUESTION OR MATTER ARISING IN CONNECTION WITH THE BUSINESS OF THE BOARD." THAT IS THE ONLY AUTHORITY. THERE IS NO AUTHORITY FOR ANYBODY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. ALTHOUGH THERE IS PROVISION FOR THE GRANTING OF FRANCHISES.

IF THERE IS NO AUTHORITY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY, CERTAINLY, THERE CAN BE NO INTERNAL AUTHORITY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. THAT IS POINT ONE. I HAVE TO REFER NOW TO SECTION 2, BECAUSE SECTION 2 AMENDS BY ADDING 21.2 TO THE PUBLIC UTILITY ORDINANCE AND IT MAKES REFERENCE TO SECTION 118 OF THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE.

SECTION 118 OF THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE GIVES THE AUTHORITY TO ERECT OR OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. I AM SURE MR. LEGAL ADVISOR WILL AGREE WITH ME THAT NO MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE OR RATHER NO BYLAW IN ITSELF, BECAUSE THIS DEALS WITH THE COUNCIL MAY BY BYLAW GRANT A FRANCHISE UPON SUCH TERMS. IN ADVANCING OF THE FRANCHISE, AUTHORIZE OR OPERATE. I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THIS DEPARTS FROM THE ORDINANCE THAT IS THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, WHEN A BYLAW CAN BE MADE TO GIVE THE POWER TO OPERATE THE PUBLIC UTILITY WHEN THERE IS NO POWER GIVEN IN THE LEGISLATION ITSELF. I THINK WHAT WE HAVE TO DO, IS WE HAVE TO TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT THESE 2 SECTIONS, AND I'M NOT OPPOSED TO THE GENERAL IDEA THAT IS BEING PROMULGATED HERE, BUT I SAY THERE IS A WEAKNESS, AS I HAVE INDICATED IN THOSE 2 PARTICULAR SECTIONS. PERHAPS, MR. LEGAL ADVISOR WOULD SAY WHETHER OR NOT HE WOULD HAVE TO TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT THOSE PARTICULAR POINTS I HAVE MADE.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE LEGAL ADVISOR IS ALWAYS TAKING SECOND OR THIRD OR FOURTH LOOKS AT THE LEGISLATION. AS A RESULT OF TAKING A PRIVATE LOOK AT THE LEGISLATION OF SECTION 19.2, IT IS SUGGESTED IN THIS HOUSE FOR AMENDMENT. IT APPEARS WHEN THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD WAS CONSIDERING THE PROCEDURES TO DEAL WITH APPLICATIONS FOR THE RENEWAL OF A FRANCHISE TO THE MUNICIPALITY OF WHITEHORSE, THAT THERE WAS A WEAKNESS IN THE ORDINANCE, WHICH YOU ARE ATTEMPTING TO REMEDY BY AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 21, BY ADDING A SECTION 21.2 WHICH HAS NOT YET BEEN READ OUT BY THE CHAIRMAN. IN THAT SECTION, IT APPEARS THE COMMISSIONER HAS, BY ONE ORDIN-

ANCE, THE POWER TO APPROVE A FRANCHISE, THE MUNICIPALITY HAS THE RIGHT TO GRANT A FRANCHISE, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER.

TO NARROW THE 2 SECTIONS INTO ONE, IT APPEARED TO BE HELPFUL TO THE PROCEDURES THAT THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD, NOR SHOULD THE APPROVAL OF THE MUNICIPALITY BE GRANTED WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD EITHER. THERE IS A WEAKNESS IN PROCEDURE IN THIS, RATHER THAN A WEAKNESS IN LAW. PUT IN EXAMINING THESE SECTIONS, THEN THE BOARD WAS CONSIDERING WHAT OTHER PLACES HAVE GOT FRANCHISES AND THEY WERE FAMILIAR WITH THE NEWSPAPER REPORTS OF COMPLAINTS FROM ROSS RIVER. SO I AM LOOKING THROUGH THE LEGISLATION, WE FIND THAT THERE IS IN EXISTENCE AT THE PRESENT TIME, NO FRANCHISE IN RESPECT TO ROSS RIVER, AND SOME OTHER PLACES IN THE TERRITORY. BUT NEVERTHELESS, WITHOUT A FRANCHISE HAVE BEEN GRANTED, PEOPLE ARE BUYING ELECTRICITY FROM A PRODUCER AND THAT PRODUCER IS SELLING ELECTRICITY. THERE ARE A FEW OTHER PLACES AFFECTED SUCH AS TAGGISH. IN ORDER TO GET BY THE PROHIBITION IN SECTION 19, IT WAS NECESSARY TO DO SOMETHING TO THIS ORDINANCE.

SECTION 19.1 SAYS THAT NO ONE CAN OPERATE, NO ONE SHALL IN THE TERRITORY, A PUBLIC UTILITY WITHOUT A FRANCHISE GRANTED EITHER BY THE MUNICIPALITY OR THE COMMISSIONER. A FRANCHISE IS AN AGREEMENT TO SUPPLY ELECTRICITY WITHIN A DEFINED AREA. AN ELECTRIC AND PUBLIC UTILITY IS, ITSELF, DEFINED AS A PERSON WHO SELLS ELECTRICITY. THE COMBINED EFFECT OF THE DEFINITION OF SECTION 19.1 WOULD MEAN THAT PEOPLE WHO BUY ELECTRICITY IN ROSS RIVER OR WHO SELL ELECTRICITY IN ROSS RIVER WITHOUT A FRANCHISE, COULD BE HELD TO COMMITTING AN OFFENSE.

IT WAS NECESSARY THEREFORE, TO CARRY OVER FROM THE TIME OF COMING INTO OPERATION OF THIS ORDER, TO SUCH A TIME AS A FRANCHISE IS APPLIED FOR AND GRANTED TO SOMEBODY. TO LEGALIZE WHAT APPARENTLY IS HAPPENING IN THESE PLACES, WHICH IS, THAT PEOPLE ARE PRODUCING AND SELLING ELECTRICITY AND PEOPLE ARE BUYING IT. THE LANGUAGE CHOSEN HERE WAS DELIBERATELY CHOSEN SO AS TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A FRANCHISE WHICH IS AN EXCLUSIVE AUTHORITY TO SELL ELECTRICITY AND NO ONE ELSE CAN SELL IT IN THE SAME PLACE AND TO JUST CALL IT AN INTERIM AUTHORITY FOR A PERSON TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY, WHICH MEANS AND INTERIM AUTHORITY TO SELL ELECTRICITY TO THE PUBLIC IN THAT PLACE. I MAY BE WRONG IN



THIS, BUT I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING WRONG IN THE LANGUAGE WHICH YOU ARE ATTEMPTING TO USE IN THIS SECTION TO LEGALIZE THIS POSITION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF MR. CHAIRMAN WOULD READ THE SECTION 2 AS WELL, SO THAT WE KNOW IT IS READ AND WE CAN DEAL WITH BOTH OF THEM TOGETHER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE WILL TAKE THESE TWO SECTIONS TOGETHER THEN. SECTION 2: SECTION 21 OF THE SAID ORDINANCE IS AMENDED BY ADDING THERETO THE FOLLOWING NEW SUBSECTION:

"21.(2) NOTWITHSTANDING SECTION 118 OF THE *Municipal Ordinance*, THE COMMISSIONER SHALL NOT APPROVE A BY-LAW OF A MUNICIPALITY GRANTING OR RENEWING A FRANCHISE UNLESS THE FRANCHISE HAS BEEN FIRST APPROVED BY THE BOARD."

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. LEGAL ADVISOR GAVE AN EXPLANATION OF WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL IS FOR. I'VE ALREADY SAID THAT I DON'T ARGUE WITH THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL. I THINK IT IS SOUND. WHAT I AM SAYING IS THAT THERE ARE SPECIFIC LEGISLATIVE ERRORS THAT THIS HAS BROUGHT FORWARD IN MY MIND. I THINK ON FURTHER CONSIDERATION, THE LEGAL ADVISOR WOULD SEE QUITE CLEARLY WHAT I AM GETTING AT HERE. I WANT TO REPEAT THAT THERE IS A DEFINITE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A FRANCHISE AND AN AUTHORITY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. AN INDIVIDUAL CAN HAVE A FRANCHISE ON CERTAIN ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT OR CERTAIN RADIO OR T.V. EQUIPMENT BUT THEY STILL HAVE TO GET A PERMIT OR LICENSE TO SELL THAT EQUIPMENT IN A MUNICIPALITY. THERE IS THE DIFFERENCE THAT I AM TRYING TO GET ACROSS. THERE IS NO ARGUMENT AT ALL, THAT THE FRANCHISE CAN BE GRANTED, BUT I SAY THERE IS AN OMISSION BECAUSE THE LEGISLATION, THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES LEGISLATION, DOES NOT PROVIDE, AT THIS TIME, FOR THE AUTHORITY TO BE GIVEN TO ANYBODY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY. IT IS VERY, VERY, SILENT IN THAT AREA AND BECAUSE NOW, THE AMENDMENT PURPORTS TO SAY AN ENTIRE AUTHORITY, IF THERE IS AN INTERNAL AUTHORITY, SURELY IT MUST BE CONSIDERED THAT THERE IS AN AUTHORITY AND THE ORDINANCE IS SILENT. IT DOESN'T SHOW AN AUTHORITY. I REPEAT AGAIN, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THIS POINT CLEAR AS WELL; ALTHOUGH THE COMMISSIONER, ACCORDING TO THE UTILITY FRANCHISE BYLAWS, HEADED SECTION 118 OF THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE, HAS

THE POWER TO APPROVE BYLAWS, THE MUNICIPALITY ITSELF HASN'T THE POWER TO OPERATE, TO GRANT AUTHORIZATION FOR OPERATING, BECAUSE IF IT DID, IT WOULD BE DEPARTING FROM THE LEGISLATION, WHICH IS THE ELECTRICAL PROTECTION ORDINANCE.

I SAY, AND I THINK IT IS STANDARD LAW, THAT A MUNICIPALITY CANNOT DEPART FROM WHAT IS THE SENIOR LEGISLATION. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE CORRECT THIS TO MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR THAT THERE IS AUTHORITY TO ANY PERSON OR COMPANY TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY TO BE GIVEN. I THINK THIS IS WHAT IS MISSING ONCE THAT IS IN THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, THEN OF COURSE, THE REST OF IT WOULD FOLLOW. ONE OR TWO WOULD CERTAINLY FOLLOW BUT IT DOESN'T FOLLOW NOW AND HERE IS A HOLE THAT I THINK SHOULD BE PLUGGED.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: WITH THE RESPECT TO SOME, THIS IS GETTING HIGHLY TECHNICAL. WHAT THE BOARD DOES WHEN IT GRANTS A FRANCHISE TO SELL ELECTRICITY AND FORBID ANY OTHER PERSON FROM SELLING ELECTRICITY. IT DOESN'T GIVE ANY POWER TO THE COMPANY WHICH IS SELLING THE ELECTRICITY TO OPERATE AT ALL.

FIRST OF ALL, THE COMPANY MUST BE REGISTERED WITH THE COMPANY'S ORDINANCE. THEY MUST ACQUIRE THE RIGHT OF WAY OF A PURCHASE OF PROPERTY TO DISTRIBUTE ITS POLES AND LINES, AND SO ON. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SECTION 118 AND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE IS THAT THE MUNICIPALITY GRANTS A FRANCHISE. A FRANCHISE UNDER THAT ORDINANCE CAN BE A FRANCHISE TO OPERATE ANY ONE OF A NUMBER OF THINGS; TO LIGHT ELECTRICALLY, POWER, GAS, CABLE TELEVISION, TELEPHONE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES OR SIMILAR OR RELATED SERVICES. WATER FOR INSTANCE COULD BE DEEMED TO BE A FRANCHISE IN THAT WAY.

THEN IT GOES ON BEYOND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, GIVES THEM THE POWER TO ERECT AND OPERATE ON A HIGHWAY, SQUARE OR PUBLIC PLACE. TO ERECT ALL POLES, FIXTURES, WIRES, PIPES AND SO FORTH WHICH MIGHT OTHERWISE BE UNLAWFUL. BUT THE MUNICIPALITY CONTROLS THIS PUBLIC PROPERTY AND ROADS AND STREETS. THEREFORE, IN THE BYLAW THEY WILL GIVE THEM PERMISSION TO UTILIZE THESE. POSSIBLY SUBJECT TO PAYMENT OR POSSIBLY SUBJECT TO TAXATION. THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE CAN DO THAT AND PROBABLY DOES IT BECAUSE IT IS DEALING WITH ITS OWN PROPERTY OR PROPERTY OF ITS CONTROL.



IN THE ELECTRICAL FRANCHISE ORDINANCE, WHICH IS ONLY DEALING WITH THE RIGHT TO SELL ELECTRICITY, WE ARE NOT GIVING THE COMPANY ITSELF POWER TO OPERATE. WE ARE GIVING IT NO RIGHT WHATEVER TO GO ALONG HIGHWAYS AND BYWAYS AND PUT UP POLES. IT IS LIMITED TO A VERY NARROW FIELD. SO THIS IS THE CONTEXT WHICH WE ARE AMENDING THIS SECTION. WE ARE JUST SAYING THAT IF A PERSON MAY OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY, DO IT FOR AN INTERIM PERIOD. NOW THE INTERIM PERIOD AS THE MEMBER POINTED OUT EARLIER TODAY, CAN BE A VERY LONG PERIOD IF NOBODY WOULD APPLY FOR A FRANCHISE WITH RESPECT TO ROSS RIVER. THEN THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD HAS NO AUTHORITY IN THAT PLACE TO CONTROL THEIR PRICES AND WHATNOT. IT IS A MATTER OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND. IT MAY BE THAT WE WANT TO HAVE THAT POWER, BUT NOT IN THIS PARTICULAR SECTION. THIS MERELY GIVES THEM THE RIGHT TO OPERATE.

THE WORDS SUBJECT TO ANY CONDITIONS THAT MAY OPPOSE FROM TIME TO TIME ARE AN ATTEMPT TO GET OVER THE DIFFICULTY. WITHOUT THIS KIND OF SECTION, A PERSON DELIVERING ELECTRICITY TO ANOTHER PERSON, IS SUBJECT TO NO CONTROLS AT ALL. BUT ONE OF THE CONDITIONS THAT CAN BE OPPOSED IS, THAT THEY ARE SUBJECT TO PRICE CONTROL ON THE OTHER TOWNS, AND A FRANCHISE HOLDER WOULD BE SUBJECT TOO, IF HE HAD BEEN GIVEN A FRANCHISE. IT GIVES THE BOARD THE POWER TO DEAL WITH A MATTER WHICH SHOULD RIGHTFULLY COME WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTION. THE LEGAL POINT OF IT, I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO A LEGAL HASSLE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, BUT IT IS COMPARING APPLES AND ORANGES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN MR. LEGAL ADVISOR READ FROM THE 118 OF THE ORDINANCE HE, WHETHER INADVERTANTLY OR PERHAPS DELIBERATELY, LEFT OUT THE WORDS, BOTH WORDS, 'AND AUTHORIZING'. IN SECTION 118, IT PROVES WHAT I SAY BECAUSE THERE ARE TWO SEPARATE THINGS. IT SAYS THIS, AND I WON'T READ IT THE WAY ITS WRITTEN, NOT THE WAY ITS BEEN READ. IT SAYS, 'SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER, THE COUNCIL MAY BY BYLAW GRANT A FRANCHISE UPON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS IT MAY PRESCRIBE TO ANY PERSON UNDERTAKING TO PROVIDE ELECTRIC LIGHT, ELECTRIC POWER, GAS, CABLE TELEVISION, TELEPHONE OR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES OR OTHER SIMILAR OR RELATED SERVICES TO RESIDENTS OF THE MUNICIPALITY AND AUTHORIZING THAT PERSON TO ERECT OR TO OPERATE.

SO IT IS FAIRLY OBVIOUS THAT THERE ARE TWO SEPARATE MATTERS THAT ARE INVOLVED HERE. ONE IS THE GRANTING OF THE FRANCHISE THAT THE MUNICIPALITY CAN DO BY BYLAW AND AUTHORIZE. NOW THAT IS CLEAR. THE VERY FACT THAT THE WORD 'AND' IS IN THERE DENOTES TWO SEPARATE METHODS.

IT IS BECAUSE IT DENOTES THAT MATTER THAT I SAY, BECAUSE THERE IS NO PROVISION FOR AUTHORIZING IN THE ELECTRIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE, THAT THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE THAT IS THERE AS IT IS NOW, IS INOPERATIVE AND I WOULD SAY ULTRA VIRES OF THE ELECTED PUBLIC UTILITIES LEGISLATION. I SEE NO DIFFICULTY AT ALL IN CORRECTING THIS, WHILE YOU HAVE GOT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE ELECTIVE PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE BY ADDING AN ADDITIONAL SECTION IN THERE. TO SHOW WHO CAN AUTHORIZE AND ONCE THAT IS DONE, AFTER ALL IT TAKES CARE OF THE INTERIM AUTHORIZATION EXCEPT THAT THERE MUST BE A TIME LIMIT IMPOSED UPON IT.

WHY SHOULD THERE BE ANY OBJECTION TO FULFILLING THAT TYPE OF FUNCTION. WHAT IS THE OBJECTION? I WOULD LIKE TO GET FROM MR. LEGAL ADVISOR, WHAT IS THE OBJECTION?

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: PURSUANT TO THE BASIC OBJECTION IS THIS; THAT THE AUTHORITY TO OPERATE WIRES, POLES, AND SO FORTH OR TO DO ANYTHING IN A MUNICIPALITY IS IN THE JURISDICTION OF THE MUNICIPALITY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT THAT IS NOT THE POINT.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: THE BOARD MERELY PERMITS THEM TO GRANT A FRANCHISE. SO FAR AS LAND OUTSIDE MUNICIPALITIES IS CONCERNED, THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE IS QUITE CLEAR. IT SAYS THAT THE COMMISSIONER MAY GRANT A FRANCHISE. THAT IS THE AUTHORITY THEY NEED TO OPERATE THE POLES, LINES AND WHAT. THE BOARD MERELY SUPERVISES THE GRANTING OF THE FRANCHISE EITHER BY THE COMMISSIONER IN RESPECT TO AN OUTSIDE AREA OR THE MUNICIPALITY OF WHITEHORSE, DAWSON AND SO FORTH WITHIN A MUNICIPALITY. THERE IS NO QUESTION OF THE BOARD HAVING AUTHORITY TO COMMIT THEM TO DO ANYTHING. IT MERELY PERMITS SOMEBODY ELSE TO GRANT A FRANCHISE. TO MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR, IT MIGHT BE TO GRANT AN INTERIM PERMISSION TO A PERSON TO OPERATE A PUBLIC UTILITY, BUT WITH THE SAME LEGAL EFFECT. WE JUST HAPPEN TO USE THE WORD AUTHORITY BECAUSE IT IS A CONVENIENT WORD. THE DICTIONARY IS NOT SO BARREN THAT IT CANNOT PRODUCE A WORD OF SIMILAR MEANING.



Mr. Chamberlist: Sorry, I have got to just state on a general principle. I didn't have time to go through it completely, but there are two authorities that were set up by the B.C. Government for the B.C. Hydro. One was the area of franchises that were granted and then there was the area of the authority to operate a public utility. I haven't taken the time to read other legislation and I know that in the other legislation, it is the same. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that there is an absence of authority to operate a public utility. Certainly there is no doubt that the power to grant a franchise. At least the Legal Adviser, Mr. Chairman, has indicated that the Commissioner can grant a franchise. That is not in dispute. But because he grants a franchise, that is not an automatic authority to operate a public utility, because here is another example. The Commissioner, or any government in any jurisdiction can remove the authority to operate a public utility. This doesn't mean that it cancels out the franchise because this token must be recognized that the power of government is to remove what has been given and where a franchise has been given and an authority to operate a public utility has been given, there would have to be two authorities withdrawn. That is the two actual matters to be withdrawn. That is the granting of the franchise and the granting of the authority to operate a public utility.

I would ask that this not be finalized today until I have the opportunity to bring further information on this to you, this Committee, so that it would back up what I say is correct. I am certain in my own mind what I say is correct, but I haven't had the time to take note and deal with further investigation on it and I would ask that section 1 and 2 just remain in Committee and I will take a look into the legislation on it tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Is Committee agreed?

Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I have a question surrounding, from the chair if I may be permitted, section 19 brings us back to the old question - No public utility shall operate in the territory unless it has been granted a franchise either by a municipality or by the Commissioner. In the interim, from the time that we prepared this Ordinance, has it been possible to get

the concurrence of N.C.P.C. to come under the purview of this Ordinance?

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, the stance as I understand it, taken by N.C.P.C. that where they applied for a franchise, it will be subject to the terms the franchise has granted and they will love, honour and obey the rules as laid down in the grant of the franchise. That is all that this Ordinance is concerned with. This Ordinance does not attempt to withhold within the operation of electricity of the people or companies who buy and sell electricity for wholesale. Its limited to a narrow field to the position as I understand it, that N.C.P.C. would adopt it that if they apply for a franchise, and it is given to them under certain conditions as it would of course to anyone else, they will debate this.

Mr. Chairman: If I might, one additional question. This then leaves me with the meaning, and correct me if I am wrong, the people of Dawson or the people of Faro for instance, where N.C.P.C. do provide the electrical utility, no matter how aggrieved, have no recourse to the Board in terms of their grievance over power?

Mr. Legal Adviser: Not if the franchise is granted in respect of this legislation as written.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, that brings up another point. In Dawson for instance, is there or has there been a franchise granted? Now, here you have a position where there is a public utility. They are operated without a franchise. So this again separates the two different matters. One is a franchise, one is a public utility and this is the point that I am making and I want it clarified.

Mr. Legal Adviser: As far as I know, there is no franchise in existence but presumably that is to be handled by the City of Dawson itself in due course.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I believe on that particular point at the time I wasn't on Council, but I do remember the discussion on it. I think all it was, was a sort of a letter of invitation for N.C.P.C. to come in and put in the service. I don't think it actually was a franchise.

Mr. Chairman: Just one final question on the subject. Inasmuch as this legislation is



SUPPOSEDLY TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON AND IT WOULD APPEAR TO DISCRIMINATE BY CIRCUMSTANCE, NO DOUBT, AGAINST A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE YUKON. IS THERE ANY LEGAL WAY THAT WE COULD FORCE N.C.P.C. TO COME UNDER THE PURVIEW OF WHAT IS LAW IN THE TERRITORY?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THIS FORCES AN UNUSUAL WORD TO USE IN THAT CONTEXT. I THINK IT IS A QUESTION OF LETTER WRITING TO THE COMMISSIONER OR SOMEBODY HAVING THE COMPANY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT HAS GONE ON FOR 20 YEARS.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M REALLY INTERESTED IN THE POWERS OF THE BOARD. I WOULD LIKE MR. LEGAL ADVISER, IF HE COULD DELINEATE THEM TOO AND IN THE MUNICIPALITY, THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL WHO DEAL WITH THE VARIOUS PEOPLE WANTING THE FRANCHISE TO DISTRIBUTE THE ELECTRICAL ENERGY.

NOW THE COUNCIL MAKES UP THEIR MIND THAT THIS COMPANY WILL BE GIVEN THE FRANCHISE AND THE AUTHORITY TO DO THEIR THING WITH THE POWER OR THE PHONE OR THE TELEVISION OR WHATEVER IT IS. THEN, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE BOARD, AFTER ALL THIS HAS GONE ABOUT, THE BOARD ACTUALLY DOES HAVE THE POWER TO BE ABLE TO SAY WE DON'T AGREE WITH THE DECISION MADE BY THE MUNICIPALITY AND START OVER AGAIN FROM SQUARE ONE. THEN IT GOES THE OTHER WAY AND THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL AND THE BOARD AGREE, THE COMMISSIONER STILL HAS THE ABILITY OF SAYING - I DON'T AGREE WITH EITHER THE BOARD OR THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES. I'M GOING TO SQUASH THE FRANCHISE EVEN THOUGH YOU BOTH AGREE WITH IT ANYWAY.

THE OTHER WAY AROUND WHERE THE COMMISSIONER AND THE COUNCIL AGREE THAT THE FRANCHISE SHOULD BE GRANTED AND THE BOARD SAYS - NO, WE DON'T THINK EVEN THOUGH THE COMMISSIONER AND THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES AGREE WITH THE GRANTING OF THE FRANCHISE THAT WE'RE GOING TO ALLOW THE FRANCHISE TO BE GRANTED.

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT ALL OF THE DOUBLE JEOPARDY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT HERE WHERE THE COUNCIL, AFTER LONG AND SERIOUS CONSIDERATION, COULD FIND ITSELF SHOT DOWN, NOT BY ONLY ONE BODY, BUT TWO BODIES. ANYWAY, YOU COULD WORK ON IT, TWO OUT OF THREE. A FAIR, YOU KNOW, WHERE TWO OUT OF THREE. IT SEEMS THAT - - - - OVER GOVERNMENT. IT JUST WRANGLES A PERSON THATS

USED TO GOING OUT AND BEING ABLE TO GET THINGS DONE, NOT ONLY HAVING TO FACE ONE AUTHORITY, BUT THERE IS A DOUBLE AUTHORITY BEFORE YOU CAN DO ANYTHING WHICH SHOULD BE IN THE HANDS OF THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES ANYWAY, BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO FACE THE ULTIMATE BOSS, THE PEOPLE, IF THEY MAKE A BOO-BOO. SO HERE THEY HAVE DONE IT, THEY HAVE DONE THEIR WORK. THEY SIT NIGHT MEETINGS ON FRANCHISES AND THEN SOME BOARDS OR THE COMMISSIONER CAN SAY, IT DOESN'T MATTER EVEN THOUGH YOU ARE THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES, EVEN THOUGH YOU'VE MADE WHAT YOU THINK IS A WISE DECISION - GO TO HELL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ADDING TO THAT, THERE IS A THIRD GROUP IN THERE, A VERY IMPORTANT GROUP, THE VOTERS, BECAUSE UNDER SECTION 118 (2), ANOTHER BY-LAW FOR GRANTING OF FRANCHISES FOR ANY OF THE PURPOSES DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (1) SHALL BE VALID UNLESS PRIOR TO THE THIRD READING THEREOF, IT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND HAS RECEIVED THE ASSENT OF A MAJORITY OF THE TAXPAYERS IN THE MUNICIPALITY VOTING THEREON. SO HERE THE BOARD COMES ALONG AND SAYS, NEVER MIND ABOUT THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE VOTED ON IT, NEVER MIND ABOUT THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL, ABOUT THE CITY COUNCIL, NEVER MIND ABOUT THEM, WE DON'T WANT IT SO MR. COMMISSIONER DON'T SIGN IT. THATS A POINT WELL TAKEN. THATS THE THIRD GROUP, THE MOST IMPORTANT GROUP.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK MOST HONOURABLE MEMBERS ARE TAKING IT, NOT IN THE LIGHT THAT IT WAS WRITTEN, MAKING IT IDENTIFIED AS A QUALIFICATION WORTH LOOKING AT, BUT THE POINT WAS, I THOUGHT IN THIS LEGISLATION, I THINK IN THIS LEGISLATION, WAS TO TAKE AWAY THE POWER OF THE COMMISSIONER TO MAKE A -----

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ----- POWER OF THE PEOPLE.

MR. TANNER: IF THE COMMISSIONER GOES TO THE BOARD AND IS WORKING UNDER THE AUTHORITY, NOT UNDER THE AUTHORITY, BUT UNDER THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOARD, THEN SURELY THAT IS AN ADVANTAGE TO US IF YOU LIKE, RATHER THAN HAVING THE COMMISSIONER MAKING AN ARBITRARY DECISION, SAY YEA, NAY OR WHAT HAVE YOU. BUT THE BOARD IS STILL, MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, THE BOARD WILL STILL, AND THE POINT THAT WAS TAKEN BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST IS VERY SOUND. THAT THE BOARD CAN STILL OVERRIDE THE MAJORITY OF THE TAXPAYERS WHO HAVE VOTED FOR A FRANCHISE. THIS IS THE POINT.



MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THE SUBJECT OF THE BOARD OVERRIDING THE MAJORITY OF THE TAXPAYERS IS NOT REALLY THE SUBJECT OF THIS LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT ITS THERE.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THIS LEGISLATION WAS INTRODUCED TO THE HOUSE SOME TIME AGO. IT WAS PASSED. THE QUESTION OF DOUBLE JEOPARDY DOES NOT ARISE IN PRACTICE. THE COMMISSIONER HAS INDICATED TO THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD THAT HE WILL NOT DISAPPROVE OF A BY-LAW THAT IS APPROVED BY THE BOARD. THIS CRYSTALIZES THIS BY MAKING IT CLEAR THAT NOTWITHSTANDING HIS POWER IN THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE TO APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE BOARD, HE IS MAKING A POSITIVE AVERMENT THAT HE DOES NOT INTEND TO EXERCISE ANY PART OF APPROVAL EXCEPT ON THE ADVICE OF THE BOARD, SO THE COMMISSIONER'S PART IN THIS AREA IS LIMITED BY THE ADVICE HE SEEKS AND GETS. I CAN CONCEIVE OF THE MUNICIPALITY ITSELF TO ITS COUNCIL HAVING A DIFFERENT OPINION THAN THE BOARD OR THE BOARD HAVING A DIFFERENT OPINION THAN THE COUNCIL, BUT THE COMMISSIONER WILL BE GUIDED AND IN FACT BOUND BY THE ADVICE OF THE BOARD IN THIS MATTER WHICH IT WAS SET UP TO DO. THIS IS A FACTUAL THING SET OUT VERY STRAIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THATS A LOT OF WHITE WASH AND HOG WASH AND BALDERDASH, THERE'S EVERYTHING IN THERE. BECAUSE THE EXCUSE THAT IS BEING PUT FORWARD NOW, THAT THE COMMISSIONER QUITE NICELY IS GOING TO SAY TO THE BOARD, YOU KNOW THE COUNCILLORS APPROVED IT BECAUSE THE CITY COUNCILLOR APPROVED IT, BECAUSE THE MAJORITY OF THE SHAREHOLDER, THE MAJORITY OF THE TAXPAYERS, RATHER THE SHAREHOLDERS WANT IT. I'M NOT GOING TO O.K. IT NOT WITHSTANDING BOTH OF THEM AND YOU TELL ME "MR. BOARD" WHAT DO YOU DECIDE - SO "MR. BOARD" SAYS - WELL THOSE PEOPLE ON THE CITY COUNCIL, THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT, THE PEOPLE THAT HAVE VOTED ON IT, THE TAXPAYERS OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE - THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT - YOU BE GUIDED BY MY ADVICE. YOU KNOW, WE'RE THE BOARD. WE APPROVE IT OR WE DISAPPROVE IT. THIS IS THE SUGGESTION THAT MR. LEGAL ADVISER MAKES WHEN HE SPEAKS ABOUT RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT AS WELL, AT TIMES. I'M SURPRISED AT WHAT HE SUGGESTS THAT WE HAVE THE COMMISSIONER GO AND SAY TO THE BOARD - NEVER MIND ABOUT THESE OTHER PEOPLE, WHATS YOUR DECISION?

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. LEGAL ADVISER, AGAIN FROM THE CHAIR. COULD YOU SHOW ME WHERE IN THE TOTAL ORDINANCE THERE IS ANY COMPULSION GIVEN THE COMMISSIONER TO ACT UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOARD? MY COPY OF THE LEGISLATION WOULD INDICATE THAT THE BOARD MAY, OR THE BOARD SHALL DO MANY THINGS, THAT THE COMMISSIONER MAY DO SOME THINGS. HE IS NOT COMPELLED ANYWHERE I CAN FIND.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THERE IS A SECTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHICH SAYS THAT THE COMMISSIONER MAY NOT GRANT A FRANCHISE, MAY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD GRANT A FRANCHISE, GRANT WHEN YOU ALTER A FRANCHISE TO A PUBLIC INDIVIDUAL TO OPERATE OUTSIDE A MUNICIPALITY. THE COMMISSIONER IS BY THAT, IMPOWERED TO GRANT A FRANCHISE, BUT ONLY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD. NOW THAT IS IN CASES OUTSIDE OF WHITEHORSE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THERE IS NO COMPULSION ON THE COMMISSIONER TO ANYTHING, NOT ON MY COPY ANYHOW.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: HE DOESN'T HAVE TO GRANT ANY FRANCHISES AT ALL, BUT IF HE WISHES TO DO SO, HE MAY ONLY DO IT WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK WE ARE GOING OFF THE TRACK COMPLETELY. THIS BOARD WAS A CREATION OF THIS HOUSE AND WE SET UP THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD TO REVIEW TENDERS THAT WERE BEING MADE, APPLICATIONS THAT WERE BEING MADE FOR FRANCHISES OF ELECTRICITY AND THESE PEOPLE HAVE THE POWER TO GET TECHNICAL EXPERT HELP TO ANALYSE THESE TENDERS AND THEY WOULD MAKE THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS. LISTENING TO THE DEBATE HERE YOU WOULD THINK THAT THE ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS FORCED UPON THE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE. THIS IS A SEPARATE BODY WHO OPERATES AND DOES A SERVICE FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY. I THINK THAT MANY OF THE MUNICIPALITIES, AND I WOULD HOPE THE COMMISSIONER AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO ACT ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF A BOARD AFTER THEY HAVE HAD THE PROPER ANALYSIS MADE OF ANY TENDERS TO SUPPLY ELECTRICITY IN THE COMMUNITY OR ANY MUNICIPALITY. THAT IS WHY WE CREATED THE BOARD. THEY ARE TAKEN OUT OF THE POLITICAL FIELD AND GIVEN TO SOMEONE WHO WOULD KNOW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST FOLLOWING UP THE THOUGHT OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, IT IS QUITE TRUE THAT THIS COUNCIL APPROVED THE



PRINCIPLE OF A BOARD AND THE PRINCIPLES OF WHAT THE BOARDS' FUNCTIONS ARE ARE ENDOWED WITHIN THE REGISTRATION ITSELF AS IT IS NOW, BUT WITH THESE AMENDMENTS, IT GIVES THE BOARD A GREATER POWER THAN WHAT WAS INTENDED. THE GREATER POWER THAT IT GIVES IT NOW, GETS TO OVERRULE THE CITY COUNCIL OF A MUNICIPALITY AND THE TAXPAYERS WHO VOTE FOR OR AGAINST THE GRANTING OF A FRANCHISE. THE WAY IT IS NOW, IT IS CLEAR THAT NOT ONLY CAN A BOARD SAY TO THE COMMISSIONER AFTER THE TAXPAYERS HAVE APPROVED A FRANCHISE, THEY CAN ALSO SAY TO THE COMMISSIONER, AFTER THE TAXPAYERS HAVE REFUSED TO APPROVE A BOARD, YET WILL HAVE IT. THEY CAN SAY - NO WE DON'T WANT IT OR YES, WE DO WANT IT, ACCORDING TO WHICH WAY THE TAXPAYERS HAVE VOTED FOR IT. THIS IS WHAT MY OBJECTION IS THERE, AT THIS TIME. ACTUALLY, I DIDN'T SEE THE POINT QUITE CLEARLY, BUT IT HAS BEEN RAISED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST AND THE POINT MADE IS CLEAR. SO REALLY, A WHOLE LOOK, A MUCH GREATER LOOK SHOULD BE GIVEN AT THOSE TWO PARTICULAR AREAS.

MR. TANNER: I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, IN HIS USUAL FASHION, IS GIVING THE HOUSE THE BENEFIT OF HIS KNOWLEDGE AND I THINK EVERY MEMBER APPRECIATES IT, BUT I THINK THAT THE VIEW YOU ARE TAKING IS NOT THE VIEW THAT IS INTENDED BY THE LEGISLATION AND DOESN'T IN FACT SAY THAT. WHAT IS INTENDED HERE, IS NOT ANY RESTRICTION OF A MUNICIPALITY OR THE COUNCIL OF A MUNICIPALITY. THE RESTRICTION HERE IS VERY DEFINITELY ON THE COMMISSIONER. WHAT WE HAVE ATTEMPTED TO DO HERE, I THINK WHAT WE HAVE DONE, IS WE HAVE BROUGHT IN A SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO RESTRICT THE COMMISSIONER, NOT THE MUNICIPALITY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF THE LEGAL ADVISER COULD OUTLINE WHAT THE PROCEDURE THAT THE MUNICIPALITY WOULD GO THROUGH IN ORDER TO GRANT A FRANCHISE, USING THE ROLE THAT THE BOARD PLAYS IN THIS. I THINK THIS WOULD CLARIFY ONE OF THE POINTS THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UP.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THERE ARE DIFFICULTIES IN OPERATING, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE TWO ORDINANCES TOGETHER. BECAUSE AS IT HAPPENS, THEY WERE BOTH INTRODUCED AT THE SAME SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SECTION 118 OF THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE WAS DRAFTED AND FORMED INDEPENDANTLY OF THE ORDINANCE FOR DEALING WITH PUBLIC UTILITIES AND THEY BOTH HAD TWO SEPARATE MOTHERS, AT IT

WERE, AS THEY GAVE BIRTH, NOT TO TWINS BUT TO TWO SUCCESSIVE FAMILIES. SO THE BOARD HAS DIFFICULTY IN OPERATING EFFICIENTLY.

THE PROCEDURE IS GRAVE, AND IT IS HARD TO GIVE AN EXACT ANSWER. WHAT THE MUNICIPALITIES HAVE DONE IN PRACTICE HAS ASKED THE BOARD FOR GUIDANCE AS TO HOW THEY SHOULD FORMULATE OR RECEIVE PROPOSALS FOR THE SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY FROM THE PERIOD OF JULY, 1974 FOR A PERIOD OF TEN YEARS. UNDER THE ORDINANCE, THE BOARD FOUND IN GOING THROUGH IT, THE TWO SECTIONS TOGETHER, THAT THEY WERE DIFFICULT TO CONSTRUCE BECAUSE SECTION 118 STARTS OFF WITH THE APPROVAL OR WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER AND THEN DEALS WITH THE QUESTION OF THE PREPARATION OF THE BY-LAWS AND THEN THE COMMISSIONER'S POWER COMES INTO IT AGAIN. SO THE QUESTION AROSE, EXACTLY AS ONE OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS SAID - HOW DO YOU DEAL WITH THE INJECTION OF THE COMMISSIONER WHEN IN FACT, WHAT POSSIBLY SHOULD HAVE BEEN SAID WOULD BE - WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD AND THE BOARD WERE AT SEA. THE COMMISSIONER, HOWEVER, INDICATED THAT HE WOULD NOT GIVE APPROVAL WITHOUT THE BOARD GIVING APPROVAL. SO, TO ALL THE LINES OF PROCEDURE WHAT HAPPENED IS, THE CITY COUNCIL HAS TO SEEK PROPOSALS FROM QUALIFIED PEOPLE TO SUPPLY ELECTRICITY. THE BOARD HAS INDICATED THERE SHOULD BE SOME ELEMENT OF COMBINATION INJECTED INTO THAT SEATING OF PROPOSALS. THE CITY COUNCIL THEN GOT TO CONSIDER AND PRODUCE A BY-LAW GIVING THE GRANTING OF THE FRANCHISE TO A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL OR COMPANY AND AT THAT POINT MUST BRING IT TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR HIS APPROVAL. THE COMMISSIONER WOULD REFER TO THE BOARD SO THAT INSTEAD OF HAVING THE PROCEDURE TO READ IN A BY-LAW, A REFERENDUM AND THEN A PASSING OF THAT BY-LAW, ALL IS DONE BEFORE IT GOES TO THE BOARD AND THE BOARD WILL NOW BE ABLE TO GRANT OR WITHHOLD ITS APPROVAL BEFORE IT GOES TO THE PUBLIC AND THERE WOULD AUTOMATICALLY BE A CHANGE IN THE PROCEDURE OF ADVANTAGE AFTER THE BOARD HAS GRANTED OR WITHHELD ITS APPROVAL, IT CAN THEN GO TO THE PUBLIC FOR THE FINAL APPROVAL TO THE PEOPLE WE HAVE PRONOUNCED NOT ONLY IN THE ACTION OF THE COUNCIL BUT ON THE ACTION OF THE BOARD.



Mrs. Watson: I would like to ask the Legal Adviser. Would the people, in the referendum, would they be aware of the recommendations made by the Board?

Mr. Legal Adviser: Yes, they would.

Mr. Chamberlist: This is the very point that they are making. If the Board had made recommendations and the City called for a plebiscite for the granting of a franchise, why should the Board be placed in a position of still being able to accept or reject?

Mr. Legal Adviser: It has to supervise the affairs, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: You have some foresight into some of these things, and afterthoughts. Just looking through this Ordinance, and although I must admit I was responsible for bringing it forward. Obviously, I cleared some of the things but now I find some other areas that have got holes in them. What the functions of the Board are, are not written in the Ordinance and I just looked and see that there are no regulations about the functions of the Board either. Perhaps Mr. Legal Adviser can now point out to me where the functions of the Board are designated. All it has, are Section 14, about the powers of the Board. The Board may also have a member, or any other, person to investigate or report in any question or matter arising in connection with any business of the Board. That was the business of the Board. And too, the person authorized pursuant to this Section has all the powers of the Board for the purpose of taking evidence, or acquire necessary information for this report. But, under what conditions can somebody come before the Board? The regulations haven't been brought forward yet. So here you've got an Ordinance and with nothing clearly defined as to what anybody can do and in what manner can they come before the Board? Must there be forms filled out? Must applications be made? How must they be done? What are the types of forms? Nothing at all.

Mr. Legal Adviser: Nobody, as yet, has a case where this has arisen. The Board hasn't had an opportunity of formulating what rules it needs inasmuch as the Board has had only a few meetings.

Mr. Chamberlist: What about complaints, Mr.

Chairman? There have been many complaints so that one thing can be brought forward, I don't care if there is one. The point is this. Nobody can bring a complaint forward now even if they had the power. If the people from Ross River had the power, there is no way that it is designated that they can come before the Board and say, "This is my complaint". I'm saying that I am sure, at least Mr. Legal Adviser can agree with me, that there is no regulation and nobody can come before the Board because there is no method.

Mr. Legal Adviser: There is no requirement, as yet, for regulations. The point that has been granted, that very specifically, exactly what we do or do not do. What can we do? We can file a complaint with the Board respecting to rates and have a rate changed. The manner in which provides service to areas to which it provides service, under conditions in relation to the service.

Mr. Chamberlist: But how do they do this?

Mr. Legal Adviser: There is no necessity of a formal complaint. You just have to write a letter to the Board.

Mrs. Watson: The Honourable Member is always complaining about a number of regulations.

Mr. Chamberlist: This Honourable Member never complains about the number of regulations as long as they are not stupid regulations and I will be talking about lots of stupid regulations that have been pushed out in four or five months. Stupid they are, where whole sections of Ordinances have been taken out with one word altered and then being made into a regulation. I'll tell what bum regulations have been brought out in the last few months. But all in good time.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, surely the Honourable Member admits the fact that in the absence of regulations and in the absence of the set-up the Ordinance of how a person raises a complaint, that is to the benefit of the applicant. You are not confined to any specific area.

Mr. Chamberlist: He can't come before the Board. This is the point. He can make a complaint to whom?

Mr. Tanner: To the Board.

Mr. Chamberlist: Who are the Board?



Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: WHO ARE THE MEMBERS?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: YES.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: I'M NOT SURE, EXACTLY, WHO THEY ARE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS NOTHING IN THE REGULATIONS.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: Mr. KONG IS THE CHAIRMAN  
Mr. OLSEN IS ANOTHER MEMBER. Mr. JEFF ELTON  
IS THE VICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN HERE IS SUPPOSED  
TO BE AN UP-TO-DATE COPY OF THE REGULATIONS.  
AND HERE IN THE UP-TO-DATE COPY, THERE IS NO  
MEMBERSHIP FOR THE BOARD OR ORDER APPOINTING  
THEM. NOW, COME ON NOW.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: LOOK IN THE APPOINTMENT  
SECTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT APPOINTMENT SECTION?  
OH, COME ON NOW.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: THEY HAVE VALID APPOINT-  
MENTS. THEY HAVE HAD TWO CHAIRMEN IN THE SHORT  
PERIOD THAT THE BOARD HAS BEEN OPERATING.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IT SHOWS THE ADMINISTRATIVE  
ANTIQUITY HAS BEEN DEVELOPED IN THE LAST FEW  
MONTHS BECAUSE I USED TO SPOT THESE DARN THINGS.

Mr. STUTTER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IN ACTUAL PRACTISE,  
AND I WAS THE FIRST ONE TO PUT A COMPLAINT BE-  
FORE THE BOARD, I ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE IN  
DAWSON, AND THERE WAS NO SET FORM AND I MUST  
ADMIT I JUST TOOK A PIECE OF PAPER, WROTE  
ACROSS THE TOP THE NATURE OF THE COMPLAINT;  
HAD CARBON COPIES MADE OF IT, CIRCULATED IT  
AROUND DAWSON AND GOT ABOUT THIRTY-FIVE SIGN-  
ATURES ON THAT PETITION. I BROUGHT IT BACK  
TO WHITEHORSE AND PUT IT IN THE HANDS OF THE  
BOARD. IN ACTUAL PRACTISE, THAT IS WHAT HAP-  
PENED. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT WAS DONE LEG-  
ALLY OR NOT, BUT THEY TOOK A LOOK AT IT. I  
WASN'T TOO HAPPY ABOUT THE RESULTS.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT ISN'T A GOVERN-  
MENT BOARD. IT IS AN INDEPENDENT BOARD AND WE  
WANT TO OPERATE SEPARATE FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. McKINNON: I'M NOT IN REAL DISAGREEMENT  
WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO THE ORDINANCES AS I SEE

THEM. I THINK THAT THE LEGAL ADVISER HAS MADE  
A VERY VALID POINT THAT THE TWO ORDINANCES, THE  
MUNICIPAL AND ELECTRIC PUBLIC UTILITIES, WEREN'T  
READ IN CONJUNCTION, ONE WITH THE OTHER. THEY  
BOTH WENT THEIR SEPARATE WAYS. NOBODY REALLY  
. . . . AS THERE WAS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MELD-  
ING IN THE TWO ORDINANCES. IT IS MUST WRONG. I  
DON'T CARE HOW YOU WANT TO PUT IT, BUT IT IS  
ABSOLUTELY WRONG FOR AN APPOINTED BOARD TO HAVE  
AUTHORITY AFTER AN ELECTED BODY AND THE TAXPAY-  
ERS OF A MUNICIPALITY HAVE SPOKEN. THE PRINCIPLE  
IS JUST ROTTEN. THERE IS NO SELF-RESPECTING  
MEMBER WHO BLEEDS TOWARDS OTTAWA FOR MORE RES-  
PONSIBLE GOVERNMENT, CANNOT ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE  
THAT AFTER THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY HAVE LOOKED AT THE VARIOUS FRANCH-  
ISE PROPOSALS, HAVE GRANTED IT OR HAVE SAID THAT  
THIS IS THE ONE THAT SHOULD HAVE THE FRANCHISE.  
LET'S PUT IT TO THE TAXPAYERS OF THE MUNICIPALITY.  
THEY SEEK. THEIR APPOINTED BOARD CAN COME ALONG  
AND SAY, REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE TAXPAYERS OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY HAVE SAID, REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE  
CITY FATHERS HAVE SAID, WE KNOW BETTER AND WE  
SAY THIS AND WE SAY SHALL NOT ALLOW THAT FRANCH-  
ISE TO BE GRANTED. Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE PRINCIPLE  
IS JUST ABSOLUTELY WRONG AND THERE IS NO WAY THAT  
THIS CONFLICT SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO BE MADE. THE  
BOARD CAN'T HAVE AUTHORITY AFTER THE TAXPAYERS  
AND AFTER THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL HAS SPOKEN.  
THE RECOMMEND THAT THEY ALSO LOOK AT THE FRANCH-  
ISE PROPOSAL. THAT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
THEIR EXPERTISE ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC BE  
ABLE TO MAKE A WISE DECISION. BUT ONCE THE DE-  
CISION HAS BEEN MADE, CERTAINLY, FOR GOD'S SAKE  
THAT DECISION OF THE TAXPAYERS AND THE CITY  
COUNCIL MEMBERS HAVE TO BE THE DECISION THAT IS  
ACCEPTED BY, AND NOT THE BOARD INTERVENING AFTER  
THAT AND BEING ABLE TO SAY, "REGARDLESS OF ALL  
THESE, WE STILL DO NOT ALLOW THIS FRANCHISE TO  
BE PASSED."

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS NOT WHAT  
THIS AMENDMENT SAYS.

Mr. McKINNON: I AM TALKING ABOUT THESE TWO  
ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT.

Mr. TANNER: THIS AMENDMENT IS MERELY SAYING  
THAT WHEN THE FRANCHISE IS ABOUT TO, WHEN THE  
COMMISSIONER GETS INTO THE ACT IF YOU LIKE AT  
THE END, HE WILL NOT GIVE CONSENT UNLESS HE HAS  
SPOKEN. SURELY EVERY MEMBER MUST WANT THAT  
BECAUSE IT IS NOT GIVING ANY MORE AUTHORITY TO  
THE COMMISSIONER. IT IS TAKING AWAY AUTHOR-  
ITY FROM THE COMMISSIONER.



MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT ISN'T THE POINT THAT IS BEING MADE AT ALL. THE POINT THAT IS BEING MADE BOTH BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST AND MYSELF IS QUITE CLEAR THAT IF THE COMMISSIONER WANTS TO HAVE THE AUTHORITY TAKEN AWAY FROM HIM, THIS IS FINE, AND WE SUPPORT IT. AS A MATTER OF FACT, I DON'T THINK HE SHOULD BE HERE AT ALL. BUT THE MAIN THING IS THAT HE IS GOING TO ASK THE BOARD, FOR THEM TO DECIDE WHETHER THE VOTE OF THE TAXPAYER IS SATISFACTORY TO THEM AND THAT'S WHERE THE OBJECTION MUST BE SUSTAINED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF THE LEGAL ADVISER CAN TELL US HOW THE BOARD IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS, PARTICULARLY IN B.C. AND ALBERTA WHO HAVE VERY EFFICIENT OPERATING AND VERY STRONG ELECTRICAL PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARDS; WHAT IS THE PROCEDURE THERE IN REGARDS TO THE MUNICIPALITIES AND THE BY-LAW IN THEIR MUNICIPALITIES THAT ARE REQUIRED TO GO TO REFERENDUM?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: I DON'T THINK COMMONLY THEY ARE. ONCE THERE IS A BOARD SET UP TO SUPERVISE THEM. I DON'T THINK SO. I THINK THEY MAKE AN APPLICATION TO THE BOARD AND THAT IS IT. THE BOARD HAS JURISDICTION AND THAT IS SUBSTITUTED FOR REFERENDUM. AN UNFORTUNATE HABIT OF REFERENDA, VERY OFTEN THEY ARE NOT PASSED, AND THEN THE CITY'S ... ITS POWER. IT IS BETTER TO BE A FEDERAL BOARD. BUT AS I SAY, IN THE BACK OF THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE, NO THOUGHT WAS GIVEN TO THAT ORDINANCE ... THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ORDINANCE BEING DRAFTED AND VICE VERSA. THIS IS AN ATTEMPT, IN SOME WAY CURIOUS, BY INTERJECTING INSTEAD OF THE POWER OF THE COMMISSIONER BEING ... AT THE BOARD AT THIS POINT, THE COMMISSIONER GIVES HIS APPROVAL BEFORE THE BOARD HAS GIVEN APPROVAL AHEAD OF TIME AND AHEAD ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER, WILL TAKE THE CHAIR PLEASE.

MR. STUTTER: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AGREE WITH THE TWO HONOURABLE MEMBERS WHO HAVE RAISED THIS QUESTION BUT I THINK IT SHOULD GO FURTHER THAT IF A GROUP OF ELECTED PEOPLE, OR I SHOULD SAY VOTERS, HAVE REPORTED BACK TO THE MUNICIPALITY WHO ARE ELECTED AND THEN THAT THEY WISH TO GRANT A FRANCHISE BASED ON WHATEVER FORM IT WAS GIVEN; THEN THERE SHOULD BE A COMPULSION ON THE PART OF THE COMMISSIONER TO GRANT THAT

FRANCHISE. NOW WE HAD A BIG ARGUMENT HERE AND JUST IN REMARKING ON THE LAST COMMENTS OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE. SHE SAID THAT WE SHOULD MAYBE THINK ABOUT HOW THEY DO IT IN BRITISH COLUMBIA OR ALBERTA. THERE IS NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WHAT WE DO HERE AND WHAT THEY DO THERE FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT THOSE BOARDS REPORT TO RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. THIS IS NOT A RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. THIS IS A DICTATORSHIP AND CONSEQUENTLY, A COLONY, AND WE MUST TAKE THIS VIEW THAT WE MUST OFFER ADDED PROTECTION TO THE PEOPLE. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REMIND THE LAST TIME WE DID THIS, WAS UNDER A PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL. AFTER SEVERAL ATTEMPTS, WE FINALLY GOT INTO THE HOUSE. WE GOT FULL UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THIS COUNCIL INSTRUCTING THE COMMISSIONER TO ALLOW THE PEOPLE THE PREROGATIVE OF MAKING DECISIONS ON FRANCHISES WITHIN THE COMMUNITY OR THE FRANCHISE AREAS. THIS WAS APPROVED BY EVERY MEMBER OF THIS HOUSE AND THE COMMISSIONER OF THAT DAY AND THE COMMISSIONER OF THIS DAY HAS THE VERY SAME IDENTICAL POWER, SIMPLY SAID, "WE PASS THE BILL." HE REFUSED TO ASSENT TO IT, QUIT THE GOVERNMENT AND IS NOW A BIG SHOT IN YUKON ELECTRIC, WHO THE BILL OFFENDED. SO FOR THIS REASON, YOU CAN'T SAY THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS GOING TO DO THIS AND THE COMMISSIONER HAS TO DO THAT. THERE IS NO COMPULSION IN THE TOTAL ORDINANCE UPON THE COMMISSIONER TO DO ANYTHING. THERE IS COMPULSION UPON THE BOARD TO, THE BOARD SHALL DO THIS AND THE BOARD SHALL DO THAT BUT THERE IS NO COMPULSION UPON THE COMMISSIONER TO DO A DARN THING. I AGREE WITH THE OTHER MEMBERS. WHEN A GROUP OF PEOPLE BY VOTE, BY PLEBISCITE OR BY ANY OTHER MEANS, HAVE DECIDED BY MAJORITY THAT SOMETHING SHALL BE DONE, I THINK THAT THE BOARD SHALL BE BOUND BY THAT DECISION AND I THINK THAT THE COMMISSIONER SHOULD BE BOUND BY THAT DECISION ALSO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN ... THE BOARDS ARE INDEPENDENT OF WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS. THE BOARDS DO NOW REPORT TO THAT GOVERNMENT. I THINK THAT IF WE BEGIN TO START INTERFERE ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS, THE BOARDS ARE INDEPENDENT REGARDLESS OF WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT THEY HAVE IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS. THE BOARDS DO NOT REPORT TO THAT GOVERNMENT. I THINK THAT IF WE BEGIN TO START INTERFERING, THIS BOARD THAT WE HAVE SET UP, THE WHOLE PRINCIPLE OF THE THING THAT IT IS A TECHNICAL BOARD. THAT IT IS ABLE TO REVIEW PROPERLY



THE TENDERS THAT ARE BEING PUT FORWARD. I THINK THAT IF WE START INTERFERING, WE'RE NOT GOING TO HAVE ANY MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD AND I AM SURE THE PEOPLE WOULD NOT BE PREPARED TO ACT ON THIS BOARD BECAUSE IT IS GOING TO TAKE A GREAT DEAL OF PLANNING AND A GREAT DEAL OF EFFORT AND IT IS GOING TO TAKE A GREAT DEAL OF EXPERTISE TO ANALYZE SOME OF THESE TENDERS. THIS IS WHY WE ARE HAVING THIS BOARD. IF YOU GO TO A REFERENDUM AND SAY TO THE PEOPLE, "WHO DO YOU WANT TO HAVE THE FRANCHISE TO SUPPLY ELECTRICITY TO THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE?" THE PEOPLE DON'T KNOW. THEY HAVE TO HAVE SOME EXPERT ADVICE. THIS EXPERT ADVICE SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU MUST REMEMBER NOTHING IS INDEPENDENT. EVERY BOARD IN THE TERRITORY IS NOTHING MORE THAN A WHIPPING POST FOR THE COMMISSIONER. YOU SHOW ME ANYTHING IN THE TERRITORY, A MUNICIPALITY, AN L.I.D., A BOARD OR ANYTHING ELSE THAT IS RESPONSIBLE TO THE PEOPLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS. NONE. THE COMMISSIONER; EVERYBODY SEEMS TO BE RESPONSIBLE TO HIM. THERE IS NO QUESTION ABOUT IT. THE COMMISSIONER IS THE DICTATOR. HE IS THE BUREAUCRAT. HE'S THE MINISTER'S REPRESENTATIVE AND THIS IS HIS FOUND COLONY. THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT WE ARE UP AGAINST. IT IS STILL, NOTWITHSTANDING, IT STILL BEHOVES US, AS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PUBLIC OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN LOOKING FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY TO PROVIDE THEM WITH LEGISLATION WHICH IS NOT OPEN TO ABOUT A THOUSAND DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS. LET'S PROVIDE THEM WITH THE BEST PROTECTION THAT WE CAN. WE HAVE ALREADY POINTED OUT THAT DIFFERENT MEMBERS HAVE RISEN AND SPOKEN OF AREAS IN WHICH WE FEEL THAT THIS ORDINANCE IS EITHER LACKING CONTENT, DISCRIMINATING AGAINST CERTAIN ELEMENTS IN THE TERRITORY AS IN THE CASE OF H.C.P.C. THERE IS NO PROTECTION FOR THE PEOPLE UNDER THEIR SERVICES. BUT LET US TRY AND ATTEMPT THEREFORE, TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL THESE THINGS. WE HAVE NO INDEPENDENT LEGAL ADVISER SO WE MUST DEPEND ON THE COMMISSIONER'S LEGAL ADVISER TO ASSIST US IN THIS ENDEAVOUR AND ALSO THE TWO ELECTED MEMBERS IN THE HOUSE WHO SERVE AS PART OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE. I MERELY ASK AS I THINK SOME MEMBERS HAVE ASKED THAT THEY TAKE THIS WHOLE MATTER UNDER CONSIDERATION AND PUT SOME REAL FAST PRIORITIES ON THIS THING AND SEE IF THEY CANNOT RECTIFY SOME OF THE INEQUALITIES AND THOSE MATTERS THAT WE HAVE DISCUSSED TODAY

THAT WE FIND IN THIS ORDINANCE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE MUST HAVE MORE SPECIFIC DIRECTION. WHERE ARE THE INEQUALITIES AND WHAT DO YOU WANT CORRECTED?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SAY THIS, THAT I AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE ONLY IF THERE WAS AN INDEPENDENT BOARD BUT THE BOARD IS NOT INDEPENDENT BECAUSE SECTION 118 OF THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE MAKES IT QUITE CLEAR THAT CERTAIN THINGS MUST HAPPEN UNDER THAT PIECE OF LEGISLATION; THAT THERE MUST BE A VOTE TAKEN BY THE TAXPAYERS AND BECAUSE OF THAT SECTION THAT I SAY THAT NO BOARD SHOULD INTERFERE WITH THAT EVEN IF IT WERE AN INDEPENDENT BOARD BECAUSE THEY HAPPEN TO BE THE PEOPLE THAT MATTER. IF IT WAS, IF THE SECTION WASN'T THERE, AND THE BOARD WAS INDEPENDENT OF THE COMMISSIONER, AFTER ALL THE COMMISSIONER APPOINTS THE BOARD AND IF IT WERE INDEPENDENT OF THE COMMISSIONER, THEN THERE CERTAINLY IS SOME MERIT IN WHAT HAS BEEN SAID. BUT I CAN ONLY SPEAK MYSELF ON THE LEGISLATION AS IT IS NOW. I THINK WE HAVE SAID ENOUGH TO SEE THE VERY MANY LOOPHOLES THE MANY OBJECTIONS ESPECIALLY IN SECTION 2 AND 2 OF BILL 13 THAT WE ARE READING TODAY. PERHAPS WE CAN LET IT REST AT THAT AND GO ON WITH 3 THAT WE'LL GO THROUGH PRETTY QUICKLY.

MR. TAYLOR: LET US ASSUME THAT FURTHER CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO SECTION 1 AND 2. IS THIS CORRECT?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: I AM SURE THAT FURTHER CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN. THE COUNCILLORS SHOULD GIVE POSITIVE DIRECTION. I THINK THAT THE LAST MEMBER'S SPEECH THAT WHAT IS REQUIRED TO IS A REPEAT TO SUBSECTION 2, SECTION 182 ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOBODY SAID THAT AT ALL.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THEN IT APPEARS, MR. CHAIRMAN THAT THE ONLY WAY THAT YOU ARE GOING TO RESOLVE WHAT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED IS IN THE CONFLICT THAT THERE MAY BE A DECISION OF THE BOARD ON THE ONE HAND AND A REFERENDUM ON THE OTHER AND ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO WAY.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN THREE THINGS ARE DONE. WHEN A FRANCHISE IS GOING TO BE GRANTED TO A MUNICIPALITY, THE MUNICIPALITY IS GOING



TO BE GRANTED A FRANCHISE. THE BOARD HAS A RESPONSIBILITY WITH THEIR EXPERTISE AND WITH THEIR KNOWLEDGE TO POINT OUT TO THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL AND TO THE PEOPLE OF THE MUNICIPALITY WHAT ARE THE ASSETS AND WHAT ARE THE LIABILITIES OF THE DIFFERENT FRANCHISE PROPOSALS. THEY SHOULD BE THE ADVISORY GROUP TO THE CITY COUNCIL AND TO THE PEOPLE OF WHITEHORSE. MUNICIPAL COUNCIL WITH THEIR ADVISE AND WITH THEIR EXPERTISE AS A BOARD, MAKES THE DECISION IN FAVOUR OF ONE OF THE COMPANIES APPLYING FOR THE FRANCHISE. THEN THEY HAVE TO, WITH THIS KNOWLEDGE, GO TO THE PEOPLE, THE TAXPAYERS OF THAT MUNICIPALITY AND SAY, "LOOK IT, THIS IS WHAT WE THINK. THIS IS THE ADVISE WE RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD. THIS IS THE DECISION THAT WE HAVE MADE. DO YOU RATIFY OUR DECISION OR NOT?" WHEN ALL THESE THINGS ARE DONE AND ARE DONE AS THEY SHOULD BE, THEN CERTAINLY THE BOARD SHALL NOT HAVE THE POWER AFTER THIS OF SAYING EVEN THOUGH ALL THESE THINGS HAVE BEEN DONE, NOW THAT THE VOTE HAS BEEN TAKEN WE SAY NO, THAT THE FRANCHISE IS NOT GOING TO BE GRANTED TO THE COMPANY, THAT THE TAXPAYERS HAVE VOTED HAVE FOR, THAT THE MUNICIPALITY HAS AGREED UPON BUT IT'S GOING, WE'RE NOT APPROVING THE FRANCHISE TO THAT COMPANY. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT HAVE THIS POWER AFTER THE TAXPAYERS HAVE SPOKEN.

SO THE AREA IN WHICH IT SHOULD BE THAT THE WELL DEFINED AND LAID OUT BOARD POWER IS IN THE AREA OF WORKING ON WITH THE CITY, IN GIVING EXPERT KNOWLEDGE OF THE GRANTING OF FRANCHISES AND ON THE DIFFERENT FRANCHISE APPLICATIONS. BUT THE SECTION HAS TO BE READY AND, AFTER ALL, THESE STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN AND A DECISION HAS BEEN MADE BY THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY OF THE PEOPLE THEN, FOR IT DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY, AFTER THAT DECISION HAS BEEN MADE, BY SAYING WE DID AGREE WITH THIS AND WE ARE GOING TO DO THIS. THAT IS WHERE THE AMENDMENT SHOULD BE MADE AND THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH AMENDMENTS THAT WERE REPORTED. IT WAS A DAMNABLY .. THESE TWO ORDINANCES WERE BROUGHT UP SEPARATELY AND THIS WAS COSTLY BETWEEN THE TWO BUT THE PRINCIPLE HAS TO BE OVERRIDING AND, IF ALL THESE THINGS ARE DONE PROPERLY, THEN THE BOARD, AFTER ALL THE THINGS HAVE BEEN DONE, CAN HAVE THE AUTHORITY OF SAYING REGARDLESS OF THIS DECISION, WE ARE NOT GOING TO ACCEPT THE DECISION OF THE PEOPLE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN I SAY SOMETHING ON THIS IF I MAY? BASICALLY WHAT THE HONOURABLE

MEMBER IS SAYING THEN IS, HE DOESN'T LIKE SECTION 2, THE AMENDMENTS IN SECTION 21 BECAUSE THE BOARD GETS IN A SECOND TIME AFTER THE PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN.

MR. MCKINNON AND SOME MEMBERS: RIGHT.

MR. MCKINNON: THIS SEEMS TO ME THAT IT'S A GOOD POINT OF DISCUSSION AND THAT THE BOARD SHOULD APPROVE THE APPLICATION FOR A FRANCHISE PRIOR TO ...

MR. TANNER: NO, NO THAT'S BUYING ..

MR. MCKINNON: BUYS AND RECOMMENDS, THAT'S RIGHT. THEN PRIOR TO A REFERENDUM HE DOES GET INTO THE CONFLICT ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AGREE IT ISN'T EASY. THIS ISN'T RIGHT. THIS IS ANCIENT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD WE HAVE ANOTHER LOOK AT THAT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. THE NEXT IS SECTION 3. SUBSECTION 26(1) OF THE SAID ORDINANCE IS REPEALED AND THE FOLLOWING SUBSTITUTED FOR 26 (1) "SO THAT ANY MUNICIPALITY WITHIN WHOSE BOUNDARIES A PUBLIC UTILITIES OPERATE OR 10 RESIDENCES OF A MUNICIPALITY OR WHERE A PUBLIC UTILITY OPERATES OUTSIDE A MUNICIPALITY, ANY CONSUMER OF ELECTRICITY, RESIDENT IN THE AREA TO WHICH THE PUBLIC UTILITY PROVIDES SERVICE, MAY ON PAYMENT OF THE PRESCRIBED FEE, FILE A COMPLAINT WITH THE BOARD RESPECTING:

- (A) THE RATES CHARGED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITY OR THE CLASSIFICATION TO WHICH THESE RATES APPLY,
- (B) A PROPOSED RATE INCREASE BY THE PUBLIC UTILITY, NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN PURSUANT TO SECTION 23,
- (C) THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PUBLIC UTILITY PROVIDES SERVICE,
- (D) THE AREAS TO WHICH THE PUBLIC UTILITY PROVIDES SERVICE, OR
- (E) THE CONDITIONS INCLUDING ANY PAYMENTS TO BE MADE IN RESPECT THEREOF IMPOSED BY PUBLIC UTILITIES IN ESTABLISHING, CONSTRUCTING, MAINTAINING OR OPERATING AN EXTENSION TO ITS FACILITIES.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S OBVIOUS WHAT WE HAVE TRIED TO ACCOMPLISH HERE, EXACTLY WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED FOR IN HIS BILL THAT WAS INTRODUCED SOME WEEKS AGO; AND WE'VE GONE A LITTLE FURTHER BECAUSE AFTER WE LOOKED



AT IT WE FELT THE SUGGESTION THE MEMBER MADE HAD GREAT VALIDITY AND WE CUT THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTS REQUIRED IN THE MUNICIPALITY WHERE OBVIOUSLY THERE ARE NUMBERS WHO COULD GET TOGETHER AND DO IT - FROM 25 TO 10 AND WE'VE MADE IT, OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITY, ANY INDIVIDUAL RECIPIENT OF THE SERVICE. WE FEEL THIS SHOULD SATISFY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER UNLESS HE HAS ANYTHING SPECIFIC, I CAN'T SEE WHERE THERE SHOULD BE TOO MUCH DISCUSSION ON THAT.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I FIND PARTICULAR OBJECTION TO THE LAST SIX WORDS THAT ARE UNDERLINED AND THAT IS ON PAYMENT OF THE PRESCRIBED FEE. I WONDER WHY IT IS NECESSARY, WHEN SOMEBODY HAS A GOOD LEGITIMATE COMPLAINT TO PUT BEFORE THE BOARD AND ON TOP OF THAT INSULT, THEY ARE GOING TO TURN AROUND AND GIVE A FEE. SURELY THE BOARD SHOULD BE IN A POSITION TO BE ABLE TO DETERMINE AT FIRST GLANCE WHETHER OR NOT IT IS A LEGITIMATE CASE TO PUT BEFORE THE BOARD WITHOUT ASKING A FEE.

Mr. Tanner: WELL, I UNDERSTAND THE MEMBER'S COMPLAINT BUT WHEN WE WENT THROUGH THIS ORDINANCE THE LAST TIME THE WHITEHORSE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST BROUGHT THE BILL IN, WE IN THE WISDOM OF THIS HOUSE, WE MADE IT 25. NOW WE'VE GONE ALL THE WAY FROM 25 DOWN TO 1 AND AS FAR AS THE PEOPLE OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITY ARE CONCERNED, AND LET'S BE HONEST ABOUT IT, THAT MEANS THAT RIGHT NOW ANYBODY CAN SEND IN AN APPLICATION JUST ON THE WINK OF AN EYE, IF YOU LIKE, AND WE FEEL BY HAVING SOME PRESCRIBED FEE IT WILL STOP SOME FRIVOLOUS COMPLAINTS. I DON'T THINK THAT'S AN UNREASONABLE APPROACH.

Mr. Chamberlist: NOW, Mr. Chairman, I TEND TO DISAGREE WITH YOU, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN. IT MIGHT BE AN ORDINARY WORKING STIFF THAT CAN'T AFFORD THE PRESCRIBED FEE WHICH MIGHT BE A HUNDRED DOLLARS. MIGHT BE JUST A MAN WHO HAS A LITTLE CABIN AND HE FINDS THAT HE IS BEING CHARGED A MINIMUM OF FIFTEEN DOLLARS A MONTH FOR A LITTLE CABIN, WHERE HE HAS A ONE HUNDRED WATT LAMP IN. IT SEEMS TO ME NOT VERY PROPER TO ATTEMPT TO GET A PRESCRIBED FEE OUT OF A PERSON LIKE THAT. CERTAINLY THE GOVERNMENT WHEN IT SETS UP A BOARD OF THIS DESCRIPTION MUST BE PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PAYMENT BECAUSE TO MAKE FEES AVAILABLE TO PEOPLE WHO SIT ON THAT BOARD AND WHY PENALIZE THE PERSON THAT WANTS TO REGISTER A COMPLAINT. IF HIS COMPLAINT ISN'T A SUBSTANTIVE COMPLAINT IT WILL NOT BE GIVEN MUCH CONSIDERATION. I INTEND TO

AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON CITY THAT HE SHOULD CUT THOSE WORDS OUT OF THE PAYMENT OF THE PRESCRIBED FEE BECAUSE THAT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE GOVERNMENT TO SUPPLY SERVICES WITHOUT CHARGE.

Mr. Tanner: I DON'T DISAGREE ENTIRELY WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER EXCEPT THAT JUST A FEW MONTHS AGO, OR WAS IT TWO YEARS AGO WHEN WE BROUGHT THIS BILL IN, HE WAS AS CONVINCED AS I WAS WHEN I SUPPORTED HIM WHEN HE INTRODUCED THIS BILL, THAT WE SHOULD HAVE 25 COMPLAINANTS ALL TOGETHER IN A GROUP AND NOW WE HAVE GONE ALL THE WAY FROM 25 TO 1 COMPLAINT SO WE HAVE COVERED THE PROBLEMS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE HAS HAD BUT HOW DO YOU GET AWAY FROM SOMEBODY WHO FRIVOLOUSLY SENDS IN COMPLAINTS EVERY TEN MINUTES. IT MIGHT BE SOMETHING LIKE, SOMEBODY MAKING A HABIT OUT OF DOING SOMETHING LIKE THIS AND GOING TO COURT AND WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE THAT.

Mr. Chamberlist: THAT'S AN HONOUR, I HAVE NEVER BEEN ACCUSED OF DOING ANYTHING FRIVOLOUS BUT CERTAINLY THE WORDS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT IN THERE ARE FRIVOLOUS WORDS - ON PAYMENT OF THE PRESCRIBED FEE, BECAUSE SUPPOSING 25 PEOPLE WHO GO FORWARD TO COMPLAIN, SIGN A PETITION THAT QUITE OFTEN THAT WE HAVE MANY FRIVOLOUS PETITIONS THAT COME BEFORE COUNCIL; WOULD YOU PENALIZE EVERYONE OF THESE PEOPLE JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE FRIVOLOUS? THE POINT THAT HAS BEEN RAISED ABOUT THE REDUCTION TO ONE PERSON, THIS IS QUITE GOOD AND QUITE FAIR. I THINK IT IS PROPER, THIS IS WHY I DON'T RAISE ANY OBJECTION AT ALL TO THE BASIC AMENDMENT. IT'S SOMETHING THAT GOES MUCH FURTHER. I AGREE THAT WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE HAD ASKED FOR BUT I AM GOING TO SUPPORT COUNCILLOR STUTTER ON THIS PARTICULAR POINT. THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO FEE FOR REGISTERING A COMPLAINT. IT'S JUST LIKE ANYBODY WHO WANTS TO GO BEFORE ANY BOARD. I MEAN, THIS IS GOING TO BE A COURT ISSUE, A JUDICIAL BOARD AND THE FIRST THING YOU ARE GOING TO BE FACED WITH, IS TO PAY FOR IT TO GO BEFORE A JUDICIAL BOARD.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO MAKE A POINT, THAT I PUT IN A COMPLAINT NOT TOO LONG AGO TO THE SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT. I CAN SEE IT WOULD PASS THIS ONE. WE WOULD HAVE TO PUT OUR DOLLAR BILL OR TWO DOLLAR BILL AND COMPLAIN TO THE SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT OR WHEREVER IT WAS.



Mr. Tanner: That might be a good suggestion for a source of income. The object of the amendment is now to go all the way from 25 and I think it takes a complaint of a most frivolous nature to get 24 other people to complain with him on his frivolous complaint. Now, any individual can walk up and lay a complaint and I think the payment of a fee, I don't think it is unreasonable for some sum of money to say that they aren't frivolous.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the word 'prescribed fee' in section 3 be deleted.

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, meeting of the Board at the moment are questionable. One of the members has to come from Vancouver, it's \$180.00 a meeting. One of the members has to come from Haines Junction. If this is changed and some substitute for delay or as a block, has an unnecessary complaint, is not substituted in subsection 2 of the same section which reads: The Board shall, without undue delay, hear an adjudicated complaint filed and may make an order fixing a rate, prohibiting a rate, terms or conditions, and so forth. So, whenever it gets a complaint it is almost obligated in every case to hold a public hearing and requires a utility to be represented and of the whole personality of the hearing with all the persons present. Now, I'm not saying it's a bad thing, all I'm saying is does the House really wish that every letter of complaint to the Board should result in a public hearing, or should some consideration be given to how to deal with the whole operation of the Board, if every letter of complaint requires a public hearing. And there is no way of screening this in advance. We may have to set up some kind of a system, whereby, the Board itself might have to have the power not to have a hearing in relation to the complaints. In other words, a single letter may figure and say it's once a week, something like that. Each time a complaint is filed, instead of having 35 people file the same complaint, we might have 25 different complaints coming in from Ross River. The Board should hold a hearing .... It is quite a situation.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, you'll never know until we get a regulation.

Mr. Legal Adviser: I mean, the intention was, one of the original drafts is not disclosing a

state secret, I think it had five or ten dollars but it is not the custom of putting a dollar amount here, we just substitute a prescribed fee of ten dollars.

Mr. Chamberlist: You have a hundred million dollar .... and are trying to relate it to a five dollar or a ten dollar fee? I mean, what's the point?

Mr. Legal Adviser: The purpose is not to raise revenue. The purpose is to make the individual think a little bit and be a little responsible before he is the cause for a public hearing.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that responsible was the amendment that was offered by the Honourable Member for Watson Lake and I am sure that if there was a legitimate complaint in any one of the areas where the Board is capable of acting, that in a few municipalities, finding 25 people to sign a complaint, where a complaint is justified, is no problem at all. And the Honourable Member for Dawson City, I am positive, has no problem in any way shape or form in the smaller municipalities in the Yukon, in finding 25 people, probably he could have found 300 if they exist at the time and he wanted to see most of his constituents to sign the complaint also. All right, ten in the smaller areas is what the Honourable Member for Watson Lake asked for and I am sure where the legitimate complaints are in areas outside the municipality ten people will sign a complaint. This is when you have a responsible complaint because you have people signing the complaint with their name on complaint before them. There are so many independent and free staging and thoroughly enjoyable people in the Yukon, I can tell you that boy that floor is going to be waxed every night by at least one free thinking independent individual who feels he has a real or imagined slight being done to him by the utility outside the municipality and that Board is going to be going steady from frivolous complaints even if the person and the member of the public putting the complaint forward thinks that it is a real complaint. Certainly we all know quite a large number of constituents who for five or ten dollars to get their wine right would not ... even if the fee were a hundred dollars. The way of doing it was the way the Honourable Member for Watson Lake first brought the amendment forward. It was down 25 for the municipalities, 10



OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITIES, NO PRESCRIBED FEE. THAT'S THE SENSIBLE AND THE RESPONSIBLE WAY OF GOING ABOUT THIS AMENDMENT FOR THE ORDINANCE. LET'S NOT GET CARRIED AWAY BY THIS GREAT LIBERALIZATION WHERE FROM 25 TO 10 HAS BEEN CANCELLED. WE ARE JUST OPENING UP CORNERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF COUNCILLOR STUTTER WOULD TAKE THE CHAIR A MOMENT.

MR. TAYLOR: I HAVE DESPERATELY BEEN TRYING TO GET INTO THIS DEBATE BECAUSE IT IS ONE WHICH, OF COURSE, CONCERNS MY ELECTORAL DISTRICT BUT THE COMMENTS JUST MADE BY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE WEST, REFLECTS MY OPINION AS WELL. THE PRESCRIBED FEE IN ANY EVENT, I COULD NOT GO FOR BECAUSE IF YOU REALLY THINK ABOUT IT, A PRESCRIBED FEE IS AN OPEN CHECK FOR THE COMMISSIONER AND REPRESENTS TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION. NOW, IF YOU SAID FOR TEN DOLLARS IN THE ORDINANCE OR TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS THEN YOU WOULD HAVE TAXATION BY REPRESENTATION. BUT I THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT POINT AND IT'S NOT ONE TO BE TOTALLY CONSIDERED IN JEST BUT IN ANY EVENT, I WOULD ASK THAT WHEN THE BILL COMES BACK FOR RE-CONSIDERATION, IF, AGAIN THE SAME PEOPLE - THE COMMISSIONER'S LEGAL ADVISER AND THE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE WHO ARE ON THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE WOULD CONSIDER LEAVING THE MUNICIPALITY TO 25 RESIDENTS AND LEAVING, IN THE OUTLYING DISTRICTS, I HAD CONSIDERED EVEN ASKING FOR 5 BUT I WENT FOR 10 LAST TIME BECAUSE I SAID I MIGHT HAVE A CHANCE OF GETTING IT. BUT LEAVE IT AT 10. TEN WOULD MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES AND TAKE OUT ANY PAYMENT OF PRESCRIBED FEE AND I ALSO HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS HERE I WOULD LIKE MR. LEGAL ADVISER TO LOOK AT. I HAVE A QUESTION IN RESPECT OF 26(B)(2) A PROPOSED RATE INCREASE BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES. A NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN PURSUANT TO SECTION 23 AND I JUST HAVEN'T HAD TIME TO REVIEW SECTION 23 MAKING IT IMPERATIVE THAT THE BOARD REFER THIS MATTER BACK TO THE PEOPLE FOR CLEARANCE, BE IT THE MUNICIPALITY OR NOT, TO ADVISE THEM THAT THEIR UTILITY COMPANY HAS, IN FACT, GONE TO THE BOARD AND ASK FOR A RATING.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: NO, IT HAS TO APPLY FOR A RATE CHANGE WITH THE BOARD. THE BOARD DOESN'T HAVE TO NOTIFY THE PUBLIC.

MR. TAYLOR: NO, THIS IS THE POINT THEN. HOW WILL THE PUBLIC KNOW UNDER SECTION 26(1) ..

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE COMMISSIONER..

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER.

MR. TAYLOR: HOW WOULD THE PEOPLE BE ABLE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS SECTION WHICH WE ARE PROVIDING TO THEM FOR THEIR PROTECTION UNDER SUB(B) HOW COULD THEY OPPOSE THE RATE INCREASE WHEN, IN FACT, THERE IS NO COMPELSION UPON THE UTILITY COMPANY OR THE BOARD TO ADVISE THOSE PEOPLE THAT INDEED THE PEOPLE WHO ARE OPERATING A UTILITY IN THEIR AREA ARE GOING TO INCREASE THEIR POWER RATE. THEY MUST ALMOST GET A LIGHT BILL AND WONDER WHY THEIR POWER IS GOING UP AND THEN COMPLAIN TO THE BOARD. NOW MY OTHER QUESTION, AND I'LL JUST SAY AT THIS TIME, ON (C) YOU SAY THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PUBLIC UTILITY PROVIDES SERVICE. WOULD THIS INCLUDE THE QUALITY OF SERVICE? HAVE YOU ANY IDEA?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: IN RESPONSE TO THE SECOND QUESTION, I WOULD THINK THAT MANNER AND QUALITY ARE THE SAME DEAL. AS FAR AS NOTICE IS CONCERNED, IT'S IN RESPECT OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY WHICH HOLDS THE FRANCHISE. IF THE FRANCHISE IS GRANTED BY A MUNICIPALITY, THE MUNICIPALITY MUST BE INFORMED. IF THE FRANCHISE IS GRANTED BY THE COMMISSIONER, THE COMMISSIONER MUST BE INFORMED. IT'S UP TO THE FRANCHISE GRANTOR TO INFORM THE PUBLIC FROM THAT POINT ON. AND I THINK THIS WOULD BE DONE.

MR. TAYLOR: YOU THINK IT WOULD BE DONE. WOULD YOU LOOK INTO THIS WHEN YOU CONSIDER THE RE-SHAPING OF THIS ORDINANCE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I SHOULD SPEAK ON THIS SECTION TOO. ON 26(1) THE FACT THAT THERE WAS ONLY ONE CONSUMER ATTESTING AND IT WAS BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION BY, ACTUALLY IT WAS A CONSTITUENT FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE, WHO BROUGHT IT TO OUR ATTENTION THAT IN SOME OF THE COMMUNITIES WHERE YOU HAVE COMMERCIAL OPERATORS WHO ARE PAYING COMMERCIAL RATES WHO ARE OBJECTING TO THE RATE THEY ARE PAYING AND WANT THEIR RATES REVIEWED. AND IN SOME OTHER COMMUNITIES IT IS DIFFICULT TO GET 5 OR AT THAT TIME, 25 COMMERCIAL OPERATORS IN ONE COMMUNITY. THERE ARE JUST NOT THAT MANY COMMERCIAL OPERATORS. SO, WE LOOKED AT 10 AND 5 WHEN IN SOME AREAS YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE THAT MANY AND YET, BY NOT HAVING 5 OR 10, YOU ARE NOT GIVING THESE PEOPLE THE OPPORTUNITY TO FILE A COMPLAINT BEFORE THE BOARD AND I THINK THIS IS WHERE IT LEAD FROM AND I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE REALIZES THIS AND THAT IS WHY HE BROUGHT IT IN TO START WITH. IT IS VERY



OFTEN IN THE SMALL COMMUNITIES THAT COMMERCIAL OPERATORS WHO ARE ASKING FOR A REVIEW OF THE COMMERCIAL RATE. AND IN SOME COMMUNITIES THERE ARE NOT THAT MANY.

Mr. TAYLOR: I WON'T GET INTO THIS LONG STORY, BUT WHEN I FIRST BROUGHT THE MATTER TO THE ATTENTION OF THE LEGAL ADVISOR AND SUGGESTED TO HIM THAT I WISHED TO HAVE A PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL IN THIS MATTER IN ORDER TO SOLVE THIS PROBLEM, WHICH HAS BEEN IN EXISTENCE FOR SOME TIME NOW, I DID CONSIDER FIVE FOR THE VERY REASONS I'VE JUST EXPRESSED.

HOWEVER, AS I STATED EARLIER, I FELT THAT I WOULDN'T GET ANYWHERE WITH THAT. I THOUGHT THAT IF I ASKED FOR TEN, I MIGHT GET IT, WITH THIS GROUP I AM DEALING WITH. YOU MUST TAKE THAT INTO ACCOUNT. I DO AGREE WITH YOU THAT FOR INSTANCE, IN THE COMMUNITY OF ROSS RIVER, FIVE WOULD JUST ABOUT COVER IT. EVEN WITH TEN, IF WE HAVE TO HAVE THAT, IF WE COULD EVEN GET THAT, I PREFER FIVE. THERE IS NO QUESTION IN MY MIND. IF I COULD GET THAT, I WOULD BE EXTREMELY HAPPY. THE FOUR OR FIVE THAT ARE THERE COULD CONCEIVABLY GO AND GET SOME RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER TO GO ALONG WITH HIM. AT LEAST WE COULD GET TO THE IDEAS THAT GET BEFORE THE BOARD. FOR THESE REASONS I SAY FINE, LEAVE US WITH TEN. IF WE CAN HAVE FIVE ALL THE BETTER.

Mr. McKINNON: Go 25, 5.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, AS WE GO ON, WE OPEN UP MORE DOORS BECAUSE OF ANOTHER POINT HAS RISEN. REFERENCE HAS BEEN MADE ALL OF A SUDDEN - COMMERCIAL USES HAVE BEEN BROUGHT INTO THE PICTURE. BUT THE WAY THE ORDINANCE READS RIGHT NOW, IT SAYS 25 RESIDENTS. IT DOESN'T SAY ANYTHING ABOUT COMMERCIALS. RIGHT NOW, WE HAVE CHANGED THE WORD FOR OUTSIDE AREAS FROM RESIDENTS TO A CONSUMER. A VERY INTERESTING POINT CAME UP WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE RAISED THE QUESTION OF SECTION 93. IN READING IT, I FIND THAT WHERE A PUBLIC UTILITY IN A MUNICIPALITY SETS A RATE, HE HAS TO FILE IT WITH THE BOARD. IF IT IS OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITY, YOU HAVE TO FILE IT WITH THE COMMISSIONER. SO WHERE DOES THE BOARD ACT? ONLY IN MUNICIPALITIES?

UNDER SECTION 23.2, WHERE DOES THE BOARD ACT? DOES THE BOARD ONLY ACT FOR MUNICIPALITIES? THEN WHAT IS THE POINT OF SENDING - Mr. LEGAL ADVISOR WITH THE HOARY HEAD, JUST SHAKING

IT, JUST SUGGESTED THAT THE COMMISSIONER DOESN'T HAVE TO DEAL WITH IT, AND WHAT WOULD THE RATE STRUCTURE BE FILED WITH HIM FOR. IF IT IS THE BOARD THAT DEALS WITH IT?

Mr. LEGAL ADVISOR: IF MY HAIR IS GREY Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE GREY HAIRS ARE PUT THERE BY THIS PARTICULAR HONOURABLE MEMBER. Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE COMMISSIONER IS THE AUTHORITY WHO GRANTS FRANCHISES OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITY. HE ACTS ON BEHALF OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE PARTICULAR AREAS AND ITS PROFITS SHOULD BE SOLD. NOTICES GO THROUGH HIM AND HE WOULD THEN BE OBLIGATED TO NOTIFY THE RESIDENTS OF THE AREAS.

BUT THE WORD CONSUMER WAS DELIBERATELY CHOSEN IN THE DRAFTING OF THE NEW AMENDMENT OF SECTION 26, TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE DIFFERENCE OF TYPE OF USER BECAUSE IT WAS THOUGHT THAT IN SOME SMALL AREAS, THERE WOULD BE ONLY A SINGLE COMMERCIAL USER AND HE MIGHT FAIL TO GET OTHER PEOPLE'S SUPPORT IF ANY COMPLAINTS OCCURRED.

IT WAS NO ACCIDENT, THAT THE MATTER WAS THOROUGHLY THRASHED OUT AND THIS WAS THE RESULT. BUT THEN IT WAS THOUGHT NECESSARY TO PUT A BLOCK ON FRIVOLOUS COMPLAINTS TO SOME EXTENT BY PUTTING IN THE PRESCRIBED DETAIL. THERE IS NO HARD AND FAST POLICY ON THIS, WHATEVER THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS WISHED, PROVIDED

I WOULD ASK, THAT THEY THINK AS ONE OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS DID OF THE BOARDS CONCERNED NOT TO BE HOLDING PUBLIC HEARINGS, FOR EVERY SINGLE COMPLAINT.

Mr. TAYLOR: JUST ONE FURTHER IDEA DID ARISE. I THINK IF YOU HAVE FIVE OR TEN OR EITHER ONE IN A SMALL OUTLYING DISTRICT AND CERTAINLY 25 IN A SMALL MUNICIPALITY, I THINK THAT YOU WOULD FIND A RESTRICTION ON THE CHAOTIC SITUATION, IT WAS SUGGESTED. HOWEVER, IT DID CROSS MY MIND TO SUGGEST THAT, DEPENDING ON WHAT AREA WE TRAVEL HERE, I SUGGEST THAT THE BOARD BE COMPELLED TO SIT AT SPECIFIC TIMES ONCE EVERY MONTH, ONCE EVERY TWO MONTHS FOR THE PURPOSE OF HEARING THE COMPLAINTS, IF WE WENT THE OTHER ROUTE. BUT I THINK IF WE WENT THE 5 OR 10 I DON'T THINK THIS WOULD PRESENT TO THE BOARD ANY PROBLEMS. HOWEVER, IF IT DID IN ACTUAL FACT, IF THIS WAS TO OCCUR AT THE FOLLOWING AND NEXT ENSUING SESSION OF COUNCIL, THAT COULD BE REVIEWED AND A CHANGE COULD BE AFFECTED TO ACCOMMODATE THAT SITUATION. I DON'T REALLY THINK IT IS GOING TO HAPPEN THAT WAY.



MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE ARE GOING TO REVIEW THE FIRST TWO SECTIONS AS BEEN ASKED BY COUNCIL. I WISH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD JUST THINK, BECAUSE HE KNOWS BETTER THAN I DO, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE WOULD KNOW BETTER THAN I DO TOO, WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE OUTLYING AREAS WHERE YOU ONLY WANT ONE OR TWO. PERHAPS OVERNIGHT YOU COULD GIVE IT SOME THOUGHT BEFORE WE BRING BACK ANY FURTHER AMENDMENTS TO THIS.

MR. TAYLOR: I THINK IN ANSWER TO THAT, I COULD ANSWER BY STATING THAT FIVE WOULD ACCOMMODATE THAT VERY NICELY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WITHOUT A PRESCRIBED CASE.

MR. TAYLOR: WITHOUT A PRESCRIBED CASE, I WILL NOW RESUME THE CHAIR AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON SECTION 26.1 OR INDEED BILL NO. 13 AT THIS TIME?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A REPORT PROGRESS AND I SUGGEST WE PROROGUE PROGRESS FOR THE SECOND COUNCIL.

MR. STUTTER: I WILL SO MOVE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE COMMITTEE AGREE THAT I REPORT PROGRESS.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. TANNER: I WILL SECOND THE MOTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE MOTION IS CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: THE COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. MAY WE HAVE A REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 2 P.M. THIS AFTERNOON TO DISCUSS PUBLIC BILLS. I CAN REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL NO. 13. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER, SECONDED BY

COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT MR. SPEAKER RESUME THE CHAIR AND THIS MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: IS IT THE WISH OF THE HOUSE THAT THE REPORT BE ADOPTED AS THE DIRECTOR STATED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, IN RESPECT TO THE AGENDA FOR TOMORROW, I DO NOT BELIEVE AT THIS TIME THERE IS ANYTHING IN COMMITTEE BUT I THINK IN FURTHER PROCESSING OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS OF THE HOUSE, WE MAY HAVE WORD FOR YOUR COMMITTEE TOMORROW.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I MOVE THAT WE CALL IT 5:00.

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. STUTTER: I SECOND THAT MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON THAT WE NOW CALL IT 5:00. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: THIS HOUSE NOW STANDS ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW MORNING.

ADJOURNED

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1974

MR. SPEAKER READS THE DAILY PRAYER.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM CLERK, IS THERE A QUORUM PRESENT?

MADAM CLERK: THERE IS, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY CORRESPONDENCE OR DOCUMENTS TO BE TABLED?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE FOR TABLING TODAY SESSIONAL PAPERS NO. 2 THROUGH 13, AND NO. 16 AND 18.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER DOCUMENTS OR CORRESPONDENCE TO BE TABLED? ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEE? ARE THERE ANY BILLS TO BE INTRODUCED? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION THAT SESSIONAL PAPERS 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, AND 13 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, MR. SPEAKER, MR. SPEAKER I HAVE A NOTICE OF MOTION THAT THIS COUNCIL VIEWS WITH GREAT CONCERN THE CONTINUING ABUSES BY SEEMINGLY IRRESPONSIBLE PEOPLE IN THEIR DRINKING HABITS IN PUBLIC PLACES AND RECOMMEND THAT THE ADMINISTRATION BRINGS FORWARD IN THIS SESSION AMENDMENTS TO THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE, MAKING IT AN OFFENCE TO DRINK INTOXICATING LIQUOR WITHIN 500 FEET OF OUTSIDE THE BUILDING IN ANY MUNICIPALITY.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES OF MOTION?

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE ONE NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING N.C.P.C.'S APPLICATION TO THE YUKON WATER BOARD AND I ALSO HAVE ANOTHER NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF THE YUKON ELECTORAL DISTRICT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? WE WILL NOW COME TO THE MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR TAYLOR SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WITH ALL INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE PROPOSED CAMPGROUND AND RECREATIONAL AREAS THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY AS REFERRED TO IN THE FEBRUARY NEWSLETTERS OF COUNCIL INCLUDING SIZE AND LOCATION OF SUCH AREAS. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, THERE IS NO DEBATE ON THIS SO I WOULD ASK FOR THE QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED.*

*MOTION NO. 1*

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT SESSIONAL PAPERS NO. 1 AND 14 PLUS LEGISLATIVE RETURNS, NOS. 1, 3, 4, 7 AND 12 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED.*

*MOTION NO. 2*

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, AND SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST THAT BILL NO. C-9, AN ACT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT BE DISCUSSED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME?

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I AM. I'LL TRY



AND KEEP REMARKS IN THE HOUSE QUITE SHORT IN THIS REGARD AS I KNOW THAT ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WILL CERTAINLY WANT TO HAVE UNLIMITED DEBATE ON THIS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT MATTER WHEN OR IF IT IS PASSED WITH THE COMMISSION. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY, MR. SPEAKER, THAT I HAVE BEEN MADE AWARE THAT BILL NO. C-9 IS NOW IN THE COMMISSION STAGE HAVING PASSED SECOND READING IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS. IT IS GOING TO REMAIN IN COMMITTEE STAGE MR. SPEAKER UNTIL THE TIME THAT THE VIEWS OF BOTH THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL HAVE BEEN HEARD. I THINK THAT, KNOWING THE TIME LIMITATION CONCERNING THE JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION AND THE ELECTION IN THE FALL, THAT IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT THIS BECOME A PRIORITY ITEM IN DEBATE BEFORE THE HOUSE. FOLLOWING THE DEBATE IN THE HOUSE, MR. SPEAKER, IF WE DO HAVE UNANIMITY ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES, IT IS THEN RECOMMENDED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE THAT ONE MEMBER OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GO TO OTTAWA TO PRESENT THE VIEWS BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE. IF THERE ARE DIVERGENT OPINIONS OF THIS HOUSE TO WARRANT THE AMENDMENT TO THE YUKON ACT CONTAINED IN BILL NO. C-9 THEN THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IS PREPARED TO HAVE AS MANY COUNCILLORS PRESENT BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE AS THERE ARE COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE DIVERGENT VIEWS OF THE AMENDMENTS TO BILL NO. C-9. MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT OF COURSE ALL MEMBERS WILL GIVE THIS ITEM PRIORITY WHEN WE LEAVE THE HOUSE AND GO INTO COMMITTEE BECAUSE IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT DEBATE TAKE PLACE IMMEDIATELY AND THAT REPRESENTATION BE MADE TO OTTAWA FORTHWITH SO THAT THE FALL ELECTION CAN BE HELD UNDER THE CHANGES IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE YUKON ACT. MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT ALL MEMBERS KNOW, THAT ALL MEMBERS HAVE MANY, MANY THINGS TO SAY ON THIS BILL BUT RATHER THAN TAKE THE TIME OF THE HOUSE AT THIS TIME, I THINK IT WOULD PROBABLY BE MORE EXPEDIENT TO LEAVE THAT DEBATE FOR COMMITTEE. I JUST WANTED TO LET ALL MEMBERS BE AWARE OF THE PRIORITIES THEY SHOULD BE GIVING TO THIS, OF COURSE, ITEM OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE, AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD DRAW TO ALL MEMBERS' ATTENTION THAT, WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN IS PRIMARILY CORRECT. ONE THING THAT SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE IS THE FACT THAT THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL IS NOT NOW SITTING AND THEY HAVE GOT TO BE CALLED TOGETHER AND GIVES THIS HOUSE, PROBABLY A FEW MORE DAYS BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY, THE COMMITTEE IN OTTAWA

WILL NOT SIT UNTIL IT HEARS BOTH COUNCILS. SO IT DOES ALLOW US A LITTLE MORE TIME THAN WE WOULD NORMALLY HAVE UNDER OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT THE HIGH PRIORITY, MUCH HIGHER THAN ANYTHING ELSE THAT IS BEFORE COUNCIL AT THIS TIME AND I CONCUR FULLY WITH WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE SAID AND I TRUST THAT THE MAJORITY MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE WILL RECOGNIZE THAT IT IS TOP PRIORITY.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION NO. 3.

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TAYLOR THAT THE 13TH SESSION OF 22ND WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY PRESENTLY IN SESSION, UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORT C 11, AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT 1867 TO 1965 WHICH WILL ENTITLE THE YUKON TERRITORY AND THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES TO BE REPRESENTED IN THE SENATE BY ONE MEMBER EACH. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME?

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER. NOBODY GOES BACK INTO HISTORY WITH SOME OF THE DEBATES I HELD IN THE UNIVERSITY ON THE ABOLITION OF THE SENATE AS A USELESS PIECE OF MACHINERY IN THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTIONAL MAKEUP, I DON'T THINK, REALLY, THE MEMBERS SHOULD BE WORRYING ABOUT GETTING INTO THE DEBATE, WHETHER THEY THINK THE SENATE PERFORMS A USEFUL FUNCTION OR WHETHER IT SHOULD BE ABOLISHED OR WHETHER IT SHOULD BE AMENDED OR ANY OF THESE ITEMS. I THINK THE POINT OF FACT IS THAT THE SENATE IS PART OF THE CONSTITUTION OF CANADA AND THE ONLY WAY IT CAN BE CHANGED IS THROUGH THE PARLIAMENT



OF CANADA AND AMENDMENTS TO THE BNA ACT OF WHICH WE HAVE NO CONTROL. AS LONG AS THE SENATE IS THERE AND IT IS AVAILABLE AND ALL OTHER JURISDICTIONS IN CANADA HAVE REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE, I THINK THAT THE YUKON AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES SHOULD ALSO HAVE REPRESENTATION ON THIS BODY. OF COURSE, BILL NO. C-9 IS NOW REPORTED BACK FROM COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT. THERE IS STILL DEBATE ON THE REPORTS MADE IN THE HOUSE BEFORE THIRD READING AND I THINK IT WOULD BEHOVE THIS COUNCIL TO HAVE THE MOTION BEFORE PARLIAMENT THAT WE DO ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE OF BILL C-11 WHICH WOULD PROVIDE SENATE REPRESENTATION FROM BOTH THE YUKON AND THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. I THINK IT WOULD BE AN INDICATION TO THE PARLIAMENTARIANS THAT WE ARE FULLY IN ACCORD WITH THE CHANGES IN THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE FOR THIS PRIVILEGE FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THE YUKON HISTORY. OF COURSE THEN, IF THIS IS DONE, IT LEAVES THE GUESSING GAME OF WHO WILL BE THE FIRST SENATOR FOR THE YUKON AND THERE HAS BEEN MUCH SPECULATION ALREADY THAT THE PRESENT COMMISSIONER MAY NOT BE FULFILLING ANOTHER APPOINTMENT AS THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. PERHAPS HE WILL BE THE ONE WHO WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE SENATOR'S POSITION AND, MR. SPEAKER, ANYTHING THAT I COULD DO TO HASTEN MR. COMMISSIONER'S DEPARTURE FROM THE COMMISSIONER'S POSITION AND DOWN TO OTTAWA, I WOULD ALSO BE VERY HAPPY TO DO. SO, MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT THIS MOTION WOULD BE RESENTED AS SUPERFLUOUS IF THE BILL HAD PASSED THE REPORT STAGE AND HAD BEEN GIVEN THIRD READING, BUT AS IT PRESENTLY SITS IN THE REPORT STAGE BEFORE THE HOUSE, I THINK A MOTION SUPPORTING THE PRINCIPLE OF BILL C-9 FROM ALL THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE YUKON COUNCIL WOULD ASSURE AND ENSURE THAT THE BILL WAS PASSED, PERHAPS UNANIMOUSLY, IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS. THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, AS SECONDER OF THE MOTION, I WOULD JUST BRIEFLY LIKE TO SAY THAT THE INTRODUCTION AND FINAL ACCEPTANCE OF BILL C-11 CULMINATES WHAT HAS BEEN A PROJECT, I THINK, OF SUCCESSIVE COUNCILS. CERTAINLY DURING MY EXPERIENCE IN THE YUKON AND EACH ONE, AT SOME POINT IN TIME, HAD EXPRESSED THE DESIRE THAT THE YUKON PARTICIPATE IN THE DEBATES OF THE SENATE WHICH, OF COURSE, YOU MUST APPRECIATE IS A JOINT HOUSE OF PARLIAMENT AND I REALLY THINK AND CONSIDER THIS IS A REAL STEP FORWARD TOWARD EVENTUALLY THE DAY WE TAKE OUR FULL PLACE IN CONFEDERATION. I CERTAINLY HOPE THAT ALL MEMBERS WOULD SUPPORT THE MOTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I AM GOING TO SUPPORT THE MOTION ALTHOUGH I RAISE SOME OBJECTION FROM WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE WEST HAS SAID WITH REFERENCE TO THE COMMISSIONER. I CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE TO HASTEN HIM AWAY FROM THE TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION IN A COMPLETE MANNER BUT I DON'T THINK THAT IT WOULD BE CORRECT FOR US TO ENCOURAGE THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO APPOINT A PERSON SUCH AS HE TO THE SENATE BECAUSE I THINK IT SHOULD BE A PERSON WHO HAS SHOWN MUCH RESPONSIBILITY AND NOT IRRESPONSIBILITY AS HAS BEEN MADE BY THE COMMISSIONER. CERTAINLY IN VIEW OF WHAT HE SAID ON PAGE 5 OF HIS OPENING ADDRESS; HE MADE CERTAIN SUGGESTIONS THAT THERE SHOULD BE PROVISIONS FOR HIS RESIDENCE INVOLVEMENT IN THE BUSINESS BOARDS OF THE YUKON I WAS THINKING OF THAT WHEN HE MADE THOSE REMARKS AS HE WAS APPLYING TO VARIOUS COMPANIES IN THE YUKON FOR A POSITION, KNOWING FULL WELL, THAT HIS DAYS ARE QUICKLY COMING TO AN END IN THE YUKON. CERTAINLY THE BILL THAT HAS BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE OTHER PLACE IS ONE THAT WE ALL WELCOME AND I HOPE WE SUPPORT IT UNANIMOUSLY BUT CERTAINLY THOSE WHO AGREE, OUR VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS SHOULD BE MADE AWARE THAT IT'S NOT A UNANIMOUS SITUATION THAT HE BE RECOMMENDED TO GO TO THE SENATE. NOR, IF IT CAME TO THE VOTE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, WOULD THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON ENCOURAGE JAMES SMITH, COMMISSIONER TO BE THE SENATOR FOR THE YUKON.

MR. MCKINNON: WE WANT NORM.

LAUGHTER

MR. TAYLOR: WE COULDN'T GET RID OF HIM IF WE TRIED.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE EVERY INTENTION OF SUPPORTING THIS MOTION. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO MAKE ONE SUGGESTION ABOUT THE WORDS "13TH SESSION" ARE REALLY NOT NECESSARY. WOULD IT NOT BE BETTER FOR THE MOTION TO BE WORDED "OF THE 22ND WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL" - IT IS JUST A SUGGESTION. ...TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION TOO FOR THE MOVER AND SECONDER AND I AM GOING TO SUPPORT BILL. IN THE BODY OF THE ADDRESS OR SOMEWHERE WITHIN THE BILL, COULD YOU NOT HAVE IT ADDRESSED TO SOMEBODY IN OTTAWA RATHER THAN THE SPEAKER OR SOMEBODY IN THE COMMONS?

MR. MCKINNON: I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. SPEAKER, I CAN ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT THE HONOURABLE



MEMBER ON THE GOVERNMENT SIDE OF THE HOUSE ....

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE DIRECTOR OF TERRITORIAL..

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS CALLING FOR QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

QUESTION PERIOD.

MR. SPEAKER: NOW WE COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. MADAM CLERK WILL YOU SEE IF THE COMMISSIONER IS AVAILABLE? WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER, JUST BEFORE I START, I HAVE A TELEX MESSAGE HERE THIS MORNING FROM JUDGE BUCHANAN, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, THAT I WOULD LIKE TO DELIVER TO YOU AND HONOURABLE MEMBERS AT THIS TIME. THE COMMITTEE HAS BEFORE THEM, BILL C AN ACT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT, THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT AND HAS DECIDED TO DEFER FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THIS BILL UNTIL THE COUNCILS OF THE NORTH WEST TERRITORIES AND THE YUKON TERRITORY MEET AND DECIDE WHETHER THEY WISH TO PRESENT THEIR VIEWS OR COMMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE. COPIES OF THE BILL ARE BEING FORWARDED TO YOU BY SPECIAL DELIVERY FOR IMMEDIATE DISTRIBUTION TO THE COUNCILLORS. IN VIEW OF THE TIME CONSTRAINTS AND THE ANTICIPATED FALL ELECTIONS, THE COMMITTEE WOULD APPRECIATE HEARING THE COUNCIL'S INTENTIONS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. I WILL GIVE THIS TELEX TO THE CLERK.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: APPOINTMENT OF MR. MILLER TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE QUESTIONS TO MR. COMMISSIONER. MR. COMMISSIONER, LAST SESSION I ASKED A SERIES OF QUESTIONS AND I AM GOING TO REPEAT THOSE QUESTIONS. THE SERIES OF QUESTIONS WERE AS FOLLOWS. IT DEALT WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. MILLER TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THE QUESTIONS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

WAS AN INTERNAL COMPETITION HELD FOR THIS JOB? WAS SENIOR CIVIL SERVANTS GIVEN CONSIDERATION? DID MR. MILLER APPLY IN THE COMPETITION? ON WHAT GROUNDS WERE THE LEGITIMATE APPLICANTS REJECTED?

WHEN AND HOW WAS THE COMPETITION TERMINATED? IF MR. MILLER DID NOT APPLY AND THE COMPETITION WAS TERMINATED, HOW DID HE RECEIVE THE APPOINTMENT?

WAS MR. MILLER GIVEN THE JOB ON THE CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH Y.T.G.?

IN ANY EVENT, HOW COULD HE BE APPOINTED WHEN MR. FLEMING WAS STILL IN THAT POSITION BUT ON SICK LEAVE?

THEY WERE OUT FOR WRITTEN ANSWERS.

A MONTH HAS PASSED BY, MR. COMMISSIONER. ARE WE GOING TO GET ANSWERS TO THOSE QUESTIONS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ANSWERS ARE ON MY DESK READY FOR SIGNATURE.

QUESTION RE: BILLING FOR OUT-PATIENTS TO HOSPITALS AND NURSING STATIONS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT CHANGES ARE BEING MADE RE: BILLING FOR OUT-PATIENTS TO HOSPITALS AND NURSING STATIONS? AS MR. COMMISSIONER IS AWARE, AT THE WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL BOARD AND AT OTHER TIMES, I HAVE ASKED AND MADE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THESE CHARGES BE CANCELLED AND THAT THEY BE ACCEPTED BY THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN. HAS MR. COMMISSIONER TAKEN ANY STEPS IN THIS REGARD?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I WOULD ASK THAT COUNCILLOR TANNER BE PERMITTED TO ANSWER THIS.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, IN ANSWER TO THE MEMBER'S QUESTION. YES, IT HAS BEEN TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT. WE HAVE A PLAN AFOOT WHICH

WE THINK WE CAN ELIMINATE THAT PROBLEM AND WITH ANY LUCK WE SHOULD HAVE SOMETHING WITHIN A VERY FEW MONTHS. THAT IS THE REPLY TO THAT QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WITHIN A VERY FEW MONTHS, DID YOU SAY?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, BECAUSE IT DOESN'T ONLY INVOLVE MY DEPARTMENT BUT BOTH THE NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS NO POINT, MR. SPEAKER, IN ATTEMPTING TO GET ANSWERS FROM MR. TANNER, BECAUSE HE IS WRONG. I WILL ASK MR. COMMISSIONER. MR. COMMISSIONER, IT WAS ALREADY A FORMULATED POLICY AS TO HOW TO OVERCOME THIS PROBLEM AND THAT WAS BY ACCEPTING THE PAYMENTS. NOW I AM BEING TOLD BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, THAT A FEW MONTHS ARE GOING TO ELAPSE. WILL THE COMMISSIONER ENSURE THAT DURING THIS SESSION, THIS SPECIFIC MATTER IS DEALT WITH SO THAT PEOPLE WHO REQUIRE TO VISIT THE HOSPITAL IN OUTLYING AREAS ESPECIALLY DO NOT BE CHARGED WHEN THERE ARE NO OTHER PLACES THEY CAN GO IN AND SEEK TREATMENT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: NO, I WON'T GIVE THAT UNDERTAKING, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER INDICATE WHY HE WON'T GIVE AN UNDERTAKING?

MR. COMMISSIONER: NO.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: RADIO AND TELEVISION FACILITIES  
IN ROSS RIVER AND TESLIN

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION I WOULD DIRECT TO MR. COMMISSIONER THIS MORNING. I HAVE, FOR SOME TIME IN THIS HOUSE FOR MANY YEARS, ATTEMPTED TO ASK THE ADMINISTRATION FROM TIME TO TIME, TO COMMUNICATE WITH C.B.C. IN RESPECT TO RADIO AND TELEVISION FACILITIES IN ROSS RIVER AND TESLIN. I HAVE A REPLY FROM MR. COMMISSIONER TO HALF OF THE QUESTION ON JANUARY 4TH, POINTING OUT IN HIS REPLY THAT ROSS RIVER WILL RECEIVE RADIO AT A TARGET DATE OF AUGUST 1ST, 1974. I AM WONDERING IF MR. COMMISSIONER HAS YET HEARD, OR ANY RECENT NEWS SINCE LAST WE SAT, IN RESPECT OF THE TESLIN TELEVISION FACILITIES?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I AM QUITE CONFIDENT THAT THERE HAS BEEN NOTHING, BECAUSE IF THERE HAD BEEN, IF WE HAD HAD ANY MORE INFORMATION, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN CONVEYED TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS BEEN ASKING THESE QUESTIONS ON A REGULAR AND PROPER BASIS.

QUESTION RE: MEETING BETWEEN COUNCILS OF  
N.W.T. AND YUKON

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A FURTHER QUESTION FOR MR. COMMISSIONER. IN RESPECT TO A REQUEST BY THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL TO MEET WITH THE YUKON COUNCIL, HAS THE COMMISSIONER RECEIVED ANY SUCH REQUEST FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES FOR A MEETING BETWEEN THE COUNCILS. IF SO, WHAT REALLY WAS GIVEN?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, I HAVE NEVER HEARD FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ON THIS. IT WAS A COMMUNICATION FROM ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AND I TURNED THE QUESTION OVER TO THE CLERK, I BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS A PROPER REPLY MADE BUT AS FAR AS FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IS CONCERNED, I AM QUITE CONFIDENT THAT WE HAVE NEVER RECEIVED ANY SUCH REQUEST, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SUPPLEMENTARY TO THAT QUESTION, MR. COMMISSIONER, IS IT NOT TRUE THAT THE COMMUNICATION THAT WAS SENT TO THE PARTICULAR TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES, INDICATED BY YOU THAT IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE TO CALL COUNCIL TOGETHER AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME AND NOTWITHSTANDING THAT, YOU WERE ABLE TO CALL COUNCIL TOGETHER TWO DAYS LATER. IS IT NOT CORRECT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: IT COULD WELL BE. I DON'T KNOW.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY TO MY INITIAL QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, COULD ANYONE HERE IN THIS CHAMBERS, ADVISE ME OF JUST WHAT THE REPLY TO THAT COMMUNICATION WAS?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I THINK I CAN REPLY TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER. I DON'T KNOW HOW FAR IT WAS CIRCULATED, BUT CERTAINLY THE LETTER FROM ONE OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUN-



CILLORS CAME TO ME AND THE QUESTION HE WAS ASKING IS WHAT EXPERIENCE HAD TAKEN PLACE IN THIS COUNCIL IN THE YUKON AND AS FAR AS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WAS CONCERNED, I ANSWERED IT AND I GOT A REPLY FROM THE COUNCILLOR THE OTHER DAY.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, I ALSO REPLIED TO THIS GENTLEMAN. WHAT I'M ASKING ABOUT IS THE LETTER IN RESPECT TO THE MEETING BETWEEN THE TWO COUNCILS?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: IT WAS A LETTER FROM A PRIVATE COUNCILLOR, Mr. SPEAKER. WE NEVER HAD ANYTHING FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. TAYLOR: WHAT I'M ASKING IS WHAT WAS THE REPLY TO THE LETTER RESPECTING THE COMMISSIONER?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: THE PARTICULAR COUNCILLOR WAS SIMPLY ADVISED OF THE FACT THAT AT THAT TIME OUR COUNCIL WAS NOT IN SESSION - WORDS TO THIS PARTICULAR EFFECT.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. SPEAKER, TO CLARIFY MATTERS A LITTLE FURTHER, THERE HAVE BEEN TIMES WHEN THIS HOUSE HAS PASSED MOTION BY UNANIMOUS OPINION THAT WE MEET WITH THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY COUNCIL AND THERE HAS BEEN MOTIONS THE OTHER WAY AND ALWAYS WHEN IT GOT UP TO THE COMMISSIONER'S LEVEL OR THE MINISTER'S LEVEL, THESE MEETINGS HAVE BEEN SQUELCHED

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, AT NO TIME HAVE I EVER SQUELCHED ANY MEETING OR ANY PROPOSED MEETING BETWEEN THESE TWO COUNCILS IN MY OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS COMMISSIONER, I HAVE NEVER HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO SQUELCH THE MEETING BECAUSE THERE HAS NEVER BEEN ANYTHING COME THAT WOULD ALLOW ME TO SQUELCH IT.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT PROBABLY Mr. COMMISSIONER MIGHT HAVE A GUILTY CONSCIENCE OR SOMETHING BECAUSE I DIDN'T MENTION HIM SPECIFICALLY. I SAID WHEN IT GOT UP TO THE COMMISSIONER'S LEVEL. I DIDN'T SAY IT WAS THIS COMMISSIONER'S LEVEL, BUT YOU CAN FIND IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS WHERE MOTIONS HAVE PASSED THIS HOUSE AND HAVE PASSED FOR A MEETING WITH THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL. NOT ONE OF THESE MEETINGS COME TO FRUITION BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN THE POLICY OF THE INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT TO KEEP THE TWO COUNCILS APART.

Mr. COMMISSIONER: WELL THAT'S ANOTHER ANIMAL ALTOGETHER.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. SPEAKER, MIGHT I POINT OUT TO THE COMMISSIONER AGAIN BY WAY OF A QUESTION. WOULD YOU BE PREPARED, Mr. COMMISSIONER, TO TABLE A COPY OF THE REPLY THAT YOU SENT TO THAT PARTICULAR COUNCILLOR IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES SIGNED BY YOURSELF, SAYING THAT IN FACT YOU COULDN'T GET THE COUNCIL TOGETHER. AND CERTAINLY IF THAT WASN'T AN OPPORTUNITY TO KEEP THE COUNCILS APART, NOTHING ELSE IS. THIS IS, I DON'T WANT TO SEE YOU IN THE SENATE.

Mr. SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR?

QUESTION RE: MONTHLY PAYMENT FOR Y.T.C.'S  
ELECTRICITY USED IN ROSS RIVER

Mr. TAYLOR: I HAVE A FURTHER QUESTION RESPECTING A PIECE OF CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESSED TO - WOULD YOU DIRECT MY QUESTION TO Mr. COMMISSIONER - ADDRESSED TO Mr. COMMISSIONER JAMES SMITH, ON MARCH 12TH, FROM Mr. DIECKMAN IN ROSS RIVER, IN WHICH HE ASKS: "I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW MUCH MONEY IN TOTAL IS PAID TO THE YUKON ELECTRICAL COMPANY EACH MONTH BY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE ELECTRICITY USED FOR THE GOVERNMENT IN ROSS RIVER ALONE." I AM WONDERING IF HE HAS YET REPLIED AND IF SO, JUST WHAT WOULD THAT AMOUNT BE?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, IF MY MEMORY IS CORRECT, I THINK THE LETTER GOT TO MY DESK YESTERDAY AND I SENT IT AROUND FOR A REPLY TO BE CONSTRUCTED TO Mr. DIECKMAN. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE AMOUNT IS ON THAT, Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. TAYLOR: COULD I BE ADVISED WHEN THAT IS KNOWN?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: OH SURE. I THINK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, THE LETTER THAT HE REFERS TO, I THINK THAT HE IS MARKED AS A RECIPIENT OF A COPY OF THE LETTER THAT CAME TO ME, IF I'M CORRECT, SO WE'LL SIMPLY SEE THAT HE GETS A COPY OF THE REPLY.



QUESTION RE: DECISIONS AND REQUESTS OF RESOURCE ENVIRONMENT PEOPLE

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. Commissioner whether requests and decisions made by the resource people under the Land Use regulations in the Northern Canada Inland Water Act, whether these come to the attention of the Commissioner, whether they come to the attention of the Executive Committee and whether the requests and the decisions could also be made available to all Members of Council? With all the new resource people that the Yukon has been inundated with, we're probably worse off in the dark to what is actually happening and what decisions are being made, than we ever were. Certainly to goodness it's about time that the elected Members of the Yukon Legislative Council had at least the courtesy of knowing what the feds were doing with our country.

Mr. Commissioner: I will have to find out exactly what transpires with these particular things. I'm afraid that I just don't know the answer off hand, Mr. Speaker, but we'll certainly find out. Is that Land Use regulations?

Mr. McKinnon: All the decisions that are made by the Resource Environment people under the Land Use regulations in the north when a company applies for a Land Use regulation permit or when a mining operation applies for a water permit, we never see the request. We never know what the decisions are. I hear that there is a company called Anglo which has applied, from the rumours I hear and I won't make it a practice, and it has received 50 miles of the Yukon River for dredging purposes beginning next summer in the area where it was discovered last year that the salmon are actually breeding in the Yukon River. Where is the correlation of the input any person in the Yukon has whether this is a fact and if a request has been made, whether it has been granted or not. We don't know a damned thing about it.

Mr. Commissioner: Do these things get reported to a degree in the newsletter? Or do these not appear in the newsletter?

Mr. McKinnon: To some degree, they do.

Mr. Commissioner: I have to check on this, Mr. Speaker, but to the best of my knowledge, I think those things which appear in the newsletter were

probably about the extent of our internal knowledge of Y.T.G. I will check on this further for the Honourable Member.

QUESTION RE: INSTRUCTIONS OF THE MINISTER ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Commissioner, on various orders issued by yourself relating to the Executive Committee, especially the appointed Members of the Executive Committee, you say "pursuant to the instructions given to him by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development under the provisions of Section 4 of the Yukon Act, and Commissioner's Order 1970/1, the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory is pleased to and doth hereby appoint." So my question to you Mr. Commissioner is this. With those instructions of the Minister on the Executive Committee, were they written or oral instructions?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, at this point in the time, I would have to determine to find out because all I can tell you is that I got the instruction Mr. Speaker, as to whether it was oral or written, I'm sorry, I just couldn't tell you that.

Mr. Chamberlist: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if they were written instructions, are you prepared to table for Members of Council a copy of those written instructions?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to commit myself on that until I determine what the instructions were, then I'm prepared to answer.

Mr. Chamberlist: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Commissioner that he doesn't know what the instructions were?

Well with respect, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Commissioner said - until I determine what the instructions were. I would like to know whether he knows what the instructions were.

I didn't get what his answer says, not until I know what the instructions were. My question is, don't you know what the instructions were? If he says that he wants to review what the instructions were, that is something different, but he hasn't said that. I take it he doesn't want to answer.



QUESTION RE: DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Mr. Chamberlist: The question I would like to put either the Commissioner or the Honourable Member from Carmacks-Kluane, who is Superintendent of Schools?

Mr. Speaker: Who are you directing?

Mr. Chamberlist: I said either one of them, if they could answer, I would like to get either the Commissioner or the Honourable Member from Carmacks-Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Ferbey is the Deputy Superintendent.

Mr. Chamberlist: Was there ever an appointment made pursuant to the School Ordinance, that Mr. Ferbey or anybody is a Deputy Superintendent of Schools?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check on that.

Mr. Chamberlist: Would the Honourable Member also determine that under Section 5 there is a mandatory requirement for there to be a Deputy Superintendent of Schools appointed by the Commissioner and that from my investigation, no such appointment has been made. Therefore, the Commissioner, once more, is acting contrary to the legislation as has been usual in the past and is coming up more often.

QUESTION RE: NORTHERN PIPELINE

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Taylor?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that arises out of a news report. The Government of the Yukon Territory has been presented with a brief or a report of some nature respecting a pipeline across the northern part of the Yukon Territory. I am wondering, Mr. Commissioner if it is the intention of the Administration, to table for all members of Council, generally the matters relating to this proposal. Order please, Mr. Speaker. I find no levity in this matter. I am wondering Mr. Speaker, if the intention of having, Mr. Speaker, some of the facts related to this matter tabled before each member of Council for their consideration inasmuch as it does affect the Territory and the people of the Territory. Also I might add that any other proposal that may be

forthcoming in relation to this - - -

Mr. Chamberlist: I would like a copy.

Some Members: LAUGHTER.

Mr. Speaker: ORDER.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, this wasn't my idea.

This is Arctic Gas who put this book of knowledge together. There is a copy of it over in the library. That is as far as I'm going. If the Honourable Members want more, give me a request on Canadian Arctic Gas. I will pass it on.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I am not referring that we should pick up loads of data but what I am saying that there must be a summation of these reports. It is the summations of the reports that are, I think, most important to have. I think if anyone requested any detail on them, they could really consult with the Government in respect of any such detail. I think the summation should be laid before the Council. These reports, they may affect the land or the Territory in general. That's what this legislature is supposedly about. To keep abreast of these matters and legislation in respect of.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Speaker, for me to infer that I have the remotest clue concerning in what all this package is about is just impossible for me to say so. I would like to suggest that the Honourable Member might take a look at the package that has been given out to the public and if there are any portions of it that he feels that he or other members of the Council would like to have copies of, I would certainly make that request to the Canadian Arctic Gas people and I am sure that they would do their utmost to comply with it. To even know what a summary of this thing is, Mr. Speaker, beyond me.

Mr. Chamberlist: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Mr. Commissioner could attempt to get from the people who have supplied the whole data a consolidated summary of what the whole report is about because certainly this is the type of report of interest to the people of the Yukon and certainly, without levity,



WE DON'T WANT TO TAKE FIVE HUNDRED BOOKS AND START GOING THROUGH THEM. USUALLY, THESE PEOPLE PREPARE A SUMMARY. COULD THE SUMMARY BE OBTAINED SO THAT WE KNOW WHAT THE WHOLE THING IS ABOUT? I THINK THAT THE COMMISSIONER SHOULD GET A COPY OF THE SUMMARY FOR HIMSELF SO THAT AT LEAST HE CAN GET SOME KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT IS GOING ON. IF HE SAID THAT HE IS NOT GOING TO LOOK AT THEM, HE'LL NEVER KNOW.

MR. SPEAKER: A SUMMARY WILL BE WRITTEN IN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF I CAN GET AN ANSWER FROM THE COMMISSIONER IF HE WILL TRY TO GET A SUMMARY?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I MUST BE VERY HONEST. I DON'T EVEN KNOW IF SUCH A THING EXISTS. CERTAINLY, IF THERE IS IN EXISTENCE SUCH A THING, I WILL KNOW THAT EFFORTS WILL BE MADE TO HAVE IT AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL MEMBERS. I DO NOT WISH TO INFER BUT I DON'T EVEN BELIEVE THAT THERE IS SUCH A PART OF THE PACKAGE.

QUESTION RE: DISPOSABLE BOTTLES

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, AT THE LAST SPECIAL SESSION OF COUNCIL, MR. COMMISSIONER HAVE SOME INDICATION THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD BE PUTTING SOME INFORMATION BEFORE COUNCIL REGARDING DISPOSABLE BOTTLES AND NON-DISPOSABLE BOTTLES IN THE TERRITORY. WITH THE SUMMER SEASON JUST AROUND THE CORNER, I WONDER IF THERE IS ANY CHANCE OF US GETTING THAT INFORMATION THIS SESSION?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT IS A TABLED PAPER. BUT IT'S NOT VERY HELPFUL.

MR. STUTTER: I UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS THE LEGISLATIVE RETURN IN FRONT OF US NOW, MR. SPEAKER. I WITHDRAW THE QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR,

QUESTION RE: GROUND CONDITIONS IN FARO

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, ANOTHER QUESTION THAT I THINK IS OF IMPORTANCE. IN VIEW OF A HIGHLY DANGEROUS AND EVER INCREASING DANGER OF SUB-SOILS SLIDING IN THE FARO MUNICIPALITY, AND ALSO IN VIEW OF THE REPEATED PROBLEMS THAT HAVE OCCURRED IN THE SEWER AND WATER SYSTEMS IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF FARO AND THE SETTLING OF BUILDINGS AND RELATED THINGS TO THIS PROBLEM, I AM WONDERING

IF THE COMMISSIONER HAS EVER BEEN APPROACHED BY ANVIL, THE MUNICIPALITY OR ANY INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO EITHER A MEETING BETWEEN ALL PARTIES CONCERNED OR A PUBLIC INQUIRY IN RELATION TO SOLVING THIS GREAT PROBLEM IN FARO.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ONLY THING THAT I AM AWARE OF IS THE RETENTION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OR ANVIL OR POSSIBLY BOTH OF THE FIRM OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE WATER SYSTEM. I AM NOT AWARE OF ANYTHING ELSE THAT HAS TRANSPIRED AND TO MY KNOWLEDGE, WHATEVER THE REPORT IS, WHATEVER THE REPORTS OF THESE CONSULTANTS ARE, IF IT IS AVAILABLE, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, IT HASN'T BEEN FORWARDED TO THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT UP TO THIS POINT. I AM NOT AWARE OF ANYTHING BEYOND THAT, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY TO THAT THEN, DO I HAVE IT FROM MR. COMMISSIONER THAT APART FROM MY OWN PERSONAL REQUEST FOR A MEETING BETWEEN ANVIL, THE MUNICIPALITY, FEDERAL AND TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS, THERE HAS BEEN OFFICIAL REQUEST BY ANYONE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY FOR A MEETING ON THIS SUBJECT OR A PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO THE SUB-SOIL SITUATION AND ALL ITS RELATED PROBLEMS, BUILDINGS FALLING DOWN, PIPES BREAKING IN RESPECT TO FARO? IS THIS CORRECT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IT WOULD NOT BE RIGHT FOR ME TO SAY THAT SUCH A REQUEST HAS NOT BEEN MADE. BUT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, IT HAS NOT BEEN MADE. I HAVE NOT SEEN IT, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: IF SUCH A REQUEST WAS MADE BY ONE OR MORE OF THE PARTIES, WOULD THE COMMISSIONER GIVE CONSIDERATION TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC INQUIRY FOR THE PURPOSE OF LOOKING INTO THIS WHOLE MATTER AND RESOLVING IT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY OF SEEING A REQUEST BEFORE ME OF THAT NATURE AND THEN PASSING JUDGEMENT ON WHAT THE INFORMATION THAT WAS CONTAINED IN THE REQUEST, MR. SPEAKER.

QUESTION RE: AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE YUKON MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THESE ARE A FEW QUESTIONS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE-NORTH MIGHT BE ABLE TO ANSWER. HAS THERE BEEN AN AGREEMENT SIGNED BETWEEN THE



# YUKON MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN?

Mr. TANNER: ASK THEM ALL AT ONCE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: CAN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ANSWER THE QUESTION? HE WANTS ME TO ASK THEM ALL AT ONCE. TO ASK HIM THEM ALL AT ONCE WOULD BE TOO MUCH FOR HIS MIND. I WANT TO DO IT EASY, ONE AT A TIME.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. SPEAKER, ALL THESE ANSWERS, ALL THE ANTICIPATED ANSWERS, ARE IN THE SESSIONAL PAPER.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS NO SESSIONAL PAPER BEFORE ME NOW IN WHICH THERE IS AN ANSWER.

Mr. TANNER: THERE IS A SESSIONAL PAPER IN FRONT OF THE MEMBER. IF HE WOULD TAKE THE TIME AND READ IT, HE WILL HAVE THE ANSWER.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WE DON'T GET THE TIME TO READ IT WHEN IT COMES TO US AT A MINUTE AFTER TEN IN THE MORNING.

Mr. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

## QUESTION RE: PUBLIC DRINKING

Mr. McKINNON: I WOULD LIKE TO ASK Mr. LEGAL ADVISER IF AUTHORITY CAN BE DELEGATED BY THIS HOUSE TO ALLOW MUNICIPALITIES TO CONTROL PUBLIC DRINKING IN ITS BOUNDARIES?

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: YES, Mr. SPEAKER, BUT IT MAY REQUIRE AN ORDINANCE TO DO THIS.

## QUESTION RE: ARCTIC WINTER GAMES MEETING

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK Mr. COMMISSIONER A QUESTION. IT COMES TO MY ATTENTION THAT THERE WAS A MEETING BETWEEN THE COMMISSIONER OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES, THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA AND THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON AND I BELIEVE ONE OF THE POLITICAL PEOPLE FROM QUEBEC DURING THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES LAST MONTH IN ANCHORAGE. I WONDER, Mr. SPEAKER, IF Mr. COMMISSIONER COULD INFORM COUNCIL OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING IN REGARDS TO THE FUTURE OF THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: BASICALLY, Mr. SPEAKER, THE QUESTION WAS POSED, WERE THE PARTICIPATING PARTIES SATISFIED WITH THE CONCEPT OF THE ARCTIC

WINTER GAMES. THE ANSWER WAS YES. SHOULD THERE BE ANY KIND OF A REVIEW OF WHAT HAD TRANSPIRED AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE FIRST SERIES OF GAMES? THE ANSWER WAS YES. HOW WAS THIS TO BE DONE? THE CORPORATION, I BELIEVE I AM USING THE RIGHT TERMINOLOGY, THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES CORPORATION WAS TO PUT TOGETHER A COMPLETE REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES, AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE FIRST THREE SETS OF GAMES. ONCE THIS COMPLETED, EACH GOVERNMENT EACH PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENT, THAT WOULD BE THE THREE ORIGINAL GOVERNMENTS, WOULD NOMINATE AN INDIVIDUAL WHO WOULD SIT DOWN WITH NOMINEES OF THE CORPORATION AND EXAMINE THESE VARIOUS THINGS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WOULD COME FROM THIS WOULD BE THE REFINED CONCEPT, IF YOU WISH TO CALL IT THAT, THAT THE GAMES FORMAT WOULD FOLLOW FROM THAT POINT. THE QUESTION OF THE TIMING, I KNOW THIS IS THE WRONG WORD, BUT THE TIMING OF THE CYCLE, Mr. SPEAKER, IN OTHER WORDS SHOULD IT CONTINUE TO BE A TWO-YEAR CYCLE OR SHOULD THE CYCLE POSSIBLY BE A THREE - YEAR ONE WAS DISCUSSED AND WHILE NO FINALITY WAS ARRIVED AT BECAUSE IT COULD CONCEIVABLY WAIT UNTIL THIS WHOLE EXAMINATION TOOK PLACE, THE CONSENSUS SEEMED TO BE THAT WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF ARCTIC QUEBEC AND THE CONSEQUENT VERY HEAVY TRANSPORTATION COSTS THAT WOULD ACCRUE TO ALL PEOPLE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THIS; THAT STRONG CONSIDERATION WOULD BE GIVEN TO A THREE-YEAR CYCLE INSTEAD OF THE CURRENT TWO-YEAR CYCLE. I HAVE NOT HEARD ANYTHING FURTHER FROM THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS MEETING. WE WERE TOLD BY THE MEMBER FROM THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES CORPORATION THAT THE CORPORATION WAS VERY STRONGLY IN FAVOUR OF ARCTIC QUEBEC BEING THE HOST FOR THE NEXT GAMES AND THEY HAD A PRESENTATION WHICH WE WERE SHOWN FROM THE COMMUNITY OF SHEPPERVILLE, WHICH WAS SUPPORTED BY THE MEMBER FROM THE QUEBEC GOVERNMENT. IN QUICK SYNOPSIS, I DON'T THINK THAT THERE WAS ANYTHING ELSE THAT WAS DISCUSSED AT THAT TIME. I REPORTED TO EX COMM ON THIS. IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER AT ALL, Mrs. WATSON?

Mrs. WATSON: THAT WOULD BE A REVIEW MADE OF THIS WHOLE CONVERSATION.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. SPEAKER, WOULD THE COMMISSIONER CARE TO INDICATE WHETHER THE GAMES WILL BE HELD IN 1976 IN SHEPPERVILLE? IN 1976, IT WOULD BE THE ORDINARY CYCLE OF TWO YEARS.

Mr. COMMISSIONER: I'M SORRY, Mr. SPEAKER, I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION AT THIS MOMENT.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. SPEAKER, IT WOULD BE DELIGHTFUL



TO KNOW THAT BECAUSE I HAVE SEEN HEADLINES IN ALASKA AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AND YUKON PUBLICATIONS THAT DECLARE OFFICIALLY THAT SHEPPERVILLE, QUEBEC IS THE SIGHT OF THE 1976 ARCTIC WINTER GAMES.

Mrs. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, IN THAT CASE, THE DECISION WAS MADE BY THE CORPORATION AFTER THE RIGHT ...

QUESTION RE: AVAILABILITY OF COPIES OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN YUKON MEDICAL PROFESSION AND HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION OF COUNCILLOR TANNER. I HAVE LOOKED AT THE SESSIONAL PAPER AND IT DOESN'T ANSWER ONE OF THE QUESTIONS. CAN YOU SUPPLY MEMBERS OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WITH A COPY OF THE AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE COMMISSIONER?

MR. TANNER: NO, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER. IS IT NOT SO THAT AN AGREEMENT ENTERED BETWEEN THE COMMISSIONER AND ANY OTHER PARTY IS A PUBLIC DOCUMENT?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, COULD I REPHRASE MY QUESTION?

MR. SPEAKER: YES,

MR. TANNER: THAT IS, MY ANSWER.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE WILL ACCEPT HIS REPHRASAL OF HIS QUESTION WHICH WAS AN ANSWER.

QUESTION RE: POLICE SERVICES

MR. TAYLOR: ARISING OUT OF A QUESTION THAT I ASKED MR. COMMISSIONER YESTERDAY RESPECTING HIS BUDGET SPEECH, I HAVE JUST NOW BEEN PROVIDED WITH A COPY THIS MORNING. IT HAS TO DO WITH A QUESTION I ASKED ABOUT POLICE SERVICES, AND I FIND WHAT MR. COMMISSIONER DID SAY WAS, "... THAT A TAKE-OVER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE BY THE LEGAL AFFAIRS REQUIREMENT AND THE SIGNING OF THE POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT DURING THE LAST FISCAL YEAR WHILE SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASING OUR BUDGET, HAS PROVIDED US WITH FULL CONTROL OVER THIS ASPECT OF JUSTICE AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON." MY

QUESTION WAS AT THAT TIME, NOT HAVING THIS IN PRINT, WAS DID THE COMMISSIONER INFER THAT INDEED THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAVE CONTROL OVER POLICE SERVICES. JUST THE WAY IT IS WORDED, I AM STILL NOT CLEAR ON THAT. BUT IF IT DOES NOT HAVE CONTROL, WHO IS IN ACTUAL CONTROL IN BEHALF OF THE TERRITORY? WOULD THIS THEN BE THE MINISTER?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, SO THAT THERE IS NO MISINTERPRETATION, I WOULD ASK THAT THE LEGAL ADVISER EXPLAIN PRECISELY THE POSITION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA WITH THE DIRECTION OF THE POLICE IN THE YUKON, AND LIKEWISE THE POSITION OF THE COMMISSIONER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I THOUGHT FINLAND WAS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: MR. SPEAKER, THE POSITION IS VERY PRECISE AND IT IS EXPLAINED IN DETAIL IN THE SESSIONAL PAPER IN THIS HOUSE, WHICH IS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, THE ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAWS, THE POLICE ARE SUBJECT TO THE DIRECTION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA. IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION, THE POLICE ARE SUBJECT TO THE DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE TERRITORY. IN SECTION 4 AND SECTION 5 OF POLICE AGREEMENT THAT MAKES THIS VERY CLEAR.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY, IS IT NOT TRUE THAT WHEN WE WERE DISCUSSING THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT, THAT WE WERE ASSURED THAT SOMEONE WOULD ASSUME ON BEHALF OF THE TERRITORY THE POSITION OF A QUASI ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THIS WAS PART AND PARCEL OF DISCUSSION AT THAT TIME, NOT TAKING FROM THE REMARKS THAT THE COMMISSIONER HAS MADE IN RESPECT OF HIS BUDGET ADDRESS, I ASSUME THAT POSSIBLY THIS HAD OCCURRED. THAT IS WHAT GAVE RISE TO THE QUESTION.

QUESTION RE: REAL ESTATE BROKERS AND REAL ESTATE AGENTS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER TO MR. COMMISSIONER. MR. COMMISSIONER, SOME CONSIDERABLE TIME I HAVE MADE SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO NEW LEGISLATION TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD OVER WHICH AREAS WE HAVE NO CONTROL WHATEVER, PRIMARILY, REAL ESTATE BROKERS AND REAL ESTATE AGENTS. THE GREAT PEOPLE OF THE YUKON HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY UNSCRUPULOUS PEOPLE WHO DEAL IN REAL ESTATE AND I WOULD ASK MR. COMMISSIONER



WHETHER OR NOT IT IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S INTENTION TO BRING DOWN LEGISLATION DURING THIS SESSION IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IT IS NOT OUR INTENTION TO BRING THIS LEGISLATION IN AT THIS SESSION, BUT CERTAINLY I CONCUR WHOLEHEARTEDLY WITH THE SUGGESTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OF THE NEED OF LOOSELY-TERMED REAL ESTATE LEGISLATION. BUT WE HAVE A WHOLE SERIES OF OTHER LEGISLATIVE VACUUMS AS WELL, MR. SPEAKER, INCLUDING THE REQUIREMENT FOR A NEW PROFESSIONAL'S ORDINANCE, EITHER INDIVIDUALLY COVERING PROFESSIONS OR COMPREHENSIVELY COVERING THEM. LIKEWISE, WITH REGARD TO OUR INSURANCE, WE NEED LEGISLATION IN THAT FIELD AS WELL. THERE IS A WHOLE GREAT BUG GAP, MR. SPEAKER THAT YOU MIGHT LOOSELY TERM, OUR SEMI-SOCIAL LEGISLATION THAT HAS GOT TO BE CAUGHT UP IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE TO BRING OUT LAWS HERE IN THE TERRITORY INTO ALIGN WITH THOSE LAWS WHICH ARE PRESENTLY BEING APPLIED IN NEIGHBOURING PROVINCIAL JURISDICTIONS. ONE OF THEM BEING PARTICULARLY THE REAL ESTATE ITEM THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS MENTIONED.

QUESTION RE: PROFESSIONS' ORDINANCE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER COULD ALSO INDICATE, ALTHOUGH HE HAS MADE REFERENCE TO A PROFESSIONS' ORDINANCE, COULD ALSO INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT BY EITHER REGULATION THIS IS POSSIBLE, OR BY AMENDMENT TO THE LEGAL PROFESSIONS' ORDINANCE THE B.C. BAR ASSOCIATION OR A NUMBER OF THE BENCHERS OF THE B.C. BAR WILL ACT AS THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION OF THE YUKON. IN SOME AREAS, THERE IS AN IMMEDIATE REQUIREMENT FOR A COMMITTEE OF THIS DESCRIPTION TO EXIST. AT THE PRESENT TIME, THE LEGAL ADVISER UNDER THE ORDINANCE, ACTS IN THAT CAPACITY, BUT A VERY DIFFICULT CAPACITY. IS THERE ANY POSSIBILITY AND IT WOULDN'T TAKE MUCH BY WAY OF AMENDMENT TO BRING FORWARD FOR THIS SESSION, LEGISLATION OF SO IMPORTANT A NATURE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, I WANT TO AGREE ENTIRELY THAT THE LEGAL ADVISER FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IS BEING PLACED IN THE POSITION AS BEING THE DISCIPLINARIAN OF THE LOCAL BAR IS A TOTALLY UNTENABLE SITUATION. AS FAR AS THE QUESTION RAISED OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER AND THE POTENTIAL SIMPLICITY OF IT'S BEING GIVEN AFFECT TO, I WOULD ASK TO REFER THAT QUESTION TO THE LEGAL ADVISER

AND ASK HIS COMMENT AND OPINION ON THE ITEM EXPRESSED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: IT IS AN EXTREMELY DIFFICULT QUESTION TO ANSWER AND IT HAS TO BE NEGOTIATED. IT INFRINGES NOT ONLY ON THE COMMISSIONER BUT OTHER COMMISSIONER AS WELL AND ALSO ON THE JURISDICTIONAL AREA. I THINK THAT IT SHOULD BE POSSIBLE TO PRODUCE A LEGISLATIVE SCHEME WHICH MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT BE SUITABLE TO THIS HOUSE AND OF COURSE, IN CONCURRENCE WITH THE LEGAL PROFESSION HERE AND OF THE PROVINCE CHOSEN IT HAS TO BE OBTAINED. IT IS NOT A THING THAT CAN HAPPEN TODAY OR TOMORROW, BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT MUST HAVE CARE AND I AM SURE CAREFUL CONSIDERATION FROM THE MEMBERS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. LEGAL ADVISOR, WHOM I HAVE BEEN ASKING FROM THIS FOR THREE YEARS, WHILE I WAS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AND I AM STILL GETTING THE SAME ANSWER, "WE'LL WAIT UNTIL SOMEBODY AGREES WITH IT." WHY ISN'T THE ADMINISTRATION WORKING ON THIS PARTICULAR AREA WHICH IS OF SO MUCH VITAL IMPORTANCE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. I THINK THAT IT IS ABSOLUTELY IMPERATIVE, MR. SPEAKER, THAT THIS BE DONE FORTHWITH AND I WOULD ASK MR. LEGAL ADVISER WHETHER OR NOT HE CAN'T JUST DEAL WITH THIS PARTICULAR PROFESSION AT THIS TIME WHICH IS A NOBLE PROFESSION BUT IT IS NOT BEING TREATED IN A NOBLE MANNER BY SOME OF THE MEMBERS THAT ARE HERE. CANNOT THE LEGAL ADVISER BRING FORWARD A MINIMAL TYPE OF LEGISLATION THAT WILL AT LEAST WITH THIS AREA ... THIS PARTICULAR WAY. YOU HAVE ABOUT FIVE OR SIX WEEKS TO DO THIS PARTICULAR THING WHILE WE ARE IN SESSION.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, 5 OR 6 WEEKS IS A VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME IN WHICH TO BRING FORWARD SUCH LEGISLATION. FOR SOME CONSIDERABLE TIME THERE HAS BEEN PRESSURE. I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HIMSELF, KNOWS THAT, TO BRING FORWARD A PROFESSIONS' ORDINANCE CONTROLLING IN ONE STATUTE ALL THE PROFESSIONS ANALOGOUS TO THE METHOD CHOSEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC.

THIS DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE A POSSIBILITY IN TERRITORY. AT LEAST A WORKABLE POSSIBILITY. CERTAINLY I WOULD MAKE AN ATTEMPT TO BRING FORWARD TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION, DURING THE NEXT FEW WEEKS AS TO HOW THEY CAN ORGANIZE THE LEGAL PROFESSION AND IF



I WAS LEFT ALONE WITH THE LEGAL PROFESSION, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO SOMETHING, BUT TO TRY AND FIND OUT NOT ONLY THE LEGAL PROFESSION BUT ALL THE OCCUPATIONS WHICH, CORRECTLY OR OTHERWISE, CLAIM TO BE PROFESSIONS AND DEAL WITH THEM IN A SELF-DISCIPLINING FASHION AS WAS DONE IN QUEBEC, APPEARS TO ME TO BE OUTSIDE THE REALM OF POSSIBILITY IN THE TERRITORY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I UNDERSTAND THEN, MR. SPEAKER, FROM WHAT MR. LEGAL ADVISOR SAID THAT HE CAN DURING THE NEXT FEW WEEKS, TAKE A LOOK AT THE SITUATION, VISIBLY, THE LEGAL PROFESSION. IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? WE WISH TO THANK MR. COMMISSIONER FOR HIS ATTENDANCE. AND THERE ARE NO PRIVATE BILLS IN ORDER TO BECOME PUBLIC BILLS IN ORDER?

BILL # 1 FIRST READING

IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 1, INTITLED THE INTERIM SUPPLY ORDINANCE 1974-75, BE GIVEN FIRST READING.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR A SECOND TIME.

MRS. WATSON: NOW, MR. SPEAKER

BILL #1, SECOND READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 1 ENTITLED, THE INTERIM SUPPLY ORDINANCE 1974-75, BE GIVEN SECOND READING AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I AM GOING TO MAKE MY POSITION CLEAR, RELATIVE TO THIS PARTICULAR BILL. THIS PIECE OF LEGISLATION IN THE REQUEST FOR INTERIM SUPPLY, HAS BEEN BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE NEGLIGENCE OF THE COMMISSIONER IN THE MANNER IN WHICH HE DID USE COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS AT THE TIME OF 29TH OF NOVEMBER, 1930, AND WHICH CUMULATED IN THE COMPLETE MESS-UP OF THE STRUCTURES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF

FINANCE. BECAUSE, IF HE WOULD HAVE CALLED A PROPER SESSION OF COUNCIL AT THAT TIME, TO REMOVE ME PROPERLY FROM THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FINANCE, THE BUSINESS OF THE TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION WOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO CONTINUE IN A PROPER MANNER. HE FAILED TO DO THIS AND AS HE HAS SAID ALREADY, HE FOUND IT NECESSARY TO CORRECT. BUT IT WOULD APPEAR THAT WHAT HAS HAPPENED NOW, IS A COMPLAINT BECAUSE THIS IS THE TYPE OF BILL WHICH IS A COMPLAINT. WE HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DEAL WITH THE BUDGET IN TIME, SO NOW WE MUST ASK FOR AN INTERIM SUPPLY, I JUST WANT TO RECORD IT, THAT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INABILITY TO PROVIDE PROPER ADMINISTRATIVE CONDUCT IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, IS THE INDECISION OF THE COMMISSIONER, THE LACK OF RESPONSIBILITY IN ACCEPTING THE LEGAL ADVICE OF THE LEGAL ADVISOR WHEN IT CAME TO THE SITUATION WHEN HE ISSUED ORDERS THAT WERE ILLEGAL.

I SAY, MR. SPEAKER, THAT I NEVER OPPOSE BILLS GOING INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION, UNLIKE OTHER HONOURABLE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE, BUT I AM CERTAINLY PLEASED TO SHOW TWO MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL THAT WHAT IS OCCURRING WITH THIS BILL IS THE RESULT OF NEGLIGENCE AND NOTHING BUT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT IN 1969, WHEN HE WAS THE SO CALLED CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON A POINT OF ORDER, SIT DOWN. DON'T YOU KNOW THE RULES? MR. SPEAKER, IN 1969, I WAS NOT CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, IN 1968, BEFORE HE WAS REMOVED AS CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, AS CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE HE SAW IT NECESSARY TO BRING IN AN INTERIM SUPPLY ORDINANCE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I'VE SANCTIONED THIS AREA. I'VE BEEN CONSTANT THROUGHOUT THE YEARS BECAUSE I'VE ALWAYS FOUND IT DIFFICULT ON AN INTERIM SUPPLY BILL, THIS IS SPEAKING ON THE PRINCIPLE OF BRINGING INTERIM SUPPLY BILLS, THAT A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE DOES HAVE



GREAT DIFFICULTY IN HIS MIND BECAUSE IF YOU DO AGREE WITH 1/12 OF THE BUDGET, THEN YOU HAVE IN FACT AGREED WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF EVERYTHING THAT IS IN THE BUDGET. SO ONCE THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL IS PASSED, THEN REALLY, THERE ISN'T ANY USE IN DEBATING IN ANY FORM ANY LONGER, BECAUSE YOU HAVE AGREED IN PRINCIPLE TO 1/12 OF THE FUNDS OF EVERY PROGRAM THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS PROPOSING DURING THE FISCAL YEAR. IT'S BEEN A CONUNDRUM THAT HAS FACED THIS HOUSE CONSTANTLY BY NOT BEING ABLE TO GET THE BUDGET SESSION COMPLETED BEFORE THE 1ST OF APRIL. I IMAGINE WE WILL JUST HAVE TO CONTINUE AS WE HAVE PRIOR BY GIVING THE 1/12 INTERIM SUPPLY BILL TO ALLOW THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE TERRITORY TO CONTINUE AND THEN DEBATE THE BUDGET AFTER. I FIND IT EXTREMELY DIFFICULT AND A WRONG PROCEDURE TO FOLLOW BECAUSE AS I SAY, YOU HAVE ACCEPTED, BY ACCEPTING THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL, THE PRINCIPLE OF ALL THOSE MEASURES CONTAINED IN THE BUDGET EVEN THOUGH YOU HAVEN'T EXAMINED THE BUDGET AND SCRUTINIZED THE DETAIL. IT IS A DIFFICULT PROBLEM. THE ONLY ANSWER IS TO HAVE THIS BUDGET SESSION OF COUNCIL BE MOVED FORWARD SO THAT BY APRIL 1, THE BUDGET HAS BEEN PASSED IN ITS ENTIRE FORM WITHOUT HAVING TO GO TO THE INTERIM SUPPLY MEASURE.

IT IS A DIFFICULT QUESTION THAT EVERY MEMBER WHO ISN'T ON THE GOVERNMENT SIDE OF THIS HOUSE HAS TO FACE IN DEALING WITH THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

BILL NO. 2 FIRST READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH THAT BILL NO. 2, INTITULED THE FIFTH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74, BE GIVEN FIRST READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR A SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: NOW, MR. SPEAKER

BILL NO. 3 SECOND READING

IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 2 INTITULED THE FIFTH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74, BE GIVEN SECOND READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

BILL NO. 3 FIRST READING

IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 3 INTITULED THE FIRST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE BE GIVEN FIRST READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN WILL THE BILL BE READ FOR A SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: NOW, MR. SPEAKER.

BILL NO. 3 SECOND READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 3 INTITULED THE FIRST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE BE GIVEN SECOND READING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THERE HAS BEEN A VERY IMPORTANT ERROR GOING ALONG HERE. I WOULD LIKE TO POINT IT OUT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY SHE DOESN'T SEEM TO REALIZE WHAT SHE IS DOING. SHE READ OUT AND YOU, MR. SPEAKER REPEATED THE WORDS. YOU READ OUT, "FIRST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE". I WOULD RESPECTFULLY POINT OUT THAT IT SAYS "FIRST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE 1974-75". OTHERWISE, IT WOULD DEAL WITH ORDINANCES. I THINK THAT SHE SHOULD CORRECT THIS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS MADE A VERY VALID POINT AND I WOULD LIKE TO THANK HIM.

MR. SPEAKER: BILL NO. 3 READS, THE FIRST APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75.

*MOTION CARRIED*

BILL NO. 4 FIRST READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 4 INTITULED THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, 1974, BE GIVEN FIRST READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN WILL THE BILL BE READ FOR THE SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: NOW, MR. SPEAKER.

BILL NO. 4 SECOND READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 4 INTITULED THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, 1974, BE GIVEN SECOND READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

BILL NO. 5 FIRST READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 5 INTITULED THE LOAN AGREEMENT ORDINANCE (1974) NO. 1, BE GIVEN FIRST READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR THE SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: NOW, MR. SPEAKER.

BILL NO. 5 SECOND READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 5 INTITULED THE LOAN AGREEMENT ORDINANCE (1974) NO. 1 BE GIVEN SECOND READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

BILL NO. 6 FIRST READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 6 INTITULED THE MUNICIPAL GENERAL PURPOSES

LOAN ORDINANCE BE GIVEN FIRST READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR A SECOND TIME.

MRS. WATSON: NOW, MR. SPEAKER.

BILL NO. 6 SECOND READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 6 INTITULED THE MUNICIPAL GENERAL PURPOSES LOAN ORDINANCE BE GIVEN SECOND READING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I DON'T THINK YOU PUT THE QUESTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER: DID I NOT?

MR. TANNER: NO.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

*MOTION CARRIED*

BILL NO. 7 FIRST READING

IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT BILL NO. 7 INTITULED AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE BE GIVEN FIRST READING AT THIS TIME.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR A SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER ON THE NEXT SITTING DAY.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: LAUGHTER.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR AND COUNCIL RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.



MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I WILL SECOND THE MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH THAT MR. SPEAKER NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONVENING IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS PUBLIC BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. WILL MR. TAYLOR PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR FOR THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I NOW CALL COMMITTEE OR ORDER.

MRS. WATSON: I AM VERY ANXIOUS TO GET INTO DISCUSSION OF THE BILL C-9 AND I AGREE BUT BEFORE WE DEAL WITH BILL C-9 I WONDER IF WE COULD DEAL WITH BILL NO. 1, AN INTERIM SUPPLY ORDINANCE. IT IS A MINOR DETAIL AND THEN WE COULD GO TO MOVE IT OUT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. THEN WE COULD GO ON TO DISCUSSION OF BILL C-9.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S NOT A MINOR DETAIL, BILL NO. 1, BECAUSE I WILL BE SPEAKING FOR NEARLY AN HOUR ON ONE PARTICULAR ITEM IN BILL NO. 9 WITHOUT ANYBODY ELSE HAVING ANY DISCUSSION. JUST TO COMMENCE I FIGURE ON A BRIEF FOUR HOURS FOR NO. 1.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, ... RESEARCH ON INTERIM SUPPLY BILLS WHEN THEY APPEARED BEFORE HOUSE IN THE PAST AND THE DISCUSSIONS ON THIS BILL WAS VERY, VERY LIMITED. ACTUALLY BILL NO. 1 IS DIFFERENT, GIVING COUNCIL THE OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY CONSIDER THE MAIN ESTIMATES WHEN THEY COME UP FOR DISCUSSION, SO IT IS NOT UNDER ANY PRESSURE OF TIME. I DON'T THINK ANY MEMBER OF COUNCIL WOULD WANT TO BE UNDER THIS KIND OF PRESSURE AND THIS IS WHY I WOULD MOVE NOW THAT BILL NO. 1 BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT ANY ..

INTERRUPTION.

MRS. WATSON CONTINUES: I MOVE THAT THIS BILL BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT AMENDMENT AND MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE. BILL NO. 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: BEFORE I RECEIVED

THE MOTION, IT WAS INDICATED TO THE CHAIR PRIOR TO NOON, THAT COMMITTEE WISHED TO DISCUSS MATTERS ARISING OUT OF MOTION NO. 2. I THINK IT SHOULD FIRST BE DECIDED AS TO WHETHER COMMITTEE WISH THE TIME TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 1 AND IF THAT'S THE CASE, THEN A MOTION WOULD BE IN ORDER. IS IT THE WISH OF COMMITTEE THAT WE MOVE TO BILL NO. 1?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THERE ARE TWO REALLY IMPORTANT THINGS IN COMMITTEE AT THE MOMENT. THAT IS THE DISCUSSION ON C-9 AND ALSO THE MAIN BUDGET AND I THINK THAT AMPLE TIME SHOULD BE GIVEN TO DISCUSS BOTH OF THOSE THINGS, NATURALLY. I SEE NO REASON WHY WE CAN'T DISPENSE WITH BILL NO. 1 IN ORDER TO ALLOW AMPLE DISCUSSION ON BOTH BILLS OR THE MOTION C-9 AND ON THE MAIN ESTIMATES THAT ARE NOW IN COMMITTEE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE SHOULD ALL GO NOW TO BILL NO. 1. WOULD YOU PLEASE SIGNIFY? WE WILL NOW GO BILL NO. 1.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL READ THE EXPLANATORY NOTE. THE PURPOSE OF THIS BILL IS TO SUPPLY FUNDS TO DEFRAY EXPENSES OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE FOR A PERIOD OF ONE MONTH. THE MONTH OF APRIL. IN THE EVENT THAT THE 1974/75 MAIN ESTIMATES CANNOT BE PASSED BEFORE MARCH 31ST, 1974 AND AS WE ALL KNOW, TODAY IS MARCH 22ND. WE ARE GOING INTO THE WEEKEND, WE JUST HAD THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND WE HAVE THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET FOR 1973/74 TO DISCUSS FULLY, TO GO INTO DETAILS AND SO THAT MEMBERS OF THESE CHAMBERS ARE NOT RESTRICTED UNNECESSARILY IN THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND SUPPLEMENTARY FOR 1973/74 I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT WE ACCEPT THIS BILL AND MOVE IT OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT.

CHAIRMAN: ORDER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER MR. CHAMBERLIST, BEFORE WE PROCEED WE HAVE THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WHO IS IN CHARGE OF THAT DEPARTMENT HERE, OR WHO IS DEALING IN MONEY MATTERS HERE.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS AN INTERIM SUPPLY BILL AS THE MEMBER WHO HAS MOVED THE BILL HAS POINTED OUT; IT'S FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. I WISH WE COULD GET ON WITH THE READING OF THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, THIS IS NOT AS SIMPLE AS THAT. HERE WE ARE BEING ASKED TO VOTE ON \$5,071,000 AND NOW THE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH IS SAYING IT IS A VERY SIMPLE THING. FIVE MILLION DOLLARS, JUST GO AHEAD AND PASS THE AMOUNT WITHOUT ANY DISCUSSION. MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS USUAL FOR THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF TREASURY TO BE HERE FOR THE QUESTIONING ON ANY MONEY MATTER AND I ASK THAT THEY BE CALLED IN AS WITNESSES.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK WE SHOULD PROCEED WITH THE READING OF THE BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT'S NORMAL IN THESE CASES THAT IN DEALING IN MATTERS FINANCIALLY, WE HAVE WITNESSES FROM TIME TO TIME AND MORE PARTICULARLY, THE TREASURER. IS IT THE WISHES OF COMMITTEE THAT WE DO HAVE TREASURER ATTEND?

SOME MEMBERS: YES.

SOME MEMBERS: NO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL, MAY I HAVE SOME DIRECTION ON THIS MATTER?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE REFUSAL BY MEMBER OF WHITEHORSE NORTH TO HAVE SOMEONE HERE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS WITH REFERENCE TO THE PROPOSED EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND APPARENTLY SHOWS HIS TOTAL INADEQUACIES AND I WOULD GO TO THE EXTENT OF SAYING HIS STUPIDITY.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. LOOK, LET'S STOP THIS... THE BILL IS HERE FOR ONE SPECIFIC PURPOSE. THE BILL IS HERE TO ENABLE MEMBERS TO DISCUSS THE BILL THAT YOU WANT TO DISCUSS THIS AFTERNOON, THE FEDERAL BILL. DISCUSS THE BUDGET AT A LATER TIME. EVERY ONE OF THESE ESTIMATES WILL BE DISCUSSED IN THE BUDGET AND CAN BE DISCUSSED. WHAT'S THE NEED OF WITNESSES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE. A MEMBER HAS PROPERLY ASKED FOR A WITNESS AND I AM AT THE DIRECTION OF THE COMMITTEE, AS A CHAIRMAN, THIS IS A VERY REASONABLE REQUEST. AS I SAY, I AM AT THE DIRECTION OF THE COMMITTEE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE ARE NOT GOING INTO DETAILS OF THE BUDGET AT THIS TIME AND I

THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST HAS A VERY LEGITIMATE REQUEST IF WE WERE GOING INTO THE SUPPLEMENTARY AND INTO THE ESTIMATES, BUT WE ARE GOING INTO AN INTERIM SUPPLY AND ALL WE ARE ASKED, IS TO VOTE IF THE GOVERNMENT CAN AFFORD TO PROCEED TO THE PAYROLL AND CONTINUING OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT AT THE LEVEL THAT YOU APPROVED LAST YEAR, AT THE 1973/74 LEVEL. THIS IS WHAT YOU ARE ASKED TO DO. YOU ARE ASKED TO PAY INVOICES, YOU ARE ASKED TO GIVE AUTHORITY TO PAY PAYROLL. WE ARE NOT ASKING YOU TO APPROVE NEW PROGRAMS AND BIG SUM OF MONEYS. ALL YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE IS EXPENDITURE OF THIS SUM OF MONEY TO DEFRAY THE EXPENSES FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, ORDER, PLEASE. I THINK THE CHAIR IS IN A DIFFICULT POSITION IN THIS REGARD BUT I THINK AT THIS TIME I WOULD HAVE TO MAKE A RULING ON THIS MATTER. UNLESS, BY MOTION THAT, I BELIEVE THE TREASURER WAS ASKED FOR AND AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER REGARDING FINANCE, DIRECTION IS GIVEN TO THE CHAIR THAT THESE PEOPLE NOT ATTEND, I WOULD ASK THEM, THESE GENTLEMEN, TO APPEAR TO DISCUSS THIS PAPER, ITEM BILL NO. 1.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ROGER, ROGER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON A POINT OF ORDER. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE MADE A STATEMENT THAT I SUGGEST IS FALLACIOUS AND IMPROPER. SHE SAID THAT THIS AMOUNT OF MONEY IS TO PAY THE CURRENT BILLS. NOW, THE CURRENT BILLS WOULD BE IN THE 1973/74 ESTIMATES. THIS BILL HERE IS FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL WHICH WE HAVEN'T COME TO YET AND ALSO...

MRS. WATSON: THAT IS NOT WHAT I SAID.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AND ALSO, SHE SAID.. I'M ALREADY ON THE FLOOR ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MAY I HAVE ORDER, PLEASE. I HAVE BEFORE THE CHAIR AT THIS TIME, INDICATION ON HEARING ONE QUESTION ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, I HAVE TWO MORE TO HEAR. PLEASE PROCEED.



Mr. Chamberlist: . . . indicated that this was for, as I have already said when I was so rudely interrupted, the expenditure of paying bills, but this indeed is the way this bill is set up for the month of April. Now the month of April is a twelfth of the total amount of the budget and if we would be passing five million dollars and seventy-one thousand dollars without examining the expenditures and what that one-fourth of each particular item is for, it would mean in effect, that we would be acquiescing to the main estimates for twelve times that amount. This, Mr. Chairman, is one of the points. I think, however, I have questions that I wish to answer and I am not satisfied that we should take a lump sum of each particular appropriation and accept a lump sum. I think that Council, and indeed the public whose money this is, should be able to know that the people sitting around this table are prepared to question the Treasurer and the Executive Committee Member that is responsible for the expending of these sums, what the money is to be used for and all other matters relative to this.

It is not an unreasonable request. It is a request that I always granted when I was in that position of having witnesses here and I should ask Mr. Chairman that special note be taken that this has been the procedure always and that we have never changed in all the years that I have been connected with the Territorial Government.

Mr. Chairman: Councillor Tanner.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Member would like to put that in the form of a motion and let us see what the rest of the Members want.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have a point of order? Councillor Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I hate to be taking up your time because there are too many important things before the House, but the Honourable Member misquoted me and I think the votes and proceedings will show that he did. I would like to refer the Honourable Member's attention to when he was Chairman in 1968. When, after the bill was read, I estimate the same motion that the Honourable Member made. Mr. Chairman, and I am quoting Mr. Chamberlist,

Mr. Chairman, I vote that this bill be accepted without amendment. This was your motion as soon as the bill had been read, Wednesday, March 27th, 1968 at 11:00 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Chamberlist, when someone questions as you are now. Mr. Chairman, I think section 2 of the bill speaks for itself. The last two lines, 'such sums shall be paid and applied only in accordance with the schedule.' It is fairly obvious then, that these amounts will only be paid out in accordance with this schedule and of course the Honourable Member who has raised the question, that it should only be those items that have been approved before when discussing the supply situation itself, and I feel that although we cannot make any definite statements in the effect of the position on passing the bill, I think we can agree amongst ourselves, as this would be a case for stopping it because we can always stop it. There is no itemized discussion of the schedule. The members agree amongst themselves that this bill would be passed out of committee without amendment to provide the interim supply for depending on the main estimates being discussed at a later time. This is what we are asking committee to do today.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

I've heard the points raised by Councillor Chamberlist and I feel that it is his privilege as an individual member to be able to question a bill before the House. Councillor Watson has made the point that at some point in time, that bills have been heard without witnesses and I don't know if you can relate the two, honestly relate the two sets of circumstances. However, I think the chair would hold to the principles contained and inculcated in Beauchesne and the general tradition of parliamentary rule, in committee as it is in the House. Unless there is some very valid reason why members cannot get full disclosure or full answers to their questions, why they should not be permitted to do so.

In this case I would rule that the Treasurer and the Executive Committee Member be asked to attend committee at this time for the purpose of discussing Bill No. 1 and answering questions of all members who so wish to be answered. This ruling, I should advise you, is subject to appeal, if the committee should feel, for any



VERY GOOD REASON, THAT THIS SHOULD NOT TAKE PLACE. BUT, ORDER PLEASE, THERE MUST BE A RULING GIVEN. THAT IS MY RULING AND I WOULD DIRECT THAT THE CLERK WOULD ASK THE TWO PARTIES IF IT IS POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO ATTEND AT THIS TIME.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD QUESTION YOUR RULING ON THIS. I HAVE DONE THOROUGH RESEARCH ON THIS IN '62 AND '63 WHEN INTERIM SUPPLY BILLS WERE PASSED. NEVER, AT ANY TIME, DID THEY DISCUSS ANY OF THE SCHEDULE, ITEM BY ITEM AND NEVER, AT ANY TIME, WERE WITNESSES CALLED. THE SAME UNDERTAKING WAS GIVEN AS THIS, AS WAS IN 1969. THE PRECEDENT WAS THAT IF I HAD THOUGHT THE PRECEDENT HAD BEEN SET AND ALL WE ARE ASKING IS TO FOLLOW THE SAME PROCEDURE THAT HAS BEEN FOLLOWED IN THE PAST. I DON'T THINK THAT THIS TYPE OF A BLOCK SHOULD REALLY BE, THE TIME WHERE WE GO INTO THE ITEMIZED ITEMS IS WHEN WE GO INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE MATTER, AS I ADVISED, IS I HAVE ISSUED INSTRUCTIONS AND DIRECTIONS THAT MY RULING IS TO BE CHALLENGED, IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM. I AM BEING AS ABUNDANTLY FAIR AS I CAN. THEN IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO ASK MR. SPEAKER TO RESUME THE CHAIR AND MAKE A RULING ON THIS MATTER IF SOMEONE SO WISHES TO APPEAL THE RULING.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU SAID THAT YOU WOULD NEED SOME FAIRLY VALID REASONS IF THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER AND THE TREASURER WERE NOT TO BE CALLED. I THINK I CAN GIVE YOU A FAIRLY VALID REASON AND THAT IS THAT THERE HAS BEEN SOME INFORMATION THAT BY THE PASSAGE OF BILL NO. 1 NOW, THAT IN ACTUAL FACT, THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE BEING ACCEPTED. WELL THAT IS A COMPLETE 'RED HERRING' AND BOTH OF THE MEMBERS FROM WHITEHORSE EAST AND WHITEHORSE WEST, KNOW FULL WELL THAT THE PASSAGE OF THIS PARTICULAR BILL DOES NOT, IN ANY WAY, RELATE DIRECTLY TO THE MAIN ESTIMATES. IN THE ACCEPTANCE OF THIS BILL IS NOT THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES. AT THE TIME THAT THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE BEING DEALT WITH, THATS THE TIME THAT ALL THE WITNESSES, ALWAYS HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO BE BROUGHT IN FOR QUESTIONING AND THERE HAS BEEN NO SUGGESTION OF ANY CHANGE THERE.

THE POINT IS, IF WE CAN GET RID OF THIS, WE CAN GET ON TO THE THINGS THAT DO REQUIRE TIME TO DEBATE. THE DEBATE ON BILL C-9 AND THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND SOME OF THE OTHER WORK THAT WE

HAVE IN COMMITTEE. IT DOES SEEM TO ME, IT WOULD BE JUST COMPLETELY DUPLICATING WITNESSES BEING BROUGHT IN FOR THIS BILL AND AGAIN FOR THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE QUESTION THAT I RAISE IN THE CHAIR AS AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER OF THE FLOOR, I WOULD HAVE A VERY STRONG OPINION IN THIS MATTER. THE QUESTION THAT I AM CONSIDERING AT THIS POINT IN TIME IS THE RIGHT OF A MEMBER TO CALL ON ANY BILL OF LEGISLATION NO MATTER HOW IMPORTANT OR NOT IMPORTANT IT MAY SEEM TO SOME PEOPLE, REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE ADMINISTRATION TO EXPLAIN IT OR ASK QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO IT. THAT IS THE QUESTION THE CHAIR IS DEALING WITH AT THE MOMENT. THE IMPORTANCE OR NONIMPORTANCE OF THE BILL TO THE CHAIR IS NOT IN QUESTION.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO YOUR RULINGS. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU ARE NOT EVEN BEING CONSISTENT IN THAT RESPECT NEITHER, MR. CHAIRMAN, BECAUSE YOU, AS A PRIVATE MEMBER, HAVE A NUMBER OF TIMES OVER THE LAST TWO AND A HALF, THREE YEARS, CALLED FOR WITNESSES AND THEY HAVEN'T ALWAYS BEEN AVAILABLE. BECAUSE SOME MEMBER, ONE MEMBER CALLS FOR A WITNESS, THEY HAVEN'T ALWAYS BEEN THERE. ITS BEEN THE CONSENSUS OF THE HOUSE, WHETHER OR NOT THE CHAIRMAN CALLS FOR AGREEMENT AND ITS NEARLY ALWAYS BEEN GIVEN AGREEMENT. THE ONLY REASON THAT I AM AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE IS SAYING OTHER THAN DIFFERENT IS BECAUSE OF WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON POINTS OUT. THOSE WITNESSES WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND IT WILL BE A TOTAL DISCUSSION OF THE WHOLE ESTIMATE, WHICH IT SHOULD BE AND THIS IS BEING REALLY REPETITIOUS. AS FAR AS THIS PARTICULAR BILL IS CONCERNED, IT WAS MY FEELING THAT WE SHOULD DISCUSS THIS BILL AND THE SUPPLEMENTARY TODAY AND THEN WE COULD HAVE THE WITNESSES. BUT WE DID THIS AS A CONVENIENCE TO MEMBERS, SO THAT WE CAN GET THIS OUT OF THE WAY AND HAVE ALMOST FREE DISCUSSION FOR A WHOLE WEEK IF NECESSARY ON BILL C-9 AND THEN GO INTO THE ESTIMATES AND GIVE A MONTHS DISCUSSION ON THOSE IF IT IS NECESSARY. AND I REALLY FEEL, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WE HAVE BEEN, WITH THE TACTIC THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST HAS TAKEN NOW, WHICH IS MOST UNFAIR, BECAUSE WE'VE TRIED TO ACCOMMODATE HIM AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO



REPLY IN RESPECT, BECAUSE THERE IS SOMETHING THAT MUST BE CONSIDERED AS WELL. THAT HERE THE SUGGESTION THAT HAS BEEN MADE FIRSTLY, THAT THIS INTERIM SUPPLY BILL, IN NO WAY RELATES TO THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THIS IS WHAT I GOT FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON,

NOW, IF WE LOOK AT THE MAIN ESTIMATES, THE MAIN ESTIMATE IS IN THE AMOUNT OF SIXTY MILLION DOLLARS EIGHT HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED SEVEN DOLLARS AND IF WE LOOK AT THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL, IT'S FIVE MILLION AND SEVENTY-ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED NINE, WHICH IS ONE TWELFTH, SO HOW CAN THEY SAY IT DOESN'T RELATE? SO IT MUST RELATE, ONE TO THE OTHER.

THERE IS ANOTHER POINT THAT MUST BE CONSIDERED AS WELL. HERE THE MEMBERS ARE ASKING US, AND THIS SURPRISES ME BECAUSE THEY ARE MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, ARE ASKING US TO DEAL WITH AN INTERIM SUPPLY BILL FOR 1974-75 WHEN IN FACT THEY HAVEN'T ASKED TO DEAL WITH THE 5TH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE OF 1973-74. SO THEY ARE TRYING TO GET THROUGH AN ORDINANCE FOR 1974-75 DEALING WITH MONIES OF THE FUTURE, WITHOUT DEALING WITH MONIES OF THE PRESENT. THIS SURPRISED ME NO END. NOW HOW COULD I HAVE MANAGED TO WORK THAT TYPE OF A PROPOSITION FORWARD.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF WE COULD CLOSE THE DEBATE TO THIS DEVELOPMENT. THE QUESTION, AS I SAY FROM THE CHAIR, IS WHETHER OR NOT THE MEMBERS HAVE A RIGHT TO CALL WITNESSES. AS I SAY, I RULED THEY DO HAVE THAT RIGHT IN THIS CASE, NOTWITHSTANDING WHAT MAY HAVE BEEN THE CASE ALWAYS IN THE PAST. I KNOW THAT IN OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES IN OTHER COUNCILS, MOST MEMBERS HAVE ALWAYS BENT TO ALLOW A MEMBER THE OPPORTUNITY TO QUESTION A WITNESS IN RESPECT OF A BILL, AND I SO RULED AND AS I SAY THE MEMBERS MAY APPEAL THIS. I THINK IT HAS BEEN DONE IN FAIRNESS AND UNDER THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF BEAUCHESNE. I WOULD AGAIN INSTRUCT THE CLERK IF SHE WOULD SEE IF THESE PEOPLE ARE AVAILABLE AND IF SO, ASK THEM TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULDN'T GO THAT FAR. I WOULDN'T APPEAL YOUR RULING, BUT I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT AND MR. CHAIRMAN KNOWS THIS FULL WELL THAT LAST YEAR, WHEN THE SHOE WAS ON THE OTHER FOOT, AS FAR AS THE MAKEUP OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WAS CONCERNED, THERE WERE TIMES THAT WITNESSES WERE ASKED TO BE CALLED BEFORE COMMITTEE WHEN CERTAIN BILLS WERE IN

COMMITTEE AND THOSE WITNESSES OR THAT COMMISSION WAS DENIED. NOW THIS IS NOT BY ANY MEANS SETTING A PRECEDENT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO SO THAT WE CAN SAVE TIME TO THOROUGHLY GO THROUGH THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET WITH THE NECESSARY WITNESSES THAT ARE REQUIRED AND IF WE PASS THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL NOW, THEN THE WITNESSES WILL BE CALLED AND THE MEMBERS CAN TAKE ALL THE TIME THAT THEY LIKE AND ASK ALL THE QUESTIONS THAT THEY WISH AT THAT TIME. I COULDN'T AGREE WITH YOU MORE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I HAVE NEVER COME ACROSS, IN ANY LEGISLATIVE BODY WHERE THEY HAVE BEEN DEALING WITH FINANCE; WHERE AN APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE OR APPROPRIATION LEGISLATION FOR THE CURRENT YEAR IS NOT DEALT WITH PRIOR TO ANY APPROPRIATION FOR A CONSECUTIVE YEAR AND THIS REALLY, I MEAN, WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN ASKED FOR AND WHAT THE CONCERN SHOULD BE IS FOR THE BILL NO. 2 WHICH DEALS WITH THE 5TH APPROPRIATION TO BE CLEARLY DEALT WITH FIRST; AND I WANT TO SAY THIS MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT ALTHOUGH IN THE PAST, UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, IT HAS BEEN INCONVENIENT TO HAVE WITNESSES CALLED. NEVER, EVER HAS THERE BEEN ANY WITNESSES REFUSED TO BE CALLED WHEN A MEMBER ASKED OR WHEN HE DEALT WITH MATTERS OF A FISCAL NATURE.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THAT POINT, THERE IS ONE OTHER THING I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT AND THAT WAS LAST YEAR, WHEN THREE OF US; COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, YOURSELF AND MYSELF DIDN'T AGREE TO COME BACK ONE NIGHT TO DISCUSS THE BUDGET, THE WHOLE BUDGET WAS PASSED THROUGH WITHOUT US BEING THERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT YOU HAD THE PRIVILEGE OF GOING THERE, DIDN'T YOU?

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVEN'T SPOKEN ONCE ON THIS TODAY YET BECAUSE OF THE KIND OF PROCEDURAL KRANGLE, I WAS HOPING THIS COUNCIL WASN'T GOING TO GET INTO, BUT I THINK WE CAN ALL SEE WHICH WAY WE ARE GOING TO HEAD IN THIS SESSION ALSO.

I WANT TO MAKE A COUPLE OF COMMENTS. THE ONE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON MADE ABOUT IT BEING A 'RED HERRING' THE BUSINESS ABOUT THE PRINCIPLE OF VOTING FOR A TWELFTH OF THE BUDGET WHETHER HE HAS ACCEPTED THE PROGRAM IN THE WHOLE OF THE BUDGET. I ASSURE YOU,



HONOURABLE MEMBER, THIS ISN'T A 'RED HERRING'. IF YOU WILL CHECK BACK IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, YOU'LL SEE THAT THIS IS AN AREA THAT HAS BOTHERED ME SINCE THE FIRST TIME THAT I SAT AT THIS COUNCIL AND I HAVE SPOKEN ON IT JUST ABOUT EVERY BUDGET TODATE, WHERE AN INTERIM SUPPLY MEASURE HAD COME BEFORE THE HOUSE BEFORE THE BUDGET WAS PASSED.

I WILL JUST GIVE HIM ONE EXAMPLE OF IT. UNDER NEW COMPLICATIONAL TECHNICAL TRAINING IN THE BUDGET, WE ARE GOING UP MAN YEARS FROM 6.0 TO 62.5 BECAUSE THERE IS A NEW PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY INSTRUCTORS WHICH IS GOING TO HIRE SEVENTEEN MORE PEOPLE FOR NEXT YEAR. I KNOW NOTHING OF THE PROGRAM INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY INSTRUCTORS, BUT I AM GOING TO APPROVE ONE TWELFTH OF THEIR SALARY UNDER THE AGGITATION VOTE BY VOTING FOR THE BUDGET, SO I HAVE REALLY ACCEPTED THE PRINCIPLE OF SOMETHING WHICH I KNOW NOTHING ABOUT IN ACCEPTING THE INTERIM SUPPLY AND KNOWING THAT IT WOULD GO THROUGH ANYWAY, I WOULD BE VOTING AGAINST THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL BECAUSE IT IS CHAUKED FULL OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS THAT I WON'T KNOW ABOUT UNTIL I GET IT INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES. SO YOU CAN CALL IT A 'RED HERRING' IF YOU LIKE, BUT IT IS A VERY REAL MATTER OF PRINCIPLE TO ME AND YOU'LL FIND OUT THAT MY STAND ON THIS HAS BEEN CONSISTENT THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU . . . BY YOURSELF.

MR. MCKINNON: RIGHT, I AGREE WITH YOU AND I THINK THAT THE POINT AT THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL ABOUT THE PROBLEM THAT I AM SAYING RIGHT NOW AND I STILL SAY THAT IT IS A PROBLEM. I DON'T THINK THAT I HAVE IT, THE COST ON THIS THE FIRST TIME I HAVE WATCHED THE COUNCIL. EVEN IN THE OTHER POSITION WHERE I WAS . . . TOWARDS OTHER MATTERS WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THIS TYPE OF OPERATION . . . SO THAT I COULD UNDERSTAND IT BECAUSE THERE WAS A MAJORITY IN THE HOUSE TO TAKE CARE OF THE INTERIM SUPPLY AT ANY RATE BUT THIS IS A REAL PROBLEM. I TELL YOU, THAT ALL MEMBERS DO HAVE A VERY REAL PROBLEM IN THIS INSTANCE.

THE OTHER POINT - I CAN ONLY SAY THAT IT IS UNUSUAL AND IT HAS NOT BEEN REQUESTED GENERALLY ON INTERIM SUPPLY, THAT THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER BE PRESENT, HOWEVER, I THINK THAT MY STAND ON ANY TIME THAT ANY MEMBER WANTED WITNESSES BEFORE THE HOUSE HAS ALSO BEEN CAUTIONED

OVER THE YEARS AND THOSE WITNESSES, WHENEVER I HAVE BEEN PUT IN AN OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE ON WHETHER OR NOT THEY SHOULD APPEAR, THEY HAVE ALWAYS BEEN PRESENT BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL.

THERE IS ONE OTHER VERY REAL DANGER HERE TOO BECAUSE AS I SEE IT, THE DEPUTY SPEAKER, THE CHAIRMAN HAS MADE A RULING. IF HIS RULING IS NOT AGREED TO BY THE HOUSE BY RULES OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE REGULARLY, HE WOULD BE CONSIDERED TO NO LONGER HAVE THE CONFIDENCE OF THIS HOUSE AND ABOUT THE THING THAT YOU COULD . . . THE POSITION THAT YOU ARE REALLY FORCED TO GIVE IN TO IS TO RESIGN HIS POSITION AS DEPUTY SPEAKER AND I THINK THAT WE HAD BETTER BE PRETTY CAREFUL BECAUSE THIS IS ONE AREA THAT I DON'T THINK THAT ANY MEMBER OF COUNCIL REAL WANTS TO GET INTO.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I JUST HAVE ONE FURTHER POINT THAT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE AND THAT REALLY IS THAT THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL IS ONLY THERE FOR THE ONE REASON AND THAT IS THAT IT SEEMS VERY UNLIKELY THAT THIS HOUSE, IF ITS GIVEN AMPLE OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE THE MAIN ESTIMATES AT LENGTH AND WITH THE WITNESSES AND BEING GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY THAT THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO QUESTION THE BUDGET; ITS VERY UNLIKELY THAT THE MAIN BUDGET IS GOING TO BE PASSED BEFORE THE END OF THE MONTH. NOW WHAT ARE THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS SUGGESTING THAT WE DO THEN? DO WE JUST SHUT GOVERNMENT DOWN FROM THE END OF THE MONTH? I MEAN THATS THE IDEA OF THIS INTERIM BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST TO CLARIFY. I FOUND, I THINK ITS ONE OF THE MANY APPROPRIATE ITEMS OF BEAUCHESNE FOR THE EDIFICATION OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE AS TO THE DECISION THAT I REACHED IN THIS MATTER. THAT IS YOU'LL FIND UNDER ANNOTATION NO. 4. THE PRINCIPLES THAT LIE AT THE BASIS OF ENGLISH PARLIAMENTARY LAWS OR IT ALSO AMPLY SAYS ARE TO PROTECT THE MINORITY RESTRAIN THE IMPROVINANCE OR TERANY OF A MAJORITY TO SECURE THE TRANSACTION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS IN AN ORDERLY MANNER TO ENABLE EVERY MEMBER TO EXPRESS HIS OPINION WITHIN LIMITS NECESSARY TO PRESERVE DECORUM AND PREVENT UNNECESSARY WASTE OF TIME TO GIVE ABUNDANT OPPORTUNITY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF EVERY MEASURE TO PREVENT ANY LEGISLATIVE ACTION BEING TAKEN ON SUDDEN IMPULSES.

I WOULD ONCE AGAIN ASK IF MADAM CLERK WOULD SEE IF MR. TREASURER AND THE APPROPRIATE EXECUTIVE



COMMITTEE MEMBER WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR COMMITTEE AT THIS TIME.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, may I just intercede. I am very sorry to take up more time, but we will bring the Treasurer in here and before we go into debate, I disagree on your statement.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, in that case, I suggest that the undertaking that I gave to the House that we will deal with Bill #1, and then we will go to C-9. That undertaking was to accommodate Members so I think that if that is the case that we are going to have those two gentlemen, we can also deal with at the same time with Bill #2 as the Honourable Member wants and we will get to C-9 in due course. I will also point out to Members that it was just this morning that the world was going to come to end if we didn't deal with C-9. Now if we are going to have the witnesses, we are going to deal with Bill 1 and 2.

Mr. Chamberlist: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate that once the witnesses will be here, I will ask then that Bill No. 2 be dealt with first because that is the appropriation for 1973-74. We will deal with that in a manner that will give about two days and it will show once more how really inconsistent the Members that sit now on the Executive Committee. They show quite clearly that they do not recognize that the responsible Government that is required is more important than bringing about these Bills at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, I think at this time we will conclude discussion of this matter and Madam Clerk, I will once again ask if you will get hold of these gentlemen and find out if and when they may attend Committee and I will stand Committee in recess at this time.

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: We have with us at this time, Mr. Huberdeau, our Treasurer and Mr. Merv Miller Executive Committee Member to assist in discussions on Bill #1, Interim Supply Appropriation Ordinance, and I will proceed with the reading of the Bill.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Chairman that we not deal with Bill #1 but

deal firstly with the Fifth Appropriation Ordinance. I think this would be of greater importance. There may be items in the Fifth Appropriation Ordinance which should likely be in the following year's budget requirements. It would appear to me that the terms of financing is one for the following year and this is for funds to be expended for the supplementary for this year. I think it would be beneficial to deal with this now.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Member for pointing out some statements that we have already made and I agree with them.

Mr. Chairman: Committee agrees then to move to Bill #2?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I will proceed with the reading of the Bill.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, should I read the explanatory note into the Votes and Proceedings before we read the Bill? "The purpose of this Bill is to supply funds to defray the expenses of the Public Service for a period of one month (April) in the event that the 1974-75 Main Estimates have not been passed before March 31, 1974."

Mr. Chairman reads Bill #1.

Mr. Chairman: You have support data. The first item is Administrative Services in the amount of \$100,000.00

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, there is a question I would like to ask either one of the witnesses. It doesn't matter which one answers. The money that is being asked for here, is this transfer money from other votes or are we asking for money additional to what has been voted on in 73-74 and whether if it is additional money is there going to be any tax structure to meet these?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the question, it doesn't refer to Admin. Services. It refers to the total budget.

Mr. Chamberlist: The total budget.

Mr. Miller: THE FUNDS THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR UNDER OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ARE FUNDS THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE FROM BUDGETED SURPLUS WHICH WHEN WE PUT FORWARD OUR MAIN ESTIMATES LAST SPRING, A YEAR AGO, THERE WAS A BUDGETED SURPLUS OF APPROXIMATELY ONE AND ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS. THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR IN THIS BUDGET ARE \$820,000.00 LEAVING A BUDGETED SURPLUS OF 1973-74 FUNDS STILL AVAILABLE.

Mr. Chairman: SUPPORT DATA IS FOUND ON PAGE FIVE OF THE APPENDIX TO BILL #2.

Mr. Chamberlist: LET ME PERSUE THIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN. CAN COMMITTEE THEN UNDERSTAND THEN FROM WHAT YOU SAY THAT THE SURPLUS WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT THAT IS BEING ASKED FOR AND WHICH WOULD LEAVE HOW MANY THOUSANDS DOLLARS DID YOU SAY, Mr. MILLER?

Mr. Miller: APPROXIMATELY \$700,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: AND THIS SURPLUS, I TAKE IT, WOULD BE CARRIED FORWARD FOR THE YEAR 1974-75.

Mr. Miller: THE SURPLUS WOULD GO INTO OUR WORKING CAPITAL FUND. THIS IS OUR NORMAL CUSTOM AND WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR FURTHER YEARS. THAT IS RIGHT.

Mr. Chamberlist: WHEN YOU SAY, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, IS THIS WORKING CAPITAL FUND THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OR A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AS WELL?

Mr. Miller: WELL, WE HAVE TWO, WE HAVE A WORKING CAPITAL FUND FOR MAINTENANCE AND A CAPITAL FUND, A SEPARATE FUND, WHICH ACCUMULATES ONLY CAPITAL ITEMS.

Mr. Chamberlist: BUT IS THIS \$700,000.00 FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUND ONLY?

Mr. Miller: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ONLY.

Mr. Chamberlist: THANK YOU, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. Chairman: THE FIRST ITEM ON PAGE FIVE IS ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, \$50,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: WHEN YOU SAID THAT YOU REVOTE FUNDS THAT WERE ON EXPENDITURES THAT COMES FROM THE PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR, WERE THESE MONIES UNEXPENDED THEN IN 1972-73?

Mr. Miller: THAT IS CORRECT, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHEN THIS ITEM WAS BUDGETED FOR IN 1972-73, THE BILL WASN'T RECEIVED TO PAY IT IN TIME FOR THAT FISCAL YEAR.

Mr. Chamberlist: WASN'T THERE ANY PROVISION MADE IN THE ESTIMATES OF 73-74 FOR UNPAID BILLS?

Mr. Miller: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE NEVER PROVIDE AT THE TIME OF MAIN ESTIMATES FOR UNPAID BILLS. OUR NORMAL PRACTICE IS TO PROVIDE FOR THE YEAR'S ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES AND WHEN WE RUN INTO A SITUATION SUCH AS THIS, OUR NORMAL PRACTICE HAS BEEN TO COME AND ASK FOR A REVOTE BY THE COUNCIL.

Mr. McKinnon: I WONDER IF, Mr. CHAIRMAN, SOMEONE COULD ANSWER IN THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE ORDINANCES WHICH ARE VERY WELL DONE, WHETHER THEY ARE GOING TO BE KEPT IN THE LOOSE LEAF FORM SO THAT YEAR BY YEAR ACCOUNTS BY COUNCIL SESSION CAN BE GOTTEN OUT OF THIS FORM AND INTO THE BOOK SO THAT WE HAVE A COPY OF THE BOOK OF ORDINANCES AT ALL TIMES.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. COMMISSIONER

Mr. Commissioner: THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. LEGAL ADVISER IS NOT HERE AT THE MOMENT BUT IS NECESSARY FOR US TO MAINTAIN THIS IN TWO FORMS. I BELIEVE THAT THE BOUND FORM, NOT THE LOOSE-LEAF FORM, BUT THE BOUND FORM IS LOOKED UPON AS THE FORM THAT IS ACCEPTABLE TO THE COURTS. NOW MAYBE THIS IS NOT EXACTLY LIKE THAT BUT, IT IS BASICALLY THAT. WE MUST MAINTAIN THE BOUND FORM AND WE MUST MAINTAIN SUPPLEMENTS TO THAT BOUND FORM IN THE BOUND FORM. THE LOOSE LEAF ONE THAT YOU SEE BEFORE NOW IS THE ONE THAT IS DEALT WITH ON THE COMPUTER SYSTEM. I BELIEVE THAT IT IS LOCATED IN WINNEPEG, IN OTTAWA, AND THE REVISED PAGES WILL START TO COME FORWARD SO THAT IN THAT ONE, YOU'VE GOT AN UPTODATE LIST.

Mr. McKinnon: WON'T WE ALWAYS BE TWO YEARS BEHIND?

Mr. Chairman: YES, WE WILL. THE PROBLEM IS RIGHT HERE, Mr. CHAIRMAN. IT IS NOT ENTIRELY WITH THE COMPUTER. THIS IS AN ABSOLUTELY FANTASTIC JOB. BY THE TIME THIS HAS GONE BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PEOPLE AND OUR OWN SECRETARIAT, WHAT HAVE YOU; I AM SURE THE CLERK WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO ELUCIDATE ON THIS FURTHER IF YOU WANT. THIS IS A MAJOR JOB,



MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD MR. MILLER INDICATE WHAT WAS THE ACTUAL FIGURE FOR THESE CONSOLIDATED ORDINANCES?

MR. MILLER: TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT FIGURE HERE, BUT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, IT WAS WITHIN \$1,000.00 OF \$50,000.00. IN OTHER WORDS, IT WAS SOMETHING BEYOND \$49,000.00 AND WE HAVE ROUNDED IT OFF TO \$50,000.00 FOR CONVENIENCE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COMMENCE?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: COMMENCE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT, \$30,000. THIS IS JUST FROM THE CHAIR. DOES THIS PROVIDE FOR THE COMMISSIONER DURING THE PAST YEAR OR WHAT DOES THIS PROVIDE FOR?

MR. MILLER: NO THIS BASICALLY IS FOR A SMALL GROUP OF PEOPLE THAT WE PUT TOGETHER THAT WE CALL THE LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT WHO ARE WORKING ON PUTTING TOGETHER INFORMATION FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE COMMISSIONER SO THAT WHEN THE COMMISSIONER CAN GET CLOSE TO THE NEGOTIATING TABLE, HE HAS THE BACKGROUND AVAILABLE TO HIM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WILL ALL THIS INFORMATION BE AVAILABLE TO THE NEWLY APPOINTED YUKON LAND CLAIMS REPRESENTATIVE? MR. COMMISSIONER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS A PAPER COMING FORWARD THAT WILL EXPLAIN BASICALLY THE FUNCTIONS THAT ARE GOING ON IN THIS SECRETARIAT AND ALSO IT WILL DELINEATE CERTAIN BASIC THINGS WHICH WE ARE DOING NOW WHICH WILL FALL INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN. SOME OF IT PRACTICALLY IMMEDIATELY, SOME MORE IN THE COURSE OF TIME. AS FAR AS THE BASIC BACKGROUND MATERIAL IS CONCERNED, IT COMES INTO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND YOUR QUESTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT WILL BE AVAILABLE TO ANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE YUKON, THE ANSWER IS YES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ONE QUESTION. YOU SAY THIS IS 100% RECOVERABLE. IS THIS OVER AND ABOVE THE FISCAL ARRANGEMENT OR IS IT A SEPARATE ITEM? IT IS OVER AND ABOVE.

MR. MILLER: THIS IS OVER AND ABOVE THE FISCAL ARRANGEMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS THE

FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE, \$20,000.00

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS A VERY INTERESTING QUESTION I WISH TO ASK OF THIS. IF THIS IS A FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE AND WE ONLY HAVE REPRESENTATION HERE, WHY SHOULD WE BE PAYING THE COSTS OF THIS SECRETARIAT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: YOU ARE NOT PAYING IT. IT IS GIVEN TO YOU AS A SEPARATE ITEM FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AGAIN, IS THIS AN ITEM OVER AND ABOVE OUR FISCAL ARRANGEMENT.

MR. MILLER: YES. IT IS OUTSIDE THE ARRANGEMENT. IT IS CLAIMABLE.

MR. MCKINNON: DOES THIS INCLUDE THE SENDING OF YUKON ORDINANCES DOWN TO THE PEOPLE IN OTTAWA TO COMPUTE IT?

MR. MILLER: YES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS GIVES A TOTAL OF \$100,000.00 UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS THE TERRITORIAL TREASURER, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$119,000.00 AND THE BREAKDOWN IS FOUND ON PAGE 8.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE WHAT POSITIONS HAVE BEEN TRANSFERRED TO THE FUNCTION OF CENTRAL PURCHASING DURING THE PAST YEAR?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAD TWO PEOPLE IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT WHO WERE WORKING ON ASSETS CONTROL. THIS IS THE PHYSICAL ASSETS, THE DESKS, THE CHAIRS, THE EQUIPMENT, ETCETERA. IT SEEMED EXPEDIENT TO MOVE THOSE PEOPLE IN CENTRAL PURCHASING WHERE THEY COULD CONTROL THE STUFF AT THE ORIGINAL SOURCE. DURING THE COURSE OF THE YEAR, WE FOUND THAT WE NEEDED IN THE CENTRAL PURCHASING OFFICE CORPORATION, A THIRD PURCHASING OFFICER. IN THE TREASURER'S OPERATION WE HAD AN ACCOUNTANT 1 POSITION WHICH WE DID NOT ATTEMPT TO FILL. WE TRANSFERRED THE ACCOUNTANT 1 POSITION AND RECLASSIFIED IT AS A PURCHASING OFFICER. THE PURCHASING OFFICER NEEDED STAFF ASSISTANCE IN THE FORM OF A CLERK-TYPIST. AGAIN, TREASURY HAD AN EXCESS POSITION WHICH WE TRANSFERRED TO CENTRAL PURCHASING.

Mr. Chamberlist: Was that included for in last year's estimates?

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was.

Mr. Chamberlist: I mean, the bodies, were the bodies included?

Mr. Miller: The positions were provided for in last year's budget.

Mr. Chairman: We are taking 200 and 203 in the amount of \$44,600.00 conjointly.

Mr. Miller: The positions, Mr. Chairman, are provided for on page ten of the 1973-74 estimates.

Mr. Chamberlist: The point that I make wasn't that money included in the ...

Mr. Miller: The money for the positions were included in the total vote 02 last year.

Mr. Chamberlist: Right, so what we've done then is we have just transferred the money out of your department into the central purchasing.

Mr. Miller: It's still within vote 02.

Mr. Chairman: Is it clear? The next item is the right-off of bad debts, \$1.00.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, as is our normal custom, the write off of bad debts is handled from an accounting stand point to setting up a reserve. Under the financial administration ordinance, the commissioner has certain authorities to write off bad debts on his own. The commissioner of the Yukon does prefer to use that approach. He prefers to come to council to have them written off. What we are asking from here is authority to take off the book debts that we have not been able to collect because of bankrupt companies, deceased persons, can't locate people, any number of reasons. We have tried to the best of our ability to locate these people. We haven't been able to do it.

Mr. Chamberlist: How does the one dollar effect put this into effect?

Mr. Miller: As I indicated earlier, these accounts are from a bookkeeping or accountant's standpoint; are technically written off now by setting up a reserve each year for provision for

bad debts. The legislative authority required to put this into true effect is a vote of one dollar. There will be nothing charged against the dollar. It will be charged on the books against the reserve.

Mr. Chairman: Clear? The next item is write off of obsolete central storage inventory, \$318.29.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, these are items that we gathered up either as a result of the turn-over of the Alaska Highway, or of items that we found in the course of a board of survey that took place last summer. They are obsolete items and we don't wish to carry in our storage because we would have no use for them. Again, the only way we can get them off the books, is by an appropriation of this council.

Mr. Chamberlist: You debit your inventory this way. Is this what you are saying?

Mr. Miller: That is right. We debit our inventory and charge this, and credit our inventory and debit our vote.

Mr. Chairman: The next item is ex-gratia payment, \$1,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, it is about time. It should give the main interest as well.

Mr. Chairman: This gives a total of \$1,319.29. Is this clear? Next is the department of education in the amount of \$290,000.00. Details may be found on page eleven. The first item is schools curriculum supplies and salaries, \$33,000.00

Mr. Chamberlist: His explanation.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Last spring, we took on more staff; a supervisor of central instruction, for a thorough review attempting to analyze the checks in our Yukon schools. We discovered that quite a number of our students required remediation in the basic skills and the reason for this is the attention for the past few years. This is not just unique to the Yukon Territory, but it is unique to North America and Canada that the teaching methods have not stressed this basic skill. Consequently, our children are not performing, or quite a number of our children are not performing at the level in



READING, LANGUAGE AND MATH THAT THEIR GRADE LEVELS SHOULD TYPIFY. SO, WE HAD OUR SUPERVISOR IN SPECIAL INSTRUCTION, INVESTIGATE IT AND WE RECOMMENDED THAT WE PUT INTO OUR SCHOOLS, TUTORS WHO WOULD BE TUTORING THE REMEDIAL CASES AS USING INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PAPERS. NOW THESE INDIVIDUALIZED BOOK-TYPE OF PAPERS WOULD BE REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THIS PROGRAMME. THEREFORE, WE PROCEEDED TO PURCHASE THESE LESSONS. THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT THEY WERE, AND THAT IS WHY THIS ESTABLISHMENT 302 IS OVEREXPENDED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$33,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WAS THE PROGRAM APPROVED BY TERRITORIAL COUNCIL BEFORE THE MONEY WAS EXPENDED?

MRS. WATSON: NO, THIS PROGRAM WAS APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER AT THAT POINT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I KNOW THAT QUESTION, I CAN ANSWER, WAS THE EXPENDITURE APPROVED BY TERRITORIAL COUNCIL?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS WAS AN EMERGENCY SITUATION AND I THINK THAT NO MEMBER OF THIS COUNCIL WILL FEEL THAT WE SHOULD HAVE SAT BACK AND WHEN WE SAW THE RESULTS FROM SOME OF OUR TESTS THAT WE GOT FROM SOME OF OUR SCHOOLS AND SAT BACK AND WAITED FOR ANOTHER YEAR. WE EMBARKED UPON PURCHASING THESE LESSONS. WE WERE ABLE TO, UNDER OUR MANPOWER PROGRAM, AND THE EXPLANATION IS IN SESSIONAL PAPER No. 10, UNFORTUNATELY IT IS NOT IN COMMITTEE AT THIS TIME. YOU WILL GET COMPLETE INFORMATION ON THIS PROGRAM IN SESSIONAL PAPER No. 10 AND WE PROCEEDED TO EMBARK UPON THIS PROGRAM. I AM NOW ASKING FOR COUNCIL--

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN DID THE PROGRAM START?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PROGRAM STARTED IN SOME SCHOOLS ON SEPTEMBER 15 AND IT VARIES FROM SEPTEMBER 15 TO THE MIDDLE OF OCTOBER.

BEFORE THE PROGRAM COULD START, WE HAD TO BRING OUR TUTORS INTO TOWN TO GIVE THEM SOME IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND THIS WAS DONE UNDER THE MANPOWER PROGRAM. THE TUTORS' WAGES ARE BEING PAID BY MANPOWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF THE TUTORS' WAGES ARE BEING PAID BY MANPOWER, COULD WE GET SOME BREAKDOWN AS TO THE \$33,000 BECAUSE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT SALARIES, NOW WE ARE SAYING

THAT THE TUTORS ARE BEING PAID BY MANPOWER. CAN WE HAVE A BREAKDOWN OF THE \$33,000?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE INITIATION OF THE YUKON-WIDE INTENSIVE PROGRAM OF REMEDIATION AND THE BREAKDOWN IS IN SESSIONAL PAPER No. 10.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER THEN IF WE CAN STOP UNTIL WE HAVE A LOOK AT THAT BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT \$33,000 IS BEING SPENT ON. IT IS NOT A SMALL AMOUNT OF MONEY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IF THIS INFORMATION CAN BE SENT FOR, WE COULD REFER BACK --

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE'VE GOT IT HERE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE HAVE IT. PROCEED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE INDIVIDUAL LESSONS IN THE SUBJECT AREA THAT THE CHILD NEEDS REMEDIATION. IF YOU WANT A COST BREAKDOWN OF EACH LESSON IN EACH SUBJECT AREA; THIS I CAN'T PROVIDE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AM NOT INTERESTED IN THAT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT I AM CONCERNED ABOUT IS A BREAKDOWN OF THE \$33,000 AS FAR AS IT RELATES TO WHICH PORTION IS IT'S SALARIES BECAUSE I AM A LITTLE BIT CONFUSED WITH A STATEMENT THAT IS BEING MADE, THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE REFUNDED BY MANPOWER. SO IF I CAN GET AN EXPLANATION WHAT IS BEING REFUNDED BY MANPOWER, I MIGHT BE ABLE TO CONSIDER THESE--

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, SESSIONAL PAPER No. 10 DOES DEFINE THAT, AND IF YOU WILL LOOK AT THE ATTACHMENT AT THE BACK OF THE SESSIONAL PAPER; THE SALARIES FOR THE TUTOR TRAINING, 16 PEOPLE EMPLOYED FOR 42 WEEKS, IN 1973-74 WAS \$84,000. THAT IS BEING PAID BY MANPOWER. THE \$5,000 IS THE PROGRAM MANAGER. THE PROGRAM IS CARRIED ON IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES.

THE MANAGER GETS PAID \$5,000, THE SECRETARY'S SALARY. THE PROGRAM COORDINATOR IS OUR SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION. THE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS, PREMISES RENTALS FOR THE OFFICE OF THE ORGANIZATION WHO HAVE ENTERED INTO THE AGREEMENT FOR THIS MANPOWER PROGRAM. THE TELEPHONE, THAT IS MANPOWER PAID, THE MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES ARE WHAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT HAD TO SUPPLY. THE MANPOWER PROGRAM COVERED THE COST OF THE OFFICE EXPENSES FOR THE ASSOCIA-

TION FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES. THEY PAID THE COST OF THE TUTOR TRAINEES WHO ARE CARRYING ON THE TUTOR PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOLS.

THE TERRITORIAL PORTION OF THE PROGRAM, WAS TO PROVIDE THE REMEDIAL MATERIAL THAT WAS USED IN THE SCHOOLS. THE TOTAL OF THAT WAS \$55,000. WE WERE ABLE TO PURCHASE SOME OF THAT MATERIAL OUT OF OUR EXISTING BUDGET, BUT WE HAD TO OVER-EXPEND THE PRIMARY 302'S BUDGET BY \$32,000 TO PURCHASE ALL OF THE MATERIALS THAT WAS REQUIRED FOR THE PROGRAM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AM SORRY IT IS A LONG EXPLANATION BUT WHAT I AM ASKING FOR IS THAT ONE ITEM OF \$33,000; I WANT TO KNOW HOW MUCH OF THAT ITEM IS SALARIES AND HOW MUCH IS MATERIALS. IT IS AS SIMPLE AS THAT.

MRS. WATSON: IT IS ALL MATERIALS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHY DO YOU MISLEAD AND SAY 'AND SOME OF IT' AND THIS IS WHY I'M ASKING. IF IT IS ALL MATERIALS, THEN SAY IT IS ALL MATERIALS.

MRS. WATSON: WELL THAT IS THE ESTABLISHMENT HEADING.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT'S AN ESTABLISHMENT HEADING WHICH WE HAVE ESTABLISHED THREE YEARS AGO. I AGREE, MAYBE WHAT WE SHOULD HAVE SAID IN THE VOTE WORDING WAS TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES. I WOULD AGREE WITH THAT, MR. CHAIRMAN. BUT THE ESTABLISHMENT HEADING IS A COMMON HEADING THAT WE USE EVERY YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT IS MATERIALS ONLY.

MR. MILLER: RIGHT,

MR. CHAIRMAN: I JUST HAVE ONE QUESTION FROM THE CHAIR. AT WHAT POINT IN TIME WAS THIS PROGRAM INITIATED?

MR. MILLER: SEPTEMBER 15.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON \$33,000- SCHOOLS-CURRICULUM SUPPLIES AND SALARIES? CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS KINDERGARTENS-\$7,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HAS THIS PROGRAM STARTED ALREADY?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS PROGRAM STARTED ALMOST AT THE SAME TIME AS THE OTHER PROGRAM. THIS IS BUYING AGAIN, MATERIALS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? NEXT IS RECREATION AND AMATEUR SPORT-\$30,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH OF THIS IS FOR RENTAL OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SUITE AT THE HOTEL IN ANCHORAGE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS FOR THE BUDGET FOR THE OPERATION OF THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES. I CAN CIRCULATE COPIES OF THE BUDGET FOR THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES. WE HAVEN'T HAD A COMPLETE ANALYSIS AS A RESULT OF THE GAMES, BUT MR. RAYBURN INFORMS ME THAT WE ARE PRETTY WELL WITHIN THE \$30,000. BUT I CAN CIRCULATE THE BUDGET FOR THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES TO THE MEMBERS WHO WISH IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? NEXT ITEM IS YUKON VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTRE-\$220,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS INDICATES JUST THE NAME OF ONE COURSE AND OTHER COURSES. I WONDER IF YOU WOULD INDICATE WHAT THE OTHER COURSES ARE.

MRS. WATSON: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DO HAVE THE OTHER COURSES. I HAVE IT BROKEN DOWN. THE BLADE PROGRAM, AND AGAIN THE EXPLANATION IS VERY THOROUGH IN SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 9. MAYBE THE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THAT WHEN WE GO INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATE IN DETAIL OR WE CAN DISCUSS IT NOW. WE HAVE THE BLADE PROGRAM IN TEN COMMUNITIES AND THE PORTION OF THE COST TO THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1973-74 IS \$167,750. THEN WE HAVE HOME MANAGEMENT COURSE, WHICH WAS REQUIRED UNDER THE HOUSING PROGRAM AND THE COST IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1973-74 IS \$22,800. THE LOGGING COURSE-\$15,450, OIL-BURNER MECHANICS \$2,500 AND ARTS AND CRAFTS IN COMMUNITIES, WHERE WE HAVE THE INSTRUCTORS TRAVELLING THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY PROVIDING INSTRUCTION IN ARTS AND CRAFTS-\$11,500, WHICH TOTALS \$220,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE THERE ANY AMOUNTS OF THIS MONEY REFUNDABLE IN PORTION FORM FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WOULDN'T BE FROM



NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, IT'S UNDER THE CANADA MANPOWER AGREEMENT. THERE IS APPROXIMATELY \$130,000 THAT IS RECOVERABLE.

Mr. McKINNON: WHEN WAS THIS PROGRAM STARTED, Mr. CHAIRMAN?

Mrs. WATSON: THE BLADÉ PROGRAM? WE TRIED IT ON A TRIAL BASIS IN 1972-73 AT KISHWOOT HALL AND ROSS RIVER. THIS IS AN ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM; IT IS A BASIC LITERACY PROGRAM. IT IS REALLY THE FIRST THROUGH THE DEFICIT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT HAS MADE TO TAKE ADULT EDUCATION INTO THE COMMUNITIES. IN 1973-74, WE PUT IT INTO TEN COMMUNITIES AND THIS IS WHERE THE COST HAS BEEN INCURRED—THE \$167,000.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A FEW REMARKS AND THESE ARE REMARKS I'VE MADE BEFORE IN THIS HOUSE. I'M GOING TO REITERATE THEM. I DO BELIEVE IN THEM, WHEN I STATE THEM. I WOULD LIKE TO DRAW MEMBERS' ATTENTION TO ANNOTATION 240 OF BEAUCHESNE, WHICH SAYS THAT 'SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, WHEN TREATED AS CUSTOMARY AND AS A MATTER OF COURT, INSTEAD OF BEING RESTRICTED TO OCCASION OF UNPERCEIVED CONTINGENCIES DO MORE TO DESTROY EFFECTUAL PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL THAN ANY OTHER INDIRECT METHOD THAT COULD BE DEvised. THE INTRODUCTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES OF ANY CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT, IS REALLY A BREACH OF CONTRACT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT. FOR WHEN THIS IS DONE, THE BUDGET STATEMENT IS DESTROYED AND IN EFFECT THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET IS SET UP.'

I WOULD LIKE TO DRAW MEMBERS' ATTENTION TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. WE HAVE, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IN EFFECT, A \$290,000 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE OF WHICH I WOULD SAY \$260,000 OF THAT IS IN NEW PROGRAMS WHICH HAVE NOT GONE BEFORE THIS HOUSE AND WHICH HAVE NOT HAD THE APPROVAL OF THIS HOUSE PRIOR TO GOING INTO EFFECT. ALBEIT, THEY ARE PROBABLY VERY NECESSARY AND IMPORTANT PROGRAMS AND HOPEFULLY WILL PROVE TO BE EXTREMELY SUCCESSFUL.

BUT, THEY HAVE BEEN PUT INTO EFFECT, EVEN THOUGH THERE WERE SPECIAL SESSIONS OF THIS HOUSE CALLED FOR OTHER MATTERS. IT IS MY CONTENTION, IT ALWAYS HAS BEEN AND I SEEM TO BE GETTING MORE CONSISTENT AS I GROW OLDER. AT ANY RATE, THAT SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, THAT NEW PROGRAM; THAT EXPENDITURE OF THE TAXPAYER'S MONEY IS A DECISION THAT SHOULD BE MADE IN THE HOUSE AND THE

HOUSE ALONE. Mr. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD CAUTION, AND CAUTION VERY STRONGLY, THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND THE MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT TO TRY AND PERVERT THE PARLIAMENTARY RESPONSIBILITY OF EXPENDING THE TAXPAYER'S MONEY THROUGH PROGRAMS THAT ARE ACCEPTED OR REJECTED IN THE HOUSE. WHEN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES OF SUCH A LARGE EXPENDITURE ARE BROUGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE, I THINK THAT REALLY THE GOVERNMENT AND THE EXECUTIVE CAN PERVERT WHAT THE RIGHT ORDER OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE WOULD BE. I WOULD REALLY ASK MEMBERS TO TAKE THIS INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN THEY ARE EMBARKING ON NEW PROGRAMS; TO TRY AND FORESEE THE PROGRAMS AS FAR BACK AS POSSIBLE AND ALSO WHAT THE AVAILABILITY OF COUNCIL IS THERE. FOR MEMBERS TO INTRODUCE THE PROGRAM; THAT THEY SHOULD BE INTRODUCED AT THAT TIME. IT IS PARLIAMENTARILY WRONG FOR ALL THESE PROGRAMS TO BE INITIATED AND NOT BEING ASKED TO AGREE, ON MONIES AND PROGRAMS ALREADY STARTED AND MONIES ALREADY SPENT.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, AS A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, I COULDN'T AGREE MORE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER AND I THINK THAT THE MEMBER FOR EDUCATION WILL SPEAK FOR HERSELF, BUT I THINK THAT IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES THIS WAS A CASE WHERE WE HAD A PROGRAM OFFERED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IF WE DIDN'T TAKE IT, WE WOULD HAVE PASSED UP A YEAR OF GOOD TRAINING. BUT AS FAR AS THE PRINCIPLE OF WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAYS, I MOST HEARTILY AGREE WITH HIM.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, PERHAPS YOU SHOULD DO WHAT I DIDN'T DO, GET THE HELL OUT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHEN THEY TRY AND PUSH THOSE THINGS DOWN YOUR THROAT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, WOULD Mr. MILLER INDICATE HOW MUCH OF THE VOTE TO DATE, THAT IS \$7,691,306, HAS BEEN EXPENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO THIS TIME.

Mr. MILLER: I'M SORRY, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DIDN'T BRING THOSE FIGURES WITH ME. I CAN GET THEM IN A MATTER OF MINUTES.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF WE COULD ADJOURN SO THAT WE CAN GET THEM BECAUSE IT IS AN IMPORTANT POINT. ANOTHER \$290,000 IS BEING ASKED FOR, YET WE DON'T KNOW WHETHER THERE IS ANY MONEY STILL LEFT IN THE VOTE. I WONDER, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IF WE COULD RECESS WHILE THESE FIGURES ARE BROUGHT TO US.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THIS INFORMATION QUICKLY AVAILABLE? ALRIGHT, WE'LL CALL A RECESS.

MR. MILLER: I'LL GO AND GET IT; YOU DON'T NEED TO RECESS.

MR. MILLER: O.K., AS LONG AS YOU CAN GET THE INFORMATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK AT THIS TIME, I WILL CALL A BRIEF RECESS BECAUSE WE CAN'T CLEAR THIS ITEM UNTIL WE GET THE INFORMATION. IT WILL JUST TAKE A MOMENT.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE MR. MILLER HAS A REPLY TO THE QUESTION.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE END OF FEBRUARY OR FEBRUARY 27, ACTUAL EXPENDITURES FOR THE EDUCATION VOTE WERE \$7,172,168. IN ADDITION, WE HAD UNLIQUIDATED COMMITMENTS AT THAT TIME OF \$282,263. TOTAL OF THOSE TWO ARE \$7,465,431.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WAS THIS AFTER ALL RECOVERIES FOR THAT DEPARTMENT HAD BEEN MADE FROM THE VARIOUS OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DON'T NET THE RECOVERIES IN THE VOTE. THE VOTE IS THE GROSS EXPENDITURE OF THE DEPARTMENT. THE RECOVERIES ARE SHOWN AS A SEPARATE ITEM AND THEY ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE APPROPRIATION FOR SALE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH OF THAT IS RECOVERABLE THEN?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, OF THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL'S EXPENDITURES, USING ROUND FIGURES, WE NORMALLY RECOVER 60% OF THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL EXPENDITURES. THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL EXPENDITURES TO THE END OF FEBRUARY ARE \$1,168,000 OUT OF THE \$7M EXPENDITURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE WE CLEAR THEN?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS THE ONLY RECOVERY?

MR. MILLER: THERE ARE A FEW OTHER MINOR ONES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THEY RELATE PRIMARILY TO RECREATION AND AMATEUR SPORT, RENTAL OF SCHOOLS, SALE OF SUPPLIES AND ALL THE LITTLE BITS THAT WE GET FROM SCHOOL BUSES. IT IS VERY LITTLE

OTHER THAN VOCATIONAL SCHOOL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH IS EXPECTED TO BE SPENT FOR THE MONTH OF MARCH?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT THE DEPARTMENT WHO HAS PUT UP THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE FEEL THAT THEY CAN LIVE WITH THE \$290,000 THAT THEY ARE ASKING FOR IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL PLUS THE \$230,000 THEY HAD AVAILABLE TO THEM AS A FREE BALANCE AT THE END OF FEBRUARY. SO THAT WOULD BE \$526,000 OR \$527,000 WHICH WOULD BE THEIR EXPECTED EXPENDITURE DURING THE MONTH OF MARCH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU SAY OF THE \$282,263, WERE COMMITMENTS. WERE THAT COMMITMENTS PRIOR TO JANUARY 31 OR WAS THAT COMMITMENT INCLUDED IN FEBRUARY?

MR. MILLER: THOSE COMMITMENTS, WERE THE COMMITMENTS OUTSTANDING AS AT THE END OF FEBRUARY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: INCLUDING FEBRUARY.

MR. MILLER: INCLUDING FEBRUARY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE FIRST ITEM IS TERRITORIAL SECRETARY AND REGISTRAR GENERAL - \$5,000.00.

MR. TANNER: I WONDER WHETHER HONOURABLE MEMBERS WANT THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF THAT DEPARTMENT HERE AS A WITNESS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO NEED TO ASK FOR HIM.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WAS ASKING WHETHER THE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE. I NOT ASKING THAT I WANT...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON THE \$5,000.00? NEXT ITEM IS RECORD OFFICE - \$10,000.00. WHAT IS THE BASIC, THIS IS FROM THE CHAIR, WHAT IS THE BASIC CHANGE IN INCREASED RECORDS. IS THIS A NEW PROGRAM?

MR. MILLER: THIS IS BOTH REALLY, IT COVERS ADDITIONAL POSTAGE RESULTING FROM HIGHER VOLUMES OF MAIL AND I BELIEVE THERE WERE SOME ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES IN ADDITION TO THE BUDGETED ITEM FOR SOME BOXES FOR STORING ALL RECORDS IN. THEY ARE MOVING FASTER ON



THE RECORDS RETENTION PROGRAM THAN WE HAD ANTICIPATED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$405,065.00.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, VOTE 5. WE HAVE INCLUDED THIS VOTE 5 IN THIS SUPPLEMENTARY SO THAT MEMBERS COULD SEE THE TRANSFERS THAT ARE TAKING PLACE WITHIN THE VOTE. NOW THERE ARE NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS BEING REQUESTED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DETAIL IS ON PAGE 21.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I EXPLAINED THERE IS NO ADDITIONAL MONEY REQUESTED IN VOTE 5. THIS IS PURELY TO INDICATE TO MEMBERS WHAT TRANSFERS HAVE TAKEN PLACE DURING THE COURSE OF THE YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WANT TO KNOW WHAT THOSE TRANSFERS ARE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, JUST A SECOND, WE WILL JUST NOW GO TO VOTE 5. IT IS FOUND ON PAGE 17. THE FIRST ITEM IS MENTAL HEALTH - \$48,000.

MR. TANNER: APPARENTLY BECAUSE OF THE CHEQUES AND BALANCES UNDER THIS PARTICULAR SECTION OF THE ITEM IT DOESN'T APPEAR ON THE BILL BECAUSE IT WAS A ZERO BALANCE, BUT WE SHOULD PROBABLY GO THROUGH.

O.K.  
MENTAL HEALTH - \$48,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS ALL FOR PRISONERS TO BE MENTALLY ILL? THE EXPLANATION HERE IS TO PROVIDE PAYMENT OF HOSPITAL SPACE FOR CERTAIN PRISONERS FOUND TO BE MENTALLY ILL AND UNFIT TO SERVE THEIR SENTENCES IN PENITENTIARIES AND TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASE IN THE INMATES IN INSTITUTIONS. HOW MANY PRISONERS ARE THERE? WHAT WITH THE INMATES? HOW DO YOU ARRIVE AT \$48,000?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM PLEASED THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED THIS QUESTION. MOST OF THE PROBLEMS IN MENTAL HEALTH SEEMED TO APPEAR WHILE HE WAS IN THAT DEPARTMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT.

MR. TANNER: HOWEVER, IT IS, THE EXPENSE

OCCURRED MR. CHAIRMAN, BECAUSE A NUMBER OF PRISONERS WHICH WEREN'T UNDER OUR DIRECT CONTROL SUDDENLY TURNED UP AND WE HAD TO FIND THE FUNDS TO PICK UP THREE YEARS' COSTS OF HAVING THEM INSTITUTED OUTSIDE. I WILL GIVE A LITTLE FURTHER INFORMATION. IT WAS NO FAULT OF YOUR PAST DEPARTMENT MR. CHAMBERLIST. THIS OCCURRED BECAUSE THE INSTITUTE THAT HAD THESE INMATES DIDN'T BILL THE DEPARTMENT BETWEEN THE YEARS AND WE FINALLY PICKED IT UP WITHIN THE LAST TWO OR THREE MONTHS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS AN AREA WHERE WE MUST NOT ACCEPT A LUMP SUM. I WANT A BREAK-DOWN OF THAT \$48,000. NOW CAN WE GET A BREAK-DOWN? I DON'T WANT TO APPROVE \$48,000 WITHOUT KNOWING HOW THE \$48,000 CAME ABOUT. NOW, CAN WE GET SOMETHING FROM THE TREASURER?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE IT AT HAND AND I AM QUITE SURE THAT THE FIGURES CAN BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BEFORE WE GO . . . INTERRUPTED . . . VOTE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT THESE FIGURES TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE HOUSE, NOT TO ME.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THIS THREE YEAR PAYMENT WAS IN RESPECT OF TWO PRISONERS AND THE PAYMENTS WERE APPROXIMATELY \$30,000 IN RESPECT OF THOSE TWO PERSONS.  
IN ADDITION, THERE WAS A \$4.00 PER DIEM INCREASE IN THE RATES CHARGED IN OUTSIDE INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAS CAUSED THE FURTHER \$18,000 INCREASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS IT INDICATED NOW THAT THE YUKON HOSPITAL INSURANCE SCHEME DOES NOT COVER MENTALLY ILL PATIENTS?

MR. TANNER: NOT SPECIFICALLY, IT ALL DEPENDS ON WHAT REASON THEY WERE INSTITUTIONALIZED AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MUST HAVE KNOWN THIS WHEN HE WAS IN THAT DEPARTMENT. THERE ARE SOME PATIENTS WHICH ARE PUT INTO AN INSTITUTION BY THE COURTS AND OUR, THAT VOTE DOES NOT COVER THOSE PATIENTS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS INSUFFICIENT EXPLANATION OR DOCUMENTATION TO SUPPORT THE INCREASE OF \$48,000 IN THIS PARTICULAR ITEM. I WANT TO KNOW WHAT, MORE ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR SITUATION, NOT NECESSARILY THE NAMES OF THE PATIENTS, BUT UNDER WHAT CIRCUM-

STANCES THESE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN PLACED IN A MENTAL HEALTH CARE. NOW, TO ACCEPT \$48,000 AS AN ITEM LIKE THIS, WITHOUT HAVING THAT INFORMATION, IT WOULD BE MOST IMPROPER. I WILL ASK IF COUNCILLOR TANNER WOULD BRING THAT INFORMATION FORWARD, SO THAT COUNCIL CAN AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE MANNER IN WHICH THE MONEY IS BEING SPENT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THOUGHT THE EXPLANATION GIVEN BY MYSELF AND MR. MILLER DID COVER THE SUBJECT. FIRST OF ALL WE ARE CAUGHT IN A BIND BECAUSE THE INSTITUTES OUTSIDE SET THE RATES AND WE HAVE NO CONTROL OVER THE RATE AND THEY HAVE INCREASED THE RATE BY \$2.00 PER DAY APPROXIMATELY AND ALL PATIENTS THAT WE HAVE OUT THERE IN THAT RESPECT COST US \$18,000 A YEAR. THE OTHER \$30,000 WAS TO PICK UP TWO PATIENTS WHO WERE IN AN INSTITUTION OUTSIDE OF THE YUKON FOR THREE YEARS. THE INSTITUTE DIDN'T BILL THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT. CONSEQUENTLY, WE HAVE GOT THREE YEARS' BILLS FOR THEM IN A TOTAL AND THAT IS WHY YOU'VE GOT SUCH A HIGH COST OF \$30,000. IN OTHER WORDS IT COST US \$15,000 A YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF IT AND WHETHER OR NOT THESE CHARGES CAN'T RIGHTLY BE PUT AGAINST THE YUKON HOSPITAL INSURANCE PLAN. FROM THE TOP OF MY HEAD AND I HAVE TO GO BACK ON IT, THERE IS PROVISION UNDER CERTAIN AREAS FOR THIS TO HAPPEN. THAT IS WHY I WANT THE DETAILS ON IT. ONCE WE HAVE THE DETAILS, WE'LL HAVE A LOOK. I WANT THE AMOUNTS, WHAT THE BILLING IS FOR AND THEN GO INTO THE YUKON HOSPITAL INSURANCE SCHEME TO SEE IF IN FACT THAT SHOULD NOT BE BILLED TO THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE SCHEME WHICH IS A COST SHARING PROPOSITION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER, JUST AT THIS POINT, IF IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE THAT THE ADMINISTRATION OR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER COULD PREPARE A MEMO OR MEMORANDUM SETTING OUT THE INFORMATION BEING REQUESTED?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL BRING THAT INFORMATION FORWARD. BUT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS NOT QUITE CORRECT, HE HAS GOT IT PRACTICALLY ALRIGHT, EXCEPT FOR CASES WHERE THE COURT COMMITS THEM, AND THIS IS WHAT THE CASE IS HERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL THIS IS THE INFORMATION WE WANT TO BRING FORWARD. ONCE YOU BRING THAT

FORWARD, I WILL BE ABLE TO DEAL WITH IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I PASS THEN TO THE NEXT ITEM IS SUBSIDIZED MEDICAL TRAVEL IN THE AMOUNT OF \$77,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF COUNCILLOR TANNER CAN INDICATE HOW MANY CASES OF SUBSIDIZED TRAVEL SINCE THIS NEW SCHEME HAS BEEN PUT INTO EFFECT, THAT IS THE COMPLETE COST OF SUBSIDIZED TRAVEL.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ALL MEMBERS I AM SURE ARE QUITE FAMILIAR WITH HOW THIS HAS COME ABOUT. I AM GOING TO GIVE THE EXPLANATION BECAUSE I THINK THE PRESS SHOULD REPORT IT BECAUSE THERE SEEMS TO BE AN OPINION ABOARD THAT SUBSIDIZED MEDICAL TRAVEL IS PAID FOR OUT OF THE MEDICARE SCHEME AND IT ISN'T. ITS PAID FOR AS A SEPARATE VOTE WITHIN OUR BUDGET AND MEMBERS WILL RECALL THAT IN THE SPRING OF THIS PAST YEAR THEY ASKED THAT WE TAKE AWAY THE CONTRIBUTION ON THE PART OF THE PATIENT OF \$100 PER EVACUATION AND YOU WILL FIND THAT OUR BUDGET HAS NOW INFLATED FROM A VOTE LAST YEAR, MR. CHAIRMAN, OF \$37,000 TO A VOTE OF \$37,000 PLUS WENT UP TO \$77,000. NOW THE QUESTION THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED; OBVIOUSLY I CAN'T GIVE THEM OFF HAND. I SUPPOSE THAT FIGURE IS AVAILABLE AND IF SO I WILL BRING IT FORWARD AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS A DECREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$55,000 UNDER YUKON HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF COUNCILLOR TANNER COULD GIVE AN EXPLANATION OF THE DECREASE.

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, BASICALLY WHAT IT IS DEPENDENT ON THE MEDICAL REFEREE AND FUNDS THAT WE ANTICIPATE AND CAN'T ACTUALLY VOTE EACH YEAR AND YOU WILL FIND THAT AS YOU GO FURTHER THROUGH THE BUDGET THERE ARE OTHER VOTES THAT ARE HARD TO ANTICIPATE AND THIS IS ONE WHERE BILLS HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO MEDICAL REFEREE, THEY HAVE NOT YET BEEN SETTLED. THIS YEAR END WE HAVE THAT MONEY ON HAND.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF WE HAVE THIS MONEY IN HAND, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE HAVE THIS MONEY IN HAND ON THE BOOKS OR OTHERWISE, WHY ARE WE THEN TAKING IT AWAY TO USE IN ANOTHER VOTE? I WONDER IF MR. MILLER WILL EXPLAIN THAT?



Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE ARE NOT TAKING IT AWAY TO USE AS ANOTHER VOTE, WE ARE USING IT WITHIN THE SAME VOTE FOR ANOTHER PART OF THE HEALTH VOTE. THIS HAS BEEN OUR COMMON PRACTICE OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS TO MY KNOWLEDGE WHERE WE HAVE COME TO COUNCIL AND LAID THE FACTS ON THE TABLE, WHERE WE HAVE OVER-ESTIMATED FOR SOME PARTICULAR REASON. WE HAVE TAKEN THOSE FUNDS AND USED THEM TO COVER UNDER-ESTIMATES.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS AMOUNT OF \$55,000 INCLUSIVE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COST SHARES?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHEN WE ARE LOOKING AT THIS SIDE OF THE APPROPRIATION ITS THE GROSS FIGURE NOT THE NET FIGURE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: SO THAT THEREFORE, IT INCLUDES THE FEDERAL PORTION OF THE PAYMENT. CAN WE GET AN ANSWER TO THAT? YES OR NO.

Mr. MILLER: THIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IS THE COST... THE GROSS COST TO A HOSPITAL. THE PORTION THAT WE RECOVER FROM CANADA WOULD BE SHOWN UNDER A RECOVERY. NOW OUR COSTS HAVE GONE DOWN, OUR RECOVERIES WILL SUBSEQUENTLY GO DOWN FROM IT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IS IT NOT SO THAT THE RECOVERY AMOUNT IS WITHIN THE AMOUNT OF THE EXPENDITURE ON ANY ITEM.

Mr. MILLER: I JUST MAYBE NOT CLEAR ON THE QUESTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. MILLER, WOULD ANSWER THIS. WHERE THERE ARE ESTIMATES IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATES ARE THE AMOUNTS OF MONIES THAT WE GET FROM OTHER SOURCES AS WELL AS OUR OWN SOURCE. NOW WOULD IT BE FIRSTLY CORRECT TO SAY THAT THE AMOUNT IN ESTABLISHMENT 515 WHEN ITS FIRST, WHEN WE BRING IT FORWARD AT BUDGET TIME, IS THE TOTAL AMOUNT A GROSS AMOUNT WHICH INCLUDES THE MONIES FROM OTHER AGENCIES, IS THAT RIGHT?

Mr. MILLER: NOT QUITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT IS A GROSS AMOUNT OF WHAT WE EXPECT TO PAY TO HOSPITALS. NOW, ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN, WE DO INCLUDE A RECOVERY WHICH INDICATES WHAT WE EXPECT TO RECOVER FROM OTTAWA.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IN RECOVERING, THE RECOVERY, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IS A RECOVERY PORTION OF THAT WHICH YOU EXPECT TO PAY. ISN'T THAT RIGHT?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS CORRECT. THE AMOUNT THAT WE RECOVER RELATES TO OUR EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT, O.K. NOW, WHAT I'M SAYING IS THIS, THAT THE AMOUNT THAT YOU HAVEN'T SPENT - \$55,000 IN THAT \$5,000 AMOUNT THERE IS ALSO INCLUDED AN AMOUNT THAT YOU WOULD HAVE EXPECTED TO GET BY WAY OF RECOVERY. IS THAT RIGHT?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, ITS NOT INCLUDED IN THE \$55,000. I SEE WHAT YOU ARE GETTING AT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: OF COURSE YOU SEE WHAT I AM GETTING AT. HE KNOWS WHAT I AM GETTING AT. BECAUSE WE UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

I WOULD ASK FOR ORDER BECAUSE IT MAKES IT DIFFICULT FOR THE STENOGRAPHERS TO INTERPRET MANY PEOPLE SPEAKING AT THE SAME TIME. WOULD YOU CONTINUE COUNCILLOR.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS ALREADY AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN US Mr. MILLER THAT THE AMOUNT OF MONEY EXPENDED TO PAY FOR HOSPITAL SERVICES IS IN THAT 515 VOTE. WE HAVE AGREED ON THAT. SO THAT ANY MONEY THAT IS LEFT OVER FROM WHAT WAS EXPECTED TO BE EXPENDED INCLUDES ANY MONIES THAT WOULD NORMALLY BE RECOVERED TOWARDS MEETING THAT AMOUNT. IS THAT CORRECT?

Mr. MILLER: CORRECT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. NOW WE COME TO THE NEXT QUESTION.. WE ALL TRANSFER IN HERE, FUNDS FROM ONE ESTABLISHMENT INTO ANOTHER. NOW IN ESSENCE, WE ARE, IF THE CASE WAS THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN WOULD BE NEEDING EXTRA MONEY, YOU WOULD BE TAKING ADDITIONAL MONEY FROM A SOURCE WHICH WAS TO BE USED FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE AND PLACING IT INTO ANOTHER AREA WHERE YOU SHOULD NOT BE PUTTING IT INTO. THIS IS WHY I AM QUESTIONING THIS REFERENCE TO THE TRANSFER AND COMING OUT HERE WITH A NEW BALANCE. NOW ISN'T THIS RIGHT?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I GET WHAT THE

MEMBER IS STRIVING AT. IF WE WERE NET VOTING THESE ITEMS, WHICH WE ARE NOT DOING, I WOULD AGREE WITH YOU. WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE IS ONLY TALKING ABOUT GROSS DOLLARS. NOW, WHEN WE BOIL THE THING OUT AGAIN, IGNORING THE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS, WHEN WE BOIL THE THING DOWN AT THE END OF THE YEAR WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A BUDGETED CIRCLE. THE FACT THAT WE USE YUKON HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES AS AN OFFSET IN THIS CASE IS NOT GOING TO EFFECT US.

Mr. Chamberlist: NOW THE MONIES THAT THIS COUNCIL HAS VOTED IN THIS VOTE AND TAKE THE LAST FOUR ESTABLISHMENTS, 515, 525, 531 AND 532. THE TOTAL MONEY OF WHAT WAS VOTED FOR THERE IS GOING TO BE USED LESS THE TOTAL OF THOSE AMOUNTS. AM I CORRECT THERE?

Mr. Miller: YES.

Mr. Chamberlist: ALRIGHT, THEN WHAT IS NOT GOING TO BE USED IN THOSE AMOUNTS, YOU ARE GOING TO TAKE THOSE AMOUNTS AND YOU ARE GOING TO USE THEM, THOSE AMOUNTS OF MONEY, FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSIDIZED MEDICAL TRAVEL. IS THAT CORRECT?

Mr. Miller: YES.

Mr. Chamberlist: ALRIGHT, IN THAT CASE ALTHOUGH WE HAVEN'T DEALT WITH THAT ITEM BECAUSE I'VE GOT THERE THINGS TO SAY IN THIS; TAKE FOR INSTANCE THIS \$70,000 ON YUKON HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN. WE ARE GOING TO TAKE MONEY WHICH INCLUDES WHAT WAS ESTIMATED FOR, THE PREMIUMS PAID BY THE PUBLIC WHICH IS IN THAT, AND WE ARE GOING TO USE IT FOR MENTAL HEALTH BECAUSE YOU ARE TAKING THOSE FIGURES AND USING THAT MONEY THERE. YOU ARE THINKING AHEAD, NOW YOU'VE ALREADY AGREED WITH ME THAT THATS THE TOTAL THAT BALANCES THAT OFF.

Mr. Miller: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT REAL DOLLARS AND CENTS HERE, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT APPROPRIATED OR ESTIMATED DOLLARS. AND THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT POINT. WHEN YOU COME TO THE REAL DOLLARS AND CENTS, THE CASH IN THE BANK, WE ARE NOT ADJUSTING THAT ONE DODA. ALL WE ARE DOING IS ADJUSTING THE APPROPRIATED DOLLARS.

Mr. Chamberlist: WHEN YOU APPROPRIATE DOLLARS, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I AM SPEAKING FROM THE CHAIR. THEN YOU APPROPRIATE DOLLARS, YOU APPROPRIATE DOLLARS

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SPENDING THAT MONEY AND WHEN YOU HAVEN'T GOT THAT MONEY TO SPEND, AND WHEN YOU HAVEN'T SPENT THAT MONEY, WHAT IS LEFT OVER IS WHAT YOU ARE PUTTING INTO ANOTHER VOTE WHERE THERE, ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT, THERE IS A SHORTAGE. THEN YOU HAVE TWO ITEMS SHOWING THAT THERE IS SHORTAGE IN SUBSIDIZED MEDICAL TRAVEL AND A SHORTAGE IN MENTAL HEALTH. THEREFORE, IT APPEARS HERE, AND I THINK THIS QUESTION HAS BEEN RAISED BEFORE AND VERY UNSATISFACTORY, THAT ARE SHOWING AN AREA THAT YOU ARE TAKING FUNDS THAT COME IN APPROPRIATED FUNDS. THAT COME IN WHAT YOU EXPECT TO SPEND, ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES AND YOU ARE GOING TO USE IT FOR PURPOSES WHICH I SAY THAT YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO USE IT FOR. ALTHOUGH IT IS WITHIN THE SAME VOTE. SOME OF IT IS MONEY THAT IS GIVEN TO THE PUBLIC POCKET IN PREMIUMS AND IT IS THE INTENTION HERE TO USE THAT MONEY THAT HAS BEEN APPROPRIATED INTO ANOTHER AREA.

Mr. Miller: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS NOT AT ALL CORRECT. THIS ESTIMATE COULD HAVE BEEN PUT UP TO THIS COUNCIL SHOWING THE MENTAL HEALTH, THE SUBSIDIZED MEDICAL TRAVEL AND THE CORRECTIONS BRANCH, ADDITIONAL FUNDS REQUIRED. WE COULD HAVE PUT IT UP THAT WAY. THEN TOLD YOU AT THE END, WHEN WE WERE ALL FINISHED THAT IT WASN'T NEW MONEY BECAUSE REALLY WE HAD ALL THIS OTHER MONEY THAT WASN'T BEING SPENT.

Mr. Chamberlist: YOU DON'T THINK THAT I WOULD ACCEPT THAT FROM YOU FOR ONE MOMENT, DO YOU?

Mr. Miller: Mr. CHAIRMAN ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

Mr. Miller: WE DIDN'T DO THAT. WHAT WE ARE SAYING HERE IS THAT THIS COUNCIL APPROPRIATED MONEY FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE AND HEALTH CARE INSURANCE AND CHILD WELFARE AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE. IT ISN'T GOING TO BE SPENT. THEY DIDN'T APPROPRIATE CASH. THEY APPROPRIATED ESTIMATED DOLLARS. WHEN WE COME TO THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN, WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT DOLLARS HERE FOR THE PEOPLE TO PUT UP IN PREMIUMS. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT AN ESTIMATE IN DOLLARS WE THOUGHT WE WOULD SPEND. THE ACTUAL ACCOUNTING FOR THAT PLAN IS SEPARATE AND DISTINCT. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS APPROPRIATION.



Mr. Chamberlist: I wonder if we can approve that \$55,000.00, I would be glad to finish this debate and I want to go onto the next item.

Mr. Chairman: Clear on the \$55,000.00. The next item is Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan. A decrease of \$70,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: If there is a decrease of \$70,000.00, the amount of money expended one must assume is the amount that has been estimated for and appropriated less \$70,000.00. But would Mr. Miller agree with that point?

Mr. Miller: That is correct.

Mr. Chamberlist: I happen to know, and there is a Sessional Paper here that says so, that there was nearly \$600,000.00 that has been saved in two years for that. How can you say now that only \$70,000.00 of the total amount have not been expendible? An explanation for that.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, again, in our main estimates for 1973-74, we have appropriated \$1,312,000.00 for Y.H.C.I.T. Our current estimate of expenditures for Y.H.C.I.T. are \$1,242,000.00. Now that is only the expenditure side. The majority of the funds that are in the surplus account shown on that paper that was tabled on Y.H.C.I.T., the \$600,000.00 are from increased revenues. In addition to our estimates on the premiums and recoveries from the Canadian Government.

Mr. Chamberlist: You are not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Miller is not attempting to suggest to me that the increased revenues is between the amount of \$70,000.00 and the amount that was left is the amount of increased revenues. Why are there increased revenues when you know this is not so?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, if I have mislead the Member, I am sorry. All I was suggesting that the \$600,000.00 in the Y.H.C.I.T. account is an accumulated surplus which represents the net of the revenues received from either premiums or recoveries under the--from the Federal Government, less the expenditures that we will have made under that plan until the end of March, 1974.

Mr. Chamberlist: I am suggesting to you that your bookkeeping method is misleading the public because having a look at it in this way is

showing a difference of \$70,000.00 between one that has been estimated and appropriated from the public purse so that the expenditures that you see is \$1,242,000.00 when you know full well that \$1,242,000.00 has not been expended. Do you say, Mr. Chairman I want to get an answer to this question, do you say that of the \$1,312,000.00 which was appropriated that \$1,242,000.00 has been spent?

Mr. Miller: I am suggesting Mr. Chairman that will be what is spent at the end of March 1974.

Mr. Chamberlist: So if from \$1,000,000.00, if the difference from that, from \$1,000,000.00-- I hope that Members will listen to this very carefully because really this is a case of governmental bookkeeping, you know, which is just made to look good, but there is something that I don't like about this and it is clear now. Here we have from the witness. Agreement that \$1,312,000.00 was appropriated. That \$1,242,000.00 will be the expenditure up to March 31, and that therefore, there would be \$70,000.00 which would be left over from the appropriation. If that is the case, how could there be \$300,000.00 let's say for this year or more in actual cash. How the figures just don't work, do they?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, what I am referring to there is a difference between the appropriations of the Territory and the accounting that takes place. The appropriations are Council's authority to spend money. The actual money spent may or may not bear any relationship to the appropriation in terms of the dollars.

Mr. Chamberlist: I just want to go over this point, once more and see if we can get the same answers. One million, three hundred and twelve thousand has been appropriated, because these have been the estimates for the Health Care Insurance Plan. Do I get agreement with that?

Mr. Miller: Correct.

Mr. Chamberlist: The amount of money expended on those appropriations is \$1,242,000.00.

Mr. Miller: Correct.

Mr. Chamberlist: This leaves the \$70,000.00 that is here. Now we have agreed on that so far.

Mr. MILLER: CORRECT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH IN ACTUAL MONEY THEN HAS COME INTO THE END OF MARCH OR WILL COME INTO THE END OF MARCH 31st?

Mr. MILLER: I AM SORRY, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DIDN'T BRING THE REVENUES WITH ME. I ONLY BROUGHT THE EXPENDITURES. I THINK THAT THEY WERE IN THE PAPER THAT WAS PRESENTED.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NOW LET'S JUST TAKE A LOOK AND GET AN ANSWER TO THIS ONE. IT DOESN'T COVER IT AND THIS IS THE POINT THAT I'M SAYING BECAUSE IT DOESN'T SHOW THE AMOUNT OF MONEY. ALL I WANT TO KNOW IS THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT IS COMING IN TO THE WHOLE OF 1973-74 BECAUSE ACCORDING TO THESE FIGURES AND ACCORDING TO WHAT Mr. MILLER HAS SAID, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT WITH THE SURPLUS ... HOW MUCH IS THE SURPLUS HERE, Mr. MILLER. DO YOU KNOW APPROXIMATELY?

Mr. MILLER: TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THE SURPLUS IS \$680,000.00.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS FOR TWO YEARS?

Mr. MILLER: IT IS MADE UP OF APPROXIMATELY OF \$250,000.00 FROM 1972-73 AND THAT WOULD LEAVE \$400,000.00.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: SO THAT WE MUST PRESUME THEN FROM WHAT YOU HAVE SAID THAT SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND TWELVE THOUSAND HAS COME IN BY WAY OF MONEY BY PREMIUMS. IS THAT CORRECT?

Mr. MILLER: APPROXIMATELY, \$1,642,000.00

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-TWO THOUSAND? IS THIS THE FIGURE? IS THIS THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT HAS COME IN?

Mr. MILLER: I WOULD ASSUME SO, Mr. CHAIRMAN. I DON'T HAVE THAT FIGURE HANDY. I CAN GET IT AND WOULD BE GLAD TO DO SO.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THAT BEFORE WE GO ON. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT POINT HERE AND I WANT TO SEE THAT FIGURE.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, ACTUALLY THAT FIGURE DOESN'T DIRECTLY RELATE TO THE APPROPRIATION AND ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES AT THIS TIME. SO COULDN'T WE NOT CLEAR THIS AND THE INFORMATION BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE, ONE AT A TIME.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: SHE DOESN'T KNOW THAT. SHE HASN'T LEARNED THAT.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS INTERJECT.

Mrs. WATSON: THANK YOU.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: JUST BECAUSE YOU'RE A FEMALE THAT'S ALL.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THE REASON WHY I ASKED FOR THIS PARTICULAR ITEM BECAUSE THESE FIGURES DON'T JIVE, AND I THINK IT WOULD BE IMPROPER FOR US NOT TO RECOGNIZE WHAT IS TAKING PLACE HERE IS A MANNER IN WHICH TO BALANCE UP; TO BRING A REAL BALANCE ABOUT AND NOT DISCLOSE THE TRUE AMOUNTS OF MONIES THAT HAVE COME IN UNDER THE HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN AND WHAT AMOUNT OF MONIES ARE BEING TRANSFERRED FROM ONE ESTABLISHMENT TO ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT. IN THE SAME VOTE. ESPECIALLY WHEN THE SUGGESTION AFTER ALL THESE FIGURES THAT I HAVE ASKED FOR SHOWS THAT THERE IS A HUGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A \$70,000.00 AMOUNT AND A \$400,000.00 AMOUNT. COULD I GET THIS FIGURE? WOULD IT TAKE LONG? COULD WE HAVE A FEW MINUTES RECESS?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THIS QUESTION OF Mr. MILLER. WOULD THIS TAKE TIME ...

Mr. MILLER: I THINK IT IS IN MY OFFICE, IF YOU COULD GIVE ME TEN MINUTES, I WILL GO DOWN AND GET IT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: COUNCIL RECESS FOR A FEW MINUTES.

RECESS



Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this time I will call COMMITTEE back to order, and I believe that Mr. MILLER has some answers to questions.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'm not entirely sure I can answer the Honourable Member's question at this time. The figures that I have available to me are on a cash basis, not on an accrual basis. There is quite a difference in this program. On a cash basis at the end of this fiscal year, we anticipate having a cash surplus, money in the bank, of \$485,000.00, which is made up of a cash surplus at the end of the last fiscal year of \$375,000.00, and a cash surplus this year of \$110,000.00. The \$110,000.00 represents premiums in excess of our estimate. Go ahead.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Sessional Paper has indicated that something like \$600,000.00 surplus. Now where - this is a \$600,000.00 surplus to the end of the year, actual money in the bank, based on the same basis.

Mr. MILLER: No it isn't.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Now, I know there is one month ahead, but this applies to the year previously when it would start because the years of 1971-72, that would be the end of May, 1972, would have taken care of that month. This is not what I'm asking for - not withstanding you come up with this \$485,000.00. What I am trying to ascertain from you, and I repeat again, based on the figures that are in here, how can you say that \$70,000.00 is the only difference when you are going to have \$485,000.00 in the bank. You are just saying that this year we are just going to have a surplus of \$110,000.00. Is this what you are saying now?

Mr. MILLER: On a cash basis, that's correct Mr. CHAIRMAN. If the Honourable Member would give me the weekend I will present a statement to him on Monday showing the cash basis and the accrual basis on which this plan works, and the difference between the two. It is a very difficult subject to discuss without having the figures available in a statement form.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: I would suggest then, Mr. CHAIRMAN, we just report progress on this item and on Monday we will get that information.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, this has nothing to do with this item, the statement which he is going to present. It really does not have anything to do with it so I would suggest that we clear this item, and add that the Honourable Member obtained the information that he requested from the Treasurer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think this is a matter that everyone is concerned about, and if there is information we will just stand over that particular section, but we can't continue with the bill. I think that would be normal.

Mr. STUTTER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, in this particular instance this bill, this particular part that we are discussing now, has an end result of zero. It does not in any way affect the dollars involved in Bill #2.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: That's right. That's right.

Mr. STUTTER: It can be discussed even though the bill were passed.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Right, I'm not arguing against this. I'm saying that the item should be left. We shouldn't come to discussion on the item.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I can't agree with the Honourable Member. I think we can clear the item and it can be discussed when we get to the budget - when that Sessional Paper comes into effect, just as easily as now. As the Honourable Member from Dawson points out, there is a net balance at the end of this vote so what difference does it make to the vote that we want to pass in the Supplementary.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Because there may not be a net balance once we have a look at the other figures.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Generally, when we go through, let us not get tangled again in the matter of procedure. We will stand and circle this item as we do normally.

AND THE REVIEW OF ESTIMATES WILL CARRY MOST OF THE INFORMATION. I BELIEVE THAT FURTHER INFORMATION WILL BE FORTHCOMING FROM MR. MILLER WHENEVER HE CAN GET IT HERE. NOW THE NEXT ITEM IS CHILD WELFARE SERVICES WHICH IS A DECREASE OF \$26,000.00.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FOLLOWING 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 ITEMS ARE ALL THE TYPE OF A PROGRAMME THAT ARE VERY DIFFICULT TO PREDICT. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS WHEN HE WAS IN THIS POSITION - IN FACT, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE PREDICTIONS BUT THEY ARE DIFFICULT TO PREDICT BECAUSE YOU ARE TRYING TO PREDICT WHAT SORT OF ASSISTANCE IS GOING TO BE NEEDED IN THE COMING YEAR SO THE NEXT FIVE ITEMS ARE ALL REDUCTIONS, THE REASON BEING THAT YOU CANNOT ACCURATELY SAY WHAT YOUR EXPENSES ARE GOING TO BE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON CHILD WELFARE SERVICES \$26,000.00?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS SOCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$26,000.00. WHY IN THIS... PARTICULAR, I JUST CAN'T RECALL FROM THE CHAIR, HOW MUCH MONEY WAS ESTIMATED.

MR. TANNER: \$465,000.00 I THINK.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHY THIS PARTICULAR REDUCTION?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE CASELOAD AND THE EXPENDITURES UNDER THE CASELOAD ARE LESS THAN WHAT WE ANTICIPATED WHEN WE PUT TOGETHER THE BUDGET WHICH REFLECTS A DECREASE IN THE CASELOAD FROM OUR PROJECTIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT THAT IT WAS GOING THE OTHER WAY. ANYTHING FURTHER ON SOCIAL ASSISTANCE? NEXT ITEM IS CATEGORICAL ALLOWANCES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000.00. CLEAR?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS CHILDREN'S GROUP HOMES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT DOES COUNCILLOR TANNER INDICATE WHERE THE REDUCTION OCCURS IN THIS PARTICULAR ITEM.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T RECALL, I COULDN'T TELL YOU THE EXACT FIGURE, BUT I THOUGHT THE QUESTION THE MEMBER MIGHT HAVE ASKED IS DOES THIS INCLUDE THE COST OF THE FIRE THAT WE HAD IN ONE OF THE HOMES?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WILL COME TO THAT.

MR. TANNER: I WILL PRE-EMPT YOU ON THAT ONE BECAUSE THAT COMES IN A DIFFERENT VOTE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, OF COURSE. THAT'S WHY I WILL COME TO IT LATER.

MR. TANNER: IT IS IN A SUPPLEMENTARY. AS FAR AS THE SPECIFIC CASE ON THAT PARTICULAR ONE, I COULDN'T TELL YOU; PERHAPS MR. MILLER CAN TELL YOU.

MR. MILLER: IT'S JUST A STRAIGHT OVER ESTIMATE, IN OTHER WORDS THE FUNDS THAT WE APPROPRIATED IN 1973-74 WERE IN EXCESS OF THE NEED AND WHEN YOU GET TO THE FOUR-FIVE BUDGETS YOU WILL SEE THAT DECREASE REFLECTED.

MR. TANNER: THAT APPLIES TO THE PREVIOUS ONE TOO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON CHILDREN'S GROUP HOMES?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT IS ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ADDICTION SERVICES \$20,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I THINK, IS THIS FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE COST OF THE ALCOHOLISM SUPERVISOR THAT WAS -- ARE WE GOING TO, ARE WE BRINGING THIS AMOUNT BACK IN THE NEXT PROVISION CLAUSE IN THE BUDGET?

MR. MILLER: THERE IS PROVISION, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR THE ALCOHOLISM PROGRAM IN NEXT YEAR'S BUDGET.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS CORRECTIONS BRANCH \$90,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE GET A BREAKDOWN OF



THIS ITEM?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE BASIC REASON FOR THE \$90,000.00 INCREASE IN THIS VOTE, AND A VERY GENUINE QUESTION. I WOULD SAY THE FIRST ONE ON THIS VOTE, AS IT SAYS THERE, WE ANTICIPATED THE KIND OF COST WE ANTICIPATED. ONE OF THEM WAS THE AGREEMENT. THE EMPLOYEE AGREEMENT WHICH WE MADE WITH THOSE PARTICULAR EMPLOYEES WAS 5% OR 6% HIGHER THAN IT WAS WITH THE BALANCE OF THE EMPLOYEES TO BRING THEM INTO LINE WITH THEM. OF COURSE, THE OBVIOUS INCREASE IN THE COST OF FOOD IN BOTH INSTITUTES IN THE LAST YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD BE MORE SPECIFIC WHEN HE SAYS 5% OR 6%. IT'S LIKE SAYING TO SOMEBODY, I'M PREPARED TO GIVE YOU \$5,000 OR \$6,000. WHICH AMOUNT DO YOU WANT TO TAKE?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WAS CONSISTENT OF ALL THE EMPLOYEES AND PERHAPS MR. MILLER CAN TELL US THAT. I THINK IT WAS 5.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PROVISION IN THE ORIGINAL BUDGET FOR A WAGE INCREASE, WAS A 5% INCREASE. DURING THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, OR AS A RESULT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, THE CORRECTION OFFICERS AND THE COOKS WERE GRANTED THE 8% INCREASE WHICH ALL EMPLOYEES GOT AND IN ADDITION, THEY WERE GRANTED AT LEAST A 1 STEP RISE IN THE SCALE WHICH EQUATED IN MOST CASES TO SOME 15% OR 16% COMPOUNDED OVER THEIR PREVIOUS SALARY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH OF THIS \$90,000 IS INCLUDED IN THOSE PARTICULAR EMPLOYMENT INCREASES THAT HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO?

MR. MILLER: TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WOULD EQUATE TO APPROXIMATELY \$75,000 OF THE \$90,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE OTHER \$15,000 FOR?

MR. MILLER: THE ADDITIONAL \$15,000 COVERS FOOD, THE VERY LARGE INCREASE IN THE COST OF FOOD. THE LAST FIGURES THAT WE HAD THAT I SAW ON THIS MATTER INDICATED THAT THE FOOD IN THE TWO INSTITUTIONS HAD INCREASED BY 26%.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$405,065. DETAILS ARE ON PAGE 21. THE FIRST ITEM IS COMMUNITY PLANNING AND LAND DISPOSAL- \$178, 065.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, ARE WE TO UNDERSTAND THAT \$178,000 ODD IS BEING SPENT ON STUDIES? IT HAS BEEN SPENT ON STUDIES IN THIS PAST YEAR?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS RIGHT, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE AMOUNT OF MONEY WE HAVE SPENT OR COMMITTED OURSELVES TO SPEND ON STUDIES IN THE LAST YEAR IS \$239,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH OF THIS HAS BEEN COMMITTED SINCE THE END OF SEPTEMBER?

MR. MILLER: I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT JUST OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD, THERE WAS PROBABLY \$4,000 OF IT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, FROM THE PREVIOUS QUESTION, I UNDERSTOOD IT, THAT THE FUNDS WERE PHYSICALLY EXPENDED AFTER SEPTEMBER, OR WAS A DECISION MADE TO EXPEND THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER. COULD THE MEMBER ELUCIDATE WHAT HE MEANS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS ANYBODY HAVING TROUBLE UNDERSTANDING MY ENGLISH?

MR. TANNER: YES, I AM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU KNOW, THAT IS PRETTY STRANGE FOR THESE PEOPLE WHO COME FROM A PART OF THE --

MR. CHAIRMAN: COULD WE PROCEED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE QUESTION: HOW MUCH OF IT WAS EXPENDED AFTER SEPTEMBER? I THINK THAT MR. MILLER HAS ANSWERED THE QUESTION. I AM SATISFIED WITH THE ANSWER. IT WAS A SIMPLE QUESTION. I GOT A SIMPLE ANSWER. IT WASN'T FROM A SIMPLE PERSON EITHER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. TANNER.

MR. TANNER: IT DOESN'T MATTER, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW IN THIS \$178,065, LET ME PUT IT THIS WAY, BECAUSE I DON'T RECALL WHETHER THESE EXPENDITURES, THESE STUDIES, WERE AUTHORIZED BY THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL OR

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I DON'T RECALL WHAT WAS DONE THERE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATES FOR THIS PARTICULAR ESTABLISHMENT INCLUDED STUDY MONEY OF \$41,000.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN WERE THE STUDIES INITIATED?

MR. MILLER: THE MAJORITY OF THESE STUDIES WERE INITIATED LAST SUMMER AND SOME OF THEM FAIRLY EARLY IN THE SUMMER.

MR. TANNER: THEN, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS JUST LOGICAL TO ASSUME THAT THE DECISION TO INITIATE THOSE STUDIES WAS MADE PRIOR TO JUNE, BUT AFTER THE LAST TERRITORIAL BUDGET SESSION.

MR. MILLER: I WOULD ASSUME THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. TANNER: THERE, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS LOGICAL TO ASSUME THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SHOULD KNOW VERY WELL WHAT THESE STUDIES ARE ABOUT BECAUSE HE, AS ON THE EXECUTIVE, MADE THAT DECISION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DIDN'T ASK THAT. I KNOW WHAT THEY ARE ABOUT. YOU ARE GETTING MOUTHY HERE. YOU ARE GETTING DIZZY AGAIN. WHAT I WANT TO KNOW IS, WHETHER, BECAUSE I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHETHER THEY WERE BY RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR BY COUNCIL. I WONDER IF I CAN BE REFRESHED.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE MAJORITY OF THESE WERE BY RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT, NOW. WERE THESE STUDIES BROUGHT FORWARD? NO, THE QUESTION I SHOULD ASK IS WHY WASN'T REFERENCE MADE TO THESE STUDIES DURING THE SPECIAL SESSION OF OCTOBER? THIS WAS AFTER I LEFT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

MR. MILLER: I'M AFRAID I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF THE COMMISSIONER WILL ANSWER THAT BECAUSE HE SEEMS TO BE SPENDING THE PUBLIC'S MONEY WITHOUT TELLING THE ELECTED PEOPLE ABOUT IT. PERHAPS, HE CAN ANSWER THAT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN--

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HE DOESN'T WANT TO ANSWER THAT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY I ASK. BESIDES THE SESSION WE HAD IN OCTOBER, WE HAD A SESSION IN JUNE, WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, IF HE WAS INTERESTED COULD HAVE VOTED FORWARDS TO COUNCIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I REALLY DON'T KNOW WHAT THE HELL I WASTE MY TIME WITH ALL THIS, PIMP ALONG SIDE OF ME.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, A POINT OF PRIVILEGE COME ON--

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HE IS NOT A PIMP. I APOLOGIZE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES, I DO BELIEVE THAT THE MEMBER IS DUE AN APOLOGY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL I'VE GIVEN HIM ONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: KINDLY KEEP YOUR LANGUAGE AND SOFORTH PARLIAMENTARY END OF YOUR CONDUCT--

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ALRIGHT MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL DO THAT BUT IT SEEMS SO FUTILE AT TIMES TO HAVE TO BE DEBATING WITH A PERSON WHO KNOWS NOTHING ABOUT WHAT IS REQUIRED OF US. I WANT TO GET DOWN TO THE BASIC AGAIN. WERE THESE PLANS, OR THESE PLANNING STUDIES, WHICH WAS, IF THEY WERE RECOMMENDED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, BROUGHT FORWARD IN ANY FORM FOR TERRITORIAL COUNCIL TO APPROVE THE EXPENDITURES PRIOR TO THE EXPENDITURES BEING MADE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, OBVIOUSLY NOT, BECAUSE THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THEY HAVE BEEN PRESENTED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT TO MAKE THIS STATEMENT. IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, I HAVE ALWAYS SAID THAT COUNCIL MUST BE ADVISED ON ANY EXPENDITURES OF MONEY, SO I HOPE THAT COUNCILLOR TANNER WILL TAKE NOTE OF THAT. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER, WILL YOU TAKE THE CHAIR?



Mr. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THIS PARTICULAR VOTE. I SEE THAT IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES, WE PROVIDED AN AMOUNT OF \$105,246 FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND LAND DISPOSAL SERVICES AND IT WAS STATED TO PROVIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TO ASSIST AN ORDERLY AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITIES IN THE TERRITORY. NOW WE HAVE ANOTHER \$178,065 IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR THE CONDUCT OF PLANNING STUDIES WHICH IS RELATIVELY THE SAME THING. I HAVE FOUND AND I THINK WE HAVE HAD TABLE DOCUMENTS ON SOME OF THE COMMUNITY PLANS A FEW DAYS AGO. I HAVE FOUND, TO MY DISTRESS AND THE DISTRESS OF MANY PEOPLE IN OUTLYING COMMUNITIES THAT WE HAVE BEEN BE-SIEGED UPON BY SOUTHERN EXPERTS ONCE AGAIN, MANY OF THEM WITH LONG HAIR AND LONG BEARDS TO MAKE YOU WONDER FROM WHENCE THEY CAME, WHO HAVE ROARED INTO OUR COMMUNITIES AND SAID, "YOU POOR PEOPLE. HOW CAN YOU LIVE LIKE THIS? YOU CAN'T LIVE LIKE THIS. WE ARE GOING TO TELL YOU HOW TO LIVE," AND HAVE CONDUCTED STUDIES, SOME OF WHICH, I IMAGINE THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF GOOD IN THESE STUDIES. SOME OF WHICH THERE IS TO THE COMMUNITIES, NOT VERY GOOD. I HAVE FOUND, AND THERE ARE SEVERAL PEOPLE DOING THESE STUDIES, IT ISN'T ALL ONE GROUP. I HAVE FOUND, IN TALKING WITH SOME OF THE PEOPLE IN THESE COMMUNITIES, THAT THEY ARE VERY DISPLEASED WITH THE MANNER IN WHICH SOME OF THE PLANS ARE BEING ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT. IN THE CASE OF WATSON LAKE, WE HAD A GROUP OF MEN COME IN AND WE HOLD MEETINGS AND PEOPLE HAVE MADE RECOMMENDATIONS, THEN THEY GO BACK AND MAKE CHANGES. THEN THEY COME BACK AND HOLD OTHER MEETINGS UNTIL I DON'T FEEL THAT ANY OF THESE PLANS, NOT ONE OF ANY OF THEM SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AS A PLAN OF ANY COMMUNITY OF THE YUKON TERRITORY BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY UNTIL SUCH A TIME AS THE COMMUNITY AND A GOOD SEGMENT OF THE COMMUNITY, AT A PUBLIC MEETING, HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO VIEW THE FINAL PLAN. THAT IS THE FINAL ONE. THE ONE WHICH SATISFIES THE PLANNER. UNTIL THAT MEETING HAS BEEN HAD, AND A SUBSTANTIAL MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY, WHO, GIVING ALL OPPORTUNITY TO GET TO THIS MEETING AND KNOW IT'S IN COURT, CAN ACCEPT THIS PLAN OF THEIR COMMUNITY.

INDEED, BECAUSE THESE ARE THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TO LIVE THERE.

AS I SAY, WE ARE SPENDING A GREAT DEAL OF MONEY ON SOUTHERN EXPERTS. THIS WAS NEVER REALLY DISCUSSED AT THE TABLE IN THE SPRING SESSION AND IT WAS EXTREMELY UNFORTUNATE THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE A FALL SESSION AT WHICH TIME WE COULD DIVE INTO PROBLEMS LIKE THIS. THIS IS A PROBLEM AND MANY PEOPLE IN THE TERRITORY ARE OFFENDED. NOT ALL THE PEOPLE BUT MANY PEOPLE. THEIR WHOLE LIVES ARE BEING DICTATED TO AGAIN BY SOUTHERN EXPERTS. I INTENDED ON RAISING THIS WHEN WE DEALT WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND I MAY HAVE FURTHER TO SAY ON IT.

I THINK IT SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AND BY THIS LEGISLATURE, THAT NONE OF THESE TEN COMMUNITIES BE FORCED TO LIVE BY A PLAN UNTIL THEY HAVE THEMSELVES, GIVEN IT GENERAL ACCEPTANCE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

Mrs. WATSON: I WOULD LIKE TO DRAW THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S ATTENTION TO SESSIONAL PAPER #12, AND EVEN IF IT ISN'T IN COMMITTEE THIS EXPLAINS PART OF THE REASON WHY THESE FACTS WERE UNDERTAKEN. UNFORTUNATELY, I CAN'T AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE COMPLETELY. THIS IS NOT UNUSUAL, HOWEVER, I'M QUITE FAMILIAR WITH THE STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE IN SOME OF THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES IN THE RURAL AREAS OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IN REGARDS TO THE STUDIES MANY OF THEM WERE INSTIGATED AT THE REQUEST BY SOME OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WITHIN THOSE COMMUNITIES. THEY FELT THEY SHOULD GO INTO SOME TYPE OF LAND USAGE, SOME TYPE OF ZONING WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES, THEY REQUIRED FURTHER DIRECTION AT LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERE. THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WAS NOT ABLE TO PROVIDE THE LOCAL DIRECTION UNTIL YOU HAVE AN OVERALL PLAN. NOW THESE ARE WHY THESE EXPERTS, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER LIKES TO REFER TO THEM, HAVE BEEN CALLED IN, HAVE DONE THE STUDIES. NONE OF THESE PLANS WILL BE ADOPTED UNTIL THE COMMUNITY ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT, ADOPTS IT. THERE IS PROVISIONS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES FOR COMPLETE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ALL ASPECTS OF THE PLAN, AND THE PLANS WILL NOT BE BROUGHT INTO UTILIZATION UNLESS BY BYLAWS, THE ZONING BYLAWS



WITHIN THE COMMUNITY ITSELF, SO IT IS RATHER UNFORTUNATE THAT I CANNOT AGREE WITH THE REMARKS OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE.

Mr. Chamberlist: I MYSELF FIND IT DIFFICULT TO SAY THAT I THINK THAT STUDIES HAVE THEIR VALUE IF YOU REALLY WANT TO KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON IN SMALL COMMUNITIES. I DON'T ARGUE AT ALL AGAINST THE PRINCIPLE OF HAVING STUDIED THEM. I WONDER IF MR. MILLER, MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD INDICATE HOW THIS \$178,000.00 WAS BROKEN DOWN. HERE AGAIN WE HAVE A LUMP SUM AND THERE IS NO OTHER INFORMATION THAT IS GIVEN TO US.

Mr. Miller: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I CAN ACCOUNT FOR THE TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON STUDIES OF \$239,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: COULD WE GET A LIST OF THESE?

Mr. Miller: YES, CERTAINLY. I CAN PRESENT A LIST TO THE MEMBERS.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I AM WONDERING IN RESPECT OF THE REMARKS I MADE, I MIGHT SAY THAT I'M GLAD TO HEAR FROM AT LEAST ONE MEMBER THAT THERE WILL BE NO ACCEPTANCE OF THE PLANS UNTIL THE COMMUNITIES, AS I HAVE HAD REQUESTED, HAVE BEEN FULLY CONSULTED. I THINK IT SHOULD BE REMEMBERED THAT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOME OF THESE PLANS THE COMMUNITIES WERE NOT FULLY INVOLVED IN THE THING. THE PLANNERS ARE BY TENDER AND NOT GOVERNMENT PEOPLE, THESE ARE DONE BY TENDER. I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF IN THE FUTURE, THAT PLANNING WILL NOT BE UNDERTAKEN UNTIL AT LEAST THE LEGISLATURE HAS ADVISED IN ESTIMATES OR BY MESSAGE OF THE COMMISSIONER OR BY SOME OTHER MEANS IN THE BUDGET FOR EACH OF THESE COMMUNITIES SO THAT THE COMMUNITIES MIGHT KNOW PRIOR TO THE PLANNING THAT THERE IS INDEED GOING TO BE AN EFFORT MADE TO PLAN THE COMMUNITY. I AGREE WITH WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST SAID. I'M NOT AGAINST PLANNING, BUT I'M AGAINST THE METHODS IN SOME CASES THAT HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED IN THE PLANS FOR THESE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES. EACH ONE IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT FROM THE OTHER, AND EACH CIRCUMSTANCE IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT, BUT I FEEL IT MY DUTY AND INDEED I HAVE BEEN ASKED TO MAKE THIS REPRESENTATION TO THE HOUSE AT THE TIME OF ESTIMATES. SO I MAKE THEM AND I

TRUST THAT THE GOVERNMENT WILL ABIDE BY THE STATEMENT AS MADE BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I MUST SAY THAT AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON WAS SPEAKING, I WAS GOING THROUGH ONE OF THE STUDIES FROM HIS CONSTITUENCY MAINLY BECAUSE OF WHAT'S BEEN SAID. I AM SURE HE WILL BE HAPPY TO NOTE THAT THE PLANNERS HAVE DECIDED BECAUSE THE HINTERLAND DOES NOT HAVE AN ESPECIALLY SIGNIFICANT NATURAL SUITABILITY FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM. I'M SURE THE PEOPLE IN TESLIN WILL BE VERY HAPPY TO HEAR THAT. ALSO, HAVING FOUGHT FIRES IN THE TESLIN AREA DURING THE 1958 FIRE YEAR, THE PLANNERS HAVE ALSO DECIDED THAT THE FIRE-BREAK AT TESLIN IS APPROXIMATELY TWICE AS WIDE AS NECESSARY, AND MORE EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES FOR FUTURE FIRE-BREAKS WOULD BE NARROW PATHS OR TRAILS HAVING UNDERBRUSH TRIMMED OUT. I CERTAINLY WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEVERAL OF THOSE EXPERTS IN THE TESLIN AREA DURING THE 1958 FIRE. EVEN IF THE FIRE-BREAKS THAT ARE NOW AROUND YUKON COMMUNITIES ARE TOTALLY INADEQUATE WHEN A FIRE THE SIZE OF THE ONE WE WERE FIGHTING ARE BURNING, IT JUST SHOWS THE COMPLETE LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE AREAS OF THE YUKON THAT WE'RE PAYING ONE-QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS LAST YEAR TO STUDY THESE AREAS. I AGREE WITH YOU WHOLEHEARTEDLY. I HOPE THAT YOU LET YOUR CONSTITUENTS IN THESE COMMUNITIES HAVE A REALLY HARD LOOK AT SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE THEY ARE FOISTED UPON THE PEOPLE BECAUSE SEVERAL OF THE ITMES HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP AT ALL TO THE FACT.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I RATHER RESENT THIS STAND STATED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST. THERE ARE COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE HAD PLANNING, AND THERE ARE SEVERAL OF THEM THAT ARE VERY PLEASED WITH THE PLAN WHETHER THEY AGREE WITH IT COMPLETELY OR NOT. BUT IT IS A GUIDE, AND THAT IS WHAT IT IS SUPPOSED TO BE. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT, SOIL ANALYSIS- EVERYTHING HAS BEEN DONE.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I WILL CONCLUDE THIS PARTICULAR DISCUSSION BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO GET INVOLVED IN ANY OF THIS SO-CALLED PERSONALITY CONFLICT, BUT IN THE CASE OF THE TESLIN PLAN THIS IS CORRECT. THE L.I.D. NOW HAVE A COPY, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THEY HAVE MORE THAN ONE.



RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER. DO YOU WISH TO RESUME THE CHAIR MR. TAYLOR?

MR. TAYLOR: YES. IN VIEW OF THE POWER FAILURE, WOULD IT BE IN ORDER TO DISMISS THE WITNESSES?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. STUTTER: I'LL SECOND IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS WILL DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: THE COMMITTEE WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. MAY WE HAVE A REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 10:30 A.M. TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 11:35 A.M. AND RECONVENED AT 2:10 P.M. MR. I. HUBERDEAU AND MR. M. MILLER, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER, ATTENDED COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS BILL #1. I CAN REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL #2. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR AND THIS MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: YOU HAVE HEARD THE REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE. ARE YOU AGREED? MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TANNER: I MOVE THAT WE CALL IT 5 O'CLOCK.

MR. STUTTER: I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION,  
MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHITEHORSE NORTH, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OF DAWSON THAT WE NOW CALL IT 5 O'CLOCK. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: THIS HOUSE NOW STANDS ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 O'CLOCK, MONDAY MORNING.

ADJOURNED.

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1974

MR. SPEAKER READS THE DAILY PRAYER.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM CLERK, IS THERE A QUORUM PRESENT?

MADAM CLERK: THERE IS, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY DOCUMENTS OR CORRESPONDENCE TO BE TABLED?

MRS. WATSON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE FOR TABLING THIS MORNING SESSIONAL PAPERS NOS. 17 AND 20 AND LEGISLATIVE RETURNS NO. 14.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEE? ARE THERE ANY BILLS TO BE INTRODUCED? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTIONS OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE NOTICE OF MOTION. TODAY I MOVE SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 17 TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? MOTION NO. 4.

MOTION NO. 4

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT SESSIONAL PAPERS NO. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12 AND 13 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I CALL QUESTION. IF YOU WOULD, PLEASE, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION NO. 5

MR. SPEAKER: MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER, THAT THIS COUNCIL VIEW WITH GREAT CONCERN THE CONTINUING ABUSES BY SEEMINGLY IRRESPONSIBLE PEOPLE IN THEIR DRINKING HABITS IN PUBLIC PLACES AND RECOMMEND THAT THE ADMINISTRATION BRING FORWARD

IN THIS SESSION, AMENDMENTS TO THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE MAKING IT AN OFFENCE TO DRINK INTOXICATING LIQUOR WITHIN 500 FEET OUTSIDE OF A BUILDING IN ANY MUNICIPALITY. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THE MOTION AT THIS TIME?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE OBVIOUS REASONS FOR THE MOTION BEING BROUGHT TO COUNCIL ARE CLEARLY DEFINED WITHIN THE WORDING OF THE MOTION ITSELF. FOR SOME CONSIDERABLE TIME, I HAVE BEEN ATTEMPTING TO GET THE COMMISSIONER TO BRING FORWARD AN AMENDMENT TO THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE TO CORRECT WHAT HAS NOW BECOME AN ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION TO STOMACH. I KNOW THAT THERE MAY BE STRONG OBJECTION FROM SOME BUT I THINK IT WOULD BE AGREED BY ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL THAT WE DON'T WANT TO INTERFERE WITH THE GENERAL LIBERALIZATION OF THE LIQUOR LAWS THAT WE HAVE. BUT THERE ARE NECESSITIES FOR US TO CONTROL THE CONDUCT OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO IRRESPONSIBLY ATTACK THE LIBERALIZATION OF THE LAWS WE HAVE PUT FORWARD BY CONDUCTING THEMSELVES IN A VERY IRRESPONSIBLE MANNER. I DON'T THINK, MR. SPEAKER, THAT ANY ONE OF US WANTS TO SEE PEOPLE NOT BEING ABLE TO TAKE A BOTTLE OF BEER OF SOME LIQUOR WITH THEM ON THEIR OUTINGS AND PICNICS, AND I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO RESTRICT THE USE OF HAVING A BEVERAGE AT ANY TIME BUT WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING IN THE STREETS OF WHITEHORSE, CERTAINLY IN THE STREETS OF DAWSON, AND FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND RECENTLY BEEN GETTING LARGER IRRESPONSIBLE ATTITUDES OF A FEW PEOPLE IN POWER IS TO MAKE THE AREAS THEMSELVES A BOTTLE STRENGTH HAVEN WITHOUT MUCH THAT CAN BE DONE FOR IT. I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. SPEAKER, THAT THIS TIME THE COMMISSIONER BRING DOWN THE LEGISLATION FOR AN AMENDMENT AND NOT PLAY AROUND WITH IT AS HE HAS DONE IN THE LAST TWO YEARS, AS I HAVE CONTINUOUSLY ASKED THAT SOMETHING OF THIS NATURE BE DONE. I WOULD ASK THAT MEMBERS OF COUNCIL APPROVE THE SUGGESTION THAT HAS BEEN MADE AND I THINK IT WILL HAVE THE GENERAL PUBLIC'S ACCEPTANCE THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY. THANK YOU.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I SECONDED THIS MOTION PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE PROBLEMS THAT HAVE DEVELOPED IN DAWSON, PARTICULARLY AROUND DISCOVERY DAY CELEBRATIONS IN THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS. I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THE SUGGESTION THAT SOME OTHER MEMBER, PERHAPS MOVE THIS INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. I THINK THE CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION, I DON'T KNOW THAT THE LAST PART OF THE MOTION, REQUESTING THAT THE



ADMINISTRATION BRING IN THE AMENDMENT JUST TO THAT EXACT EFFECT IS REALLY WHAT WE WANT. I WOULD PARTICULARLY LIKE TO SEE THE AUTHORITY VESTED IN THE MUNICIPALITIES THEMSELVES TO SEE IF THEY CAN COME UP WITH THEIR OWN GOVERNING REGULATIONS OR BY-LAWS IN THAT PARTICULAR INSTANCE. I THINK IT DOES NEED CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION, PROBABLY IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A FEW REMARKS ON THIS MOTION, THEN I WILL MOVE, AFTER CONCLUDING, THAT IT GO INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION. I THINK THERE IS A VERY REAL PRINCIPLE INVOLVED IN THE LIBERALIZATION OF THE DRINKING REGULATIONS THAT WERE BROUGHT ABOUT IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. I THINK THAT WE AS TERRITORIAL LEGISLATORS HAVE TO BE PARTICULARLY CAREFUL WHEN WE MAKE LEGISLATION, WHAT THE PRINCIPLE IS BEHIND THAT LEGISLATION. I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THAT THE LEGISLATION HAS BEEN GIVEN A VERY FAIR CHANCE TO OPERATE, THAT PROBABLY 99.9 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE HAVE PROVEN THEMSELVES CAPABLE OF ACCEPTING THE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT WERE PLACED UPON THEM AS MATURE CITIZENS WITH THE LIBERALIZATION OF THE DRINKING LAWS. NOW, WHAT IS THE LEGISLATIVE BODY SUPPOSED TO DO? ARE THEY SUPPOSED TO BE MAKING LAWS FOR THE 99.9 PERCENT OF THE PUBLIC WHO SHOW THEIR MATURITY AND RESPONSIBILITY? ARE THEY SUPPOSED TO BE MAKING LAWS RESTRICTIVE AND OPPRESSIVE FOR THE .1 PERCENT THAT ARE ALWAYS GOING TO BE IMMATURE AND ARE ALWAYS GOING TO BE IRRESPONSIBLE ARE NOT GOING TO ACCEPT THE ADVANTAGES OF LIBERAL LEGISLATION. MR. SPEAKER, ANOTHER THING PEOPLE LOSE SIGHT OF WHEN THEY TALK ABOUT DRINKING ON THE STREETS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES AND IN THE YUKON GENERALLY, IS THAT IT IS AGAINST THE LAW AS IT NOW STANDS TO BE DRUNK IN A PUBLIC PLACE. SO REALLY, THE MAJORITY OF THE COMPLAINTS ARE NOT ABOUT THE DRINKING ON THE STREETS, IT'S ABOUT THE DRUNKS ON THE STREETS. AS THE LAW NOW STANDS, IT IS PROHIBITED TO BE DRUNK IN A PUBLIC PLACE. SO PERHAPS THE PEOPLE WHO ARE COMPLAINING AN AWFUL LOT SHOULD BE THINKING, DO WE WANT TO THROW THE BABY OUT WITH THE BATH WATER OR SHOULD WE BE LOOKING TOWARDS A RIGID ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW AS IT NOW STANDS. AND IT IS ALSO AGAINST THE LAW, AS IT NOW STANDS, TO THROW A BOTTLE THROUGH A WINDOW, THROUGH A DOOR, OR TO THROW A BOTTLE OR A GLASS ON THE STREET AND SHATTER IT. PERHAPS WE SHOULD BE LOOKING INTO THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE RATHER THAN, IN A PANIC, BE CHANGING THE ORDINANCE. I ORIGINALLY BROUGHT THE PRINCIPLE BE- FOR THE HOUSE AND I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO IT,

WHATSOEVER BECAUSE I AM NOT CAPABLE OF DELINEATING WHAT A PUBLIC PLACE SHOULD BE AND IF THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE FEEL THAT THEY HAVE THIS ABILITY THEN I SAY MORE POWER TO THEM AND LET THEM GO AHEAD AND DO IT BECAUSE THEY ARE THE PEOPLE WHO ARE SUPPOSED TO BE CLOSEST TO THE GRASS ROOTS OF THE CONSTITUENTS OF THE MUNICIPALITY. AND IF THEY THINK, IN THEIR WISDOM, THAT THEY CAN COME UP WITH A PROPER DELINEATION OF A PUBLIC PLACE SO IT WILL NOT PROHIBIT PEOPLE, SUCH AS AT THE BALL PARK WHERE I THINK, AFTER A BALL TOURNAMENT, PEOPLE SITTING IN THE STANDS, HAVING A COOL BEER, THEN PUTTING THEM IN A LITTER BARREL WHICH WERE PROVIDED, I CAN'T SEE HOW IT COULD SHOCK ANYBODY. I KNOW THAT DURING HOT SUMMER DAYS MY WIFE AND I USUALLY GO TO THE WILDERNESS AREAS, TO ROBERT SERVICE PARK OR THE ROTARY PARK AND HAVE SOME LUNCH, AND SINCE THAT I AM, I GENERALLY CART ALONG A COLD BOTTLE OF BEER AND OPEN IT UP. I DON'T THINK ANYBODY IN THE PARK, AND I DON'T THINK MY CHILD IS AFFECTED, AND I DON'T WANT TO GO BACK TO THE DAYS WHERE YOU HAVE TO PUT IT IN A BROWN PAPER BAG OR HIDE IT IN YOUR SHIRT, OR UNDER THE DASH. I MEAN, IS THAT WHAT THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE WANTS? LET THEM DO IT AND LET THEM BE RESPONSIBLE AND LET THEIR CONSTITUENTS SAY IF THAT'S WHAT THEY WANT OR NOT. I AGREE WITH THEM WHOLE HEARTEDLY AND I DON'T ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE OF PEOPLE WALKING DOWN THE STREET IN AN INTOXICATED CONDITION, THEY SHOULDN'T BE DOING THAT ANYWAY -- SITTING ON A STREET CORNER AND DRINKING OUT OF A BOTTLE OF WINE. IT DOES STILL OFFEND ME, BUT, IN JUST ABOUT ALL CASES I'VE SEEN THOSE PEOPLE WOULD BE PICKED UP FOR BEING DRUNK BECAUSE IF THEY GET INTO THAT POSITION OF FLAUNTING THE LAW IN THAT WAY, IN THAT WAY THEY ARE BREAKING THE LAW BY BEING INTOXICATED, IN A PUBLIC PLACE.

I DON'T LIKE THE SUGGESTION TO MAKE IT AN OFFENCE TO DRINK INTOXICATING LIQUOR WITHIN 500 FEET OUTSIDE OF A BUILDING IN ANY MUNICIPALITY. I AM SICK AND TIRED OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE CARPING AT THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WHERE THEIR LIBERAL ATTITUDE IN ALLOWING THESE GREAT ILLS AND ABUSES BE ON THE STREETS OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE. I HAVE NO COMPUNCTION WHATSOEVER AND NO QUALMS WHATSOEVER IN PLACING THE DRINKING REGULATIONS IN THE MUNICIPALITY IN THE HANDS OF THE CITY FATHERS. WE HAVE TRIED AND TRIED IN HOW WE COULD COME UP WITH AND HOW WE COULD BE FAIR IN STOPPING ABUSES OF PUBLIC DRINKING--BUT NOT PROHIBITING IT FOR THE 99.9 PERCENT OF THE PUBLIC THAT ARE ACCEPT-



ING THE NEW LIBERAL REGULATIONS AND NOT PROHIBITED IN BEING ABLE TO HAVE A DRINK IN THE ROTARY PARK. I THINK THE ROTARY PEOPLE THEMSELVES WERE SELLING BEER WHEN THE CANOEISTS CAME DOWN THE YUKON RIVER AND IF ANYONE CAN TAKE EXCEPTION TO THAT, THEY SHOULDN'T BE IN THE YUKON. LET THEM GO SOMEWHERE ELSE. AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, IF YOU CAN'T GO ANYWHERE AND HAVE A BEER IN THE ROBERT SERVICE PARK, TAKING YOUR WIFE AND YOUR FAMILY WITH YOU, THEN I SAY THAT THAT'S PROHIBITIVE ALSO. BUT WE COULDN'T COME UP WITH THE REGULATIONS; MAYBE THE CITY COUNCIL ARE MUCH MORE TALENTED, MUCH MORE RESPONSIBLE, AND MAYBE THEY CAN MAKE THE DELINEATION OF WHAT IS A PUBLIC PLACE AND WHAT ISN'T WITHOUT PROHIBITING SOME OF THE REAL GOOD THAT HAS COME ABOUT IN THE REGULATIONS. IF IT HAS TO DO WITH THE WHOLE TERRITORY I SEE ABSOLUTELY NOTHING AGAINST THE MOTION BECAUSE THERE IS NO WAY I WOULD ACCEPT THAT THIS ISN'T WORKING EXTREMELY WELL IN THE CAMPGROUNDS, IN THE OUTLYING AREAS, AT THE LAKE AND THERE IS NO WAY I WOULD EVEN THINK OF BRINGING IT DOWN TO PROHIBIT THAT WHICH IS WORKING SO WELL. BUT IN THE CITY IT DOESN'T WORRY ME A BIT BECAUSE I'M NOT ONE OF THOSE, BECAUSE I CONSIDER MYSELF A MATURE AND RESPONSIBLE MEMBER OF SOCIETY WHO DOESN'T GO ON THE STREETS DRINKING OR THROWING BOTTLES OR GLASSES. BUT IF THE CITY FATHERS WANT TO PROHIBIT AND MAKE LEGISLATION AGAINST THE 99.9 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE, WHO I SAY ARE RESPONSIBLE AND MATURE PEOPLE AND HAVE ACCEPTED THEIR RESPONSIBILITY UNDER THE LIBERALIZED DRINKING LAWS THEN IT SHOULD BE THEIR BABY AND THEY SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS FOR IT AND LET THEM HAVE THAT RESPONSIBILITY. I HAVE ASKED THE LEGAL ADVISER WHETHER IT IS POSSIBLE TO DELEGATE THAT AUTHORITY; HE HAS SAID THAT IT IS; I SAY HERE IT IS FELLOWS, YOU CAN GO TO IT. SEE IF YOU CAN COME UP WITH A SET OF PROPER REGULATIONS WHICH WE COULD USE. THERE IS ONE MORE POINT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE, MR. SPEAKER, BEFORE I ASK THAT THIS BE MOVED TO COMMITTEE FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. WHEN INSPECTOR MARCOUX FIRST CAME TO THE YUKON TERRITORY, HE ARRIVED JUST AT THE TIME WE WERE PROCESSING THE NEW LIQUOR ORDINANCE AND HE WAS PRESENTED WITH A BRIEF THAT HAD BEEN WRITTEN BY HIS PREDECESSOR AND BY HIS STAFF. HE CAME TO THE COUNCIL TABLE AND READ THE BRIEF DECLARING ALL THE WOES AND ALL THE ILLS THAT WOULD BETIDE THE YUKON TERRITORY IF THE ORDINANCE WAS PASSED. BEFORE INSPECTOR MARCOUX LEFT HE CAME OVER TO SEE ME, MR. SPEAKER, AND HE SAID, "YOU KNOW, I WAS SO WRONG, I WAS SO DEAD WRONG WHEN I PRESENTED THAT BRIEF BEFORE COUNCIL. I JUST WANTED YOU TO KNOW THAT. WHEN I GO OUT

TO ANY OTHER JURISDICTION OR TO ANY PROVINCE AND AM ASKED TO SPEAK, I SPEAK ON THE YUKON LIQUOR ORDINANCE AND I SPEAK ON HOW WONDERFUL IT'S WORKING AND HOW MATURE AND HOW REMARKABLE PEOPLE ARE IF YOU GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY." HE SAID, "FOR GOD'S SAKE, DON'T BE PANICKED INTO CHANGING THAT ORDINANCE BECAUSE IT IS WORKING WELL FOR THE CONSTABULARY, IT'S WORKING WELL FOR THE PUBLIC AND WE PROBABLY HAD LESS PROBLEMS THAN WE HAVE EVER HAD BEFORE AND THAT BRIEF THAT I PRESENTED HAS BEEN WRITTEN BY PEOPLE WHO I THOUGHT KNEW WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN THE YUKON AND IF I HAD BEEN HERE A YEAR THERE IS NO WAY THAT I WOULD HAVE PRESENTED THAT BRIEF BEFORE THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL."

SO I AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DAWSON WHO SPOKE AND I THINK PERHAPS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE, I'M NOT SURE, THAT IF THE MUNICIPALITIES WITHIN THEIR BAILEY-WICK WHO WANT TO HAVE THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENFORCEMENT OF DRINKING IN PUBLIC PLACES AND MAKING THE RULES AND REGULATIONS, LET THEM GO TO IT. I THINK THAT PERHAPS IT WILL STOP A LOT OF THE CARPING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL IS USING TOWARDS THE TERRITORIAL BODY BECAUSE RIGHT NOW THEY ARE ABLE TO DO THIS WITHOUT HAVING THE RESPONSIBILITY OF DELINEATING WHAT ARE PUBLIC PLACES AND WHETHER THEY ARE GOING TO PROHIBIT DRINKING WITHIN THE TOTAL JURISDICTION OF THE MUNICIPALITY WHICH I WOULD SAY TO GETTING RIGHT BACK IN THE PROHIBITIVE AREAS WHERE THEY ONCE WERE BEFORE, BUT IT WOULDN'T BOTHER ME BECAUSE I WOULD BE OUT OF THE CITY LIMITS--DOING MY THING, MR. SPEAKER. THANK YOU.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I BELIEVE IT WAS THE INTENTION OF MEMBER WHO HAS SPOKEN BEFORE TO MOVE THIS INTO COMMITTEE AND I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE AT THIS TIME THAT MOTION NO. 5 BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR FOR WATSON LAKE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, THAT MOTION NO. 5 BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED.*

MOTION NO. 6

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TAYLOR THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COUNCIL THAT THE GOVERN-



MENT IMMEDIATELY INTRODUCE LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING AN ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE SO THAT A JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF TERRITORIAL ELECTORAL DISTRICT CAN BEGIN FORTHWITH. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME?

Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think all Members of Council are extremely worried about the timing and the ability of elections this fall to be held under reorganized Territorial Electoral Districts. If the machinery does not start moving immediately for a judicial redistribution of those electoral boundaries and Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that there is no reason whatsoever, even prior to the passing of Bill C-9 before the House or even prior to debate in this House on the proposed changes in the Yukon Act; why the machinery can't be set up immediately so that at the moment that the Bill is passed that machinery is set up and is able to go into action so that a judicial redistribution of Territorial Electoral Districts can begin. Even more so, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that that judicial commission can begin work prior to the passage of the bill. This is the view of the Chief Electoral Officer in Ottawa and it is the view of other constitutional experts. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be politic and expedient of this House to make sure that everything we are capable of doing is done so that a fall election will be held on schedule, run under the new Yukon Act and run on new Territorial Electoral Districts.

To make sure that the machinery gets into motion immediately so that there is not going to be a period of time in the Yukon Territory where the public of the Yukon Territory are not going to be represented by elected Members in each district. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of this motion should be accepted unanimously by the House. I think that the Members of Government should realize the priority that is needed in introducing legislation establishing the Electoral Boundaries Committee and that legislation should be given priority immediately upon its introduction to the House so that a judicial commission can be set up immediately and the machinery get going during this session, so that this fall the Territorial election will take place under an expanded Council at the proper date that the election should take place. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion I think that the Honourable Member who has spoken before has again stated the case very clearly. We have, as a Council, been chasing this matter of judicial redistribution for some time now and in the past as Sessional Paper No. 2 (1973 First Session) in a reply to a question asked on December 6th 1972, the Commissioner simply, on behalf of the Administration, replied that neither judicial redistribution nor the enlargement of Council Membership are within the competence of this Administration and it went on to say that the matter of constituency boundaries is one that is governed by the Elections Ordinance and the Council has the ability by amending that Ordinance. And it further goes on to state that the enlargement of Council Membership can only be accomplished through an amendment to the Yukon Act.

It was hoped that the Administration would have read these requests. I believe there was one motion sometime back as being in effect a feeling of Council and would have proposed by now the necessary legislation to give effect to judicial redistribution. However, this motion is quite clear and it is my hope that the Administration will get on this thing right away and will attach the importance to it that should be attached to it and that they will give it all priority in getting legislation to the House and as the Honourable Member who has spoken before, has stated, that the House will give it immediate consideration so that we can get on with the appointment of the Committee.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that what is being asked for now is something that was asked for over a year ago and the Executive Committee had dealt with it and also had approved the time table for carrying this out. There was one difficulty. I think its only fair to show, and I think the same difficulty is still here. That is the number of districts to be set up under judicial apportionment. Now, if the Bill, its known that the Bill C-9 before the House, goes through as is, we know that there are going to be twelve districts or not necessarily so, because it may be that the Commission that would be looking into this might decide that some of the constituencies might have two members. It doesn't necessarily mean that each of the Members of Council have to represent a separate constituency. This is entirely up to the Committee



ITSELF, AGAIN IT MIGHT BE THAT THE COUNCIL MIGHT INCREASE THE NUMBER AND THE COUNCIL MIGHT DECIDE, RATHER THE PARLIAMENT MIGHT DECREASE THE NUMBER AND PARLIAMENT MIGHT DECIDE THAT THE METHODS OF PUTTING ADDITIONAL MEMBERS MIGHT CHANGE. BUT, THIS DOESN'T IN ANY WAY ALTER THE FACT THAT THE LEGISLATION SHOULD BE READY. THAT THERE SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE PREPARATION FOR THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE TO BE PUT TOGETHER AND CERTAINLY THERE IS NO REASON AT ALL WHY AT THIS TIME, ESPECIALLY AS WE HAVE NOT THE LEGISLATION BEING BROUGHT BEFORE US AND INTRODUCED AND BECAUSE OF THE LOAD OF WORK WE HAVE, THIS MIGHT NOT TAKE PLACE FOR ANOTHER MONTH. IF THE ADMINISTRATION INSISTS ON GOING THROUGH THE FINANCIAL LEGISLATION FIRST AND FOREMOST, IT WOULD MEAN THAT ANOTHER MONTH AT LEAST IS GOING TO BE LOST. THEREFORE, I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. SPEAKER, THAT WE SUPPORT THIS MOTION, PURELY ON THE PRINCIPLE THAT WE HAVE TO GET ON WITH THE JOB OF BRINGING FORWARD THE NECESSARY BOUNDARIES, ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE AND ALSO THAT THE LEGISLATION THAT IS AVAILABLE TO BE PRESENTED AT THIS COUNCIL, BE INTRODUCED IMMEDIATELY, SO THAT IT CAN BE DEALT WITH PROMPTLY AND THAT THE JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF THE TERRITORIAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS CAN PROCEED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DELAY.

THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, BOTH HONOURABLE MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN, OR THE THREE HONOURABLE MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN NOW, ARE PARTIALLY CORRECT. THE LEGISLATION IS READY. IT HASN'T YET BEEN INTRODUCED BECAUSE WE HAVE THE FINANCIAL BILLS TO GET THROUGH AND AS FAR AS COUNCILLOR MCKINNON'S POINT, WE HAVE BEEN IN ONGOING CONTACT WITH MR. CASTONGUAY. WE HAVE GOT AS FAR AS WE POSSIBLY CAN, THAT IS THE DRAWING UP OF THE LEGISLATION AND SO ON, AND WE ARE PREPARED TO INTRODUCE IT IN THIS SESSION JUST AS SOON AS WE KNOW WHICH WAY TO MOVE AS FAR AS OTTAWA IS CONCERNED. AS FAR AS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS CONCERNED.

THEREFORE, MR. SPEAKER, I AM MOVING AN AMENDMENT TO THIS MOTION SAYING - IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COUNCIL THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTRODUCE LEGISLATION IN THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL ESTABLISHING, AND SO ON AS THE MOTION READS. IN OTHER WORDS, I AM REMOVING THE WORD IMMEDIATELY, MR. SPEAKER, AND PLACING IT AFTER LEGISLATION IN THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: GET YOUR AMENDMENT OUT AND SEE WHAT WE DO WITH IT.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, THE AMENDMENT READS. THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT IS MOVED. IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COUNCIL THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTRODUCE LEGISLATION IN THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL ESTABLISHING AN ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE SO JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF THE TERRITORIAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS CAN BEGIN FORTHWITH.

WOULD YOU LIKE A COPY, MR. SPEAKER?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE WOULD ALL LIKE COPIES, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS, SO WE CAN GET THE COPIES.

#### RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, MAY I HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK ON THE AMENDMENT?

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN BY COUNCILLOR TANNER AND SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT MOTION #6 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS: "IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COUNCIL THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTRODUCE LEGISLATION IN THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL ESTABLISHING AN ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE SO THAT A JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF TERRITORIAL AND ELECTORAL DISTRICTS CAN BEGIN FORTHWITH".

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ON THE AMENDMENT. I WOULD LIKE TO CONVEY TO ALL MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL HERE THAT IN NO WAY ARE WE TRYING TO DELAY THIS RE-APORTIONING OF CONSTITUENCIES IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. THE LEGISLATION IS PREPARED AS FAR AS WE CAN GO. THE LEGISLATION IS PREPARED BASED ON THE FORMULA SO THAT THE COMMITTEE CAN BE AN ON-GOING TYPE OF COMMITTEE SO THAT RE-APORTIONMENT CAN TAKE PLACE ON A CONTINUING BASIS. SO MUCH OF THE LEGISLATION DEPENDS UPON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT AND WE WOULD NOT REALLY BE GAINING TIME BY DEALING WITH THE LEGISLATION AT THIS TIME AND THEN HAVING TO GO BACK AND AMEND IT AGAIN, IF THE YUKON ACT AMENDMENTS ARE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY. BUT I CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE TO GIVE THE REASSURANCE TO THE COUNCIL HERE THAT THERE WILL BE NO DELAY, ABSOLUTELY NO DELAY, TO THIS COMMITTEE GETTING TO WORK BECAUSE OF THE LEGISLA-



TION NOT BEING INTRODUCED AT THIS TIME. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO POSE ONE QUESTION TO THE PEOPLE WHO ARE PROPOSING THIS MOTION AND THIS IS THE FACT THAT IMPLICATION IN THIS MOTION IS THAT THERE WILL BE A REDISTRIBUTION REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THERE ARE AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE YUKON ACT OR NOT. FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE YUKON ACT WERE NOT PULLED BACK AND NOT PROCEEDED WITH AT THIS TIME, THE AMENDMENT TO THE YUKON ACT PULLED BACK AND PROCEEDED WITH AT THIS TIME, WE ARE THEN GOING TO BE FACED WITH A TERRITORIAL ELECTION, ELECTING ONLY SEVEN MEMBERS TO THE COUNCIL. THE DIRECTION IN THIS MOTION DIRECTS THAT THERE BE A JUDICIAL RE-APORTIONMENT OF CONSTITUENCIES BASED ON SEVEN CONSTITUENTS IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. I AM WONDERING WHETHER THIS IS WHAT THE PEOPLE WHO INTRODUCED THIS MOTION SO WISH. WHETHER THE LEGISLATION THAT THEY WANT BROUGHT DOWN WOULD TAKE CARE OF A REDISTRIBUTION REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THERE IS AN ENLARGEMENT OF THE COUNCIL OR NOT.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I AM INDEED SHOCKED TO SEE AN AMENDMENT TO A MOTION #6 IN THE MANNER THAT IT HAS BEEN PRESENTED. THE MOTION THAT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST PLACED URGENCY ON A QUESTION THAT THIS HOUSE HAS OFTEN DISCUSSED AND DEBATED. AS YOU NOTICE, THERE ARE TWO KEY WORDS TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION. ONE IS "IMMEDIATELY INTRODUCED" AND THE LAST, THIS IS ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION. AND THE LAST WORDS IN BOTH CASES OF THE AMENDMENT IS "FORTHWITH". THIS IS URGENCY EVEN THE AMENDMENT INDICATES BY RETAINING THE WORD "FORTHWITH". THIS IS AN URGENT MATTER. NOW, WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER PROPOSING THE MOTION ROSE A WHILE AGO, HE SAID A VERY SIGNIFICANT THING. I WENT BACK TO THE TAPE TO FIND OUT IF INDEED HE DID SAY THAT. HE SAID, AND I QUOTE, "IT HAS NOT BEEN YET INTRODUCED BECAUSE WE HAVE THE FINANCIAL BILLS TO GET THROUGH." THIS MATTER AROSE THE OTHER DAY IN COMMITTEE WHEN THE HOUSE WERE TALKING ABOUT ANOTHER MATTER OF VERY URGENT IMPORTANCE. AND INDEED, IT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION BEFORE THIS HOUSE AT THIS MOMENT. THAT IS THE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-9, THE YUKON ACT AMENDMENTS. THESE WERE SET ASIDE BY A MAJORITY OF MEMBERS BECAUSE THEY FELT THAT THE BUDGET, AND MATTERS FISCAL FOR SOME REASON, WERE MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE YUKON ACT AMENDMENTS. THIS WAS FOLLOWED. BUT NOW, HERE AGAIN, WE FIND THAT ANOTHER PIECE OF EQUALLY IMPORTANT LEGISLATION IS BEING REFUSED TO US AT THIS TIME UNTIL WE GET THROUGH THE FINANCIAL BILLS. I SUBMIT, MR. SPEAKER, TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE, THAT THESE TWO

SITUATIONS BEAR NO RELATIONSHIP TO EACH OTHER. FISCAL MATTERS, THE MATTER OF THE ESTIMATES, THE MATTER OF INTERIM SUPPLY, BEAR NO RELATIONSHIP TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS AND JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION. THIS IS WHY SOMETIMES MEMBERS SUCH AS MYSELF BECOME HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS OF MOTIVES OF GOVERNMENT AND INDEED THIS IS WHY SOMETIMES FEELINGS RUN A LITTLE DEEP IN THE HOUSE. VIRTUALLY, THIS AMOUNTS TO MY MIND, TO BLACKMAILING, BLACKMAILING OF SOME MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE AND THE PEOPLE THEY REPRESENT IN ORDER TO GET THROUGH ESTIMATES. I DON'T FIGURE THIS IS FAIR, PROFITABLE, REASONABLE OR OTHERWISE. ALL I AM ASKING FOR, AND I AM SURE ALL THE MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO SEE, IS THIS LEGISLATION LAID BEFORE US. WE HAVE BEEN TOLD BY ONE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT THIS LEGISLATION IS READY. IT IS SITTING IN THE OFFICES ALL SET TO GO. SO THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO QUESTION IN ANYONE'S MIND, MR. SPEAKER, THAT THEY CAN WALK INTO THIS HOUSE YESTERDAY, TODAY, OR TOMMOROW AND PREFERABLY, WALK INTO THE HOUSE AND INTRODUCE THE BILL WE HAVE SO LONG SOUGHT AND SO LONG ASKED FOR. THE AMENDMENT CLEARLY WOULD INDICATE THAT THEY WISH TO DELAY THIS BECAUSE OF ESTIMATES AND I DEPLORE IT. I ABSOLUTELY DEPLORE IT. I THINK IT IS A VERY DANGEROUS PRECEDENT TO ESTABLISH IN TERMS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS. I JUST CAN'T FIND THE WORDS TO SAY HOW REPUGNANT THIS AMENDMENT, OR THE INTENTION BEHIND THIS AMENDMENT, I SHOULD SAY, IS TO ME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, SPEAKING ON THIS AMENDMENT. THERE ARE A COUPLE OF VERY IMPORTANT POINTS THAT OBVIOUSLY HAVE BEEN OVERLOOKED, EITHER DELIBERATELY OR INADVERTENTLY BY THE MOVER AND SECONDER OF THE AMENDMENT.

IF WE LOOK AT THE MOTION ITSELF, THE MOTION CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THE GOVERNMENT IMMEDIATELY INTRODUCE, AND USE THE WORK INTRODUCE HERE, THE LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES. NOW THE REASON WHY THIS MOTION IS OBVIOUS TO ME HAS BEEN PUT FORWARD BECAUSE THE COMMISSIONER IN HIS OPENING ADDRESS, HAS ALREADY SAID THE LEGISLATION IS THERE. HE SAID ON PAGE THREE, AND GOING ON TO PAGE FOUR, "THE INCREASED POPULATION OF THE TERRITORY, THE SCATTERED NATURE OF OUR ESTABLISHED SETTLEMENTS AND THE ANTICIPATED EXPANSION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COUNCIL, WARRANT A GENERAL REDISTRIBUTION OF TERRITORIAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BY MEANS SIMILAR TO THAT USED IN THE PROVINCES. TOWARDS THIS END, LEGISLATION WILL BE PROPOSED TO ESTABLISH AN ELECTORAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION."



WHICH WOULD BE ENTRUSTED WITH THE TASK OF RECOMMENDING TO COUNCIL A RECONSTRUCTION OF OUR ELECTORAL DISTRICTS SO AS TO REFLECT THE REALITIES OF CHANGING TIME." Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Members who have moved the amendment, all the motion is asking for is that they introduce at this time, the very piece of legislation that the Commissioner is available for proposal. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North already indicated that it is there and ready.

Now, when the Honourable Member from Watson Lake used the word "blackmail", there can be no doubt that what has been said was an attempt by Councillor Tanner, and I am surprised at Councillor Watson in this case, supporting those particular words or supporting the amendment, very surprised because she knows full well that we had asked for this legislation to come forward as early as possible at least to get it started, and here we have a specific statement made by the Commissioner saying that the legislation will be proposed and then we are being told that notwithstanding, that the legislation is here. You pass the budget, rubber stamp it without question of any of the items that

are in there that should be discussed and especially in the Commissioner's, so-called Budget Address, he says quite clearly that the Budget items will be given very close consideration by the Members of Council. Just to use his words, Mr. Speaker, on page five of Sessional #2, when the Commissioner says, "the expenditures proposed for the coming year will be reviewed by this Council in detail." Now, he says this. He suggests that we do it. And now we are being pushed and I will use the word again, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake has used, blackmailed because we are going to do the very thing that the Administration asked us to do. And that is, study the proposed expenditures in detail.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment and as it reads in any event it just shows the total incapability of bringing forward an amendment that doesn't even amend that what is suggested that should be amended. How it reads, "It is the opinion of this Council, that the Government introduce legislation in this Session of Council." But it is not the opinion because the Government is already indicated that they are going to introduce this legislation, to electoral boundaries. So everything has already been done. Now he changes it to read from what is being asked to be done now, to what is being asked

that has already been done. That is the end of stupidity. What are these people playing at? Games? As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that there is perhaps a lack of understanding of what is really looked towards for the benefit of the people of the Yukon. That is, the responsible attitude of responsible people who are put in a responsible position. This is impossible to find at this time. I would suggest even those Members of Council, in view of what I have said, who have voted to put this amendment through, withdraw their amendment and don't act so childish in this matter. Let us get on with approving the motion as it is so that it can be recognized which we all recognize what the legislation is here. The legislation is ready, and that the legislation be introduced so that it can be dealt with the priority that it should receive. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I find it most ironic at this point in time in the Yukon's history, that an all party agreement of the House of Commons saw fit to put aside debate on supply because of the importance of the introduction, first and second reading of the amendments of the Yukon and the North West Territories Act and the corresponding amendments to the Canada Elections Act.

Here we are, in this House, which should have given without a doubt absolute priority to the amendments to the Yukon Act and to the setting up of an Electoral Boundaries Committee so that judicial redistribution of territorial electoral districts could begin forthwith and what are we doing? We are debating Interim Supply and Supplementary Estimates.

Really, Mr. Speaker, how ignorant can we be. Certainly, there can't be any question as to what the priorities of this Session are. What the people of the Yukon Territory have been demanding for 70 years or more. Now we have the ability to make and to be available to make comment on some changes to the Yukon Act which we have been demanding, which we have been crying for, for years and years. What are we doing? We are wasting our time debating Supplementary Estimates and Interim Supply.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I understand the procedure, the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development are not proceeding further on the Bill. If we discuss C-9 in this House, representation could



BE MADE BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE TOMORROW AS TO WHAT CHANGES WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE FURTHER IN THE YUKON ACT OR WHETHER WE ACCEPTED IT. THEN THE TOTALITY OF THE BILL AS IT APPLIES TO THE YUKON WILL BE READY FOR PROCESSING. THE STATEMENT THAT WE HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THE NORTH WEST TERRITORY'S COUNCIL GOES INTO SESSION OR GOES TO OTTAWA, IS JUST NOT FACTUAL, MR. SPEAKER BECAUSE WE CAN FINISH ALL THE DELIBERATIONS WHICH HAVE TO DO WITH THE YUKON PART OF THE BILL AS SOON AS THIS HOUSE GETS OFF IT'S BUTT AND DELIBERATES AND DISCUSSES THE PRIORITIES OF THIS SESSION WHICH SHOULD BE THE BILL, C-9 AND WHICH SHOULD BE THE LEGISLATION SETTING UP THE ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE.

MR. SPEAKER, HOW THE GOVERNMENT AT THIS TIME CAN INTRODUCE A MOTION WHICH WOULD DELAY THE INTRODUCTION AND THE PASSAGE OF THIS LEGISLATION, WHICH IS OF ULTIMATE IMPORTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME TO COMPREHEND.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, MAYBE I'M ONE OF THOSE THAT ARE A LITTLE MIXED UP BUT IT DOES SEEM TO ME THAT WE'VE ALREADY BEEN ASSURED THAT LEGISLATION, TO SET UP THE COMMISSION, HAS ALREADY BEEN PREPARED. THE ONLY THING I CAN DO AT THIS POINT IS JUST ASK A QUESTION WITHOUT REALLY HEARING AN ANSWER AND THAT IS: IF WE INTRODUCE THIS LEGISLATION AT THIS POINT AND SET UP THAT COMMITTEE, JUST EXACTLY WHAT WILL THAT COMMITTEE DO AT THIS POINT UNTIL THOSE AMENDMENTS ARE DISCUSSED OR AT LEAST APPROVED TO THE YUKON ACT?

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE AN ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IF I MAY BE PERMITTED. IT TAKES TIME AS WE KNOW, MR. SPEAKER TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE. FIRST OF ALL IT MUST BE DETERMINED WHO WILL BE THE MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE. SECONDLY, THE TERMS OF REFERENCE, WITH THE ONE EXCEPTION OF THE FINALITY OF THE DECISION OF PARLIAMENT IN TERMS OF BILL C-9. BUT AS THE COMMISSION, WE CAN GET ALL THIS GROUNDWORK DONE SO THAT THE MINUTE WHETHER WE ARE ASSEMBLED IN SESSION OR NOT, THE MINUTE THE DECISION IS MADE IN OTTAWA BY PARLIAMENT OF HOW MANY SEATS WE ARE GOING TO HAVE, AUTOMATICALLY PUTS THEM TO WORK. THEY HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO SCAN THE YUKON AND THE PROBLEM THAT THEY ARE GOING TO FACE, IT ONLY REMAINS TO DETERMINE THE EXISTING BOUNDARIES AND POPULATIONS. THERE COULD BE A TREMENDOUS

AMOUNT OF WORK DONE THAT IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE DONE IN ANY EVENT. I THINK THAT MIGHT ANSWER THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S QUESTION.

THIS WOULD OF COURSE, WOULD TIE ITSELF. THE TERMS OF REFERENCE WOULD TIE ITSELF TO THE DECISION OF PARLIAMENT IN RESPECT TO BILL C-9.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN FURTHER ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, IS THIS, IF THE LEGISLATION HAS BEEN DELT WITH IN THE HOUSE. IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT IT IS BROUGHT INTO EFFECT IMMEDIATELY BUT THE MOMENT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM VATSON LAKE HAS INDICATED THAT OTTAWA HAS CLEARED THE BILL, THEN THE COMMISSIONER GIVES ASSENT AND THEN IT IS UNDER WAY.

THIS IS THE PREPARATION THAT WE MUST BE DOING SO THAT IT IS ALL READY FOR THE COMMISSIONER TO GIVE ASSENT WHEN THE NECESSARY LEGISLATION THE FEDERAL LEGISLATION HAS BEEN PASSED IN THE HOUSE. THAT IS WHERE WE MUST BE READY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, HOW CAN YOU ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE OR A COMMISSION, WHATEVER YOU ARE GOING TO CALL IT, WITHOUT HAVING THE LEGISLATION COMING INTO FORCE. THIS IS EXACTLY WHERE YOU ARE GOING AGAINST WHAT YOU ARE SAYING. YOU SAY, HAVE THE LEGISLATION READY, HAVE THE LEGISLATION EMPOWERING WHOEVER IS SETTING UP THE COMMITTEE, THEN HAVE THEM GO INTO ACTION AFTER YOUR LEGISLATION COMES INTO FORCE. I'VE ASSURED YOU THE LEGISLATION IS READY AND THAT THERE WILL BE ABSOLUTELY NO DELAY BECAUSE THE COUNCIL HAS NOT PASSED THE LEGISLATION. NO DELAY IN THE REAPPORTIONMENT IN THIS COMMITTEE GETTING TO WORK. I'VE ASSURED YOU THAT. I'VE ALSO ASKED A QUESTION, WHICH HONOURABLE MEMBERS HAVE FAILED TO ANSWER. IN THIS MOTION, ARE THEY WANTING TO INDICATE THAT YOU HAVE A JUDICIAL REAPPORTIONMENT WHETHER YOU HAVE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT OR NOT?

I THINK THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT IN THIS MOTION. IF YOU READ YOUR MOTION CAREFULLY, YOU WILL SEE THAT THE IMPLICATIONS ARE THERE. IF YOU BRING IN LEGISLATION FOR REDISTRIBUTION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS WHETHER THERE ARE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT OR NOT; THAT IS NOT STATED IN THAT MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: PLEASE, COULD WE NOT HAVE A DEBATE ON THIS MOTION, OR AMENDMENT.

MR. TAYLOR: IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION RAISED

BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, I FIND IT INCREDIBLE THAT THE MEMBER WHO HAS CREATED THIS LEGISLATION OR PARTICIPATED IN IT DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THAT WITHIN THE LEGISLATION AS DRAFTED, WE PROVIDE FOR SUCH THINGS. WHEN LEGISLATION IS BROUGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE, WE CAN DEBATE, WE CAN AMEND IT AND IF INDEED IT HAS NOT BEEN PROVIDED FOR IN THE LEGISLATION, IT IS EVEN GREATER REASON TO GET THAT LEGISLATION BEFORE THE HOUSE. WITHIN THAT ARE THE TERMS OF REFERENCE ANSWERING THE QUESTION THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS STATED.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED? DISAGREED? MADAM CLERK WILL YOU POLL THE HOUSE.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE.

MRS. WATSON: AGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST.

MR. MCKINNON: DISAGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE.

MR. TAYLOR: DISAGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON.

MR. STUTTER: AGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DISAGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH.

MR. TANNER: AGREED.

MADAM CLERK: MR. SPEAKER, THE VOTE IS 3 YEH, 3 NAY.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE AMENDMENT CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: MOTION NO. 7. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON--

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER, THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED HAS NOT YET BEEN READ FROM THE CHAIR.

MR. SPEAKER: YOU ARE CORRECT. WE WILL PASS IT AGAIN.

MOTION NO. 2

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TAYLOR THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COUNCIL THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTRODUCE LEGISLATION IN THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL ESTABLISHING AN ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE SO THAT A JUDICIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF TERRITORIAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS CAN BEGIN FORTHWITH.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION NO. 2

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR KEN MCKINNON SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DON TAYLOR THAT THE COMMISSIONER PETITION THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT REQUESTING THAT THE APPLICATION OF THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION BEFORE THE YUKON WATER BOARD TO RAISE THE LEVEL OF MARSH LAKE TO ITS HISTORICAL HIGH LEVEL WATER MARK BE WITHDRAWN.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

THAT THE COMMISSIONER INFORM THE MINISTER THAT IN THE OPINION OF THIS COUNCIL THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION SHOULD BE GIVEN THE NECESSARY INSTRUCTIONS AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP A HYDRO SITE THAT WILL SERVE YUKON'S NEEDS FOR THE FORSEEABLE FUTURE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THE MOTION AT THIS TIME?

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER. MR. SPEAKER I HAVE RAISED THIS MATTER AS A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE IN THE HOUSE AT ONE TIME AND ALSO IT WAS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE MEETINGS THAT COUNCIL HAD WITH THE HONOURABLE JEAN CHRETIEN, THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, WHEN THE MINISTER WAS HERE DURING SOURDOUGH RENDEZVOUS. ALSO PRESENT AT THAT MEETING, WAS ONE OF THE DIRECTORS OF THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION AND A DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE NORTHERN AFFAIRS BRANCH, MR.



DIGBY HUNT.

MR. SPEAKER, I TOOK FROM THE MEETING THAT WE HAD WITH THE MINISTER AND MR. HUNT, THAT THEY WERE IN SYMPATHY OF WHAT SEEMED TO BE THE EXPRESS DESIRE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN A FORMULATION OF A POWER POLICY FOR THE YUKON THAT WOULD SERVE THE YUKON'S NEEDS FOR THE FORSEEABLE FUTURE.

AS I UNDERSTAND IT NOW MR. SPEAKER, BY LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY, THE N.C.P.C. DO NOT HAVE THE ABILITY OF BORROWING A HUGE CAPITAL SUM TO BE ABLE TO CONSTRUCT MAJOR POWER DEVELOPMENTS. SO THEY ARE STUCK WITH HAVING TO PROVIDE AD HOC MEASURES LIKE THEY ARE GOING TO AT THE AISHIHIK POWER PROJECT AT OTTER FALLS AND ALSO WITH THE RAISING OF THE MARSH LAKE CHANGE TO ITS HISTORICAL HIGH LEVEL WATER MARK.

I THINK PROBABLY ALL MEMBERS SAW AN ARTICLE IN THE WHITEHORSE STAR SEVERAL WEEKS AGO CONCERNING WHAT ONE LONG TIME RESIDENT OF THE AREA AND A COTTAGE OWNER AT MARSH LAKE SAID HAPPENED AT THE HISTORICAL HIGH LEVEL WATER MARK AT THE MARSH LAKE BEACH. I THINK THAT I HAVE ALSO MADE IT CLEAR TO MEMBERS THAT IT WOULD BE THE ABSOLUTE RUINATION OF ALLOWING THIS WATER TO BE RAISED TO ITS HIGH LEVEL WATER MARK OF WHAT IS THE BEST AREA FOR RECREATION IN PROXIMITY TO WHERE THE MAJORITY OF THE POPULATION OF THE YUKON LIVE, WHITEHORSE. IT WOULD JUST BE INCREDIBLE THAT A GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION THAT ONCE SAVED THIS AREA FROM TIMBER CUTTING UPON PROTEST OF THE COUNCIL AND OF RESIDENTS OF THE COMMUNITY, THAT SAME GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY WAS NOW GOING TO DESTROY THE AREA WHICH THEY ONCE SAVED ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

OF COURSE THIS IS THE WAY THE TWISTS IRONICALLY WORK SOMETIMES IN THE YUKON, MR. SPEAKER. HOWEVER, IT WAS MY FEELINGS FROM BOTH THE MINISTER AND MR. HUNT, THAT IT WOULD BE UNNECESSARY FOR THE FEW MEGAWATTS OF POWER AND VERY FEW MEGOWATTS OF POWER THAT WERE GOING TO BE AVAILAEE THROUGH THE RAISING OF THE MARSH LAKE HISTORICAL HIGH LEVEL WATER MARK.

THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO UNDERTAKE STUDIES THAT WOULD PROVIDE A 25-50 MEGAWATT POWER PLANT SOMEWHERE IN THE YUKON WHICH WOULD PROVIDE BOTH INDUSTRY AND HOMES WITH A SUPPLY OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY AND AS WE ALL KNOW THE COST OF BOTTLED FUEL IS JUST ESCALAT-

ING BEYOND THE POCKETBOOK OF THE AVERAGE MIDDLE-INCOME WAGE EARNER IN THE YUKON AND CERTAINLY WITH THE HYDRO POTENTIAL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WHICH HAS BEEN SHOWN BY MANY AND VARIOUS STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN COMMISSIONED BY ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT. CERTAINLY THE TIME IS NOW TO BE LOOKING AT A SITE WHICH WILL PROVIDE MORE POWER NEEDS FOR THE YUKON FOR THE FORSEEABLE FUTURE.

MR. SPEAKER, RATHER THAN EVERY TWO YEARS, BEING FACED WITH A CHOICE OF THE RUINATION OF AN AREA LIKE OTTER FALLS, LIKE MARSH LAKE; CERTAINLY FOR ONCE AND FOR ALL WE CAN GET IT DONE FOR A 50 YEAR PERIOD OF TIME SO THAT THE ENVIRONMENTALISTS CAN HAVE THEIR SAY, THE MINING INDUSTRY CAN HAVE THEIR SAY. AT LEAST, LETS NOT GO THROUGH THIS EXERCISE OF FUTILITY EVERY SEVERAL YEARS TO THE DISTURBANCE OF ALL SECTORS OF THE YUKON ECONOMY.

MR. SPEAKER, I CANNOT JUST CONVINCE COUNCIL HOW EXPLOSIVE THIS ISSUE IS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

I CAN TRUTHFULLY SAY THAT NEVER AS A POLITICIAN AND THIS IS EVEN CONCERNING THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN, HAS THERE BEEN A REACTION FROM THE PEOPLE TOWARD THE ATTEMPT OF THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION TO SEEK AN APPLICATION TO RAISE THE WATER LEVEL OF MARSH LAKE.

I THINK IT WOULD BE A HOPELESS AND A USELESS CONFRONTATION AND WHY GO THROUGH THIS CONFRONTATION OF THE YUKON PUBLIC AND THE WATER BOARD FOR THE FEW MEGAWATTS OF POWER. FOR REALLY NOTHING THAT IS GOING TO BE DONE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE YUKON PEOPLE, EXCEPT TO CAUSE AN AWFUL LOT OF CONTROVERSY.

CERTAINLY THE POLITIC THING FOR THE MINISTER TO DO IS TO ASK N.C.P.C. TO WITHDRAW ITS APPLICATION AND AT THE SAME TIME ISSUE A PRESS RELEASE STATING THAT THE N.C.P.C. HAS BEEN INSTRUCTED AND WILL BE GIVEN LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO BE ABLE TO SET UP A HYDRO GENERATING SITE WHICH IS GOING TO SUPPLY THE NEEDS OF THE YUKON. CERTAINLY, THIS IS THE SENSIBLE APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM AND WE'VE GOT TO GET OUT OF THE QUANDRY OF EVERY SEVERAL YEARS COMING BEFORE THIS HOUSE, COMING BEFORE THE WATER BOARD AND ALL THE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS BEING RAISED WHICH JUST WON'T HAVE TO COME EVERY COUPLE OF YEARS IF THE PACT WHICH WAS MENTIONED IN MOTION NO. 7 ISN'T ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA.



I THINK THAT, MR. SPEAKER, KNOWING THE FEELING OF THE MINISTER AND MR. HUNT THAT THEY WOULD APPRECIATE AND WELCOME SUCH A MOTION AS MOTION NO. 7. IT SHOWS THAT YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S ELECTED MEMBERS ARE BEHIND WHAT SEEMS TO BE THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE MINISTER AND OF ONE OF THE DIRECTORS OF THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, THE QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE MOTION RESPECTING TWO THINGS, THE POSSIBLE RESTRICTION OF RECREATIONAL AREAS IN THE MARSH LAKE COMPLEX AND THE MATTER OF FINDING POWER FOR THE YUKON IN GREAT QUANTITY HAVE BEEN QUESTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN BATTED AROUND FOR SOME TIME.

AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST HAS STATED; WE HAVE A REAL IDENTIFIABLE PROBLEM BEHIND THE DAM HERE IN WHITEHORSE.

ANY INCREASE IN THE FOOTAGE OF WATER STORAGE, PRESENTS ECOLOGICAL PROBLEMS, RECREATIONAL PROBLEMS, AND I THINK THAT EVERYBODY IS PRETTY WELL AWARE OF THEM, SO I WON'T DEAL WITH THEM AT THIS TIME.

THERE IS ONE REAL PROBLEM, THAT IS THEY NEED WATER TO SUPPORT TURBINES HERE AND DEPENDING ON THE YEAR, DEPENDING ON THE PRECIPITATION, DEPENDING ON MELT, SPRING MELT, SOME YEARS THEY HAVE SUFFICIENT WATER, SOME YEARS THEY HAVEN'T. IF WE HAVE A DRY SEASON, THE POWER MUST BE FOUND ELSEWHERE OR DIESEL GENERATION HAS TO SUPPLY IT HERE IN TOWN.

SO THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT ABOUT THE NEED FOR POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. WE HAVE SMALL DEVELOPMENTS. WE HAVE AISHIHIK, I THINK COMING IN AT 35 MEGAWATTS WE HAVE THE WHITEHORSE HYDRO, WHICH I JUST CANNOT RECALL RIGHT NOW WHAT ITS POTENTIAL IS. BUT THEY ARE VERY SMALL. WE KNOW THAT WHITEHORSE IS RUNNING AT FULL CAPACITY. WE ALSO ARE INFORMED THAT WHEN AISHIHIK COMES ON LINE... WE KNOW THAT WHITEHORSE IS RUNNING AT FULL CAPACITY. WE ALSO ARE TOLD AND INFORMED THAT WHEN AISHIHIK COMES ON LINE, THAT IT SHALL BE - IT'S TOTAL CAPACITY SHALL BE USED. NOW AISHIHIK WHEN IT COMES TO WHITEHORSE WILL FEED INTO A POWER GRID, BUT EVEN TODAY, AS I SAY, AISHIHIK WILL BE TOTALLY CONSUMED. EVEN TODAY AT FARO ON THE OTHER END OF THIS POWER GRID WHICH IS THE BEGINNING OF A POWER GRID, AND EVERY NIGHT WHEN THEY RUN THAT SHOVEL OUT THERE THAT AFFECTS THE POWER HERE

RIGHT IN THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE. THERE IS NOT SUFFICIENT POWER IN OTHER WORDS TO EVEN ACCOMMODATE ONE PIECE OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT IN A MINE OPERATION AT FARO. IT KNOCKS THE CYCLE METERS IN WHITEHORSE EVERYTIME IT TAKES A BITE. THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE LINE FROM WHITEHORSE TO FARO THROUGH CARMACKS IS VERY IMPORTANT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT ASKING N.C.P.C. TO PROVIDE US WITH A LARGE HYDRO POTENTIAL. IT'S IMPORTANT INASMUCH AS I HAVE SAID BEFORE IT FORMS A POWER GRID, IT'S THE START OF A POWER GRID, AND ANYWHERE ALONG THAT LINE YOU CAN FEED POWER TO IT OR YOU CAN EXTRACT POWER FROM IT. NOW YOU CAN CONSIDER THAT IF THERE WAS SUFFICIENT POWER IN THAT EXISTING POWER GRID TO SERVICE FARO AND BACK TO WHITEHORSE FROM CARMACKS, YOU COULD DEVELOP THAT GRID ON TO THE MAYO DISTRICT TO SERVICE UNITED KENO HILL, MAYO, KENA ELISA, YOU COULD EXTEND IT INDEED ON TO DAWSON AND SERVE THE IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF THE DAWSON AREA, AND ANY OPERATIONS, RESOURCE OPERATIONS VISA VIS MILL CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO MINING OPERATIONS IN THE MINTO AREA. THESE ARE ALL VERY IMPORTANT THINGS AND VERY REAL THINGS MR. SPEAKER. IN DEALING WITH THIS SUBJECT MORE RECENTLY IN TALKING WITH MR. HUNT AND INDEED IN SOME CONVERSATIONS WITH THE MINISTER, I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT N.C.P.C. HAD NOT UNDERTAKEN ANY STUDIES IN THE YUKON OR WERE NOT AWARE OF ANY REAL STUDIES RELATING TO MAJOR POWER SOURCES AND OTHER THAN I BELIEVE THE INGELDOW REPORT, AND I FOUND THIS STRANGE BECAUSE I KNOW PERSONALLY OF STUDIES THAT HAVE GONE ON AT LEAST FOR TWENTY-FIVE OR MAYBE THIRTY YEARS, AND I KNOW THAT THE ANSWER TO THE POWER PROBLEM IN THE YUKON IS CERTAINLY IN THE PELLY VALLEY. THERE IS NO QUESTION IN MY MIND, (A) BECAUSE IT IS CENTRAL, (B) BECAUSE IT CAN SUPPLY THE KIND OF POWER WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IN TERMS OF MEGAWATT. JUST FOR THE RECORD, MR. SPEAKER, I CITE FROM INFORMATION GAINED BY THE FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES BRANCH IN THE FIFTIES, AS A MATTER OF FACT IN THE EARLY FIFTIES, AND THIS WAS A QUOTING NOW FROM THE RECORD OF A REPORT ON THE POTENTIAL HYDRO POWER RESOURCES OF THE YUKON BY H. T. RAMSDEN, DISTRICT ENGINEER, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND YUKON DISTRICT WATER RESOURCES BRANCH. HE TALKS ABOUT GRANITE CANYON SITE WHICH IS THE SITE IN QUESTION, IT IS LOCATED ON THE PELLY RIVER ABOUT TWELVE MILES DOWNSTREAM FROM THE MOUTH OF THE McMILLAN, THAT IS BELOW THE HIGHWAY, AND A



DAM ABOUT 320 FT. 5 FT. HIGH WOULD CREATE A RESERVOIR WITH AN ACTIVE STORAGE VOLUME OF 3,692 ACRE FEET OF STORAGE, THAT IS ACTIVE STORAGE, AND A USABLE STORAGE VOLUME OF 5,762,000 ACRE FEET, AND THE TOTAL INSTALLED CAPACITY OF THE PROJECT WOULD BE 253 MEGAWATTS, THAT IS 253,000 KILOWATTS AND WE ALSO HAVE THE BRAYDEN CANYON SITE WHICH I WON'T GO INTO ALL THE DETAILS BUT A DAM ABOUT 220 FT. HIGH WOULD PROVIDE ABOUT ANOTHER 180 MEGAWATTS OR 180,000 KILOWATTS, SO HERE IS WHERE WE FIND THE POWER FOR THE PELLY VALLEY. ALSO, WE TALKED ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF A SMELTER, AND I THINK THAT THE 100,000,000 TON REQUIREMENT FOR A SMELTER FEED IN TERMS OF ZINC, LEAD ZINC ORES AND CONCENTRATES SHALL WE SAY, IS JUST ABOUT REACHED, AND IF YOU PUT UP A SMELTER YOU NEED BIG BLOCKS OF POWER, AND I CAN'T JUST STAND HERE TODAY AND GIVE YOU THE EXACT AMOUNT. I HAVE HEARD SOME QUOTATIONS BUT AGAIN IT IS DECIDED BY THE SIZE OF THE ELECTROLYTIC ZINC SMELTER, BUT WE KNOW WE ARE GOING TO NEED POWER. NOW, IF WE ARE TALKING ABOUT POWER, WE ARE TOLD THAT IT WILL TAKE FIVE YEARS BEFORE YOU WILL GET ANY BENEFIT WHATSOEVER OUT OF A NEW PROJECT SUCH AS A NEW DAM, AND SO IT POSSIBLY WOULD TAKE THREE TO FIVE YEARS TO BUILD THE SMELTER. BUT NOW IS THE TIME - IT'S IMMEDIATE, AND THIS IS WHAT THE MOTION HERE HOPEFULLY REFLECTS THE IMMEDIACY AGAIN OF THE SITUATION. WE KNOW THAT SOME STUDIES - INCIDENTALLY, I MIGHT ADD THAT FOR ALL MEMBERS' INFORMATION I TELEPHONED THIS MORNING TO THE WATER RESOURCES PEOPLE AND THEY INFORMED ME THAT IN ADDITION TO THE INFORMATION THAT IS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT ON THIS AND OTHER SITES, RELATED SITES, THAT THERE IS EVEN DETAIL IN VANCOUVER BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT HAD A TEAM WORKING ON THIS AS A VERY SPECIAL ITEM IN THE FIFTIES, AND THEY HAVE EVEN GONE SO FAR AS TO GO INTO TURBINE SPECIFICATIONS IN PLANT DESIGN AND EVERYTHING FOR EACH ONE OF THESE SITES, AND SO I PUT IT TO COMMITTEE AND ALSO TO THE RECORD IN THE HOPES THAT N.C.P.C. WOULD LOOK AT THIS FACILITY, LOOK AT THIS RESEARCH AND INDEED GIVE IT SOME THOUGHT BECAUSE I WAS GIVEN THE CLEAR OPINION IN DISCUSSING THIS WITH MR. HUNT AND OTHERS THAT THEY WERE NOT POSSIBLY AWARE THAT THIS MUCH WORK HAD BEEN DONE IN DETERMINING POWER POTENTIAL. SO, THEN WE CAN ONLY HOPE THAT THE MOTION HAVING BEEN APPROVED AND HOPEFULLY APPROVED THAT THE N.C.P.C. WILL GET ON WITH THE JOB, AND PROVIDE WHAT THE YUKON REALLY NEEDS BADLY NOW - HYDRO ELECTRIC POWER FOR EVERYBODY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY NECESSITY FOR ME TO MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO THE FIRST PART OF THE RESOLUTION BECAUSE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROTECTING THE RECREATIONAL AREAS OF MARSH LAKE SPEAKS FOR ITSELF. I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SOME GENERAL REFERENCE TO THE SECOND PORTION OF THE MOTION BECAUSE THERE HAS BEEN A NEGLECT ON THE PART OF THE NORTHERN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT TO FOLLOW UP THE REPORTS THAT THEY HAD RECEIVED FROM INGELDON & ASSOCIATES LIMITED OF VANCOUVER. ON APRIL 28, 1967, THE THEN ASSISTANT-DEPUTY MINISTER, JOHN McDONALD, SENT A LETTER TO THAT PARTICULAR FIRM AND DETAILED WHAT WAS REQUIRED TO COMPRISE THE CARRYING OUT OF SURVEYS OF WATER RESOURCES IN THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND SET OUT SOME OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY, AND IT INCLUDED - I WON'T GO THROUGH ALL THE DETAILS BUT JUST SOME OF THE THINGS IT INCLUDED, THAT ONE AUGMENTING AS APPROPRIATE, ANY EXISTING INFORMATION THAT MAY ALREADY BE AVAILABLE RESPECTING THE SITES OF POTENTIAL HYDRO ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENTS, AND EXTENDING THE INFORMATION OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION TO INCLUDE HYDRO ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENTS OF A GENERAL CAPACITY OF FROM FIVE TO FIFTY MEGAWATTS. IT IS ALSO TO MAKE SURE THAT THE DETAILS OF BOTH QUESTIONS 1 AND 2 WERE INCLUDED IN THE CONTEMPLATED RESOURCE; THE NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS, NATURAL AND MINERAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS OF THE YUKON. IT WAS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT THEY ALSO MAKE REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS, AND ASK THAT THEY BE PLACED IN ORDER OF PRIORITY IN WHICH THEY WERE TO BE ASSESSED. IN THE FIRST ORDER OF PRIORITY WAS ESSENTIALLY YUKON WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCES TO THE VAN GORDER CREEK AREA, THE CLINTON CREEK AREA, THE CARMACKS AREA, THE FLAT RIVER AREA IN THE CONTEXT OF CANADA TUNGSTEN, THE SNAKE RIVER AREA WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO QUEST EXPLORATION. NOW THESE SURVEYS WERE CARRIED OUT, THEN THE INFORMATION THAT WAS GIVEN WAS SUPPOSED TO BE THE GUIDELINE FOR NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION, AND INDEED THE REFERENCE TO NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION WAS INDICATED WHEN IN A PARAGRAPH IT SAID THIS, AND I QUOTE: "THE FOREGOING IS TO BE CARRIED OUT UNDER THE GENERAL DIRECTION BOTH OF THE RESOURCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GROUP OF THE DEPT. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, AND OF THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION. IT IS ALSO TO RELY ON THE PUBLISHED STREAM-FLOW MEASUREMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES & RESOURCES, PUBLISHED DATA IF REQUIRED WOULD



BE SECURED BY THE RESTRAINTS & ECONOMIC GROUP." IT IS FAIRLY OBVIOUS THEN THAT EVERY INTENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS IN SPENDING WHAT WAS OVER \$95,000.00 ON THE INGELDOW REPORT TO HAVE N.C.P.C. OBTAIN ALL THE INFORMATION RELATIVE TO NECESSARY SITES SO THAT THOSE SITES CAN BE DEVELOPED, AND THIS MOTION THAT WE HAVE PUT FORWARD NOW IS REALLY DOING NOTHING MORE THAN REITERATING WHAT N.C.P.C. HAVE BY WAY OF INFORMATION, BUT IS ASKING THEM TO PROCEED ON THE BASIS OF THE INFORMATION THEY HAVE TO ASCERTAIN A SOURCE OUT OF THE MANY SOURCES THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN TO TAKE CARE OF THE NEEDS OF THE HYDRO FUTURE OF THE YUKON. BUT, THERE IS ONE FURTHER POINT THAT THIS ONLY LIMITS TO A MAXIMUM OF 50 MEGAWATTS YET THERE ARE AREAS WHICH HAVE A FAR GREATER POTENTIAL SO THEY HAVE NOW THE REPORTS AND STUDIES UP TO 50 MEGAWATTS, BUT THE QUESTION IS WHETHER ONE OR TWO SITES OF 50 MEGAWATTS ARE GOING TO SUFFICE OR WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD BE GOING INTO AN AREA OF HYDRO ELECTRIC PRODUCTION THAT WILL BE SUFFICIENT FOR THE FUTURE GENERATIONS TO COME, AND THIS IS SOMETHING THAT MUST BE DONE NOW. I WOULD SUGGEST MR. SPEAKER THAT MEMBERS OF COUNCIL RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS A REQUIREMENT TO THE FUTURE OF THE YUKON TO HAVE A PROPOSAL BROUGHT FORWARD BY N.C.P.C. SO THAT THEY CAN, THAT THE GOVERNMENT CAN ACCEPT THE COST STRUCTURE AND THAT THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO PROCEED WITH A MAJOR HYDRO DEVELOPMENT SITE SO THAT WE MAY HAVE THAT FUTURE WITHOUT, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST SAID, WITHOUT CONTINUALLY COMING BACK FOR FURTHER STUDIES, FURTHER DIRECTIONS AND FURTHER OBJECTIONS. THANK YOU MR. SPEAKER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM AT ALL IN SUPPORTING THIS MOTION, THERE IS, HOWEVER, ONE PART OF THE SECOND PART OF THE MOTION THAT I DO HAVE A LITTLE PROBLEM WITH AND I WILL BE COMING TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I FIND THAT THE PROPOSAL AS BEING PUT FORWARD BY N.C.P.C. TO RAISE THE WATER LEVEL IN THE MARSH LAKE AREAS IS REALLY NOTHING OTHER THAN A STOP GAP METHOD, AND I PARTICULARLY SUPPORT THE MOTION FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT THIS SUGGESTION OF N.C.P.C. IS ONE THAT WOULD ONLY TAKE CARE OF THE NEEDS OF THE WHITEHORSE AREA, THE FARO AREA, AND OF ANY OTHER AREAS THAT ARE SERVICED BY THAT PRESENT GOOD SYSTEM, BUT I'VE ALWAYS, EVER SINCE I'VE BEEN INTERESTED IN POLITICS, INTERESTED IN POWER, HAVE STATED THAT I WOULD DO WHATEVER I COULD TO SEE THAT CHEAP POWER

BE MADE AVAILABLE TO AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE IN THE TERRITORY. WE HAVE GOT TO LOOK FURTHER THAN JUST THE POWER DEVELOPMENT ITSELF, PERHAPS SOMETHING ALMOST AS EXPENSIVE AS THE GRID SYSTEM, AND AS THE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE HAS MENTIONED, THERE IS NO REASON WHY, AT LEAST THERE IS NO REASON THAT I COULD SEE, WHY THE GRID SYSTEM SHOULDN'T BE EXTENDED IN MANY AREAS OF THE TERRITORY TO TAKE IN SOME OF THE LARGER COMMUNITIES. WHEN MR. HUNT WAS HERE WITH THE MINISTER JUST TWO OR THREE WEEKS AGO, HE STATED THAT HE FELT THE FINANCING OF A LARGE HYDRO DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE TOO GREAT FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE FAR GREATER THAN THE REQUIRED NEEDS AT THE MOMENT, BUT IT DOES SEEM TO ME THAT IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WAS TO TAKE A FURTHER LOOK TO CONSIDER THIS SMELTER THAT WAS POINTED OUT BY COUNCILLOR TAYLOR AND CONSIDER THE FANTASTIC PROJECTED INCREASES IN THE POPULATION AND CONSIDERED THE NEED TO START CONSERVING POSSIBLE FUEL, THAT THE EXPENSE PART OF IT SHOULD BE LOOKED AT FROM A DIFFERENT ANGLE. I AM SURE ALSO THAT IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WERE TO MAKE LOW-INTEREST LOANS AVAILABLE TO MOST OF THE RESIDENTS IN THE TERRITORY PAYABLE OVER A FAIRLY LONG PERIOD OF TIME, MOST PEOPLE IF THEY KNEW THAT THEY HAD CHEAP ELECTRICITY MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM WOULD GLADLY CONVERT THEIR HOUSING TO ELECTRICITY, AND I'M SURE THAT IF MOST OF THE HOUSES IN THE TERRITORY WERE HEATED ELECTRICALLY THERE WOULD INCREASE THE DEMAND OR THE USE OF ELECTRICITY TO A CONSIDERABLE DEGREE. SO AS I SAY I HAVE NO PROBLEM SUPPORTING THE MOTION, BUT I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT ONE THING. IN THE SECOND PART OF THE MOTION IT DOES GIVE ME PERHAPS A LITTLE TROUBLE, AND THAT IS THE WORDS "LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY". I WOULD HOPE THAT BY PUTTING THOSE WORDS IN, IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE FUNCTION OF THE YUKON WATER BOARD IS BEING OVERRULED. IT DOES HAVE A TENDANCY TO INDICATE THAT TO ME ANYWAY IN THE MOTION. IF I READ IT WRONG WELL THAT'S FINE, OTHERWISE IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT SHOULD PERHAPS BE AMENDED SO THAT IT DOES NOT IN ANY WAY OVERRULE THE AUTHORITY OF THE YUKON WATER BOARD.

MR. MCKINNON: TO ANSWER THE QUESTION MR. SPEAKER, AS I UNDERSTAND THE N.C.P.C. ACT, THE N.C.P.C. UNDER THE ACT WHICH THEY NOW OPERATE UNDER DO NOT HAVE THE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO BE ABLE TO BORROW LARGE SUMS OF



MONEY AT LOW-INTEREST RATES TO BE ABLE TO CAPITALIZE MAJOR POWER DEVELOPMENTS. THIS IS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY WE HAVE THE SMALLER AD HOC TYPE OF PLANTS BEING DEVELOPED, SO IT'S UNDER THE ACT THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GIVE THE N.C.P.C. THE AUTHORITY UNDER THE ACT TO BE ABLE TO PUT INTO EFFECT A MAJOR POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. TANNER: QUESTION Mr. SPEAKER,

Mr. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

Mr. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. MADAME CLERK WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF Mr. COMMISSIONER IS AVAILABLE. WE WILL HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

*RECESS.*

Mr. SPEAKER: THE COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ORDER. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: SMALL BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. SPEAKER, WITH REGARDS TO THE SMALL BUSINESS LOAN FUNDS, HOW ARE REGULATIONS DISTRIBUTED AND WHY ARE THEY NOT IN THE REGULATIONS BOOKS?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: I AM SORRY Mr. SPEAKER, I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHERE THEY ARE BUT, WE WILL CIRCULATE THESE OR DISTRIBUTE THEM ALONG WITH THE REGULATIONS PURSUANT TO THE FEDERAL ACT, Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IS IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT YOU HAVE APPOINTED THE CHAIRMAN?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, I THINK THAT THAT IS A FAIR STATEMENT AS FAR AS I'M AWARE. THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, BUT AGAIN AS I SAY I'M SPEAKING ENTIRELY OF MEMORY Mr. SPEAKER, AND THERE WERE SOME DOCUMENTS ON MY DESK, EITHER TODAY OR FRIDAY IN CONNECTION WITH THIS, BUT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. COMMISSIONER I WANT YOU TO INDICATE WHETHER YOU APPROVE OF

A BOARD ACTING ARBITRARILY IN REFUSING TO ALLOW APPLICANTS FOR THOSE FUNDS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE AVAILABLE FOR TO ASSIST SMALL BUSINESS PEOPLE IN BEING REFUSED TO BE INTERVIEWED OR PRESENT THEIR CASES TO THE BOARD. WOULD YOU INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT YOU ARE IN APPROVAL OF THIS?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, I AM NOT GOING TO ANSWER ANY SUCH QUESTION BECAUSE I'M JUST NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER THAT KIND OF A QUESTION. I DON'T KNOW.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. SPEAKER, CAN WE TAKE IT THEN FROM Mr. COMMISSIONER THAT IT DOESN'T MATTER TO HIM WHETHER THE RIGHT OF NATURAL JUSTICE IS BEING REMOVED FROM A PERSON WHO WISHES TO GO BEFORE A BOARD AND PLACE HIS COMPLAINT OR HIS APPLICATION BEFORE THEM. WOULD YOU BE PREPARED TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, I'M BEING LED INTO A WHOLE SERIES OF QUESTIONS WHICH I AM JUST NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER AT THIS TIME.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: LET ME PUT ONE MORE QUESTION Mr. SPEAKER, AND PERHAPS, IN THIS MATTER, WE WILL GET SOMETHING FROM HIM PRETTY PROMPTLY. A NUMBER OF VERY WELL THOUGHT OUT BUSINESS PROPOSITIONS HAVE BEEN PLACED BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS LOANS BOARD. MANY PEOPLE WHO KNOW OF THESE PROPOSITIONS, KNOW THAT THEY ARE SOUND VENTURES. IT HAS BEEN REFUSED. THESE PROPOSITIONS HAVE BEEN REFUSED WITHOUT CORRESPONDENCE, WITHOUT REASONS WHY AND SIMPLY ON THE BASIS, I WOULD SAY, OF THE DISLIKES OF INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AGAINST THE PEOPLES THAT HAVE APPLIED.

WILL YOU ASCERTAIN, Mr. COMMISSIONER, AT THIS TIME, WHEN WILL A FULL REPORT COME FORWARD FROM THE SMALL BUSINESS LOANS BOARD SO THAT THIS COUNCIL CAN IDENTIFY WHETHER OR NOT THE BOARD HAS BEEN ACTING WITH IMPROPRIETY IN THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY ARE DEALING WITH THE SUBJECT MATTER OF APPLICATIONS?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, ONCE AGAIN I'M BEING ASKED TO ANSWER A QUESTION WHICH I AM NOT REALLY PROPERLY EQUIPPED TO ANSWER. IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, THIS IS FEDERAL MONEY AND IT COMES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF MY MINISTER. THE REGULATIONS ARE ISSUED UNDER HIS ORIGINAL BASIC AUTHORITY AND THE REPORTS WITH REGARD TO THE COMMITTEES' ACTIVITIES GO TO THE MINISTER. I THINK IT IS UP TO HIM TO DECIDE AS TO WHETHER



OR NOT ANY FURTHER INVESTIGATION OR QUERY SHOULD BE MADE. IF ANY WRITTEN COMPLAINT IS MADE TO ME, MR. SPEAKER, WITH REGARD TO ACTIONS OF THE BOARD, AS POSSIBLY OUTLINED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, I WOULD CERTAINLY BE VERY PLEASED TO SEE THAT THEY ARE PROPERLY REFERRED. NOW BEYOND THAT, I'M AFRAID THAT I AM JUST NOT EQUIPPED OR PREPARED TO GO ON AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THIS BRINGS UP THE SUPPLEMENTARY. MR. SPEAKER, PERHAPS WE CAN GET THIS DEADHEAD STANDING NEXT TO ME TO, NOT TO INTERFERE WITH A QUESTION OF ALL SERIOUSNESS THAT I AM PUTTING FORWARD IN THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE IN THE YUKON. IF THE MAN WANTS TO ACT LIKE A DUMB BELL, LET HIM DO SO, BUT NOT HERE.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THIS BRINGS FORWARD THE SUPPLEMENTARY. THE AUTHORITY FOR DISTRIBUTION OF THOSE FUNDS COMES FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO THE COMMISSIONER, AS THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE TERRITORY, FOR DISTRIBUTION BY A BOARD APPOINTED BY HIM, AND ALSO THAT ONE OF HIS OFFICERS IS NAMED AS THE LOAN DIRECTOR. I THINK THIS IS CLEAR.

WHERE A SPECIFIC PROPOSED INDUSTRY HAS BEEN PUT FORWARD AND SUFFICIENT GUARANTEE AND COLLATERAL BY WAY OF . . . WHICH HAVE BEEN PROVIDED AND OFFERED. WILL THE COMMISSIONER INDICATE, OR WILL THE COMMISSIONER SAY HE WOULD INVESTIGATE AS TO WHY THIS BOARD IS NOT ACCEPTING THIS TYPE OF COLLATERAL WHEN IT FALLS WITHIN THE LEGISLATION THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PUT FORWARD TO ASSIST SMALL BUSINESSES IN THE OPERATION OF THEIR BUSINESS.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I THINK I HAVE CLEARLY INDICATED THAT IF I HAVE A WRITTEN COMPLAINT COMES TO ME OR A WRITTEN SUBMISSION COMES TO ME, I THINK I AM DULY BOUND TO CHECK FURTHER INTO IT, BUT JUST SIMPLY ON THE BASIS OF AN EXCHANGE OF QUESTIONS HERE ON THE FLOOR OF THE COUNCIL, MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD FIND IT VERY DIFFICULT TO ANSWER ANYTHING. YOU KNOW, MORE THAN I HAVE ANSWERED AT THIS TIME. I THINK IT MUST BE REMEMBERED BY HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THIS KIND OF A FUND IS A FUND OF LAST RESORT. I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THE WORDING OF THE REGULATIONS IS BUT I BELIEVE THAT A FORMAL TURN DOWN IS REQUIRED FROM WHAT IS LOOKED UPON AS THE NORMAL LOAN INSTITUTIONS, MR. SPEAKER.

POSSIBLY LOCAL BANKS OR POSSIBLY THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK, AGAIN I'M NOT TOO SURE OF THE TERMINOLOGY HERE, BUT AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THIS BEING A FUND OF LAST RESORT, AS FAR AS BUSINESS FINANCING IS CONCERNED, IT MAY WELL BE THAT IN SOME INSTANCES THAT THE LEVEL OF SOPHISTICATION OR THE LEVEL OF COLLATERAL THAT IS OFFERED WOULD CLEARLY INDICATE THAT THIS BOARD, THAT IN LIEU OF A FORMAL TURN DOWN FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS THAT THEY ARE INHIBITED BY THEIR REGULATIONS FROM PROCEEDING FURTHER. CERTAINLY, IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO RAISES THIS POINT, AND I DON'T QUESTION BUT WHAT HE HAS SOME VALID REASON FOR RAISING THIS, IF THERE WAS A COMPLAINANT CAME TO ME WITH A WRITTEN SUBMISSION, I WOULD BE DULY BOUND TO FOLLOW IT UP.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR TAYLOR.

QUESTION RE: HAND IN CARMACKS AREA FOR RAILROAD YARDS

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT TO MR. COMMISSIONER AND ITS ALMOST EVERY SESSION I DO ASK THIS QUESTION FOR THE PURPOSES, I THINK, THAT ALL MEMBERS AND MR. COMMISSIONER WOULD APPRECIATE. I AM WONDERING IF AS YET THE ADMINISTRATION HAVE RECEIVED OR GRANTED ANY APPLICATIONS FROM THE WHITE PASS & YUKON ROUTE OR TO THE CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILROADS FOR LAND UPON WHICH TO PLACE RAILROAD YARDS IN THE CARMACKS AREA.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF I COULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY OF UPDATING MY SEARCH OF THE RECORDS ON THIS MATTER. I DON'T WANT TO MISLEAD THE HOUSE WITH REGARD TO THIS AND I WOULD HAVE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY OF HAVING A SEARCH MADE OF THE CURRENT RECORD SITUATION.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR?

QUESTION RE: CONSTRUCTION OF ROSS RIVER SCHOOL

MR. TAYLOR: I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT A QUESTION TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE RELATED TO THE ROSS RIVER SCHOOL AND I HAVE NOTED IN THE BUDGET THAT THERE IS A SUM PROPOSED IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCHOOL. I AM WONDERING IF SHE WOULD BE PREPARED, MR. SPEAKER, THIS MORNING TO ASSURE US THAT IF THE SUMS ARE PASSED BY COUNCIL THAT THE SCHOOL WILL IN FACT BE UNDER CONSTRUCTION THIS YEAR.



Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I can't assure that it will be under construction. I know that the design work is being worked on right now and there is a great deal of planning and design work already been put into this project and that we are very hopeful that the contract will be let and construction commenced this building season, but to guarantee it would be another matter. But certainly I hope that this will be done.

Mr. Taylor: A further supplementary question Mr. Speaker. When the school is constructed and when it is in operation, is it intended that grades 10, 11 and 12 will be taught in this school.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are planning a school to accommodate kindergarten to grade 10. Just very recently, in fact over the past week, we have had some submissions from the community of Ross River asking us to give consideration for instruction at the grade 11 and 12 level and I think it was indicated that some of the department officials will be out to speak to the people at Ross River, but you must realize that if we are going to change the level of instruction that will be given at the Ross River School, the grade 11 and 12, then it would be necessary to increase the funding for the construction of this school because the design of the building would have to be changed quite a great deal. Because you would have to then accommodate shop and home economic courses. I am aware of the situation and we will be contacting the people and having meetings with them.

Mr. Taylor: One final supplementary question to this matter. Apparently, I understand then from the Honourable Member, Mr. Speaker, that design work is underway. If this design work is available for viewing, would the Honourable Member be prepared to allow Members of Council to see the general design of the school, once this information is available?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, the architect has not completed the design at this time and if the Honourable Member would like to be contacted when the design is completed, that is fine. I would be happy to do that.

QUESTION RE: C-11

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to

ask Mr. Commissioner a question. Last Friday Mr. Speaker, it was moved by Councillor McKinnon, seconded by Councillor Taylor, that the 22nd Wholly Elected Council of the Yukon Territory presently in session, unanimously support C-11, an Act to amend the British North America Act 1867-1965, which will entitle the Yukon Territory and the North West Territory to be represented in the Senate by one member each. This motion passed the House unanimously, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to ask Mr. Commissioner whether the motion has been forwarded to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, not as yet, but it will be going out in today's communication schedule.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I would like to advise Mr. Commissioner that motion No. 7, that the Commissioner petition the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development requesting that the application of the N.C.P.C. before the Yukon Water Board: to raise the level of Marsh Lake to its historical high level water mark be withdrawn and be it further resolved that the Commission inform the Minister that in the opinion of this Council, the N.C.P.C. should be given the necessary inspections and legislative authority to develop the hydro site that will serve Yukon communities for the foreseeable future, passed this House unanimously this morning. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. Commissioner, whether this motion will be forwarded to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development today.

Mr. Commissioner: I cannot guarantee today but it will go first thing tomorrow morning. We generally have to wait on the votes and proceedings, Mr. Speaker, in order to get the exact wordings on these things and it will definitely be out of here tomorrow morning. If Honourable Members felt that in this particular instance that they would like to have this forwarded to the Minister today, I would ask the Clerk if she could pull the wording out, and I would certainly be very pleased to get it out today.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would be much more interested if Mr. Commissioner could ask the Minister for a reply to one or several or some of our motions once in a while.



MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS THE WHOLE IDEA OF SENDING THEM. ALL THAT WE CAN DO IS ACT ON THE BASIS THAT COUNCIL HAS PASSED THESE MOTIONS AND SEEK THE MINISTER'S CONCURRENCE OR OTHERWISE, TO THEM.

QUESTION RE: COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. MR. COMMISSIONER, ARE COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS PUBLIC DOCUMENTS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, UNLESS THERE IS SOME SPECIAL REASON THAT I AM NOT PRESENTLY AWARE OF, THE ANSWER IS YES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. COMMISSIONER, COULD YOU INDICATE WHY TWO WEEKS AGO WHEN I TRIED TO GET FIVE COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS WHICH WERE NOT DISTRIBUTED IN THE REGULATIONS, I LEARNED THAT UPON THE INSTRUCTIONS OF MR. FINGLAND, THESE ORDERS WERE NOT TO BE GIVEN TO ME AND IT WAS ONLY BECAUSE IT TOOK MY PERSISTENCE FOR FOUR DAYS AND BECAUSE I INFORMED THE LEGAL ADVISER THAT IF THEY WERE NOT FORTHCOMING, I WOULD ONCE AGAIN GO TO COURT AND TAKE AN ACTION AGAINST IT, THAT THEY DID COME FORWARD AND WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER ADVISE ME WHETHER OR NOT MR. FINGLAND'S ORDERS WERE GIVEN TO HIM BY HIMSELF TO FRUSTRATE ME IN THE OPERATION OF MY OFFICE AS TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR. THAT'S THE FIRST ONE.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVEN'T GOT A CLUE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AGREE. DO YOU SAY, MR. COMMISSIONER, THAT YOU DID NOT GIVE INSTRUCTIONS TO MR. FINGLAND TO NOT TO GIVE ME COPIES OF COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I DON'T KNOW TO WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS REFERRING, MR. SPEAKER. I BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE SOME COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS FROM TIME TO TIME THAT ARE ISSUED PURSUANT TO THINGS OTHER THAN TERRITORIAL ORDINANCES, WHICH DO NOT GET PUT INTO THE FOLDERS THAT ARE THEN DISTRIBUTED, AND THIS HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION AND I BELIEVE THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE A SEPARATE SECTION OF THE BINDERS SET ASIDE FOR THE INCLUSION OF THESE THINGS, MR. SPEAKER. OTHER THAN THAT I CAN'T BE VERY HELPFUL IN ANSWERING THAT QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, WITH RESPECT, I AM ATTEMPTING TO GET SOME STRAIGHT FORWARD

ANSWERS FROM THE COMMISSIONER. I WANT TO KNOW WHETHER HE GAVE INSTRUCTIONS, YES OR NO? IT IS A SIMPLE ANSWER THAT I AM TRYING TO GET FROM HIM. DID YOU GIVE ANY INSTRUCTIONS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I AM NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. I AM NOT AWARE OF PRECISELY WHAT INSTRUCTIONS ARE REFERRED TO OR ANYTHING ELSE. THE PARTICULAR ORDER IN QUESTION, I THINK THAT I HAVE ANSWERED AS WHY THEY WERE NOT IN THESE FOLDERS. I HAVE EXPLAINED AS TO WHAT WE ARE DOING TO SEE THAT THEY GET INTO THESE FOLDERS AND BEYOND THAT, WHY, I DON'T, I JUST DON'T CONTEMPLATE WHAT THE QUESTION IS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AM GOING TO FOLLOW UP THIS LINE OF QUESTIONING, MR. SPEAKER, BECAUSE IT IS A PARTICULAR AREA WHERE IT INTERFERES WITH THE EFFORTS OF TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS TO FIND OUT AND ASCERTAIN WHAT ORDERS ARE BEING ISSUED. WHY AN APPOINTED MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE ANY DIRECTION OVER WHAT TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS, WHAT DOCUMENTS THAT TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS WANT TO GET HOLD OF. IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT MR. COMMISSIONER'S REASON TO BELIEVE NOW THAT MR. FINGLAND'S FUNCTION IS TO FRUSTRATE ME IN MY, OR ATTEMPT TO FRUSTRATE ME, IN MY DUTIES. IF I COULD ONLY TAKE IT IN MY HOPE THAT THE MINISTER WILL TAKE NOTE OF THIS PARTICULAR THING BECAUSE THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT IN ANYBODY'S MIND MR. COMMISSIONER, THAT MR. FINGLAND IS DELIBERATELY TRYING TO PREVENT ME FROM ASKING AND RECEIVING ORDERS THAT I HAVE ASKED FOR. I CAN'T GET AN ANSWER FROM YOU. UNLESS MR. COMMISSIONER IS PREPARED TO ANSWER WHETHER HE GAVE INSTRUCTIONS IT CAN ONLY BE ASSUMED THAT HE KNEW THAT MR. FINGLAND WAS REFUSING, WAS INSTRUCTING THE SECRETARIAT NOT GIVE ME DOCUMENTS THAT I HAD ASKED FOR. I WANT TO, BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO STOP, MR. SPEAKER FOR A BREAK, PERHAPS I WILL STOP ASKING MY QUESTIONS WHEN WE COME BACK THIS AFTERNOON.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, I HAVE. DO YOU WANT TO CONTINUE WITH QUESTIONS, THEN?

MR. TANNER? YES, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: WE WILL PROCEED UNTIL THE HOUR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU ISSUED A COMMISSIONER'S ORDER, ORDER #1970/2, RELATING TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THIS WAS ONE OF THE ORDERS THAT I



WASN'T AWARE OF AND I DON'T THINK ANY MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WAS AWARE OF OR HAVE THEY GOT A COPY OF IT. THE VERY, THIS WAS SIGNED BY YOURSELF AND IT SAYS THIS, THAT THE VERY FIRST SECTION SAYS, AND THIS REFERRING THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, "THE MEMBERS SHALL SERVE FULL TIME DURING PLEASURE AND CARRY OUT THE DUTIES OF THEIR OFFICE UNDER THE MANAGEMENT AND DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSIONER." FROM WHOM DID YOU OBTAIN AUTHORITY TO ISSUE A COMMISSIONER'S ORDER TO YOURSELF GIVING YOU DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT OVER THE ELECTED PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ONLY WAY I CAN ANSWER QUESTIONS LIKE THIS IS IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL SUBMIT QUESTIONS THAT WILL GET A WRITTEN ANSWER. THIS IS THE ONLY WAY I CAN ANSWER THEM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE ASKED FOR WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND I WAS TOLD LAST, I HAVE GIVEN WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND I HAVE ASKED FOR WRITTEN ANSWERS. ON FRIDAY, MR. COMMISSIONER TOLD ME THAT HE HAD ANSWERS FOR A SERIES OF QUESTIONS I HAD ASKED ON HIS DESK FOR SIGNATURE. WE COME FORWARD TODAY AND THEY ARE NOT HERE YET.

MR. TANNER: ON A POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER. THEY ARE ON HIS DESK.

MR. COMMISSIONER: THEY ARE RIGHT HERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I HAVEN'T GOT THEM ON MY DESK.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, LEGISLATIVE RETURN #14 HAS BEEN INTRODUCED.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER, ORDER PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, I HAVEN'T GOT IT AND THAT IS WHAT I ASKED FOR. I TOLD YOU BEFORE THAT I HAVEN'T GOT IT. NOW, WELL I HAVEN'T GOT IT YET. CAN I GET AN ANSWER THEN FROM MR. COMMISSIONER TO THIS QUESTION WHETHER IT BE IN WRITING OR OTHERWISE. WHERE DID YOU GET THE AUTHORITY TO SIGN AN ORDER ISSUING TO YOURSELF INSTRUCTIONS THAT YOU HAVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT OVER ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL? CAN I GET AN ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION, WRITTEN OR OTHERWISE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IN THEIR CAPACITY AS MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, CARRYING OUT ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS THAT ARE PLACED IN THE HANDS OF THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, WHO DELEGATES

AFTER THE COMMISSIONER FROM THAT PARTICULAR ANGLE.

MR. SPEAKER: IN VIEW OF THE HOUR, WE WILL RECESS UNTIL 2:00 P.M.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: THE COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS FOR 1973-74

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO CONTINUE WITH MY LINE OF QUESTIONING FROM THIS MORNING RELATIVE TO THE ISSUING OF COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS FOR 1973/2. WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER INDICATE FROM WHOM DID HE GET INSTRUCTIONS OR AUTHORITY TO ISSUE THAT ORDER GIVING HIM DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT OVER THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER, IN BEAUCHESNE, ANNOTATION 171, PAGE 146, "A QUESTION ORAL OR WRITTEN MUST NOT REPEAT IN SUBSTANCE A QUESTION ALREADY ANSWERED OR TO WHICH AN ANSWER HAS BEEN REFUSED."

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I'M WELL AWARE OF THE ANNOTATIONS. I'M PLEASED THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS NOW READING A LITTLE BIT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER. I WISH YOU WOULD MAKE A RULING ON THE QUESTION THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS NOW PUT FORTH. THIS QUESTION HAS ALREADY BEEN ANSWERED, PART OF IT HAS BEEN ANSWERED. THE COMMISSIONER HAS INDICATED THAT HE WOULD PROVIDE A WRITTEN ANSWER IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD PRESENT A WRITTEN QUESTION AND I THINK THE QUESTION IS AT AN END.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, WITH RESPECT, THE COMMISSIONER HAS NOT ANSWERED. IF HE WILL INDICATE THAT HE IS PREPARED TO GIVE A WRITTEN ANSWER THAT WILL BE ENOUGH FOR ME. BUT HE HAS NOT INDICATED. I WILL ASK HIM NOW WHETHER HE WILL GIVE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION THAT HAS BEEN PUT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, I THINK IT IS MY DESIRE TO CO-OPERATE WITH MEMBERS IN THESE KIND OF QUESTIONS AND I SAY THAT PREVIOUSLY, IF

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD LIST THIS SERIES OF QUESTIONS AS WRITTEN QUESTIONS, I WILL DO MY BEST TO PROVIDE HIM WITH WRITTEN ANSWERS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEN I TAKE IT HE WILL ANSWER THAT. THAT IS A QUESTION ASKING FOR A WRITTEN ANSWER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: NO, MR. SPEAKER, PLEASE. IT IS NOT RIGHT THAT I SHOULD BE GETTING INTO ANY KIND OF A DEBATE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER. I'M SIMPLY SAYING THAT THIS TYPE OF QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, IF IT IS GIVEN AS A WRITTEN QUESTION, I WOULD DO MY BEST TO GIVE A WRITTEN ANSWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS A WRITTEN QUESTION THEN MR. SPEAKER, A WRITTEN QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. WHO AUTHORIZED YOU TO ISSUE C.O. 1973/2 IN THE METHOD IN WHICH YOU WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND DIRECTION OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE? ALRIGHT, THAT'S THAT QUESTION. WE WILL GO ON TO ANOTHER ONE.

QUESTION RE: COMMISSIONER'S AUTHORITY TO APPOINT AN ADMINISTRATIVE EXECUTIVE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. COMMISSIONER, YOU REPLIED TO MY QUESTION OF FEBRUARY 22, IN REFERENCE TO MR. FINGLAND. MY FIRST QUESTION THEN WAS, WOULD YOU INDICATE UNDER WHAT ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD AGAIN STAND ON A POINT OF ORDER, ANNOTATION 177, REPEAT A QUESTION IN SUBSTANCE ALREADY ANSWERED. I BELIEVE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS RECEIVED AN ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IN LEGISLATIVE RETURN 14.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS A PREAMBLE TO ANOTHER QUESTION AND I'M JUST LEADING INTO THE ANSWER. THAT'S ALL IT IS AT THE MOMENT. IT'S JUST A PREAMBLE, MR. SPEAKER. THE PREAMBLE TO MY QUESTION IS THIS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER. A QUESTION ORAL OR WRITTEN MUST NOT BE A SPEECH HOWEVER SHORT, NOR BE OF UNREASONABLE LENGTH.

MR. SPEAKER: PREAMBLES ARE OF DIFFERENT LENGTH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: EXACTLY.

MRS. WATSON: BUT THEY ARE SPEECHES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: CAN I CONTINUE MR. SPEAKER?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD SUGGEST HE COULD CONTINUE IF HE ASKS A QUESTION IF HE DOES NOT MAKE A SPEECH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'LL START AGAIN. THE PREAMBLE TO MY QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, TO THE COMMISSIONER IS THIS. ON FEBRUARY 22ND, I ASKED THIS QUESTION. WOULD YOU INDICATE UNDER WHAT AUTHORITY MR. FINGLAND ACTS IN HIS CAPACITY AS ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER. THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, WAS MR. FINGLAND ACTS IN HIS CAPACITY AS THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSIONER. THE QUESTION IS THIS, MR. SPEAKER TO MR. COMMISSIONER. UNDER WHAT STATUTORY AUTHORITY DOES MR. COMMISSIONER FIND THE AUTHORITY TO APPOINT AN ADMINISTRATIVE EXECUTIVE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, A POINT OF ORDER, ANNOTATION 171, "A QUESTION ORAL OR WRITTEN MUST NOT SEEK INFORMATION SET FORTH IN DOCUMENTS EQUALLY ACCESSIBLE TO QUESTIONERS AS STATUTES, PUBLIC REPORTS, ETC."

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, WITH RESPECT, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS NOT AWARE THAT THERE IS NO STATUTORY AUTHORITY. THIS IS WHY I AM ASKING THIS. AND I WILL AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IF THERE WAS STATUTORY AUTHORITY. MY QUESTION IS QUITE CLEAR. WHERE DOES THE COMMISSIONER GET HIS STATUTORY AUTHORITY? IF HE WANTS IT AS A WRITTEN QUESTION I WILL BE PLEASED TO HAVE HIM ACCEPT IT AS A NOTICE OF A WRITTEN QUESTION. WOULD HE BRING FORWARD A WRITTEN ANSWER AT THIS SESSIONAL PAPER AS BEEN PASSED IN THE COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION AND THEN WE WILL HAVE THAT INFORMATION. DOES THE COMMISSIONER, MR. SPEAKER, ACCEPT THIS AS A WRITTEN NOTICE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IF IT'S A WRITTEN QUESTION, I GUESS IT'S A WRITTEN QUESTION.

QUESTION RE: POWER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW, ON THE SAME DAY, AS A PREAMBLE OF FEBRUARY 22ND, I ASKED QUESTION 2. WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER ALSO ASCERTAIN WHETHER OR



NOT THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WHO IS APPOINTED, ONLY WHEN HE IS ABSENT, HAS THE POWER UNDER THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE TO ACT IN ANY OTHER CAPACITY. THE ANSWER THAT WAS GIVEN, MR. SPEAKER, WAS THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER (EXECUTIVE) HAS THE SAME POWER UNDER THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE AS OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. HE HAS THE SAME POWERS AS THE COMMISSIONER ONLY WHEN THE COMMISSIONER IS UNABLE TO ACT BECAUSE OF ABSENCE, ILLNESS, OR OTHER INCAPACITIES. MY QUESTION IS THIS, UNDER WHAT SECTIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE DOES MR. FINGLAND OR ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAVE ANY POWER? IF MR. COMMISSIONER WOULD LIKE TO TREAT THAT AS NOTICE OF A WRITTEN QUESTION, I WILL BE CONTENT, WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER INDICATE THAT?

Mrs. WATSON: POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, AGAIN ANNOTATION No. 171. I WOULD LIKE MR. SPEAKER'S RULING ON THIS. A QUESTION ORAL OR WRITTEN MUST NOT MULTIPLY, WITH SLIGHT VARIATIONS, A SIMILAR QUESTION ON THE SAME POINT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, SPEAKING ON THE POINT OF ORDER, THIS IS NOT ON THE SAME POINT. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS ALREADY READ OUT AND MISINTERPRETED THAT WHERE THERE WAS A STATUTORY REQUIREMENT, THE QUESTION THEN OF COURSE, WOULD BE OUT OF ORDER. WHAT I AM ASKING IS WHERE IS THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENT THAT HAS BEEN INDICATED BY ANSWER THAT IS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE. I WANT TO KNOW WHAT SECTIONS?

Mrs. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER. THAT WAS CONTAINED IN THE LAST QUESTION, IN A SLIGHT VARIATION, A SIMILAR QUESTION ON THE SAME POINT. HE IS JUST NEEDLESSLY TAKING TIME OF THIS COUNCIL.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THE TIME...

Mrs. WATSON: HE COULD PUT IT ALL IN ONE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: (CONTINUES) THE TIME IS BEING TAKEN BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE WHO IS NOT SO VERSED AS SHE WOULD ATTEMPT TO MAKE OUT IN THE BEAUCHESNE'S PROCEDURE. THE QUESTIONS ARE QUITE PROPERLY PUT. IF THE COMMISSIONER REFUSES OR IS UNABLE TO...

Mrs. WATSON: POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. SPEAKER. POINT OF PRIVILEGE. ARE WE HAVING A QUESTION PERIOD OR ARE WE HAVING A SESSION OF DEBATE? I AM FULLY RIGHT IN MY POINT OF ORDER, TO BE

DRAWING THE REQUIREMENTS ON THE TYPE OF QUESTION TO BE PUT BEFORE THE HOUSE TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS AND I WOULD WISH THAT MR. SPEAKER WOULD MAKE A RULING ON THIS. THIS IS IN REGARD TO ONE OF THOSE QUESTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: LET US PROCEED WITH OTHER QUESTIONS AND LET THIS MATTER REST.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: DO I UNDERSTAND, MR. SPEAKER, YOU ARE ADVISING THE COMMISSIONER NOT TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION?

Mr. SPEAKER: I'M NOT ADVISING THE COMMISSIONER IN ANY WAY AT ALL.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IN THAT CASE, MR. SPEAKER, I STAND ON MY RIGHTS TO PUT THE QUESTION TO THE COMMISSIONER AND THE QUESTION IS QUITE CLEAR. WOULD HE ACCEPT WHAT I ASKED FOR AS WRITTEN NOTES?

Mr. SPEAKER: MR. COMMISSIONER, WILL YOU ANSWER THAT?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: IT'S A WRITTEN QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER. I GUESS IT'S ALRIGHT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

Mr. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: LOTS MORE MR. SPEAKER.

QUESTION RE: WRITTEN REPLIES FROM THE COMMISSIONER

Mr. SPEAKER, A QUESTION TO THE COMMISSIONER. MR. COMMISSIONER, THERE WERE VARIOUS QUESTIONS ASKED BY VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL, ON JULY 15TH, JULY 23RD, JULY 26TH AND JULY 30TH. WHY DID IT TAKE UNTIL FRIDAY, MARCH 22ND TO GET THESE ANSWERS BROUGHT FORWARD TO COUNCIL? WELL, MR. SPEAKER, CAN MR. COMMISSIONER ANSWER IN ANY WAY OR IS HE ONCE AGAIN SHOWING HIS INCAPABILITY OF HIM OR HIS ADMINISTRATORS IN ANSWERING?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: I DON'T KNOW.

Mr. SPEAKER: ORDER, ORDER.

Mrs. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD LOOK AT THE ANNOTATION OF 171, IT

SAYS, "SEEK FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARGUMENT, INFORMATION ON THE MATTER OF PAST HISTORY." YOU HAVE YOUR ANSWER TO THE LAST QUESTION. FORGET IT AND ASK A NEW QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I SIMPLY WANT TO KNOW WHY THE MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL ARE HAVING TO WAIT UP TO EIGHT MONTHS TO GET ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT TO ADMINISTRATION AND IF THE COMMISSIONER, WITH RESPECT MR. SPEAKER, THE COMMISSIONER MUST BE ABLE TO SAY WHY THEY HAVE BEEN DELAYED AND THIS IS SIMPLY WHAT I'M ASKING. IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE WOULD STOP TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE QUESTIONS THAT ARE BEING PUT IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA, MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS JUST TO ASCERTAIN WHY THE ADMINISTRATION IS LAGGING BEHIND AND NOT KEEPING UP WITH ITS WORK. NOW, I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER COULD GIVE SOME SORT OF EXPLANATION. ANYTHING, BUT SOMETHING.

MR. COMMISSIONER: I HAVE NOTHING ...

QUESTION RE: REVOKING MR. FLEMING'S APPOINTMENT

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE COMMISSIONER INDICATES THAT HE HAS NOTHING TO OFFER. AGAIN, I AGREE WITH HIM. MR. COMMISSIONER, IN ANSWER TO A SERIES OF QUESTIONS, LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 14, I AM GOING TO DEAL WITH ONE OF THE QUESTIONS NOW BECAUSE THERE WILL BE SOME OTHER DEBATES AT A LATER DATE. THE ANSWER TO THE LAST QUESTION WAS IN ANY EVENT, HOW COULD HE BE APPOINTED WHEN MR. FLEMING WAS STILL IN THAT POSITION BUT ON SICK LEAVE. THE ANSWER TO THAT WAS, THE POSITION WAS VACANT EFFECTIVE JULY 2ND, 1973. MR. SPEAKER, WOULD MR. COMMISSIONER INDICATE WHY IF THE POSITION WAS EFFECTIVE JULY 2ND, 1973, WAS THE COMMISSIONER'S ORDER REVOKING MR. FLEMING'S APPOINTMENT NOT MADE UNTIL OCTOBER 4TH, 1973?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, AGAIN, ON A POINT OF ORDER I WOULD OBJECT. REPEAT IN SUBSTANCE A QUESTION ALREADY ANSWERED, AND I THINK THIS IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT. THE QUESTION HAS ALREADY BEEN ANSWERED AND IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS PURSUING THE QUESTION ON A LATER DAY, I DO NOT THINK THAT SHOULD BE PERMITTED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I KNOW THE ADMINISTRATION IS AFRAID BECAUSE OF THE

SHOCKING MANNER IN WHICH MR. FLEMING WAS TREATED BUT MY QUESTION IS A SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION.

MRS. WATSON: ON A POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER.

MR. SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE WILL SPEAK.

MRS. WATSON: I THINK THE WHOLE AREA SHOULD BE REVIEWED. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST IS BREACHING EVERY ASPECT OF ANNOTATION 171. YOU'RE BREACHING THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION PERIOD. THE QUESTION PERIOD IS FOR GETTING INFORMATION AND YOU'RE USING IT AS A MEANS OF CROSS-EXAMINATION. I DON'T THINK THIS IS THE PURPOSE. YOU ARE WASTING EVERYONE ELSE'S TIME. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET ON WITH THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS LIKE THIS, PUT THEM DOWN AS WRITTEN QUESTIONS. THEN WE COULD GO ON.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, MAY I GET AN ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION? IF A POSITION WAS VACANT ON JULY 2ND...

MRS. WATSON: POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, I DO NOT THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS THE RIGHT TO PUT THE QUESTION BEFORE THE HOUSE. HE HAS ALREADY RECEIVED AN ANSWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT'S A DIFFERENT QUESTION I'M ASKING.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, IT'S THE SAME QUESTION IN SUBSTANCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WOULD MR. SPEAKER PLEASE RULE FAIRLY ON THIS AND I'M SURE HE WILL. THE QUESTIONS ARE TWO DIFFERENT QUESTIONS. THE QUESTION THAT WAS ASKED AS A SERIES OF QUESTIONS. ONE QUESTION THAT I ASKED WAS HOW COULD A PERSON BE APPOINTED AT SUCH AND SUCH A DATE.

MR. SPEAKER: COULD WE GO ON TO SOME OTHER QUESTION?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: LOOK, THIS IS IMPORTANT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE BECAUSE THE SAME THING MIGHT APPLY WITH OTHER AREAS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE. I'M TRYING TO SHOW TO THIS COUNCIL, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. TANNER: ON A POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER. I THINK THE SPEAKER HAS RULED. I THINK THE HOUSE SHOULD GO BY WHAT



THE SPEAKER HAS RULED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER HASN'T RULED. HE ASKED IF WE SHOULD GO ON TO OTHER QUESTIONS. IT'S A POINT OF SPECIAL PRIVILEGE THAT I STAND AT THIS TIME, THAT MR. SPEAKER...

MR. SPEAKER: THE PRIVILEGE HAS NOT...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, YOU HAVEN'T HEARD THE POINT YET.

MR. SPEAKER: NO, BUT THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS SPECIAL PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH YES, THERE IS SPECIAL PRIVILEGE FOR ANY MEMBER OF COUNCIL WHO WISHES TO DEBATE A PARTICULAR POINT AND I PUT IT TO THE SPEAKER, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: IT'S A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S RIGHT, THAT'S WHAT I AM SAYING. IT'S A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE. THIS IS WHY I AM ON MY FEET. I POINT OUT TO YOU, MR. SPEAKER, WITH THE UTMOST RESPECT, THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS. ONE FOLLOWS THE OTHER BUT IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT THE SECOND QUESTION IS IN THE SAME CONTEXT AS THE FIRST ONE. THERE ARE DIFFERENT DATES AND ISSUES HERE AND THIS WAS A RESULT THAT THESE PARTICULAR DATES, AS HONOURABLE MEMBERS ALREADY KNOW, THERE WAS SOME OTHER AREA WHERE DATES HAD TO BE DEALT WITH. WHERE A PERSON HAD AN ORDER ISSUED CONTRARY TO LAW AND THIS IS ONCE AGAIN, AND THE QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER, IF HE WILL BE ALLOWED TO ANSWER, MR. SPEAKER.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER. HE IS BRINGING UP A QUESTION OUT OF AN ANSWER, TO A QUESTION HE HAS ALREADY ASKED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE IS NOT GOING TO TIRE ME OUT. NOW THAT'S GOING TO BE FOR SURE. THE POSITION IS THAT THE QUESTION IS A LEGITIMATE QUESTION. I KNOW THERE MIGHT BE SOME FEAR IN THE MINDS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA.

MRS. WATSON: A POINT OF PRIVILEGE MR. SPEAKER. I WISH YOU WOULD RULE ON THIS. I'M QUITE PREPARED TO RECEIVE YOUR RULING AND TO ABIDE BY YOUR RULING ON THE HONOURABLE MEMBER CONTINUING WITH THAT LINE...

MR. SPEAKER: I THINK YOU'RE BOTH OUT OF ORDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL DO YOU AGREE, MR. SPEAKER, THAT THEY ARE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS? I THINK THIS IS WHAT YOU HAVE TO RULE ON. WHETHER THEY ARE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS. AND IF THEY ARE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS THEN I MUST BE ALLOWED TO CONTINUE.

MR. SPEAKER: IF I CAN SEE THEM IN WRITING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS AN ORAL QUESTION I AM PUTTING, MR. SPEAKER. IT'S AN ORAL QUESTION. IF THE COMMISSIONER WANTS TO ACCEPT IT AND WANTS A WRITTEN NOTICE OF IT, I WILL LET HIM KNOW AND RECEIVE IT AS WRITTEN NOTICE. IT'S AN ORAL QUESTION AND OBVIOUSLY THE EVIDENCE IS QUITE CLEAR, THE ADMINISTRATOR SIGNED THE DOCUMENT. NOW, I WANT TO KNOW WHY.

MRS. WATSON: ON A POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, I AM QUITE PREPARED TO ABIDE BY THE RULING...

MR. SPEAKER: I SEE NO GREAT DESCENTION BETWEEN THE TWO QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEN PERHAPS I CAN CLARIFY FOR MR. SPEAKER TO WHERE HE WILL SEE THE DIFFERENCE. THE DIFFERENCE, MR. SPEAKER, IS THIS. THAT THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION THAT WAS GIVEN AS A RESULT OF MY QUESTION OF FEBRUARY 22ND, DEALT WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF A PERSON WHEN ANOTHER PERSON WAS STILL IN THAT CLASSIFICATION AND CAPACITY. THE ANSWER WAS THAT THE POSITION BECAME VACANT ON A CERTAIN DATE. I NOW SAY TO THE COMMISSIONER - HOW COULD THAT POSITION HAVE BEEN VACANT ON THAT DATE WHEN THE POSITION WASN'T REVOKED UNTIL SOME MONTHS LATER. SURELY, THERE IS A CLEAR DIFFERENCE THERE. AND THIS I THINK IS A CLARIFICATION TO MAKE IT CLEAR BECAUSE OF THE TWO DIFFERENT DATES INVOLVED. I WANT TO KNOW WHY?

MR. SPEAKER: THE COMMISSIONER DECLINES TO ANSWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU SHOULDN'T SPEAK FOR THE COMMISSIONER, WITH RESPECT, MR. SPEAKER. LET HIM SPEAK FOR HIMSELF.

MR. SPEAKER: I TAKE IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL LET HIM SPEAK FOR HIMSELF. IF HE DECLINES TO ANSWER, I WANT IT RECORDED. BUT HE DECLINES TO ANSWER.

NOW DOES HE DECLINE TO ANSWER?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I DON'T HAVE AN ANSWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AH, THAT IS QUITE TRUE, AND THAT IS WHAT I WANT TO GET ON THE RECORD THAT HE DOESN'T HAVE AN ANSWER AS IN MANY INSTANCES. BECAUSE I SAID MR. SPEAKER, I WILL NOT GO ONTO ANY OTHER - - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, A QUESTION SHOULD NOT - - -

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'M SPEAKING TO THE SPEAKER, SIT DOWN YOU STUPID - - - SIT DOWN, PLEASE -- YOU STUPID NUT.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER PLEASE. ARE THERE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES THERE ARE OTHER QUESTIONS. WHAT SUPIDITY.

MRS. WATSON: ON A POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, A QUESTION MUST NOT CONTAIN AN EXPRESSION OF OPINION OF A QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SHE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT SHE IS TALKING ABOUT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: TO GO ON TO ANOTHER AREA OF QUESTIONS, MR. - - PERHAPS I WILL GIVE ANOTHER MEMBER A CHANCE.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, THE ONLY POINT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THAT I BELIEVE UNDER NORMAL PRACTICES, THE QUESTION PERIOD IS LIMITED TO ABOUT ONE HOUR AND IT SEEMS TO ME WE HAVE TAKEN UP THAT HOUR ALREADY. THERE ARE GOING TO BE MANY OTHER DAYS BETWEEN NOW AND THE END OF THIS SESSION FOR QUESTION PERIODS, WHERE IT WILL BE OTHER TIMES TO QUESTION. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF IMPORTANT THINGS TO DISCUSS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AND I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE GET ON WITH THE WORK OF THE HOUSE.

MRS. WATSON: AGREED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: QUESTIONS ARE THE WORK OF THE HOUSE AND THEY HAVE NEVER BEEN, WITH RESPECT, ANY RESTRICTIONS ON QUESTIONS IN THIS HOUSE FROM ALL MY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND I DOUBT WHETHER ANY OTHER MEMBER WOULD SAY THAT EITHER. HOWEVER, ANOTHER QUESTION. I HAVE ONLY GOT - -

MR. SPEAKER: WOULD YOU MAKE IT BRIEF, SO WE CAN GET ON - -

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ALL MY QUESTIONS ARE BRIEF. ITS THE INTERRUPTIONS THAT MAKE THEM APPEAR LONG. MR. SPEAKER, MY QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. MR. COMMISSIONER, WHEN A TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR HAS BEEN ASKED TO ATTEND WITH A PERSON TO SEE YOU, WHY DO YOU REFUSE TO ALLOW THAT TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR TO APPEAR?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I AM NOT ANSWERING THAT QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT DID HE SAY? HE'S NOT ANSWERING. DID I HEAR THE COMMISSIONER ANSWER THAT? MR. SPEAKER?

MR. SPEAKER: ITS UP TO YOU TO DECIDE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL CAN MR. SPEAKER ASK WHETHER THE COMMISSIONER WANTS TO ANSWER IT? I MEAN WHATS A SPEAKER, WITH RESPECT, WHATS THE SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR FOR? I MEAN I AM ASKING YOU TO ASK HIM.

MR. TAYLOR: ON A POINT OF ORDER, MR. SPEAKER, I MUST RISE THAT IT IS A VERY PARAMOUNT SIN AGAINST THE RULES OF THE LEGISLATURE TO REFLECT UPON THE ACTIONS OF THE CHAIR. IT IS NOT PROPER AND I DON'T WANT TO GET INVOLVED IN THIS PERSONALITY CONFLICT, BUT WE CANNOT REFLECT UPON THE CHAIR AT ALL, IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS QUITE TRUE, BUT I AM BEING FRUSTRATED, MR. SPEAKER, I WANT THE COMMISSIONER TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SO THAT COUNCIL MEMBERS KNOW WHAT THE COMMISSIONER IS SAYING OR THINKING IN ANSWER TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. NOW DOES HE WANT TO ANSWER OR DOESN'T HE WANT TO ANSWER? AND IF HE SAYS, NO, THEN AT LEAST ITS RECORDED, BUT HE IS NOT SAYING ANYTHING.

HE DOESN'T WANT TO ANSWER - IS THIS THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE, MR. SPEAKER?

MR. SPEAKER: YES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THATS THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE. VERY WELL AS LONG AS IT IS RECORDED. THIS IS WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR.



MR. SPEAKER, OVER THE WEEKEND, I HAVE HAD REASON TO SPEAK TO A NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT WHO HAVE SHOWN VERY MUCH CONCERN OVER THE FACT THAT WE DID NOT IMMEDIATELY DISCUSS BILL C-9 ON FRIDAY IN COMMITTEE AND HAVE INDICATED THAT THERE WOULD BE A RESPONSIBILITY OF THIS COUNCIL IF THERE WAS A FAILURE TO MEET THE NECESSARY DEADLINE TO HAVE THE BILL GO INTO THE HOUSE FOR THIRD READING. ALSO THAT THE STANDING COMMITTEE THEMSELVES WANT TO HEAR FROM THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL. MY INFORMATION IS THAT THE COMMISSIONER WHO, BY HIS ORDER C-72, HAS DIRECTION AND CONTROL OF MANAGEMENT OVER THE ELECTED PEOPLE, HAVE INSTRUCTED THEM TO DEAL WITH FINANCIAL BILLS BEFORE DEALING WITH THIS POINT OF C-9.

QUESTION RE: C-9

NOW I WOULD ASK THE COMMISSIONER, AT THIS STAGE. MR. COMMISSIONER, DO YOU CONSIDER THAT C-9 HAS A FAR GREATER IMPORTANCE AT THIS TIME FOR THE YUKON THAN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES THAT ARE BEING DEALT WITH?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THAT IS A QUESTION THAT IS NOT MY PRIVILEGE TO ANSWER, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: THE QUESTION IS OUT OF ORDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: LOOK, MR. COMMISSIONER, MR. SPEAKER. MR. COMMISSIONER, IS IT NOT CORRECT THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ADVISES THE PROCEDURE THAT SHOULD BE ADOPTED IN THE HOUSE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL ANSWER THAT QUESTION. THIS HOUSE DETERMINES WHICH ITEMS ARE GRANTED PRIORITY. AND WHEN WE WENT INTO COMMITTEE ON FRIDAY, THIS HOUSE MADE THE DECISION TO DEAL WITH BILL NO. 1 AND 2. AND IT WAS THE DECISION OF THIS HOUSE, AND THIS HOUSE ALONE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, I WILL REMIND MR. SPEAKER THAT BEFORE WE RECESSED FOR LUNCH ON FRIDAY, IT WAS AGREED THAT C-9 WERE TO BE DEALT WITH IN THE AFTERNOON. THE QUESTION THAT I HAVE PUT TO THE COMMISSIONER - NOW AGAIN I SAY TO YOU MR. COMMISSIONER THAT YOU EVADED YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES HERE AND I HAVE ASKED YOU A QUESTION AND I WANT YOU TO ANSWER IT. DO YOU CONSIDER - - -

INTERRUPTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER PLEASE.

MRS. WATSON: ON A POINT OF ORDER. TO REPEAT IN SUBSTANCE A QUESTION ALREADY ANSWERED. NOW THE COMMISSIONER HAS GIVEN HIM AN ANSWER. I HAVE GIVEN HIM AN ANSWER AND HE SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO ASK THE SAME QUESTION AGAIN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ITS A DIFFERENT QUESTION I ASKED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER. ITS THE SAME QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT I ASKED YET, HOW CAN IT BE THE SAME QUESTION?

MR. SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST. WILL YOU PLEASE - - - YOUR LINE OF QUESTIONING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, IF THE JACK-IN-THE-BOX WOULDN'T KEEP JUMPING UP AND DOWN, SO I CAN ATTEND TO THE COMMISSIONER.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. AS A MEMBER OF THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL, I RESENT VERY MUCH, HAVING TO SIT HERE FOR A FULL HOUR BEING LECTURED TO BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST. AND HE IS USING THE QUESTION PERIOD AS AN EXCUSE. I THINK THE SPEAKER IS GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE A RULING HERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL PUT MY QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. IF YOU HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADVISE THE MEMBERS OF YOUR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AS TO WHAT WOULD BE THE -

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, POINT OF ORDER. A QUESTION ORAL OR WRITTEN MUST NOT BE HYPOTHETICAL. MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF ORDER, IT WAS A HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO ONE KNOWS WHAT I AM GOING TO SAY YET, YOU KNOW, AND SHE IS SAYING ITS A HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE ARE GETTING NOWHERE.

Mr. Chamberlist: I will drop that particular question because there is no point in dealing with it further. There is no sense, there is no feeling unfortunately, so I will have to leave that particular area.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner; there are some seventy committees...

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe you ruled that the question period was at an end.

Mr. Chamberlist: No he didn't.

Mr. Speaker: I asked.

Mr. Chamberlist: You asked, but you didn't rule it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION RE: YUKON COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Commissioner. There are approximately seventy committees and boards in the, attached to the Government of the Yukon Territory. Would Mr. Commissioner arrange to have the committees and boards make up, brought together in one booklet and allow each member of Territorial Council to have them so that they know who are board members and committee members?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, it's already done.

Mr. Speaker: Could we have the questions as brief as possible?

Mr. Chamberlist: That was a very brief one.

Mr. Speaker: Could we have the questions as brief as possible so we can get along with the business of the House that you are all so interested in getting at?

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Commissioner. As a result of some questions and answers that were given during the discussion of the supplementary, it was intimated that over two hundred supplementary estimates, it was intimated Mr. Commissioner, that there were over two hundred and eighty thousand dollars being spent

Mr. Tanner: Out of order, Mr. Speaker. I think if the Honourable Member will check in Beauchesne he will find that he can't discuss in the question period those matters that are in front of the House.

Mr. Chamberlist: The matter is not in front of the House, it was in the committee and in any event it was the subject of the result of a question I wish to ask the Commissioner.

Mrs. Watson: On a point of order though, Mr. Speaker, it refers a question oral or written must not refer to the day or answers to questions in the current session.

Mr. Chamberlist: I am not dealing with that at all. These people just won't listen. You know, they just won't listen. If they wait and take their time, they might learn something. This is how they serve their apprenticeship, by learning.

Mr. Speaker: Could we get along with the business of the House?

QUESTION RE: INSTRUCTION FUNDS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chamberlist: That's right, Mr. Speaker, if you tell these people not to keep jumping in. Now, Mr. Speaker, my question for the Commissioner is this. That it was intimated that there was some two hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars spent on reports on the instruction of the Executive Committee - most of it while I was a member of the Executive Committee.

Can Mr. Commissioner indicate at any time when authority to spend money was given by the Executive Committee to the Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: I am in no position to give an answer directly in that matter. I think that question was asked here in the estimate the other day.

Mr. Chamberlist: Would Mr. Commissioner then take that as written notice and come up with an answer?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner can't answer that question. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse East knows full well that the question was answered when we were



DEBATING THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES AND YOU HAD THE ANSWERS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE QUESTION WAS NOT. THERE WAS A FALLACY AND A DELIBERATE UNTRUTH TOLD THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS TO SPEND CERTAIN MONEY. I HAVE SEARCHED ALL MY NOTES ON ALL THE PERIODS OF TIME DURING THE SIX MONTHS OF LAST YEAR THAT I WAS A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND I CANNOT FIND ONE AREA WHERE AUTHORITY WAS GIVEN TO THE COMMISSIONER TO ACTUALLY SPEND MONEY ON STUDIES. THAT IS A POINT I WANT TO GET FROM THE COMMISSIONER. IF HE DOESN'T WANT TO ANSWER, MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HAVE GOT IT IN THEIR MINDS THAT THIS MONEY WAS SPENT WITHOUT AUTHORITY. I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? AS THERE ARE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, WE WISH TO THANK MR. COMMISSIONER FOR HIS ATTENDANCE. AS THERE ARE NO PRIVATE BILLS AND ORDERS, WE COME TO PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS.

BILL NO. 7 - AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE

WHEN DO YOU WISH THE ORDINANCE TO BE READ FOR A SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: ON THE NEXT SITTING DATE, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR AND COUNCIL RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DAWSON THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSE OF MEETING IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.

ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL NOW CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER AND I AM WONDERING, MADAM CLERK, IF YOU COULD SEE IF MR. TREASURER AND MR. MILLER COULD ATTEND WITH US.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME, I'LL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. WE HAVE WITH US MR. MILLER AND MR. HUBERDEAU TO ASSIST US IN OUR DISCUSSIONS FURTHER TO BILL #2. WHEN LAST WE ROSE, I BELIEVE THERE WERE SOME QUESTIONS THAT WERE FORTHCOMING AND IF POSSIBLE COULD WE HAVE THE ANSWERS TO SOME OF THOSE QUESTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, I WONDER IF I COULD PUT ONE QUESTION FIRST THAT I HAVE TAKEN A LOOK AT OVER THE WEEKEND? ARE THESE SUPPLEMENTARIES ESTIMATES OR ACTUAL COSTS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR THE MOST PART, THESE WILL BE ACTUAL COSTS, THAT WILL BE INCURRED. NOW, IN SOME CASES, THEY ARE STILL ESTIMATES BECAUSE THE PRECISE AMOUNTS ARE NOT IN AS YET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN WHICH PARTICULAR AREAS OF THE SUPPLEMENTARIES ARE THE ONES THAT ARE ESTIMATES AND THE ITEMS THAT ARE THE COSTS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE EDUCATION VOTE, WHICH WE DEALT WITH ON FRIDAY, SOME OF THOSE ITEMS ARE STILL ESTIMATES. THEY ARE NOT PRECISE AMOUNTS. WE ANTICIPATE THE EXPENDITURES OF THESE AMOUNTS FOR THE PURPOSES THAT WERE SPECIFIED. THE ACTUAL WON'T BE KNOWN UNTIL LATER ON.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE THERE ANY ITEMS THAT ARE ACTUAL COSTS?

Mr. MILLER: THERE ARE SOME ITEMS, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT ARE VERY CLOSE TO ACTUAL COSTS. FOR EXAMPLE, THE FIRST ITEM I DEALT WITH, THE CONSOLIDATION OF ORDINANCES WAS WITHIN A NUMBER OF DOLLARS FROM BEING AN ACTUAL COST ITEM.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WOULD WE HAVE ANY ANSWERS OR UPDATING AS TO WHERE WE NOW STAND?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN. THE FIRST QUESTION THAT WAS LEFT IN ADVANCE REGARDED MENTAL HEALTH. THE QUESTION WAS REQUESTING A BREAKDOWN OF THE AMOUNT OF \$48,000.00. THE TWO ITEMS THAT MAKE UP THE \$48,000.00 RELATE TO THE PRISONERS THAT WERE FOUND TO BE MENTALLY ILL AND UNFIT TO SERVE THEIR SENTENCES IN THE PENITENTIARY, WHICH EQUATED TO \$29,000.00. OR TO BE PRECISE, \$19,497.00. THE BALANCE OF THE \$48,000.00 IS MADE UP OF A PER DIEM RATE INCREASE OF \$4.26 IN THE CASE OF ALBERTA HOSPITALS AND \$3.52 IN THE CASE OF B.C. HOSPITALS. THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT WE HAVE COMMITTEED UNDER THIS ESTABLISHMENT AND UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ORDINANCE AND THE CRIMINAL CODE ARE 15 TO 16 PEOPLE WHICH EQUATES AT \$4.25 PER DAY TO \$24,795.00.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

Mr. MILLER: THE NEXT QUESTION, Mr. CHAIRMAN, RELATED TO SUBSIDIZED MEDICAL TRAVEL AND THE QUESTION WAS HOW MANY EVACUATIONS HAD BEEN UNDERTAKEN UNDER THIS PLAN. I HAVE COMPARATIVE FIGURES FOR THE YEAR 1972-73. EVACUATIONS INSIDE THE TERRITORY WERE 170. TO MARCH 19TH, 1974, FOR THE 1973-74 FISCAL YEAR, THE ACTUAL EVACUATIONS INSIDE THE TERRITORY WERE 425. OUTSIDE THE TERRITORY EVACUATIONS FOR 1972-73 WERE 199. AGAIN TO MARCH 19, 1974, FOR THE 73-74 FISCAL YEAR, THERE WERE 364 EVACUATIONS OUTSIDE THE TERRITORY.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

Mr. MILLER: THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE PREPARED WRITTEN ANSWERS TO. THE CLERK, IF SHE WOULD DISTRIBUTE THEM, WE CAN THEN DISCUSS THEM.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WHILE THAT IS BEING DISTRIBUTED I WONDER, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IF I COULD PUT A QUESTION DEALING WITH AN ITEM. I HAVE GOT IT ON MY MIND NOW AND I WANT TO GET AN ANSWER FROM HIM. THERE WAS SOME CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION THE OTHER DAY ABOUT THESE PLANNING STUDIES. DO YOU KNOW OF ANY INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO SPEND THIS MONEY ON STUDIES?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THIS DIRECTED THROUGH THE CHAIR?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: YES, THROUGH THE CHAIR TO Mr. MILLER.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I KNOW OF NO SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I WAS NOT ON THE COMMITTEE AT THE TIME. I HAVE NOT SEEN ANY SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO SPEND THAT MONEY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF Mr. MILLER CAN INDICATE AT WHAT DATE HE WAS APPOINTED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE? JUST FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS PARTICULAR QUESTION?

Mr. MILLER: I'M SORRY, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T RECALL THE DATE THAT I WAS APPOINTED TO THE COMMITTEE.

Mr. McKINNON: IT WASN'T A MEMORABLE EXPERIENCE?

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S EDIFICATION, I REMEMBER VERY, VERY DISTINCTLY WHEN THE COMMUNITY PLANNING APPROVAL WAS GIVEN TO STUDIES FOR PROPER PLANNING COMMUNITIES WAS APPROVED. IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ...

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THE QUESTION THAT I AM ASKING, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IS THIS. WHETHER THERE WAS, AND PERHAPS I CAN FIND THE APPOINTMENT SHEET FOR Mr. MILLER, THIS MIGHT ... BECAUSE HE HAS ALREADY SAID, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT Mr. MILLER HAS INDICATED THAT HE DOESN'T RECALL, DURING THE TIME THAT HE HAS BEEN ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THAT ANY MONEY WAS AUTHORIZED TO BE SPENT. IS THIS CORRECT?

Mr. MILLER: FOR THIS PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: FOR THIS PARTICULAR PURPOSE, YES. IF YOU WILL ALLOW ME JUST A MOMENT.



Mr. CHAIRMAN: FOR THE EDIFICATION OF THE CHAIR. ARE WE ON COMMUNITY PLANNING?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NO, IT IS JUST AN INTIMATED QUESTION THAT I HAVE ASKED. THE APPOINTMENT WAS MADE OF THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL OF 1973. DO YOU RECALL THAT DAY, Mr. MILLER? THROUGH THE CHAIR I AM ASKING THAT QUESTION.

Mr. MILLER: YES.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: SO THAT IT CAN BE TRUE TO SAY THAT FROM THE FISCAL YEAR, THE FIRST OF APRIL OF 1973, YOU WOULD KNOW OF ALL MONIES THAT WOULD, EXCEPT DURING THOSE FIRST DAYS, THE FIRST OF APRIL TO THE 24TH OF APRIL, OF ALL MONIES THAT HAD BEEN AUTHORIZED TO BE EXPENDED. I AM NOT TALKING ABOUT INSTRUCTION TO HAVE THE SURVEYS, BUT OF MONIES EXPENDED. YOU HAVE ALREADY INDICATED THAT YOU KNOW NOT OF ANY MONIES. DID YOU AGREE, Mr. MILLER?

Mr. MILLER: IN RESPECT TO COMMUNITY PLANNING Mr. CHAIRMAN, I KNOW OF NO AUTHORIZATION FOR ANY MONEY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, MAY I CONTINUE PLEASE? Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE CAN ACCEPT IT THAT ALTHOUGH THERE WAS SOME INSTRUCTION GIVEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT THERE BE PLANNING UNDERTAKEN THERE WAS NOT AUTHORITY FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE GIVEN TO EXPEND MONEY. I RAISE THIS PARTICULAR POINT BECAUSE THERE WERE SUGGESTIONS MADE THAT I WAS ON THE COMMITTEE WHEN MONEY WAS AUTHORIZED TO BE SPENT FOR THAT PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT WAS NOT THE INFERENCE THAT I WAS MAKING. I SAID THAT I PERSONALLY, KNEW OF NO INSTRUCTIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NO, THAT IS RIGHT. YOU KNEW OF NO INSTRUCTIONS BUT YOU WERE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WEREN'T YOU?

Mr. MILLER: NOT NECESSARILY, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT IN COMMITTEE, THE WITNESSES ARE NOT ON TRIAL HERE. THEY ARE ONLY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

Mrs. WATSON: MAYBE I COULD GIVE A LITTLE MORE INFORMATION. HERE IN THE FISCAL YEAR, 1973-74, THERE WAS PROVISION MADE FOR A COMMUNITY PLANNER. THAT WAS THE YEAR, WAS IT NOT, Mr. MILLER?

Mr. MILLER: YES.

Mrs. WATSON: WE WERE UNABLE TO OBTAIN THE SERVICES OF A COMMUNITY PLANNER SO THE DECISION WAS MADE TO HAVE THE COMMUNITY PLANNING DEALT WITH ON A CONTRACT BASIS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WOULD YOU PROCEED, Mr. MILLER?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE NEXT QUESTION RELATED TO THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN AND THE QUESTION EVOLVED, AND I PROMISED TO BRING FORWARD A STATEMENT SHOWING THE CASH POSITION VERSUS AN ACCURAL POSITION. I ALSO BROUGHT FORWARD FOR MEMBERS, A STATEMENT SHOWING THE REVENUE AND RECOVERIES THAT WERE ESTIMATED IN THE BUDGETS OF 1972-73 AND 1973-74, THE ACTUAL REVENUE AND RECOVERIES WHICH WERE ACCRUED IN THAT PERIOD, THE APPROPRIATED EXPENDITURES AND THE ACTUAL EXPENDITURES FOR THE SAME PERIOD AND THE EFFECT OF THOSE TWO ITEMS. THE TOTAL APPROPRIATION, OR ESTIMATE, WHICH INDICATES THAT FOR THE TWO YEAR PERIOD THERE WAS \$722,000.00 OF ADDITIONAL REVENUE OR EXPENDITURES APPROPRIATIONS UNSPENT. THE SECOND STATEMENT, Mr. CHAIRMAN, RELATES TO THE SAME SUBJECT, THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN. IT INDICATES THE PREMIUMS RECEIVED AND RECOVERIES, THE EXPENDITURES FOR EACH YEAR, THE CASH SURPLUS AS OF MARCH 31ST, 1973. THE CASH SURPLUS WE ESTIMATE WILL BE AS OF MARCH 31ST, 1974 AND THE CONVERSION OF THAT CASH SURPLUS TO AN ACCRUED SURPLUS OR TO AN ACCRUED BASIS OF ACCOUNTING WHICH INDICATES THE \$680,000.00 THAT WAS PRESENTED ON SESSIONAL PAPER #14.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR ON THIS ITEM?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: QUITE FRANKLY, I JUST CANNOT FOLLOW BECAUSE OF THE QUESTIONS THAT I HAVE ASKED AND YOU HAVE SIMPLY NOT ANSWERED THEM. I THINK IT IS OF NO AVAIL, BECAUSE I DON'T CARE WITH WHAT FIGURES YOU COME UP WITH. THE FACTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES AS FAR AS THE QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED. THERE IS NOT GOING TO BE ANY POINT IN RAISING IT BECAUSE I KNOW WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN. IT IS GOING TO HAPPEN

THAT YOU ARE JUST GOING TO HAVE YOUR WAY. MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THIS AND ESPECIALLY IN PARTICULAR, COUNCILLOR TANNER, ALMOST ALL OTHER MEMBERS, EXCEPT PERHAPS, COUNCILLOR RIVETT, HAVE SAT WITH ME ON FINANCE COMMITTEE. THEY KNOW FULL WELL THAT I AM JUST AS AGGRESSIVE WHEN I WAS ON THE FINANCE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING HOW THE FUNDS OF THE TERRITORY ARE BEING SPENT AS I AM NOW. IT IS SIMPLY THAT I REALLY FEEL THAT MEMBERS OF COUNCIL SHOULD KNOW AND BE CLEAR IN THEIR MINDS EXACTLY HOW FUNDS ARE BEING EXPENDED AND WHAT ARE THE MEANINGS OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTARIES. I SAY, THAT I DON'T FOLLOW AND PERHAPS OTHER MEMBERS DO, BUT I CAN'T FOLLOW THE FIGURES THAT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF WHAT NOW HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO COUNCIL AS A SUPPLEMENTARY. WE ARE \$70,000.00 OVER. I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND IT. IT'S JUST NO POINT IN ARGUING AGAINST IT BECAUSE I HAVE TO GO OVER THE SAME ARGUMENT TIME AND TIME AGAIN. IT'S THE OLD THING. IT'S A MATTER OF WHO KEEPS THE BOOKS. YOU CAN JUGGLE THEM ABOUT TO MAKE THEM LOOK ANYTHING, BUT YOU'RE NOT MAKING IT UNDERSTANDABLE IN PLAIN, ORDINARY SPEAKING ENGLISH SO THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT ACCOUNTANTS CAN UNDERSTAND IT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAYBE FOR THE CLARITY OF ALL MEMBERS. ONE ITEM WHICH I THINK WE OFTEN TEND TO OVERLOOK WHEN WE ARE DEALING WITH ESTIMATES AND WHEN WE ARE DEALING WITH ACTUALS IS THE FACT THAT APPROPRIATIONS ARE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO SPEND MONEY. THEY HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP TO THE ACCOUNTING PROCESS THAT GOES ON IN THE GOVERNMENT. THAT IS THE KEY ISSUE AT THIS POINT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS MATTER?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST TO MAKE SURE I AM ABSOLUTELY CLEAR ON IT. ON FRIDAY I WAS PRETTY SURE I WAS FOLLOWING THE LINE OF THOUGHTS BY THE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST AND NOW THAT I HAVE THIS PAPER IN FRONT OF ME, I HAVE IT QUITE CLEAR OR AT LEAST I THINK IT IS. I JUST NEED TO ASK JUST ONE SMALL QUESTION TO MAKE SURE. THAT \$70,000.00 IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY UNDER 515, IS THAT THE SAME \$70,000.00 AS WE ARE SHOWING IN 73-74 AS AN EXTRA OR DIFFERENCE IN THE EXPENDITURE?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. STUTTER: THANK YOU. IT IS CLEARER TO ME, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT OPENS ANOTHER QUESTION. IF THE ESTIMATES, HERE WE HAVE IN 1973-74, TAKING A FULL PAGE, YOU HAVE ESTIMATES OF \$1,402,470.00. RIGHT?

MR. MILLER: RIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS ESTIMATED RECOVERIES, THE ESTIMATED REVENUES AND RECOVERIES. NOW, WE FROM THE ACTUAL REVENUES AND RECOVERIES WERE \$1,619,000.00. SO THAT WE HAVE \$217,000.00 MORE IN RECOVERIES THAN WE ANTICIPATED IN OUR ESTIMATES. SO WE SHOULD HAVE \$217,000.00 MORE. WE ARE SAYING THE EXPENDITURES ARE JUST A DIFFERENCE OF \$73,530.00. SO THAT IF, AND THIS IS WHERE I TAKE IT YOU GOT YOUR ROUND FIGURE OF \$73,000.00, IF WE ADD THE \$73,000.00 AND THE \$209,000.00. THAT IS \$73,000.00 LESS THAN WHAT WAS EXPECTED TO BE SPENT AND \$217,000.00 MORE ... WE ARE TALKING ABOUT \$290,000.00 WHICH IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT WE EXPECTED TO AND WHAT MORE WE GOT. WHERE DO WE FIND THIS FIGURE THIS \$290,000.00 WHICH SHOULD SHOW THE BALANCE OF YOUR FIGURES? I OPERATE MY BUSINESS LIKE THAT, PERHAPS I'VE BEEN OPERATING MY BUSINESS WRONG FOR ALL THIS TIME. I DON'T KNOW. PERHAPS YOU CAN TELL ME SOMETHING.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE QUESTION RELATES AGAIN TO THE ORIGINAL POINT THAT I TRIED TO MAKE. APPROPRIATIONS ARE ONLY ESTIMATES OR LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY, THEY ARE NOT ACTUAL FIGURES. IF THE MEMBERS WILL TAKE THAT FIRST SHEET AND LAY IT BESIDE THE SECOND SHEET THAT I HANDED OUT, YOU WILL FIND THAT IN 1973-74 THE ACTUAL REVENUE AND RECOVERY SHOWN ON THE SECOND SHEET ABOUT MIDWAY DOWN THE PAGE ARE \$1,619,783. THE ACTUAL EXPENDITURES ARE \$1,239,000. THOSE ARE THE ACTUALS. THAT IS THE PRECISE ACCOUNTING SIDE OF THE QUESTION AND THAT IS WHERE THE SURPLUS FLOWS. THAT INDICATES THAT THAT SURPLUS OF \$380,000 IN 1973-74 IS GOING IN TO THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN FUND.

THE APPROPRIATION AND THE REVENUE ESTIMATES HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP TO THAT AT ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF THAT MONEY IS COMING INTO THE YICIP FUND, WHAT IS IT DOING IN



HERE WHERE YOU ARE TAKING THAT \$70,000 AND YOU'RE USING IT IN SOME OTHER ESTABLISHMENT IN VOTE 05.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE ARE NOT USING THE ACTUAL MONEY, WE ARE USING THE LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION THAT HIS COUNCIL PASSED A YEAR AGO. THE \$1,312,000 LESS THE \$1,239,000 IS WHAT'S LEFT OVER IN THE APPROPRIATION, NOT IN THE BANK, IN THE APPROPRIATION ONLY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: BUT, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL DID NOT APPROPRIATE MONEY OUT OF THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN BY PREMIUMS AND THE FUNDS THAT ARE COMING INTO THE PLAN FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO APPROPRIATE IN TO PUT IT INTO ANOTHER VOTE, INTO ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT. THEY DIDN'T DO THAT. THEY DID IT FOR THE PURPOSE OF YHCIP AND FOR NO OTHER REASON. I WANT TO KNOW WHY ITS GOING INTO ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT, WHEN YOU RAISE THIS MONEY FROM THE PEOPLE FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, AS INDICATED ON THE SECOND SHEET AND AS INDICATED IN MY PREVIOUS EXPLANATION, THE MONIES RAISED BY PREMIUMS AND THE MONIES RAISED BY RECOVERIES FROM NATIONAL HEALTH LESS THE EXPENDITURES UNDER THE YHCIP PLAN ARE GOING TOWARD THAT PLAN'S SURPLUS.

THE FACT THAT THIS COUNCIL APPROPRIATED MONEY AND IN THOSE ESTIMATES THERE WAS AN ESTIMATED REVENUE HAS NO BEARING ON WHAT GOES INTO YHCIP CASH SURPLUS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS NO POINT IN ARGUING Mr. CHAIRMAN. AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, MONEY THAT HAS BEEN APPROPRIATED FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE HAS BEEN REDUCED AND PUT INTO ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT, AND I DON'T CARE WHAT WAY YOU LOOK AT IT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS MATTER? NEXT ITEM.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE LAST ITEM THAT WAS ASKED FOR WAS A LIST OF STUDIES UNDER THE COMMUNITY PLANNING, STUDIES AMOUNT. I HAVE TABLED FOR THE MEMBERS BENEFIT A PAPER SHOWING A LIST OF THE STUDIES UNDERTAKEN DURING THE YEAR TOTALLING \$237,150.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: AGAIN, I'LL ASK YOU THE QUESTION, WHERE WAS THE AUTHORITY OBTAINED TO SPEND THAT MONEY?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION PRECISELY. I CAN ONLY ASSUME THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE GAVE AUTHORITY TO HAVE THOSE STUDIES UNDERTAKEN.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DID GIVE THAT AUTHORITY. THIS COUNCIL GAVE THE AUTHORITY TO HIRE A TOWN PLANNER. THEY WEREN'T ABLE TO RECRUIT A TOWN PLANNER. THE PLANNING HAD TO BE DONE IN THE COMMUNITY. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MADE THE DECISION THAT IT COULD BE DONE ON A CONTRACTORIAL BASIS FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY AND THIS IS THE ANSWER THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS SEEKING AND THAT IS HOW IT WAS DONE. THIS IS WHERE THE AUTHORITY WAS GIVEN.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I SAY THE AUTHORITY TO HAVE A PLANNER DO SOME STUDIES WAS GIVEN. THERE IS NO ARGUMENT WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE ON THAT POINT. NONE WHATEVER.

WHAT I AM TRYING TO ASCERTAIN IS BEFORE THE MONEY WAS SPENT AND ONCE WE KNEW WHAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF THESE STUDIES WERE GOING TO BE, THOSE COSTS WERE NOT BROUGHT FORWARD TO COUNCIL FOR COUNCIL TO AGREE TO THOSE EXPENDITURES. SO, THEREFORE, IT WAS DONE AFTER. RIGHT HERE IS WHAT WE'VE GOT, IS A REQUEST FROM COUNCIL TO APPROVE AN EXPENDITURE OF MONEY THAT HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT WITHOUT PRIOR CONSULTATION WITH THIS COUNCIL. ALL MONIES ARE SUPPOSED TO BE WITH THE CONSULTATION OF COUNCIL. THIS WASN'T DONE. I SAY THAT ON THE BASIS OF ANSWERS THAT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED THAT IT WASN'T DONE AND THAT IS SEPARATE FROM THE FACT THAT THE STUDIES WERE AUTHORIZED. I HAVE NO ARGUMENT ON THAT POINT.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS ABSOLUTELY CORRECT THAT THE AUTHORITY IS REQUESTED HERE IN THIS SESSION.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: ITS ALREADY BEEN SPENT.

Mr. TANNER: ALL SUPPLEMENTS ARE EXACTLY JUST THAT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER JUST SPOKE, IS SOMEWHAT CONFUSED WITH THE SPECIFIC POINT, THAT WHERE THERE ARE STUDIES, IF THESE STUDIES FOR INSTANCE, HAVEN'T BEEN AUTHORIZED BY COUNCIL AND THEN AS A RESULT OR HAD THERE BEEN AN ITEM OF \$1 BEING PUT IN



SPECIFICALLY FOR THESE STUDIES AND THEN THE COST OF THE STUDIES HAD COME FORWARD THEN CERTAINLY, THERE IS SOME REASON TO SAY THAT THERE WAS AUTHORITY FOR THESE STUDIES.

THESE WERE STUDIES THAT WERE NOT IN OR CONTEMPLATED AT THE TIME OF THE 1973-74 BUDGET COMING BEFORE THIS HOUSE. THESE WERE ALL NEW STUDIES WHICH WERE DECIDED UPON AFTER THE 73-74 BUDGET. ALTHOUGH, WE HAVE HAD THE STUDIES, I HAVEN'T HAD THE TIME TO READ THEM, TO SEE IF THEY WERE WORTH SPENDING THE MONEY ON THEM OR NOT. WE HAD TO HAVE THE STUDIES. NO DOUBT WE HAVE TO PAY FOR THEM. I SIMPLY AM SAYING THAT IT WAS AN IMPROPER METHOD TO USE. TO GO AHEAD AND SPEND \$200,000 WITHOUT FIRST HAVING THE DECENCY TO SAY TO COUNCIL, 'WELL LOOK, WE CAN'T GET A PLANNER, WE HAVE TRIED FOR A COUPLE OF YEARS. WE ARE GOING TO DO IT BY CONTRACT. WE EXPECT THAT THESE STUDIES ARE GOING TO BE \$XX. WE WANT TO PUT AN ITEM IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY SO THAT ONCE WE GET THE BILLS FOR THEM, WE WILL BE ABLE TO PAY THEM.'

I AM SIMPLY SAYING THAT IF THIS WAS DONE, UNDER THE USUAL METHOD, THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN SATISFACTORY. THERE IS NO REASON TO BELIEVE THAT IT DID HAPPEN THIS WAY THAT IN FACT THESE STUDIES WERE AUTHORIZED AND I DON'T DISAGREE WERE AUTHORIZED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. BUT THE FUNDING SHOULD HAVE COME BEFORE COUNCIL MR. CHAIRMAN BEFORE THEY WERE GIVEN AUTHORITY. THIS IS MY OBJECTION.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY I ASK--

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I FEEL THAT IN THIS INSTANCE, THERE SHOULD BE NO CRITICISM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BECAUSE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPROVED THE EXPENDITURE OF THIS AND THERE ARE TWO ELECTED PEOPLE ON THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHO AGREED WITH THE EXPENDITURE OF THESE FUNDS AND ONE, YOU HAVE ELECTED PEOPLE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND AS YOU HAVE MORE AND MORE ELECTED PEOPLE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THEY ARE GOING TO MAKE DECISIONS IN THIS REGARD, SO THAT NEW PROGRAMS CAN BE BROUGHT INTO PLACE, SO THAT EMERGENCY SITUATIONS CAN BE TAKEN CARE OF AND THEN THEY COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL TO INDICATE WHAT DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE AND TO GET THEIR APPROVAL FOR THEM. BUT I THINK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS WRONG IF HE FEELS THAT THERE SHOULD BE CRITICISM OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON THIS BECAUSE I ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY COMPLETELY ON THE EXPENDITURE OF THESE

FUNDS AND IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST IS NOT PREPARED TO ACCEPT IT THAT IS FINE BUT I AM CERTAINLY PREPARED TO ACCEPT IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. CHAIRMAN, DURING THE TIME OF THIS YEAR THAT I WAS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, I HAVE KEPT ALL MY NOTES ON EVERYTHING AND EVERY MEETING THAT I ATTENDED. I THOROUGHLY EXAMINED THEM OVER THE WEEKEND. ALTHOUGH I AGREE THERE WAS DISCUSSION ON HAVING THE STUDIES DONE, AT NO TIME DURING THE PERIOD OF THE 1ST OF APRIL TO THE END OF SEPTEMBER, DID I OR COUNCILLOR WATSON AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEY. WE AGREED TO THE STUDY AND IF THE EXPENDITURES OF MONEY HAS TAKEN PLACE AT ALL IN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THEY MUST HAVE TAKEN PLACE SINCE THE LAST DAY OF SEPTEMBER.

I AM SAYING THAT SHE IS INCORRECT AND DOESN'T REMEMBER CORRECTLY, BUT WE DID AGREE TO THE STUDY. WE DID NOT AGREE TO THE EXPENDITURE BECAUSE ITS ALWAYS BEEN MY PHILOSOPHY THAT NO MONEY WILL BE SPENT UNLESS ITS BEEN AUTHORIZED BY COUNCIL PROPERLY. IF THE RECORDS WERE ONLY ABLE TO SPEAK OUT, IT WOULD SHOW QUITE CLEARLY THAT IS WHAT THE POSITION IS.

AS I SAY, IF THE BILLS HAVE BEEN DONE THEN WE HAVE TO PAY FOR THEM. BUT I'M JUST SAYING THAT THE PROCEDURE WASN'T DONE PROPERLY, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD NOT AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEY. THIS IS WHAT WE ARE HERE FOR, TO MAKE SURE THEY TAKE NOTE OF WHAT WE SAY TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE IT DOESN'T HAPPEN.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT ITS QUITE CLEAR, IN THE LAST YEAR WE VOTED \$30,000 FOR PLANNING STUDIES. IF THE CRITICISM IS THAT WE'VE OVERSPENT, FAIR ENOUGH. BUT ITS CERTAINLY NOT A CRITICISM THAT IS BRAND NEW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS WHAT I SAY, WHERE THERE WAS A SPECIFIC AMOUNT OF MONEY SET ASIDE FOR SPECIFIC PLANNING AND WHATNOT, THEN OF COURSE, WHEN THERE IS AN OVERAGE YOU COME BACK FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY, BUT I AM JUST ACCEPTING WHAT MR. MILLER HAS SAID, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT SINCE HE HAS BEEN A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, SINCE THE 24TH OF APRIL OF LAST YEAR, WHICH IS ALMOST A COMPLETE FISCAL YEAR, HE DOESN'T RECALL ANY INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS THOUGH HE DOES RECALL AS WE ALREADY DO, THAT AUTHORITY WAS GIVEN FOR THE



STUDY AND THIS IS THE POINT I MAKE. I THINK IT IS A VALID POINT, I THINK WE WENT AHEAD, WE DID THE STUDIES AS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAD DECIDED TO DO BUT WE WENT AND SPENT THE MONEY WHEN THERE WERE THREE SESSIONS OF COUNCIL IN BETWEEN WITHOUT COMING FORWARD AND SAYING, 'HERE IS A SUPPLEMENTARY.'

NOT ONLY THAT, THERE WAS A SUPPLEMENTARY BROUGHT FORWARD ON THE CAMPBELL BRIDGE, WHY WASN'T A SUPPLEMENTARY BROUGHT FORWARD AT THAT TIME AS WELL? IT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER, WILL YOU TAKE THE CHAIR, PLEASE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM AS CONCERNED AS SOME OTHER MEMBERS THAT HAVE SPOKEN ABOUT THESE NEW PROGRAMS. CERTAINLY, I THINK THAT THE ADMINISTRATION MUST REALIZE THAT IT IS NOT PROPER IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM TO EMBARK ON NEW PROGRAMS WITHOUT FIRST COMING TO THIS LEGISLATURE. OTHERWISE, THERE WOULD BE NO FURTHER NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATURE.

WHILE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT NEW PROGRAMS, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS. I SEE IN THE BREAKDOWN WE HAVE A TRANSIT AND TRAFFIC STUDY FOR \$12,000. NOW WE HAVE THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE. COMMUNITY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. COULD SOMEONE REFRESH ME AS TO WHAT THIS ENTAILS BECAUSE IT IS \$33,500. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS STUDY WAS TABLED IN COUNCIL THE OTHER DAY. IT IS THE VERY LARGE THICK ONE THAT ILLUSTRATES OR OUTLINES ALL THE COMMUNITY NEEDS THROUGHOUT THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. TAYLOR: IS THIS THE SEWER MAINTENANCE STUDY?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS A DIFFERENT STUDY THAT WAS COMPLETED PRIOR TO THIS CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE GET COPIES OF THIS STUDY SO THAT WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT WHILE WE ARE DISCUSSING THIS ITEM. I MEAN THE SHEETS.

MRS. WATSON: YOU HAVE IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH, I SEE. I BEG YOUR

PARDON.

MR. TAYLOR: POSSIBLY I'LL TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AFTER. THEN WE GO THROUGH A LIST OF THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES; TESLIN, DAWSON, MAYO AND SO FORTH. COULD I BE INFORMED AS TO WHAT IS THE KLUANE CORRIDOR STUDY. WHAT IS THAT ALL ABOUT. \$38,200.

MR. MILLER: THIS STUDY, MR. CHAIRMAN, RELATES TO A STUDY OF WHAT IS COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS THE KLUANE CORRIDOR RUNNING UP THE ALASKA HIGHWAY TO HAINES JUNCTION. DOWN FROM HAINES JUNCTION THROUGH B.C. TO THE ALASKA BORDER AND RUNNING NORTH OF HAINES JUNCTION TO THE END OF THE PARK. IT'S REALLY INTENDED TO DETERMINE PLANNING OR LAND USE ALONG THAT CORRIDOR ROUTE, THAT BORDERS ON THE PARK AND RUNS FROM HAINES JUNCTION DOWN THROUGH TO WHITEHORSE.

MR. TAYLOR: THESE ARE VERY INTERESTING THINGS BECAUSE THIS IS SOMETHING THIS LEGISLATURE NEVER KNEW. I THINK IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO TELL US. THIS IS THE FIRST TIME I'VE EVER HEARD OF A KLUANE CORRIDOR IN MY WHOLE EVER-LIVING LIFE.

HOW COULD WE GET MORE INFORMATION ON THIS? DOES THIS FORM PART OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA FOR INSTANCE AND HAINES, ALASKA? WHEN CAN ONE GET MORE INFORMATION ON THIS BECAUSE THIS TYPE OF THING, WE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THESE THINGS BEFORE MONIES ARE EXPENDED IN THESE AREAS. IT SOUNDS VERY INTERESTING, BUT NEVERTHELESS, IT STILL AMOUNTS TO \$38,200. WHO ORIGINATED IT? WAS IT A REQUEST OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT? ITS A LOT OF MONEY.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAYBE I CAN SHED SOME LIGHT ONTO THE QUESTION THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS ASKED.

REGARDING THE STUDIES OF THE COMMUNITIES SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, I WOULD REFER THE HONOURABLE MEMBER TO SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 12, WHERE IT OUTLINES SOME OF THE PLANS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS DOING TO TRY TO IMPLEMENT THE COMMUNITY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

NOW, THE KLUANE CORRIDOR STUDIES, IF YOU REMEMBER WHEN THE KLUANE PARK WAS DISCUSSED HERE IN COUNCIL TWO YEARS AGO, THERE WAS SOME CONCERN



RELEASE LAND, SO THEY WON'T HAVE TO CONTINUE TO FREEZE ALL THAT LAND, SO THAT PEOPLE CAN GET A HOLD OF LAND IN THAT AREA IF THEY WANT.

MR. TAYLOR: ONE VERY IMPORTANT POINT HERE IS THAT, NOTWITHSTANDING, THAT WE STILL HAVEN'T HEARD ABOUT THIS CORRIDOR STUDY AND I WOULDN'T THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD EMBARK ON ANY KIND OF A PLAN DEVELOPMENT UNDER THIS PLAN UNTIL ITS FIRST BEEN REFERRED TO THE LEGISLATURE. I WOULD HOPE THIS WOULD BE THE CASE. I WOULD ASSUME THAT WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS CASE WOULDN'T BE THE WAY THINGS WORK AND THAT'S WHAT PARLIAMENTS ARE ALL ABOUT.

I HAVE ONE FINAL QUESTION. YOU HAVE PLANNING ORDINANCE AND ITS \$4,000. COULD I HAVE AN EXPLANATION OF THAT. I KNOW OF NO PLANNING ORDINANCE.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ADMINISTRATION HAS LOOKED AT THE NEED FOR A PLANNING ORDINANCE OR A PLANNING ORDINANCE FOR ALL THE LAND UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE COMMISSIONER, OUTSIDE OF COMMUNITY.

IN ORDER TO GET SOME EXPERTISE IN THIS MATTER, WE CONTRACTED WITH A GENTLEMAN WHO HAD JUST COMPLETED DOING A PLANNING ORDINANCE FOR THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, WHO IS QUITE AN EXPERT IN THE FIELD AND HE UNDERTOOK TO PROVIDE US WITH THE BACKGROUND, THE NEEDS, THE BASIC MATERIAL NECESSARY FOR US TO PUT TOGETHER A PLANNING ORDINANCE. THIS IS JUST IN ITS FINAL... STAGE WITHIN OUR OWN ADMINISTRATION AND WILL BE COMING TO COUNCIL AT SOME APPROPRIATE TIME, EXPRESSED BY COUNCILLORS AT THAT TIME THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, IN ORDER TO, IF A PARK WAS ESTABLISHED IN THAT AREA, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT TO HAVE SOME SORT OF PLAN AVAILABLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THAT AREA. ESPECIALLY THE AREA THAT RUNS PARALLEL TO THE PARK BORDER. AT THAT TIME, THE KLUANE PARK WAS ESTABLISHED, THERE WAS A GREAT DEAL OF INTEREST IN THE ACQUIRING OF LAND AND THIS IS QUITE A NATURAL THING FOR PEOPLE TO DO. BECAUSE MOST OF THE APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN TURNED DOWN BECAUSE A GREAT PORTION OF THAT AREA HAD BEEN FROZEN, IT WASN'T AVAILABLE FOR DISPOSAL, IT WAS NECESSARY FOR SOME PLAN TO BE DEVELOPED SO THAT THE LAND COULD BE RELEASED AND DISPOSED OF ON A VERY ORDERLY BASIS.

THIS IS WHY THE CORRIDOR STUDY IS BEING DONE. SO THAT WHEN THE CORRIDOR STUDY IS DONE AND, INCIDENTLY THE GROUPS WHO ARE DOING THE STUDY,

AND I'VE FORGOTTEN WHO THEY ARE, HAVE HAD MEETINGS ALL ALONG IN THE COMMUNITIES, TO DETERMINE WHAT THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE IN THAT AREA ARE. THEN THE GOVERNMENT WILL BE ABLE TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN, IF IT IS APPROVED AND TO

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S THE STRANGEST THING. WE HAVE GOT TWO LAWYERS NOW, WHO ARE SUPPOSED TO BE THE ONES TO PREPARE OUR LEGISLATION. WE ARE NOW CONTRACTING OUT OUR LEGISLATION. SURELY, THIS IS A POINT THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED WITH COUNCIL BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT. I'D LIKE TO KNOW HOW MANY OF THESE WERE PROVIDED FOR IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, THIS IS NOT A LAWYER TO WRITE AN ORDINANCE, BUT THIS IS AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS A PLANNER, A PLANNING EXPERT AND HE IS PROVIDING US WITH THE BASIC POLICY THAT WE NEED TO PUT TOGETHER A PLANNING ORDINANCE FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY. HE IS A CONSULTANT. HE IS NOT A LAWYER, HE IS A CONSULTANT, AND HE IS NOT WRITING THE ORDINANCE HE IS PROVIDING THE POLICY AND THE PLANNING ADVICE THAT WE NEED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHY DIDN'T YOU SAY SO, THEN PERHAPS YOU WON'T LAUGH. YOU SAY PLANNING ORDINANCE . . . . LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MRS. WATSON: THATS O.K.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO, BEFORE I RESUME THE CHAIR, THERE IS NO USE BEING REPETITIOUS ABOUT THIS, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE MEMBERS IF THEY WOULD TAKE IN MIND AND CERTAINLY THE ADMINISTRATION, IF THEY WOULD REFLECT UPON THE REMARKS I MADE WHEN LAST WE SPOKE ON THIS SUBJECT OF PLANNING. HAVING REFERENCE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANS IN THE OUTLYING COMMUNITIES. THANK YOU AND I WILL RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON ESTABLISHMENT 601, COMMUNITY PLANNING AND LAND DISPOSAL? CLEAR?

SOME MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM, AND THIS ENDS THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS.



Mr. Miller: THATS THE OUTSTANDING ANSWERS.

Mr. Chairman: THANK YOU. THE NEXT ITEM IS MUNICIPAL SERVICES - \$77,000.

Mr. Chamberlist: WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT INCREASING GRANTS IN LIEU OF TO COMMUNITIES, IS THIS AMENDMENTS TO THE MUNICIPAL AID BILL?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THESE AREN'T AMENDMENTS TO THE MUNICIPAL AID BILL, THIS IS THE PAYMENT OF OUR GRANT IN LIEU OF PROPERTY TAX TO THE MUNICIPALITIES.

Mr. Chamberlist: IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY, THIS IS PAID UNDER THE MUNICIPAL AID ORDINANCE. Mr. Chairman, WHAT I WANT TO FIND OUT FROM Mr. Miller IS WHETHER THERE IS TO BE AN AMENDMENT TO THE ORDINANCE TO DO THIS OR WHETHER IT IS BEING DONE BY REGULATION.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THIS RELATES ENTIRELY TO THE EXISTING MUNICIPAL AID ORDINANCE AND WHAT IT INVOLVES IS THE SCHEDULE REQUIRED UNDER THE ORDINANCE PROVIDES FOR THE ASSESSMENT TO BE DONE IN NOVEMBER, IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECTLY. WHEN WE PUT UP OUR MAIN ESTIMATES LAST YEAR, WE DIDN'T PROVIDE SUFFICIENT FUNDS. FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE, THEIR MILL RATE INCREASED, SUBSEQUENTLY, WE HAD TO PAY THEM MORE DOLLARS, UNDER THAT ORDINANCE. THIS IS WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT - INCREASE IN ASSESSEMENT AND INCREASE IN MILL RATE, NOT A CHANGE IN THE ORDINANCE.

Mr. Chamberlist: I SEE.

Mr. Chairman: THE NEXT ITEM IS AMBULANCE SERVICES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$ 50,000.

Mr. Chamberlist: THIS IS THE EXACT AMOUNT THAT WAS AGREED TO EARLY ON IN LAST YEAR. I HAVEN'T GOT THE EXACT DATE.

Mr. Miller: THAT'S CORRECT Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: IN TERMS OF THE TAKEOVER, THIS IS FROM THE CHAIR. IN TERMS OF THE TAKEOVER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT IN RESPECT OF THE HIGHWAY TAKEOVER - IS ANY PART OF THIS RECOVERABLE FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

Mr. Miller: NO, Mr. Chairman, THE TAHKINI AMBULANCE SERVICE IS NOT RECOVERABLE. THE AMBULANCE IS OPERATED ALONG THE HIGHWAY

AS PARTS OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY ARE STILL RECOVERABLE FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Chairman: ARE YOU CLEAR THEN ON \$405,065?

Mr. Chairman: WE WILL THEN TURN TO TOURISM CONSERVATION AND INFORMATION - \$100,000. THAT IS BROKEN DOWN ON PAGE 24.

THE FIRST ITEM IS ADMINISTRATION - \$15,000.

Mr. Chamberlist: I HEARD, Mr. Chairman, IN AN ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR OF TOURISM, THAT THEY AREN'T GOING TO INTEND TO ENCOURAGE MORE PEOPLE TO COME INTO THE YUKON UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THERE IS MORE HOTEL ACCOMMODATION, EXCEPT FOR THE MONTHS OUTSIDE OF THE SUMMER TIME. WHAT IS THE POINT OF INCREASED PROGRAM OF TOURIST PROMOTION IF HE SAYS WE DON'T WANT TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO COME IN. ANY IDEA WHAT THE INCREASE IS FOR IN THAT CASE?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THESE ARE ESTIMATED COSTS THAT WE WILL OVERSPEND FOR 1973-74. THEY DON'T RELATE TO THE NEW YEAR BUDGET.

Mr. Chamberlist: I AM AWARE OF THAT.

Mr. Chairman: ARE YOU CLEAR ON THIS ITEM?

NEXT ITEM IS CAMPGROUND MAINTENANCE - \$40,000.

FROM THE CHAIR. DOES THIS INFER THAT FROM NOW ON THERE WILL BE PLOUGHING INTO LITTER BARRELS AND MAKING LITTER BARRELS AVAILABLE IN THE WINTER TIME? IS THIS THE REASON?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THAT IS PART OF THE ANSWER. WE HAVE FOUND THAT IN ORDER TO KEEP THESE LITTER BARRELS IN CERTAIN AREAS, AT LEAST IN REASONABLE CLEANLINESS, PUT IT THAT WAY, THAT WE'VE HAD TO EXTEND A PORTION OF OUR LITTER BARREL PROGRAM FOR A FULL TWELVE MONTHS SEASON.

Mr. Chairman: CLEAR?

SOME MEMBERS: CLEAR.

Mr. Chairman: THE NEXT ITEM IS THE GAME BRANCH, \$45,000.

ARE ALL THESE AIR PATROLS RELATED SOLELY TO THE OPERATION OF THE GAME DEPARTMENT?

Mr. Miller: YES, Mr. Chairman, THEY ARE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I JUST GAVE THIS A TOTAL OF \$100,000. ARE YOU CLEAR?

SOME MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS LEGAL AFFAIRS, \$26,000. THE EXPLANATION IS ON PAGE 27.

THE FIRST ITEM IS \$20,000 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF WE COULD GET AN EXPLANATION, MR. CHAIRMAN OF HOW IS THE INCREASED ADMINISTRATION COST TO A TUNE OF \$20,000, DOES THIS MEAN THAT THERE WAS MORE STAFF TAKEN ON? WAS THERE MORE STAFF TAKEN ON OR WAS IT IN THE SAME PERIOD?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I BELIEVE THIS RELATED ENTIRELY TO COURT REPORTER DUTIES WHERE THINGS WERE FALLING BEHIND AND WE HAD TO TAKE ON ADDITIONAL STAFF TO TRY AND CLEAN UP THE BACKLOG.

MRS. WATSON: IT ALSO INCLUDED SOME JURY PROBLEMS WHERE IT COST EXTRA FOR WITNESSES WHICH RAISED THE COST.

MR. TANNER: ALSO, MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK IT SHOULD BE POINTED OUT THAT THE LEGAL FRATERNITY IN TOWN WAS COMPLAINING THAT IT WAS TAKING AS MUCH AS SIX MONTHS TO GET DISCOVERIES IN FRONT OF A JUDGE OR MAGISTRATE, CONSEQUENTLY, THATS PROBABLY WHERE THE MONEY CAME IN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON THAT ITEM? THE NEXT ITEM IS LEGAL AID, \$6,000. GIVING US A TOTAL OF \$26,000 FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS.

THE NEXT ITEM IS HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WORKS, \$62,849.20 AND THE BREAKDOWN IS ON PAGE 30.

THE FIRST ITEM IS MAINTENANCE OF TERRITORIAL BUILDINGS, \$150,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DOES THE MAINTENANCE OF TERRITORIAL BUILDINGS INCLUDE THE MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS THAT ARE UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE HOUSING CORPORATION?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT DOESN'T INVOLVE THE RENTAL-PURCHASE OR THE PUBLIC HOUSING SCHEME. SOME OF OUR MAINTENANCE PEOPLE ACTUALLY DO WORK ON THOSE, BUT IT IS CHARGED BACK TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WHEN IT IS CHARGED BACK TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION, THAT COMES UNDER RECOVERY. IT IS ENTIRELY DIFFERENT ISN'T IT MR. CHAIRMAN? THIS IS WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN GIVING US BEFORE IN THE OTHER AREAS. YOU TOLD US TO KEEP OUR MINDS SEPARATE BETWEEN RECOVERIES AND ESTIMATED COST. NOW IN THAT \$150,000 AND BECAUSE OF MY QUESTION, I TAKE IT THAT THE, WHAT HAPPENS IS THAT THE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT CARRIES OUT THE REPAIRS, MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION BUILDINGS AND THEN THE HOUSING CORPORATION GET BILLED BACK - THAT IS A RECOVERY. MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD MR. MILLER INDICATE WHETHER THAT IS THE POSITION?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT ISN'T CORRECT IN THIS CASE. WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE BUILDING MAINTENANCE MAN WORKS ON A RENTAL-PURCHASE HOUSE, IT IS CHARGED TO THIRD PARTY SERVICES WHICH IS THEN BILLED FROM THIRD PARTY SERVICES. THEY DON'T CHARGE THEIR TIME TO MAINTENANCE OF TERRITORIAL BUILDINGS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT IT IS A RECOVERY, IS IT NOT MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. MILLER: THERE IS A RECOVERY BUT IT IS NOT A RECOVERY AGAINST THIS ESTABLISHMENT. IT IS AGAINST ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: UNDER WHAT ESTABLISHMENT IN THIS PARTICULAR VOTE WOULD THE OTHER ITEM THEN, THAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO, COME IN?

MR. MILLER: NOT IN THIS PARTICULAR PAGE. GIVE ME A MOMENT AND I WILL REFER TO LAST YEAR'S BUDGET. IT IS UNDER THIRD PARTY SERVICES, ESTABLISHMENT 905.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO THAT, YOU SAY THEN, IN THAT CASE THAT THE THIRD PARTY SERVICES, THEY ARE PEOPLE FROM THE MAINTENANCE BRANCH OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT.

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I UNDERSTAND THEN THAT THE MAINTENANCE PART OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT HAS TWO SEPARATE SETS OF BILLINGS. THE BILL FOR MAINTENANCE OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AND THE BILL FOR MAINTENANCE OF HOUSING CORPORATION BUILDINGS. IS THAT CORRECT?



Mr. Miller: That is essentially correct.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well isn't it so that both the sets of buildings are Territorial Government buildings in any event?

Mr. Miller: Yes, in the real sense, they are, but we cost them separately.

Mr. Chairman: Are you clear on maintenance of Territorial buildings?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Next is Territorial Roads and Airstrips, \$50,000.

I wonder if I could have an explanation on this? Has this gone into roads or airstrips or what?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this relates to a number of items. I will deal with them as I have them here. The Faro Access Road required complete resurfacing. Tahkini Hot Springs Road required more maintenance than we had budgeted for. The South Access Road required very costly repairs and drainage installation. We put a full time year round employee into Old Crow part way through the year. The Airstrips on the Dempster Highway at Mile Post 78, Mile Post 101 and the Airstrip on the Canal Road, Mile Post 209 required heavy maintenance to the settlement and surface repairs. And the maintenance of the Selkirk Airstrip was added to the program.

Mr. Chairman: Just one further question from the Chair. It was understood by Council that when the one cent tax went on aviation fuel, this money was to be applied solely to airport maintenance. Is this the case?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, when the tax went on aviation fuel, the purpose of that tax was to increase our maintenance on airstrips. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman: Do I have it that there was insufficient funds in that fund to do the work on the airstrips?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there weren't separate funds set up as the funds of the aviation tax

Fuel tax, go into consolidated revenue and the expenditures come out of the consolidated revenue.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Territorial Roads and Airstrips? Clear?

Next is Recreational Roads and Boat Launching Ramps, \$50,000.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, during the year we added the Pelly Ranch Road to this program, repairs to the road, mainly the replacement of three bridges and the repair of other bridges accounted for approximately \$12,000. Surface repairs to the Bonanza Road caused by an extremely wet summer and also necessitated by increased mining and tourist traffic accounted for approximately \$4,000. The balance was for the deterioration of the surface and to repair washouts on the Granville Road.

Mr. Chairman: Are you clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: The next item is Tote Trail Assistance, \$50,000.

Under Tote Trail Assistance we get \$200,000 and we budgeted \$100,000 in the main estimates. Does this mean that the Federal Government have agreed to increase our allotment for Tote Services?

Mr. Miller: No, Mr. Chairman, the \$50,000 revote that we have here is funds that weren't expended in prior years, that were available. This is the first time, to my knowledge and I look back a number of years, that this full \$100,000 wasn't sufficient and we had to find extra funds for this particular year. Until we know whether this program will continue in excess of \$100,000 we don't know whether to ask Ottawa for additional money. One year's history doesn't indicate a real need at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Tote Trail Assistance?

The next item is Dawson Skyline, \$8,000.

Mr. Chamberlist: Why would this year, Mr. Chairman, be an increase on that item when

IT HAS BEEN PRETTY STABLE FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS? IS THERE ANYTHING SPECIAL HAPPENING?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, DURING THE COURSE OF THIS YEAR THE WINCH HAD TO BE COMPLETELY RE-BUILT. THIS INCLUDED THE INSTALLATION OF A NEW SHAFT, AS BEARINGS WERE OVERHEATING, THE MAIN LOAD DRUM HAD TO BE RE-BUILT BECAUSE OF WEAR. THIS IS DONE APPROXIMATELY EVERY FIVE TO TEN YEARS. THEY HAD TO INSTALL FUEL TANKS UNDERGROUND AS THE FUEL CONGEALS IN THE ABOVE GROUND TANKS DURING LOW TEMPERATURES.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM ALASKA HIGHWAY AND HAINES ROAD IS A REDUCTION OF \$308,000.

COULD WE HAVE AN EXPLANATION ON THIS?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE MONIES THAT WE WON'T BE SPENDING DURING THE YEAR. I SHOULD EXPLAIN FOR COMMITTEES' BENEFIT THERE ARE CERTAIN ITEMS UNDER THE BUILDING MAINTENANCE CLASS THAT WE DEALT WITH PREVIOUSLY, WHICH WE HAVE TRANSFERRED FROM THE ALASKA HIGHWAY. ALL THE BUILDINGS ON THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, OR A LOT OF THE HOUSES WERE TRANSFERRED TO ACCOMMODATION SERVICES AND SUBSEQUENTLY, TRANSFERRED DOLLARS FOR THAT PURPOSE. IT CONSISTS OF AN ACCOUNTING EXERCISE.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I UNDERSTOOD THAT ALL THE FUNDS DEALING WITH THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, THE MONEY COMING IN, THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY WERE 100% RECOVERABLE FUNDS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IS THIS CORRECT SO FAR?

Mr. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

Mr. McKINNON: O.K. NOW, MAYBE I SHOULD BE ASKING A QUESTION OVER COFFEE INSTEAD OF IN THE HOUSE. IF THESE ARE FEDERAL FUNDS THAT ARE ESTIMATED AND ARE COMING IN SPECIFICALLY FOR A PROJECT WHICH IS THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, HOW CAN THESE FUNDS BE TRANSFERRED TO OBVIOUS TERRITORIAL PROJECTS, LIKE RECREATION ROADS AND TERRITORIAL ROADS AND AIRSTRIPS, TRANSFERRED FROM ONE ESTABLISHMENT TO ANOTHER.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THIS RELATES BACK TO THE QUESTION OF APPROPRIATIONS VERSUS ACTUAL COSTS. APPROPRIATIONS ARE ONLY LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO SPEND ACTUAL COSTS FOR COMPLETELY DIFFERENT THINGS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS ITEM?

NEXT ITEM IS WRITE-OFF OF OBSOLETE PARTS, \$62,849.20.

Mr. STUTTER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DO HAVE A QUESTION ON THIS. THIS ACTUALLY IS REALLY THE ONLY ITEM THAT WE ARE BUDGETING FOR, ALL THE REST ARE OFF-SETTING, BUT IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE, ITS QUITE POSSIBLE I TAKE IT THAT THE RECOVERY COULD BE A GOOD PORTION OF THIS ALSO. I DON'T WANT TO GET THE TWO MIXED UP. THESE ARE OBSOLETE PARTS THAT ARE NOW NOT BEING USED BY THE GARAGE?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE ITEMS THAT RELATE, THESE ARE EQUIPMENT PARTS THAT RELATE TO EQUIPMENT WE NO LONGER HAVE. IT IS OUR INTENT TO SELL THESE ITEMS ONCE WE HAVE COUNCIL'S AUTHORITY TO REMOVE THEM FROM OUR INVENTORY WHICH IS WHAT THIS IS. IT IS OUR INTENTION TO SELL THEM BY OUR NORMAL MEANS OF SALE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: BUT HERE, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVEN'T APPROPRIATED ANY MONEY IN THE LAST BUDGET AND NOW WE ARE SAYING THERE IS AN INCREASE IN MONEY THAT WE HAVEN'T APPROPRIATED. THIS IS WHAT WE REALLY ARE SAYING Mr. CHAIRMAN. THERE IS NO ITEM, IT'S A FUNNY BOOKKEEPING METHOD. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT PERHAPS BECOMES IN ITSELF MYSTIFYING. TAKE THE ITEM BEFORE YOU APPROPRIATE \$4,000,000.00 ODD DOLLARS, THERE IS \$308,000.00 THAT YOU KNOW, YOU EXPECT NOT TO USE. OF COURSE, THERE IS A REDUCTION IN THE OVERALL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES AT THE END OF MARCH. HERE, IN THIS ITEM NOTHING HAS BEEN APPROPRIATED, BUT BECAUSE YOU MIGHT BE SELLING EQUIPMENT YOU ADD THE AMOUNT OF MONEY OF WHAT YOU MIGHT BE SELLING AND YOU SAY THAT WE COME UP WITH A REVISED VOTE, BUT WE HAVEN'T VOLUNTEERED ANYTHING AND NOW YOU ASK ME IF THERE IS ONE, I THINK IT'S IN THE WRONG POSITION.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE ARE ASKING FOR HERE IS AN APPROPRIATION TO ALLOW US TO TAKE OUT OF OUR STORES OBSOLETE PARTS. THE ONLY WAY WE CAN TAKE THEM OUT IS TO HAVE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY BY WAY OF APPROPRIATION TO ACTUALLY TAKE THEM OUT OF OUR STORES.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THIS PROGRAM BEEN UNDER WAY?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, TO THE BEST



OF MY KNOWLEDGE TWO YEARS WE WROTE OFF OR WE ASKED FOR PERMISSION TO WRITE OFF AND WE RECEIVED IT - SOME \$20,000.00 OF PARTS THAT WE WERE TRYING TO DISPOSE OF AT THAT TIME.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHY, IF WE HAVE AN INVENTORY AMOUNT. SUPPOSING I DO MY INVENTORY, I HAVE MY INVENTORY ON THE SHELVES, I KNOW WHAT EXACTLY THE VALUE OF THE INVENTORY IS. SOME OF THE INVENTORY BECOMES OBSOLETE INVENTORY SO WE WRITE OFF OBSOLETE INVENTORY, AND THIS IS THE WAY IT IS DONE. I REALLY CAN'T UNDERSTAND, THIS IS THE STRANGEST METHOD I'VE EVER COME ACROSS IN ACCOUNTANCY. HERE YOU ARE WRITING OFF AN INVENTORY BY ADDING.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Chamberlist: JUST AN APPROPRIATION.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, INVENTORIES ARE HANDLED IN GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING BY REVOLVING FUNDS. THIS COUNCIL APPROVED THE REVOLVING FUND OF \$500,000.00 FOR GARAGE PARTS AND EQUIPMENT. THE VOTE WORDING AT THE TIME REFERS THAT THERE CAN BE NO DECREASE OF THAT APPROPRIATION OF \$500,000.00 WITHOUT THE PRIOR CONSENT OF THE COUNCIL. THE ONLY WAY TO TAKE THIS OUT OF INVENTORY, IN OTHER WORDS TO CREDIT INVENTORY, IS TO HAVE SOMETHING TO CHARGE IT TO. THIS REQUIRES AN APPROPRIATION OF THIS COUNCIL TO DO THIS. I CAN UNDERSTAND THE MEMBER'S CONCERN, IT IS NOT A NORMAL BUSINESS ACCOUNTING METHOD, IT IS A NORMAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING METHOD.

Mr. Chamberlist: WELL DO YOU THINK THAT EXPLAINS IT?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, THERE IS A REQUIREMENT UNDER THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ORDINANCE SECTION 29, SUBSECTION (5) IF YOU READ 29(5) IN THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ORDINANCE.

Mr. Miller: THAT'S CORRECT - IT GIVES, OH PARDON ME.

Mr. Chamberlist: CERTAINLY, BECAUSE - I'M NOT ARGUING THAT YOU CAN'T WRITE-OFF, BUT I'M SAYING THAT IN ORDER TO BE IN THE APPROPRIATION AREA WHEN IN FACT IT'S A REDUCTION OF INVENTORY THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, WHAT WE ARE DEALING WITH HERE IS MAINTAINING THE REVOLVING FUND VOTED BY THIS COUNCIL AT ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS. IF WE REDUCE THAT REVOLVING FUND, WE WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY YOU HAVE GIVEN US. WHAT WE ARE SAYING IS BEFORE WE CAN TAKE ANYTHING OUT OF INVENTORY WE MUST HAVE YOUR PRIOR CONSENT TO DO SO.

Mr. Chamberlist: WELL ASK FOR IT.

Mr. Miller: I'M TALKING ABOUT TAKE ANYTHING OUT AND GET RID OF IT NOT USE IT, AND THIS IS WHAT WE ARE ASKING FOR HERE.

Mr. Chamberlist: TAX WISE IT WOULDN'T BE VERY GOOD IF YOU WERE IN BUSINESS YOU KNOW.

Mr. Miller: I DON'T DISAGREE WITH YOU.

Mr. Chamberlist: I'M PLEASED YOU SAID THAT.

Mr. Chairman: ANYTHING FURTHER?

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, IN SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 4 THERE IS ALMOST \$371,000.00 IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES ASKED FOR. NOW IF YOU HAVEN'T OF HAD THE ALASKA HIGHWAY ESTIMATES, NOT THE ACTUAL FIGURES JUST THE ESTIMATES, WHERE WOULD YOU HAVE FOUND THAT \$371,000.00 WHICH I WOULD DETERMINE WOULD BE PRETTY CLOSE TO ACTUAL EXTRA MONEYS THAT YOU NEED IN SUPPLEMENTARIES FOR MAINTENANCE OF TERRITORIAL BUILDINGS, TERRITORIAL ROADS AND AIRSTRIPS AND SUCH.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, IF WE DIDN'T HAVE THAT SO-CALLED FREE BALANCE OF ALASKA HIGHWAY FUNDS WE WOULD HAVE COME BACK AND ASKED FOR THE ADDITIONAL \$371,000.00 OUT OF WORKING CAPITAL.

Mr. Chamberlist: BUT WHERE WERE YOU GOING TO GET IT?

Mr. McKinnon: IS THAT ACTUAL OR ESTIMATED? (LAUGHTER)

Mr. Chairman: ORDER PLEASE. IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER THEN ON THE ITEM OF \$62,849.20.

Mr. McKinnon: I WONDER IF I COULD ASK Mr. COMMISSIONER SEEING THAT HE IS HERE WITH THE \$308,000.00 THAT WASN'T NEEDED FOR

MAINTENANCE OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, I WONDER IF I COULD ASK MR. COMMISSIONER A PERENNIAL QUESTION - WOULDN'T THAT HAVE BEEN A NICE LITTLE CHUNK TO PUT TOWARDS THE 20 MILES TOWARDS HAINES JUNCTION THAT IS SUCH AN ABOMINATION. THERE IS NEVER ANY MONEY, NOW THERE'S \$308,000.00 THIS YEAR.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO MANIPULATE THIS MONEY - THERE'S ALL KINDS OF THINGS THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE DONE WITH IT. THERE'S TEN MILES OF CURVES THAT SHOULD COME OUT THERE, THERE'S TWENTY MILES OF CURVES DOWN BELOW TESLIN THAT SHOULD COME OUT, THERE'S HOW MANY MILES THAT COULD BE PAVED, 300 - I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY MILES IT IS THAT SHOULD BE PAVED. THERE'S ALL KINDS OF THINGS, BUT THE UNFORTUNATE PART OF IT IS THAT WE HAVE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WHICH MR. MILLER WOULD BE PLEASED TO EXPLAIN TO YOU. THERE ARE CERTAIN INHIBITIONS WITHIN THIS THAT LIMIT OUR RULES OF MANOEUVRE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I NEVER KNEW MR. CHAIRMAN THAT THE COMMISSIONER WAS VOID OF MANIPULATIVE ABILITY AT ANY TIME.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'VE NEVER SEEN SUCH MANIPULATION. HERE AT LEAST I'M ASKING IT BEING KEPT WITHIN THE ESTABLISHMENT WHICH IS THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY. THE MANIPULATION HAS BEEN TO EVERY OTHER ESTABLISHMENT EXCEPT THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY SO IF YOU WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE MANIPULATION OF FUNDS JUST TAKE A LOOK AT THIS ESTABLISHMENT AND WATCH IT GO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR IN THIS ITEM?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, THE NEXT ITEM IS YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION - \$1.00.

MR. TANNER: OH GEE, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A LONG DISCUSSION ON THAT. I THINK WE SHOULD BREAK FOR COFFEE NOW MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COMMITTEE AGREE TO RECESS FOR A SHORT RECESS?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, WE WILL JUST CALL FOR A SMALL RECESS THEN - VERY SHORT THOUGH.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I NOW CALL THE HOUSE BACK TO ORDER AND WE ARE DEALING WITH 1133 WITH ITEM 1801, OPERATING SUBSIDY, \$1.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD LIKE A COMPLETE EXPLANATION OF THE \$1.00 ITEM.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS PARTICULAR APPROPRIATION RELATES TO THE HOUSING UNITS THAT WERE BUILT IN 1972, 71-72 IN DAWSON CITY, IN MAYO AND WATSON LAKE. AT THAT TIME THE AGREEMENT SIGNED WITH C.M.H.C. WAS UNDER SECTION 40. THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS & CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING ASKED US AT THAT TIME IF WE WOULD CONVERT IT TO SECTION 43 SO THAT ALL COMMUNITIES WOULD HAVE RENTAL PURCHASE HOUSING UNDER SECTION 43. SINCE PUTTING THESE ESTIMATES TOGETHER, WE HAVE BEEN INFORMED BY C.M.H.C. THAT THEY HAVE NOW OPENED UP SECTION 40 AND THEY ARE NOW DOING THINGS UNDER SECTION 40 THAT THEY PREVIOUSLY WEREN'T DOING. I AM NOT ENTIRELY SURE THAT WE WOULD WANT TO EXERCISE THIS OPTION. I HAVE PEOPLE WORKING ON IT RIGHT NOW. WE MAY NOT WANT TO EXERCISE THE OPTION OF CONVERTING TO SECTION 43. WE MAY WANT TO CONTINUE UNDER SECTION 40 UNDER SOME OF THEIR LIEU INTERPRETATIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: FROM WHERE WOULD YOU APPROPRIATE THE MONEY?

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE DOLLARS ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE IN THE ESTIMATES. IN OUR LAST YEAR'S ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING CORPORATION, WE APPROPRIATED \$196,000.00 FOR AN OPERATING SUBSIDY. WE HAVE DISCOVERED IN THIS PROGRAMME THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO NEED THAT MUCH MONEY IN THIS CURRENT FISCAL YEAR, PRIMARILY DUE TO THE DELAY IN GETTING HOUSING GOING AND IN THE VERY LOW CONSTRUCTION THAT WE HAD THIS CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH OF IT HAVE WE ACTUALLY USED IN THIS CURRENT FISCAL YEAR?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE BEST OF RECOLLECTION, THE EXPENDITURES TO DATE UNDER THIS PROGRAMME ARE NIL. THE ONLY EXPENDITURES THAT WE DO ANTICIPATE RELATE TO THE INTEREST ON THE DEBENTURES AND THE TAXES, THE TAX BILLS, WHEN THEY ARE PRESENTED. THEY WILL BE PAID BEFORE MARCH 1ST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF THE EXPENDITURES ARE NIL, THEN WHY ARE YOU NOT ADDING OTHER APPROPRIATION ITEMS DEDUCTING FROM THE OPERATING SUBSIDY THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT YOU WILL NOT BE USING IN THIS YEAR TO FOLLOW THAT SAME LINE OF THINKING



IN THE OTHER VOTES THAT WE DEALT WITH?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THESE VOTES, WE HAVE NOT SHOWN ALL OF THE REDUCTIONS THAT WE ANTICIPATE. WE HAVE ONLY SHOWN THOSE ITEMS THAT WE KNOW WE HAVE MONEY THAT WE NEED FOR SOME OTHER PURPOSE. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU WILL FIND THAT THE REDUCTIONS THAT WE ARE SHOWING OFFSET ADDITIONAL DOLLARS THAT WE WERE REQUESTING IN SOME OTHER ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN YOU SAY ADDITIONAL DOLLAR MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS NOT ADDITIONAL DOLLARS IN ACTUAL CASH. BUT AS YOU HAVE SAID BEFORE, IT IS AN APPROPRIATION REDUCTION OR INCREASE OF AN APPROPRIATION. IS THAT CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF THAT IS CORRECT, THEN WHY ARE YOU NOT FOLLOWING THE SAME PROCEDURE IN THIS PARTICULAR ITEM? WHY ARE WE NOT DEPARTING FROM WHAT YOU HAVE ALREADY DONE ON PREVIOUS VOTES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I HAVE INDICATED, ALL WE DID IN PREVIOUS VOTES WAS WHERE WE NEEDED ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION, WE FOUND THE OFFSETS. WE DO NOT NEED AN ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION IN THIS AREA SO WE ARE NOT SHOWING THE LAPSING BALANCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE LAPSING BALANCE AT THE END OF THE YEAR? WOULD IT BE INCLUDED IN THE FOLLOWING YEAR'S BUDGET?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. IT WOULD JUST LAPSE AND DISAPPEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE YOU SAYING THEN, THAT THE HOUSING CORPORATION WILL BE LOSING THE USE OF THAT \$196,000.00 COMPLETELY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HOUSING CORPORATION WILL LOSE THE USE OF ANY MONIES THAT LAPSE IN THIS CURRENT FISCAL YEAR BECAUSE THEY DON'T NEED THEM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MANY HOUSES COULD HAVE BEEN BUILT FOR \$196,000.00?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE. THIS IS NOT CAPITAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH, I BEG YOUR PARDON. THAT'S RIGHT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS A SUBJECT FOR THE TAXES AND UTILITIES COSTS OF THE OPERATING OF THESE HOUSES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WOULD WE BE ABLE TO GET THIS BACK AGAIN FROM THE FOLLOWING YEAR IF IT LAPSED? IF IT IS UNSPENT MONEY?

MR. MILLER: IF IT WAS NEEDED, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR THIS PARTICULAR PROGRAMME AND I AM NOT ENTIRELY SURE THAT WE HAVE THE FULL \$196,000.00 FUNDING IN TERMS OF CASH AT THE MOMENT. I BELIEVE WE HAVE. BUT IF THERE IS ANY CASH LAPSES AT THE END OF THE YEAR, THEY GO INTO THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS ITEM, \$1.00? CLEAR? NEXT ITEM IS UNDER PROJECT CAPITAL AND IS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$333,103.67. THE BREAKDOWN IS FOUND ON PAGE 38.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HAVE WE PASSED 34? YOU'RE NOT FOLLOWING THIS THEN?

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, THIS SAYS PAGE 34 FOR \$130,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YOU'RE CORRECT. I WAS FOLLOWING THE BILL. I AM SORRY. THE NEXT ITEM IS FOUND ON PAGE 35. IT IS AN OPERATING RECOVERY UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,000.00. SPEAKING OF THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE, IS THIS OUR SHARE NOTWITHSTANDING THAT IS RECOVERABLE, IS THIS OUR SHARE OR IS IT THE TOTAL COST OF THE SECRETARIAT?

MR. MILLER: THIS IS THE TOTAL COST FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF COUNCILLOR STUTTER WOULD TAKE THE CHAIR, PLEASE?

MR. STUTTER TAKES THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR?

MR. TAYLOR: I WOULD LIKE TO HARKEN BACK NOW THAT WE ARE NOW BACK TO THE QUESTION OF THE RECOVERY. THIS AMOUNTS TO THE RECOVERY, THE 100% RECOVERY OF THE COST OF ESTABLISHING A SECRETARIAT FOR YUKON PARTICIPATION IN THE



INDIAN LAND CLAIMS NEGOTIATIONS. WHEN LAST WE DISCUSSED THIS ESTABLISHMENT, I BROUGHT CONCURRENCE, I THINK FROM MR. COMMISSIONER, IF I AM NOT MISTAKEN. IF I HAVEN'T, I WOULD LIKE CONCURRENCE OR AT LEAST I DID FROM SOMEONE IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT THE INFORMATION BY THE SECRETARIAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO MR. SHAW WHO IS ALSO A YUKON REPRESENTATIVE AND HE WOULD HAVE BENEFIT OF ALL THE SERVICES. I BELIEVE I HAVE THAT. MY QUESTION IS, WHO COMPOSES THIS SECRETARIAT. IN PARTICULAR WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE AND JUST WHAT IS THEIR FUNCTION? I WONDER IS I COULD HAVE THAT CLARIFIED?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST HAD BASICALLY A SIMILAR QUESTION AND A PAPER IS BEING PREPARED AT THIS TIME WHICH GOES INTO DETAIL AS TO PRECISELY WHAT THE SECRETARIAT'S FUNCTIONS ARE AND WHAT ARE THEY COMPOSED OF. PLUS DETAILS OF THE PARTICULAR MONEY AND THE THINGS THAT THEY ARE PRESENTLY DOING IN THE WAY OF RESEARCH. THOSE THINGS WHICH I THINK SOME OF IT WILL, SOME OF IT I BELIEVE IS RIGHT NOW, FALLING INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN AND THOSE THINGS WHICH WILL BE RETAINED AS INTERNAL INFORMATION OF THE GOVERNMENT. THIS IS BEING PUT TOGETHER AS A CONSEQUENCE OF A QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST HERE IN THE HOUSE.

MR. TAYLOR: THEN I ASSUME, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WHENEVER WE GET AROUND TO THE MAIN ESTIMATES THAT THIS ITEM WILL REOCCUR AND WILL GIVE US AN OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE THE QUESTION. THANK YOU.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD MR. MILLER INDICATE WHETHER THESE TWO ITEMS ARE OUTSIDE THE NORMAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENT SO THAT THEY ARE OVER AND ABOVE THE FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR NEXT YEAR?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE PARTICULAR ITEMS ARE OUTSIDE OF OUR CURRENT FINANCIAL AGREEMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DIDN'T ASK THAT BECAUSE THERE IS GOING TO BE ANOTHER FINANCIAL AGREEMENT THAT IS GOING TO BE SIGNED FOR 74-75. WHAT I WANT TO KNOW IS WHETHER IT IS OUTSIDE THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENT FOR THE 74-75?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE IS WITHIN AND ONE IS WITHOUT, OUTSIDE THE AGREEMENT. THIS WAS DUE TO AN OVERSIGHT AND THE INDIAN LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT INADVERTENTLY GOT INSIDE THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT OR WITHIN THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT. THE F.I.C.C. IS STILL OUTSIDE THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT. WE INTEND TO TAKE THIS UP WITH OTTAWA FOR SUBSE-

QUENT YEARS AND HAVE IT DELETED AND HANDLED OUTSIDE THE AGREEMENT.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE, IS THIS A BIG COMMITTEE? IS THIS A COMMITTEE BETWEEN ALL THE DEPARTMENT HEADS? IS THAT WHAT IT IS? AND ITS PRIME FUNCTIONS ARE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE IS SET UP SUBJECT TO AN INSTRUCTION FROM MY MINISTER IN WHICH HE IS CHARGED UNDER THE GOVERNMENT RE-ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1966, OF CO-ORDINATING THE FUNCTIONS OF ALL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS NORTH OF THE 60 PARALLEL. THIS IS DONE THROUGH THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IN OTTAWA WHICH IS MADE UP, I BELIEVE, OF ALL THE DEPUTY MINISTERS OF THE DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE REPRESENTED NORTH OF 60. I AM THE CHAIRMAN HERE UNDER THE MINISTER'S INSTRUCTIONS OF A LOCAL COMMITTEE OF THAT SAME MAKE-UP. IN OTHER WORDS, EACH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT REPRESENTED HERE IN THE YUKON, HAS AN OFFICIALLY ASSIGNED REPRESENTATIVE AND I THINK, ALTERNATES TO THIS COMMITTEE. THIS IS TO CARRY OUT THE MINISTER'S FUNCTIONS UNDER THE GOVERNMENT RE-ORGANIZATION ACT AS MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, HE IS CHARGED WITH THAT CO-ORDINATING RESPONSIBILITY. AND THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT THIS COMMITTEE'S FUNCTIONS ARE.

MR. TAYLOR: I WAS ABOUT TO RISE TO ASK MR. CHAIRMAN WHY THESE FUNDS WOULD COME THROUGH OUR BUDGET AT ALL? WHY THEY JUST WOULDN'T BE EXPENDED AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL THROUGH NORTHERN AFFAIRS ESTIMATE? HOWEVER, THEN I GATHER THAT THIS IS OUR SHARE INASMUCH AS THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IS, IN FACT, A DEPARTMENT, A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT. WOULD THIS JUST REPRESENT THE SHARE OF MR. COMMISSIONER'S COMMITTEE, MR. CHAIRMAN. IS THIS THE WAY IT WORKS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, THIS REPRESENTS THE TOTAL COSTS OF THE SECRETARIAT SERVICES THAT WE PROVIDE FOR THIS COMMITTEE. I AM SORRY I DON'T KNOW HOW THEY ARE DELINEATED IN THE ESTIMATES, MR. MILLER MAY HAVE SOME FURTHER COMMENT ON THIS. BUT THIS SHOULD REPRESENT NOT A SHARE, MR. CHAIRMAN, BUT THE ACTUAL RECOVERABLE COSTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THIS PARTICULAR SERVICE. DID MR. MILLER NOT VERIFY THAT?



Mr. MILLER: Yes, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS THE TOTAL COST OF THE SECRETARIAT. THE SECRETARIAT IS MADE UP OF ONE PERSON AND SUPPORT STAFF OF A CLERK-TYPIST PLUS CERTAIN TRAVELLING EXPENSES THAT THAT PERSON INCURRS IN DOING THIS FUNCTION. THIS IS THE TOTAL COST PAID FOR OUTSIDE OF OUR FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS BY I.A.N.D.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THEN DOES THAT FOLLOW THAT CERTAINLY IF THESE FUNDS ARE BEING EXPENDED AND RECOVERED THROUGH OUR BUDGET THAT WE ARE ENTITLED TO THE ACTIVITIES OF THIS PARTICULAR COMMITTEE. WHEN MAY WE REALLY EXPECT REPORT FROM THIS COMMITTEE AND KNOW OF THEIR ACTIVITIES?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ARE REPORTED TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IN OTTAWA AND THE BOOK THAT YOU HAVE THERE IN FRONT OF YOU IS THE TOTAL PACKAGE. THAT IS THE TOTAL ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE ACTIVE IN CANADA. IT IS THIS BLUE BOOK THAT IS ON COUNCILLOR McKINNON'S DESK AT THE MOMENT. I THINK ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HAVE BEEN DISTRIBUTED ONE.

Mr. TAYLOR: I WILL RESUME THE CHAIR AT THIS TIME.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,000.00? THE NEXT IS EDUCATION, RECOVERY FROM MANPOWER, \$130,000.00, GIVING US A TOTAL OF \$180,000.00 IN RECOVERIES. CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS \$333,103.67 UNDER PROJECT CAPITAL ON PAGE 38. THE FIRST IS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANT, \$22,103.67.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS AVAILABLE TO COUNCILLORS THAT WERE UNEXPENDED AT THE CLOSE OF THE PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR AND WE MAKE THEM AVAILABLE ON AN ON-GOING BASIS TO COUNCILLORS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? NEXT IS FURNITURE AND OFFICE EQUIPMENT, \$28,000.00.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IF I RECALL, WE HAD ALREADY VOTES FOR FURNITURE AND OFFICE SUPPLIES, \$75,000. I BEG YOUR PARDON, \$30,000.00 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF WAREHOUSE EQUIPMENT FOR THE LIQUOR CONTROL OPERATION UNDER THAT VOTE. WHAT IS THIS \$28,000.00 FOR?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE THIS IS 2101 THAT WE ARE ON.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THE POINT I AM MAKING IN LAST YEAR'S ESTIMATES, WHICH I HAVE IN FRONT OF ME, ESTABLISHMENT 2102.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WE ARE AT 2101.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL ON THIS PAGE HERE YOU HAVE 2102. THAT'S WHERE I WAS LOOKING.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS AN ERROR. IT SHOULD BE 2101.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU. 2101, ALL RIGHT. THAT IS WHAT I WAS REFERRING TO. COULD WE HAVE ANY INDICATION OF WHERE THIS MONEY WAS USED AND INCIDENTLY, I WONDER IF, Mr. CHAIRMAN, Mr. MILLER COULD UNDERTAKE TO SAY WHAT FURNITURE WAS STILL AVAILABLE IN GOVERNMENT STORES THAT WAS NOT SUPPLIED, AND YET WE BOUGHT NEW FURNITURE? BECAUSE WE HAVE AN INVENTORY OF NEW FURNITURE, AS I UNDERSTAND IT.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, FURNITURE AND OFFICE EQUIPMENT, THE FUNDS OF \$30,000.00 AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR WERE NOT FOUND ADEQUATE TO PROVIDE FURNITURE FOR NEW STAFF ADDITIONS AND TO CONTINUE OUR PROGRAMME OF GRADUAL REPLACEMENT OF FURNITURE AND OFFICE EQUIPMENT THROUGHOUT THE GOVERNMENT. DURING THE COURSE OF THE YEAR, WE UNDERTOOK TO EQUIP THE TOURISM AND INFORMATION BRANCH. I AM NOT SURE WHETHER WE DID ANY OTHERS OR NOT, Mr. CHAIRMAN, BUT WHAT WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO DO WITH FURNITURE AND OFFICE EQUIPMENT IS THAT WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO ARRIVE AT STANDARDS. AND WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO HAVE THE FULL COMPLEMENT OF OLD FURNITURE REPLACED THE DAY WHEN WE MOVE INTO OUR NEW ADMINISTRATIONS BUILDING. I DON'T HAVE THE SPECIFIC DETAILS IN FRONT OF ME OF JUST WHAT WAS SPENT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT I AM HAVING DIFFICULTY IN UNDERSTANDING IN THIS PARTICULAR ITEM, THE MAIN ESTIMATES FOR LAST YEAR, THE SUM OF \$30,000.00 WAS ASKED FOR. WHAT IS WRONG WITH THOSE THAT ARE ASSESSING THE NEEDS WHEN THEY COME BACK AGAIN WITH ANOTHER 100% OF THE SAME AMOUNT? NOW, SURELY, THERE MUST HAVE BEEN SOME CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO THE AMOUNT. I COULD SEE IF THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE OF \$5,000.00 OR \$6,000.00 PEOPLE CAN MAKE A MISTAKE. BUT WHEN YOU SEE A DIFFERENCE OF ALMOST THE IDENTICAL AMOUNT AGAIN, IT SEEMS THERE WAS SOME BAD MANAGEMENT SOMEWHERE ALONG THE LINE. I WONDER IF THERE IS ANY REASON THAT CAN BE GIVEN WHY IT IS JUST ALMOST THE SAME



AMOUNT?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, ADMITTEDLY OUR ESTIMATE LAST YEAR WAS UNDERESTIMATED AND WHAT WE HAD FORGOTTEN TO PROVIDE FOR WAS THE NEW STAFF ADDITIONS THAT WE INCURRED DURING THE YEAR.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS MUSEUM CONSTRUCTION GRANTS, \$15,000.00. DOES THIS MEAN WE HAVE HAD PEOPLE MATCH GRANTS IN EXCESS OF \$25,000.00?

Mr. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT, Mr. CHAIRMAN. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$40,000.00.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: DID THIS ALL GO TO THE SAME MUSEUM?

Mr. MILLER: NO, Mr. CHAIRMAN, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE THERE WAS TWO MUSEUMS INVOLVED IN THIS: THE MCBRIDE MUSEUM IN WHITEHORSE AND THE BURWASH MUSEUM.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THE MCBRIDE MUSEUM, DID THEY GET \$25,000.00 LAST TIME? HOW MUCH OF THIS \$25,000.00 WAS ORIGINALLY VOTED TO THE MCBRIDE MUSEUM?

Mr. MILLER: I'M SORRY, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT FIGURES WITH ME.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: I THINK WE SHOULD KNOW WHO IS GETTING THIS MONEY BECAUSE IT'S TWENTY-FIVE, PLUS ANOTHER FIFTEEN.

Mr. MILLER: I'LL BRING THAT ANSWER FORWARD, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THIS MONEY HAS ALREADY BEEN EXPENDED IN ANY EVENT.

Mr. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: RIGHT. THE NEXT ITEM IS ROAD EQUIPMENT - \$9,465.00.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, I WOULD LIKE TO GO BACK ON THIS MUSEUM GRANT SITUATION. AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE POLICY OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL TO HAVE TO SPECIFICALLY PASS A GRANT FOR A PARTICULAR MUSEUM. NOW, IF THE MONEY HAS ALREADY BEEN EXPENDED, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHO GAVE THE AUTHORITY, IF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL DIDN'T, TO PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL GRANT, AND THEN COME ALONG TO TERRITORIAL COUNCIL AND SAY, "WE

WANT YOU TO VALIDATE IT". WHERE DOES THE AUTHORITY COME FOR THAT GRANT?

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, WITH RESPECT, IS INCORRECT. I THINK THERE IS A FORMULA FOR COST-SHARING TO A MAXIMUM OF \$25,000.00, BUT THE GRANTS DID NOT HAVE TO COME BACK HERE TO THE COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. WE VOTED \$25,000.00 TO BE USED FOR ASSISTANCE FOR MUSEUM CONSTRUCTION, AND ON THE BASIS OF THE COST-SHARING FORMULA, THE FUNDS WERE THEN APPROPRIATED TO THESE VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS FOR MUSEUMS IN THE TERRITORY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS QUITE TRUE, Mr. CHAIRMAN, UP TO \$25,000.00. WHAT I AM SAYING NOW IS, WHERE DID THE AUTHORITY COME TO PAY OUT ANY OTHER GRANTS PRIOR TO ASKING TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WHETHER THEY APPROVE OF IT. THIS IS THE PAYMENT OUT OF GRANTS. THE WORD "GRANT" ITSELF IS SOMETHING THAT SPEAKS. I WONDER, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHETHER Mr. MILLER COULD INDICATE WHERE THE AUTHORITY CAME FROM? PERHAPS HE'S LOOKING FOR IT NOW.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THESE FUNDS WERE PAID IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY THAT WAS APPROVED BY THIS COUNCIL A YEAR AGO, AND THE POLICY READS: "FUNDS MAY BE GRANTED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW MUSEUMS BUT NOT FOR RENOVATIONS OF OLD BUILDINGS. CONTRIBUTIONS ARE MADE ON A TWO FOR ONE BASIS IF THE MUSEUM IS LOCATED OUTSIDE OF A MUNICIPALITY AND A ONE FOR TWO IF LOCATED WITHIN A MUNICIPALITY."

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S RIGHT, ON THE BASIS OF THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WAS VOTED, AND THAT WAS \$25,000.00, AND THAT WAS QUITE RIGHT. WHAT I'M SAYING IS, IF THE MONEY WAS PAID OUT, IT WAS PAID OUT FOR AN AMOUNT OVER AND ABOVE WHAT THE COUNCIL VOTED ON. ONCE AGAIN, WHAT IS BEING SAID IS THAT WE FOLLOWED THE SAME PROCEDURE OF PAYOUT BUT WE DIDN'T COME TO THE COUNCIL TO ASK PERMISSION TO DO IT. THAT'S WHAT IS BEING SAID. AS I SAY, YOU KNOW, WHAT'S THE USE? I'M NOT OBJECTING AT ALL. I THINK THE MUSEUMS HAVEN'T PROPERLY BEEN LOOKED AFTER FOR YEARS AND THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN EVERY ASSISTANCE POSSIBLE, BUT I'M SAYING THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS GOT NO RIGHT WHATSOEVER TO ATTEMPT TO BY-PASS THIS COUNCIL IN THE MANNER THAT IT IS CONTINUING TO DO.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING ON ROAD EQUIPMENT? THE NEXT IS FREE ENGINEERING - TERRITORIAL PROJECTS - \$113,000.00.

Mr. MCKINNON: WHERE?



Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE HAVE FOUND OURSELVES WITHIN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR IS A VERY SERIOUS LACK OF LONG-TERM PLANNING, AND IN ATTEMPTS TO GET THAT LONG-TERM PLANNING BROUGHT UP TO A REASONABLE STANDARD WE FOUND THAT WE HAD TO EXTEND THESE FUNDS IN ORDER TO GET CONTRACTS READY FOR LETTING WITHIN THE NEXT TWO TO THREE WEEKS OR WITHIN THE NEXT MONTH. OTHERWISE, WE WOULD BE CONSTANTLY BEHIND THE EIGHT BALL IN NOT GETTING OUR PLANNING UP TO DATE, IN GETTING THE LAND, THE WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS INSTALLED WHEN THE PEOPLE WANT THEM.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NOW, HERE AGAIN WE HAVE ANOTHER EXPENDITURE ON PLANNING WITHOUT SEEKING PREVIOUS AUTHORITIES. CONSEQUENTLY, WITH THE PLANNING STUDIES FOR THE COMMUNITY, WHERE THEY HAD THE AUTHORITY TO HAVE THE STUDIES BUT WITHOUT THE AUTHORITY TO PAY, PLUS ANOTHER \$113,000.00 -- THAT'S \$350,000.00 THAT HAS BEEN SET FOR PLANNING. I NOTICE THE NEXT ITEM, MAPPING INDIAN COMMUNITIES, MORE PLANNING, ANOTHER \$25,000.00. IT LOOKS LIKE IT'S COSTING US A HALF MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR FOR PLANNING.

Mr. MCKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, MY QUESTION OF THE TREASURER WAS, WHAT COMMUNITIES AND WHERE ARE THE COMMUNITIES LOCATED THAT WILL BE TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THESE PRE-ENGINEERING TERRITORIAL PROJECTS?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE PRIMARY ONES ARE WATSON LAKE, HAINES JUNCTION, RIVERDALE SUBDIVISION, HILLCREST SUBDIVISION, AND PORTER CREEK. IN ADDITION, WE HAVE DONE SOME WORK TO MY KNOWLEDGE AT CARMACKS, ROSS RIVER, BEAVER CREEK, MAYO, TESLIN -- I THINK THAT'S ABOUT THE FULL EXTENT OF THE LIST.

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, SOME OF THESE MONIES WILL BECOME PART OF THE TOTAL PROJECT COST.

Mr. MILLER: NO, MOST OF THESE FUNDS, Mr. COMMISSIONER, WILL REMAIN WHERE THEY ARE BECAUSE THEY ARE PRE-ENGINEERING. IT IS THE FEASIBILITY STAGE RATHER THAN THE PHYSICAL PLANNING SIDE OF IT.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THEY ARE A PART OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, ARE THEY NOT? DON'T THEY TIE DIRECTLY INTO THAT?

Mr. MILLER: THERE WAS A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF WORK DONE IN CONNECTION WITH THAT PROGRAM.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS ITEM? THE NEXT IS MAPPING INDIAN COMMUNITIES - \$20,000.00. CLEAR? THE NEXT IS RECREATIONAL ROADS, BOAT LAUNCHING RAMPS AND AIRSTRIPS - \$120,000.00.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS SOMETHING. HERE WE HAVE TWO ITEMS FOR THE SAME. WE HAVE ALREADY APPROVED OF 903 - TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE INCREASED COST OF MAINTAINING RECREATIONAL ROADS AND LAUNCHING RAMPS THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY, AND WE HAVE APPROVED \$50,000.00 ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THAT WAS OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S RIGHT. THIS IS WHAT I AM TALKING ABOUT. BOAT RAMPS ARE USUALLY PUT IN AS A MAINTENANCE ITEM BECAUSE WHAT HAS BEEN RECENTLY IS THAT THEY HAVE BEEN PUT IN WITH CONCRETE SLABS THEY HAVE PICKED UP FROM ELSEWHERE AND USED IT AS A MAINTENANCE ITEM. THIS IS WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST. THEY HAVE TAKEN THE OLD CONCRETE PADS FROM THE OLD NISUTLIN BRIDGE AT TESLIN AND USED THEM AS BOAT RAMPS. NOW, IS THERE ANY INTERWOVEN MATTER IN THESE TWO?

Mr. MILLER: NO, Mr. CHAIRMAN, CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BOAT RAMP COMES UNDER ESTABLISHMENT 2921, AND MAINTENANCE OF AN EXISTING BOAT RAMP COMES UNDER THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ITEM 903.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: BUT THERE'S NO, EXCEPT FOR A FEW, THERE'S NO MAINTENANCE TO DO ON THE BOAT LAUNCHING RAMPS SO WE'VE REALLY PASSED THE \$50,000.00 IN A HURRY, UNLESS IT WERE BROKEN DOWN FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF RECREATIONAL ROADS.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THIS HAPPENS TO BE AN ESTABLISHMENT TITLE; RECREATIONAL ROADS, BOAT LAUNCHING RAMPS AND AIRSTRIPS. THERE ARE NO FUNDS -- WELL, IN THE CAPITAL ITEM, IT'S FOR THE FARO AIRSTRIP, RECONSTRUCTION OF THE BEAVER CREEK AIRSTRIP, AND TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE REROUTE OF THE TAKHINI HOT SPRINGS ROAD FROM PRIVATE PROPERTY.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS THE DAWSON AIRPORT BUILDING - \$25,000.00. CLEAR? NEXT IS THE SKAGWAY ROAD ENGINEERING - \$60,000.00.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: HAVE WE GOT A START-UP DATE ON THAT YET?



MR. MILLER: A START-UP DATE ON THE SKAGWAY ROAD? THE CONTRACTOR IS ON THE SITE AND IS WORKING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? CAMPBELL HIGHWAY RECONSTRUCTION - REDUCTION OF \$230,465.00.

MR. MILLER: THESE ARE FUNDS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WON'T BE SPENT IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR AND WE'RE JUST OFFSETTING, IF YOU LIKE, OUR PREVIOUS OFFSETS AGAINST THOSE ITEMS WHERE WE NEED ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IN OTHER WORDS, YOU'VE SHUT DOWN PROJECTS LIKE BRIDGES, AND THIS TYPE OF THING?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS WAS WORK THAT JUST WASN'T COMPLETED WITHIN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE CAMPBELL HIGHWAY THERE WERE A NUMBER OF ITEMS WE JUST COULD NOT GET DONE BECAUSE OF WEATHER, ETC. THAT IS NOT SLOWING DOWN THE CAMPBELL HIGHWAY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT IS THE MAYO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE - \$9,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE HAVE AN EXPLANATION OF WHAT THESE MANAGEMENT HOUSES ARE AND THEN WHAT WE DO WITH ONE, WE DO WITH THE LOT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE HOUSES THAT WE BUILD UNDER THE ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR YUKON FOREST SERVICE. THEY ARE 100 PERCENT RECOVERABLE FROM I.A.N.D. OUTSIDE THE AGREEMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT IS CARMACKS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE - \$10,000.00.

MRS. WATSON: THAT'S THE SAME, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ONE IS \$9,000.00 AND THE OTHER IS \$10,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE SAME REASON, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES. NEXT IS ROSS RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE - \$12,000.00. NEXT IS THE ROSS RIVER AIRSTRIP - \$120,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS THE EXPANSION OF THE EXISTING STRIP?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THE STRIP WAS EXPANDED, IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECT, 7,000 FEET.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS GIVES US A TOTAL OF \$333,103.67. THE NEXT ITEM IS LOAN AMORTIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$458,600.00. THAT IS FOUND ON PAGE 42. CLEAR?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT ARE THESE SELF-AMORTIZED LOANS? WOULD YOU JUST LIST THEM?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS \$458,600.00 IS COMPRISED OF THE REPAYMENT OF LOANS UNDER THE LOW COST HOUSING PROGRAM AND REPAYMENT OF LOANS UNDER THE RIVERDALE SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS THE ORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OR A RECENT ONE?

MR. MILLER: THIS IS PART OF THE FULL DEVELOPMENT TO DATE. THESE ARE FUNDS THAT WE'VE RECEIVED FROM THE SALE OF LOTS IN EXCESS OF OUR NEED TO PAY BACK THE AMORTIZATION TO DATE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? THE NEXT ITEM IS DUST CONTROL PALLIATIVES REVOLVING FUND - \$1,200,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF WE COULD HAVE AN EXPLANATION OF THIS WHOLE DUSTY ITEM?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD THINK THAT WE REQUIRE IT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE'RE ASKING FOR HERE IS THE AUTHORITY TO CREATE A REVOLVING FUND OR AN INVENTORY TO HANDLE DUST CONTROL PALLIATIVES, PRIMARILY, CALCIUM CHLORIDE. OUR CALCIUM CHLORIDE PROGRAM FOR THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR, A TOTAL SUM OF 8,000 TONS OF CALCIUM CHLORIDE, WHICH WE HAVE TO START ORDERING AND HAVE SHIPPED IN, SOME OF IT PRIOR TO MARCH 31ST OF THE FISCAL YEAR IF WE ARE GOING TO GET THE DUST CONTROL PROGRAM UNDERWAY DURING THE COURSE OF THE SUMMER. WHAT WE ARE HOPING TO DO WITH THIS IS TO RUN A COMPLETELY SEPARATE REVOLVING FUND JUST FOR DUST CONTROL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS THE STOCK OF THE CALCIUM CHLORIDE?

MR. MILLER: THIS IS THE ACTUAL INVENTORY OF IT, YES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW, WHAT OTHER MONIES BESIDES ARE GOING TO BE REQUIRED FOR THE BUILDING TO HOUSE THE GOODS ITSELF, THE CALCIUM CHLORIDE; WHAT EQUIPMENT IS GOING TO BE NEEDED; HOW MANY OTHER ASSOCIATED AMOUNTS OF MONEY ARE GOING TO BE REQUIRED FOR THIS DUST CONTROL OVER AND ABOVE THAT \$1,200,000.00?



Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE BUILDING WE ARE CURRENTLY USING IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA IS SITUATED IN THE D.P.W. COMPOUND HERE, THE OLD D.P.W. COMPOUND. IT IS AN OLD WOOD-FRAME BUILDING THAT HAS NO OTHER USE. IT WAS AN OLD GARAGE, AND WE HAVE SPENT LITERALLY NOTHING ON IT TO MAKE IT INTO A STORAGE SHED. WE PROVIDE NO OTHER EQUIPMENT. THE CONTRACTOR PROVIDES THE EQUIPMENT FOR APPLYING THE MATERIAL. WE DO IT ALL BY CONTRACT. WHITE PASS PROVIDES THE EQUIPMENT FOR UNLOADING AND THE CONTRACTOR PROVIDES THE EQUIPMENT FOR LOADING THE CALCIUM CHLORIDE, SO WE DON'T ANTICIPATE ANY OTHER EXPENDITURES IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA. WE ARE INTENDING THIS YEAR TO HAVE A STOCK OF CALCIUM CHLORIDE AT CARMACKS AND, IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECTLY, WATSON LAKE, AND AT BOTH LOCATIONS WE HAVE PUT UP A SIMPLE WOOD BARRIER THAT WE ARE COVERING WITH A SPECIAL TARP TO KEEP THE WEATHER OUT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THE BUILDING THAT IS BEING USED IN THE OLD D.P.W. COMPOUND, IF I RECALL IT, IS OPEN TO THE WEATHER. HOW MUCH DAMAGE HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST TO SOME OF THIS CALCIUM CHLORIDE AND HOW MUCH DAMAGE, Mr. CHAIRMAN, DOES ONE VISUALIZE IS GOING TO TAKE PLACE UNLESS THIS BUILDING IS PROPERLY PROTECTED FROM THE WEATHER?

Mr. MILLER: THIS BUILDING, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, IS NOT OPEN TO THE WEATHER ANY LONGER. IT MAY HAVE BEEN AT ONE TIME BUT THEY HAVE BOTH ENDS CLOSED OFF NOW. I DON'T KNOW HOW GOOD THE ROOF IS BUT OUT OF 8,000 TONS THAT WERE DELIVERED LAST YEAR, OUR TOTAL LOSS WAS SOMETHING IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF 60 TONS. NOW, THAT RELATES TO A LOT OF ITEMS: 1. THE CRUSTING, 2. THE ODD LOAD THAT DIDN'T GET ACROSS THE SCALES FOR SOME PARTICULAR REASON. BUT, OUT OF 8,000 TONS LAST YEAR THERE WAS A SHORTAGE OF 60 TONS IN THE TOTAL PROGRAM.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT AMOUNT OF PALLIATIVES HAVE WE KEPT IN THE PAST HERE?

Mr. MILLER: AS INDICATED, I THINK THAT LAST YEAR WE WENT THROUGH 8,000 TONS OF IT THROUGH THE COURSE OF THE SUMMER. PRIOR TO THAT, OUR PROGRAM WASN'T NEARLY AS EXTENSIVE AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE WERE DOWN BELOW 5,000 TONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MANY TONS DOES THIS AMOUNT OF \$1,200,000.00 REPRESENT.

Mr. MILLER: AT THE CURRENT COST, THIS WOULD REPRESENT SOMETHING A LITTLE OVER 11,000 TONS. OUR CURRENT PROGRAM FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR IS 8,000 TONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE AMOUNT OF PALLIATIVES WE ARE USING, IS IT REDUCED EACH YEAR BY THE ADDITION OF PAVING ON SOME OF OUR HIGHWAYS?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, BUT, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR, AT THE MOMENT WE ARE NOT INTENDING TO DO ANY PAVING SO IT'S A VERY SMALL AMOUNT. YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT TEN MILES OF PAVING AND THE AVERAGE ...

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WE'RE NOT DOING ANY PAVING THIS YEAR?

Mr. MILLER: THERE WILL BE NO PAVING DONE THIS YEAR -- AT THE MOMENT. WE'RE STILL TRYING TO FIND FUNDS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THERE AGAIN, I TAKE IT THAT THIS AMOUNT IS BEING FOUND IN THE EXISTING PROJECT CAPITAL?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS NOT REALLY MONEY THAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR. WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE IS TYING UP AN INVENTORY FOR A PERIOD OF A YEAR. SO, IT'S REALLY USING WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS ON A REVOLVING BASIS. WE WILL HAVE PAID FOR SOME BY MARCH BUT WILL START TO CHARGE IT OUT IN MAY AND BY THE END OF SEPTEMBER, IT WILL BE ALL CHARGED OUT OF THE REVOLVING FUND; THERE'LL BE NOTHING THERE. IT'S PURELY AUTHORITY TO ALLOW US TO USE PUBLIC FUNDS TO CREATE AN INVENTORY FOR A PERIOD OF A YEAR.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WE'VE NEVER EXPERIMENTED WITH THIS THIS WAY BEFORE SO I TAKE IT THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE THE FIRST TIME FOR DOING IT IN THIS MANNER.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IN THE PAST WE HAVE KEPT DUST CONTROL PALLIATIVES IN OUR CENTRAL PURCHASING REVOLVING FUND. THE PROBLEM THAT WE'RE RUNNING INTO IS THE LARGE QUANTITY AND THE NEED TO HAVE SOME OF THIS MATERIAL IN WHITEHORSE OR IN THE YUKON PRIOR TO MARCH 31ST, PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF SHIPPING PROBLEMS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: HAS THIS REVOLVING FUND IN FACT BEEN ESTABLISHED? IS IT IN OPERATION?

Mr. MILLER: NO, Mr. CHAIRMAN, AS I INDICATED, WE HAVE A CENTRAL PURCHASING REVOLVING FUND OF \$500,000.00 BUT WE'RE FINDING THAT IT IS NOT SUFFICIENTLY LARGE ENOUGH TO CARRY THIS TYPE OF MATERIAL SO WE'RE PROPOSING TO EXCLUDE EVERYTHING RESPECTING DUST CONTROL AND DEAL WITH IT AS A SEPARATE ITEM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THAT?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THIS? SO IT'S A TOTAL OF \$2,991,938.16. WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE ON THIS? ARE THE WITNESSES EXCUSED? COMMITTEE AGREED? I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU BOTH FOR ATTENDING.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, POSSIBLY IF THE WITNESSES WANTED TO STAY WHILE WE DISCUSSED BILL NO. 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IN LIGHT OF THE TIME I THINK WE WOULD BE...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE WOULD BE HERE A LONG TIME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO YOU WISH THE WITNESSES HERE TOMORROW MORNING?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T THINK SO. I THINK WE HAVE GOT THE MATTER OF C-9 TO DEAL WITH IN COMMITTEE, AND I THINK THAT SHOULD BE DEALT WITH.

MR. STUTTER: THAT MATTER HAS ALREADY BEEN DECIDED BY THE HOUSE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO YOU WISH THE TREASURER HERE TOMORROW?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE THAT BILL NO. 5...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WON'T RECEIVE ANY MOTIONS AT THIS MOMENT. I AM JUST LOOKING FOR SOME DIRECTION. DO YOU WISH THE WITNESSES TO ATTEND TO US TOMORROW OR WILL THEY BE REQUIRED?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THE WITNESSES ATTENDING AT ANY TIME. I WANT TO ASSURE COUNCIL THAT I AM NOT GOING TO RUSH THROUGH THE ENTIRE BILL OF NO. 1. IT WILL TAKE JUST AS LONG TO DO THAT BILL TO DEAL WITH THE BUDGET AND IT IS ON YOUR SHOULDERS AND THE MEMBERS' SHOULDERS, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHO ARE HOLDING BACK DISCUSSION OF C-9. THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT IT. I AM GOING TO LOOK AT THE ENTIRE BUDGET EXACTLY AS I WOULD TREAT THE MAIN ESTIMATES, BECAUSE EVERY ITEM HAS TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE COMMITTEE HAS ALREADY DECIDED THAT WE ARE DISCUSSING BILL NO. 1 AND BILL NO. 2 IN

COMMITTEE BEFORE WE WENT INTO DEBATE ON BILL C-9, AND IF THEY DO NOT WANT THE WITNESSES HERE TOMORROW TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 1, THAT IS JUST FINE WITH ME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE CHAIR IS SOMEWHAT CONFUSED AS TO THE INTENTION OF COMMITTEE. I BELIEVE WE STARTED WITH BILL NO. 1, OR WE STARTED WITH DISCUSSIONS OF BILL C-9 AND THEN WE WENT TO BILL NO. 1, AND THEN WE SUDDENLY ARRIVED, WHEN WE ALL GOT TOGETHER, ON BILL NO. 2. NOW IS IT THE INTENTION OF COMMITTEE TOMORROW MORNING TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 1, OR IS THE INTENTION OF COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS THE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-9, THE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BILL C-9, I WOULD SAY.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE MOVE, OR WHOEVER WANTS TO MOVE, BILL 2 OUT, DISCUSS BILL 1 IN THE MORNING, AND THEN GET ON TO C-9.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS NO WAY THAT YOU ARE GOING TO GET BILL NO. 1 DEALT WITH AND COMPLETED TOMORROW. THERE IS NO WAY. WAKE UP, YOU PEOPLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL, I THINK FOR THE MOMENT THEN, I WILL ASK THE WITNESSES IF THEY WOULD LIKE TO RETURN POSSIBLY AT A QUARTER AFTER TEN IN THE MORNING, IF THAT WOULD BE CONVENIENT.

*WITNESSES EXIT THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS*

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE AT THIS TIME?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE THAT BILL NO. 2, THE FIFTH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74, BE MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENTS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: SECONDER?

MR. TANNER: I WILL SECOND THAT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. STUTTER, WOULD YOU TAKE THE CHAIR FOR A MOMENT?

*MR. STUTTER TAKES THE CHAIR*

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. TAYLOR.

MR. TAYLOR: I RISE ONLY TO POINT OUT THAT I VERY UNLIKELY WILL HAVE A VOTE ON THIS MATTER.



I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT WERE I TO HAVE A VOTE, AS I WILL ON THIRD READING OF THIS BILL, I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF IT. I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF IT BECAUSE THE PRINCIPLE OF THIS GOVERNMENT-OR OF ANY GOVERNMENT- SPENDING MONIES AND PARTICULARLY CREATING NEW PROGRAMS, WITHOUT FIRST COMING TO THE LEGISLATIVE BODY, IS REPUGNANT TO ME AND IT CERTAINLY OFFENDS THE PRINCIPLE OF LEGISLATIVE AND PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OVER THE PUBLIC PURSE AND THE SPENDING OF MONIES. IT INVOLVES ITSELF AROUND ALL PRINCIPLES OF PARLIAMENTARY OR LEGISLATIVE CONTROLS. IT IS A VERY, VERY BAD THING. AS A MATTER OF FACT, IT IS AN EXTREMELY DANGEROUS THING TO HAVE THIS GOING ON. YOU HAVE TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION. WERE THE ADMINISTRATION TO COME AND SAY - AND I HAVE LOOKED THROUGH THESE ESTIMATES AS WE HAVE GONE THROUGH THEM - AND I HAVE SEEN SOME 6 OR 7 HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IN O & M THAT HAVE BEEN EXPENDED ON NEW PROGRAMS INSTITUTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION WITH NO KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT OF THE LEGISLATURE, WHO ARE OF COURSE THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAVE TAKEN IT ON THEMSELVES, IN MY OPINION, TO EXCLUDE THE LEGISLATURE. I CONSIDER IT A SLAP ON THE FACE, AND I DON'T KNOW HOW OTHER MEMBERS FEEL ABOUT IT BUT I CANNOT HELP BUT RISE TO MAKE THIS COMMENT AT THIS TIME. I FEEL THAT IF THE GOVERNMENT WERE TO SAY "ALL RIGHT, WE ADMIT OUR MISTAKE, IF IT WERE IN TRUTH A MISTAKE, AND WE WILL PROVIDE YOU WITH EQUIVALENT MONIES IN THE AMOUNT OF 7 OR 8 HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IN O & M AND THE ALTERNATE AMOUNT IN CAPITAL IN ORDER THAT WE CAN OFFSET ANY TAXATION IN THE FORTHCOMING YEAR, I MIGHT EVEN - AS REPUGNANT AS IT IS - CHANGE MY THINKING ON THIS. BUT I CERTAINLY CANNOT CHANGE MY THINKING ON THE PREMISE THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAVE WANTONLY GONE AHEAD AND SPENT MONEY ON PROGRAMS WITHOUT CONSULTING THIS LEGISLATURE. AS I SAY, I FIND IT AS REPUGNANT TO ME AS IT IS TO THE PRINCIPLE. I URGE ALL MEMBERS NOT TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF THIS BILL. I WILL RESUME THE CHAIR AT THIS POINT IN ORDER THAT WE BE AS SPARE AS POSSIBLE.

MR. TAYLOR RESUMES THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, DURING THE DISCUSSION OF THIS SUPPLEMENTARY, I RAISED SPECIFIC POINTS WHICH MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR, I THINK, THAT ALTHOUGH THERE WERE PROGRAMS RECOMMENDED AND APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, I SAY (AND I POINT MY FINGER AT THE COMMISSIONER) THAT HE ARBITRARILY WENT

AHEAD AND AUTHORIZED THE EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC FUNDS WITHOUT COMING TO THIS COUNCIL, TO US - THE COUNCIL - FOR APPROVAL. I POINT MY FINGER AT HIM BECAUSE HE HAS TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE NEGLIGENCE THAT HE IS NOW CONTINUALLY SHOWING. IT MUST BE MADE CLEAR AS WELL, THAT THE PEOPLE IN OTTAWA WHO READ THESE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS MUST BE SHOWN QUITE CLEARLY THAT WE ARE FED UP TO THE TEETH WITH HIS CONDUCT AND HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THIS COUNCIL. I SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM NOT GOING TO SUPPORT THE BILL AS THE PRINCIPLE THAT HAS BEEN BREACHED IS SO PROFOUND - THE PRINCIPLE THAT THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL MUST AT ALL TIMES BE CONSULTED FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS, EVEN THOUGH THE AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT THE NEW PROGRAMS HAS BEEN GIVEN. ALL THE PROGRAMS GIVEN TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL, IS GIVEN SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL, TO MAKE THE FUNDS AVAILABLE. THIS HAS NOT BEEN CARRIED OUT, AND THE BLAME IS THE COMMISSIONER'S AND NOBODY ELSE. THE BLAME SHOULD BE PUT EXACTLY WHERE IT IS. IT IS HIS FAULT FOR WHAT GOES ON IN THESE CHAMBERS ALL THE TIME.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IS IT NOT PROPER FOR THE CHAIRMAN TO READ THE PREAMBLE AND THE TITLE OF THE BILL BEFORE IT IS MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE?

MR. CHAIRMAN: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I JUST WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT AS FAR AS THIS BILL IS CONCERNED, I AM GOING TO SUPPORT IT, BUT AT THE SAME TIME I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE ADMINISTRATION THAT I HAVE TO AGREE WITH SOME OF THE REMARKS THAT HAVE BEEN PASSED AROUND THIS TABLE REGARDING, IN CERTAIN INSTANCES, THE SPENDING OF FUNDS THAT CERTAINLY WERE NOT AUTHORIZED BY THIS COUNCIL. AS I SAY, I AM GOING TO SUPPORT THE BILL, BUT NEVERTHELESS WITH THAT CAUTION AT THIS POINT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL READ THE PREAMBLE OF THE BILL BEFORE WE DEAL WITH THE MOTION TO MOVE THE BILL OUT OF COMMITTEE. I APPOLOGIZE THAT I GOT SO INVOLVED WITH THE MULTITUDE OF THINGS HERE THAT I FORGOT. (MR. CHAIRMAN READS THE PREAMBLE OF BILL NO. 2) ANY FURTHER DEBATE ON THE MOTION? ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED? MADAM CLERK, I DON'T THINK WE WILL NEED A DIVISION CALL. WE WILL LEAVE THAT FOR THE THIRD READING. MAY I HAVE A SHOW OF THOSE WHO AGREE?

NOTION CARRIED.



MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE DEAL WITH BILL NO. 1 AT THIS TIME, INTERIM SUPPLY APPROPRIATION, 1974-75. THE REASON THAT I AM ASKING FOR THIS TO BE HANDLED AT THIS TIME IS THAT I CANNOT SEE WHY WE HAVE TO GO INTO A LONG DEBATE ON IT. WE THOROUGHLY DISCUSSED THIS THE OTHER DAY AND ANY OF THE RESEARCH THAT I HAVE DONE ON INTERIM SUPPLY BILLS, AND PARTICULARLY WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST WAS THE SELF-APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE... THE DISCUSSIONS TOOK ALL OF TWO PAGES OF BEAUCHESNE AND WHEN THE BILL WAS INTRODUCED, HE GAVE INTRODUCTION. WHEN THE BILL GOT TO COMMITTEE, I WOULD LIKE TO READ..."MR. CHAIRMAN AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER AND I WILL PROCEED WITH THE READING OF BILL NO. 15, THAT IS THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL."HE READS BILL NO. 15. MR. CHAIRMAN: "WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE IN RESPECT OF THIS BILL?"

MR. CHAMBERLIST: "MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THIS BILL BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT AMENDMENT." ONE AND A HALF PAGES LATER, IT WAS MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT DEBATE AND WITHOUT AMENDMENT. I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT YOU PROCEED TO READ THE BILL, BILL NO. 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. I WOULD DRAW THE ATTENTION OF ALL MEMBERS TO THE TIME. IT DOES APPEAR TO THE CHAIR THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE SOME DISCUSSION AND DEBATE IN THIS MATTER, AND I WOULD THINK THAT MANY MEMBERS HAVE PUT IN A PRETTY GOOD DAY AND MIGHT WISH TO DISCUSS IT MORE PROPERLY IN THE MORNING.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MRS. WATSON: DISAGREE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECONDER TO THAT MOTION?

MR. MCKINNON: SECONDED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED? WILL THOSE AGREED KINDLY SIGNIFY.

*MOTION DEFEATED.*

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT MR. CHAIRMAN READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I RISE ON THE POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE READ FROM THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO AN INTERIM BILL, BUT SHE DID NOT REPEAT WHAT THE INTERIM BILL WAS AND THE ITEM THAT WAS ON IT. IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT AT THAT TIME THERE WAS ONLY ONE ITEM TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR AND THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL MEMBERS WAS GIVEN TO DISCUSS THE MOTION IF THEY WANTED TO. HOWEVER, OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL DIDN'T SEE FIT TO NECESSARILY DO THIS, AND SO THEY HAD DECIDED THAT IT WAS NOT NECESSARY. THE INTERIM BILL CAN BE READ AND I PROMISE YOU THAT IT WILL BE TREATED IN EXACTLY THE SAME MANNER AS A MAIN BILL. I WILL GO THROUGH EVERY ITEM, PIECE BY PIECE, AND GIVE IT THE DETAIL THAT THE COMMISSIONER SAID WE SHOULD GIVE IT, IN HIS BUDGETRY ADDRESS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, NOW THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS FOLLOWING THE INSTRUCTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER. THE REST OF THE DAY HE HAS BEEN SCREAMING AND SHOUTING ABOUT THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS GIVING, AND NOW THAT THE COMMISSIONER SAYS YOU MUST GO THROUGH EVERY DETAIL, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS GOING TO BE A LITTLE "YES" MAN AND GO THROUGH EVERY DETAIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S RIGHT.

MRS. WATSON: THAT'S FINE. I THINK WE SHOULD READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: LET'S KEEP THIS PERSONAL CONFLICT OUT OF IT.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS TWICE WITHIN THE LAST FIFTEEN MINUTES THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST HAS GOT UP AND STATED THAT HE INTENDS TO LOOK FOR AND TAKE JUST AS MUCH TIME AND GO INTO JUST AS MUCH DETAIL IN DEALING WITH THE INTERIM BILL AS HE INTENDS TO DO WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES FOR THIS YEAR. NOW, EVERYBODY KNOWS THAT THERE ARE SOME VERY IMPORTANT THINGS TO BE DISCUSSED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, AND MORE PARTICULARLY BILL C-9, THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT. NOW, IT DOES APPEAR TO ME THAT THE MEMBER - AS I HAVE JUST SAID - IS GOING TO DUPLICATE THE WORK IN DISCUSSING THE INTERIM BILL AND THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THE OTHER DAY I MADE THE ACCUSATION THAT IT IS A RED HERRING THAT IS BEING DRAWN IN FRONT OF THE PEOPLE AND THE



MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL, WHEN BOTH THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST AND THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST SAY THAT THE PASSAGE OF THE INTERIM BILL WAS THE SAME THING AS THE PASSAGE OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THEY KNOW FULL WELL THAT THIS IS NOT TRUE. THE PASSAGE OF THE INTERIM BILL DOES NOTHING MORE AT THIS POINT THAN ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT TO CARRY ON SPENDING FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL OF THIS YEAR. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT AT THE TIME, THE RATE OF TIME IT TOOK JUST TO DISCUSS THE DETAIL ON THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1973-74, THAT THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE GOING TO TAKE A LONG, LONG TIME TO GET THROUGH AND THERE IS NO WAY THAT THOSE ESTIMATES - OR, IF WE WERE TO LISTEN TO THE ARGUMENTS PUT OUT BY THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST, THE INTERIM BILL - IS EVER GOING TO BE PASSED BY THE END OF THIS MONTH. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE GET ON WITH THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM SORRY THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN DOESN'T RECOGNIZE THE PRINCIPLE THAT THE INTERIM BILL, AS IT IS PUT FORWARD NOW, INDICATES A TWELFTH OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT. BECAUSE IT INDICATES A TWELFTH OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT, IT INDICATES A TWELFTH OF EVERY ITEM THAT HAS BEEN BUDGETED FOR. NOW, I WANT TO KNOW THOSE ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN BUDGETED FOR. I FEEL IT IS MY DUTY TO EXAMINE THOSE ITEMS, AND BECAUSE I MADE REFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT THE COMMISSIONER HAD INDICATED THAT THE BUDGET WILL BE GIVEN THE CLOSEST SCRUTINY. IT SEEMS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE IS NOT RECOGNIZING THAT THERE IS A REQUIREMENT TO GIVE THE CLOSEST SCRUTINY TO ALL THESE ITEMS. NOT ONLY WOULD I BE FAILING IN MY DUTY IF I DIDN'T, BUT I THINK SHE WOULD BE FAILING IN HER DUTY IN NOT MAKING SURE THAT OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL EXAMINED THOSE ITEMS. IF SHE WANTS THE BUDGET TO SUCCEED, SHE KNOWS FULL WELL THAT SHE HAS TO HAVE THE SUPPORT OF ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO GET THESE THINGS THROUGH PROPERLY. I AM SORRY MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THERE IS ANY THOUGHT IN THE MIND OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON THAT I WANT TO DO ANYTHING ELSE BUT TO DO MY JOB ON THIS COUNCIL. THAT IS ALL I AM CONCERNED WITH. I AM NOT GOING TO SEE \$62 MILLION DOLLARS, OR ANY PART OF IT, JUST WILLFULLY AND NEGLECTFULLY, AND BY DERELICTION OF DUTY, PASSED THROUGH WITHOUT ANY FURTHER REFERENCE OR COMMENTS MADE TO IT. THIS IS MY FUNCTION. I SAID LAST TIME, THAT I WOULD BE EFFECTIVE IN OPPOSITION, AND THIS IS

THE FUNCTION THAT I MUST PERFORM- THE EXAMINATION OF THE ESTIMATES. I SAY THAT THE EXAMINATION OF THE INTERIM ESTIMATES IS JUST AS IMPORTANT TO DEAL WITH, IN EXACTLY THE SAME MANNER, AS IT IS TO DEAL WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES. ONCE THE INTERIM ESTIMATES ARE DEALT WITH, AND THEY ARE DEALT WITH ON A POINT TO POINT BASIS AS THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE EXAMINED, IT WILL INDEED CUT DOWN THE WORK ON THE MAIN ESTIMATES, AND THEY WOULD NOT BE DUPLICATED. THIS IS WHY I SAY THAT IF THERE WAS RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DISCUSSION ON THE FEDERAL BILL C-9, AND THAT WAS DONE AND COMPLETED AND DONE AWAY WITH, THERE IS NO REASON WHY YOU CAN NOT JUST GO THROUGH THE BILL WITHOUT ANY PROBLEMS AT ALL. WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO IS CO-OPERATE AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. THEN, OF COURSE, WE WILL BE ABLE TO DO IT.

NOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, I POINT OUT THAT IT IS QUITE CLOSE TO FIVE O'CLOCK, AND WE SHOULD BE CALLING IT FIVE O'CLOCK NOW.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN,  
I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT WE HAVEN'T THE TIME NOW...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE. THE COMMITTEE HAS MADE A DECISION, AND WE DID THIS SOME TIME AGO. WE SEEM TO BE GETTING LOCKED UP IN ALL THESE LITTLE PERSONALITY CONFLICTS AND DISPUTES. NOW THE COMMITTEE HAS MADE A DECISION THAT WE BRING IN THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 1. THIS DECISION WAS MADE WHEN WE FIRST STARTED OFF ON THIS MERRY-GO-ROUND THAT WE HAVE BEEN FOLLOWING. IT WOULD THEN BE NECESSARY AT THIS TIME, IF IT IS YOUR WISH, THAT WE RECALL THEM. I HAVE ONLY SUGGESTED FROM THE CHAIR THAT THIS BE LEFT OVER TO TOMORROW, BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE WILL HAVE TO RECALL THE TREASURER AND MR. MILLER. I DON'T THINK THAT WOULD BE A FAIR THING TO DO AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE TIME IS 5 O'CLOCK, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. TANNER: REGARDLESS OF THE FACT THAT IT IS 5 O'CLOCK, THE MAJORITY OF THIS COMMITTEE WANTS THE CHAIRMAN TO READ THE BILL, AND HE SHOULD GO AHEAD AND READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT'S FIVE O'CLOCK, THAT'S IT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACT THAT IT'S FIVE O'CLOCK, IF THE MAJORITY OF THIS COMMITTEE WANTS THE CHAIRMAN TO READ THE BILL, HE SHOULD GO AHEAD AND READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL READ THE BILL, BUT AT THIS POINT UNTIL WE HAVE CONCLUDED DISCUSSIONS ON THIS BILL WITH THE TREASURER I...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WITH RESPECT, MR. CHAIRMAN...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE, ORDER PLEASE. UNTIL I HAVE COMPLETED, I WILL NOT READ THE PREAMBLE UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THIS BILL HAS BEEN PROPERLY DEALT WITH. IT IS A FIVE MILLION DOLLAR EXPENDITURE AND I FEEL THAT, AS MANY MEMBERS DO, AND IF YOU DON'T AGREE WITH THAT YOU CAN GET YOURSELF ANOTHER DEPUTY SPEAKER. THIS IS...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I RISE ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE AT THIS TIME, MR. CHAIRMAN. MR. CHAIRMAN THE RULE OF THE HOUSE IS THAT THIS COUNCIL IS IN SESSION FROM TEN TILL TWELVE, FROM TWO TILL FIVE, AND UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE RULES HAVE BEEN CHANGED, I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IF THE MAJORITY WANTS TO MAKE A CHANGE LET THEM DO IT BY MOTION TOMORROW AND CHANGE IT TO WHATEVER ELSE THEY LIKE. IN THE MEANTIME, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ASK YOU, I HAVE BROUGHT YOUR ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT IT IS TWELVE O'CLOCK,

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. I THINK, ORDER, THIS IS GOING INTO A CIRCLE AND THIS IS BECOMING A WORSE KINDERGARTEN THAN IT HAS APPEARED TO BE IN THE LAST SEVERAL DAYS. I WILL READ THE BILL AT THIS TIME. HOWEVER, THERE IS MUCH DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW AND IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO HAVE THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER HERE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL, COULD WE HAVE THEM BEFORE THEY RE-READ THE BILL, WITH RESPECT, YOU KNOW, I MEAN THEY, BEFORE READING THE BILL, I THINK THE WITNESSES SHOULD BE CALLED. IF THIS IS WHAT THE MEMBERS WANT TO DO, LET'S GET ON WITH IT AND LET'S GO...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE, I'LL READ THE BILL AND WE'LL DECIDE AT THAT POINT WHAT COMMIT-

TEE WOULD LIKE TO DO. "MR. CHAIRMAN READS BILL No. 1, THE INTERIM SUPPLY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE 1974-75, SECTIONS 1, 2, AND 3."

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE HAVE THE WITNESSES IN, MR. CHAIRMAN, PLEASE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MADAM CLERK, WOULD YOU CALL AND SEE IF MR. HUBERDEAU AND MR. TREASURER ARE AVAILABLE, OR MR. MILLER, PARDON ME. AND I'LL DECLARE A RECESS AT THIS POINT.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME, I WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER, AND WE HAVE AGAIN WITH US MR. MILLER AND MR. HUBERDEAU TO DISCUSS BILL No. 1.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, AT THIS TIME I WOULD WISH TO POINT OUT THAT AS HAS BEEN THE PRACTICE IN DEALING WITH MAIN ESTIMATES, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER OF THE BRANCHES, OF THE DEPARTMENTS, OVER WHOM HE IS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER, AND THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS ARE USUALLY HERE FOR QUESTIONS ON THESE ITEMS. AS I'VE INDICATED, MR. CHAIRMAN, I INTEND TO GO THROUGH THE ITEMS TO ASCERTAIN WHAT THE ONE-TWELFTH OF EACH ITEM IS, I WOULD ASK, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT I REQUIRE TWO WITNESSES, THAT'S THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATION SERVICES AND THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS OF EACH DEPARTMENT AS WE COME TO THE ITEM.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS BEING VERY UNREASONABLE, HE KNOWS FULL WELL THAT ALL WE ARE ASKING IS FOR AN INTERIM SUPPLY SO THAT WE DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE C-9, WE CAN TAKE TIME AND THEN WE CAN TAKE TIME TO GO THROUGH THE MAIN ESTIMATES. WE'RE NOT ASKING ANY MORE OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAN HE ASKED OF THE OTHER MEMBERS ON COUNCIL WHEN HE WAS HIMSELF ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I RISE ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MRS. WATSON: THIS HAS HAPPENED...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THE HONOUR-



ABLE MEMBER...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS GOING TO PERSIST IN THIS NONSENSICAL BUSINESS ABOUT THE SELF-ELECTED CHAIRMAN, I'M GOING TO BE DOING BATTLE WITH HER UNTIL I MAKE HER BREAK DOWN CRYING. NOW, I'LL HAVE HER IN TEARS, MR. CHAIRMAN, BECAUSE...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I MUST SAY THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT I'M NOT, DON'T WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, I WAS CHAIRMAN, THAT WAS SATISFACTORY AND AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED IT MATTERS NOT NOW, BUT IF SHE KEEPS ON TRYING TO NEEDLE ME SHE WILL FIND ME REAL TOUGH. SO FAR I'VE NOT BEEN TOUGH HER BUT I WILL BE, TAKE HEED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE READ THE BILL AND PASS IT OUT OF COMMITTEE, WE DEBATE C-9, AND THEN WE GO INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND AT THAT TIME I THINK WE SHOULD CALL THE WITNESSES, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO ARE IN CHARGE OF THE DEPARTMENTS AND THEN THE MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL WILL BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES IN DETAIL. WE'RE NOT ASKING ANYTHING MORE THAN OTHER COUNCILLORS HAVE ASKED. ALL WE ARE ASKING IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY BE VOTED TO GIVE THE GOVERNMENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONTINUE FUNCTIONING WHILE WE ARE TAKING OUR TIME TO DEBATE THE MAIN ESTIMATES. I DON'T TAKE THEM LIGHTLY AND I DON'T THINK ANY OTHER MEMBER OF COUNCIL WANTS TO TAKE THE MAIN ESTIMATES LIGHTLY. THEY WANT TO GET MORE INFORMATION, BUT IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO DO THIS WE KNOW FULL WELL, THE GOVERNMENT HAS TO GO ON FUNCTIONING. WE'RE JUST ASKING THAT A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY BE VOTED TO GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONTINUE ON THE ONGOING BUSINESS OF GOVERNMENT, NOT INCORPORATING NEW PROGRAMS OR ANYTHING LIKE THIS, JUST THE ONGOING BASES, PAYING THE PAYROLL AND PAYING THE INVOICES THAT HAVE TO BE PAID.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS NOT FOR THE INVOICES AND PAYMENTS THAT HAVE TO BE PAID. THIS IS BROKEN DOWN TO REPRESENT A TWELFTH OF THE MAIN BUDGET, AND NO WAY CAN ANY MEMBER OF THIS COUNCIL AUTHORIZE FIVE MILLION DOLLARS BY JUST PASSING IT OUT OF COMMITTEE. IT WOULD BE A

TOTALLY IRRESPONSIBLE ACT ON MY PART IF I DID NOT EXAMINE THESE ITEMS AND I WILL NOT UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES APPROVE FIVE MILLION DOLLARS WITHOUT ANY EXAMINATION OF THE MONIES THEY REFER TO AND I WANT MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT THE WITNESSES THAT I'VE ASKED FOR TO BE CALLED HERE SO THAT I CAN DISCUSS THESE ITEMS WITH THEM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF AT THIS POINT I COULD ASK THE COUNCILLOR FROM WHITEHORSE EAST A RATHER SIMPLE QUESTION. HE'S TOTALLY FAMILIAR WITH THE WORKINGS OF GOVERNMENT AND OF THE BUDGET PROCEDURES. NOW AGAIN, HE KNOWS FULL WELL WHAT HAPPENS IF WE REACH THE END OF MONTH WITHOUT HAVING PASSED EITHER AN INTERIM BILL OR THE MAIN ESTIMATES. NOW, MAY I JUST ASK OF HIM AT THIS POINT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT ALTERNATIVE DOES HE SUGGEST TO EITHER PASSING THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL NOW AND THEN GETTING INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES IN ALL THE DETAIL THAT YOU WISH OR, THAT'S MY QUESTION, WHAT ALTERNATIVE DOES THE MEMBER OFFER?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MY ALTERNATIVE IS THIS. I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WE DEAL WITH THE FEDERAL BILL, C-9, AND ONCE WE HAVE DEALT WITH THAT, AND ADVISED THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS WHAT ARE THE INTENTIONS AND WISHES OF THIS COUNCIL, THEN WE HAVE IT AWAY FROM HERE. THEN WE CAN GO INTO THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL AND THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND WE WOULD NOT BE DUPLICATING BECAUSE THEY COULD PRACTICALLY BE DONE TOGETHER AS LONG AS WE KNOW WHERE WE ARE GOING, AND ALL I'M SAYING IS JUST RECOGNIZE THE PRIORITY, THE IMPORTANCE OF GETTING THINGS DONE. HERE WE HAVE A LONG, HARD STRUGGLE ARRANGED FOR, WELL, I SAY ARRANGED BECAUSE CERTAINLY ALTHOUGH OTTAWA IS NOT GOING AS FAR AS WE WANT THEM TO, WE'VE GOT TO HAVE SOME COMMENTS TO SAY. AT LEAST THE STANDING COMMITTEE HAVE HAD THE GOODNESS TO SEND US A WIRE AND SAY "LOOK WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU." THE MINISTER HAS WRITTEN A LETTER WHICH I JUST RECEIVED TODAY SAYING THAT HE WANTS TO HEAR FROM THE COUNCIL. THE FRUSTRATION OF HAVING MEMBERS OF COUNCIL AND THE MAJORITY OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL OPPOSING SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DEALT WITH PERHAPS IN TWO OR THREE HOURS, THIS IS WHAT AMAZES ME. THAT IS A SIMPLE ANSWER TO A SIMPLE QUESTION AND WHY CAN'T WE DO IT THAT WAY?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS ONE FURTHER



QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK, AND IT SEEMS TO BE THAT AS FAR AS THE MEMBER HIMSELF IS CONCERNED, AND I'M NOT EXPECTING HIM TO TALK FOR EVERYBODY, BUT AS FAR AS HE HIMSELF IS CONCERNED, THEN IT SOUNDS AS THOUGH HE IS PREPARED TO DISPENSE WITH EITHER THE INTERIM BILL OR THE MAIN ESTIMATES THE END OF THE MONTH, IF THERE IS AGREEMENT THAT C-9 BE DEALT WITH, NOW, CAN I JUST GET THAT CLEAR?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, NOW, THAT'S NOT WHAT I SAID AT ALL. I SIMPLY SAID THAT WE SHOULD DEAL WITH C-9, BILL C-9, AND THEN WE CAN CERTAINLY CO-OPERATE IN SPEEDING UP THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL BEFORE THE END OF THE MONTH BY PUTTING CERTAIN CONDITIONS IN OUR DISCUSSIONS ON THE BILL THAT CAN BE DONE. FOR INSTANCE, WE CAN APPROVE AN INTERIM SUPPLY BILL SUBJECT TO CERTAIN THINGS TAKING PLACE WHEN WE GO THROUGH THE MAIN BILL. IN OTHER WORDS, WHERE WE DON'T APPROVE A CERTAIN ITEM, THEN THAT WILL BE DEDUCTED FROM THE AMOUNT. THESE THINGS CAN ALL BE DONE BUT THE OBSTINACY OF NOT WANTING TO DEAL WITH C-9, I FIND IT REALLY DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND. IT'S JUST TOTALLY ILLOGICAL.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I FIND IT JUST AS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND NOT WANTING TO PASS INTERIM SUPPLY THROUGH. WE'RE NOT MAKING, WE'RE NOT ASKING THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS TO COMMIT THEMSELVES AT ALL AS FAR AS THE MAIN ESTIMATES GO AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS FULL WELL THAT THIS IS NOT WHY WE HAVE THE INTERIM SUPPLY HERE, AND EVERYONE OF US HERE WANTS TO DEBATE C-9, BUT I THINK THAT WE SHOULD READ THE BILL AT THIS TIME, STOP THE WASTE OF TIME THAT'S BEEN GOING ON, PASS IT OUT OF COMMITTEE AND GET ON WITH OUR DEBATE ON C-9 AND GO INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES. WE'RE NOT ASKING FOR THE MEMBERS TO COMMIT THEMSELVES AS FAR AS THE MAIN ESTIMATES GO, AT ALL. THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE SIXTY-TWO MILLION, WE'RE ASKING FOR FIVE MILLION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET A START AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, MR. CHAIRMAN, UNTIL I HAVE THE WITNESSES THAT I HAVE ASKED FOR WHICH ARE THE PROCEDURAL METHODS WHICH WE HAVE ADOPTED IN THIS HOUSE.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS JUST ONE FURTHER QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST. HE HAS JUST STATED A WHILE AGO THAT HE WOULD BE, HE WOULD AT LEAST CONSIDER PASSING THE INTERIM BILL WITH CERTAIN RIDERS ATTACHED TO IT. MAYBE HE COULD SPELL

OUT THESE RIDERS, MAYBE WE CAN MEET SOME SORT OF A, MAKE SOME SORT OF A COMPROMISE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AFTER WE HAVE DEALT WITH C-9, THEN I'LL MAKE THE COMPROMISE. THEN THAT WILL SHOW GOOD FAITH IN WHAT YOU PEOPLE ARE TRYING TO GET TO DO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST FOR THE ... ORDER, PLEASE... I THINK FOR THE EDIFICATION OF THE COMMITTEE, UNFORTUNATELY IN SUPPLY THERE CAN BE NO RIDERS IN SUPPLY. CARRY ON. COUNCILLOR TANNER.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MADE THE POINT LAST WEEK THAT HE WANTED TO GET TO C-9. I THINK EVERY MEMBER IN THIS HOUSE WANTS TO GET TO C-9. THE MEMBER ACROSS THE WAY, COUNCILLOR MCKINNON SAID THAT HIS INFORMATION FROM OTTAWA WAS THAT PERHAPS THE STANDING COMMITTEE WOULD WANT TO SEE SOME MEMBER DOWN THERE. WELL, ALL OF THOSE THINGS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED. WE CAN HAVE AS MUCH TIME AS WE PLEASE TO DEBATE C-9, BY MOVING THIS OUT OF THE WAY. IT'S THE ONLY THING THAT'S HOLDING IT UP. NOW, THIS MORNING THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST MANAGED TO THINK THAT IT WAS SUFFICIENTLY IMPORTANT THAT HE SHOULD ASK AN HOUR AND FIFTEEN MINUTES WORTH OF QUESTIONS. NOW, IF ITS REALLY THAT IMPORTANT TO GET TO C-9 AS FAR AS HE'S CONCERNED, WHY DID HE WASTE THAT TIME? THREE HONOURABLE MEMBERS STOOD FOR ALMOST AN HOUR TALKING ABOUT ANOTHER MOTION, WHICH IF IT WAS SO IMPORTANT TO THE THREE HONOURABLE MEMBERS, WHY DID THEY TALK SO LONG ABOUT IT? MR. CHAIRMAN, I SUGGEST WE READ C-9 AND IT GETS MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE AND THEN EVERYBODY'S GOT AS MUCH TIME AS THEY PLEASE TO DEBATE C-9 BILL AND ALSO THE FULL BUDGET.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, I HAVE ASKED FOR WITNESSES AND YOU HAVE ALREADY RULED THAT WHEN A MEMBER ASKS FOR WITNESSES THESE WITNESSES SHOULD BE FORTHCOMING. THAT IS YOUR RULING MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MIGHT I KNOW WHAT WITNESSES YOU REQUIRE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE FIRST ITEM DEALS WITH ADMINISTRATION, I WANT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WHO IS IN CHARGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND THE BREAKDOWN OF WHAT THIS \$139,000.00 IS FOR.



MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT ORDER PLEASE NOW, WHO IS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES?

MR. STUTTER: THE COMMISSIONER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE COMMISSIONER I BELIEVE IS RIGHT HERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HE'S RIGHT HERE. NOW WE WANT - - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, HAVE YOU READ THE BILL?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OF COURSE HE'S READ THE BILL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I AM IN THE PROCESS OF READING IT AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE BILL HAS BEEN READ.

MRS. WATSON: NO MR. CHAIRMAN IT HAS NOT BEEN READ.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IF THE MEMBERS WOULD KINDLY PAY ATTENTION I WILL CONTINUE AND THE FIRST ITEM IS ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$139,906.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO, I WANT MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT THE BREAKDOWN OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND I WANT THE HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT HERE AS A WITNESS AS WELL AND THIS HAS USUALLY BEEN THE PROCEDURE UNLESS MR. COMMISSIONER IS PREPARED TO ANSWER THE BREAKDOWN ON ALL THESE ITEMS HIMSELF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES, WELL MR. COMMISSIONER IS HERE, COUNCILLOR TANNER.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD I SORT ONE THING BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER ARRIVES HERE? IN THE PAST TWO YEARS, CERTAINLY IN THE PAST YEAR BUT I THINK IN THE PAST TWO YEARS, WE HADN'T HAD DEPARTMENT HEADS HERE MR. CHAIRMAN. WE'VE MADE IT A POINT OF HAVING THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER OR MEMBERS IN CHARGE OF THEIR VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS HERE, AND AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED I THINK IT WOULD BE INCORRECT TO BRING ANY DEPARTMENT HEAD IN. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ARE HERE AND THEY ARE HERE TO TAKE THEIR LUMPS AND WHATEVER ELSE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS GOT FOR THEM, AND THEY ARE PREPARED

TO TALK ON THEIR VARIOUS BUDGETS, AND I THINK THAT IS SUFFICIENT AS FAR AS WITNESSES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WILL CONCEDE TO THAT POINT.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF I COULD SUGGEST TO TRY AND GET AROUND CERTAIN DIFFICULTY WHICH WE SEEM TO HAVE AT AN IMPASSE. I'D BE PREPARED AS THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST TO SIT IN CAUCUS UNTIL THE COWS COME HOME TO TRY AND ARRIVE AT SOME CONCILIATION ON PROCEDURE FOR THE HOUSE FOR THE NEXT LITTLE WHILE. I FEEL THAT THE OLDER I GET THE HARDER I FIND IT MAKING A PUBLIC SPECTACLE OF MYSELF IN BRINGING THE HOUSE DOWN IN WHAT I THINK IS REALLY DESERVED DISREPUTE AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL. I DON'T THINK WE ARE GETTING ANYWHERE BY ATTEMPTING TO GO ALONG IN THIS METHOD IN THIS MANNER AND I THINK THAT IF OTHER MEMBERS WOULD AGREE I'M CERTAINLY WILLING TO HAVE A BITE OF SUPPER, MAYBE LET THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS COOL OFF AND COME BACK TONIGHT AND SIT IN CAUCUS TO SEE IF THERE IS ANY POSSIBLE METHOD THAT WE CAN ARRIVE AT AT SOME PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE PRIOR TO CONTINUING THIS KIND OF A PROCEDURE. WITH THOSE REMARKS, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ATTEMPT ONCE AGAIN TO MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'LL SECOND THE MOTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST BEFORE EXCUSING THE WITNESSES I'LL DEAL WITH THE MOTION. IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST BEFORE QUESTION IS CALLED I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THEN IF THIS IS GOING TO BE THE WISH OF COMMITTEE THAT WE DO CAUCUS AND TRY TO RESOLVE THIS AFTER SUPPER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANY CONTRARY? THIS WILL DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. THANK YOU GENTLEMEN, I'M SORRY TO HAVE CALLED YOU BACK. I BELIEVE IT WILL BE SOMETIME AFTER 10:00 O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: THE HOUSE WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. MAY WE HAVE A REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE?

MR. TAYLOR: YES MR. SPEAKER. COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 2:35 P.M. THIS AFTERNOON TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. MR. MILLER AND MR. HUBERDEAU ATTENDED COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 2. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, THAT BILL NO. 2 BE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENTS AND THIS MOTION CARRIED. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. THIS MOTION WAS DEFEATED. I CAN REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL NO. 1. IT WAS THEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR AND THIS MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: YOU HAVE HEARD THE REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE. ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER

PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER NORMALLY AT THIS TIME I WOULD BE ABLE TO DIRECT YOU AS TO WHAT THE COUNCIL INTENDED ON DOING TOMORROW BUT I CAN ONLY SAY I HAVE NOT AT THIS TIME ANY DIRECTION IN THIS MATTER SO I CANNOT ADVISE YOU ACCORDINGLY.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER I MOVE THAT WE CALL IT 5 O'CLOCK.

MR. TANNER: I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH THAT WE NOW CALL IT 5 O'CLOCK. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. COUNCIL STANDS ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW MORNING.

*ADJOURNED.*





TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1974

MR. SPEAKER READS THE DAILY PRAYER.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM CLERK, IS THERE A QUORUM PRESENT?

MADAM CLERK: THERE IS, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY DOCUMENTS OR CORRESPONDENCE TO BE TABLED? ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEES? ARE THERE ANY BILLS TO BE INTRODUCED? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTIONS OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD GIVE NOTICE THAT SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 14 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION THAT LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 12, BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE THAT SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 8 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I BELIEVE THAT'S ON THE WAY THIS MORNING.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS. ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? AS THERE ARE NO MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS, WE COME TO MOTION NO. 8.

MOTION NO. 8

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 8 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DISCUSSION. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME? ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: WE NOW COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. MADAM CLERK, WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF MR. COMMISSIONER IS AVAILABLE? WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: WE WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: YUKON TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER HAS ANY COMMENT ON THE FACT THAT THE YUKON TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION HAS FILED A SUIT IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT ASKING FOR DAMAGES AND EXPENSES FROM THE COMMISSIONER FOR BREACH OF AGREEMENT AND BARGAINING AND NEGLIGENCE FOR FAILING TO PROPERLY INSTRUCT HIS AGENTS IN THE BARGAINING PROCESS MR. SPEAKER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: WELL, MR. SPEAKER WITH RESPECT, I THINK IT WOULD BE MOST INAPPROPRIATE FOR ME TO HAVE ANY COMMENT ON THIS AS IT IS A MATTER BEFORE THE COURTS.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER WOULD COMMENT FURTHER. IT SEEMS THAT THE GOVERNMENT WHICH HE HEADS AS CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, SPENDS AN AWFUL LOT OF TIME IN COURT. I WONDER IF IT IS POSSIBLE IF THE ADMINISTRATION COULD BE A LITTLE MORE CAREFUL IN THEIR ACTIONS SO THAT THEY DON'T SEEM TO END UP SO MANY TIMES BEFORE THE TERRITORIAL COURTS MR. SPEAKER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I'M NOT INTERESTED IN SPENDING TIME IN COURT. I'M INTERESTED IN DOING CONSTRUCTIVE THINGS OUTSIDE OF COURT. IT SEEMS TO BE THE ROUTE WE GET INTO SOMETIMES AND IT ISN'T INTENTIONAL, I ASSURE YOU.

QUESTION RE: COMMISSIONER'S ACCEPTANCE OF LEGAL ADVICE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SUPPLEMENTARY MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. COMMISSIONER. I'M SURE MR. COMMISSIONER WILL APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT IF IT WERE NOT FOR THE SUPREME COURT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WOULD INDEED BE ACTING IN A POSITION OF WHERE THEY ARE CONTINUALLY BEING ATTACKED BY THE ADMINISTRATION, SO MY SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE QUESTION IS THIS. ARE YOU MR. COMMISSIONER SEEKING AND ACCEPTING THE ADVICE OF THE LEGAL COUNCIL THAT WE HAVE IN THE TERRITORY?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I SEEK THE ADVICE OF ALL MY OFFICERS.



MR. CHAMBERLIST: FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY, MR. COMMISSIONER, ARE YOU SUGGESTING THAT YOU ALWAYS SEEK ADVICE AND OBEY THE ADVICE, OR COMPLY WITH THE ADVICE THAT YOU ARE GIVEN?

MR. COMMISSIONER: THAT'S ANOTHER QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, THIS IS ANOTHER QUESTION, I'D LIKE ANOTHER ANSWER, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: SOMETIMES YES, SOMETIMES NO, MR. SPEAKER.

QUESTION RE: COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION FOR EITHER THE LEGAL ADVISER OR THE COMMISSIONER. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW ONCE THE COMMISSIONER MAKES ORDERS UNDER THE YUKON REGULATIONS AND SPECIFICALLY I HAVE IN MIND AN ORDER THAT WAS MADE UNDER THE YUKON HEALTH ORDINANCE IN THIS MONTH OF MARCH, ARE FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS IN THE TERRITORY SUBJECTED TO THOSE REGULATIONS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: EXCUSE ME, MR. SPEAKER, DO YOU MEAN, WOULD THEY BE SUBJECTED TO THOSE REGULATIONS IN THEIR DAY-TO-DAY OPERATIONS? IS THAT THE QUESTION?

MR. STUTTER: I WILL MAKE IT A LITTLE CLEARER, MR. SPEAKER. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS ARE BOUND TO ABIDE BY REGULATIONS ONCE THEY COME INTO EFFECT, ONCE THE COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS ARE ISSUED UNDER OUR ORDINANCES, ARE FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS BOUND BY THOSE REGULATIONS?

MR. SPEAKER: MR. COMMISSIONER OR MR. LEGAL ADVISER.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: MR. SPEAKER, IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO GIVE A GENERAL ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS ARE BOUND BY LAW JUST LIKE INDIVIDUALS IN THOSE FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS ALSO ABIDE BY THE LAW. IF THE COMMISSIONER MAKES A VALID AND LAWFUL ORDER, THEN THEY ARE BOUND BY THAT VALID ORDER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF I COULD BE A LITTLE MORE SPECIFIC. IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, THIS WAS A COMMISSIONER'S ORDER UNDER THE HEALTH ORDINANCE AND I HAVEN'T GOT THE ACTUAL ORDER IN FRONT OF ME. I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO FIND IT IN THE CHAMBERS BUT IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE IS TO MAKE SURE THAT NO PERSON SHALL DISCHARGE UNTREATED SEWAGE OR

SEWAGE AFFLUENT IN THE SUB-SOIL WITHIN 20 FEET OF ANY BUILDING, NOR ON THE GROUND SURFACE OR INTO THE SUB-SOIL WITHIN THE LIMITS OF ANY TOWN, CITY OR VILLAGE, OR WITHIN ONE HALF-MILE OF THE BOUNDARY THEREOF EXCEPT WITH THE WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE MEDICAL HEALTH OFFICER. IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE, WOULD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS HAVE TO COMPLY WITH THAT REGULATION?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD SAY YES AND IF THERE WERE ANY PARTICULAR INSTANCES THAT ANY MEMBERS, WHERE IT CAME TO THEIR ATTENTION, THAT THIS WAS NOT BEING DONE, BRING IT TO OUR ATTENTION BECAUSE I SEE NO REASON - THIS IS ISSUED UNDER THE HEALTH ORDINANCE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT IS ISSUED UNDER THE ADVICE OF A MAN WHO, AT THE PRESENT TIME IS STILL A FEDERAL OFFICER, AND IT WOULD APPEAR TO ME THAT FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AS INDIVIDUAL OPERATORS SHOULD COMPLY WITH THIS.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE JUST ONE SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE MAIN QUESTION HERE. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. COMMISSIONER IF IT THEN FOLLOWS THAT ALL TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS UNDER HIS CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION ARE FULLY SUBJECT TO THE REGULATIONS AND ORDINANCES OF THE TERRITORY?

MR. COMMISSIONER: THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

MR. TAYLOR: THANK YOU MR. SPEAKER.

QUESTION RE: BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, A QUESTION TO MR. COMMISSIONER. YESTERDAY I RAISED A QUESTION AS TO WHY THE BOARDS AND COMMITTEES IN COUNCIL ARE NOT PUT INTO BOOKLET FORM AND PRESENTED TO TERRITORIAL COUNCIL AND IT WAS INTIMATED THAT THIS WAS DONE IN THE TELEPHONE DIRECTORY THAT WAS SUBMITTED. WELL I HAVE A COPY OF THE DIRECTORY AND THERE ARE ONLY TWELVE IN HERE. NOW, I HAVE A BOOK THAT I HAD FOR SOME TIME, WITH 64 BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS AND I ASK WHETHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL CAN BE ISSUED WITH THIS SO THAT EACH MEMBER OF COUNCIL KNOWS WHO BELONGS TO WHICH BOARD. THAT WAS THE QUESTION I ASKED AND I ASK IF MR. COMMISSIONER WILL HAVE THAT AVAILABLE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, IT IS COMPILED AND IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING WHEN I ANSWERED YESTERDAY, THAT IT WAS PART OF THE DIRECTORY THAT HAS BEEN CIRCULATED BUT IF THIS IS NOT THE



CASE, WHY, WE WILL CERTAINLY CORRECT THAT SITUATION.

Mr. SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

QUESTION RE: REGULATIONS

Mr. STUTTER: Mr. SPEAKER, BETTER THAN A YEAR AGO I WAS GIVEN SOME INDICATION BY THE PREVIOUS CLERK OF COUNCIL REGARDING REGULATIONS, THAT THERE WAS SOME THOUGHT BEING GIVEN TO A NEW SYSTEM OF BRINGING OUR REGULATIONS OR KEEPING OUR REGULATIONS UP TO DATE. MAY I ASK EITHER THE COMMISSIONER OR THE CLERK OF COUNCIL WHETHER ANYTHING IS, IN FACT, BEING DONE, IN ORDER TO SIMPLIFY THE METHOD OF KEEPING REGULATIONS UP TO DATE.

Mr. McKINNON: GIVE US EACH A GIRL.

SOME MEMBER: I'LL TAKE LINDA.

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, THIS IS QUITE CORRECT. THE STATEMENT THAT HAS BEEN MADE BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, AND AN EXERCISE IS ENTERED INTO BY THE PRESENT CLERK OF COUNCIL IN AN ATTEMPT TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT THAN WHAT HAS BEEN DONE. IT FELL BY THE WAYSIDE BECAUSE WHAT WAS BEING DONE UP TO THAT POINT IN TIME WAS SO FAR OUT OF DATE AND SO FAR BEHIND ITSELF THAT. THAT WAS THE FIRST EXERCISE AND I WILL ASK THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL TO VERIFY WHAT I AM TELLING THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS, Mr. SPEAKER BUT I DO THINK IT IS A STATEMENT OF FACT TO SAY THAT WE HAVE FINALLY GOT A CERTAIN NUMBER OF REGULATIONS IN BOOKS THAT ARE COMPLETELY UP TO DATE. THE NEXT MOVE IS TO ATTEMPT TO GET ALL OF THOSE WHICH WE HAVE SOME EXECUTIVE CONTROL OF, SOME METHOD OF RETRIEVAL WITHIN THE GOVERNMENT, Mr. SPEAKER, ONCE THAT IS DONE THEN THE CLERK CAN DEVOTE SOME TIME TO A FORMAT. PERHAPS THE CLERK WOULD LIKE TO HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY ON THIS.

Mr. STUTTER: SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION, Mr. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE COMMISSIONER IF THE TERRITORIAL AGENTS THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY ARE INSTRUCTED TO KEEP THE REGULATION BOOKS UP TO-DATE SO THAT THERE IS A COMPLETE UP TO-DATE SET OF REGULATIONS IN EVERY AREA IN THE TERRITORY.

Mr. COMMISSIONER: PERHAPS THE CLERK WOULD LIKE TO ANSWER THAT.

MADAM CLERK: I'M SORRY, WOULD YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION?

Mr. STUTTER: YES, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF THE TERRITORIAL AGENTS THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY ARE INSTRUCTED AND IN FACT DO KEEP REGULATIONS OR ONE SET OF REGULATIONS UP TO-DATE AT ALL TIMES, WITHIN REASON.

MADAM CLERK: WELL Mr. SPEAKER, BEING THAT I'VE ONLY BEEN AT MY POST FOR EIGHT MONTHS, WE HAVE NOT ADVANCED TO THIS STAGE OF FINDING OUT WHETHER TERRITORIAL AGENTS HAVE KEPT THEIR BOOKS UP TO-DATE. BUT WITH THE SYSTEM WE HAVE UNDERTAKEN, WE ARE THIS WEEK IN A POSITION WHERE WE WILL BE SENDING OUT COMPLETELY UP TO-DATE BOOKS TO THE TERRITORIAL AGENTS AND WILL BE CALLING IN THOSE BOOKS FROM THE TERRITORIAL AGENTS. WE WILL BE BRINGING THEM UP TO-DATE HERE IN THIS OFFICE.

Mr. STUTTER: FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY, Mr. SPEAKER, WILL THOSE TERRITORIAL AGENTS BE INSTRUCTED TO KEEP THOSE REGULATION BOOKS UP TO-DATE? I MEAN, IF THEY HAVE TO BE SENT IN THIS OFFICE ONCE A YEAR THERE REALLY ISN'T MUCH POINT IN HAVING THEM OUT IN THE OUTER AREAS, IF THEY ARE NOT KEPT UP TO-DATE.

Mr. SPEAKER: SOME OF THEM ALREADY DO THAT.

MADAM CLERK: YES Mr. SPEAKER. THE ANSWER IS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. INSTRUCTIONS WILL GO OUT.

Mr. McKINNON: SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION, Mr. SPEAKER. I WONDER IF Mr. COMMISSIONER COULD SAY THAT MAYBE FEWER REGULATIONS WOULD BE THE EASIEST ANSWER. THESE TWO BOOKS CONTAIN THE LEGISLATION OF THE YUKON. THOSE FOUR HUGE BLACK ONES CONTAIN THE REGULATIONS UNDER WHICH THE LAWS ARE ADMINISTERED BY THE ADMINISTRATION. DOES HE THINK THAT PERHAPS LESS REGULATIONS MAY BE THE ANSWER TO THE REGULATION PROBLEM?

Mr. COMMISSIONER: Mr. SPEAKER, THAT IS THE ANSWER. I AM IN FULL AGREEMENT.

Mr. McKINNON: SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION. DOES Mr. COMMISSIONER REALLY THINK THAT THERE IS ONE PERSON IN ALL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WHO IS FULLY



COGNIZANT WITH THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF REGULATIONS THAT ARE CONTAINED IN THE FIVE VOLUMES OF REGULATIONS?

Mr. Chamberlist: I'll stand up. I read them continuously.

Mr. McKinnon: I said I understand. When you go to the regulations, here, I will give you one example. It says in the liquor regulations that every time that a drink, a beer is served you in a cocktail lounge you have to be served a glass, and if you don't drink out of that glass, you are liable to a fine of \$500. Would anybody be convicted for it? Why is the regulation there? It's assinine, it's silly. A person would look ridiculous being brought to court for it. Is anybody thinking of going through the regulations and removing all the stupid things that are in them? Does anybody even know what's contained in the regulations?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, we can never stop the manufacturing of new regulations. We might get around to taking a look at the old ones that contain some of the inequities and foolishness that the Honourable Member says. All I'm saying to you is that, on my own personal point of view, I think it is terrible to have government buy regulations. I think the thing is absolutely crazy, but with the sophistication of the laws that you have around here now and the manner in which these laws are put together, how are you expected to administer them? I don't see how you are going to get away from regulations. Quite frankly, I think the Honourable Member has a darn good point, Mr. Speaker, and the opportunity of completely revising the regulations should be available to us now that we have some kind of a routine laid on with regard to the revised ordinances. I think that Honourable Members realize that this ten year revision of the ordinances, I may be out a year or two on that, that we used to undertake, is now something that will be an ongoing situation. In other words, the loose-leaf books will be turned out, or the new pages turned out by computer. This should take care of the legislative end of it and hopefully we can do something similar with the regulations. A complete venting of them is a prime prior requisite.

Mr. Chamberlist: Supplementary, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Commissioner would agree that we set a few days aside just to examine all the regulations and remove them as required.

Mr. McKinnon: A few days?

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, let's get a - - -

Mr. McKinnon: How about a few weeks?

Mr. Chamberlist: Well let's get a little done. Some of them for instance, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Commissioner, I don't know if he is aware of them, because I know that Mr. Commissioner signs papers, he doesn't know what he is signing most of the time. One of his officers gives him something to sign. Except for the fact that the regulation is not in the form of a cheque, he would put his name to a cheque as well. This is how easy it is to get the Commissioner's signature. So I wonder Mr. Speaker, whether Mr. Commissioner would agree that we take a certain number of the regulations pertaining to specific ordinances, that perhaps some members have objections to and deal with those and that the administration take the recommendation of the Council as to what the regulations should be.

Mr. Commissioner: I have no objections to this. This is a matter for councillors themselves to decide.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Taylor?

QUESTION RE: YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION FUND

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to Mr. Commissioner this morning and it relates to the Yukon Housing Corporation Funds. It is my understanding that over a period of time they have something like five million dollars that they will be expending. This is strictly hearsay on my part. But I am wondering Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Commissioner could advise me as to whether or not the Government of the Yukon Territory through the Housing Corporation have given consideration to make available monies from this fund or any fund that may be created, in order to offer to the people of the Territory low interest, long term mortgage loans for housing construction of their own design and construction?



MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, JUST TO BACK-TRACK A LITTLE BIT, THE TOTAL AMOUNTS OF MONIES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION WERE CONTAINED IN A SESSIONAL PAPER THAT WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL HERE, ROUGHLY SPEAKING, TWO YEARS AGO. SECONDLY, THE FUNDING OF MONIES FOR PRIVATE HOME CONSTRUCTION. AND I THINK THAT THIS IS THE QUESTION TO WHICH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DIRECTS HIMSELF, IS NOT WRAPPED UP IN THAT FUND. WE ARE IN TWO SEPARATE SCHEMES HERE.

NOW I THINK THAT HONOURABLE MEMBERS WILL RECOLLECT THAT THE TWO MAJOR UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE HOUSING CORPORATION FUNDING WAS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED, WAS THE QUESTION OF EXTENDING CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION FUNDS INTO THE PERIPHERAL AREAS OF METRO WHITEHORSE, SPECIFICALLY, PORTER CREEK. NOW, THIS HAS BEEN OVERCOME. THE NEXT BIG PROBLEM WAS THE QUESTION, AND THIS RELATED TO INCOME AND IT WAS RAISED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST, COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, AND THAT HAD TO DO WITH THE VACUUM THAT WAS CREATED IN THE INCOME LEVELS, I BELIEVE BETWEEN \$9,000 AND \$15,000. IS THAT CORRECT COUNCILLOR MCKINNON?

MR. MCKINNON: SILENT MAJORITY, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: WELL OKAY, THAT'S FINE THEN. WE'LL CALL HIM THE SILENT MAJORITY. NOW, IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THE MOST RECENT MOVES BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE FUNDING OF CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING IS SPECIFICALLY HERE TO TAKE CARE, IN THE RURAL AREAS OF CANADA OF THAT PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE. ITS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THESE MONIES WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE NOW FOR INDIVIDUAL HOUSING SCHEMES OR AS AN INDIVIDUAL TO BUILD A HOUSE WITHOUT THESE INCOME LIMITATIONS. NOW THAT IS THE BEST ANSWER THAT I CAN GIVE TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ON THIS.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WON'T ENGAGE IN A DEBATE OF COURSE ON THIS MATTER, BECAUSE I HOPE THAT EVENTUALLY WE WILL HAVE A REPORT OF THE HOUSING COMMITTEE IN MORE DETAIL THAN THE ONE PAGE REPORT THAT WAS TABLED HERE, AND WE CAN DEBATE IT AT THAT TIME. I AM JUST WONDERING, IS THE COMMISSIONER AWARE OF THE DESPERATE NEED, NOT IN WHITEHORSE AND NOT IN THE PERIPHERAL AREAS AROUND WHITEHORSE, BUT IN THE REST OF THE TERRITORY, BECAUSE BEYOND THE MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE, THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF TERRITORY AND A GREAT NUMBER OF PEOPLE.

I AM JUST WONDERING IF THE COMMISSIONER IS AWARE OF THE DESPERATE NEED FOR LOW INTEREST LONG TERM LOANS FOR PEOPLE TO BUILD HOMES WHO ARE NOT ELIGIBLE UNDER C.M.H.C. FOR LOANS.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS EXACTLY THE POINT THAT I AM MAKING THAT IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WITH THE REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS, THAT THIS PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE WILL BE ABLE TO GET CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION MONEY. AND, MR. SPEAKER, AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, THE BIGGEST SINGLE SOCIAL PROBLEM FACING THE YUKON TERRITORY IS THE LACK OF ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE. YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE A GENIUS OR HAVE A PH.D. FROM HARVARD TO FIGURE THAT OUT. YOU CAN JUST WANDER AROUND THE TERRITORY, YOU DON'T HAVE TO GO ANY MORE THAN A THOUSAND FEET AWAY FROM THIS BUILDING, LET ALONE OUT ON THE PERIPHERAL PARTS OF THE TERRITORY TO RECOGNIZE THIS, MR. SPEAKER.

QUESTION RE: G. K. FISHER-FLEMING

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, AT THE WISH OF THE COMMISSIONER, A SPECIFIC REQUEST OF THE COMMISSIONER THAT WHEN THERE IS A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE SAME MATTER, HE HAS ASKED THAT WRITTEN QUESTIONS BE GIVEN HIM AND WRITTEN ANSWERS BE OBTAINED. SO I HAVE A SERIES OF NINETEEN QUESTIONS ON ONE MATTER THAT I AM GOING TO ASK THE COMMISSIONER AND WRITTEN ANSWERS WILL BE REQUESTED. MR. SPEAKER, THESE QUESTIONS TO MR. COMMISSIONER. THESE QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, G. K. FISHER-FLEMING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: QUESTION 1. MR. FLEMING WAS ADMITTED TO HOSPITAL ON JANUARY 25TH, 1973. HAVE YOU AT ANY TIME SINCE THEN RECEIVED ANY WRITTEN OR VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS INDICATING THAT MR. FLEMING IS READY TO RETURN TO HIS PERMANENT POSITION WITH THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY?

QUESTION 2. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED SUCH ADVICE, WHY IS MR. FLEMING NOT BACK AT WORK?

QUESTION 3. DID YOU AT ANY TIME INFORM MR. FLEMING THAT YOU WOULD NOT PERMIT HIM TO RETURN TO HIS PERMANENT POSITION UNLESS HE HAD A MEDICAL CLEARANCE?

QUESTION 4. WERE YOU ADVISED IN WRITING ON MARCH 2ND, 1973 THAT MR. FLEMING WAS READY TO RETURN TO WORK ON A FULL TIME BASIS PROVIDED



ONLY THAT HE TOOK REASONABLE CARE AND OBTAIN MEDICAL ASSISTANCE SHOULD ANY ADVERSE MEDICAL SYMPTOMS DEVELOP?

QUESTION 5. ARE YOU AWARE THAT MR. FLEMING WAS GIVEN A MEDICAL CLEARANCE ON APRIL 9TH, 1973 TO ACCEPT ANY COMMENCEMENT POSITION WITH THE GOVERNMENT?

QUESTION 6. DID YOU, BY LETTER, ON THE 22ND OF JUNE, 1973 INFORM MR. FLEMING THAT YOU WERE LOOKING AT SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES AND THAT YOU HOPED THAT HE WOULD BE ABLE TO RETURN AT AN EARLY DATE IN ONE OF THESE COMMENCEMENT POSITIONS?

QUESTION 7. DID YOU RECEIVE A LETTER FROM MR. FLEMING, DATED 4TH OF JULY 1973 IN WHICH HE REQUESTED THAT A DEADLINE OF NOT LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 1ST, 1973 BE SET FOR HIS RETURN TO WORK?

QUESTION 8. DID YOU ON AUGUST 28TH, 1973 APPOINT MR. MILLER TO THE PERMANENT POSITION OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER (ADMINISTRATIVE) EVEN THOUGH MR. FLEMING HAD NEITHER RESIGNED NOR HAD HE BEEN RETIRED FROM HIS PERMANENT POSITION?

QUESTION 9. ARE YOU AWARE THAT MR. FLEMING WAS NOT REMOVED FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE UNTIL OCTOBER 4TH, 1973.

QUESTION 10. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH COMMISSIONER'S POLICY NO. 15, WHICH EXPRESSLY FORBIDS THE FILLING OF A PERMANENT POSITION IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE WITH ANOTHER PERSON ON A PERMANENT BASIS, WHILE THE ENCUMBANT IS ON APPROVED SICK LEAVE WITHOUT PAY?

QUESTION 11. DID YOU BY DELAYS AND PROMISES ATTEMPT TO RUN MR. FLEMING OUT OF TIME, SO THAT ON DECEMBER 28TH, 1973 YOU COULD ENDEAVOUR TO RETIRE HIM FOR REASONS OF ILL HEALTH, EVEN THOUGH YOU HAD BEEN IN POSSESSION OF MEDICAL EVIDENCE FOR MANY MONTHS THAT HE WAS FIT TO RETURN TO WORK?

QUESTION 12. DID YOU, IN YOUR DEALINGS WITH MR. FLEMING, TRY TO CIRCUMVENT AND NULLIFY THE PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE, THE PUBLIC STAFF RELATIONS ORDINANCE, THE REGULATIONS MADE PURSUANT TO THESE ORDINANCES AND THE POLICIES OF THE COMMISSIONER AND SEEK THEREBY TO DO BY CALLOUS AND UNLAWFUL MEANS THINGS THAT YOU WERE UNABLE TO DO BY PROPER METHODS?

QUESTION 13. WHAT WAS YOUR PURPOSE IN SO MISUSING THE POWERS OF THE OFFICE TO WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN ENTRUSTED?

QUESTION 14. DID YOU COUNSEL AND DIRECT THE DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL, TO WRITE CERTAIN LETTERS TO MR. FLEMING, IN ATTEMPT TO SERVE HIM WITH SEVERENCE PAPERS AND SEVERENCE PAY? AND IS IT NOT A FACT, THAT THREE SUCH ATTEMPTS WERE MADE AND THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE RETURNED EACH TIME BY MR. FLEMING AND ARE NOW IN A SAFE IN THE OFFICE OF THE TERRITORIAL TREASURER?

QUESTION 15. HAVE YOU BEEN AWARE THAT THE DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL SOUGHT BY MISLEADING ADVICE AND INFORMATION TO ENDUCE MR. FLEMING TO ACT IN A MANNER DAMAGING TO HIS FUTURE?

QUESTION 16. DID YOU, ON FEBRUARY 8TH, 1974 MAKE AN OFFER OF A CONTRACT TO MR. FLEMING TO WORK FOR SIX MONTHS IN OTTAWA AS A YUKON REPRESENTATIVE ON THE PIPELINE ASSESSMENT TEAM? AND HAVE YOU BEEN ADVISED BY MR. FLEMING IN THREE LETTERS THAT HE IS ENTHUSIASTIC TO GET BACK TO WORK, AS SUCH AN IMPORTANT PROJECT, THAT AS A PUBLIC SERVICE, HE IS NOT PERMITTED THE CONTRACT FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, BUT HE AGREES TO BEING SECONDED TO OTTAWA AS A PUBLIC SERVANT.

QUESTION 17. DO YOU DENY THAT IN SO INFORMING YOU, MR. FLEMING HAS SHOWN YOU THAT HIS SECONDEMENT TO OTTAWA WOULD NOT COST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY ONE CENT, BECAUSE THE PORTION OF HIS SALARY NOT FUNDED BY OTTAWA COULD BE PAID BY LONG TERM DISABILITY, IF THEY AGREE THAT THE WORK IS HARD AND HIS REHABILITATION TO FULL EMPLOYMENT?

QUESTION 18. CAN I BE INFORMED OF THE NAME OF THE YUKON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PIPELINE ASSESSMENT TEAM?

QUESTION 19. ARE YOU AWARE THAT IF YOU PERSIST IN DENYING MR. FLEMING THE RIGHT TO RETURN TO HIS PERMANENT POSITION OR TO COMMENCE HIS POSITION WITH THE GOVERNMENT, YOU ARE LEAVING YOURSELF AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, OPEN TO AN ACTION OF VERY SUBSTANTIAL DAMAGES?

THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? MR. TAYLOR?



QUESTION RE: MUNICIPAL AID GRANT FOR FARO

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I BELIEVE IT WAS ABOUT A YEAR AGO, I ASKED A QUESTION OF MR. COMMISSIONER RESPECTING THE VILLAGE OF FARO AND THE MUNICIPAL AID GRANT, POINTING OUT TO HIM THAT THE MUNICIPAL AID GRANT WAS BASED UPON I BELIEVE 863 PEOPLE, I POINTED OUT THAT INDEED THERE ARE SOME 1200 TO 1300 PEOPLE NOW IN FARO. AT THAT TIME I WAS TOLD THAT STEPS WERE BEING TAKEN TO CORRECT THIS SITUATION. I AM WONDERING IF MR. COMMISSIONER, A YEAR LATER NOW, COULD TELL ME WHAT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO CORRECT THIS STATEMENT?

I AM WONDERING IF HE COULD ASSURE ME THAT THE GRANT WILL BE BASED ON AT LEAST 1200 PEOPLE THIS YEAR?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, I CAN'T GIVE THAT ASSURANCE BECAUSE WE HAVE ATTEMPTED BY VARIOUS MEANS TO SEE WHAT COULD BE DONE TO ESTABLISH SOME MEANS OTHER THAN CENSUS WHICH WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS FOR THESE KIND OF POPULATION FIGURES, FOR GRANTS UNDER THE MUNICIPAL AID ORDINANCE AND HAVE GONE UNSUCCESSFUL IN DOING SO, MR. SPEAKER.

I THINK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS ENTITLED TO A WRITTEN REPLY TO THE QUESTION THAT HE HAS ASKED IN MORE DETAIL THAN WHAT I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO GIVE AT THE MOMENT AND THIS WILL BE GIVEN.

MR. TAYLOR: THAT WILL BE VERY MUCH APPRECIATED.

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR STUTTER?

QUESTION RE: MONTHLY NEWSLETTER MAILING LIST

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A TWO PART QUESTION AND HOPEFULLY THE COMMISSIONER COULD ANSWER THE FIRST ONE ORALLY AND THE SECOND ONE I WOULD BE QUITE WILLING TO RECEIVE A WRITTEN ANSWER. THAT IS, FIRST OF ALL DO LIBRARIES THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY RECEIVE THE YUKON TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT NEWSLETTER AND SECONDLY, MAY I HAVE A COPY OF THE MAILING LIST OF THOSE WHO DO RECEIVE THEM?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. SPEAKER, WE WILL GLADLY SUPPLY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WITH A COPY OF THE LISTING OF THE PEOPLE WHO RECEIVE THE NEWSLETTER. I DON'T BELIEVE IT IS SENT OUT TO PUBLIC AREAS. IT IS A NEWSLETTER THAT IS BASICALLY PUT TOGETHER OR WAS ORIGINALLY PUT TOGETHER TO ATTEMPT TO KEEP COUNCILLORS UP TO DATE ON ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE GOVERNMENT AND IS BASICALLY USED FOR THIS

PURPOSE, MR. SPEAKER. LET US SUPPLY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WITH THE MAILING LIST THAT HE HAS REQUESTED AND THEN POSSIBLY IT WILL LEAD TO FURTHER DISCUSSIONS.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. COMMISSIONER A QUESTION. I BELIEVE THAT IT SHOULD BE AN OFFICIAL TOP SECRET, CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT BECAUSE THE COMMISSIONER ASKED THE OTHER DAY, I WAS ASKING THE COMMISSIONER HOW WE WERE EVER GOING TO FIND OUT ABOUT LAND USE PERMITS AND WATER USE PERMITS AND MR. COMMISSIONER SAID - DO THESE THINGS GET REPORTED TO A DEGREE IN THE NEWSLETTER? OR DO THESE NOT APPEAR IN THE NEWSLETTER? AND I ANSWERED TO SOME DEGREE THEY DO. I WOULD LIKE TO INFORM MR. COMMISSIONER TO THE DEGREE THAT THEY DO FROM THE NEW NEWSLETTER, UNDER LAND USE - DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, REGIONAL MANAGER, WATER FORESTS AND LAND - THREE LAND USE APPLICATIONS WERE RECEIVED AND THREE PERMITS ISSUED AND THATS TO THE EXTENT OF THE INFORMATION THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WAS SUPPLIED BY ITS FEDERAL OFFICERS.

MR. SPEAKER, I FIND IT DISGUSTING THAT THATS THE ONLY INFORMATION THAT IS FORWARDED TO THIS HOUSE ON HOW THE LAND AND THE WATER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IS BEING USED. I CAN'T IMPRESS UPON MR. COMMISSIONER TOO MUCH, THAT IT IS DAMN WELL ABOUT TIME THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AND GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY FOUND OUT WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. AND BY MOTION, MR. SPEAKER, IF THAT'S WHAT MR. COMMISSIONER WANTS, TO THE MINISTER ASKING HIM WHETHER HE WILL INFORM THE COMMISSIONER AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AS TO WHAT THE HELL IS HAPPENING IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

QUESTION RE: LAND TITLES ORDINANCE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER COULD INDICATE WHEN COUNCIL IS GOING TO GET THE NEW LAND TITLES ORDINANCE THAT HAS BEEN WORKED ON FOR SOME TWO YEARS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: PERHAPS MR. LEGAL ADVISER MIGHT ANSWER THAT.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: MR. SPEAKER, THE FINAL DRAFT FROM THE LEGAL PREPARATION POINT OF VIEW IS NOW TYPED AND READY FOR ITS MULTIPLICATION, BUT IT HAS NOT YET GONE THROUGH THE OTHER GOVERNMENT CHANNELS WITH A VIEW TO HAVING IT ACCEPTED AS GOVERNMENT POLICY.



MR. CHAMBERLIST: WILL THIS BE FORTHCOMING,  
MR. SPEAKER, MR. COMMISSIONER OR MR. LEGAL  
ADVISOR FOR THIS SESSION?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: NO, MR. SPEAKER, THAT WOULD  
BE TOO SOON.

MR. SPEAKER: WE WISH TO THANK MR. COMMISSIONER  
FOR HIS ATTENDANCE.  
AS THERE ARE NO PRIVATE BILLS AND ORDERS WE COME  
TO PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS.

BILL NO. 2 AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SCHOOL  
ORDINANCE

MR. SPEAKER: WHEN SHALL THE BILL BE READ FOR  
A SECOND TIME?

MRS. WATSON: THE NEXT SITTING DAY.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, WAS THIS NOT THE CASE  
YESTERDAY THAT IT WAS TO BE THE NEXT SITTING  
DAY. I BELIEVE THIS IS THE NEXT SITTING DAY,  
SINCE YESTERDAY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I BELIEVE THAT I HAVE  
THE PEROGATIVE OF DOING THIS WITH THE BILL. I  
CAN SET THE DATE WHEN I WANT, TO GIVE IT  
SECOND READING AND I HAVE SAID TODAY THAT IT  
WOULD BE THE NEXT SITTING DAY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL PERHAPS, MR. SPEAKER, THE  
HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SHOULD  
UNDERSTAND THAT THE WORD AND PROMISE OF SOME-  
BODY ON THE GOVERNMENTS' SIDE SHOULD BE RECOG-  
NIZED. SHE SAID YESTERDAY IT WOULD BE TODAY.  
ITS THE OLD ADAGE THAT TOMORROW NEVER COMES.

MR. SPEAKER: CAN WE PROCEED?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I MOVE SECONDED  
BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT BILL NO. 2 INTITULED  
THE 5TH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74 BE  
GIVEN THIRD READING.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak against the passage of this Bill but not because there isn't recognition that Supplementary Estimates are a normal part of governmental operation when seeking to balance the payments of bills. It is because the Commissioner authorized, not the Executive Committee, the Commissioner authorized the expenditure of funds without the authority of this Council. The Executive Committee authorized that certain studies be carried out. I was a member of the Executive Committee at that time. I know this was done. What was done between the first of October and to date, I don't know what was authorized and what was not authorized. But certainly there was no authority given to the Commissioner to spend money. I am going to be opposed to this Ordinance on the basis that this is of prime importance to every Member of this Council. When it does come to a vote, I want those people to stand up and be counted and to say whether or not they approve to the manner in which these funds were spent. If they don't approve of the manner in which the funds were spent, then they should vote against it on the principles that there was not authority to spend that money. Not to say, "Naughty, naughty, I'll slap your wrists but I'll let it go through this time." A lesson must be taught to the Commissioner which hasn't been taught to him before. The people of the Yukon are fed up with him spending the Government's money without the authority of this legislative body. Mr. Speaker, if it does come to a split vote, I would ask Mr. Speaker to remember that he himself is a representative of the Mayo constituency and that he should vote in that particular way. Not necessarily as Mr. Speaker, but as a member of the Mayo constituency. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, in Committee, of course I had no vote in this matter, but I would like to speak at this time, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very important point. It is one of the greatest cardinal principles of Parliamentary justice that the House should have absolute control over the spending of public money. Bill #2 which we now have before us for the third reading, rather than being a supplementary estimate is indeed a major one. It represents a major interim supply in the amount of nearly \$3,000,000. Of the taxpayers' money. Money that, for the most part Mr. Speaker, is already been spent. Bill #2, now up for third reading Mr. Speaker, contains new programmes embarked upon by this

Administration without getting the necessary approval from this House and represents the spending of public monies contrary to Parliamentary approval and control which is a very, very serious matter. I believe the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West raised the other day the question as raised in Beauchesne and what the Parliamentary authorities say on this matter. I won't repeat it. Under the Financial Administration Ordinance of this Territory, Section 13: "No payments shall be made out of the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund without the authority of the Commissioner in Council." Under 15: "Where public money is by any Ordinance appropriated for any purpose or contracted to be paid by the Commissioner, such public money shall be payable by authority of the Commissioner directed to the Territorial Treasurer out of the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund. But no payments in the excess of expenditures so authorized so should be made." Those monies were allocated from the Main Estimates last year. Anything in excess of that is, quite apart from unforeseen contingencies as contained in 16 where an accident happens to a public work or where things of an urgent nature are required, then we are covered in Supplementary. Also, I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, for the record, to Section 26 of the Financial Administration Ordinance: "It is a term for every contract for payment of any money by the Territory that payment thereunder is subject to there being an appropriation for the particular service for the fiscal year which any commitment thereunder would come in course with payment." Again, we see that the Government has embarked on a new programme, or approved new programmes without approval of this Legislature. Thereby, destroying the effectiveness of this House, Mr. Speaker. It would therefore, be morally wrong for me to condone such a practice for if I did, Mr. Speaker, the Administration could well consider this a precedent for the future by which they could go and tax the people of the Yukon, create new programmes and spend public monies, bypassing this House. Thereby, destroying any semblance of legislative democracy in the Yukon Territory. The people of the Yukon Territory that sent me to this Council would not expect me to vote in favour of such a practice or to lend a hand in the establishment of such a precedent. I cannot, therefore, in conscience, Mr. Speaker, vote to the passage of this Bill, and in the interest of Parliamentary and common justice, I would urge all other Members to refuse passage of this Bill at this time.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I made my comments



DURING DEBATE IN COMMITTEE ON THE BILL. SUBSTANTIALLY, I DO AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST, AND FROM WATSON LAKE. I GOT UP TO PAGE 21 AND UP TO THAT POINT I HAD INDICATED THAT A MILLION DOLLARS TO MY KNOWLEDGE THE LEAST OF THE PROGRAMMES WERE COMING IN UNDER THE GUIDE OF SUPPLEMENTARY THAT I KNOW NOTHING ABOUT AND OF COURSE HAD GIVEN, OR HAD DEBATED IN THIS HOUSE OR HAD BEEN ABLE TO LISTEN TO THE PROGRAMMES PRIOR TO THEM APPEARING IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES. I STAND BY WHAT I SAID IN COMMITTEE THAT SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES ARE DANGEROUS IN UNDERMINING PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY AT THE BEST OF TIMES AND WHEN THEY CONTAIN NEW PROGRAMMES, THEY REALLY CAN BE TERRIBLY DANGEROUS AND FRUSTRATING TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. MR. SPEAKER, FOR THE REASONS THAT WERE STATED AT THAT TIME, AND FOR THE REASONS I STATE NOW, I'LL BE VOTING AGAINST THE SUPPLEMENTARY #4 WHEN THE VOTE IS CALLED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU WOULD CLOSE OFF THE DEBATE IF YOU SPEAK.

MRS. WATSON: OH, I'M SORRY.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, ALL I'M GOING TO SAY IS THAT I'LL JUST REPEAT AGAIN WHAT I SAID IN COMMITTEE YESTERDAY. UNFORTUNATELY I AM TAKING THE POSITION WHERE I AM SLAPPING THE WRISTS OR ATTEMPTING TO SLAP THE WRISTS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, BUT NEVERTHELESS, I AM SUPPORTING THE BILL.

MR. MCKINNON: VOTE AGAINST IT. YOU'LL REALLY SLAP THEM.

MR. STUTTER: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST YESTERDAY ADMITTED MORE THAN ONCE THAT WHILE HE WAS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, HE DID AGREE THAT THE STUDIES SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT BUT HE DID NOT AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS. I DO FIND SOME FAULT IN THAT IT WAS NOT PUT BEFORE COUNCIL BETWEEN THE TIME THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGREED IN PRINCIPLE TO THE STUDIES PRIOR TO THE SPENDING OF FUNDS. I WOULD CAUTION THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE NOT TO GET INTO THIS SITUATION AGAIN IN THE FUTURE, BECAUSE IT DOES APPEAR THAT WE ARE OVERLOOKING THE FUNCTION OF COUNCIL IN APPROPRIATING FUNDS BY GOING, I MIGHT SAY, THROUGH THE BACK DOOR TO SPEND FUNDS THAT HAVEN'T BEEN APPROPRIATED BY COUN-

CIL.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, THE LAST MEMBER JUST POINTED OUT THAT COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST WAS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND WAS PARTY TO MAKING THE DECISION TO IMPLEMENT THESE PROGRAMMES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I RAISE ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. SPEAKER. THAT IS AN OUTRIGHT LIE. I WILL NOT STAND FOR THIS LYING OF THIS MAN. I HAVE MADE IT CLEAR, MR. SPEAKER, THAT I SUPPORTED THAT THERE BE STUDIES MADE, NOT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMMES WHICH IS ONLY SOMETHING THAT THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL CAN AUTHORIZE BY VOTE OF FUNDS. NOW, IF THIS MAN PERSISTS IN THE LIES IN THIS MANNER, MR. SPEAKER SHOULD CORRECT HIM QUICKLY. IT IS A LIE AND I DENY WHAT HE SAYS, MOST EXPLICITLY.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, HOW THE WORM HAS TURNED. THE DECISION TO GO AHEAD WITH THE PROGRAMMES AND THE DECISION TO IMPLEMENT THOSE PROGRAMMES WAS MADE PRIOR TO MY BEING ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THIS MAN INSISTS, MR. SPEAKER, ON USING THE WORD IMPLEMENTATION. OBVIOUSLY, AND I SHOULD PERHAPS BE LENIENT WITH HIM, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY MR. SPEAKER, HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND EVEN THE MEANING OF THE WORD, IMPLEMENTATION AND WHAT IS IMPLIED BY IMPLEMENTATION. IMPLEMENTATION IS IMPLIED WHEN THE PROCEDURE THAT IS REQUIRED TO PUT INTO FORCE A RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TAKES PLACE. AND THAT IMPLEMENTATION IS DONE ONLY WHEN THE MATTER, THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAS BEEN PLACED BEFORE COUNCIL FOR COUNCIL TO VOTE ON THE MONIES. IF THAT IS THE CASE, THAT HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND IT. ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT I REGRET FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THAT THIS MAN IS IN THIS POSITION. EVEN IF HE SAYS, IMPLEMENTATION, AGAIN, I'LL LET HIM CONTINUE, BECAUSE AS I HAVE EXPRESSED, THERE'S NO UNDERSTANDING IN HIS MIND AS WHAT'S BEEN MEANT. I CERTAINLY DID NOT AUTHORIZE IMPLEMENTATION. I AUTHORIZED AND AGREE THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE STUDIES MADE AND GO TO THE COUNCIL FOR IT. THAT'S THE WAY, YOU STUPID ASS.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I MOST HUMBLY APOLOGIZE TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

MR. TANNER: HE MADE A DECISION TO GO AHEAD WITH NEW PROGRAMMES BUT HAVING MADE THAT DECISION, HE SAID WE MUSTN'T FINANCE THEM. GREAT! THE PROGRAMMES IN THAT SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET, THERE ARE TWO OR THREE WHICH HAD TO BE IMPLEMENTED BECAUSE THE NECESSITY WAS THERE. I AGREE WITH SOME MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR ANY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT IN THAT CAPACITY SHOULD NOT IMPLEMENT NEW PROGRAMMES ON A NORMAL ONGOING BASIS. BUT THESE NEW PROGRAMMES WERE ONES THAT HAD TO BE IMPLEMENTED BECAUSE THERE WAS CONDITIONAL MONEY, FEDERAL CONDITIONAL MONEY TIED TO THEM. ON THE PARTICULAR POINT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER RAISES ON THE STUDIES, THERE WAS A VOTE ALREADY IN THE BUDGET IN THE PREVIOUS YEAR AND THAT HAS BEEN EXPANDED. IF THE CRITICISM IS THAT THEY HAVE SPENT TOO MUCH MONEY, FAIR ENOUGH. BUT THAT IS NOT A NEW PROGRAMME.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ...

MR. SPEAKER: WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE TAKE HER SEAT FOR A MOMENT. I HAVE A REQUEST TO MAKE? CAN I HAVE A RECESS FOR A MINUTE OR SO?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

RECESS



MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS SESSION WILL NOW COME TO ORDER.  
 MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THERE SHOULD BE SOME CLARIFICATION ON BILL NO. 2 AND I'M QUITE PREPARED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, THE ANSWERABLE FOR BILL NO. 2.

I BELIEVE IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT AND I BELIEVE VERY STRONGLY THAT IT'S ELECTED PEOPLE ARE APPOINTED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BY MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL. THE ELECTED PEOPLE MUST BE PREPARED TO STAND UP AND ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DECISIONS THEY HAVE MADE.

I AM VERY MUCH PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR APPROVING THE IMPLEMENTATION FOR A NEW FISCAL YEAR OF THE NEW PROGRAMS THAT WERE PRESENTED TO THIS COUNCIL IN BILL NO. 2.

IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT THE OTHER MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHO IS SITTING IN THIS HOUSE TODAY, WHO WAS ALSO PART OF THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS AND WHO ALSO APPROVED THESE NEW PROGRAMS, IS NOT PREPARED TO STAND UP AND ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE APPROVAL THAT HE ALSO GAVE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I RISE ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. SPEAKER. I HAVE ALREADY STOOD UP AND ACCEPTED THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THESE PARTICULAR STUDIES BE CARRIED OUT. I HAVE ACCEPTED THAT. I WILL NOT ACCEPT ANY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE COMMISSIONER SPENDING MONEY WITHOUT COMING TO COUNCIL. I DON'T CARE WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SAYS, MR. SPEAKER, THAT SHE IS JUST TRYING TO DO WHAT I DID OFTEN IN THE PAST, IS COVER UP FOR THE COMMISSIONER.

MR. SPEAKER, MY PRIVILEGE POINT IS THIS VERY CLEARLY. I WILL ALWAYS STAND UP AND ACCEPT ANY KNOCKS THAT ARE COMING MY WAY BUT I WILL NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, ACCEPT THE SUGGESTION THAT I HAVE ALLOWED THROUGH MY POSITION ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, GOVERNMENT FUNDS TO BE SPENT WITHOUT FIRSTLY AUTHORIZATION OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WHICH IS THE ONLY MANNER IN WHICH THE COUNCIL CAN ACT. I WANT THAT POSITION CLEAR. WHATEVER ELSE COUNCILLOR WATSON IS PREPARED TO SAY, FINE AND DANDY BUT I WILL NOT ALLOW HER TO CONTINUALLY SAY, I AM NOT STANDING UP TO MEET MY RESPONSIBILITIES.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I'M NOT GOING TO BELABOR THE POINT, OTHER THAN THE FACT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH WAS NOT ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT THAT

TIME. I AM PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY AND I DON'T KNOW THEN, WHO THE OTHER EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WAS THAT SAT IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND WHO DISCUSSED THE NEW PROGRAM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON ANOTHER POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. SPEAKER, AND I WILL CONTINUE TO DO THIS IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DOESN'T SEPARATE WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AUTHORITY TO GET CERTAIN STUDIES DONE AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THAT AUTHORITY BY SEEKING THE FUNDS FROM THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL. I WILL REPEAT AGAIN FOR HER BENEFIT, IN CASE SHE IS HARD OF HEARING, THAT I HAVE ACCEPTED THE RESPONSIBILITY OF RECOMMENDING IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH HER AND ALL OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT THERE WAS A REQUIREMENT FOR STUDIES TO BE CARRIED OUT IN OTHER COMMUNITIES.

I AM NOT ARGUING AGAINST THE VALUE THAT THESE STUDIES WILL ULTIMATELY HAVE. I SAY SIMPLY THAT I DID NOT AUTHORIZE THE COMMISSIONER TO SPEND THE PUBLIC'S MONEY WITHOUT FIRST COMING TO TERRITORIAL COUNCIL.

MRS. WATSON: I THINK THIS IS AN INDICATION, THE FACT THAT THESE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED, IS AN INDICATION OF THE POWER OF THE ELECTED MEMBER ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE TO THE COMMISSIONER THAT THOSE PROGRAMS, THESE INSTIGATED, THESE FOR THE NEW FISCAL YEAR BECAUSE THEY WERE VERY VALID AND GOOD PROGRAMS. I AM PREPARED TO DEFEND THESE NEW PROGRAMS AND IT WAS ON THE ADVICE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND MORE SPECIFICALLY THE TWO ELECTED MEMBERS WHO WOULD HAVE TO STAND UP IN THIS COUNCIL TO DEFEND THE EXPENDITURE OF THIS MONEY, THAT THE COMMISSIONER AUTHORIZED THE EXPENDITURE OF THAT MONEY. I THINK THAT THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT POINT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. AGAIN, MR. SPEAKER, AN ADMISSION HAS NOW BEEN MADE THAT THE COMMISSIONER DID GO AHEAD AND SPEND THIS MONEY. BUT THAT THE MEMBERS WHO ARE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD STAND UP AND SUPPORT HIM AND SAY THAT 'WE AUTHORIZED HIM TO SPEND THAT MONEY' AND AGAIN I SAY NO. I WILL NOT SAY THAT BECAUSE WE DIDN'T DO THAT. ALL THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DID WAS TO SAY THAT WE REQUIRE CERTAIN STUDIES TO BE DONE BUT THE COMMISSIONER KNOWS UNDER THE AUTHORITY THAT IS INVESTED IN HIM, UNDER THE YUKON ACT, HE HAS TO COME BEFORE THE COUNCIL. HE DIDN'T



DO IT. IT SHOWS SIMPLY THAT HE IS AN AUTOCRAT AND COUNCILLOR WATSON IS TRYING TO BACK HIM UP WHEN SHE SHOULD BE PUNCHING HIM DOWN.

MR. SPEAKER: COULD WE PROCEED WITH THE THIRD READING OF THE BILL?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO THIS BILL. THE OPPORTUNITY WAS GIVEN TO THE OTHER MEMBERS WITHOUT THE INTERRUPTION. I AM JUST TRYING TO INDICATE TO COUNCIL THAT I AM QUITE PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DECISIONS THAT I MAKE IN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I BELIEVE THAT THE PROGRAM, THE NEW PROGRAMS, THAT I DID APPROVE OF ARE VERY, VERY VALID PROGRAMS. I WOULD LIKE TO GO INTO THE EDUCATIONAL BUDGET, THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET, THE ONE PROGRAM THAT WAS APPROVED AND IT WAS BEGUN BEFORE THE NEW FISCAL YEAR, WAS THE REMEDIATION OF THE BASIC SKILLS AND I THINK THIS WAS A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT PROGRAM. TO WAIT UNTIL WE HAD A COUNCIL SESSION TO BEGIN THE PROGRAM, WOULD HAVE DELAYED IT.

AS A RESULT, WE MADE THE DECISION, THE CHILDREN IN OUR YUKON SCHOOLS WHO HAVE LEARNING PROBLEMS, HAVE LEARNING DISABILITIES ARE NOW HAVING THE ADVANTAGE OF HAVING INDIVIDUALIZED TUTORING IN THAT SCHOOL. AND BECAUSE THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WAS GIVEN THE PERMISSION TO EXPEND FUNDS TO BUY THE MATERIALS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I RISE ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE AGAIN. MR. SPEAKER, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KEEPS ON SAYING THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WAS GIVEN THE AUTHORIZATION TO SPEND FUNDS. THIS IS AN UNTRUTH. THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WAS NOT GIVEN THE AUTHORITY TO EXPEND FUNDS. WHY DOESN'T THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, MR. SPEAKER, STAND UP AND SAY 'PERHAPS WE WERE IN ERROR. THEY WERE GOOD PROGRAMS.' I DON'T THINK AT THIS STAGE, ANYBODY HAD ARGUED ABOUT THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM OR THE NECESSITY TO HAVING CERTAIN PROGRAMS. IT IS THE AMOUNT OF MONEY WHICH HAS BEEN SPENT. I WOULD HOPE--

MRS. WATSON: ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE--

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW MRS. WATSON, I'M ALREADY ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. YOU CAN'T STAND UP. OH DEAR, OH DEAR, OH DEAR. MR. SPEAKER, AS LONG AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD RECOGNIZE THE FACT THAT I MYSELF AM NOT--

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE--

MR. SPEAKER: WILL YOU BOTH PLEASE SIT DOWN.

MRS. WATSON: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. MAY I CONTINUE? I WOULD REQUEST THAT --

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. I WAS ON MY FEET.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER--

MR. SPEAKER: WILL YOU BOTH PLEASE SIT DOWN. WILL YOU CONTINUE ON YOUR POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU MR. SPEAKER. I JUST WANT TO... I AM GOING TO FINALIZE BECAUSE I THINK THIS IS GETTING NOWHERE AGAIN. I DO NOT OBJECT, MYSELF TO ANY OF THE PROGRAMS OR THE STUDIES. I HAVE MADE THIS CLEAR. I SIMPLY OBJECT TO THE SUGGESTION THAT IS BEING MADE. THIS IS REALLY THE BASIC OF THE PRIVILEGE. I OBJECT TO THE SUGGESTION THAT HAS BEEN MADE THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WAS AUTHORIZED TO EXPEND THIS MONEY. I WANT IT RECORDED THAT IS WASN'T AUTHORIZED TO DO THAT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER WOULD YOU GIVE ME THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMPLETE WITHOUT THE INTERRUPTION AND IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS A POINT OF PRIVILEGE POSSIBLY HE COULD BRING IT UP AFTER I HAVE COMPLETED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'LL DO IT WHENEVER I WANT. YOU ARE NOT RUNNING THIS--

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER, ORDER.

MRS. WATSON: NEVERTHELESS, I AM PREPARED TO DEFEND THESE PROGRAMS AND I THINK THEY ARE GOOD PROGRAMS. I THINK THESE WERE NEEDED BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT WAS FACED AND I THINK EVERY MEMBER HERE WILL ADMIT, THAT THE GOVERNMENT WAS FACED WITH COMING FORWARD WITH SOME POLICY FOR ASSISTANT MUNICIPALITIES AND SMALL COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE YUKON TERRITORY. FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURE, FOR COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, IT WAS NECESSARY FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO HAVE SOME DEFINED POLICY AND IN ORDER TO ARRIVE AT A POLICY, YOU MUST HAVE SOME STUDIES FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS DONE OF THE VARIOUS SMALL COMMUNITIES. MOST OF THE STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF WHITEHORSE



BUT NOT ALL OF THEM. THIS IS WHY THE APPROVAL WAS GIVEN FOR THE STUDIES TO BE CARRIED ON, TO SPEED UP THIS PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THIS POLICY FOR CAPITAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE MUNICIPALITIES AND COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY. BY DOING THIS, WE HAVE SPEEDED UP THE PROCESS OF PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO THESE PEOPLE BY AT LEAST ONE YEAR. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO MENTION, HONOURABLE MEMBERS, THAT THESE PROGRAMS HAD BEEN APPROVED EARLY LAST SUMMER, PRIOR TO TWO SPECIAL SESSIONS OF COUNCIL THAT WE HAD AT THAT TIME. I FEEL VERY RESPONSIBLE THAT THIS IS THE ONLY AREA I HAVE SOME THOUGHT OF NOT FULFILLING MY OBLIGATION TO COUNCIL, WHEN THESE COULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT DOWN AS PROGRAMS AND THE AUTHORITY AND THE CONCURRENCE OF COUNCIL AT THAT TIME.

I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS BEEN MOST CRITICAL OF THIS SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET, WAS A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT THAT TIME AND HE COULD HAVE BROUGHT THAT SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET OR THOSE PROGRAMS INTO THOSE SPECIAL SESSIONS AT THAT TIME. NOW ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. SPEAKER. NOW, ALTHOUGH THE OTHER WOMAN HAS ASKED SHE BE ALLOWED TO CONTINUE, I WAS QUITE PREPARED TO ALLOW HER TO CONTINUE TO ETERNITY. NOW, WHILE I WAS ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FINANCE THE AMOUNTS OF MONEY TO BE USED FOR THESE SUBJECT MATTERS NEVER CAME FORWARD OR WERE THEY APPROVED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FINANCE, AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DAWSON WILL, I'M SURE, AGREE WITH ME ON THIS POINT. IN ANY EVENT EVEN IF THEY WERE APPROVED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE THIS STILL DOESN'T NEGATE THE NECESSITY FOR BRINGING THE MATTER BEFORE COUNCIL TO DEAL WITH. THAT IS THE POINT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I'M VERY GLAD THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER CLARIFIED IT. HE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY AT THAT TIME BECAUSE THERE WERE TWO SPECIAL SESSIONS OF COUNCIL HELD TO BRING THE MATTER BEFORE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU SAID I WASN'T CHAIRMAN.

MRS. WATSON: HE WAS A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE. NOW THAT IS THE NEW PROGRAM AND I AM PREPARED TO DEFEND THEM, I HAVE A RESPONSIBLE POSITION AND I FEEL A

RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY, AND I FEEL A RESPONSIBILITY TO THE MEMBERS HERE. I AM QUITE PREPARED TO STAND UP AND BE CRITICISED FOR THE DECISIONS I HAVE MADE. I MADE THE DECISIONS BECAUSE I THOUGHT THEY WERE VALID DECISIONS. I THOUGHT THERE WAS A NEED IN THE TERRITORY. THERE WAS A NEED BY OUR CHILDREN, THERE WAS A NEED FOR A POLICY FOR ASSISTANCE FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE COMMISSIONER SPENT THE MONEY.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER.

MRS. WATSON: THE OTHER AREAS OF OVER EXPENDITURE WHICH WERE NOT NEW PROGRAMS AND I THINK I HAVE A VERY VALID REASON FOR THIS. WHILE I DO NOT PERSONALLY APPROVE AND I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYONE IN THIS CHAMBER THAT IS MORE CONSCIOUS OF EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC FUNDS THAN I AM, AND I AM VERY, VERY CAREFUL. IN THE 1971-72 FISCAL YEAR OUR ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ADVISED THE DEPARTMENT HEADS WHEN THEY CAME TO THE MEETINGS REQUESTING FUNDS FOR THE OPERATION OF THEIR DEPARTMENTS THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TO REQUEST FUNDS SUFFICIENT FOR THE OPERATION OF THEIR DEPARTMENTS FOR THAT FISCAL YEAR; THAT THERE WOULD BE NO SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGETS PRESENTED TO COUNCIL. CONSEQUENTLY, THIS WAS FINE AND WE DID NOT BRING ANY FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGETS FORWARD TO COUNCIL THAT YEAR. CONSEQUENTLY ON THE FOLLOWING YEAR WHEN WE EXAMINED THE EXISTING BUDGET OF EACH DEPARTMENT, WE THOUGHT THAT POSSIBLY BECAUSE WE HAD INDICATED THAT THERE WOULD BE NO SUPPLEMENTARY THAT POSSIBLY THE DEPARTMENT HEADS IN MANY AREAS HAD OVER-ESTIMATED THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT THEY WOULD REQUIRE TO RUN THEIR DEPARTMENT. SO WE TOOK THE OTHER TACT AT THAT TIME AND VERY MUCH SO FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1973-74 THAT YOU ONLY COME FORWARD WITH WHAT YOU THINK YOU NEED TO OPERATE YOUR DEPARTMENT. WE DON'T WANT ANY PADDING AT ALL. YOU HAVE TO SAY, YOU HAVE TO ESTIMATE YOUR EXPENDITURES ON THE PAST EXPENDITURES YOU'VE MADE AND IF YOU FIND THAT YOU HAVE NOT ESTIMATED ENOUGH YOU COME BACK TO US AND WE WILL ASK FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY. THAT IS WHY WE HAVE SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS WHO HAVE HAD TO OVER EXPEND THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WE ALLOTTED TO THEM IN THE ESTIMATES IN THE LAST FISCAL YEAR. I THINK THAT THIS DOES HAVE SOME MERIT; THIS DOES NOT ALLOW OR IT DOES NOT FORCE DEPARTMENT HEADS TO PAD

THEIR BUDGET BECAUSE IF THEY EVER PAD THEIR BUDGET IN THE LEAST THE NEXT YEAR THEY WILL BE INCREASING AND INCREASING ON THE PADDING. I WOULD MUCH SOONER, PERSONALLY, TELL A DEPARTMENT HEAD YOU COME FORWARD WITH A REALISTIC BUDGET BASED ON THE EXPENDITURES YOU HAD TO MAKE TO OPERATE YOUR BUDGET THE PREVIOUS YEAR AND ALTHOUGH YOU MAY FIND THAT YOU ARE TROUBLE, AND THERE WERE SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS. CORRECTIONS FOR EXAMPLE, WERE OVER EXPENDED BY \$90,000.00, AND THAT IS A VERY VALID EXPENDITURE BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT BUDGET FOR THE INCREASES THAT WERE NEGOTIATED BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE, AND AS A RESULT THEIR BUDGET IS MAINLY FOR SALARIES AND WAGES. AS A RESULT OF THAT THEY WERE OVER EXPENDED BY A GREAT AMOUNT OF MONEY, AND I HAVE NO MISGIVINGS ABOUT BRINGING THAT FORWARD TO THIS COUNCIL. IT WAS SOMETHING THAT CORRECTIONS COULD NOT FORESEE. IT WAS SOMETHING THAT THEY HAVE TO EXPEND, AND I FEEL THAT I HAVE EVERY RIGHT AS A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO COME BACK TO COUNCIL AND SAY, LOOK, WE FORCED HIM TO COME FORWARD WITH A REALISTIC BUDGET ON THE EXPENDITURE THAT HE KNEW HE HAD TO MAKE. NOW HE'S FORCED TO MAKE MORE EXPENDITURES, WILL YOU GIVE HIM THE \$90,000.00. I HAVE NO QUALMS ABOUT IN SUPPORTING BILL NO. 2 BECAUSE I APPROVED THE PROGRAM, I THOUGHT THEY WERE VALID PROGRAMS, I THOUGHT THEY BENEFITED THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND ALSO I TOLD THE DEPARTMENT HEAD BE REALISTIC. IF YOU NEED MORE MONEY, IF YOU ARE FORCED INTO SPENDING MORE MONEY, WE WILL BRING IT FORWARD TO COUNCIL, AND I'M SURE THAT COUNCIL WILL HAVE NO QUALMS ABOUT APPROVING THE EXPENDITURE OF NECESSARY FUNDS FOR ONGOING PROGRAMS - THINGS THAT WE ASKED OUR DEPARTMENTS TO DO FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY. SO MR. SPEAKER, ON THE BASIS OF THIS I HAVE NO QUALMS WHATSOEVER SUPPORTING THE BILL, AND I WISH THAT ALL HONOURABLE MEMBERS WOULD THINK TWICE BEFORE THEY VOTE AGAINST THE BILL. THESE ARE GOOD PROGRAMS, VERY GOOD PROGRAMS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S NOT THE POINT.

MRS. WATSON: AND, ANY EXTRA EXPENDITURE THAT WAS MADE THAT WAS NOT IN THE ESTIMATES WAS VALID EXPENDITURES, AND MOST OF THEM AS A RESULT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS ORDINANCE AGREEMENT. THEREFORE MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD HOPE THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS HERE WOULD BE ABLE TO SUPPORT THE THIRD READING OF BILL NO. 2.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, JUST BEFORE - RATHER THAN LET THIS PASS APPARENTLY THE MOTION HAS NOT YET BEEN READ FROM THE CHAIR AND, THEREFORE, THERE IS NO MOTION. THE MOTION HAS NOT YET BEEN READ FROM THE CHAIR, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO WE WILL HAVE TO DEBATE IT ALL OVER AGAIN, MR. SPEAKER. I'LL GET ANOTHER CRACK AT THE WHIP.

MR. SPEAKER: I WILL READ THE MOTION. IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH THAT BILL NO. 2, FIFTH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74, BE GIVEN THIRD READING. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. TAYLOR: DIVISION, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAME CLERK, WILL YOU PLEASE POLL THE HOUSE.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE.

MRS. WATSON: AGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST.

MR. MCKINNON: DISAGREE.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE.

MR. TAYLOR: DISAGREE.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON.

MR. STUTTER: AGREED.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM



WHITEHORSE EAST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DISAGREE.

MADAM CLERK: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH.

MR. TANNER: AGREED.

MADAM CLERK: MR. SPEAKER, THE VOTE IS THREE YEA, THREE NAY.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED.*

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, THAT BILL NO. 2 INTITULED "THE FIFTH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74" BE ADOPTED AS WRITTEN.

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, BE INTITULED THE FIFTH APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1973-74, BE ADOPTED AS WRITTEN. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED, AND THAT BILL NO. 2 HAS PASSED THIS HOUSE.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR AND COUNCIL RESOLVE IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR THE PURPOSES OF DISCUSSING BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.

MR. STUTTER: I SECOND IT.

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON, THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSES OF CONVENING IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND

MOTIONS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED, AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE WILL PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

*MR. TAYLOR TAKES THE CHAIR*

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL THE COMMITTEE TO ORDER. WHAT ARE YOUR INTENTIONS THIS MORNING?

MRS. WATSON: COUNCIL MET IN CAUCUS LAST EVENING. IT WAS AGREED BY ALL MEMBERS THAT BILL C 9 WOULD BE THE FIRST ITEM OF DISCUSSION TODAY. IT WAS ALSO AGREED BY ALL MEMBERS THAT BILL NO. 1, THE INTERIM SUPPLY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1974-75, WOULD PASS THIRD READING PRIOR TO ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1974.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS IT YOUR WISH THEN THAT WE PROCEED WITH THE DISCUSSION ON BILL C9?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF MEMBERS MIGHT CONSIDER NOT TO INTERRUPT THE DEBATE WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD BREAK OFF AT 2 O'CLOCK SO THAT WE COULD CONTINUE WITH THE WHOLE DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON. OTHERWISE THE CONTINUITY OF THE DEBATE ITSELF MIGHT BE MISSED. THAT IS JUST A SUGGESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT'S A NORMAL PRACTICE OF COMMITTEE. IT'S NOW 11:35, AND WE WILL CONTINUE AGAIN AT 2:00, AND IF SOMEBODY IS STILL SPEAKING THIS IS THE USUAL ROUTINE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: GOOD, GOOD.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, THE SUBJECT MATTER BEFORE US AT THIS TIME IS THE SUBJECT MATTER RAISED IN MOTION #2, THAT BILL NO. C 9, AN ACT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT, THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT BE DISCUSSED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. WOULD YOU PROCEED.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WAS UPON MOTIONS INTRODUCED BY MYSELF THAT DISCUSSION



OF BILL NO. C 9 WAS MOVED INTO COMMITTEE, AND I THINK THAT ALL MEMBERS HAVE AGREED THAT ANY AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT SHOULD BE TREATED AS A PRIORITY MATTER AND, OF COURSE, THESE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT SHOULD BE TREATED WITH THE IMPORTANCE THAT THEY DESERVE. IN READING BILL C 9, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MUST SAY THAT I HAVE TO BE DISAPPOINTED WITH THE FEW AMENDMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE YUKON ACT. INDEED, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF ONE PERUSES THE BILL HE FINDS THAT THE ONLY STATED CONCESSION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IS THAT TWELVE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL ARE NOW GOING TO BE ELECTED INSTEAD OF THE SEVEN MEMBERS WHICH NOW REPRESENT THE COUNCIL. IF ONE LOOKS AT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT, MR. CHAIRMAN, HE SEES THAT REAL MEANINGFUL STRIDES ARE BEING MADE TOWARDS THE EVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. IN WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL THE 14 MEMBERS FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES' HISTORY, A MEMBER CHOSEN FROM AMONGST THE RANKS OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS TO BE SPEAKER OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES LEGISLATURE. MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE THINGS THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AND THE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAVE HAD FOR SOME SEVENTY YEARS. AND CERTAINLY, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA IS WILLING TO MAKE MEANINGFUL CHANGES TO HER CANADIAN CITIZENS IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES THAT THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE TIME, AND THE TIME IS NOW, A RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT WAS GRANTED TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. MR. CHAIRMAN, THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DEBATED AND DEBATED AT THIS CHAMBER. IN FACT THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DEBATED IN THE YUKON TERRITORY SINCE THE TERRITORY WAS CARVED OUT OF THE OLD NORTHWEST TERRITORIES BY THE ACT AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY. AND, MR. CHAIRMAN, NOTHING OF REAL MEANINGFUL IMPORTANCE HAS BEEN DONE TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN THE YUKON AT THIS TIME. WHAT ARE WE GOING TO HAVE AFTER ALL THE SOUND AND FURY AND ALL THE DEBATES OF THE LAST - OVER SEVENTY YEARS - WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TWELVE MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL INSTEAD OF SEVEN MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. AND WHO DISAGREES WITH THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT NOW FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY? CERTAINLY MR. CHAIRMAN, IT ISN'T THE OPPOSITION MEMBERS. IN FACT THE NEW

DEMOCRATIC PARTY HAS IT AS A PART OF THEIR NATIONAL POLICY PLATFORM. THE NATIONAL CONSERVATIVE PARTY HAS RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT AS PART OF THE NATIONAL CONSERVATIVE POLICY. THE YUKON LIBERAL ASSOCIATION HAS PASSED BY RESOLUTION ASKING FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. MR. CHAIRMAN, WITHOUT A DOUBT THERE IS ONLY ONE GROUP IN CANADA WHO WILL NOT ACCEPT THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT FOR THE YUKON AND THAT UNFORTUNATELY IS THE CABINET OF CANADA, THE FEDERAL LIBERAL CABINET OF THE DAY. I THINK THAT ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HAVE SPOKEN TO GOVERNMENT BACK BENCHERS AND THEY ARE ALL MOST UNANIMOUS IN THEIR SUPPORT OF THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN THE YUKON AT THIS TIME. THE MINISTER TO HIS CREDIT WAS HONEST TO MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WHEN HE ADMITTED THAT THERE IS DIFFICULTY IN PROPOSING THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT TO HIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CABINET COLLEAGUES. THE ADMITTANCE IS THAT IF THERE IS A MAJORITY OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THAT AT THAT POINT IN TIME THERE IS A PROVINCIAL TYPE GOVERNMENT WITH ALL THE PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND ALL THE PROVINCIAL PRIVILEGES. MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS A CONCEPT THAT HAS DELAYED THE INTRODUCTION OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN VARIOUS LEGISLATIVE AREAS THROUGH YEARS OF THE EVOLUTION OF SELF GOVERNMENT IN CANADA. MR. CHAIRMAN, I WROTE MANY YEARS AGO AND I THINK IT IS AS VALID TODAY THAT THE GREAT TRADITIONAL MISUNDERSTANDING IN ANY MOVEMENT TOWARDS RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN CANADA HAS BEEN THE SEMANTIC BARRIER BETWEEN THE SENIOR AND EMERGING GOVERNMENT. THE PEOPLE IN THE TERRITORIES HAVE NEVER HAD DIFFICULTY GRASPING THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS CONSISTENTLY CONSIDERED RESPONSIBILITY SYNONYMOUS WITH AUTONOMY. THE DISTINCTION IS SO IMPORTANT THAT IT DESERVES ALL THE CLARIFICATION POSSIBLE. SECTION 16 OF THE YUKON ACT OUTLINES THE TWENTY-SIX AREAS IN WHICH THE COMMISSIONER OF COUNCIL EXERCISES LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY. HOWEVER, AFTER HAVING PASSED LEGISLATION IN THESE FIELDS THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL HAS NO EXECUTIVE CONTROL OVER THE ADMINISTRATION OF THESE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS. THEY RETURN HOME LEAVING THIS POWER WITH THE COMMISSIONER AND THE TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENT HEADS WHO ARE NOT ELECTED AND, THEREFORE, NOT RESPONSIBLE TO THE PEOPLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS. THIS IS A DENIAL OF THE VERY BASIS ON WHICH DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IS FOUNDED, THAT THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE ARE THE SUPREME GOVERNMENT



AUTHORITY ACCOUNTABLE TO THOSE PEOPLE, THE ELECTORATE WHO HAVE GIVEN THEM THE RIGHT TO GOVERN. THIS RIGHT DOES NOT IMPLY AUTONOMY OR PROVINCIAL STATUS. IT MEANS SIMPLY THAT THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES AND NOT APPOINTED CIVIL SERVANTS MUST FORM THE EXECUTIVE TO SUPERVISE CONTROL AND ADMINISTER THOSE PROGRAMS INITIATED BY LEGISLATION ALLOWED TO BE PASSED BY THE COMMISSIONER IN COUNCIL UNDER THE WELL DEFINED TERMS OF THE YUKON ACT. THE YUKON NOW HAS LEGISLATIVE CONTROL OVER DIRECT TAXATION, MUNICIPALITIES, ELECTIONS, LICENSING, MARRIAGE, PROPERTY AND CIVIL RIGHTS, SOME AREA OF JUSTICE, GAME, EDUCATION, LIQUOR, HOSPITALS, AGRICULTURE AND GENERALLY ALL MATTERS OF A MERELY LOCAL OR PRIVATE NATURE OF THE TERRITORY DESIRING TO LIVE UP TO OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS CITIZENS OF DEMOCRACY.

MR. MCKINNON: WE NOW ASK

THAT THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, AND NOT APPOINTED CIVIL SERVANTS, BE GIVEN CONTROL OVER THE ADMINISTRATION OF THOSE DEPARTMENTS. MR. CHAIRMAN, IS THAT TOO MUCH FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TO BE ASKING IN CANADA OF 1974? SIMPLY, THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXECUTIVE CONTROL OVER THOSE DEPARTMENTS WHERE THEY NOW HAVE LEGISLATIVE CONTROL. AND NOT EVEN THIS BILL IS BEING READIED TO BE PASSED. THE ONLY, ONLY, BODY IN CANADA AGAINST IT IS THE FEDERAL CABINET OF CANADA. ALL OTHER MAJOR PARTIES SUPPORT THIS CAUSE OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. THE BACK BENCHERS OF THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. SO IN THIS DAY AND AGE, ONE GROUP OF PEOPLE IS ABLE AND ARE ALLOWED TO FRUSTRATE THE AIMS, THE LEGITIMATE AIMS, OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, BY MOTION AFTER MOTION, THIS HOUSE HAS PLAYED OUT A BLUE-PRINT FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. WE HAVE ASKED, ISN'T IT REVOLUTIONARY, WE'VE ASKED TO BE KNOWN AS THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY INSTEAD OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. NOT EVEN THAT IS GRANTED BY THE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT. WE ASKED FOR THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TO BE INCREASED TO 15 AND THE TERM OF THE ASSEMBLY TO BE INCREASED TO FOUR YEARS. THIS IS THE ONLY AREA OF THE WHOLE BLUE-PRINT FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT THAT WE HAVE HAD ONE IOTA OF SUCCESS IN. BY THE AMENDMENTS OF THE YUKON ACT, WE NOW SEE MEMBERS GOING TO BE INCREASED TO 12 AND OF COURSE BY THE LAST AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT, THE TERM OF OFFICE WAS INCREASED TO FOUR YEARS.

WE HAVE ASKED THE COUNCILLORS THAT, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION OF THE YUKON HAS ASKED. THE NEW DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION OF THE YUKON HAS ASKED. THE YUKON LIBERAL ASSOCIATION OF THE YUKON HAS ASKED THAT THERE BE AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF NOT LESS THAN FIVE MEMBERS WITH FULL EXECUTIVE POWERS IN THE FOLLOWING CLASSES OF SUBJECTS: EDUCATION, HEALTH AND WELFARE, TERRITORIAL RESOURCES INCLUDING LAND, PUBLIC WORKS, JUSTICE AND CORRECTION, FORESTRY, FISHERIES, ALL RESIDUAL EXECUTIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS INCLUDING INDUSTRY AND LABOUR CONTROLLED OR PERFORMED BY THE GOVERNMENT. AND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TO HAVE EXCLUSIVE LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION TO MAKE ORDINANCES FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY IN RELATION TO THE ABOVE CLASSES OF SUBJECTS IN ADDITION TO THE LEGISLATIVE POWERS EXISTING IN SECTION 16 OF THE YUKON ACT. AND, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT IS THE ANSWER FROM THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, MR. CHRETIEN. MR. CHRETIEN, IN THE ACT ITSELF, REMAINS MUTE ON THE FORMATION BY LEGISLATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. HE STATES, AND I QUOTE, FROM PAGE 607 OF THE HANSARD DEBATES OF MARCH 18TH, 1974: "IT IS MY INTENTION TO COMPLEMENT THE LARGER COUNCIL BY INCREASING THE NUMBER OF ELECTED COUNCILLORS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FROM TWO TO THREE. IN SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT, THE COMMISSIONER WOULD REMAIN CHAIRMAN. BUT DURING THE LIFE OF THE NEXT COUNCIL, IT MAY BE DESIRABLE TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF APPOINTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND I WILL CONSULT THE COUNCIL ABOUT THIS. ANY REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WOULD LEAVE THE ELECTED MEMBERS IN A MAJORITY POSITION." SO THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT HANGS ON THE WHIM AND THE THREAT OF A PROMISE OF THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT WHO ADMITS HIMSELF THAT HE MAY BE REPLACED AS MINISTER IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS THE PRIME AND ABSOLUTE CONCERN OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AT THIS TIME, AND INDEED ALL PEOPLES OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. THAT THE TIME IS NOW, THAT THE YUKON ACT AND ITS AMENDMENTS NOW SHOULD HAVE DELINEATED THAT AT THIS TIME, AT LEAST, AT LEAST, MR. CHAIRMAN, MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS ON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WOULD BE MEMBERS CHOSEN FROM THOSE ELECTED TO THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HAVE HEARD MR. MINISTER SAY THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA IS NOT READY TO ACCEPT EVEN THIS CON-



CEPT AT THIS TIME. NOT A TOTAL OF AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR AN EXECUTIVE COUNCIL FROM AMONGST THE ELECTED MEMBERS BUT JUST A MAJORITY AND THE REASON THAT THIS CANNOT BE DONE AT THIS TIME, THAT THIS WOULD BE PROVINCIAL STATUS AND OF COURSE, MR. CHAIRMAN, TO MR. MINISTER AND TO HIS COLLEAGUES WHO THINK THIS WAY, ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT IT'S TOO BAD THAT THEY DON'T LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN CANADA JUST A LITTLE CLOSER.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE ASKED THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TO BE INCREASED FROM 15 TO 21 OR SUCH GREATER NUMBER AS THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MAY DETERMINE AT THE EXPIRATION OF TWELVE YEARS FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT IMPLICIT IN THE RESOLUTION. ALL NECESSARY AND OTHER CHANGES ARE TO BE AFFECTED TO CONSTITUTE THE PROVINCE OF THE YUKON WITH THE SAME LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE POWERS AS THOSE WHICH EXIST IN THE OF CANADA.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I FIND THIS OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE AND I WAS GLAD TO HEAR THE SUPPORT OF THE OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WHEN THE MINISTER WAS IN WHITEHORSE ON THIS SUBJECT.

WHAT A GALLING INSULT TO EVERY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, THAT THE RIGHT WHICH IS GIVEN TO THE FEDERAL PARLIAMENT THE RIGHT WHICH IS GIVEN TO EVERY PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE IN CANADA, THE RIGHT TO CONTROL THEIR OWN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, IS NOT EVEN WILLING TO GO THAT FAR IN THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY. HOW STUPID THEY MUST FEEL, EVERY PERSON OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IS, THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, THROUGH THEIR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES CANNOT SET THE SIZE OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENS IN CABINET MEETINGS, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK I WILL EVER HAVE THE ADVANTAGE OF SITTING IN ONE. WE MUST JUST BE CONSIDERED, THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE NORTH OF CANADA'S 60, TO BE ILLITERATE, INARTICULATE AND INCAPABLE OF DOING ANYTHING FOR OURSELVES WHEN WE CAN'T EVEN SET THE SIZE. THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC IS THERE SO THE PUBLIC ARE CONSIDERED NOTHING. ALSO WE CAN'T EVEN SET THE SIZE.

1974 FOR THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, AND IF THERE IS ONE AREA, EVEN IF ALL MEMBERS, OR IF THERE IS A DISAGREEMENT ON THE TWELVE MEMBERS,

THAT WE SHOULD BE UNITED ON, IS THE SLAP ON THE FACE TO EVERYONE OF OUR CONSTITUANTS BY SAYING THE PRIVILEGE AND THE RIGHT THAT ALL OTHER CANADIANS ENJOY OF SETTING THE NUMBERS AND CONTROLLING THEIR PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA DOESN'T SAY, THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON ARE READY TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF DOING THIS NOW,

MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE ALSO ASKED THAT MEMBERS BE GIVEN ALL NECESSARY AUTHORITY ANALOGOUS TO THAT IN PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TO ESTABLISH THEIR INDEMNITIES AND ALLOWANCES AND TO HAVE ALL THE REQUISIT POWERS TO ESTABLISH OR PARTICIPATE IN A PENSION PLAN OR A GROUP HEALTH PLAN. FOR THE LAST AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT, THE SMALL CONCESSION OF BEING ABLE TO ESTABLISH THEIR INDEMNITIES AND ALLOWANCES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED, AS OF YET WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED THE REGULATORY POWERS NECESSARY TO ESTABLISH OR PARTICIPATE FOR MEMBERS IN A PENSION PLAN OR A GROUP HEALTH PLAN.

THEN, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE ASKED THAT SECTION 24, THAT MOST ABHORANT PIECE OF THE YUKON ACT THAT ALLOWS THE RIGHT TO INTRODUCE MONEY BILLS ONLY FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE COMMISSIONER, BE REPEALED. WHAT DOES THE MINISTER HAVE TO SAY ABOUT THIS. ON PAGE 608, IN HANSARD OF MARCH THE 18TH, 'SOME ADVISORS QUESTION THE RELEVANCE OF THE PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE APPROPRIATION OF PUBLIC FUNDS, CONTAINED BOTH IN THE YUKON ACT AND THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT. HERE IS THE PROVISION. IT IS NOT LAWFUL FOR THE COUNCIL TO ADOPT OR PASS ANY VOTE, RESOLUTION, ADDRESS OR BILL FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF ANY PART OF THE PUBLIC REVENUE OF THE TERRITORIES OR OF ANY TAX OR IMPOST TO ANY PURPOSE THAT HAS NOT BEEN FIRST RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL BY MESSAGE OF THE COMMISSIONER IN SESSION OF WHICH SUCH VOTE, RESOLUTION, ADDRESS OR BILL IS PREPOSED.'

MR. SPEAKER, HONOURABLE MEMBERS ARE AWARE THAT THIS PRINCIPLE IS EXPRESSED IN ALMOST IDENTICAL TERMS IN THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT. THIS PRINCIPLE APPLIES TO BOTH PARLIAMENT AND PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN I USED TO EXERCISE IN DEBATING EXERCISES, THAT WAS BATING THE QUESTION AND IF THE MINISTER HAS EVER TRIED TO PULL THE WOOL OVER PARLIAMENT'S EYES AND THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, BY BATING THE QUESTION, THIS IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF IT.



OF COURSE, THIS PRINCIPLE APPLIES TO BOTH PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, BUT WHO IS IN THE CONTROL OF PARLIAMENT AND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY? THE CABINET OF THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THE CABINET OF CANADA, ALL ELECTED MEMBERS. NOW THE MINISTER, A STUDENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, COULD TRY AND PULL THIS ONE OFF IN THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA, IS I AM AFRAID TO SAY, ANOTHER PRETTY OBVIOUS INSULT TO THE INTELLIGENCE OF BOTH THE PEOPLE HE IS DEALING WITH IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND THE PEOPLE HE IS DEALING WITH IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE ASKED THE STATUS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY BE ENLARGED SO THAT IT SHALL HAVE FULL CAPACITY TO ATTEND ALL INTER-PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCES AND TO PARTICIPATE IN RESULTING DISCUSSIONS AND GRIEVANCES.

THE ONLY CONCESSIONS WE HAVE HAD IN THIS REGARD IS WHEN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS HAVE BEEN STRONG ENOUGH AND BOLD ENOUGH TO FORCE THEIR WAY INTO PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL CONFERENCES RATHER THAN HAVING THE RIGHT AND THE PRIVILEGES TO BE SITTING THERE AS FULL-FLEDGED MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN THE DELIBERATIONS ON THE FUTURE OF CANADA. EVEN THIS RIGHT HASN'T BEEN ALLOWED BY THE AMENDMENTS OF THE YUKON ACT,

THE LAND TITLES ACT, TO BE REPEALED IN RESPECT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AND REPLACED BY A LAND TITLES ORDINANCE. EVEN THE MINOR SQUARE MILE WHICH ARE RELATIVELY SO INFINITESIMAL OF YUKON LAND THAT IS NOW UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE COMMISSIONER HAS TO GET TITLE FROM OTTAWA, FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. WE CAN'T EVEN HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY IN CANADA OF 1974 OF HAVING A LAND TITLES ORDINANCE FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY THAT CAN ISSUE TITLE TO THAT LAND WHICH IS UNDER CONTROL OF THE COMMISSIONER.

FINALLY, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE ASK THAT ALL CROWN LANDS BE HELD IN THE NAME OF THE CROWN IN THE RIGHT OF THE TERRITORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, EXTREMELY IMPORTANT AT THIS TIME, THAT THE BENEFITS OF THE RESOURCES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON ARE GOING TO BE DEVELOPED FOR THE PRIOR RIGHT AND THE PRIOR BENEFITS OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE LIVING HERE, RAISING THEIR FAMILIES AND DEVELOPING THOSE RESOURCES HERE.

WE CANNOT EVEN GET INTO CONSIDERATION HERE AT THIS TIME, THAT THESE RESOURCES ARE TO BE HELD

IN THE RIGHT OF THE TERRITORY FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY TO LIVE IN.

AFTER ALL THE YEARS OF ASKING, AFTER ALL THE YEARS OF DEMANDING, AFTER ALL THE YEARS OF BEGGING, WHAT HAVE WE GOT OUT OF THE DEMANDS THAT EVERYBODY IN CANADA IS MAKING TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. WE HAVE GOT AN INCREASE FROM 7 TO 12 MEMBERS AND THAT IS IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I HAVE SAID AT THE BEGINNING, I COULDN'T BE MORE DISAPPOINTED WITH WHAT I SEE IN THE AMENDMENTS OF THE YUKON ACT. I AM HAPPY FOR OUR BROTHERS IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES THAT THEY ARE FINALLY GETTING SOME MEANINGFUL REFORMS TOWARDS RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. I WILL NEVER BE PERSUADED OTHERWISE, THIS IS TIME FOR THE MINISTER TO ACT AND GRANT FULL RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT TO THE YUKON TERRITORY AS IN THESE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT. OF COURSE, THIS IS THE STAND THAT I'VE TAKEN CONSISTENTLY OVER THE YEARS AND ONE WHICH I WILL NOT BE SWAYED FROM.

IN CONCLUSION, MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT OUT OF THE DEBATE TODAY, I WOULD HOPE THAT PERHAPS THE TENDER WOULD BE, WE'LL GRASP AT EVERY LITTLE CRUMB THAT WE CAN GET BUT IT STILL ISN'T ENOUGH. IT'S NOT WHAT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON WANT. IT'S NOT WHAT WE THINK WE ARE READY FOR AT THIS TIME. WE CAN'T AGREE TO THE CONCEPT OF A FORMULA FOR INCREASING THE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. THIS RIGHT HAS TO BE GIVEN TO THE MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ACTING THROUGH THEIR CONSTITUENTS, THE SAME RIGHT THAT HAS BEEN GIVEN TO EVERY OTHER PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE AND WITH THAT AMENDMENT WE CAN ACCEPT WHAT IS IN THE YUKON ACT. BUT SAY THAT NOWHERE, NOWHERE DOES IT COME NEAR FULFILLING THE ASPIRATIONS AND A LEGITIMATE DESIRE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT NOW FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY.

THANK YOU.

RECESS



Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this time I will call Committee to order. Councillor Stutter would you take the Chair?

Mr. STUTTER: Yes, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. CHAIRMAN at long last we have got to the point where we can hopefully offer some direction to the Committee in Ottawa in this matter and no doubt the journals of the debate today, this morning and this afternoon, would be taken into account by the Committee in addition to any representations that may be forthcoming by individuals to the Committee by appearance. But, I have taken some considerable time to consider Bill C-9 and I think to remind ourselves when we get down to any debate that will come out of this discussion, that there are several things to keep in mind. I think that in my mind, in looking at this amendment, I still refer back to the often quoted statement from Justice Sissons in where he establishes, in law at least, the real position that the Yukon Territory is constitutionally in and without restating the whole thing I just quote: "I know of no Government of the Yukon Territory distinct from the Commissioner or the Commissioner in Council and the home Government of the colony is the Government of Canada." So, to my mind, and I think the mind of others we are reasonably sure of our position as a colony. This being the case I would refer you back to international covenant on economic, social and political rights under the charter of the United Nations which states that the state parties to the present covenant which, of course, includes the Government of Canada, including those having responsibility for the administration of non-self-governing and trust territories shall promote the realization of the right of self determination and shall respect that right in conformity with the provisions of the charter of the United Nations. I don't think that; you know, as I have stated this, Mr. CHAIRMAN, on several occasions, I don't think that should be overlooked because it is quite a commitment by the Government of Canada as a signatory to an international covenant. As we all know both the motions referred to by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West this morning, Motion No. 40 of 1966 and Motion No. 1 of 1968 have been considered by the Standing Committee who now consider this Bill and they express the general desire of successive Councils really before them and

following them. This Council has gone on record as supporting advancements and constitutional reform as well. It would be well to remember that the whole question arose back in 1971/72 when the Joint Senate and House of Commons Committee on the Constitution of Canada came to the Yukon and inquired into what we thought about our position as Canadians among other Canadians. They noted that, and I quote "It is important for all Canadians who understand that northern Canadians, those who live in our two territories do not have exactly the same relationship to the institutions governing them as Canadians living in provinces do." It further noted and recommended, Mr. CHAIRMAN, "that we feel that the best approach would be for the Government of Canada to make the following commitments to its northern citizens. That the object of northern policy is to foster fullest self-government and provincial status for the two territories. Administrative and legislative policies in so far as they concern the structure of the government in the North should be tested against and advance this objective." At the same time they proposed the Yukon and the Northwest Territories should be each entitled to representation in the Senate. As we know, Bill No. C-11 is ready for final passage in the House of Commons to implement at least that one measure of constitutional advancement.

Now, in the fourth report of the Standing Committee of 1973, late '73 the Committee which of course, we all know is composed of many partisan beliefs, submitted as follows in their fourth report: "While considering the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1974 under the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, your Committee agreed to report the following to the House." And this is the report, and I think it is very, very significant. "Your Committee recommends that the repeated requests to the Yukon Territorial Council for government reform at the territorial level be granted and that Resolution No. 40 of the Council, submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development be accepted by the Government and that the Government consider the advisability of introducing appropriate amendments to the Yukon Act." This was a Motion of Council. I would say that that has been for the people of Yukon, a real step forward. In an appearance before the Standing Committee, Mr. CHAIRMAN, just before Christmas, I endeavoured on behalf of those I represent in the Watson Lake constituency, to make three major points. Just three out of the many and they were these. That the Government of



THE YUKON TERRITORY MUST BE ESTABLISHED AND DEFINED AS SUCH AND GIVEN ALL THE NECESSARY POWERS TO GOVERN UNDER THE YUKON ACT. Now, nowhere in the amendments before us and under consideration do I find any attempt being made to, in fact, style the Government of the Yukon Territory. Indeed, in one part, I believe it's Part 6, the amendment calls for giving the power over the control of lands, so forth, to the Commissioner rather than the Government of the Yukon Territory. In other words, what I'm attempting to say, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment doesn't go far enough to recognize any government for the Yukon Territory as such. The Government is a small "G" Government still. I was hopeful that the amendment might cure this.

Another second recommendation was that the Council of the Yukon Territory may be known and styled as the Yukon Legislative Assembly and its membership be sufficiently enlarged as to permit the development of a cabinet form of government therefrom and any further enlargement of the same must henceforth be at the discretion of the Yukon Legislative Assembly. Now we, in viewing the amendments, do not find any reference in styling the Yukon Legislative Assembly. It is proposed in the amendment that we shall enlarge the Council which I feel is a move forward, however, I have some reservations on Part 2. It is clear that no form of cabinet government that will at this time emerge from these amendments. I will have something to say on Part 2; enlargement of Council, at a later point.

My third recommendation at that time for the Standing Committee was that if a form of Executive Committee concept was to be considered as a transitional stage, such Committee should be composed of the majority of elected members and the powers to administer must be established and defined under the Yukon Act.

These, Mr. Chairman, were three of the more principle points that I felt should have been embodied in the drafting of what is now Bill C-9. It was not felt advisable, I would suppose, by the Government because it does not appear.

Finally, at this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention to question and answer section following the Committee hearings here in Whitehorse prior to Christmas where I was asked the following questions by Mr. Nielsen, following my presentation. He said, "If this Committee were asked to recommend to

the House of Commons, that the House consider adopting in a Motion of January 23rd, 1968, that is Motion No. 1. And to bring about appropriate changes in the Yukon Act, would you be in favour of such a motion as meeting with requests of the people of the Yukon?" At that time, I answered this: I would be and I am sure, and I am speaking for those I represent, I'm quite prepared to say that we would accept any meaningful reform and if that is the best we can get, fine, we support it whole heartedly. But we are attempting to impress upon Committee, Mr. Chairman, that we are looking now for a cabinet form of government. That was my stand at that time. I also, in answer to a question from Mr. Barnett, stated to answer the first part of Mr. Barnett's question which was related to provincehood. I hope I did not imply in the brief that we are at this time interested in provincehood. We do feel that to achieve the provincial status we must first prove that we have responsible government and that we can make it work. I think most members would agree with that philosophy. So there is was and here we are. We have before Committee Bill C-9. I would like for a moment, Mr. Chairman, to take a look at Bill C-9.

Part 1 of Bill C-9 deals with the enlargement of the Council of the Yukon Territory to 12 members. In this I must say, as representative of the Watson Lake constituency, we agree. I also think at this time, Mr. Chairman, it is important that we deal as swiftly as possible with the establishment of judicial redistribution procedures by establishing the Committee and I would hope that that Bill would be forthcoming as quickly as possible.

Under Part 2 I have a great deal of difficulty and I can honestly say that I do not agree in any way, shape or form with Part 2 being the enlargement of Council beyond the 12 members referred to in Part 1. This is tied to a census; this is I think no longer the business of the House of Commons or of the Government of Canada. This is the prerogative of the Legislative Council of the Yukon Territory. When the Minister was in Whitehorse this matter was discussed and I think he has been made aware of those members who are in deference to this particular section. I feel it must be modified. I feel modified to the extent that I have outlined.

In Part 3 it states the Council shall elect one of its members to be Speaker and (2) the Speaker shall preside over the Council when in session.



I CONSIDER AND I CAN ONLY CONSIDER THAT THIS IS A HOUSEKEEPING TYPE OF AMENDMENT BECAUSE IF YOU LOOK AT SECTION 13, I BELIEVE IT IS, SECTION 13 OF THE YUKON ACT, ALSO WRITTEN IN 1898, RECOGNIZES THE EXISTENCE OF A SPEAKER WHEN IT STATES THAT A MAJORITY OF THE COUNCIL INCLUDING THE SPEAKER CONSTITUTES A QUORUM. SO I CONSIDER THIS TO BE A HOUSEKEEPING PART.

NOW, IN PART 4 WE HAVE A PROBLEM RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT AND DESIGNATING THE COMMISSIONER IN COUNCIL IN RELATION TO THE OPERATION OF PRISONS, JAILS, AND LOCK-UPS DESIGNATED AND I FIND THAT ALSO A HOUSEKEEPING SECTION.

PART 5, I FIND SOMEWHAT BEWILDERING BECAUSE I HAVE NOT THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND OR READ THE FRENCH LANGUAGE. HOWEVER, I AM TOLD THAT THIS IS A HOUSEKEEPING MATTER BRINGING INTO LINE THE APPROPRIATE SECTION, THE FRENCH VERSION OF THE YUKON ACT IN LINE WITH THE SAME STATEMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT. AND I CANNOT COMMENT BEYOND THAT ON THAT SECTION BUT I AM LED TO BELIEVE THAT THIS IS ALSO A HOUSEKEEPING SECTION.

PART 6 IS, OF COURSE, ANOTHER HOUSEKEEPING SECTION IN RELATION TO CHANGES MADE IN PART 4.

PART 7, I HAD A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFICULTY WITH. I LOOKED FOR MOTIVES, I LOOKED AT MANY AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION IN RESPECT TO THIS. IT HAS NOT BECOME ABUNDANTLY CLEAR TO ME BECAUSE IT IS SO OBVIOUS TO ME NOW THAT IN AS MUCH AS THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AS I STATED EARLIER AND I THINK WE ALL AGREE, THERE IS NO LEGAL ENTITY TO HOLD LAND IN THE TERRITORY. SO THE ONLY LEGAL ENTITY WOULD BE THAT IN THE NAME OF THE COMMISSIONER. AND THIS IS INDEED WHAT IT IS DOING. SO THIS I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH. SO IT BRINGS US BACK TO AND WE'VE TALKED A GREAT DEAL ABOUT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT, I WON'T GO INTO THAT OF ANY LENGTH, AS I SAY, I'M DISAPPOINTED THAT WE DON'T AS YET HAVE ANYTHING WHICH WOULD HAVE THE SEMBLANCE TO RELATE TO A CABINET FORM OF GOVERNMENT, MR. CHAIRMAN. I HAD A FEAR THAT IT MAY BE THAT WITH THE MINISTER DECLARING THAT WE MAY HAVE THREE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ELECTED FROM COUNCIL AND APPOINTED BY THE COMMISSIONER TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT HE MAY WISH TO REMOVE THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SECTION. UNFORTUNATELY I DO NOT SEE ANY AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD BRING THIS ABOUT. I THINK IT'S VERY, VERY IMPORTANT THAT THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY PROVISIONS IN THE ACT SHOULD BE LEFT. THAT IS IN SUB-

SECTION 12 OF THE YUKON ACT. I THINK THAT IT BEHOOVES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THIS IS AT THE GOVERNMENT LEVEL RATHER THAN THE PARLIAMENTARY LEVEL THAT DURING THE COURSE OF COUNCIL, SHOULD THESE AMENDMENTS BE ACCEPTED BY PARLIAMENT TO PROVIDE THIS COUNCIL WITH MORE LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDANCE THAT IS SO THAT THEY MAY HAVE THEIR OWN STAFF, IT MAY HAVE ITS OWN LEGAL ADVISER, ITS OWN CLERK, ITS OWN SERGEANT-AT-ARMS AND FUNCTION UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE. INDEPENDANT FROM ANY RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OTTAWA ORIENTATED ADMINISTRATION. I THINK IT WOULD MAKE FOR A HEALTHIER POLITICAL CLIMATE IN THE YUKON AND WOULD BE A REAL STEP FORWARD IN OUR LEGISLATURE. CLOSER TO THE REAL MEANING OF LEGISLATURE IN THE PARLIAMENTARY SENSE. I HAD INTENDED ON MAKING COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND HOW THE INFLUENCES OF PARTY POLITICS COULD SEVERELY DAMAGE ANY ATTEMPT MADE TO CONSIDER RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT AS BEING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT. BECAUSE ALREADY WE HAVE THE INTERFERENCE OF TWO GOVERNMENTS

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND AN ARM OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WHICH IS THE ADMINISTRATION THAT WE HAVE IN THE TERRITORY HERE, AND WITH THE INVOLVEMENT, AT LEAST FROM THE VIEW POINT OF AN INDEPENDENT MEMBER OF A POLITICAL PARTY, ALSO TELLING YOU WHAT TO DO AND WHAT NOT TO DO, I THINK YOU CAN SEE HOW THE WHOLE THING WOULD BE ABSOLUTELY DESTROYED AND THROWN IN CHAOS. I WOULD SINCERELY HOPE THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN. AS A MATTER OF FACT, I LISTENED TO AN INTERVIEW WITH THE MINISTER ON C.B.C. WHILE DRIVING TO THIS SESSION AND HE AGREED WITH THE SAME PREMISE, SO I WILL SAY NO MORE THAN THAT.

I WOULD AGREE WITH THE AMENDMENT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PART II. NOW PART II MUST BE AMENDED AND I WOULD HOPE THAT A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE OR THE MINISTER HIMSELF OR AT HIS DIRECTION WOULD GIVE VERY SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO AMENDING PART II TO PROVIDE, FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TWELVE MEMBER COUNCIL, THAT ANY FURTHER INCREASES OR DECREASES IN THE SIZE OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BE THE PREROGATIVE OF THE COUNCIL.

I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT TO THE EDIFICATION OF MEMBERS AND THE MINISTER OR WHO EVER MAY READ THE SECTIONS OF THIS DEBATE, THAT THE MINISTER HAS UNDER SECTION 20 SUBSECTION 2, STILL THE RIGHT OF CONTROL NOTWITHSTANDING THAT THIS LEGISLATURE IS GIVEN THE RIGHT UNDER THE YUKON ACT TO INCREASE ITS SIZE AND ITS NUMBER OF SEATS. SUBSECTION 20 (2) STATES -



'ANY ORDINANCE MADE AFTER THE COMING INTO FORCE OF THIS SUBSECTION, OR ANY PROVISION OF SUCH ORDINANCE MAY BE DISALLOWED BY THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL AT ANY TIME WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER ITS PASSAGE.' THE INCREASE BY THIS COUNCIL COULD ONLY BE DONE BY AN ORDINANCE OR AN ACT, AND THE POWER OF DISALLOWANCE IS CLEARLY THERE. I WOULD THINK THAT POSSIBLY IT MAY HAVE ESCAPED THE ATTENTION OF THOSE WHO HAVE DRAFTED THIS PIECE OF LEGISLATION, BUT I OFFER IT AS A SUGGESTION AND AN ARGUMENT WHY. WE SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BE GIVEN THE RIGHT TO ENLARGE OUR OWN LEGISLATURE.

I WOULD SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IN CLOSING, THAT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SECTION (2) AND WITH THE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2, I WOULD CLEARLY AND WHOLEHEARTEDLY SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT CONTAINED IN BILL C-9 THAT MY WHOLEHEARTED CONCURRENCE WITH EVERY PART OF THE BILL. I SAY AGAIN, I DON'T FEEL ITS GONE FAR ENOUGH, BUT AS I STATED AT THE, BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MY LAST APPEARANCE BEFORE THEM, THAT WE WOULD CERTAINLY AGREE WITH ANY MEANINGFUL ADVANCES AND AMENDMENTS IN RESPECT OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. I AM CONSISTENT IN THAT ENDEAVOUR AND I DO HOPE UPON HOPE, THAT THIS PIECE OF LEGISLATION CAN BE IMPROVED ON BEAUTIFULLY. BUT I DO HOPE THAT WHEN IT DOES GET INTO COMMITTEE AND BEFORE THE COMMONS, THAT IT DOES NOT BE LOST, EITHER WITHDRAWN OR DEFEATED, BECAUSE WE WOULD HAVE LOST A GREAT GREAT GREAT DEAL OF WORK AND EFFORT WOULD HAVE GONE DOWN THE DRAIN IN RELATION TO BRINGING TO THE YUKON A GREATER MEASURE OF ECONOMY. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

I WILL RESUME THE CHAIR.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE I SPEAK ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT IN BILL C-9, I WOULD LIKE TO PREFACE THOSE PARTICULAR THOUGHTS I HAVE BY GOING BACK A LITTLE BIT, JUST A SHORT WHILE INTO HISTORY, BECAUSE OF SOME REMARKS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST.

I WANT FIRSTLY, TO CLEARLY INDICATE THAT WHAT I WILL BE SAYING WILL NOT BE BASED ON POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP OR PARTY DISCIPLINE IN ANY MANNER.

THE REASON WHY I WANT TO PREFACE MY REMARKS IN THIS WAY IS BECAUSE I MUST GO BACK TO WHEN THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IN THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

DURING THE YEARS OF THE DIEFENBAKER ADMINISTRATION HAD THE MOST OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF ANY GOVERNMENT IN THE HISTORY OF CANADA. THEY DID NOT TAKE THE STEPS TO CREATE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT WHICH WOULD HAVE PERHAPS AT THIS TIME, BROUGHT FORWARD THE NECESSARY CHANGES THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON ARE SEEKING TODAY. I SAY THIS BECAUSE ALTHOUGH THEY HAD PASSED AND CHANGED THE ACT TO INCREASE THE MEMBERS OF THE YUKON TERRITORIAL COUNCIL FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND INSTITUTE AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FINANCE AS A STATUTORY COMMITTEE, NO PROVISION WAS MADE WITHIN THE LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR EXECUTIVE FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE FUTURE. WHEN I READ IN THE HANSARD OF CRITICISMS BY A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT AND OTHER MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT OF THIS PARTICULAR PARTY, RELATING TO THOSE SAME AREAS, I FEEL THAT IT IS A PLAY AT PARTY POLITICS AND WE IN THE YUKON ARE GOING TO SUFFER IF THAT TYPE OF PARTY POLITICS IS NOT KEPT OUT OF THIS PARTICULAR DEBATE.

IT IS PLEASANT TO KNOW THAT PEOPLE FROM ALL PARTICULAR AFFILIATIONS HAVE INDICATED THEIR WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT THROUGH THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA, CERTAIN CHANGES. THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA, WHEN THE LAST CHANGES TO THE YUKON ACT WERE MADE, IN MY OPINION, DIDN'T GO FAR ENOUGH THEN. THAT WAS IN 1970. BUT IT WAS INDICATED THAT IT WAS AN EXPERIMENTAL STAGE AND FURTHER BENEFITS WOULD BE CREATED ONCE THAT PARTICULAR EXPERIMENT HAD HAD A FAIR TIME ON CONSIDERATION TO WORK. WELL, IT MAY BE TO SOME THAT IT HAS WORKED. IT APPEARED TO ME FOR A LONG TIME THAT IT COULD WORK, BUT THEN WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE PARTICULAR AREAS INVOLVED WHERE IT WAS MADE DIFFICULT TO WORK AND THEN I WILL GET ON THAT PARTICULAR POINT, THEN I WILL BE SPEAKING WHEN I COME TO BILL C-9 ITSELF.

ONE OF THE AREAS THAT I WAS SOMEWHAT SURPRISED TO READ, WAS WHEN THE MINISTER, AND I MUST SAY THIS AND I THINK THIS HAS ALREADY BEEN SAID BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST, THAT THE MINISTER WAS QUITE FORTHRIGHT WITH US WHEN HE CAME HERE. AND I THINK I HAVE MY OWN FEELINGS THAT HE TRIED TO GO MUCH FURTHER THAN HE DID IN PRESENTING THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARLIAMENT. I THINK SOMEWHERE ALONG THE LINE, THIS WAS STOPPED AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST HAS ALREADY INDICATED THAT ALTHOUGH EXECUTIVE COUNCILS OF THE YUKON HAVE APPROVED WHAT WAS MOTION 40 AND THEN MOTION 1, AND THAT THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY SUPPORTS THE CHANGES FOR A MORE RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT, THAT THE N.D.P. HAVE APPROVED THIS, THAT THE YUKON LIBERAL PARTY HAVE APPROVED THIS. WHAT HE DID LEAVE OUT, AND



WHAT I CAN ASSURE AND IS ALSO THE FACT WHICH SURPRISES ME EVEN MORE, IS AT THE LIBERAL NATIONAL CONVENTION BY RESOLUTION MOVED BY MYSELF AND SECONDED BY DAVE ROBERTSON, THE RESOLUTION WAS THAT CANADIAN IDENTITY BE GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON IN THE FORM OF FOUR RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENTS. THIS RESOLUTION WAS ACCEPTED AND SO STRONGLY AND SUPPORT WAS GIVEN SO STRONGLY IN FAVOUR OF IT, THAT WHEN IT CAME TO THE VOTE, ONLY A HANDFULL OF PEOPLE STOOD UP AGAINST, WHEN ALMOST 2,000 PEOPLE STOOD UP IN FAVOUR OF THE MOTION. IT WAS REALLY SOMETHING TO SEE, WHEN THERE WERE APPROXIMATELY A DOZEN CABINET MINISTERS IN THAT MAIN BALLROOM, THE CHATEAU LAURIER AT THE TIME, WHO STOOD UP AND GAVE SUPPORT TO IT, AND THAT MR. PELLETIER AND WARREN ALLMAN, BOTH CABINET MINISTERS, WENT UP TO THE MICROPHONE AND SPOKE IN FAVOUR OF IT, THAT WARREN ALLMAN, THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL OF CANADA, ASKED THE QUEBEC DELEGATION TO SUPPORT IT AND THIS THEY DID. AND THEN TO SEE WHAT WE HAVE BROUGHT FORWARD IS SOMETHING THAT I CANNOT, FOR THE LIFE OF ME, UNDERSTAND. IT APPEARS TO ME THAT THERE IS A CASE OF A SIMILARITY WHERE WE HAVE A STANDING COMMITTEE WHO APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSITION THAT WAS PUT FORWARD.

NOW, FOR SOME REASON, UNKNOWN TO US ALL, THERE IS A WATERED DOWN PROPOSAL BEING BROUGHT FORWARD INTO THE YUKON ACT.

I HAVE OFTEN INDICATED THAT PROBLEMS LIE AT THE FEET OF THE SENIOR HIERARCHY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT. QUITE FRANKLY, THIS GIVES ME NO REASON TO CHANGE MY VIEWS ON THIS PARTICULAR SITUATION. I AM ABOUT THE MOST DISAPPOINTED MAN EVER, AS A RESULT OF WHAT I SEE HAS BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD AND HAS BEEN PUT BEFORE PARLIAMENT WHICH PROPOSES THAT THERE HAS BEEN CHANGES OF A GREAT NATURE BEING MADE.

I HAVE SOME SYMPATHY FOR THE MINISTER. I DON'T KNOW WHATS BEHIND IT. I AM SURE IF HE COULD SPEAK, HE WOULD BE ABLE TO SAY. I NOTE THAT THERE WAS REFERENCE TO THE MINISTER SAYING, SO WHAT WE ARE SAYING THAT IN ESSENCE, WE WOULD HAVE ALL THE LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE PREROGATIVES IF THOSE RESOLUTIONS WERE FOLLOWED THAT WOULD MAKE US, IN A SENSE, THE SAME ANALOGOUS TO A PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

NOW, I DON'T KNOW WHO GAVE HIM THESE WORDS TO SAY, BECAUSE IN A VERY VERY WELL KNOWN, NOW BY THIS COUNCIL, JUDGEMENT, THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE HAS ALWAYS REFERRED TO,

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

HERE WE HAVE A POLITICAL OPINION. HERE WE HAVE AN OPINION THAT HAS BEEN PLACED BEFORE US BY A JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT. ANOTHER JUDGE WHO MAKES HIS VIEWS FELT WITH REFERENCE TO WHAT THE STATUS OF THE YUKON IS. I AM GOING TO READ, MR. CHAIRMAN, PARTS OF A JUDGEMENT GIVEN BY MR. JUSTICE MORROW. ALTHOUGH IT WAS A JUDGEMENT GIVEN IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES, IT WAS RELATIVE TO THE SAME SITUATION AS EXISTS IN THE YUKON. THIS IS A JUDGEMENT BETWEEN THE ROYAL BANK OF CANADA AND JOHN McQUERIES SCOTT AND THE COMMISSIONER OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. HE SAID - 'BY THE YUKON TERRITORY ACT, 1898, CHAPTER 6, THE YUKON TERRITORY WAS TAKEN OUT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AND THEN IN 1905 A MAJOR CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR CHANGE TOOK PLACE WITH THE FORMATION OF THE PROVINCES OF ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.' THEN HE GOES ON TO SPEAK ABOUT THE NEW NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. "IN THE NEW NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT, THE DESIGNATION OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR DISAPPEARS FROM THE LEGISLATION. SECTION 3 OF THE NEW ACT MAKES PROVISIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, THIS THE COMMISSIONER OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES." WHETHER THIS WAS A DELIBERATE STEP TO DEMARK THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF GOVERNING PROVINCES WHICH HAD JUST EMERGED TO WHAT IS REFERRED TO AS SOUTHERN CANADA AND THAT VAST AREA TO THE NORTH, IS NOT KNOWN. FROM THIS TIME ON, HOWEVER, EXCEPT FOR CHANGES IN THE NUMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND IN THE NUMBERS WHO ARE ELECTED, AND I WILL INTERJECT HERE TO SHOW THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH A RELATIVELY SANE SITUATION, THERE HAS BEEN NO



SERIOUS LEGAL CHANGE IN THE MANNER OF GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WHEN WE CONSIDER BILL C-9, THE INCREASE OF A NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS, AGAIN, IS NO SERIOUS LEGAL CHANGE, IN THE MANNER OF GOVERNMENT IN THE YUKON.

HE WENT ON TO SAY HERE OF COURSE, REFERENCE IS BEING MADE TO THE GOVERNMENT IN THE LEGAL SENSE RATHER THAN TO GOVERNMENT IN A DEFECTO POLITICAL SENSE. ONE CAN INTERPRET THAT THAT ADMINISTRATION HAS A LEGAL GOVERNMENTAL CONNOTATION. BUT IT IS CERTAINLY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON, WHILE THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ARE NOT GOVERNMENTS IN THE POLITICAL SENSE AS WE RECOGNIZE GOVERNMENTS IN PROVINCES.

THE JUDGE WENT ON TO INDICATE BY SECTION 4 OF THE 1906 STATUTE, THE EXECUTIVE POWERS VESTED PREVIOUSLY IN THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR AS OF AUGUST 31ST, 1905 BECAME VESTED IN THE COMMISSIONER AND THE WORDS WERE CHANGED TO READ - 'AND THE COMMISSIONER SHALL ADMINISTER THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORIES AND INSTRUCT INSTRUCTIONS FROM TIME TO TIME GIVEN HIM BY THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL OR THE MINISTER.' THOSE WORDS ARE EXACTLY THE SAME WORDS THAT WE HAVE IN THE YUKON ACT.

HE FURTHER WENT ON TO SAY, AGAIN BY SECTION 4 IS FOUND THE COMMISSIONER SHALL ADMINISTER THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORIES UNDER INSTRUCTION FROM TIME TO TIME GIVEN BY THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL OR THE MINISTER. HE WENT ON TO SAY THIS. IT IS NOT AS IF IT IS A JUDGEMENT OF A LONG WAY BACK. IT BRINGS UP TODATE THE EXISTING SITUATION OF THE POLITICAL LIFE OF THE POEPL E IN THE YUKON AND LIKEWISE IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. HE SAID "DOWN TO 1905, THE GENERAL INTENT WOULD APPEAR TO BE TO ADMINISTER THE TERRITORIES PRETTY MUCH AS A COLONY, WITH THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT REMAINING THE DOMINANT AUTHORITY AND ADMINISTERING THROUGH A LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR, JUST AS THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT. THAT IS UP TO 1905. I WILL COMPLETE - JUST AS THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT WOULD GOVERN A COLONY."

AFTER THE MORE POPULACE AREAS WERE FORMED INTO SELF-GOVERNING PROVINCES, THE CONTROL AND DIRECTION FROM OTTAWA OF THE REMNANT DID NOT DIMINISH. HE WENT ON TO SAY THIS, AND I HAVE UNDERLINED THESE WORDS BECAUSE I THINK IT IS VERY IMPORTANT. HE WENT ON TO SAY - 'SUBSTITUTING A COMMISSIONER FOR THE LIEUTENANT-

GOVERNOR SEEMED TO INDICATE A CHANGE FROM COLONIAL STATUS TO ONE MORE AKIN TO A MERE DEPARTMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.' THIS IS WHY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I ATTEMPTED TO OBTAIN FROM THE COMMISSIONER, DURING A QUESTION PERIOD, \*WHETHER INDEED HE RECOGNIZED THAT THE YUKON TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION WAS IN FACT AN AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHICH OBVIOUSLY FROM A JUDGEMENT OF A COURT, WHICH HAS NOT BEEN APPEALED AND NOT BEEN OVERRULED, STILL APPEARS TO EXIST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I REPEAT THAT; SEEM TO INDICATE THE CHANGE FROM COLONIAL STATUS AKIN TO ONE MORE DEPARTMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. HE WENT ON TO SAY, "THIS IS THE WAY IT HAS CONTINUED TO THE PRESENT DATE." HE GIVES AS A NOTATION FOR A COURT REFERENCE FOR THE TERRITORIES BEING REFERRED TO A COLONY. SEE THE REMARKS OF WALBRIDGE, CHIEF JUSTICE FOUND ON PAGE 11 OF THE QUEEN VERSUS THE COLONY OF 1885. WE HAVE THEN A SITUATION THAT HAS DEVELOPED WHICH BRINGS US TO SAY WHERE HAVE WE GONE? HAVE WE INCREASED OVER THE LAST 75 YEARS OUR FUNCTIONS TOWARDS SELF-REPOSIBLE GOVERNMENT? I SAY. NO, BECAUSE IT IS NOT WRITTEN IN LEGISLATIVE FORM. ON PAGE 19 OF THIS TYPE-WRITTEN JUDGEMENT, HE SAID, I AM REFERRING TO JUSTICE MORROW AGAIN, "THE GOVERNING LEGISLATION MAKES IT CLEAR THAT THE EMPLOYEES OR SERVANTS OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT ARE NOT THE EMPLOYEES OR SERVANTS OF THE COMMITTEE. ALTHOUGH HE MAY HIRE THEM AND MUST PAY THEM, BUT OF HER MAJESTY. THE COMMISSIONER AS EXECUTIVE OFFICER IS NOT THE HEAD OF A STATE OR GOVERNMENT INDEPENDENT OF HER MAJESTY. BUT THE INSTRUMENT ONLY FOR RELAYING OR CARRYING OUR INSTRUCTIONS THAT MAY COME FROM HER MAJESTY THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT OR TO HIM THROUGH THE ORDINANCES PASSED BY THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL." THE CONCERN THAT I AM BRINGING FORWARD NOW IS THE CONCERN THAT SHOULD BE FELT IN APPROVING WITHOUT STRONG REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CONTRARY THE SUPPOSITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN PLACED FORWARD BY THE MINISTER TO THE FEDERAL PARLIAMENT. I CAN ONLY SAY AGAIN, A FURTHER REMARK MADE BY MR. JUSTICE MORROW. HE SAYS THIS, "ALTHOUGH THE GOVERNMENT AS PRESENTLY CONSTITUTED, MAY GIVE THE APPEARANCE OF A PROVINCE AND THE COMMISSIONER IN COUNCIL MAY APPEAR TO HAVE MUCH THE SAME POWERS TO LEGISLATE AS ARE TO BE FOUND ENUMERATED IN SECTION 92 OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT THE OVERRIDING PHRASE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ACT AND ANY OTHER ACT OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA MUST IN LAW HAVE THE EFFECT OF MAINTAINING IT IN A SUBORDINATE POSITION TO THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA OR IN THE CONDITION OF



AN INFANT COLONY." HERE ARE TWO JUDGEMENTS BY TWO VERY WELL-RESPECTED JUSTICES OF OUR NORTHERN COURTS. SO CLEAR IN DEFINING ARE THE SORTS OF THESE JUSTICES THAT I WOULD THINK IT WOULD BE IMPROPER FOR THIS COUNCIL TO TURN THEIR EYES AWAY FROM WHAT HAS BEEN READ IN REGARDS TO THIS MATTER.

IN THE NOTES THAT WERE GIVEN BY THE MINISTER, AND ON PAGE 4 OF THE COPY OF THOSE NOTES THAT WERE SENT OUT TO US ON MARCH 18TH, HE SAYS IN THE THIRD PARAGRAPH, IN THE MIDDLE OF THAT THIRD PARAGRAPH, "I ARRANGED WITH THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TO ESTABLISH THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO ADVISE HIM IN HIS DUTIES ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE WHOLE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL." AS YOU KNOW, I ASKED A QUESTION OF THE COMMISSIONER THE OTHER DAY, WHICH THE ANSWER WAS NOT FORTHCOMING, WHERE DID HE OBTAIN THE AUTHORITY TO ISSUE AN ORDER TO HIMSELF SIGNED BY HIMSELF TO GIVE HIM THE POWER OF DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT OVER THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE? HE HAS REFUSED TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. I HAVE BEEN ADVISED BY THE MINISTER THAT THIS CERTAINLY WAS NOT THE INTENT. I HAVE ASKED THE COMMISSIONER TO PRODUCE THE AUTHORITY THAT GAVE IT TO HIM AND I AM GOING TO START WORRYING HIM FROM TOMORROW ON TO GET THAT AUTHORITY PRODUCED BECAUSE HE HAS ACTED OUTSIDE WHAT WAS THE INTENT OF THE MINISTER WHEN HE HAD BROUGHT THESE CHANGES FORWARD.

YOU MIGHT ASK WHY DO I INTERJECT WITH THAT PARTICULAR ARGUMENT HERE. IT IS BECAUSE IT IS NOT SPELLED OUT IN THE LEGISLATION ABOUT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THEREFORE, HERE WE HAVE A CASE OF AN APPOINTED PERSON USURPING, ABUSING THE LAWS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT BEFORE PARLIAMENT ALREADY AND WHAT PROTECTION HAVE WE GOT THAT THIS WILL NOT OCCUR IN THE FUTURE.

I THINK WE COULD ALSO NOW MAKE REFERENCE TO FURTHER REMARKS THAT HE HAS MADE IN HIS NOTES. HE SAID WORDS TO THE EFFECT THAT "TO FULFILL MY GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE FOR THE FURTHER EVOLUTION OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORY AND TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIES FOR MORE CONTROL OVER THEIR AFFAIRS TO HAVE MORE SAY IN THE DECISIONS THAT EFFECT THEM." I QUITE FRANKLY, CANNOT SEE HOW A MERE INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS ARE GOING TO PROVIDE FOR FURTHER EVOLUTION OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORY. ALL IT IS DOING IS INCREASING THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AROUND THIS COUNCIL TABLE WITH NO ADDITIONAL POWER GIVEN TO THEM BECAUSE OF THE LACK

OF EXECUTIVE CONTROL THAT STILL RESIDES IN THE HANDS OF THE APPOINTED COMMISSIONER.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM GOING TO REFER TO SOME SECTIONS OF THE YUKON ACT AS I DEAL WITH BILL C-9. BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO INDICATE WHAT MY THOUGHTS ARE OF WHAT COULD HAVE AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS. TO ME THE FIRST THING WHICH IS NOT IN THE PRESENT ACT AND COULD HAVE BEEN PUT IN THE PRESENT ACT IS THE WHOLE PRINCIPLE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. NOW THE MINISTER HAS SAID, THERE IS NO REASON FOR THIS TO GO INTO THE ACT, INTO THE LEGISLATION BECAUSE THERE IS NO PROVISION FOR ANYTHING LIKE THAT IN ANY OF THE PROVINCIAL JURISDICTIONS AND INDEED IN THE FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS AND THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT. I SAY, RIGHT HE IS. BUT IT HAS ALREADY BEEN INDICATED BY OTHER PEOPLE THAT HAVE SPOKEN TODAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION AND THE JURISDICTION OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA HAVE ALL ELECTED PEOPLE WHO ARE CHOSEN, FIRSTLY CHOSEN A LEADER OF THE MAJORITY ON THAT PARTICULAR JURISDICTION IS CHOSEN BY THE ELECTED MEMBERS AND THEN HE, IN TURN, CHOOSES FROM AMONGST THEM PEOPLE TO SERVE IN A CABINET CAPACITY IN HIS CABINET. CERTAINLY THERE CAN BE NO ANALOGY BETWEEN AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AS WE UNDERSTAND IT AND AS WE HAVE IT OPERATING NOW, WITH THE APPOINTED AND ELECTED TOGETHER TO A PROVINCIAL CABINET WHICH IS AN EXECUTIVE COUNCIL THAT EXISTS AS IT EXISTS NOW IN THE OTHER JURISDICTIONS. ONE CANNOT JUST SAY THESE ARE BOTH SIMILAR IN SUCH A WAY THAT WE DO NOT HAVE TO MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO IT IN THE LEGISLATION KNOWN AS THE YUKON ACT. I THINK THIS A GREAT ERROR BECAUSE AS THE MINISTER HAS INDICATED, HE MAY NOT BE MINISTER NEXT YEAR. THERE MIGHT BE A CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT, A CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION WITH DIFFERENT POLITICAL PHILOSOPHIES. AND IF THIS HAPPENS, WHATEVER THE MINISTER OF THE DAY DECIDES, CAN BE CHANGED BUT WHEN IT IS ENSHRINED WITHIN THE LEGISLATION AT LEAST THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PARLIAMENT TO SAY, YES OR NO TO CHANGE IT IN LEGISLATION. I FEEL STRONGLY THAT IT IS A GRAVE ERROR TOWARDS A MEASURE OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT THAT THE REFERENCE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN PROPOSED CHANGES HAS BEEN LEFT COMPLETELY OUT OF THE LEGISLATION THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED.

SECTION 3 OF THE YUKON ACT MAKES PROVISION FOR THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL TO APPOINT A CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO BE STYLED AND KNOWN AS THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. MR. WALLY FIRTH, M.P. FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES, HAS



VERY SUSENTLY DECLARED WHAT HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THAT IS WHEN IT IS RELATED TO THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. I CANNOT BUT HELP AGREE WITH WHAT HE HAD TO SAY. AS A MATTER OF FACT, THIS WAS ALSO ECHOED BY, AND TO SOME EXTENT, BY A MEMBER FOR THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY. I THINK I WOULD FIRSTLY, BEFORE I GO ON TO MR. FIRTH, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY ONE AREA THAT I AGREE WITH WHOLEHEARTEDLY WITH SOME REMARKS MADE BY MISS FLORA MACDONALD, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS. SHE SAID IF WE LOOK AT THE IDEA OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH DEPARTMENT HEADS TO BE CHOSEN FROM ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES IT WOULD APPEAR THAT ALL THESE DEPARTMENT HEADS WILL BE IN A DANGEROUS POSITION. THE ELECTED PEOPLE WILL BE RESPONSIBLE TO THOSE WHO ELECTED THEM. BUT THE COMMISSIONER HAD HIS STAFF WILL BE IN THE POSITION TO UNDERMINE THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES IF THEY SHOULD SO CHOOSE. HOW TRUE DO I KNOW THAT THAT EXISTED. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY MR. COMMISSIONER HAS LEFT. I WANTED TO HEAR, I WANTED TO LET HIM HEAR EXACTLY WHAT I HAD TO SAY, BUT, OF COURSE, HE DOESN'T WANT TO HEAR SOME THINGS. HOW TRUE IT IS THAT THIS POSITION HAS DEVELOPED. IT IS A REAL SITUATION THAT CAN'T CONTINUE TO DEVELOP. MR. FIRTH SAID SPECIFICALLY DEALING WITH WHAT WE SAY AND WHAT IS IN THE YUKON ACT #3 THAT THE GOVERNMENT IN COUNCIL MAY APPOINT FOR THE TERRITORY, A CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO BE STYLED AND KNOWN AS THE COMMISSIONER. HE SAID THIS, "ONE SOLUTION TO THIS PROBLEM THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AND CONSIDERED SERIOUSLY IS TO HAVE AN ELECTED PERSON REPLACE THE COMMISSIONER, SOMETHING LIKE TO THE MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL SYSTEM. THE HEAD OF THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD THEN BE ANSWERABLE TO THE FULLY ELECTED BODY. THIS COUNCIL WOULD BE ANSWERABLE TO THE POWER AND HAVE THE POWER TO FIRE, IF NEED BE, THE HEAD OF THE ADMINISTRATION. IN THIS WAY, AT LEAST, THE MAN AT THE TOP WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES." ALTHOUGH I DON'T GO FULLY WITH HIS IDEAS, CERTAINLY THE COMMISSIONER SHOULD BE AN APPOINTED PERSON, AN ELECTED PERSON SO THAT HE HAS TO, FOR HIS ERRORS, FOR HIS IMPROPER ACTIONS, HAS TO FACE THE PUBLIC AND THE PUBLIC HAVE TO BE ABLE TO TREAT HIM IN THE MANNER THAT THE SITUATION DESERVES. HE WENT ON TO SAY, "UNTIL THE PRESENT POSITION OF COMMISSIONER COMES UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE ELECTORATE, THE STIGMA OF COLONIALISM WILL CONTINUE. THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE ARE ASKING FOR, OR READY FOR, FULL PROVINCIAL STATUS. BUT IT WOULD BE A BIG STEP FORWARD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES." THERE IS MUCH MERIT IN WHAT HAS

BEEN SAID AND I AM IN FAVOUR OF SEEING THE POSITION OF THE COMMISSIONER AN ELECTED POSITION. HERE IS A SITUATION WHERE THERE DOESN'T HAVE TO BE ANY CHANGES TO THE YUKON ACT MADE IN THIS AREA BECAUSE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL MAY APPOINT. WHAT CAN BE SAID IS THIS, THAT HE WILL APPOINT HIM WHEN THE PERSON HAS BEEN ELECTED. BUT IT DOESN'T SAY THAT HE HAS TO APPOINT SOMEBODY WHO IS NOT AN ELECTED PERSON. AS A MATTER OF FACT, AN ELECTED PERSON CAN BE APPOINTED. THERE IS NO REASON WHY OUT OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS, A MEMBER IS SUGGESTED TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO POSITION OF COMMISSIONER IF WE ARE NOT GOING FOR PROVINCIAL STATUS I WOULD NEVER SAY THAT WE SHOULD TAKE PROVINCIAL STATUS NOW. I'VE ALWAYS ASKED FOR A TIMETABLE WHEN THE PROVINCIAL STATUS SHOULD COME. THAT IS MY FEELING ON THAT POINT. IN SECTION 5, THE SAME THING APPLIES TO THAT OF THE ADMINISTRATOR. WHY IN HEAVEN'S NAME, DID SOMEBODY WHO COMES WITH TWO SUITCASES TO THE YUKON CONTROL THE EVERYDAY LIFE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON? AND BEEN DOING SO FOR A WHOLE YEAR. WHY? HE CAN INFLUENCE PEOPLE IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN SUCH A WAY THAT IT CAN INTERFERE WITH THE LIVELIHOOD OF PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, THAT HE CAN INTERFERE WITH THE EVERYDAY OPERATIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE, THAT, INDEED, HAS THE CONTROL, PRACTICALLY, OF THE LIVELIHOOD OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE, AND WE HAVE NO WAY THAT WE CAN INTERFERE WITH HIM. WE HAVE ALSO A THIRD APPOINTED PERSON. WHY CAN'T ALL OF THESE APPOINTED PERSONS BE GIVEN TO ELECTED PERSONS WHO OBVIOUSLY HAVE RECEIVED A MAJORITY OF VOTES IN THEIR PARTICULAR CONSTITUENCIES. OTHERWISE, THEY WOULDN'T BE SITTING IN THE HOUSE BECAUSE WE HAVE THE POSITION, AS I HAVE SAID, THAT WE NOW HAVE THREE UNTOUCHABLES. NONE OF THE PUBLIC CAN TOUCH THEM. THERE IS NO WAY THAT THE PUBLIC CAN GO FORWARD AND ATTACK THE ACTIONS OF THE APPOINTED PEOPLE FROM THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN GUILTY OF THE MISADMINISTRATION AND MAL-ADMINISTRATION OF THE TERRITORY'S AFFAIRS. THESE ARE CHANGES THAT CAN BE DONE. THEY CAN BE MADE. I SEE NO REASON WHY THEY HAVEN'T BEEN DEALT WITH. BY THE SAME TOKEN, UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE YUKON ACT AS IT EXISTS, THEN THE SALARY OF THE COMMISSIONER AND THE ADMINISTRATOR WOULD, INSTEAD OF BEING SET BY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL, CAN BE PAID OUT OF THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND IF THEY DON'T DO THEIR JOB PROPERLY, THE COUNCIL, WHEN IT DEALS WITH THE FINANCES CAN REDUCE THAT WAGE SALARY TO \$1.00 AND THIS WAY YOU GET RID OF PEOPLE THAT YOU WANT TO GET OUT OF THE POSITIONS. WE HAVEN'T EVEN GOT THE POWER TO RE-



DUCE THEIR PAY TO \$1.00 BECAUSE THEY GET PAID DIRECTLY FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND WE HAVE NO INFLUENCE AT ALL IN THAT PARTICULAR AREA.

THEN, WE COME TO SECTION 9 WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I SHOULD ADVISE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT HIS TIME HAS EXPIRED. IS IT THE WISH OF THE COMMITTEE THAT HE CONTINUE?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: PROCEED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. NOW WE COME TO SECTION 9, MR. CHAIRMAN. WHAT REALLY BOTHERS ME IN THIS SECTION 9 THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE, IS THAT THERE IS A DEFINITION THERE. THE DEFINITION BEING, "MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL SHALL BE ELECTED TO REPRESENT SUCH ELECTORIAL DISTRICTS IN THE TERRITORY AS ARE NAMED AND DESCRIBED BY THE COMMISSIONER IN COUNCIL." THERE IS NO PROVISION FOR EXPANSION OF THE CONSTITUENCIES WITHOUT HAVING TO GO TO ANOTHER APPORTIONMENTS. IT MAY BE AS A RESULT OF SOMETHING HAPPENING IN A YEAR OR TWO YEARS, ALREADY, WE HAVE GOT INTO THE NUMBERS GAME OF THE 5,000 OR SO ADDITIONAL VOTERS THAT WOULD SOME HOW OR OTHER, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT WOULD BE FAR PREFERABLE IF THE DECISION AS TO HOW MANY MEMBERS THERE SHOULD BE. FOR INSTANCE, I WOULD MUCH PREFER TO SEE THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD CONSIST OF NO LESS THAN TWELVE MEMBERS AND THAT THE EXPANSION TAKES PLACE BY THE COUNCIL WHEN IT RECOGNIZES THE NEED. AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST HAS SAID, IF THESE PEOPLE IN OTTAWA THINK THAT EACH AND EVERY ONE OF US HERE AND ANY FUTURE MEMBERS THAT WILL BE COMING TO THE COUNCIL TABLE, PERHAPS OTHERS THAT WILL REPLACE US AT THE COUNCIL TABLE, HAVEN'T GOT THE CONSIDERATION, THE CONSIDERABLE UNDERSTANDING TO BRING IN EXTRA MEMBERS WHEN IT IS NECESSARY, THEN REALLY THEY ARE SUFFERING FROM SOME SORT OF STATE OF MIND. BECAUSE THE PEOPLE HERE, WE ARGUE AND FIGHT WITH EACH OTHER AND WE ENTER INTO LEGISLATIVE FISTICUFFS. THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON WHO HAVE BEEN CONTINUALLY BEING ELECTED TO VARIOUS BODIES OF ELECTED POSITIONS HAVE GOT THE CAPABILITIES OF DECIDING WHAT IS GOOD FOR THEMSELVES AND FOR THE AREAS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGISLATIVE GOVERNMENT.

I THINK THAT THE MINISTER, WHEN HE BRINGS THIS

FORWARD, PROBABLY IS THINKING IN TERMS OF DOING SOMETHING THAT IS RIGHT. I DON'T THINK HE WOULD RAISE MUCH OBJECTION IF WE ASK FOR THAT SPECIFIC CHANGE TO BE MADE. I'M SURE HE WOULDN'T RAISE OBJECTION TO THAT. I THINK THAT WOULD BE EASY TO OVERCOME.

I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ABOUT SECTION 11. FOR INSTANCE, SECTION 11 IS ONE OF THE AREAS WHERE THE COMMISSIONER, AND THIS IS WHY I'M SO OPPOSED TO THE STATUS OF THE COMMISSIONER TODAY, IS THAT THE COMMISSIONER SHALL CONVENE THE SESSION OF COUNCIL. HERE YOU HAVE A PUBLIC SERVANT DIRECTING THE ELECTED PEOPLE, WHEN THEY CAN SIT AND WHEN THEY CAN'T SIT. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO STOMACH FOR YEARS, BECAUSE IT OPPOSES EVERY PRINCIPLE OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT THAT THE PARLIAMENT IS CALLED TOGETHER, AND LEGISLATURE IS CALLED TOGETHER, BY THE POLITICAL PERSON WHO IS IN CHARGE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODY, AND THAT'S WHERE THE DIRECTION AS TO WHEN COUNCIL SHOULD CONVENE. I DON'T UNDERSTAND AGAIN WHY THE MINISTER HASN'T TAKEN A LOOK AT A SIMPLE ITEM LIKE THAT. HE SAYS ON ONE HAND, I WANT TO GIVE PEOPLE, THE ELECTED PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL CONTROL OVER THEIR OWN AFFAIRS. I WILL HAVE AN ELECTED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. HE WILL NOT PUT IT IN THE LEGISLATION AND YET MAINTAINS THAT AN APPOINTED PERSON, SUCH AS THE COMMISSIONER, CAN CALL PARLIAMENT TOGETHER.

IT HAS BEEN SHOWN ALREADY THAT THE COMMISSIONER CONVENES COUNCIL FOR HIS CONVENIENCE, NOT FOR THE BUSINESS OF THE PUBLIC. THIS IS WHERE IT HAS TO BE CORRECTED.

I AM SO SORRY, I MUST INTERJECT MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT MR. COMMISSIONER IS NOT HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS DEBATE. I ALWAYS UNDERSTOOD THAT HE WAS SO INTERESTED IN RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT BUT HE HAS LEFT THE DEBATE, BECAUSE HE JUST DOESN'T WANT TO HEAR CRITICISMS AGAINST THE OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE BROUGHT UP A VERY VERY VALUABLE POINT WHEN HE MADE REFERENCE TO SECTION 22.

IT'S QUITE RIGHT THAT EVEN THOUGH WE HAVE AN INCREASE TO TWELVE OR WHATEVER MAY BE DECIDED. WE HAVEN'T GONE ONE STEP FORWARD BECAUSE ANYTHING THAT IS GOING TO BE DECIDED ON CAN BE WIPED OUT. IT CAN BE WIPED OUT SIMPLY IN THE SAME MANNER THAT THE, EVEN WHILE I WAS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOTH COUNCILLOR WATSON AND MYSELF WERE QUITE ANNOYED WITH IT AT THE TIME, THAT WE PASSED A PIECE OF LEGISLATION ON LABOUR AND WHAT HAPPENS TO IT? THE HOUSE PASSES IT, THE COMMISSIONER IS ASKED TO GIVE



ASSENT TO IT, THE COMMISSIONER REFUSED TO GIVE ASSENT TO IT, UPON THE INSTRUCTIONS OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS, OR INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT. IT'S UNDER THAT SECTION THAT THAT HAPPENS. THAT IS A DANGEROUS SECTION TO ALLOW TO REMAIN IN THERE AND NO CONSIDERATION HAS BEEN GIVEN TO ITS REMOVAL.

I THINK THAT WE HAVE MADE IT CLEAR THAT THERE ARE JUST SUCH A LACK OF AMENDMENTS TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT IN HERE. THAT ALL WE CAN SAY UP TO THIS STAGE IS THAT WHAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED IS NOTHING MORE THAN AN INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SEATS OF COUNCILLORS. ALL THE OTHER THINGS THAT WERE ASKED FOR WHICH WERE LEGITIMATE AREAS IN MOTION NO. 40 OF 66 OR MOTION NO. 1 OF 68 HAVE BEEN LEGATED AND LEFT TO DIE. IF WE GET CHANGES AT THE SPEED OF WHAT WE ARE GETTING THEM NOW, MY GREAT GREAT GRANDCHILD, I'M SURE, WILL BE ABLE TO VIEW THE CHANGES IN THIS HOUSE AND PROBABLY STANDING IN THE SAME POSITION WITH THE SAME STRONG VOICE ASKING FOR CHANGES AGAIN. BECAUSE I JUST CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHY THESE CHANGES ARE NOT BEING MADE,

I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SOME REFERENCE TO THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED. THIS IS SECTION 46, I BELIEVE IT IS OF THE YUKON ACT. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THERE HAS BEEN AN ERROR MADE BUT UNDER THE TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT THERE COMES A CONFLICT. FIRSTLY, I WOULD SAY THIS. I KNOW IT IS AS A RESULT OF CERTAIN ENQUIRIES THAT I HAD MADE THAT THEY FOUND THERE WAS A BIG HOLE IN SECTION 46 BECAUSE THE COMMISSIONER HAS BEEN CANCELLING FEDERAL LEASES WITHOUT THE POWER TO DO IT, BECAUSE THE SECTION DEALING WITH LANDS SHOW QUITE CLEARLY UNDER THE EXISTING ACT, SECTION 46, AS IT READS NOW. READS AS FOLLOWS - 'LANDS REQUIRED BEFORE OR AFTER THE 1ST DAY OF APRIL 95 WITH TERRITORIAL FUNDS - AND THERE IS ONE WORD PUT IN - ON - BECAUSE IT'S THE PARTICULAR DAY WAS LEFT OUT SO THAT THE DAYS BEFORE SOMETHING HAPPENS AND THE DAY AFTER, IF ANYBODY HAD AN AGREEMENT UNDER THE PARTICULAR DAY, THERE WAS NO WAY TO DEAL WITH IT. SO THAT'S NO PROBLEM THERE. NOW, IN 46 (c) IT SAYS - PUBLIC LANDS THE ADMINISTRATION OF WHICH HAS BEFORE OR AFTER THE 1ST DAY OF APRIL 1955 BEEN TRANSFERRED BY THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL TO THE TERRITORY. NOW, THEY HAVE AMENDED IT TO SAY - BE TRANSFERRED BY THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL TO THE COMMISSIONER. NOW THE COMMISSIONER HAS BEEN CANCELLING LEASES OF FEDERAL LANDS BY NOTIFICATION WHEN IT WASN'T HIS LAND TO TRANSFER, BECAUSE THE LANDS WERE TRANSFERRED TO THE TERRITORY AND NOT TO HIM.

SO, WE FIND THAT THE SAME THING OCCURS LATER ON IN THAT AREIGNMENT. NOW CAN THEY MAKE THIS AMENDMENT? THE APPLICATION UNDER THE TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT AND THEY HAVEN'T TAKEN NOTICE OF IT, AND I HOPE THEY WILL TAKE NOTICE OF IT NOW, WHICH IS CHAPTER T-6 OF THE REVISED ORDINANCES. SUBSECTION (2) OF SECTION 3. SECTIONS 5, 8, 12 AND PARAGRAPH 19, APPLY TO TERRITORIAL LANDS THE RIGHT TO THE BENEFICIAL USE OR TO THE PROCEEDS OF WHICH ARE APPROPRIATED TO THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT DOESN'T APPLY TO COMMISSIONER'S LAND, SO THERE IS AN AREA THERE OF FALSE LIES RIGHT IN THAT SITUATION.

IN ANOTHER AREA WHICH HAS BEEN OMITTED, SECTION 24. IT'S A WONDER HOW THE FEDERAL JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DIDN'T SPOT THIS. THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS UNABLE TO HOLD ANY PROPERTY IN HIS NAME, BECAUSE SECTION 24 SAYS THIS. THIS IS ON THE TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT. 'NO OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF OR UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA SHALL DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY IN HIS OWN NAME OR IN THAT OF ANY PERSON PURCHASE OR ACQUIRE ANY TERRITORIAL LAND OR ANY INTEREST THEREIN.' SO, YOU'VE GOT A SITUATION THERE WHERE THE COMMISSIONER CAN'T HOLD ANY LAND, BUT THE TERRITORY OF COURSE CAN.

THERE ARE SOME OTHER AREAS OF WHICH I'LL COME INTO QUESTION ON THE LAND SITUATION, WHICH I WOULD NOT MAKE ANY ISSUE OF AT THIS TIME, BECAUSE THESE THINGS CAN BE STRAIGHTENED OUT. I HAVE ALREADY WRITTEN A LONG LETTER IN DETAIL TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT POINTING OUT THE ERRORS IN THIS PARTICULAR PART AND I AM ASKING THEM TO TAKE A LOOK AT IT.

NOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ASK THAT IN DEBATING THIS, THAT WE GIVE A VERY CLOSE CONSIDERATION, CLOSE LOOK AND CONSIDERATION TO A NUMBER OF ASPECTS THAT YET HAVE GOT TO BE DEFINED.

DO WE WANT TO GET A SEMBLANCE OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT BY HAVING ALL OUR EXECUTIVE MEMBERS ELECTED PEOPLE, THAT INCLUDES THE COMMISSIONER. I THINK THIS SHOULD BE A KEY CONSIDERATION. IF WE DO, SHOULD WE NOT SAY THAT THIS SPECIFIC THOUGHT BE INCORPORATED WITHIN THE LEGISLATION. I THINK WE WILL FIND IN THAT AREA, WE HAVE THEN, A FULL MEASURE OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE YUKON STATED IN THE HOUSE AND THIS SURPRISED ME. 'AT THE TIME THE MINISTER INTRODUCED THAT CONCEPT, HE WAS REFERRING TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN THE COMMONS IN 1970, I SAID IT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. I STILL MAINTAIN THAT STAND.' NOW HE SAYS THIS A COUPLE OF TIMES

AND HE WENT ON FURTHER ON THE SAME PAGE TO SAY - 'I SAY IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOR MORE FUNDAMENTAL REASONS THEN THAT.'

NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHY THAT I HAVE DONE THAT WHEN I FEEL THAT SOMETHING IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, WHY HE DIDN'T ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, TAKE IT BEFORE THE COURTS AND SAY LOOK, THIS IS ULTRA VIRES OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT OR ULTRA VIRES OF THE YUKON ACT. WHY NOT BRING THAT FORWARD? BUT TO BE CRITICAL FOUR YEARS AFTERWARDS WITHOUT DOING ANYTHING AGAINST IT, THERE AGAIN I SAY ITS PLAYING AT PARTY POLITICS AND I DON'T LIKE THAT. I WANT TO MAKE MY POSITION CLEAR THAT WHETHER THE LIBERAL PARTY, THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, THE N.D.P. FORM ANY OPINIONS THAT RELATE TO THE BENEFITS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO SEE. THIS IS WHY I BELIEVE THAT THE TIME IS COMING VERY CLOSE FOR AN INDEPENDENT VOICE IN PARLIAMENT AND IF WE HAVEN'T GOT IT AT THIS DATE, THAT'S FOR SURE.

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK AT THIS TIME WE WILL DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS



MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME, I WILL CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER. PROCEED. COUNCILLOR TANNER.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DIDN'T PLAN TO SPEAK BUT I DID WANT TO ASK THE PREVIOUS SPEAKER ONE QUESTION. PERHAPS NOW THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS BACK AGAIN, I HOPE IT IS NOT CONFIDENTIAL TO THE LAST MEMBER'S STARTING AND FINISHING SPEECH, BUT FIRST OF ALL THE LAST SPEAKER MADE REFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT ONE OF THE BILLS WAS DISALLOWED BY THE COMMISSIONER UPON INSTRUCTION FROM THE DEPARTMENT. I THINK THE MEMBER WILL AGREE THAT ALL PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS SUFFER, IF IT IS SUFFERANCE, THAT ALL SUFFER UNDER THE SAME PROBLEM THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN DISALLOW ANY OF THEIR LEGISLATION. THE QUESTION THAT I HAVE FOR THE LAST MEMBER IS IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING ALTHOUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS DISALLOWED THAT BILL, THEY DID IT ON THE INSTRUCTION OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT BECAUSE IT WAS ULTRA VIRES OF THE FEDERAL CODE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE POINT THAT I MAKE IS THAT LEGISLATION THAT IS PASSED BY THIS HOUSE, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, BE CANCELLED OUT BY A FEDERAL AUTHORITY. IF THE LEGISLATION HAD BEEN ULTRA VIRES OF ANY ACT, OUR LEGAL ADVISOR WOULD NOT HAVE ALLOWED IT TO GO BEFORE THIS HOUSE FOR CONSIDERATION. IT WAS AFTER IT WAS PASSED THAT IT WAS TURNED DOWN. NOT BEFORE. THAT IS THE POINT I MAKE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS EXACTLY THE POINT THAT I AM MAKING TOO, IS THE FACT THAT IF THE LEGAL ADVISOR HAD GIVEN US HIS ADVICE AND AS I REMEMBER THE DEBATE, HE DID, AND HE DID EVEN MAKE THE SUGGESTION THAT IT COULD POSSIBLY BE ULTRA VIRES, THAT FACT IS THAT IF IT IS ULTRA VIRES, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IRRESPECTIVE OF THROUGH WHAT AGENCY, HAS THE RIGHT TO DISALLOW IT AND THEY'VE GOT TO DO SO BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO ALL OF CANADA AND THE SAME RIGHT EXISTS WITH ALL LEGISLATIVES, ALL LEGISLATION ACROSS THE COUNTRY UNDER ANY PROBLEM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I BEG TO DIFFER WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BECAUSE WHAT WOULD NORMALLY HAPPEN AND THIS IS WHERE THE COURTS WOULD COME IN EFFECT, AND THIS IS WHY I BELIEVE IN OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM, WHEN A LEGISLATIVE BODY PASSES LEGISLATION IN ANY OF THE JURISDICTIONS OF CANADA, AND IT IS BROUGHT INTO EFFECT, AND SOMEBODY WISHES TO

CHALLENGE THE AUTHORITY OF THAT LEGISLATION, AND THE CAPABILITY OF THE JURISDICTION TO HAVE PASSED THAT LEGISLATION, THEY WOULD GO BEFORE A COURT AND A COURT WOULD DECIDE WHETHER IT WAS ULTRA VIRES OF THE POWERS VESTED IN THAT PARTICULAR JURISDICTION. THIS IS THE WAY THINGS SHOULD BE DONE, NOT A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT SAYING, "YOU CAN'T HAVE THE LEGISLATION EVEN THOUGH YOUR LEGISLATIVE BODY HAS PASSED IT." I DON'T WANT TO GO INTO EXTENSIVE DEBATE ON THIS PARTICULAR POINT, BUT SIMPLY CLARIFY THAT HERE WAS AN AUTHORITY THAT IS GIVEN TO THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE YUKON ACT TO MAKE LEGISLATION AND THEN AFTER THIS LEGISLATIVE BODY PASSED THE LEGISLATION, THE COMMISSIONER DID NOT ASSENT TO IT BECAUSE HE WAS GIVEN INSTRUCTIONS NOT TO ASSENT TO IT. THIS IS THE POSITION THAT I MAKE. NOBODY CAN ARGUE AGAINST THE FACT THAT THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR NOT, WE HAVE TO ADMIT THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T WANT TO FLOG A DEAD HORSE BUT I THINK YOU'LL FIND AND FAR BE IT FOR ME TO UPSTAGE THE LAST SPEAKER BECAUSE EVERYBODY RECOGNIZES HIS AUTHORITY AND RESEARCH HAS BEEN PROVEN HERE THIS AFTERNOON BUT I THINK THAT YOU'LL FIND THAT IF YOU LIVED IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, DURING THE 1930'S OR DURING THE LATE 1920'S ON A NUMBER OF OCCASSIONS PARTICULARLY AS FAR AS BANKING WAS CONCERNED, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DISALLOWED ACTS OF THEIR LEGISLATURE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AFTER THE LEGISLATION WAS PASSED. THIS IS THE POINT I AM MAKING THAT LEGISLATION WAS PASSED, AND ESPECIALLY WHEN THEY DEALT WITH THE FUNNY-MONEY ISSUE. THE LEGISLATION WAS PASSED AND THEN IT WAS CHALLENGED BY THE COURTS AND IT WAS CHALLENGED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TOOK IT BEFORE THE COURT AND THE COURTS DECLARED IT ULTRA VIRES OF THEIR POWERS. THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT I AM SAYING. WHAT HAPPENED WITH US HERE WAS DIFFERENT. IT WAS INSTRUCTIONS WERE GIVEN TO THE SENIOR CIVIL SERVANT IN CHARGE OF ADMINISTERING THE TERRITORY, WHO WAS INSTRUCTED NOT TO APPROVE, NOT TO GIVE ASSENT TO THE LEGISLATION THAT HAD BEEN PASSED BY THIS COUNCIL. THIS IS WHY I AM SAYING THAT WAS THE DIFFERENCE. I AGREE WITH WHAT COUNCILLOR TANNER HAS SAID AND I RECALL READING ON IT. I WAS NOT IN CANADA AT THE TIME BUT I RECALL READING ABOUT IT. IT WAS PASSED BY THE ALBERTA LEGISLATIVE BODY AND THEN AFTER IT WAS PASSED AND GIVEN ASSENT TO



BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF ALBERTA AT THE TIME, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THEN TOOK THE MATTER BEFORE THE COURTS TO SET ASIDE THE LEGISLATION ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND ULTRA VIRES OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN ACT. THEY WON AND THIS IS THE PROCEDURE THAT SHOULD BE DONE. IF OURS WERE WRONG, THEN THAT IS THE WAY TO DO IT, BUT NOT TO ALLOW THE DEPARTMENT TO GO AND INSTRUCT THE COMMISSIONER NOT TO GIVE ASSENT TO LEGISLATION THAT WAS PASSED BY THIS HOUSE.

Mr. McKinnon: JUST TO CLARIFY THE POINT JUST A BIT FURTHER ON THE QUESTION, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT IF YOU'LL CHECK BACK IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS YOU'LL FIND THAT THE LEGAL ADVISOR TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY DRAFTED THE BILL AND SAID THAT IT WAS ULTRA VIRES OF THE POWERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. SO IT WAS ANOTHER LEGAL ADVISOR TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SAYING THAT THE LEGAL ADVISOR TO THE YUKON GOVERNMENT WAS WRONG AND IT DIDN'T EVEN GET TO THE PASSAGE STAGE SO IT COULD BE BROUGHT INTO A COURT WHICH OF THE LEGAL ADVISORS WAS RIGHT. THAT'S THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, VIS-A-VIS, THE LEGISLATION OF THIS HOUSE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I AM CERTAINLY NOT GOING TO SPEAK AT LENGTH THIS AFTERNOON ON THE ISSUE OF CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS. IT HAS BEEN DEBATED FOR MANY YEARS IN THIS HOUSE AND IT IS A VERY DISCOURAGING ISSUE BECAUSE THE CHANGES THAT COME ABOUT ARE VERY SLOW AND THEY DRAG ON FROM YEAR TO YEAR. ALSO I FEEL THAT IT IS RATHER DISCOURAGING BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THAT THE MAN ON THE STREET REALLY UNDERSTANDS THE DESIRES THAT SO MANY OF THE PEOPLE AROUND THE CHAMBERS HERE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE AS FAR AS EVOLUTION OF MORE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. PEOPLE ARE AWARE THOUGH, WHEN YOU HAVE SOMETHING GLARING COME BEFORE THEM, THAT THERE IS A REQUIREMENT FOR THE YUKON TO HAVE MORE RESPONSIBILITY AND MORE SAY IN THE DIRECTION OF THEIR OWN AFFAIRS. I REFER BACK TO WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST SAID THE OTHER DAY AND AGAIN REPEATED THIS MORNING: LAND PERMIT, LAND USAGE, LAND DEVELOPMENT, LAND DISPOSAL, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, THESE ARE ALL AREAS WHERE THE GENERAL PUBLIC CANNOT UNDERSTAND AND RESENTS VERY MUCH WHY THEY HAVE TO GO TO FEDERAL AUTHORITIES TO GET PERMISSION AND TO GET AUTHORITY TO DO VARIOUS THINGS WITH THE LAND IN THE YUKON TERRITORY AND THIS IS ONE

AREA THAT STRIKES HOME VERY, VERY CLOSELY TO THE MAN ON THE STREET. THEY RESENT THE CONTROL THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS OVER OUR LAND AND OVER OUR NATURAL RESOURCES. AND IN THIS AREA, THEY WOULD CERTAINLY LIKE TO SEE SOME CHANGES. THE OTHER AREA, AND I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO BRING INTO AT THIS TIME AND WE ARE DISCUSSING LAND AND THE RESOURCES IS THE FACT THAT THE MAN ON THE STREET RESENTS VERY, VERY MUCH THE FACT THAT THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IS NEGOTIATING A SETTLEMENT OF LAND CLAIMS OF YUKON LAND. AND YET THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON ARE NOT HAVING VERY MUCH TO SAY. NOW, THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON, WHO IS A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE, IS A MEMBER OF THE NEGOTIATION TEAM. IN THE LAST MONTH OR SO, WE HAVE A, I WOULD ALMOST TAKE IT AS A TOKEN APPOINTMENT, OF Mr. SHAN. AND YET Mr. SHAN WHO WILL FULFILL HIS FUNCTIONS IS NOT RESPONSIBLE TO ANYONE HERE IN THE YUKON TERRITORY, TO ANYBODY WHO REPRESENTS THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. AND THIS GIVES PEOPLE QUITE A BIT OF CONCERN. THEY ARE ALMOST TAKING THE YUKON TERRITORY, THEIR LAND AND CUTTING IT UP AS YOU DO A PIE AND YET THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO INPUT INTO IT AT ALL. I WAS VERY INTERESTED IN THE DISCUSSION ON SECTION 20 OF THE YUKON ACT. I WAS VERY CONCERNED WITH SECTION 20 ESPECIALLY WITH THE COPY OF THE TELEX THAT WE RECEIVED YESTERDAY FROM THE NATIVE BROTHERHOOD AND IT WAS A TELEX WHICH WAS SENT TO JEAN CHRETIEN RE INDIAN EDUCATION IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. "AS THE POSITION OF THE YUKON NATIVE BROTHERHOOD TOWARDS THE EDUCATION OF YUKON INDIAN CHILDREN HAS BEEN THAT THIS IS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY. WE URGE THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS TO INSURE THAT THE EDUCATION ORDINANCE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY BE POSTPONED FOR TWO YEARS AS PER THE ATTACHED COPY OF THE BAND COUNCIL RESOLUTION RECENTLY BEING DISCUSSED WITH THE TWELVE INDIAN BANDS OF THE YUKON TERRITORY." TO INSURE THAT THE EDUCATION OF THE YUKON ORDINANCE BE POSTPONED FOR TWO YEARS. NOW THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INDIANS IN CANADA IS ALSO THE MINISTER OF NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND HE IS ALSO THE MINISTER WITH THE POWER WITHIN THE YUKON ACT. IT MAKES ME VERY, VERY NERVOUS INDEED, AND I AM SURE THAT THIS IS THE TYPE OF THING THAT MAKES THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY, VERY NERVOUS OF THE FACT THAT WE DO NOT HAVE CONTROL OF OUR OWN DESTINY. THESE ARE REAL THINGS THAT HIT HOME. THESE ARE THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE BECOME CONCERNED ABOUT. I AM ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE SIZE OF THE COUNCIL. I AM CONCERNED BECAUSE THERE ARE MANY AREAS WITHIN THE YUKON TERRITORY WHO DO NOT, THEY HAVE REPRESENTATION, I SHOULDN'T SAY THAT THEY DO NOT, BUT BECAUSE OF THEIR DISTINCT GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION, ::



BECAUSE OF THEIR ECONOMIC SITUATION, THEY SHOULD HAVE DIRECT REPRESENTATION IN THIS HOUSE AND IT HAS CONCERNED ME QUITE SOME TIME BECAUSE OF THE LARGE CONSTITUENCIES IN THE OUTLYING AREAS AND BECAUSE OF THE VARIOUS DIFFERENT NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE THAT MAKE UP A CONSTITUENCY THAT IT IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT THAT THESE CONSTITUENCIES BE DIVIDED UP AND SO THAT YOU HAVE YOUR POCKETS OF SETTLEMENTS HAVING REPRESENTATION IN THIS HOUSE. ALSO, I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE SIZE OF THE COUNCIL AGAIN, FOR ANOTHER REASON AND THAT IS IF WE GO INTO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT AND WE ARE IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT AND WE ALL WANT IT TO SEE IT PERSUED AND WE ALL WANT TO SEE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MEMBERSHIP ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL, AND UNLESS THE COUNCIL IS EXPANDED, I REALLY HAVE SOME GRAVE DOUBTS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. YOU NEED MORE MEMBERS THAN SEVEN IF YOU HAVE THREE, FOUR OR FIVE MEMBERS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. YOU NEED A MUCH LARGER COUNCIL. YOU NEED A LARGE CAUCUS TO BE THE DISCIPLINARY BODY OF THE PEOPLE WHO REPRESENT THE COUNCIL ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I THINK THAT THIS IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT. I WAS VERY DISAPPOINTED WHEN I SAW THAT THE AMENDMENT TO THE YUKON ACT, THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE YUKON ACT, MADE PROVISION FOR ONLY TWELVE MEMBERS. BUT I SUPPORT VERY STRONGLY THE CONCEPT THAT THIS HOUSE SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT AND AUTHORITY TO SET THEIR OWN MEMBERSHIP THE SIZE OF THEIR COUNCIL IN THE FUTURE. IF WE ARE GIVEN THIS THEN WE CAN LET WITH TWELVE. WE CAN MAKE THE NECESSARY ADJUSTMENT. WHEN AND IF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY REQUIRE, AT TO THE PRESENT TIME, THE SIZE OF THE COUNCIL RIDICULOUS AS IT MAY SEEM, HAD IT BEEN AN ISSUE OF CONTENTION BETWEEN THIS COUNCIL AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHICH IS ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAVE NO UNDERSTANDING OF THE SITUATION OR THE CONDITIONS OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY WILL BE MUCH MORE RELUCTANT I AM SURE TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF COUNCIL THEN POSSIBLY EVEN SOME OF THE FEDERAL MEMBERS IN OUR BODY. BECAUSE THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY ARE GOING TO HAVE TO PAY FOR THE COUNCILLORS WHO SIT IN THESE CHAMBERS. I THINK THAT THEN WHEN THE POWER LIES HERE WITHIN THIS COUNCIL, THEN IT IS GOING TO BE UP TO THE POLITICIANS TO CONVINCE THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY THAT THEY NEED A LARGER COUNCIL. AND WHEN THE COUNCIL OPERATES AS A VIABLE LEGISLATURE AND WE HOPE AS AN EXECUTIVE, I AM SURE THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY WILL NOT BE RELUCTANT

TO INCREASE THE SIZE.

ONE OTHER AREA THAT I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON VERY BRIEFLY. I WOULD LIKE TO REVERT BACK TO SOMETHING THAT I HAVE WANTED TO SAY THAT THE SETTLEMENT OF THE INDIAN LAND CLAIMS THAT THE FACT THAT THERE IS NO ONE WHO IS RESPONSIBLE TO ANY ONE IN THE YUKON, NO BODY TO REPORT TO THE YUKON PEOPLE. AND AS IT IS STRUCTURE NOW, IT SHOULD BE THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT WHO REPORTS ON THE NEGOTIATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY. I FEEL MYSELF THAT HE HAS TREATED THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY VERY SHODILY BECAUSE HE HAS NOT MADE ANY STATEMENT ON WHAT THE PURPOSES, WHAT THE ASPIRATIONS OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS ARE. I AM VERY MUCH IN SUPPORT OF THE FACT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST HAS ASKED FOR A REPORT ON THE INDIAN LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT AND I AM VERY HAPPY THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS HAVING THE REPORT COMPLETED. THE ONLY REASON I AM BRINGING UP THIS INDIAN LAND CLAIM NEGOTIATIONS IS THE FACT THAT WE DO NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE INVOLVED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL ANSWER THIS QUESTION THAT I AM GOING TO PROPOSE TO HER. FROM INFORMATION I HAVE RECEIVED, THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. SHAW WAS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMISSIONER. COULD YOU INDICATE WHETHER THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WAS CONSULTED BEFORE THAT RECOMMENDATION WAS MADE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE NO INFORMATION ON THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. SHAW. I HEARD THE ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE NEWS MEDIA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER WILL INDICATE WHETHER, MR. CHAIRMAN, HE HAD MADE THE RECOMMENDATION FOR MR. SHAW TO BE APPOINTED TO THAT COMMITTEE?

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, I THINK COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MY MINISTER AND MYSELF IS A PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST BEFORE THAT COMMISSIONER ANSWERS THAT QUESTION, I THINK I WOULD HAVE TO SAY THAT THE COMMISSIONER HAS EVERY RIGHT TO NOT ANSWER THAT QUESTION IF HE SO DISPOSED. I THINK THAT IT IS A RATHER ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF HE WISHES TO, THE POINT THAT I AM MAKING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS THIS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE COMMISSIONER AND NOBODY IN



THE HOUSE IS ALLOWED TO TRY TO DIVE INTO THE MINISTER'S MIND, SO TO SPEAK, SO IF THE COMMISSIONER WISHES TO ANSWER IT--

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T WANT TO SAY ANYTHING ABOUT DIVING INTO THE COMMISSIONER'S MIND. THE REASON WHY I REALLY ASK THIS QUESTION TO BRING FORWARD, IT IS REALLY TO DO WITH THIS BILL C-9. IT HAS TO DO WITH THE STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THE MINISTER HAS ALWAYS INDICATED, IN FACT THE WHOLE STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THAT THE COMMISSIONER SHALL SEEK ADVICE FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I HAPPEN TO KNOW THAT HE DID MAKE THE RECOMMENDATION AND I'M SATISFIED THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE DID NOT KNOW.

I AM SIMPLY POINTING OUT THAT THE COMMISSIONER DOESN'T ALWAYS CONSULT WITH THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THIS IS WHERE THE SITUATION AS FAR AS C-9 IS EVIDENT. UNLESS THERE IS A FULLY ELECTED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHERE ALL MEMBERS ARE KEPT INFORMED AS TO WHAT IS GOING ON, THERE BECOMES A SITUATION WHERE THERE IS AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF APPOINTED PEOPLE AND AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ELECTED PEOPLE. THIS IS A DANGEROUS SITUATION. THIS IS WHY I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WHEN WE MAKE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS, THAT WE STRONGLY RECOMMEND THAT WE HAVE ALL ELECTED PEOPLE.

THERE IS ONE OTHER POINT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HAS MADE AND I AM GOING TO AGREE WITH HER 100%. I THINK, AND I WANT THE YUKON NATIVE BROTHERHOOD TO KNOW THIS, THEY SENT ME A COPY OF THIS LETTER TOO, AND I'M GOING TO MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR, THAT ALTHOUGH EDUCATION IS A RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE YUKON ACT, CERTAINLY AS FAR AS INDIANS GO, THEY HAVE, UNDER THE INDIAN ACT, CERTAIN RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. BUT NO WAY, WOULD I ALLOW OR SUPPORT THE YUKON NATIVE INDIAN BROTHERHOOD DICTATING TO ME HOW LONG I AM GOING TO HOLD UP A PIECE OF LEGISLATION, ALTHOUGH I THINK IT IS PRETTY BAD LEGISLATION THATS BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD, BUT I'M NOT GOING TO HOLD UP LEGISLATION JUST SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY'VE ASKED FOR IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER? MR. COMMISSIONER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I RISE HERE. I SHOULD NOT RISE HERE BUT IT HAS JUST BEEN

STATED, SOMETHING THAT IS A COMPLETE AND TOTAL UNTRUTH. I THINK I SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO REBUT THIS ITEM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BY ALL MEANS.

MR. COMMISSIONER: I HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH SUGGESTING MR. SHAW'S NAME AS A MEMBER OF THIS INDIAN LAND CLAIMS COMMISSION. I WOULD ASK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO SAID THAT, WOULD HE PLEASE RISE AND HAVE IT RECORDED THAT HE ACCEPTS THIS BACK FROM ME. I DID NOT RECOMMEND MR. SHAW TO THE MINISTER IN THIS PARTICULAR REGARD.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AM AWARE THAT THE COMMISSIONER HAD DISCUSSED THE APPOINTMENT OF A PERSON TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THIS COMMITTEE AND THE NAME OF MR. SHAW CAME UP IN THAT DISCUSSION.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WAS ASKED TO PASS JUDGEMENT, IF IT WERE FELT THAT MR. SHAW WOULD ACCEPT THE APPOINTMENT. I'M JUST NOT GOING TO BE ACCUSED OF SOMETHING THAT IS COMPLETELY AND TOTALLY INCORRECT. LIKEWISE, I WAS ASKED TO CONTACT MR. SHAW, BUT I WAS NOT THE ORIGINATOR OF THIS PARTICULAR SUGGESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THANK YOU, MR. COMMISSIONER. COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, A GREAT DEAL HAS BEEN SAID ON BILL C-9 ON THIS PARTICULAR OCCASION. A GREAT DEAL HAS BEEN SAID ON PREVIOUS OCCASIONS PARTICULARLY BY THE THREE MEMBERS ON COUNCIL THAT HAVE EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO THE 22ND WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL. I AGREE A GREAT DEAL WITH WHAT THEY HAVE SAID BUT NEVERTHELESS, WHEN WE ARE DEBATING A BILL OF THIS IMPORTANCE, I THINK IT IS NECESSARY FOR EACH MEMBER TO GET UP AND STATE THEIR VIEWS ON THE INDIVIDUAL PARTS OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS.

I FEEL THAT IN SOME RESPECTS, ONE HAS TO PUT A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TRUST IN THE MINISTER OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS. I'VE ALWAYS TAKEN A VIEW ALL MY LIFE, THAT I WOULD TRUST SOMEBODY UNTIL I AM SHOWN THAT I HAVE REASON NOT TO TRUST THEM. PARTS OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS I GO ALONG WITH 100%.

THE NO. 1, THAT COUNCIL SHOULD BE INCREASED TO 12 TO BEGIN WITH. I FIND NO FAULT IN THAT AND I THINK THAT 12 IS PROBABLY A GOOD NUMBER TO START OFF WITH. I THINK THAT THIS PARTICULAR AMENDMENT IS FINE.



WHEN WE COME TO THE 2ND AMENDMENT, I DO HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFICULTY IN ACCEPTING THAT TYPE OF A FORMULA FOR FURTHER INCREASE IN COUNCIL. I NOTICED AROUND THE TABLE TODAY OF THE FOUR PREVIOUS SPEAKERS THAT EVERY ONE OF THEM SUPPORTS THE VIEW THAT THAT DECISION SHOULD BE LEFT IN THE HANDS OF COUNCIL. I GO ALONG WITH THAT PART 100% BECAUSE AS I STATED, EVEN WHEN THE MINISTER WAS HERE, THERE ARE SO MANY INSTANCES WHERE DEVELOPMENT IN A YOUNG TERRITORY SUCH AS OURS, CAN TAKE PLACE IN SUCH A WAY THAT WE MAY NOT, IN FACT DO NOT, TIE IT INTO THAT TYPE OF A FORMULA. I WOULD CERTAINLY GO ALONG WITH THE FEELING THAT COUNCIL ITSELF HAVE THE POWER TO INCREASE THE NUMBERS BEYOND THAT 12.

WHEN WE COME TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, ITSELF, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO READ A FEW THINGS FROM THE MINISTER'S SPEECH. THE SECOND READING OF THE BILL. HE STARTS OUT BY SAYING, 'THE CASE WE'RE GIVING THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIES MORE CONTROL OVER THEIR AFFAIRS IS ALSO STRENGTHENED BY OUR EXPERIENCE, WITH THE OPERATIONS OF THE CHANGES THIS HOUSE APPROVED FOUR YEARS AGO, AND WITH THE ARRANGEMENT WE INTRODUCED THEN, TO GIVE THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES A VOICE ON THE EXECUTIVE SIDE OF GOVERNMENT.' SKIPPING A PARAGRAPH HE GOES ON TO SAY, 'MY VIEW, IS THIS JOINING OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE SIDES OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL HAS WORKED WELL.' THERE MAY BE SOME ARGUMENT ABOUT THAT AROUND THIS TABLE BUT NEVERTHELESS THAT IS THE MINISTER'S VIEW.

HE ALSO GOES ON TO SAY, 'THE CHANGES THAT I AM PROPOSING TODAY TO THE YUKON AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACTS ARE INTENDED TO BUILD UPON THIS TRADITION, TO FULFILL MY GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE FOR THE FURTHER EVOLUTION OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES AND TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIES FOR MORE CONTROL OVER THEIR AFFAIRS. TO HAVE MORE SAY IN THE DECISIONS THAT AFFECT THEM.' HE THEN GOES ON OF COURSE AND MENTIONS THE FIRST AMENDMENT WHICH IS 12. THEN WE COME TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND HERE IT HAS BEEN STATED BY AT LEAST THREE OF THE PREVIOUS SPEAKERS, THAT THEY FELT THAT THE MAKE-UP OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD BE WRITTEN RIGHT INTO THE YUKON ACT.

I WOULD AGREE WITH THEM IF, AT THIS TIME, THE MAKE-UP OF THAT COMMITTEE WAS SUCH THAT THE ELECTED MEMBERS OUTNUMBERED THE APPOINTED MEMBERS. BUT AT THE SAME TIME, IF IT IS NOT

TO BE THAT WAY, IF IT IS TO BE ---AS SUGGESTED BY THE MINISTER AT THIS POINT, A 3 AND 3 SPLIT, THEN I WOULD NOT WANT TO SEE IT WRITTEN IN THE YUKON ACT. FOR THE SIMPLE REASON AND AGAIN, QUOTING FROM THE REMARKS MADE BY THE MINISTER, HE SAYS, 'IT IS MY INTENTION TO COMPLEMENT THE LARGER COUNCIL BY INCREASING THE NUMBER OF ELECTED COUNCILLORS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FROM 2 TO 3. UNDER SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT, THE COMMISSIONER WOULD REMAIN CHAIRMAN BUT DURING THE LIFE OF THE NEXT COUNCIL,' AND THIS IS THE IMPORTANT PART, 'IT MAY BE DESIRABLE TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF APPOINTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE', AND I WILL CONSULT WITH A COUNCILLOR ABOUT THIS. SO IN OTHER WORDS, HE IS SAYING THAT IF WE SHOW FURTHER RESPONSIBILITY, A FURTHER ABILITY TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY, THEN HE, PERSONALLY, WOULD BE WILLING TO GO A STEP FURTHER AND GIVE THE CONTROL OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE INTO THE HANDS OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS.

AS I SAY, UNTIL I HAVE BEEN SHOWN REASON NOT TO TRUST THE MINISTER, I AM PREPARED TO ACCEPT THAT SUGGESTION AND AS FAR AS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IS CONCERNED, THE OTHER SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT, I HAVE TO AGREE WITH COUNCILLOR TAYLOR THAT THEY APPEAR TO BE MOSTLY OF A HOUSE-KEEPING NATURE. I DON'T THINK THAT THE AMENDMENTS GO FAR ENOUGH. I WOULD HAVE TO AGREE WITH THE COUNCILLOR FROM WHITEHORSE WEST IN SAYING THAT AFTER WE GET THROUGH DEBATING ON BILL C-9, IT IS HOPED AND I WOULD AGREE WITH HIM HERE, THAT EVEN THOUGH THE AMENDMENT MAY APPEAR TO BE SOMEWHAT SHORT OF WHAT WE REALLY WANT, I WOULD HOPE THERE IS AT LEAST A UNANIMOUS MOTION OR RESOLUTION OUT OF THIS COUNCIL SUPPORTING THOSE PARTS OF THE AMENDMENT, WHICH SO FAR HAVE SHOWN UP IN THE DEBATES OF ALL MEMBERS THAT THEY COULD SUPPORT AND THOSE PRIMARILY ARE THE 12, A GOOD STARTING POINT THAT WE ACCEPT OR AT LEAST WE ARE FAIRLY HAPPY TO HAVE AN INCREASE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

THERE ARE ONE OR TWO OTHER POINTS. I HAVE KEPT A SCORE TAB OF WHAT I FELT WERE THE IMPORTANT THINGS THAT ALL MEMBERS HAVE STATED. IT DOES APPEAR TO BE A PATENT DEVELOPING ON SOME OF THESE AMENDMENTS.

AS I SAY, SOME OF THE AMENDMENTS I GO ALONG WITH 100%. I THINK THEY ARE A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION BUT PERHAPS THAT STEP IS NOT AS LARGE AS WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT GO. APART FROM THOSE FEW REMARKS, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD



SUPPORT THOSE PARTS OF THE AMENDMENTS ANYWAY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T THINK THAT THE MEMBER FROM DAWSON RECOGNIZED AS A SPECIFIC AREA THAT I WAS SPEAKING ABOUT WHICH WAS NOT A CASE OF MISTRUST OF THE MINISTER. BUT THE DANGER THAT THE MINISTER MAY NOT BE THAT SAME MINISTER. TODAY, YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT MINISTER JEAN CHRETIEN. HE MAY, AFTER THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL, BE MOVED TO ANOTHER PORTFOLIO. BECAUSE THEN IT WOULD BE TOO LATE TO CONSIDER FURTHER AMENDMENTS AND IT MIGHT TAKE ANOTHER FIVE YEARS TO CORRECT THE SITUATION.

IT MAY BE THAT WITH THE SITUATION THAT HAS DEVELOPED AS FAR AS MINORITY GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA, WE HAVE TO BE PRACTICAL ABOUT IT, IT MAY BE THAT THERE MAY NOT BE THE SAME GOVERNMENT IN POWER IN A YEAR OR TWO YEARS, EVEN IF THE MINISTER DID REMAIN IN THE SAME PORTFOLIO. THIS IS WHY I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE LACK OF COOPERATION OF THE REFERENCE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITHIN THE LEGISLATION ITSELF, THE AMENDMENTS ITSELF.

A FURTHER POINT. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER I WAS WRONG IN CONSTRUING WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST SAID. I UNDERSTOOD THAT REFERENCE SHOULD BE MADE BY WAY OF UNANIMITY NOT ONLY ON THE SECTIONS THAT ARE AGREED WITH BUT THOSE AREAS THAT THE COUNCIL HERE DO OBJECT TO ON THE BASIS THAT THEY WERE NOT INCORPORATED AS AMENDMENTS.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON MADE REFERENCE ONLY TO THE SECTIONS THAT WERE AGREED WITHIN THE BILL. IF WE DID THAT AND SAID WE AGREED WITH THE INCREASE TO 12, AND I DON'T THINK ANYBODY IS DISAGREEING WITH THE INCREASE TO 12, IT DOESN'T GO ANY FURTHER. THIS IS REALLY WHAT IS CONCERNING ME AT THIS TIME. THAT ALL IT HAS DONE, ALL THE BILL DOES, IS SIMPLY INCREASE THE NUMBER OF ELECTED PEOPLE IN THE CHAMBERS OF THE YUKON TERRITORIAL COUNCIL TO THAT OF 12 FROM 7.

IT DOESN'T GO ONE IOTA BEYOND THAT.

TRYING THAT I'VE MADE REFERENCE TO OR THE COMMISSIONER OR RATHER THE MINISTER WOULD INDICATE QUITE CLEARLY THAT THE COMMISSIONER, AS AN OFFICE, IS COMING TO AN END OR THAT THE COMMISSIONER AS AN OFFICE WILL ONLY BE A REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN A PARTICULAR AREA, HE CAN BE GIVEN CHARGE OF THE DEFENSE FOR THE

YUKON AND HE CAN HAVE HIS OWN ARMY AND PLAY AT BEING A FIELD MARSHALL, WITH THREE OR FOUR PEOPLE. THIS IS FINE, HE CAN BE LOCKED INTO THAT POSITION AND I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO A PERSON IN THE POSITION OF COMMISSIONER OR SOME OTHER NAME AS A LIAISON OFFICER BETWEEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE TERRITORY UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE EXPANSION, THE APPROVAL TAKES PLACE.

AS IT IS NOW, AND I'M SURE ALL MEMBERS MUST AGREE, THERE IS ONLY ONE AREA WHERE THERE ANY CHANGES TO THE ACT AND THAT IS THE EXPANSION FROM 7 TO 12 AND NOTHING MORE. THIS IS WHERE WE'VE GOT TO SAY QUITE CLEARLY THAT IT IS INSUFFICIENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF, OH COUNCILLOR TANNER, I JUST HAVE A QUESTION THAT I WISH TO DIRECT AT MR. LEGAL ADVISOR. PROCEED.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT ALL MEMBERS ARE TO BE CONGRATULATED TODAY IN EXPRESSING THEIR VIEWS, SOME OF WHICH HAVE BEEN ONGOING FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS. A NUMBER OF YEARS THAT THOSE MEMBERS HAVE BEEN IN THE COUNCIL AND I THINK THEY EXPRESSED THE VIEWS OF A LOT OF YUKONERS.

MR. SPEAKER, I THINK THERE IS ONE THING THAT I'VE GOT TO RETAIN UNTO MYSELF, THERE HAVE BEEN THREE MEMBERS ALREADY SPOKE. THEY HAVE HAD THEIR VARIOUS LEGAL CASES AND I'VE GOT MY CASE, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MY CASE IS, 'IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY BETWEEN NORMAN S. CHAMBERLIST, PLAINTIFF AND JAMES SMITH ESQ., COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, DEFENDANT.

THE REASONS FOR THE JUDGEMENT OF THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE W. G. MORROW AND DURING HIS JUDGEMENT, HE SAYS, 'BEFORE I READ THE JUDGEMENT I WOULD POINT OUT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT I HAVE CHANGED ONE WORD BECAUSE HE HIMSELF ASKED THE JUSTICE TO CHANGE THE WORD AND THE JUDGE DID I THINK IN THE SECOND FINDING. MR. MORROW SAID, I MERELY WANT TO HAVE MY CASE BECAUSE ALL OTHER MEMBERS SEEM TO HAVE ONE AND MEMBERS SHOULD DRAW THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS FROM IT. 'I SEE NOTHING WRONG IN THE COMMISSIONER EXPERIMENTING WITH AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF HIS MINISTER AND THE CONCURRENCE OF THE COUNCIL.' IN THE FIRST JUDGEMENT, HE SAID HIS COUNCIL AND I THINK THAT IS BEING CORRECTED. INDEED, THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PART, MR. CHAIRMAN, 'AS ONE LOOKS



BACK OVER THE HISTORY OF BRITISH COLONIES AND DOMINIONS, WHICH WE ARE INCLUDING CANADA. IT IS BY SUCH EXPERIMENTS WITHOUT LEGAL SANCTION, SHALL WE SAY, THAT THE CONVENTIONS OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT WHICH ARE MORE IMPORTANT IN THE END THAN THE WRITTEN LAW, I'VE GAINED IN ONE.'

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE POINT?

MR. TANNER: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED WHAT THE POINT IS. THE POINT IS THIS, IF WE LIKE IT OR NOT, WE ARE IN A COLONIAL-TYPE SITUATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS WHAT WE WANT TO CHANGE.

MR. TANNER: AND WE WANT TO CHANGE IT AND AS MR. JUSTICE MORROW POINTS OUT, THE WAY IT HAS BEEN CHANGED UP TO DATE, UP UNTIL THE ACT GOES THROUGH THE FEDERAL HOUSE, HAS BEEN PRIMARILY ON AN ONGOING HISTORICAL PRECEDENT--TYPE BASIS. WE HAVE HAD THE BRINGING FORTH OF AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND IT WOULD SEEM LOGICAL TO ME MR. CHAIRMAN THAT WE SHOULD CONTINUE ON THAT BASIS FOR SOME TIME.

AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE POINT I'M TRYING TO MAKE MR. CHAIRMAN, I'VE HAD THE PUBLIC STOP ME ON THE STREET, TALK TO ME, PHONE ME AT THE HOUSE, GREATLY CONCERNED ABOUT A GREAT NUMBER OF THINGS. FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAD A PACKED GALLERY HERE WHEN WE HAD A MEDICARE DEBATE, WE'VE HAD ALL SORTS OF DISCUSSIONS AND THE PUBLIC IS VERY INTERESTED IN THE PUBLIC DRINKING AND THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE POINTED OUT, EVERY COUNCILLOR IS PERSISTENTLY GETTING ASKED ABOUT THE LAND PROBLEMS IN THE YUKON. THE SCHOOL'S ORDINANCE, I'M SURE IS GOING TO GENERATE A GREAT DEAL IN THE PUBLIC VIEW. TAXES AND TRAILER PARKS AND DOZENS AND DOZENS OF OTHER ITEMS.

EVERY MEMBER ENJOYS OR HAS TO DEAL WITH QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC. MR. CHAIRMAN I HAVE YET TO HAVE VERY MANY QUESTIONS FROM MY CONSTITUENTS OR VERY MANY QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AS A WHOLE AS REGARDS TO A CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE YUKON.

I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE BLAME LIES FOR THAT MR. CHAIRMAN, WHETHER IT IS OURS, OUR FAULT AS POLITICIANS, WHETHER IT IS THE PRESS' FAULT BECAUSE THEY DON'T REPORT US, WHETHER IT'S THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAULT BECAUSE THEY DO NOT

PUT OUT NEWS RELEASES, WHETHER IT'S JUST THAT THE PUBLIC IS NOT INTERESTED, BUT THE FACT REMAINS - LOOK AT THE GALLERY- THE FACT REMAINS THAT THE PUBLIC DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE VITALLY INTERESTED IN THE EXPANSION OF THE COUNCIL BUT ALSO IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE YUKON, RATHER THE CONSTITUTIONAL EXPANSION OF THE YUKON. THEREFORE, MR. SPEAKER, THE FIRST SUGGESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIRST SUGGESTION THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE EXPANDED TO TWELVE TO MY MIND SUITS THE PUBLIC NEED, AND I'VE GOT TO EXPRESS ONLY MY OWN OPINION ON IT, SUITS THE PUBLIC NEED AS OF TODAY. I DON'T THINK THE PUBLIC IS PREPARED TO BEAR THE COST OF ANY FURTHER EXPANSION OTHER THAN TWELVE. THAT IS MY OWN OPINION MR. CHAIRMAN AND I WANT TO MAKE IT VERY CLEAR. BUT THAT IS THE WAY I READ THE PUBLIC FEELING, THAT WE NEED A CHANGE, WE NEED MORE MEMBERS BUT ANY MORE THAN TWELVE, AT THIS TIME, I THINK WILL BE TOO MUCH FOR THE PUBLIC TO TAKE. I THINK THE FACT THAT WE NEED MORE MEMBERS HAS BEEN ILLUSTRATED BY THE PROBLEMS WE'VE HAD WITH OUR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS, AND IN SPITE OF THE PERSONALITIES, IN SPITE OF THE PROBLEMS THAT WE HAVE HAD IN THIS COUNCIL, AND IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT I DON'T THINK THE PUBLIC HAS UNDERSTOOD WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST THREE AND ONE-HALF YEARS, I THINK THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAS WORKED. FROM MY OWN OBSERVATION SINCE HAVING, IN THE FEW MONTHS SINCE I'VE BEEN ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, I HAVE FOUND THE COMMISSIONER HAS GONE OUT OF HIS WAY TO INVOLVE ME, AND I HOPE MRS. WATSON, IN MOST OF THE DECISIONS, IN THE DECISIONS WHICH HE HAS TO MAKE PERTAINING STRICTLY TO THE LEGISLATURE OR TO THE YUKON. I THINK IT'S FORTUNATE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THIS COMMISSIONER WAS A PREVIOUS TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR AND UNDERSTOOD THE FRUSTRATIONS HE HAD WORKING UNDER A COMMISSIONER, AND I THINK HE BENT OVER BACKWARDS IN MOST RESPECTS TO TRY TO CHANGE THEM FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TO WORK IN BOTH THIS COUNCIL AND WITH HIM CLOSELY ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE INTENTION OF THE FEDERAL HOUSE AND OF THE MINISTER TO EXPAND COUNCIL ON AN ON-GOING BASIS WAS AN IMPROVEMENT ON WHAT WE'VE HAD UP TO NOW. IF THERE IS MORE MEMBERS REQUIRED WE HAD TO GO BACK AND GET A CHANGE IN THE FEDERAL ACT. I THINK WITH THE BEST INTENTIONS IN THE WORLD, IN THEIR BEAUTIFUL PATERNALISTIC WAY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SET DOWN AND SAID "OKAY LET'S SEE IF WE CAN GET A FORMULA SO WE DON'T HAVE TO COME BACK", AND THEY DEVISED A FORMULA AND MR.



CHAIRMAN, WHAT THEY HAVE COME UP WITH IS THE MOST CUMBERSOME, UNWORKABLE AND DIFFICULT FORMULA WHICH WILL CREATE PROBLEMS FOR THIS HOUSE, IT WILL CREATE PROBLEMS FOR THAT OTHER HOUSE, IT WILL CREATE PROBLEMS FOR THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE GOT TO PUT THE AMENDMENTS INTO EFFECT, IT WILL CREATE PROBLEMS FOR STATISTICS CANADA, IT WILL CREATE PROBLEMS FOR THE CENSUS TAKERS, IT WILL CREATE PROBLEMS RIGHT DOWN THE LINE, AND MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT WITHOUT ANY PROBLEM AT ALL YOU CAN GET A UNANIMOUS DECISION FROM THIS HOUSE THAT THIS HOUSE SHOULD MAKE ITS OWN DECISION ON HOW MANY MEMBERS IT WILL HAVE. I THINK, MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS WE SHOULD MAKE IS TO TAKE THAT RIGHT OUT AND LET US DECIDE FOR OURSELVES BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO ANSWER TO THE PUBLIC, AND AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HAS SAID, AND MAYBE THERE IS NO PRICE ON DEMOCRACY, BUT IT'S THOSE PEOPLE OUT THERE THAT HAVE GOT TO PAY FOR IT, AND THEY ARE NOT GOING TO ALLOW US TO GO ANY FURTHER THAN IS PRACTICAL AND NECESSARY. MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK TO MY MIND THESE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT CONTAIN TWO BASIC IDEAS. ONE OF THEM IS THE EXPANSION OF COUNCIL AND AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, AND I THINK AS FAR AS ALL MEMBERS ARE CONCERNED, WE HAVE ALL EXPRESSED OURSELVES ON THAT. WHAT THEY'VE COME UP WITH IS NO GOOD AND IT SHOULD BE IN THIS HOUSE. THE OTHER ONE AND THE ONE THAT I ENDORSED IS THE EXPANSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T BELIEVE WE SHOULD WRITE THE EXPANSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE INTO THE BILL BECAUSE IF YOU DO, YOU ADMITTEDLY TAKE THE CHANCE, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST POINTS OUT, THAT THE MINISTER COULD CHANGE, THE PARLIAMENT COULD CHANGE AND WE COULD BE LEFT HANGING OUT, IF YOU LIKE WITH OUR TONGUES HANGING OUT WAITING FOR ANOTHER CHANGE. BUT, THE FEAR ALSO OF WRITING IT INTO THE ACT ITSELF IS IF SOME TIME IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THEIR WISDOM STOPS THEIR PATERNALISTIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE YUKON, AND IF WE GET A MINISTER WHO WANTS TO GO EVEN FURTHER THAN THIS MINISTER, AND I BELIEVE THIS MINISTER SHOULD BE CONGRATULATED FOR GOING AT LEAST THIS FAR. WE COULD DO NOTHING UNLESS WE GOT ANOTHER DEBATE AND ANOTHER AMENDMENT TO THE YUKON ACT IN THE HOUSE AND MR. CHAIRMAN, EVERY MEMBER I ASSUME HAS READ SOME OF THE VOTES & PROCEEDINGS IN THE HANSARD ON MONDAY, MARCH 18TH, AND IT'S APPARENT TO ANYBODY WHO READS THESE THAT HALF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE TALKING ON THOSE DEBATES

DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT. NOW, I WOULD GUARANTEE THAT A GREAT NUMBER OF MEMBERS WITHIN THE FEDERAL HOUSE DON'T KNOW, NOT ONLY DON'T KNOW WHERE THE YUKON IS, THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THE YUKON, AND WHEN YOU PUT THE PROPOSITION TO THEM THAT YOU HAVE GOT TO HAVE TWELVE MEMBERS UP IN THAT FUNNY PLACE UP IN THE NORTH THEY SAY WHAT FOR 20,000 PEOPLE? WHETHER OR NOT WE LIKE IT THERE IS BOTH A POPULATION AND A PRICE ON DEMOCRACY AND THAT IS A FACT. WE MIGHT NOT LIKE IT BUT WE HAVE TO LIVE WITH IT. THE VERY THING THAT WE ARE TRYING TO OBTAIN IN THIS HOUSE IS A CABINET FORM OF GOVERNMENT. THERE IS NO POINT IN SITTING HERE CRITICISING ANOTHER CABINET WHICH IS FULLY ELECTED AND SAYING THEY ARE NOT GOING FAR ENOUGH. IT IS THEIR DECISION, THEY HAVE MADE THEIR DECISION, SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE SHOULD LIVE OR TRY TO ACCOMMODATE OR TRY TO GET AS MUCH AS WE POSSIBLY CAN OUT OF THAT DECISION. I DON'T THINK - I DISAGREE WITH WHAT ANY MEMBER SAID AROUND THE HOUSE TODAY AND I DON'T THINK THERE IS THAT MUCH DISAGREEMENT EXCEPT ON THIS ONE POINT. WHETHER OR NOT WE LIKE IT WE ARE PEONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, THAT IS A FACT. THEY OWN THE LAND, THEY OWN THE RESOURCES AND THEY APPARENTLY DETERMINE, OR THEY THINK THEY SHOULD DETERMINE HOW MANY REPRESENTATIVES WE SHOULD HAVE IN THE COUNCIL, AND THEY CAN ALSO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE GOING TO GET SELF GOVERNMENT AND WHAT TIME, AND THAT IS A FACT SO WE MIGHT AS WELL LIVE WITH IT. THEREFORE, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULDN'T WANT TO SEE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT WRITTEN INTO THE ACT AT THIS TIME UNLESS, OF COURSE, THEY ARE PREPARED TO SAY THERE SHALL BE A FULLY ELECTED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, BUT LET'S FACE IT THEY ARE NOT GOING TO DO IT. THEY HAVE ALREADY MADE THAT DECISION. MR. CHAIRMAN, I ONLY HAVE ONE OTHER POINT AND AGAIN IT'S A PERSONAL ONE. ONE REASON THAT I THINK IT'S ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT WE GET THIS EXPANSION OF MEMBERSHIP IRRESPECTIVE OF ANYTHING ELSE IS THAT THIS HOUSE IS NOT REPRESENTATIVE AS IT PRESENTLY IS CONSTITUTED OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF THE YUKON. MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS A THIRD OF THE POPULATION IN THIS TERRITORY, EITHER INDIAN OR NON-STATUS INDIAN WHO IS NOT REPRESENTED IN THIS HOUSE, AND FROM WHAT I CAN FIND OUT HAVE NEVER BEEN REPRESENTED IN THIS HOUSE, AND IT'S ABOUT TIME THEY WERE. THERE IS NO WAY THAT WE CAN EITHER CONDONE OR RECOMMEND OR CRITICISE OR PASS JUDGEMENT ON THE INDIAN POPULATION OF THIS TERRITORY UNLESS THEY ARE HERE TO SPEAK UP FOR



THEMSELVES. IT'S THEIR RIGHT AND IT'S THEIR OBLIGATION TO RUN MEMBERS THIS NEXT TIME AND MAKE SURE THEY GET INTO THIS HOUSE, BECAUSE WE NEED THEM HERE. WE NEED THEM HERE SO WE CAN GET THEIR POINT OF VIEW AND THEY CAN HEAR OURS. MR. CHAIRMAN, I THANK YOU FOR THE TIME AND I THANK ALL MEMBERS BECAUSE I THINK WE CAN SEND A DECISION DOWN TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND IT WOULD BE MY SUGGESTION WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF ALL MEMBERS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WE SHOULD PERHAPS HAVE A CAUCUS MEETING AND SEE IF WE CAN DESIGN SOME SORT OF RECOMMENDATION THAT HAS BEEN REQUESTED FROM OTTAWA FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN AFFAIRS. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THANK YOU. JUST BEFORE WE PROCEED I WONDER IF I MIGHT BE PERMITTED TO DIRECT A QUESTION TO MR. LEGAL ADVISER IF YOU WOULD ASK HIM IN HERE FOR THIS PURPOSE. MR. LEGAL ADVISER, JUST FROM THE CHAIR, I WONDER IF YOU COULD TAKE A LOOK AT SECTION 18 OF BILL C-9. SECTION 18 OF BILL C-9 AFFECTS THE YUKON TERRITORY IN AS IT REFERS TO THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT. NOW IN SUBSECTION 6 OF SECTION 113 AS FOUND IN PART 18 WE DEAL WITH THE EXCLUSION OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, FOR INSTANCE, FROM THE 6 MONTHS OF COMING INTO FORCE OR SIX MONTHS PRIOR TO ISSUING THE WRIT. WHAT TIME IS THEN REQUIRED - WHAT NOTICE DOES ONE HAVE TO GIVE FOR THE ELECTORAL OFFICER OR THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER IN ORDER TO HAVE AN ELECTION. WHAT IS THE MINIMUM TIME NOW?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: SIX MONTHS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: UNDER THIS SECTION NOW.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: OH, UNDER THIS SECTION THERE IS NO MAXIMUM OR MINIMAL LIMITS TO TIME. IT SAYS THAT YOU CANNOT HAVE A CHANGE OPERATIVE FOR SIX MONTHS AFTER THE CHANGE IS MADE UNLESS THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER IS PUT IN A POSITION TO ADOPT IT IN WHICH EVENT HE WILL SAY SO BY PUTTING A NOTICE IN THE GAZETTE WHICH COULD REDUCE IT TO WHATEVER THE PRACTICALITY OF THE SITUATION IS AT THAT TIME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE ACT WHICH WOULD SPECIFY A MINIMUM TIME BY WHICH THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER CAN EFFECTIVELY WORK AND ISSUE A WRIT.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: SIX MONTHS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: FROM WHAT DATE?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: FROM THE TIME OF COMING INTO FORCE OF A CHANGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: BUT THIS IS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THIS SECTION.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THE EXCEPTION BEING MADE TO THAT SIX MONTHS TIME LIMIT, AND THAT EXCEPTION IS WHATEVER THE TIME THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER FEELS HE REQUIRES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS MEANS THAT HE DOES NOT HAVE TO USE THE SIX-MONTH PROVISION AS I READ IT, SUBSECTION 618.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THAT IS CORRECT SIR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NOW, IF HE PUBLISHES IN THE CANADA GAZETTE A NOTICE THAT THE NECESSARY PREPARATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, WHAT PERIOD OF TIME IS THEN REQUIRED TO CALL AN ELECTION TO ISSUE THE WRIT ORDERING THE ELECTION. CAN IT BE DONE THEN?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: IT'S A NON-MEASUREABLE TIME. IT'S A TIME WHICH IS FIXED BY THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER. IF HE HAS COMPLETED HIS PREPARATIONS IN TIME HE PUBLISHES A NOTICE. IF HE HASN'T, HE CAN RUN ON TO THE SIX MONTHS, BUT THE SIX MONTHS THEN APPLIES. HE MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO IT IN ONE MONTH, TWO MONTHS, THREE MONTHS, FOUR MONTHS ---

MR. CHAIRMAN: RIGHT. OKAY. THAT WAS ALL I WAS REALLY CONCERNED ABOUT.

MR. TANNER: I AM TRYING TO SECOND-GUESS WHAT THE CHAIRMAN WAS ASKING. IS THE QUESTION YOU ARE TRYING TO ASK OR WANT MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE FACT AT WHAT TIME COULD WE POSSIBLY HAVE A FEDERAL, TERRITORIAL ELECTION IF WE GOT THESE AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT AND HOW SOON?

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES, THIS IS ONE OF THE QUESTIONS I AM TRYING TO INTERPRET - JUST THE FULL MEANING OF 18, BUT THIS IS ONE OF THE QUESTIONS THAT WAS IN MY MIND - IS THE TIME-TABLE BACK FROM THE ISSUING OF THE WRIT TO THE TIME THE WRIT MAY BE ISSUED TO THE TIME SO FORTH STAGING BACK TO SEE IN TIME, THERE IS SUFFICIENT TIME FOR PARLIAMENT TO DEAL WITH THIS MATTER AND STILL BRING ANY AMENDMENTS IF THEY DO PASS PARLIAMENT INTO EFFECT.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: YES, BUT IT IS NOT BASICALLY A PARLIAMENTARY TIME-BLOCK WE ARE TALKING

ABOUT. WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IS A CHANGE COMING INTO FORCE IN THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES WHICH IS WITHIN THE POWER OF THIS HOUSE, AND IT TALKS ABOUT SIX MONTHS FROM THE EFFECTIVE DATE COMING INTO FORCE OF THAT ORDINANCE, WHICH IS AN ORDINANCE, OR A SHORTER TIME IF THE ELECTORAL OFFICER CAN DO IT QUICKER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES, THIS IS CORRECT, BUT WITHOUT THE PASSAGE OF THIS PARTICULAR BILL C-9 BY PARLIAMENT THEN WE ARE BOUND TO THE SIX MONTHS PROVISION NOTWITHSTANDING BECAUSE IT NOW EXISTS IN THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: NO, NO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES, BUT UNDER SECTION 113 I'M SURE IT DOES.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE IF THE FEDERAL HOUSE PASSES THIS BILL WE COULD HAVE A TERRITORIAL ELECTION SOMETIME IN THE FALL OR IN THE VERY LATE FALL OR EARLY WINTER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT WE CAN'T DO THAT BECAUSE WE ARE LIMITED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE WRIT. WE ARE GOING AWAY FROM THE DISCUSSION NOW AND I DON'T WANT TO GO ON TO THAT ELECTORAL BOUNDARY SITUATION BECAUSE THAT BRINGS UP ANOTHER AREA THAT DOESN'T DEAL WITH THIS AT THE MOMENT. WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO REPLY, MR. CHAIRMAN, FIRST OF ALL, REFERENCE WAS MADE TO THE JUDGMENT OF MR. JUSTICE MORROW.

UNFORTUNATELY COUNCILLOR TANNER HAS NOT READ THE WHOLE OF THE JUDGMENT, HE HAS TAKEN IT OUT OF CONTEXT OF WHAT WAS INTENDED. BUT REALLY WHAT THE JUDGE SAID IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE, AND YOU HAVE GOT TO KEEP IN MIND THAT WHAT BROUGHT THIS JUDGMENT ABOUT WAS THE ARBITRARY ACTIONS OF THE APPOINTED PERSON UNDER THE YUKON ACT WHO, WHICH CAN HAPPEN AGAIN AND AGAIN BECAUSE THERE IS NOTHING IN THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN C9 TO PREVENT THAT FROM HAPPENING IN FUTURE. WHAT HE IS RECOMMENDING IS THAT, WHAT HE IS SAYING ACTUALLY, IS UNDER OUR PRESENT SYSTEM THIS IS WHAT HAPPENS, AND THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH WHAT HAPPENS BUT OUR FUNCTION TODAY IN DISCUSSING BILL C-9 IS TO MAKE SURE THAT WHAT DOES HAPPEN IN FUTURE CAN HAPPEN ONLY BECAUSE IT IS ENSHRINED IN THE STATUTORY AUTHORITY, AND THAT SHOULD BE RIGHT WITHIN THE YUKON ACT, AND I MUST TELL YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED I CANNOT SEE THAT THERE CAN BE ANY DIFFERENCE TO WHAT WE ARE DOING TODAY AND THE PROBLEMS THAT WE ARE GOING TO

BE INVOLVED IN WITH EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND WITH A MANIPULATING COMMISSIONER WHETHER IT IS THIS ONE OR THE NEXT ONE, WHO HE WILL TEACH I'M SURE, TO BE IN THE SAME POSITION BECAUSE THE SAME THING WILL HAPPEN. NOW THIS IS WHERE THERE IS A QUESTION WHETHER OR NOT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAS BEEN WORKING. I SAY TO A GREAT EXTENT IT HAS WORKED, BUT AT THE SAME TIME I WANT TO INDICATE THAT WHILE HE FIRST HAD THE RIGHT IDEA THE COMMISSIONER CAN BY MANIPULATION AFFECT THE ELECTED PEOPLE. NOW - - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, POINT OF PRIVILEGE. HE'S MAKING INSINUATIONS THERE THAT I CAN'T AGREE WITH AND I'M GOING TO VOICE MY DISAGREEMENT VERY STRONGLY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU CAN GET UP AND SAY SO THEY DON'T - - -

MRS. WATSON: ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR POINT OF PRIVILEGE? PLEASE, BE SEATED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, HE'S MAKING INSINUATIONS ABOUT ELECTED PEOPLE BEING INFLUENCED UNDULY, AND I AM RESENTING THE INSINUATIONS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS MAKING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK IT'S WITHIN THE CONFIDENCE OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER TO MAKE THAT ACCUSATION AS LONG AS IT IS NOT AGAINST ANY MEMBER OF THIS HOUSE. I HAVEN'T HEARD - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAYBE YOU SHOULD LISTEN A LITTLE MORE CAREFULLY. HE CERTAINLY WAS MAKING ACCUSATIONS AGAINST SOMEONE IN THIS HOUSE, AND I HAVE A RIGHT TO STAND UP ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. HE SEEMS TO SLUR OVER THESE THINGS QUITE EASILY AND NO-ONE ELSE SEEMS TO NOTICE THEM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I UNDERSTOOD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS SPEAKING ABOUT WALLY FIRTH, THE COMMISSIONER OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES BUT, HOWEVER, I COULD HAVE MISUNDERSTOOD.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN ANY CASE, THE POSITION IS QUITE CLEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THERE IS A COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1970/2 WHICH THE COMMISSIONER HAS, I REPEAT, SIGNED FOR HIMSELF, GIVEN HIMSELF THE DIRECTION AND



MANAGEMENT OVER THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. YOU CAN'T DENY THAT, HE'S GOT HIS SIGNATURE ATTACHED TO THE BILL. NOW CERTAIN REFERENCE WAS MADE TO LAND, AND WE CAN'T DEAL WITH LAND UNLESS WE HAVE CHANGES TO THE ACT THAT GIVES US THE RIGHT TO DEAL WITH LAND. WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN NOW? IT'S GOING TO BE GIVEN TO THE COMMISSIONER, NOT TO THE COMMISSIONER IN COUNCIL, NOT TO THE TERRITORY. THEY ARE GOING TO ALTER IT NOW AND TAKE IT AWAY FROM THE TERRITORY AND GIVE IT TO THE COMMISSIONER, AND I HAVE TOLD HIM BEFORE THAT HE WAS DOING WHAT HE WAS DOING ILLEGALLY, THAT HE WAS CANCELLING OUT LEASES AND I KNOW THAT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN NOW, AND I SAY THIS PUBLICLY, ANYBODY WHO HAS HAD THEIR LEASE CANCELLED ARBITRARILY FROM THE COMMISSIONER CAN NOW TAKE STEPS TO SEE THAT THEY GET THEIR LAND BACK BECAUSE HE HAS DONE IT WITHOUT AUTHORITY. OTHERWISE, THERE WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN THE NECESSITY TO CHANGE THAT PARTICULAR SECTION NOW. NOW PEOPLE GET ELECTED ON THE BASIS OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. ALL MEMBERS SITTING AROUND THIS TABLE WENT TO THE POLLS ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1970, AND THEY PLATFORMED ON THE BASIS OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT FOR THE YUKON, AND NOW I HEAR THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH SPEAKING AGAINST WHAT HE WAS ELECTED - ON THE BASIS OF WHAT HE WAS ELECTED. HE SAYS NOW WE DON'T WANT RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT; WHAT WE WANT IS TO BE SATISFIED WITH THE INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF COUNCIL BECAUSE BY AGREEING TO THAT HE'S SAYING WE ARE NOT INTERESTED IN ANYTHING MORE. HE MADE REFERENCE, MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE COMMISSIONER WHO HAVING BEEN A MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WAS ALSO FRUSTRATED. LET ME SAY THAT HE HAS TRANSFERRED THIS FRUSTRATION ON THE BASIS OF WHAT HAS BEEN GOING ON. YOU KNOW, I COULDN'T HELP MAKING A PUN WHEN THE REFERENCE WAS MADE THAT WE ARE BEING TREATED AS PEONS AND YOU KNOW ROUGHLY IT MIGHT AS WELL SAY PEE ON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. WE ARE NOT CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT THEY ARE THINKING ABOUT. WE HAVE GOT TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. IN REFERENCE TO THE YUKON INDIAN POPULATION CERTAINLY, IF THEY WANT TO GET OUT AND CAMPAIGN AND BE ELECTED, BY ALL MEANS THEY'LL HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO GET TO THE COUNCIL CHAMBER. I HOPE WHEN THE DISTRIBUTION DOES TAKE PLACE THAT THEY WILL BE DISTRIBUTED IN SUCH A WAY THAT NATIVE MEMBERS WILL BE ABLE TO GET ELECTED BUT THEY MUST GET ELECTED IN THE SAME WAY AS EVERYBODY ELSE. THEN WE'LL UNDERSTAND WHAT REALLY IS REQUIRED OF THEM, THEY WILL UNDERSTAND WHAT

IS REQUIRED OF THEM AND WE'LL GET TO UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER.

THOUGH THESE THINGS GO AWAY FROM THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE AND I'M GOING TO STOP AT THIS TIME, I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO SAY QUITE CLEARLY AND I REPEAT, WHAT HAS BEEN OFFERED TO US DOESN'T GO ANYWHERE NEAR WHAT WE HAVE BEEN ASKING FOR. IT ONLY GIVES US ONE THING, AN EXPANSION OF THE SIZE, OF THE NUMBER OF COUNCIL AND NOT ONE iota more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE? IS IT YOU WISH I REPORT PROGRESS AT THIS TIME IN THIS MATTER? WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN THERE WAS A SUGGESTION LAST NIGHT, IF I MIGHT REMIND MEMBERS, AFTER DEBATE AND IT APPEARS THAT WE HAVE PRETTY WELL COME TO THE END OF DEBATE, THAT WE WOULD CAUCUS TO TRY TO REACH SOME KIND OF UNANIMITY IN SENDING A RESOLUTION OR A MOTION TO OTTAWA. IS THAT STILL THE FEELING OF COMMITTEE?

MRS. WATSON: I AGREE, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I THINK WE HAVE TO GO FURTHER THAN THAT. I THINK THAT WHAT WE DID THE LAST TIME, WE HAD ALL COUNCIL GO TO OTTAWA. WE MANAGED TO GET A GREAT CONCESSION FROM OTTAWA. THERE WAS TO BE ONLY ONE MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. WE MANAGED TO DOUBLE THAT. I THINK THAT IF WE HAVE SOME OF US GO DOWN, ONCE WE'VE HAD THE CAUCUS AND SEEN THE POINT, THAT WE SHOULD STRONGLY GO TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE AND STRONGLY SAY TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE THAT WE ARE SEEKING MUCH MORE THAN WHAT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED IN THE BILL. THIS IS WHAT THE STANDING COMMITTEE WANTS OF US. I THINK THIS IS WHERE WE HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION, NOT A MATTER OF SENDING RESOLUTIONS OR MOTIONS. IT IS JUST NOT GOOD ENOUGH. WE HAVE TO GO BEFORE THAT STANDING COMMITTEE AND LET THEM KNOW EXACTLY HOW WE, AS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE FEEL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED THAT YOU WISH TO CAUCUS IN THIS MANNER. IS THIS THE AGREEMENT OF COMMITTEE?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE AT THIS TIME?

Mr. Chamberlist: I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a seconder?

Mr. Tanner: I'll second it.

Mr. Chairman: It was moved by Councillor Chamberlist seconded by Councillor Tanner that Mr. Speaker do now resume the chair. Are you prepared for the question? Are you agreed?

*MOTION CARRIED*

Mr. Speaker: Council will now come to order. May we have a report from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, committee convened at 11:30 a.m. to discuss bills, sessional papers and motions.

Committee first considered the Commons Bill C-9 respecting amendments to the Yukon Act. Committee recessed at 12 noon and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

It was moved by Councillor Chamberlist seconded by Councillor Tanner that Mr. Speaker do now resume the chair and this motion carried.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the chairman of the committee. Are we agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the intention of committee tomorrow to continue with the bills, sessional papers and motions.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we caucus at 7:30.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Mr. Stutter: Yes Mr. Speaker, I'll second that motion.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse North seconded by the Honourable Member for Dawson that we call it 5:00 p.m. Are you prepared for the question? Are you agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried and this House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

*ADJOURNED*





WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1974

MR. SPEAKER READS THE DAILY PRAYER.

MR. SPEAKER: MADAM CLERK, IS THERE A QUORUM PRESENT?

MADAM CLERK: THERE IS, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: THE HOUSE WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY DOCUMENTS OR CORRESPONDENCE TO BE TABLED?

MRS. VATSON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE FOR TABLING LEGISLATIVE RETURNS NOS. 15 TO 19 AND SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 15.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEES? ARE THERE ANY BILLS TO BE INTRODUCED? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION TO MOVE SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 15 FOR DISCUSSION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION RE LEGISLATIVE RETURNS NOS. 17, 18 AND 19 FOR DISCUSSION IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTIONS? ARE THERE ANY MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? AS THERE ARE NOT MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS, WE COME TO MOTION NO. 9

MOTION NO. 9

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 14 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. ARE YOU PREPARED TO PROCEED WITH THIS MOTION AT THIS TIME? ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MOTION NO. 10

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 12 BE MOVED INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. SPEAKER: WE COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. QUESTION NO. 1 RE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER G.K. FISHER-FLEMING. MADAM CLERK WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF MR. COMMISSIONER IS AVAILABLE? WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

*RECESS*

MR. SPEAKER: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I UNDERSTAND THAT MR. COMMISSIONER IS PRESENTLY ENGAGED IN ANOTHER MEETING AT THE MOMENT. BUT I HAVE THREE WRITTEN QUESTIONS THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE HOUSE TO CONSIDER THIS AFTERNOON.

QUESTION RE: ROYALTY REVENUE ON MINE PRODUCTION

THE FIRST QUESTION IS; WOULD THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDE COUNCIL WITH INFORMATION AS TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF ROYALTY REVENUE ON MINE PRODUCTION, PAID OR OWING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RESPECTING THE FISCAL YEARS 1971/72, 1972/73, AND 73/74 IN RESPECT TO THE FOLLOWING COMPANIES: WHITEHORSE COPPER MINES, UNITED KENO HILL MINES, CLINTON CREEK ASBESTOS AND ANVIL MINING CORPORATION.

QUESTION RE: REVENUE FROM INCOME TAX, CORPORATION TAX

MY SECOND QUESTION; WOULD THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDE COUNCIL WITH INFORMATION AS TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF REVENUE PAID OR OWING TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN RESPECT OF FISCAL YEARS 1971/72, AND 1972/73 FROM ALL SOURCES ATTRIBUTED TO THE YUKON TERRITORY IN RESPECT OF (A) INCOME TAX (B) CORPORATION TAX.

QUESTION RE: ROYALTIES ON PRODUCTION AND EXPORT OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

MY THIRD QUESTION; WOULD THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDE COUNCIL WITH INFORMATION AS TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF REVENUE PAID OR OWING TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN RESPECT OF ROYALTIES ON PRODUCTION AND EXPORT OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: ANOTHER SESSION OF COUNCIL

MR. STUTTER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION TO ASK OF EITHER OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. ON A COUPLE OF THE SESSIONAL PAPERS THAT HAVE BEEN TABLED IN THE



HOUSE, THERE IS THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH: "If PROGRAM APPROVAL IS OBTAINED I WOULD PROPOSE TO INTRODUCE LEGISLATION AT AN APPROPRIATE FUTURE SESSION OF THIS COUNCIL IN ORDER TO OBTAIN YOUR APPROVAL." AND THIS IS ON TWO OR THREE OF THE LEGISLATIVE RETURNS. MY QUESTION IS;

IS IT THE INTENTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO CALL ANOTHER SESSION OF COUNCIL BETWEEN THIS ONE AND THE FALL SESSION, OR THE ELECTION I SHOULD SAY?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, THERE IS AN INTENTION BECAUSE WE WILL HAVE TO AMEND THE ELECTIONS BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SUPPLEMENTARY, I WONDER IF WE CAN GET A WRITTEN ANSWER. DOES THIS MEAN THAT IF WE HAVE ANOTHER SESSION OF COUNCIL, THAT THERE WILL BE NO SESSION OF COUNCIL CALLED IN THE FALL AS WAS THE LAST YEAR?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, THAT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO ANSWER AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I JUST ASKED FOR A WRITTEN ANSWER.

MR. SPEAKER: AS THERE ARE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WE COME TO PRIVATE BILLS AND ORDERS, PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS, BILL NO. 7, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SCHOOL ORDINANCE. ARE YOU PREPARED TO GIVE SECOND READING TO THIS ORDINANCE?

#### BILL NO. 7

MRS. WATSON: ON THE NEXT SITTING DAY, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR AND COUNCIL RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.

MR. STUTTER: I SECOND THAT MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DAWSON THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONVENING THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED

AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER AND WHEN LAST WE ROSE WE WERE DEALING WITH AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-9. WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE IN THIS RESPECT?

#### MOTION #2

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A MOTION SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER THAT MADAM CLERK IS PASSING TO THE MEMBERS AND TO THE PRESS IF YOU COULD JUST WAIT A FEW SECONDS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER THAT WHEREAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAS FOLLOWED A DISTINCT PATTERN BEGINNING WITH A WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL IN 1908 AND THE SUBSEQUENT INVOLVEMENT OF ELECTED MEMBERS IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE IN 1960 AND THE CREATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT IN 1970; AND WHEREAS IT IS THE INTENTION OF THE PRESENT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT TO PROVIDE FOR AN EXPANSION OF THE COUNCIL AND TO AUGMENT ELECTED REPRESENTATION ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE; NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN SESSION ASSEMBLED

- (1) SUPPORTS THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON THE COUNCIL TO TWELVE, AND
- (2) REQUESTS THAT THE COUNCIL BE GIVEN THE POWER TO DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF ITS OWN MEMBERS IN THE FUTURE;

AND BE IT RECOGNIZED THAT THE COUNCIL

- (1) IS DISMAYED BY THE ABSENCE OF FURTHER PROVISIONS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM AND THE EVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT FOR THE YUKON IN BILL C-9, AND
- (2) AFFIRMS ITS CONTINUING SUPPORT OF MOTION NO. 40 PASSED BY THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ON APRIL 15, 1966 AND MOTION NO. 1 PASSED ON JANUARY 23, 1968, WHICH MOTIONS ARE IDENTICAL TO THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IN WHITEHORSE ON DECEMBER 12, 1973.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I DON'T WANT TO TAKE THE TIME OF



COMMITTEE UP ANY LONGER ON FURTHER DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF BILL C-9. I THINK ALL MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE HAVE HAD THEIR SAY ON THE CONCEPTS OF THE BILL AND THE MOTION HAS COME ABOUT FROM THE DEBATE THAT HAS BEEN HELD SO FAR IN COMMITTEE ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE YUKON ACT. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THAT THIS HOUSE FORWARD THIS MOTION PLUS THE DEBATES ON BILL C-9 PLUS MOTIONS NO. 40, NO. 1 AND THE MOTION PASSED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IN WHITEHORSE TO EVERY MEMBER NOW SITTING ON THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AT THE EARLIEST OPPORTUNITY, LIKE THIS AFTERNOON OR TOMORROW MORNING. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, FROM THE CHAIR, IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER: (REPEATS MOTION).

WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE IN THIS RESPECT?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU AGREED? I SHALL DECLARE THIS MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A FURTHER MOTION, MOVED BY MYSELF, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT COUNCILLORS MCKINNON AND TAYLOR BE APPOINTED AS COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, CURRENTLY DISCUSSING BILL C-9, AN ACT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT, THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT.

I FEEL, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT BOTH OF THESE TWO MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HAVE HAD A GREAT DEAL TO DO WITH WHAT REFORMS SO FAR HAVE BEEN GAINED FROM OTTAWA IN THE LAST FEW YEARS AND HAVE BEEN IN ON PRACTICALLY ALL OF THE DEBATES OVER THE PAST UMPTEEN YEARS REGARDING THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES AND I AM QUITE HAPPY TO RECOMMEND THAT BOTH OF THEM GO DOWN TO OTTAWA TO REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF THE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS MR. CHAIRMAN GOING TO READ THIS FROM THE CHAIR BEFORE DISCUSSION?

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR

STUTTER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT COUNCILLORS MCKINNON AND TAYLOR BE APPOINTED AS COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, CURRENTLY DISCUSSING BILL C-9, AN ACT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT, THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT. PROCEED, COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM GOING TO VOTE AGAINST THE MOTION FOR A SPECIFIC REASON AND I DOUBT WHETHER I WILL HAVE ANYONE ELSE SUPPORT ME IN VOTING AGAINST THE MOTION BECAUSE I SAY THAT WHAT IS BEING DONE IN THIS MANNER IS AN ATTEMPT TO SHOW A DISSENTION OF FEELING AMONG COUNCIL IN THE MAIN MOTION THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN PASSED. THAT IS THE SUPPORT OF MOTION NO. 40 OF 1966 AND MOTION NO. 1 OF 1968. THE STANDING COMMITTEE HAS INDICATED THAT IT IS INTERESTED TO HAVE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL PRESENT THEIR VIEWS AND COMMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE. NOW, THERE ARE DIVERGENT VIEWS AS TO WHAT WE SHOULD STRIVE FOR IF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA DOES NOT WISH TO GO BEYOND THE INDICATED CHANGES OF BILL C-9. THIS HAS ALREADY BEEN EXPRESSED BY ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL; THAT BILL C-9 DOES ONLY ONE THING AND THAT IS INCREASE THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL FROM 7 TO 12. I THINK THAT A SPECIFIC DANGER IN JUST SIMPLY APPOINTING TWO SPECIFIC PEOPLE AS COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES BECAUSE ALTHOUGH I AGREE THAT THE TWO MEMBERS WHO HAVE BEEN NAMED, HAVE DONE CONSIDERABLE WORK ON BEHALF OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT AND FOR THE YUKON. I BELIEVE THAT THEY CANNOT GIVE THEIR OPINIONS AS TO WHAT SHOULD TAKE PLACE OR BARGAIN FOR THE BEST POSSIBLE ADDITIONS TO C-9 IF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA REFUSES TO GO ALONG WITH WHAT WE ARE INSISTING AS A MINIMUM TOWARDS RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

I HAVE MADE MY POSITION CLEAR THAT BECAUSE THE DIVERGENT VIEWS WANT TO BE EXAMINED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, I INTEND TO GO IN ANY EVENT AND EVEN IF I HAVE TO GO AT MY OWN EXPENSE AND NOT WITHSTANDING THE ABSOLUTE OPPOSITION THAT I BELIEVE COMES FROM COUNCILLOR TANNER AND COUNCILLOR WATSON. I SAY THESE SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN MADE QUITE CLEAR TO ME THAT THEIR CONCERN IS NOT FOR THE FUTURE OF THE YUKON AND SOLIDARITY OF THOUGHT OF MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL BUT TO USE THEIR POSITIONS THAT THEY HOLD NOW, TO SPLIT THE PRINCIPLE THAT HAS BEEN ENDOWED WITHIN THE MESSAGE THAT HAS BEEN SENT BY JUDGE BUCHANAN, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT.



MY HOPE WAS THAT I HAD INDICATED QUITE CLEARLY TO THEM, THAT I WAS GOING DOWN IN ANY EVENT. THAT IT COULD BE CLEARLY SAID THEN THOSE TWO COUNCILLORS WHO THEY HAVE CHOSEN TO GO DOWN AND MYSELF, WOULD INDEED BE COUNCIL REPRESENTATION. I MADE THIS POSITION CLEAR TO THEM. TO ME, THE WORDS THAT COUNCILLOR MCKINNON AND TAYLOR BE APPOINTED AS COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES INDICATE THAT THEY ARE BEING APPOINTED TO BE MY REPRESENTATIVE SPEAKING FOR THOSE PEOPLE THAT I REPRESENT AS WELL. I CAN'T ACCEPT THAT. I CAN'T ACCEPT IT BECAUSE, AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED IT DOESN'T SHOW AND ALLOW INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS WHO HAVE SOME SPECIFIC THOUGHTS THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT ABOUT BY LONG YEARS OF STUDY AND RESEARCH SHOULD BE PUSHED ASIDE AND NEGATED BECAUSE OF THE PERSONALITIES THAT ARE INVOLVED.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN I DO GO DOWN THERE AND I AM SURE THE OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL WHO ARE GOING DOWN, WILL BE KEEPING WITHIN THE TERMS OF THE MOTION THAT HAS JUST BEEN PASSED, THEY CAN HAVE MY ASSURANCE NOW AND ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL CAN HAVE MY ASSURANCE NOW, THAT I WILL BE ALSO KEEPING WITHIN THE TERMS WE HAVE OUTLINED WITHIN THAT RESOLUTION. SOME HAVE EXPRESSED FEARS NOTWITHSTANDING THAT I HAVE APPEARED BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE QUITE OFTEN, SOME HAVE EXPRESSED FEARS THAT BECAUSE OF MY ABJECT DISLIKE FOR THE MANNER IN WHICH COMMISSIONER JAMES SMITH HAS CONDUCTED HIMSELF IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TERRITORY AND THE MANNER IN WHICH HE HAS ABUSED THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND IN THE MANNER IN WHICH HE HAS MANIPULATED MEMBERS OF THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL, THAT I WOULD MAKE THAT SPECIFIC THING A POINT OF REFERENCE IN MY DISCUSSIONS AND SUBMISSIONS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT. I WANT TO ASSURE ALL MEMBERS THAT MY DISLIKE AND CONTEMPT FOR COMMISSIONER JAMES SMITH HAS NOTHING AT ALL TO DO WITH MY FEELINGS OF SEEKING FOR THE YUKON, THE BASIC DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS THAT EVERY CANADIAN IN CANADA SHOULD ENJOY. WHEN I STAND OR SIT BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE I WILL SPEAK ABOUT THE DISCONTINUANCE OF THE OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER AND WHETHER IT BE JAMES SMITH OR JOHN DOE, THE SAME POINTS THAT I MAKE WILL APPLY. I WANT TO MAKE THAT POSITION CLEAR, MR. CHAIRMAN, BECAUSE I DON'T WANT IT TO BE SAID THAT I HAVE NOT CLARIFIED MY PARTICULAR STAND. I WILL GO THERE SPEAKING AS A MEMBER OF THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL AND SPEAKING FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. I REITERATE THAT THERE WILL BE NO REFERENCE WHATEVER TO THE PRESENT INCOMPETENCE, BY ME.

BUT CERTAINLY THERE WILL BE REFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT WE HAVE APPOINTED PEOPLE WHO ARE RUNNING THIS TERRITORY AND DESTROYING THE WHOLE FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT THAT HAS BEEN ATTEMPTED IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT. PERHAPS IF THERE WERE PEOPLE WITH DIFFERENT TYPE OF FEELINGS, EVEN IF THEY WERE APPOINTED, WHO WOULD BE CONSIDERING THE GROWTH AND THE ONWARD MARCH TO RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, THERE WOULD BE LESS OF A PROBLEM THAT HAS EVEN DEVELOPED IN THE SUBMISSION RIGHT HERE OF THIS TYPE OF RESOLUTION WHICH ATTEMPTS TO SPLIT, MY COLLEAGUES, COUNCILLOR TAYLOR AND COUNCILLOR MCKINNON FROM MYSELF IN THE VERY THOUGHTS THAT THE THREE OF US HAVE WORKED TOGETHER FOR MANY LONG YEARS TO REACH THE ULTIMATE AIM.

JUST TO FINALIZE MY REMARKS, MR. CHAIRMAN, I APPRECIATE ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL'S THOUGHTS EXCEPT THOSE OF COUNCILLOR TAYLOR, I BEG YOUR PARDON OF COUNCILLOR TANNER AND COUNCILLOR WATSON, WHO IN MY OPINION, HAVE ONCE AGAIN SHOWN HOW LITTLE THEY ARE IN MIND. INDEED WHAT THEY ARE DOING IS NOT BEING WILLING TO STRENGTHEN THIS COUNCIL IN ITS SUBMISSIONS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, BY DISPENSING WITH THEIR PERSONAL DISLIKES AND RECOGNIZE THE FACT THAT I'M GOING DOWN IN ANY EVENT, BUT JUST SAY GOOD LUCK FELLOWS, DO YOUR BEST FOR THE YUKON. THAT HAS BEEN LEFT OUT ENTIRELY, THEY DON'T WANT TO SEE ME PARTICIPATE IN DOING THE BEST I CAN FOR THE YUKON, JUST FROM A PERSONAL ATTITUDE. WHETHER THEY LIKE OR DISLIKE ME, I INTEND TO GO DOWN TO OTTAWA AND WORK WITH THE OTHER TWO MEMBERS TO DO WHATEVER CAN BE DONE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THEM TO PUT FORWARD THE STRONGEST CASE POSSIBLE ON BEHALF OF THIS COUNCIL AND ON BEHALF OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, SO THAT THE YUKON WILL EVENTUALLY GET WHAT IT IS SO PROPERLY ENTITLED TO. AND THAT IS A FORM OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT, DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AND ALSO A FORM OF GOVERNMENT THAT WILL DISPENSE COMPLETELY WITH THOSE APPOINTED PEOPLE WHO HAVE NO CONSIDERATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON, BUT FOR THEIR OWN SELF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THIS MOTION?

ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU AGREED?

*you mean  
it's all  
passed?*



SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DISAGREE WITH THE MOTION. I WANT MY DISAGREEMENT RECORDED PLEASE, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

*MOTION CARRIED*

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM OF BUSINESS IS BILL NO. 1. MADAM CLERK I BELIEVE WE REQUIRE THE PRESENCE OF THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER. IS THIS THE WISH OF THE COMMITTEE?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: SEE IF THEY ARE AVAILABLE PLEASE AND I WILL DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

*RECESS*

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME WE WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER AND WE HAVE WITH US MR. HUBERDEAU AND MR. MILLER TO ASSIST US IN DELIBERATIONS RELATIVE TO BILL NO. 1. WHEN LAST WE ROSE ON THIS SUBJECT, WE WERE DEALING WITH SCHEDULE A - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$139,906.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER FIRSTLY IF WE CAN GET A CLEARLY DEFINED UNDERSTANDING FROM THE COMMISSIONER THAT IN THE PASSAGE OF THIS INTERIM BILL, THAT SHOULD COUNCIL DECIDE TO CUT BACK OR ALTER, AMEND OR OTHERWISE, ANY OF THE ITEMS IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES, THAT THESE ITEMS THAT WE CUT BACK WOULD BE CUT BACK IN TOTAL FOR THE WHOLE TWELVE MONTH PERIOD. IF ANY OF THESE FUNDS THAT ARE ASKED TO BE VOTED FOR FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL, THAT IS ONE TWELFTH OF THE TOTAL, WILL NOT BE TREATED AS IF THE ITEMS HAVE BEEN PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. COMMISSIONER?

MR. COMMISSIONER: I JUST HAVEN'T QUITE CAUGHT ON TO THIS YET, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IF I MAY BE PERMITTED. CORRECT ME IF I AM WRONG. I BELIEVE WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS REQUESTED IS ASSURANCE FROM THE COMMISSIONER THAT IF BILL #1 IS ACCEPTED, BY

COMMITTEE, THAT THE RIGHT IS RESERVED THAT WHEN IN DISCUSSION ON THE MAINS, IF SOMETHING IS CUT OUT OF THE BUDGET, I BELIEVE THE INTENTION WOULD BE THEN TO REFLECT BACK TO APORTIONMENT CONTAINED IN BILL #1 AS ONE-TWELVE OF THE BUDGET. DO I HAVE THAT CORRECT?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: I THINK YOU HAVE TO GIVE ME AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXAMINE THAT QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE COULD ADJOURN FOR A FEW MINUTES WHILE THIS DISCUSSION GOES ON?

MR. TANNER: COULD WE HAVE A SLIGHT RECESS?

*RECESS*

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME WE'LL CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER. MR. COMMISSIONER, DID YOU--

MR. COMMISSIONER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHETHER THE ANSWER I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST HERE COVERS THE PRECISE POINTS RAISED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BUT I WILL ATTEMPT TO GIVE A COMMITMENT WITH REGARD TO CERTAIN ASPECTS OF IT.

FIRST AND FOREMOST, IT WOULD CERTAINLY NOT BE ANY IMPEDIMENT ON COUNCIL'S AUTHORITY WITH REGARD TO THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THIS WOULD NOT BE IMPINGED UPON THEM.

SECONDLY, I WOULD BE PREPARED TO COMMIT THAT DURING THE 1/12 PERIOD OR AT LEAST UNTIL THE NAMES ARE PASSED THAT NO NEW STAFF RECRUITMENT WOULD TAKE PLACE. THIS WOULD NOT INVOLVE POSITIONS THAT ALREADY EXIST UP TO THIS POINT, BUT WHERE NEW POSITIONS ARE CALLED FOR IN THE BUDGET, WE WOULD COMMIT OURSELVES NOT TO HAVE ANY RECRUITMENT UNTIL THE NAMES WERE PASSED. NO NEW OPERATION IN MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS WOULD BE PUT INTO EFFECT. IN OTHER WORDS, I DON'T KNOW IF I CAN IDENTIFY ANY NEW PROGRAMS OFF HAND THAT ARE IN THE O & M ESTIMATES BUT WE WOULD NOT PUT ANY INTO EFFECT DURING THE INTERIM PERIOD.

THE ONE QUESTION THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE CONCURRENCE OF COUNCIL FROM, CONCERNS THE CHANGES TO THE MEDICARE PREMIUMS SITUATION SO THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE ANY MISUNDERSTANDING



BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATION AND COUNCIL ON THAT PARTICULAR SIDE OF THE BUDGET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN IN VIEW OF THAT ANSWER AND THE FACT THAT PARTICULAR LEGISLATIVE RETURN HAS BEEN PASSED INTO COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION, SURELY THE COMMISSIONER IS NOT SUGGESTING THAT WE PASS THE FUNDING FOR THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN WITHOUT PRIOR DISCUSSION OF ALL THE POSITIONS AS BEEN OUTLINED IN THE LEGISLATIVE RETURN.

I HAD ALREADY GIVEN AGREEMENT THAT, AND I THINK ALL MEMBERS HAVE AS WELL, WE WOULD NOT FRUSTRATE THE GOVERNMENT BY HOLDING BACK THE FUNDS THAT ARE GOING TO BE REQUIRED FOR THE PAYMENTS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO DEFRAY THE EXPENSE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE. CERTAINLY NOW WE ARE BEING ASKED ON A SPECIFIC IMPORTANT POINT WHICH REQUIRES MUCH DISCUSSION. I CONTEMPLATED ABOUT HALF A DAY AT LEAST ON THAT ONE LEGISLATIVE RETURN THAT HAS BEEN TABLED AND I'M AFRAID THAT IT WOULD BE IMPROPER FOR US TO AGREE TO THAT BECAUSE WE WOULD THEN BE AGREEING TO WHAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED IN THAT LEGISLATIVE RETURN ON THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN. I CONSIDER THAT IT DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH AND THEREFORE, I WOULD EITHER SUGGEST MR. CHAIRMAN, WE PERHAPS DEAL WITH IT IN VIEW OF THE COMMITMENTS WE HAVE FROM MR. COMMISSIONER, EXCEPT FOR THAT ONE PARTICULAR POINT PERHAPS. IT MIGHT BE ADVISABLE FOR US TO DEAL WITH THAT LEGISLATIVE RETURN OR LEAVE THAT PARTICULAR ITEM IN ABEYANCE UNTIL TOMORROW MORNING AND WE CAN DEAL WITH THE LEGISLATIVE RETURN AT THE SAME TIME AS WE'RE DEALING WITH THE HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION ITEM. IN OTHER WORDS, LEAVE THAT PARTICULAR ITEM TO LAST AS THAT IS THE ONLY ONE THAT IS BEING AFFECTED BY THE STATEMENT THE COMMISSIONER HAS JUST MADE, IF THAT WOULD BE SATISFACTORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THE CHAIR TAKE IT THAT THIS IS THE ONLY ITEM THAT IS OF CONCERN?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: TAKING IT FROM WHAT MR. COMMISSIONER HAS SAID, I ASSUME THAT THIS IS THE ONLY ITEM THAT HE'S CONCERNED WITH. I WOULD ADD THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IF IT IS THE INTENTION NOT TO RECRUIT ANY EXTRA PEOPLE DURING THE MONTH OF APRIL, NOT TO PROCEED WITH ANY PROGRAMS DURING THE MONTH OF APRIL.

THE QUESTION I ASK THEN, IS WHY ARE YOU ASKING FOR SO MUCH MORE MONEY, IF IT IS NOT GOING TO BE USED DURING THAT PERIOD OF ONE MONTH. I WONDER IF MR. COMMISSIONER CAN ANSWER THAT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: I THINK THAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR A YEAR'S MONEY, MR. CHAIRMAN AND AS A MEANS, OF PUTTING A SPECIAL BILL BEFORE YOU, WHICH INTERIM SUPPLY IS. IT IS BEING ASKED FOR 1/12 OF THE YEAR'S MONEY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT ONE THING BEFORE THE VOTE ON HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION, SPECIFICALLY TO THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE SCHEME. THE EXPENDITURE SIDE OF THE PICTURE WOULD NOT VARY BECAUSE WE ARE NOT PROVIDING A DIFFERENT STANDARD. WE ARE NOT PROPOSING EXTENDING THE BENEFITS UNDER THE HEALTH CARE SCHEME. WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS AN ALTERATION OF THE REVENUE SIDE FROM THE PREMIUMS THAT ARE BEING COLLECTED. THEREFORE, IT REALLY WOULD NOT HAVE AN EFFECT ON OUR SCHEDULE AS OUTLINED BECAUSE THE SCHEDULE DEALS ONLY WITH THE EXPENDITURES, THE APPROPRIATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I WISH TO CONTRADICT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BECAUSE IT HAS ALREADY BEEN INDICATED IN THE LEGISLATIVE RETURN THAT THERE HAVE BEEN INCREASES TO THE COST OF ADMINISTERING THAT PARTICULAR PLAN, THE MEDICARE PLAN, BY INCREASES TO THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.

THIS IS INCORPORATED, I TAKE IT WITHIN THE AMOUNT THAT IS BEING ASKED FOR. THEREFORE, IT IS A DIFFERENCE INVOLVED THERE. I HAVE ASKED FOR A COPY OF THE AGREEMENT, WITH RESPECT MR. CHAIRMAN. I HAVEN'T SEEN THE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT. I WANT THAT SO I CAN DISCUSS IT WITH THE LEGISLATIVE RETURN AND I THINK IT IS ALL TIED IN TOGETHER. THIS IS WHY I AM SUGGESTING THAT PERHAPS WE WENT AHEAD AS WE HAD PROMISED, LEFT THAT ITEM, DEALT WITH IT TOMORROW ALTOGETHER AND IN THE MEANTIME ASK THE ADMINISTRATION WHY, IF THEY HAVE NO INTENTION OF USING THE FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF OR ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS, WHY ARE THEY STILL ASKING FOR THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE SUGGESTION THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MADE THAT WE PROCEED WITH THE BILL AS IT NOW READS. WE CAN DO IT ONE OF TWO WAYS.

WE CAN EITHER DEAL WITH THE MEDICARE PAPER, SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 13 WHEN WE GET TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION OR ALTERNATIVELY, IF YOU LIKE, WE CAN GO AS FAR AS WE POSSIBLY CAN TODAY AND DEAL WITH IT



AT THE END.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I STILL AGREE WITH WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAID. I WOULD BE PLEASED TO DEAL WITH IT TOMORROW AND I AM SURE HE WILL MAKE A COPY AVAILABLE, COPIES OF THE AGREEMENT FOR TOMORROW AS WELL AS HAS BEEN PROMISED.

NOW, I STILL WOULD LIKE TO GET FROM THE ADMINISTRATION, THE COMMISSIONER, WHY HE WOULD BE ASKING FOR A FULL 1/12, IF THERE IS NO INTENTION TO USE A FULL 1/12.

HE HAS ANSWERED THE QUESTION BY SAYING, 'WE GUARANTEE NOT TO HAVE ADDITIONAL STAFF' HAS BEEN REQUESTED IN THE MAIN ESTIMATE, ' AND WE WILL NOT USE ANY MONEY DURING THE MONTH OF APRIL TO COMMENCE ANY NEW PROGRAMS.' IF THE COMMISSIONER WOULD ANSWER THAT AND INDICATE, JUST FOR AN EXAMPLE, IN ANY PARTICULAR ONE, WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THAT PARTICULAR ITEM INCLUDES NEW STAFF AND NEW PROGRAMS AND DEDUCT THAT FROM THE AMOUNT OF THAT, THEN OF COURSE THERE WOULD BE NO PROBLEM. WE WOULD THEN CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS ASKING FOR AN INTERIM SUPPLY BILL FOR THE ACTUAL COST OF OPERATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

THIS I THINK WE ARE DUTY BOUND TO GIVE HIM. I WONDER IF HE WOULD BE PREPARED TO DO THAT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE AGILITY OF MY MIND IS NOT UP TO PROPERLY ANSWERING THE AGILITY OF THE MIND OF THE GUY WHO CONCOCTED THE QUESTION. ITS JUST THAT SIMPLE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, HE WASN'T PREPARED TO ANSWER THE QUESTION, WHEN HE ASKED FOR 1/12 OF THE TOTAL BUDGET, WHEN HE WAS CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE. WHEN HE WENT ROUND THE MULBERRY BUSH WITH MR. LIVESY ON THIS AND HE STILL PASSED THE 1/12 THROUGH OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT. I WOULD SUGGEST HE FOLLOW HIS PAST ACTIONS AND LET EVERYONE ELSE PROCEED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER AT THIS POINT, IT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED THAT ONE WAY TO GET AROUND THIS IMPASSE THAT WE HAVE REACHED. IT WOULD BE TO DEAL WITH THE BILL SETTING ASIDE THE ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH WELFARE AND REABILITATION AND DEALING WITH THAT TOMORROW OR THE LAST ITEM.

MR. TANNER: I MADE THE SUGGESTION AND THAT IF IT IS AGREEABLE FOR ALL MEMBERS, I WOULD JUST

POINT OUT ONE THING: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS ASKED FOR THE CONTRACT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE DOCTORS AND OUR OPERATING COMPANY TO BE TABLED. THOSE CONTRACTS AREN'T FINALIZED YET. THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS INVOLVED IN THOSE CONTRACTS ARE HERE IN THE BUDGET AND WE CAN DISCUSS THEM. WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE READY FOR TABLING I CAN'T SAY TOMORROW.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THE DISCUSSION ON THE SESSIONAL PAPER OR THE LEGISLATIVE RETURN AS THE CASE MIGHT BE PERTINANT TO THIS QUESTION. WOULD THIS RESOLVE THE PROBLEM THAT YOU SUGGEST?

MR. TANNER: YES MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: POSSIBLY WE COULD DEAL WITH THEM CONCURRENTLY TOMORROW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN WITH RESPECT, IT'S NOT BEING SUGGESTED THAT WITHOUT VISIBLE SIGNS OF A COMPLETED CONTRACT RELATING TO THE FUNDING OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION'S BILLS THAT WE SHOULD ACCEPT BLINDLY WHAT CONTRACT IS GOING TO BE ENTERED INTO IN THE FUTURE? I AM SIMPLY AGAINST THAT PRINCIPLE IN ITSELF. CERTAINLY IF 3 YEARS OR 7 YEARS AGO A MEMBER OF COUNCIL FAILED TO RECEIVE AN ANSWER TO WHETHER OR NOT THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WAS GOING TO BE EXPENDED IN AN INTERIM SUPPLY THAT WASN'T FORTHCOMING, IT DOESN'T MEAN BECAUSE SOMEBODY BROKE HIS LEG 7 YEARS AGO THAT I HAVE TO BREAK MY LEG TO MATCH WHAT TOOK PLACE 7 YEARS AGO. I HAVE NO INTENTION OF DOING THAT.

I THINK MR. CHAIRMAN, THE QUESTION I HAVE PUT AND WHAT I AM ASKING FOR ARE LEGITIMATE QUESTIONS. IT SIMPLY IS TO REPEAT MR. CHAIRMAN, TO MR. COMMISSIONER. IF YOU HAVE NO INTENTION OF EXPENDING CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY, WHY NOT REDUCE YOUR REQUEST IN SCHEDULE A TO THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT YOU SAY YOU WANT TO EXPEND. I AM SURE YOU WILL HAVE NO DIFFICULTY FROM ANYBODY. ALL THAT HAS TO BE SAID--

MR. COMMISSIONER: EXCEPT YOU.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO YOU WILL NOT HAVE ANY DIFFICULTY FROM ME. JUST SAY HOW MUCH MONEY OF THAT, LET'S SAY OF THIS \$5,071,000 YOU NEED TO SPEND IN APRIL.

IF WE KNOW THAT, YOU HAVE ALREADY SAID THAT YOU ARE NOT GOING TO SPEND A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY, IF YOU TELL US WHAT THEN WE'VE GOT ONE STEP FURTHER IN GETTING THIS INTERIM BILL THROUGH,



PERHAPS WE CAN GET AN ANSWER TO THAT. ARE YOU PREPARED TO GIVE US AN ASSURANCE OF THAT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO IS ASKING THE QUESTION KNOWS FAR BETTER THAN I DO, THESE ARE ESTIMATES. THAT IS WHAT THEY ARE. WE ARE COMMITTING OURSELVES TO A CERTAIN NON-EXPENDITURE. THE 1/12 IS A VERY NORMAL ROUTINE IN THE COUNCIL AND IT WOULD APPEAR THAT WITH THE COMMITMENTS THAT WE HAVE GIVEN THERE SHOULD BE NO DIFFICULTY IN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKING THE QUESTIONS, RESOLVING WITHIN HIS OWN MIND AS TO WHAT IS INVOLVED IN THESE AREAS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS NOT TO HOLD IT UP. MR. CHAIRMAN, WE CAN PROCEED AND AS EACH ITEM IS DEALT WITH, WE WILL JUST HAVE TO PICK OUT THE ITEMS THAT ARE NOT GOING TO BE SPENT AND ASK FOR THEM TO BE REDUCED TO THAT AMOUNT.

I THINK WE CAN DEAL WITH IT THAT WAY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN THAT IS ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MRS. WATSON: WE ARE ONLY ASKING FOR 1/12 JUST AS HE DID IN 1969. IT IS NO DIFFERENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DON'T TELL ME WHAT HAPPENED IN 1969.

MRS. WATSON: IT IS NO DIFFERENT WHATSOEVER. I FEEL WE SHOULD PROCEED AND GO THROUGH THE ITEMS. SET THE SCHEDULE AND THEN GO INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES.--

MR. COMMISSIONER: YOU ARE RUNNING OUT OF SPEED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AM NOT RUNNING OUT OF SPEED.

MRS. WATSON: WHEN YOU CAN ASK ALL THE QUESTIONS THAT ARE REQUIRED. I AM RATHER SURPRISED THAT HE IS ASKING FOR A COPY OF THE AGREEMENT. THE NEGOTIATED AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE DOCTORS WHEN THE NEGOTIATED AGREEMENT IS BETWEEN THE PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND THE GOVERNMENT IS A MUCH GREATER SUM OF MONEY INVOLVED AND YOU ARE ALWAYS PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT AS THEY ARE GIVEN HERE IN COUNCIL. AREN'T YOU PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE TERMS OF

THE AGREEMENT THAT WILL BE GIVEN HERE IN COUNCIL TOMORROW BETWEEN THE DOCTORS AND THE GOVERNMENT?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER JUST DOESN'T SEEM TO RECALL THAT I ALREADY SAW THAT AGREEMENT. THE ONE DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC SERVICE. I HAVEN'T SEEN THE AGREEMENT DEALING WITH THE DOCTORS AND THE PERCENTAGE-WISE AREAS ARE THE AREAS WHERE I HAVE THE QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS ON THE GOVERNMENT SIDE THAT HAVE DECIDED NOW TO RAISE OBJECTIONS TO ME ASKING THESE QUESTIONS SEEM TO FORGET THE FUNCTION OF THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL, WHETHER YOU HAPPEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE OR NOT. IT IS TO MAKE SURE THAT FUNDS THAT ARE BEING EXPENDED FROM THE PUBLIC PURSE ARE FUNDS THAT ARE BEING EXPENDED WITH THE AUTHORITY OF THIS COUNCIL.

AGAIN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT ARE ATTEMPTING TO HOLD UP THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL, ARE THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THEMSELVES WHO HAVE BROUGHT THIS BILL FORWARD BY SIMPLY NOT ACQUIESING TO SIMPLE QUESTIONS THAT ARE BEING ASKED. AN AGREEMENT TO THE FACT THAT, IF THE ESTIMATES THAT ARE BEING ASKED FOR ARE NOT GOING TO BE USED, THE MONIES ARE AUTOMATICALLY A LESSER REQUIREMENT.

I DIDN'T SAY IT, THE COMMISSIONER SAID IT. HE SAID WE WILL NOT BE ASKING OR WE WILL NOT BE SPENDING THE MONIES ON STAFF. WE WILL DO NO RECRUITING, SO WHATEVER AMOUNT OF MONEY IS INVOLVED IS IN THAT PARTICULAR ITEM SHOULD BE DEDUCTED FROM THE ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED HERE--

SOME MEMBER: INTERRUPTION

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AS REQUIRED UNDER SCHEDULE A. THE SITUATION DEALING WITH THE NEW PROGRAMS ARE EXACTLY THE SAME. WHEN COUNCILLOR WATSON REFERS TO A PARTICULAR VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS WHERE SHE SAID I REFUSED, I HAVEN'T READ IT BUT I CAN ONLY SPEAK FROM RECALLING WHAT IT WAS AT THE TIME.--

MRS. WATSON: TRY READING IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE WERE NO SPECIFIC AREAS INVOLVED AT THAT TIME. NOR WAS I A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I WAS A MEMBER OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THAT. THE WHOLE SITUATION AS IT IS NOW DIFFERS FROM LAST

TIME. THE CIRCUMSTANCES DIFFER AND IF THE CIRCUMSTANCES DIFFER AND IF I WAS IN ERROR AND I WANT TO CORRECT MY ERRORS NOW, I THINK YOU SHOULD HAVE FLOORED ME AND HELPED ME CORRECT THOSE ERRORS. SO WHATEVER WAY YOU LOOK AT IT THE THING IS THAT I'M QUITE ENTITLED TO MAKE THOSE REQUESTS NOW. I'M NOT INFALLIBLE--

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBER: LAUGHTER

MR. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS THE COMMISSIONER HAS INDICATED THAT HE IS INFALLIBLE, BUT HE'S NOT.

MR. COMMISSIONER: NO, NO, NO, NO, IT WAS YOU WHO SAID THAT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE POSITION MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK IS CLEAR. IF THE COMMISSIONER WANTS TO INFORM US THAT HE WILL NOT USE THOSE FUNDS, THEN ALLOW US AS WE DEAL WITH THE ITEM TO JUST REMOVE THE PORTION THAT WILL NOT BE USED.

OTHERWISE, HOW CAN WE ACCEPT HIS WORD ON THIS?

MR. COMMISSIONER: OH COME ON.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE CAN'T ACCEPT HIS WORD.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD YOU LIKE TO PROCEED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WAS IT YOUR WISH THAT WE PROCEED. I BELIEVE YOU DO WISH TO BYPASS THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION UNTIL BROAD DISCUSSION CAN BE HELD ON THIS ITEM. IS THIS CORRECT?

MR. TANNER: SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 13.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE FIRST ITEM IS ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES-\$139,906.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I AM SORRY THAT I KEEP INTERRUPTING, BUT I KEEP ON SEEING SOME ERRORS THAT CROP UP IN IT. HERE WE HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED A COPY OF THE 1974-75 MAIN ESTIMATE. IT SHOWS THE 1973-74 ESTIMATE AND THE 1974-75 ESTIMATE THAT THE 1973-74 ESTIMATES DO NOT INCLUDE THE SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 4. I WONDER IF WE CAN HAVE A REASON WHY THEY HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED. HOW CAN YOU DEAL WITH THREE DIFFERENT ITEMS. IT MEANS THEN THAT THIS WAS PREPARED BEFORE THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES. WHY AREN'T THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES ADDED ON TO THE 1973-74 TO SHOW THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF

ESTIMATES. FOR INSTANCE, WE SEE IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY A REVISED VOTE OF \$33,747,000 AT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE. THEN WE GET IN 1973-74, ITEM \$32,314,817.

OBVIOUSLY, THIS HASN'T BEEN INCLUDED. ARE WE GOING TO HAVE CORRECTED SHEETS FOR THIS NOW THAT THE APPROPRIATION NO. 4 HAS BEEN PASSED?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE MAIN ESTIMATES PRESENTED IN ANY YEAR IN THIS COUNCIL INCLUDE THOSE ITEMS WHICH WERE VOTED AS MAIN ESTIMATES OF THE PRIOR YEAR. THEY HAVE NEVER INCLUDED SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS QUITE TRUE BUT WE HAVE NO ASSURANCE THEN THAT THE 1974-75 ESTIMATES THAT ARE BEING ASKED FOR NOW ARE NOT GOING TO BE ADDED TO AS A RESULT OF PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT GOING TO BE OFFERED BY THIS COUNCIL BY WAY OF SUPPLEMENTARIES AS HAS BEEN DONE IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 4 THAT HAS BEEN PASSED. THAT WE HAVE DONE THIS, WE HAVE DONE THIS WRONGLY. IT'S BEEN ADMITTED TO. EVEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON WHO VOTED AGAINST IT SAID THAT HE IS UNHAPPY ABOUT THE SITUATION. WHAT ASSURANCE HAVE WE GOT THAT THERE ARE NOT GOING TO BE MORE MONIES SPENT ON THOSE PARTICULAR AREAS AND ADDED ON TO THIS?

MR. STUTTER: WE TOOK A WILD GUESS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AGREE WITH THAT. HAVE WE GOT THE ASSURANCE OF THAT?

MR. COMMISSIONER: YOU'VE GOT TOO BIG AN AUDIENCE TODAY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, UNDER THE STANDARD METHOD OF OPERATING THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, THE APPROPRIATIONS PLACED BEFORE YOU IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE THE APPROPRIATIONS WHICH, IF THIS COUNCIL PASSES THEM, WILL BE THE APPROPRIATION THE GOVERNMENT WILL WORK UNDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HAVE WE ANY ASSURANCE, PERHAPS MR. COMMISSIONER, THAT THERE ARE NOT GOING TO BE SUPPLEMENTARY AMOUNTS OF MONEY ASKED FOR WITHOUT THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL GIVING APPROVAL TO THOSE EXPENDITURES? IT IS A QUESTION THAT I ASK AND I WANT SOME ASSURANCE, THAT WHAT HAS HAPPENED LAST YEAR THAT HAS BEEN OUTLINED IN SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 4, IS NOT GOING TO BE REPEATED IN THE YEAR 74-75.



Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, we will do our best to live within the constraints of the legislative authority that we have by various Acts and Ordinances.

Mr. Chamberlist: I'm pleased to hear that. I will accept that Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioner has recognized that he was in error in spending that money and he is going to correct himself this year.

Mr. Commissioner: There is no such admission Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on Administrative Services?

Mr. Chamberlist: Oh no, let's break it down. What is the \$139,906 for? I just wanted to check this out.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Honourable Member would have done his homework.

Mr. Chamberlist: That is one thing, Mr. Chairman, that nobody can accuse me of, of not doing my homework.

Mr. Chairman: There is one question in the Interim. I would like to ask for clarification. We have an amount of \$5,071,909, in Bill No. 1. We have in the mains \$60,862,907. Are these taken into conjunction or must the \$5,000,000 be deducted from the mains if this Bill was to pass?

Mr. Miller: No, the passage of Interim Supply, Mr. Chairman, does not in any way reflect on the main estimates. It is only interim authority for the Government to continue on. When the mains are appropriated or passed, that is the total dollars which the Government must work within.

Mr. Chamberlist: Yes, I agree with that. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can have an indication under Administrative Services. How many extra staff are proposed for that year? The value of the staff, our costs with fringe benefits, etc. and also whether there will be any extra programs under Administrative Services?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are we doing the mains now?

Mr. Chairman: I believe we are still on Bill No. 1.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it appears as though we are doing the mains. We are going thoroughly into the Administrative Vote. We may as well be doing the mains as the Interim if we are going to do it that way.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I will do it whatever way I like, and I will ask whatever questions I want to ask with the expenditure of Government funds.

I am quite concerned. I want to know how much staff there is to be. It's just a general question. During the mains I will be going into it very thoroughly. I just want a general answer as to how many people. Perhaps you can tell me on what page they are.

Mr. Commissioner: Page 7 on the mains.

Mr. Chamberlist: We have three extra bodies required for the Indian Land Claims, two extra bodies required for Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee, that's five extra bodies. See, this is what I want to know. In that particular area, how much money does that entail. Those extra bodies.

Mr. Commissioner: Basically, Mr. Chairman, on page 7, there are no extra bodies over and above that which we presently have authorization for. The Indian Land Claims is 100% recoverable. It's money in and money out. The Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee, the same situation, money in and money out. As far as the watchmen are concerned, this is part of the Alaska Highway takeover. There are really no new bodies involved. The facts are that we guaranteed the Federal Department of Public Works when the Alaska Highway was taken over, it was part of the agreement between the unions and the Treasury Board that there would be no loss of employment to any individual. We have basically wound up with five people who are watchman capacities, who are surplus to the Alaska Highway needs and I have of necessity as part of that agreement, taken onto our staff. We have put them into the Personnel Vote here so that they are clearly identified for the benefit of Council and other productive areas of employment are being found for these people until such time as either they are melded into our own ongoing staff or they have retired or possibly have left for other particular reasons. That is what the facts are there. Accommodation Services is the same number of people as we had in prior years.



Mr. Chamberlist: That is a very good explanation which I can read for myself. But, Mr. Chairman, the other day, Mr. Miller was quite insistent that estimates are one thing and recoveries are another thing. Right now we are dealing with the appropriation. That is estimates I just want to know the value of this staff. Perhaps, Mr. Miller, Mr. Chairman, can give me the dollars that are involved so that we know whether or not these amounts that have been estimated for are added into this \$139,906.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, obviously that portion of those peoples' salaries and other expenditures are added into the \$139,906 because that is one twelfth of the total appropriation.

Mr. Chamberlist: How much?

Mr. Miller: I don't have the exact figure, Mr. Chairman, but off the top of my head, I would suggest that we are talking about \$120,000 per annum.

Mr. Chamberlist: Right, o.k. Based on the \$120,000 per annum which is not going to be used in the month of April, a twelfth of that is \$10,000. So therefore, this is not going to be used so \$139,906 can be reduced by \$10,000. This is what has been said now. Now there is no point in laughing about this because this is what has been said by the Commissioner and by Mr. Miller. Now it seems to be they want to agree with us, but not comply with their own suggestions that they only require money that they intend to spend. They only require appropriation of funds from the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund of money that they intend to spend during the month of April. Now this has been made clear. Now there is \$10,000 there now what else is -- in monies in relation to the Indian Land Claims and the Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee? Now it must be a considerable amount more for the simple reason that we are setting aside, as I understand it, some \$20,000 in the Federal Interdepartmental Committee. Now if we are going to divide that by a twelfth in total, then we are talking then about another \$1,500 or \$1,600. This is what I am saying that we should deduct these items. Are we going to deduct them or do you want us just to agree to it and that's all? That's all the Administration wants -- get the money from the people and then to hell with them. Because that's what you say, that's what the Commissioner is saying and that's what Mr. Miller is saying. This is a case of administration malfunctioning.

Now I am saying to you that you've asked for \$139,906. You have already agreed that \$10,000 of it wasn't going to be spent so why appropriate?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I did not say that \$10,000 would not be spent. The Honourable Member knows full well that the Indian Land Claims people, the Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee people and the five watchmen are already on staff. Mr. Commissioner explained that adequately I thought.

Mr. Chamberlist: It was voted in the Supplementary for last year, but it is not voted in the supplementary for the year to come. It is in this Interim Supply Bill which is part of the main estimates. We have had a promise that none of the staff would be recruited. Now we are being told that the staff has already been recruited. And Mr. Miller is shaking his head. He says that himself, their own staff. Now this is what I am saying. Are these people on staff? If they are on staff, well it's a different picture again. Why are you asking for more staff, if they are already on staff? Obviously, there is some cooking of the books to make it look good.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Member from Whitehorse East realizes that this is purely legislative authority for the various departments to as it were, carry on in business. He has been in business, I don't know how many years, himself and I would just love to have taken his budget at any time that he thought that he was going to spend \$50,000 in a year, take one twelfth of that for the month and make him stick within that one twelfth for one month the expenses and let his business come to an end once that one twelfth was done. He knows full well that at certain times of the year in any business, that there are expenses that aren't exactly one twelfth for that particular month. He knows that this is just purely legislative authority to let these departments carry on. He knows full well too, that at the end of the year or later on in the year when monies are being spent by the departments, and we are getting closer to the budgeted amounts that has been approved by Council, that is when the true accounting comes in between monies spent and the authority given to spend money by this Council.



MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE DIFFERENCE, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN REPLY TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS THAT WHEN I AM RUNNING MY OWN BUSINESS, I AM SPENDING MY OWN MONEY AND IF I HAVEN'T GOT ANY MORE, ENOUGH OF MY OWN MONEY, I GO TO THE BANK AND BORROW IT. THIS IS DEALING WITH THE PEOPLES' MONEY. SOMEBODY ELSE'S MONEY, THAT IS WHY I'VE GOT A RIGHT TO ASK ABOUT THESE THINGS. I'M JUST GOING ON THE BASIS OF WHAT THE COMMISSIONER AND MR. MILLER HAVE INDICATED. THAT THEY WERE NOT GOING TO SPEND MONEY FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF. NOW THEY SAY THEY HAVE ALREADY GOT THE STAFF ON. NOW WHY DON'T THEY TELL THE TRUTH AND SAY LOOK WE'VE ALREADY TAKEN THE STAFF ON AND OF COURSE WE ARE KEEPING THEM ON FOR NEXT YEAR SO THE EXTRA BODIES ARE NOW ALREADY ON THE STAFF, THAT'S WHAT WE WANT THEM FOR. BUT THIS DOESN'T GIVE THAT EXPLANATION. THIS SAYS THAT IN 1973-74 THERE ARE NO STAFF RECOGNIZED HERE UNDER ESTABLISHMENT 122, IT SHOWS A NIL STAFF. UNDER ESTABLISHMENT 122 FOR 1974-75, THERE ARE THREE AND EXACTLY THE SAME WITH THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE STAFF. YOU KNOW, I THINK WHAT IS HAPPENING IS THAT THERE IS SOME SORT OF NEGLIGENCE IN THE INABILITY TO EXPLAIN THESE PARTICULAR ITEMS SO THAT THESE QUESTIONS THEN WON'T BE RAISED. SO NOW OF COURSE I HAVE TO SUPPORT THE PRINCIPLE THAT THERE ARE ADDITIONAL PEOPLE BEEN PAID IN THE INDIAN LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT AND THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE, THAT HAS BEEN PAID. NOW WHAT ABOUT THE FIVE WATCHMEN? ARE THEY ON STAFF ALREADY? I WONDER IF MR. MILLER CAN INDICATE THIS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE FIVE WATCHMEN WERE TAKEN OVER WITH THE ALASKA HIGHWAY ON APRIL 1ST, 1972 AND HAVE BEEN ON STAFF EVER SINCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF THEY WERE TAKEN ON IN 1972, AND CERTAINLY THE GOVERNMENT KNEW THAT THEY WERE GOING TO BE TAKEN OVER IN 1972, WHY WEREN'T THEY INCLUDED IN THE TAKEOVER OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY? WAS THERE AN ERROR IN NOT INCLUDING THEM IN THE COST FACTOR?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THEY WERE INCLUDED IN THE ALASKA HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES AND WILL BE IN UNTIL APRIL 1ST, 1974.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S THE POINT THAT I'M MAKING. IF THEY WERE THEN THE ADMINISTRATION KNEW THIS, WHY ARE THEY NOW BEING PUT DOWN AS ADDITIONAL BODIES FOR 1974-75 WHEN THEY ARE NOT DOWN FOR BODIES IN 1973-74? THERE MUST BE A REASON FOR THAT HAPPENING. IF THEY WERE TAKEN

ON IN '72 AND THEN I PRESUME THEY WOULD BE 72-73 AND THEN 73-74, WHY DOESN'T IT SHOW ON 73-74? IF THERE'S ERRORS BEEN MADE, SAY THAT WE MADE AN ERROR, WE'RE SORRY AND WE'RE CORRECTING IT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL LOOK ON PAGE 54 OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES, HE WILL FIND THE REDUCTION OF FIVE WATCHMEN IN THE YEAR 1974-75.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A REDUCTION IN 74-75?

MR. MILLER: TRANSFER OF BODIES IS WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. THERE WAS PROVISION IN 1973-74 ON PAGE 54 OF THE ESTIMATES FOR FIVE WATCHMEN AND NO PROVISION IN 1974-75.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEN, WHEN I MADE REFERENCE TO THIS, THE EXTRA BODIES, WHY DIDN'T YOU SAY THEN THAT THEY WERE NOT EXTRA BODIES, BUT THEY'RE BEING TRANSFERRED FROM ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? WHY MAKE ME ASK ALL THESE QUESTIONS TO SQUEEZE ANSWERS OUT OF YOU?

MR. MILLER: WITH RESPECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED THE QUESTION IN THAT WAY. HE ASKED WHAT THE DOLLAR VALUE OF THESE POSITIONS WAS, WHICH IS WHAT I GAVE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I REFERRED TO THEM AS NEW POSITIONS, MR. CHAIRMAN, BECAUSE ANYBODY CAN SEE THAT THEY APPEAR TO BE NEW POSITIONS. IF I WOULD HAVE HAD THAT EXPLANATION, I WOULD HAVE BEEN SATISFIED, BUT I DIDN'T GET THAT EXPLANATION UNTIL I HAD TO BE SPEAKING FOR A HALF HOUR. I MEAN, WHY ARE YOU TRYING TO BE SO SECRETIVE ABOUT THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I DON'T BELIEVE I'M BEING SECRETIVE ABOUT ANYTHING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'M SORRY, I'M NOT REFERRING TO YOU. YOU'RE BEING VERY QUIET, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR THEN ON ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES? NEXT ITEM IS DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY, \$98,015.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE THERE ANY TRANSFER OF BODIES IN THIS ESTIMATE?

MR. MILLER: TRANSFER OF BODIES, MR. CHAIRMAN, WAS REFLECTED ON PAGE 12 AND WE DEALT WITH THEM AT SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE TIME. THE TRANSFER



HAS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE WITH FOUR PEOPLE FROM TREASURY TO CENTRAL PURCHASING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MANY ADDITIONAL STAFF ARE PROPOSED OVER AND ABOVE THE TRANSFERS THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE?

MR. MILLER: FOUR ADDITIONAL POSITIONS, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE VALUE IN DOLLARS OF THOSE FOUR ADDITIONAL POSITIONS?

MR. MILLER: IN ROUND FIGURES, MR. CHAIRMAN, APPROXIMATELY \$45,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW THAT IS AN APPROXIMATION THERE FOR ONE MONTH OF THE REDUCTION OF SOME, JUST UNDER \$3,000. ARE THERE ANY OTHER PROGRAMS THAT ARE IN THAT \$98,000? ARE THERE ANY OTHER NEW PROGRAMS?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE NONE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WOULD IT NOT BE AGREEABLE THEN IN VIEW OF WE'RE NOT GOING TO SPEND THE MONEY FOR APRIL, THAT THIS BE REDUCED BY THE \$3,000? WOULD THAT NOT BE THE THING TO DO?

AND WHAT WOULD BE THE OBJECTION TO DOING IT? THIS IS WHAT I'M ASKING. IN VIEW OF THE CLEAR CUT STATEMENT MADE BY THE COMMISSIONER, THAT THERE WOULD BE NO RECRUITING IN APRIL AND THAT THEREFORE THE MONEY WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED IN APRIL, WHY CANNOT WE REDUCE THE APPROPRIATION ON THAT PARTICULAR ITEM BY \$3,000? ANY OBJECTION? HAVE YOU ANY OBJECTION TO REDUCING IT SIR?

INTERRUPTION BY SOME MEMBERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. COUNCILLOR TANNER?

MR. TANNER: I HAVE AN OBJECTION, MR. CHAIRMAN. THE PROCEDURE WE'RE FOLLOWING HERE IS QUITE INTERESTING TO THE PUBLIC AND IT'S QUITE INTERESTING TO MEMBERS OF COUNCIL AND NOBODY IS OBJECTING VERY MUCH TO THE WAY THE MEMBER IS CONDUCTING HIS INVESTIGATION, IF YOU LIKE. BUT EVERYBODY FULLY WELL KNOWS THAT THE PLACE TO THAT IS IN THE MAINS. WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE IS THE NORMAL REGULAR PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE WHICH HAS BEEN DONE IN THIS HOUSE BEFORE BY THIS MEMBER BEFORE AND I DON'T SEE ANY POINT IN HIS CONTINUALLY TRYING TO CHOP DOWN THE PARTICULAR ESTIMATES. WE'RE ASKING FOR ONE TWELFTH TO OPERATE FOR ONE MONTH AND WHEN WE GET

TO THE ESTIMATES DURING THAT MONTH, HE'LL HAVE EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ANY PART OR PARCEL OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES THAT HE PLEASES.

NOW IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WANTS TO CONTINUE TO KEEP SUGGESTING WE CHOP OFF BITS AND PIECES HERE, HE CAN DO SO, BUT I FOR ONE DO NOT AGREE WITH HIM AND I THINK THAT WE SHOULD PASS THAT TOTAL AMOUNT AND WITH THE ASSURANCE OF THE COMMISSIONER WHICH YOU GET THE SAME ASSURANCE FROM THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, I DON'T SEE ANY POINT IN GOING THROUGH THIS EXERCISE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DOESN'T SEE ANY POINT. HE SPEAKS ABOUT PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE, BUT LET ME TELL HIM THAT THIS, WHAT I'M DOING, IS PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE, TO EXAMINE THE FUNDS THAT ARE BEING SPENT BY THE PEOPLE. PERHAPS HE'S NOT AWARE OF THIS, PERHAPS HE HASN'T HAD THE EXPERIENCE REQUIRED TO RECOGNIZE WHAT THE FUNCTIONS OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL ARE IN THESE PARTICULAR AREAS.

WHAT I'M REALLY ASKING IS WHAT IS THE OBJECTION TO REDUCING THE APPROPRIATION IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THERE IS NO INTENTION TO SPEND THE MONEY. THIS IS THE PARTICULAR POINT. I'M SATISFIED WITH THE SUGGESTION BEING MADE THAT THIS IS A TWELFTH OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES. BUT, WHEN THERE IS A CLEARLY DEFINED STATEMENT THAT MONEY WILL NOT BE SPENT IN APRIL, WHY THEN SHOULD THERE BE ANY OBJECTION IN REDUCING THE APPROPRIATION THAT HAS BEEN ASKED FOR? THAT IT IS EXPECTED TO BE SPENT. CERTAINLY, IF YOU SAY THAT ONLY \$95,000 IS EXPECTED TO BE SPENT, FINE. BUT WHY ALLOW YOU TO TAKE \$98,000 WHEN YOU'RE ONLY GOING TO SPEND \$95,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING FURTHER ON THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE WE GOING TO REDUCE THIS BY \$3,000.00 MR. CHAIRMAN?

MRS. WATSON: NO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF ANYBODY ...

MRS. WATSON: I'LL ANSWER HIS QUESTION. NO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF ANYBODY ... OBVIOUSLY THERE IS NO UNDERSTANDING FROM COUNCILLOR WATSON AS TO WHAT I AM GETTING AT. SHE HASN'T SEEN THE POINT REALLY AT ALL. IT



IS UNFORTUNATE THAT SHE HASN'T SEEN THE POINT BECAUSE PERHAPS NOT HAVING THE EXPERIENCE IN HANDLING FUNDS AT ALL. SO I THINK THAT THE REAL LEGITIMATE POINT HERE IS WHETHER OR NOT THE ADMINISTRATION ARE ENTITLED TO APPROPRIATE MONEY FROM THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND WHEN INDEED THEY HAVE NO INTENTION OF SPENDING IT. DOES IT MEAN THAT THEY WANT TO GET ALL THE MONEY THEY CAN SO THAT THEY CAN SPEND IT IN SOME OTHER WAY AND CONCEAL THE EXPENDITURES UNTIL SUCH TIME AS SOMEBODY FINDS OUT WHERE THEY HAVE SPENT THIS MONEY? IS THIS THE REAL REASON? IF MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL DON'T WANT TO AMEND THAT AMOUNT, AT LEAST WE KNOW THAT THIS IS PROBABLY, HIGHLY PROBABLE, BEHIND WHAT IS INTENDED. THEY WANT TO TAKE AS MUCH MONEY AS POSSIBLE TO SPEND IT WHEREVER THEY WANT TO, WHENEVER THEY WANT TO. THANK YOU. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER TO SAY ON THAT ITEM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$724,740.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HO BOY, WE HAVEN'T GOT ENOUGH TIME TO TALK ON THIS ONE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE HE ASKS THE QUESTION, I'LL ANSWER IT. THERE ARE TWO POINTS. SIX NEW POSITIONS WE DELETED. ONE IS ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT. POINT SEVEN, WE DON'T ASK FOR A FULL YEAR IF WE DON'T NEED TO. LAST YEAR, WE ASKED FOR POINT SEVEN. THAT'S RIGHT. SEVEN MONTHS. SUPERVISOR OF INSTRUCTION, ONE READING SUPERVISOR, 2.7 MAN-YEARS, WERE DELETED. WE ADDED TWO REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS, ONE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST, .3 CLERK-TYPISTS, ONE CLERK II, WHO DOES THE STUDENTS' RECORDS, ONE CLERK-TYPIST II, AND ONE CLERK II. THAT'S 5.3, LESS THE DELETED POSITIONS. WE ARE ASKING FOR 2.6 NEW POSITIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF WE CAN GET SOME INDICATION OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MAN-YEARS OF THE YUKON VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTRE WHICH HAS GONE UP FROM 46 TO 68.5.

MRS. WATSON: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU CERTAINLY MAY. THE SEVENTEEN COMMUNITY INSTRUCTORS AND THOSE WERE IN THE PLADE PROGRAMME THAT WAS APPROVED HERE IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES. THE EXTRA COURSES THAT WERE PUT ON AND NEXT YEAR, THERE WILL BE SEVENTEEN FOR THE PLADE AND 4.5 FOR THE LIFE SKILLS, AND ONE, THE HOUSING CORPORATION CO-ORDINATOR IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES IF YOU REMEMBER, AND THIS IS A PROGRAMME THAT WE ARE CARRYING ON FOR THE HOUSING CORPORATION THAT MAKES YOUR 22.5 NEW MAN-YEARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS CLEARLY OBVIOUS THAT WHAT IS HAPPENING NOW IS THE ADMINISTRATION IS GOING TO FALL BACK EACH TIME ON THE FORCED SUPPLEMENTARIES THAT WERE IMPOSED UPON THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL BY THE PROCEDURE OF PROCEEDING WITH NEW PROGRAMMES WITHOUT FIRST ASCERTAINING WHETHER OR NOT THE COUNCIL WOULD APPROVE THE EXPENDITURE OF THE PROGRAMMES. THIS HAS ALREADY BEEN SPOKEN ABOUT WHILE WE WERE DEBATING THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, THE FINAL SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1973/74. THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NOW TAKEN IT UPON THEMSELVES TO SAY, "NOW THAT WE HAVE GOT SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, FOR 1973-74, TO PAY FOR PROGRAMMES THAT YOU DID NOT APPROVE AT THAT TIME, WE ARE GOING TO ACCEPT THAT YOU HAVE APPROVED THE PROGRAMMES FOR 1974-75 AND ARE GOING TO MAINTAIN FOR THESE PEOPLE." NOW IT MAY WELL BE THAT WE INTEND TO SUPPORT THE PROGRAMMES THAT HAVE BEEN INITIATED AND PAID FOR BECAUSE WE CERTAINLY WANT TO SEE THOSE PROGRAMMES GO THROUGH. BUT I THINK THE ADMINISTRATION IS SAYING, "THIS IS THE WAY TO GET THINGS DONE AND FORCE PROGRAMMES. SO THAT WHEN IT'S COMING TOWARDS THE END OF THIS YEAR OR THE LATTER PART OF THIS YEAR, IF WE WANT TO GET SOMETHING IN FOR 75-76, WE WILL GO AHEAD WITH PROGRAMMES, HIRE STAFF. PROCEED IN ALL AREAS WITHOUT HAVING THE AUTHORITY TO SPEND THE MONEY TO DO IT. THEN COME FORWARD BY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES. ASK FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MONEY BECAUSE WE HAVE TO PAY THE PEOPLE, AND THEN ADD IT INTO THE FOLLOWING YEAR TO MAKE IT APPEAR THEN THAT THE APPROVAL HAS BEEN GIVEN FOR THE PROGRAMMES IN THE FOLLOWING YEAR." OF COURSE, THIS IS WHERE I RAISE OBJECTIONS. BECAUSE THIS IS A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY, I AM NOT GOING TO RAISE ANY OBJECTIONS AT THIS STAGE ON THIS PARTICULAR VOTE BECAUSE THIS WILL BE SOMETHING THAT WILL HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES. BUT CERTAINLY IT MUST BE RECOGNIZED THAT NONE OF THIS MONEY IS GOING TO INDICATE IN ANY WAY THAT THE EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WHOLE YEAR IS TO BE CONSIDERED AS APPROVED. BECAUSE I HAVE SOME LENGTHY REMARKS IN SOME AREAS WHICH WOULD DETRACT FROM THE PRINCIPLE OF THIS PARTICULAR BILL.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REPLY TO THE IMPLICATIONS MADE THAT WE STARTED OUR NEW PROGRAMMES, SLIPPED THEM IN OUR SUPPLEMENTARY AND THEN THEY ARE AN ON-GOING THING. IN THIS INSTANCE, THIS IS NOT TRUE. THE PROGRAMMES AND THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT YOU HAVE APPROVED IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET, THOSE PROGRAMMES WILL BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF APRIL AND THE FIRST WEEK IN MAY. THE NEW COMMUNITY PROGRAMMES WILL NOT GET ROLLING AGAIN UNTIL LATE SUMMER AND EARLY FALL. SO THAT



THERE IS, THESE NEW PROGRAMMES ARE CERTAINLY NOT DEPENDENT ON LAST YEAR'S PROGRAMMES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AS A MATTER OF FACT, BY MAKING THAT REMARK, I THINK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD HAVE BEEN MUCH WISER IF SHE DID NOT ADD THAT REMARK BECAUSE NOW IT BRINGS TO MY MIND THIS SPECIFIC SITUATION. WE ARE NOT BEING ASKED IN A TERM SUPPLY TO APPROVE THE PROGRAMMES, THE MONEY FOR PAYING THE PROGRAMMES AND FOR THESE PEOPLE, TWELVE OF THEM, IN THE MONTH OF APRIL PRIOR TO THE PROGRAMMES BEING APPROVED, I AM SURE THAT SHE RECOGNIZES WHAT I AM SAYING. IT MEANS THAT THESE PEOPLE WHO ARE COMMUNITY INSTRUCTORS ARE GOING TO BE RETAINED DURING THE MONTH OF APRIL SO THAT THE PROGRAMME BECOMES A CONTINUING ONE. I SAY AGAIN, I AM NOT OPPOSING THE PROGRAMME BUT JUST THE METHODS IN WHICH THIS IS BEING BROUGHT FORWARD. THESE PROGRAMMES MAY BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF APRIL, PERHAPS I AM INCORRECT IN THE WAY I AM EXPLAINING IT. PERHAPS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL BE ABLE TO STAND UP AND CORRECT ME IN A MOMENT. I AM JUST SAYING THAT IT APPEARS TO ME FROM THE REMARKS THAT SHE MADE, THE PROGRAMME THAT IS IN EFFECT NOW WILL BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF THIS MONTH AND THE NEW PROGRAMME, THE MONEY THAT IS ASKED FOR, IS FOR THE NEW PROGRAMME TO COMMENCE APRIL 1ST. I SAY THIS, THAT IN VIEW OF WHAT THE COMMISSIONER HAS SAID, THAT THERE WOULD BE NO NEW PROGRAMMES OR NEW STAFF FOR NEW PROGRAMMES, THAT THE PEOPLE WHO ARE BEING LISTED IN THIS LIST OF PERSONNEL ARE PEOPLE FOR A NEW PROGRAMME. PERHAPS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD LIKE TO EXPLAIN THAT WHAT I HAVE SUGGESTED IS NOT CORRECT?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM NOT GOING TO EVEN ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN. I'VE NEVER SEEN ANYONE ABLE TO MIX UP THINGS BETTER THAN YOU DO, DELIBERATELY. WHAT'S THE POINT OF WASTING TIME?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OBVIOUSLY, THERE IS NO EXPLANATION TO THE QUESTION THAT I HAVE ASKED AND THEREFORE,...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS A VERY LEGITIMATE EXPLANATION. HE JUST CAN'T UNDERSTAND IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD LIKE AN EXPLANATION OF THIS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: CAN I GET AN EXPLANATION THEN IF WHAT I HAVE SAID IS NOT CORRECT, AND YOU KNOW, I AM JUST TAKING THE REMARKS ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT CERTAINLY ISN'T CORRECT. I GAVE HIM THE EXPLANATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I JUST MADE THE REMARKS ON WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS SAID AND WHEN YOU SEE COMMUNITY INSTRUCTORS, CASUAL, 17 AND THEY ARE MARKED DOWN AS CASUAL FOR NEXT YEAR, AND THESE PEOPLE ARE NOT GOING TO BE USED IN THE MONTH OF APRIL, WHY IN VIEW OF WHAT THE COMMISSIONER HAS SAID, IS THIS MONEY BEING ASKED FOR IN THAT SAME AMOUNT? I DON'T WANT TO MAKE ANY ISSUE OF IT BECAUSE I HAVE COMMENTS TO SAY AFTERWARDS. SHE IS UNABLE TO GIVE AN EXPLANATION ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS NOT TRUE. I GAVE A VERY VALID EXPLANATION. YOU WERE NOT ABLE TO UNDERSTAND IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, ORDER, PLEASE. ONE AT A TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DOESN'T REALIZE THAT SHE CAN'T STAND UP LIKE THAT UNTIL I AM SITTING.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS THE ONLY WAY I CAN GET A WORD IN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SHE'LL TAKE HER TIME. IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION I HAVE PUT BY WAY OF EXPLANATION, I'LL BE PLEASED TO HEAR IT. BUT IF SHE SAYS, "I DON'T WANT TO EXPLAIN." I CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT SHE IS UNABLE TO EXPLAIN. I'LL SIT DOWN ON THAT POINT WITH THE SATISFACTION OF KNOWING OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S INABILITY TO EXPLAIN THE QUESTION THAT I HAVE ASKED.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS UNTRUE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION? THE NEXT ITEM IS THE DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY AND REGISTRAR GENERAL, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$67,089.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF MR. FINLAND, WHO IS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER, WILL BE ABLE TO COME IN HERE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE SAID THAT WE WOULD BE JUST HAVING THE TREASURER AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER FOR INTERIM SUPPLY AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD BE ABLE TO HAVE THE OTHER EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WHEN WE WENT INTO THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, ...



MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IN THE INTEREST OF THE COMMITTEE IN THE GOOD STEAD IF WE COULD CARRY ON AND IF WE DO RUN ACROSS SOME ITEMS THAT WE HAVE ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'VE ALREADY RUN ACROSS ITEMS. WITH RESPECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS DEPARTMENT TO BE HERE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK IT IS NECESSARY AND THIS WAS THE UNDERSTANDING THAT WE HAD IN COMMITTEE THAT I AM SURE THAT THE TREASURER CAN ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS ON NEW STAFF AND ANY NEW PROGRAMMES THAT ARE REQUIRED AND THEN WHEN WE GO INTO DETAILS OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES, BY ALL MEANS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: FROM THE CHAIR, I WOULD THINK THAT WE HAVE A TREASURER HERE AND IF THERE IS SOMETHING THAT COMES UP AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DOES WANT THE MEMBER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OR WHATEVER AT THAT TIME, THEN POSSIBLY WE COULD CALL HIM BUT WE ARE GOING TO PUT THE BUILDING HERE AT A GREAT DISADVANTAGE IF WE HAVE TO KEEP CALLING FOR PEOPLE TO COME TO AND FROM THE COMMITTEE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WITH RESPECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, LET ME PUT IT TO YOU REAL STRAIGHT. ALL THE TIME, SINCE THE CONCEPTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AT ANY AREA WHERE AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER HAS BEEN REQUIRED, THERE HAS NEVER BEEN ANY OBJECTION. I KNOW THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE IS TRYING TO PROTECT THE APPOINTED PEOPLE. NOW THEY NEED PROTECTION FROM ME VERY SORELY BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO EAT THEM ALL UP. AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED, ...

ONE HONOURABLE MEMBER: YOU'D GET INDIGESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED, THEY ARE FIRST ON THIS GOVERNMENT. I HAVE ASKED FOR MR. FINGLAND. I SEE HIS NAME DOWN HERE AS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER. THERE MAY BE SOME QUESTIONS I WISH TO ASK OF HIM. IF YOU DON'T WANT TO HAVE HIM, I SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT YOU WOULD BE CHANGING THE WHOLE RULE, BECAUSE YOU HAVE INDICATED IN THE PAST THAT IF AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IS CALLED ON TO ASK A QUESTION HE SHOULD BE HERE. HE IS BEING HIDDEN, HE IS BEING CONCEALED. HE HASN'T COME FORTH PAST THE DOUBLE DOORS. THE ONLY TIME HE COMES PAST THE DOUBLE DOORS IS TO VISIT THE "JOHN". AND PERHAPS IT WOULD BE BETTER IF WE MOVED THE "JOHN" OUTSIDE THESE DOORS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER. I DON'T THINK THAT ANY MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATION IS ON TRIAL HERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: UNFORTUNATELY. HOW UNFORTUNATE. BACK TO THE "JOHN".

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT IS USUAL THAT WHEN WE DEAL WITH MONEY BILLS THAT THE TREASURER IS ALWAYS PRESENT. THE TREASURER IS PRESENT AND IF WE REQUIRE INFORMATION FROM ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATION, I AM SURE THAT THIS COULD BE ARRANGED WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF COMMITTEE. BUT CERTAINLY, THE TREASURER SHOULD ALWAYS BE HERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEN IN THAT CASE, WHAT IS, IF THE TREASURER IS HERE, THEN WHAT IS MR. MILLER DOING HERE, IF WE ARE NOT DEALING WITH HIM?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE THAT IS QUITE OBVIOUS TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT THE TREASURER IS BRAND NEW TO THE TERRITORY AND IS JUST TRYING TO GET HIS "SEA LEGS" AND MR. MILLER IS THE ONLY MAN THAT CAN ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THAT WE HAVE FOR MR. TREASURER.

MR. COMMISSIONER: YOU'VE GOT AN HOUR TO GO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T SEE ANY REASON WHY THERE SHOULD BE A REFUSAL TO HAVE MR. FINGLAND HERE. HE IS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF THESE MATTERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IF YOU KNOW THE QUESTIONS THAT YOU WISH TO RAISE, MR. TREASURER CAN DEAL WITH THEM POSSIBLY WE MIGHT HAVE TO ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM SURE THAT HE WILL GET AN OPPORTUNITY IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHY DON'T YOU SIT DOWN UNTIL I'VE FINISHED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER. ORDER, PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DO I UNDERSTAND THEN, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT YOU ARE RULING THAT I CAN'T HAVE MR. FINGLAND HERE AS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER? IS THIS YOUR RULING?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I AM RULING THAT IF IT BECOMES APPARENT THAT IT IS THE WISH OF COMMITTEE, THEN CERTAINLY, MR. FINGLAND WILL BE SOUGHT AFTER. I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY INDICATION AS YET THAT HIS PRESENCE IS NECESSARY IN COMMITTEE AT THIS TIME.



Mr. Chamberlist: Well, I have referred to him as the "Untouchable" and he surely is. Even this Committee can't touch him. Obviously not. They just hide him.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on the Secretary and Registrar General?

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, I wonder if I can get to the same questions, Mr. Chairman. The explanation again. Are there any additional bodies? Are there any transfers of bodies? What is the amount of funds that are going to be expended for those people?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there is an additional, there are two and a half man-years involved in this appropriation. One is an Employment Liaison Officer. One is an Accounting Clerk. A half man-year relates to a change from a half a Clerk-Typist I and we are now going to an Assistant Territorial Secretary which is one half additional man-years. The approximate dollars that will be involved in these two and half man-years would be probably about \$30,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, there again, that's is another \$2500 that we are not going to spend. For the month ... Why again are we appropriating more money? So far, there is something like \$15,500.00 that we are going to be appropriating. Are there any new programmes or are any of these bodies involved in new programmes?

Mr. Miller: The only new programme, Mr. Chairman, is the Employment Liaison Officer which is an on-going function that we are now taking over from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chamberlist: This particular person is the one that has been seconded to the Territorial Government in the past and is now coming on our body.

Mr. Miller: That is correct.

Mr. Chamberlist: Are the Fringe Benefits, incidentally I haven't asked this one, are the Fringe Benefits and the additions to the Public Service Alliance Agreement all added in now in to these total costs for salaries, etcetra?

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: They are added in. Not for the teachers ...

Mr. Commissioner: I rise on this, to get this noted because I mentioned this in my Budget Speech, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, there is a point that I was going to ask in the Education, perhaps I can ask it now, and perhaps Mr. Miller can give me the information. How much, or perhaps Councillor Watson can, how much, approximately, is it expected that the subsequent negotiation with the teachers will increase the salary item for the teachers.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, there is no way we have of knowing. Thank you very much.

Mr. Commissioner: It was a good try, Norm.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, the understanding that I have, I don't know if I am incorrect, the negotiations were supposed to be completed for the Education, the teachers' salaries prior to the presenting of this Budget. Now, I wonder if we can get a detailed explanation as to why this hasn't complied with with the Department of Education?

Mrs. Watson: The negotiations were postponed by mutual agreement.

Mr. Chamberlist: Is this the subject matter of the Court Action at this time? Can I get an answer to that?

Mr. Commissioner: No. You didn't hear an answer to it but it's in Court.

Mr. Chamberlist: Is this the subject matter, that there was a postponement supposedly by mutual agreement? Is this what the Government is saying? I am trying to find out Mr. Chairman. I'll wait for Mr. Chairman.

Some Honourable Member: Laughter.

Mr. Chamberlist: I'm trying to ascertain Mr. Chairman, whether or not the shortage in the Educational Budget which does not include what was to be negotiated salary commitments to the teachers of the Yukon Territory, is not in this item and it has been indicated there has been a mutual cut-off of negotiations. I was wondering whether somebody would indicate whether this mutual cut-off of the teachers' negotiations has resulted in some Court Action. I wonder if I could be answered whether in



FACT THIS IS SO OR WHETHER NOT. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE IT RECORDED SO THAT BOTH THE GOVERNMENT AND THE TEACHERS WILL BE ABLE TO EXAMINE THE ANSWERS AS THE REASONS BE, AT A LATER DATE.

MR. TANNER: BACK IN COURT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD ANYBODY CARE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION? THERE DOESN'T SEEM TO BE AN ANSWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD LIKE IT RECORDED THAT THERE IS NO ANSWER TO THE QUESTION AND ONE CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT THE QUESTION WAS BROKEN UP BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT IS NOT FACTUAL. I HOPE THOSE WILL TAKE NOTICE OF THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.

WERE THERE ANY OTHER ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS MR. MILLER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY AND REGISTRAR-GENERAL DEALING WITH THIS AMOUNT THAT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED AS A 1/12, \$67,089.

MR. MILLER: THERE ARE NO NEW PROGRAMS IN THE FISCAL YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE WE CLEAR THEN ON DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY AND REGISTRAR-GENERAL?

MRS. WATSON: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM AND I BELIEVE WE ARE RESERVING THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION IN RELATION TO SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 13. SO WE WILL PASS ALONG TO--

MRS. WATSON: IS THERE ANY REASON WHY WE COULDN'T DO WELFARE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO WE CAN'T.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE WE HAVE AGREED THAT THIS BE LEFT TO LAST.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH I SEE WHAT YOU MEAN. WE CAN'T DO THAT BECAUSE THERE IS ONE AMOUNT. THIS IS WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HASN'T SPOTTED. THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION IS ALL ONE AMOUNT. SO OF COURSE, WE CAN'T JUST DEAL WITH WELFARE. WE WILL DEAL WITH THAT IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$104,766.  
PAGE 37.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I HAVE THE SAME REGULAR QUESTIONS MR. MILLER. IF WE COULD INDICATE AS WE ARE JUST DEALING WITH STAFF AT THIS TIME. I KNOW THAT THERE IS AN INCREASE OF THREE AMBULANCE ATTENDANTS. ARE THESE ALREADY WORKING IN THE PROGRAM?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN TO RELATE TO THE MEMBER'S ORIGINAL QUESTION OF TOTAL, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT SERVICES FOR ONE ADDITIONAL ASSESSOR. THERE IS ONE UTILITY SYSTEM SUPERINTENDANT AND THERE ARE THREE MAN-YEARS FOR SWITCHBOARD OPERATOR AMBULANCE ATTENDANT WHICH WE ARE NOW HIRING ON A CASUAL BASIS TO COVER THE SWITCHBOARD AT THE HOSPITAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU ARE ALREADY HIRING THEM ON A CASUAL BASIS.

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WAS THAT INCLUDED THEN IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY. I TAKE IT THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY. THESE CASUAL PEOPLE ARE STILL BEING MAINTAINED THEN ON A PERMANENT BASIS.

MR. MILLER: SOME OF THEM WILL BECOME PERMANENT. SOME WILL REMAIN ON CASUAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE ONES THAT WILL BECOME PERMANENT, ARE ANY OF THOSE TO BE ON STAFF DURING THE MONTH OF APRIL?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T HAVE THE PRECISE ANSWER TO THAT. THERE MAY BE SOMETHING PERMANENT NOW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE THERE ANY OTHER PROGRAMS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WISH OR NEW PROGRAMS WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE YEAR'S ESTIMATE?

MR. MILLER: OTHER THAN THOSE THAT RELATE TO STAFF, THE ONLY ONE I AM AWARE OF IS THE PROVISION INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES. CERTAIN CONTRIBUTION TOWARD THE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I TAKE IT THAT THIS IS JUST A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE OPERATION OF THE MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION.

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: O.K. AND NOTHING BEYOND THAT. WE ARE ABSOLUTELY SURE.

MR. MILLER: NOTHING THAT COMES TO MY MIND AT THE MOMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS WHY I AM THINKING THAT YOU WOULDN'T KNOW BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THAT DEPARTMENT. YOU WOULDN'T KNOW THAT.

MR. MILLER: YES I AM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU ARE, DIRECTOR OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT. THAT'S RIGHT, THAT'S STILL YOURS. NOTHING FURTHER THAN THAT, YOU DON'T KNOW OF.

MR. MILLER: YES MR. CHAIRMAN THERE IS ONE MORE, THERE IS PROVISION IN THE ESTIMATES FOR THE TAKEOVER OF THE EMERGENCY MEASURES ORGANIZATION TO FUNCTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'M PLEASED YOU BROUGHT IT TO MIND BECAUSE I WAS GOING TO ASK YOU THAT AS THE NEXT QUESTION. THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, CONSERVATION AND INFORMATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$138,592.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: CAN WE RELATE THE SAME STANDARD QUESTIONS MR. CHAIRMAN FOR MR. MILLER?

MR. MILLER: UNDER TOURISM AND INFORMATION BRANCH THERE IS AN ADDITIONAL 6-MAN-YEARS. UNDER CAMPGROUND MAINTENANCE IT SHOWS THERE IS 1 AND 1/2 ADDITIONAL MAN-YEARS. HOWEVER, THOSE PEOPLE ARE CHARGED PROJECTS, UNDER THE GAME BRANCH THERE IS A PROVISION FOR AN ADDITIONAL 5-MAN-YEARS. UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES BRANCH THERE IS PROVISION FOR A FURTHER 2-MAN-YEARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN THAT IS 14 1/2 MAN YEARS, ADDITIONAL PEOPLE.

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE COST PER ANNUM FOR THOSE 14 1/2 PEOPLE, MAN-YEARS?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN I THINK I SHOULD POINT OUT TO THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST THAT A LOT OF THIS BUDGET DOESN'T EVEN COME ABOUT UNTIL SOMETIME IN THE SUMMER. PERHAPS HE'S OVERLOOKING THAT. HE MIGHT WANT TO CUT

A LITTLE MORE SINCE IT IS NOT TAKING --- TONIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS THE NEXT QUESTION THAT I AM COMING TO BECAUSE I AM GOING TO ASK WHETHER THESE EXPENDITURES HAVE NOT BEEN MADE, THAT WILL FOLLOW OF COURSE. I CAN ASSURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON THAT I AM NOT MISSING THESE. HE KNOWS THAT I DON'T MISS THESE THINGS TOO OFTEN. BUT I AM JUST TALKING THE BASIS OF THE MAN-YEARS AT THIS TIME.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE APPROXIMATE COST OF THE ADDITIONAL MAN-YEARS WOULD BE ABOUT \$170,000 PER ANNUM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO IF WE TAKE A 1/12 OF THAT, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT \$14,000. APPROXIMATELY. WHAT ABOUT ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE STARTED WITHOUT THE ADDITIONAL STAFF.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ISN'T IT SO THAT WITHIN THIS ITEM NOT ONLY ARE INCLUDED ITEMS FOR THE ACTUAL STAFF BUT THERE INCLUDED ITEMS FOR THE PROGRAMS THAT THIS STAFF HAS TO PUT INTO EFFECT. IS THAT NOT RIGHT? HOW MUCH?

MR. MILLER: THAT WAS PRECISELY MY ANSWER MR. CHAIRMAN AND I'M AFRAID I DON'T KNOW. THERE ARE NO NEW PROGRAMS, THAT'S AN EXTENSION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH WOULD THE COST OF THE EXTENSION BE THAT WILL NOT BE USED FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL?

MR. MILLER: I WOULD SUGGEST MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE ARE TALKING ABOUT ONE MONTH'S COST, WE ARE PROBABLY TALKING ABOUT AN ADDITIONAL \$5,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO IN ALL YOU SAY THAT WHAT IS BEING ASKED FOR FOR THE WHOLE YEAR IS SOMETHING LIKE \$170,000 AND \$60,000, ABOUT \$230,000 OVER AND ABOVE LAST YEAR'S? IS THIS WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

MR. MILLER: I THINK THAT WOULD BE CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD YOU EXPLAIN TO ME WHY THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF \$351,000 SHOWN AS THE CHANGE BETWEEN 1973-74 AND 1974-75?

MR. COMMISSIONER: THE RENT IS HIGHER.



Mr. Chamberlist: You have agreed, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Miller has agreed that there is just about \$230,000. Right on the first page of the Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information Services, it shows that there is a change between the estimates between 1973-74 and 1974-75 of \$351,900. I wonder if we can be told where the other \$122,000 can be found.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman a certain portion of that \$122,000 would relate to wage increases, fringe benefit increases on existing staff, additional costs of material that we would incur next year and there was a certain amount of it that relates to, particularly in the game area, to air patrols which won't be carried out until the summer months.

Mr. Chamberlist: From what you say Mr. Miller the increases over and above the suggestion that you have made which is for labor and that is salaries and a new programme of \$132,000 which is approximately some 12% of the total amount is for additional is for wages, material and the like.

Mr. Commissioner: 8%

Mr. Chamberlist: \$122,000 off of \$1,662,000. We're taking off the \$230,000 that I've talked about. You take the \$230,000 off that he has already indicated, would be approximately 10%, something like that. Take the \$230,000 off the \$1,663,000 which leaves about \$1,433,000. We're talking about \$120,000. We are talking about 8 or 10%. It's in that range. I haven't got my ready reckoner with me. This is what you are saying. I want to get these answers so that when we come to the main estimates, I want you then to be able to justify the answers you are giving today. Do you agree with what the Commissioner says. I am trying to co-operate with him just this once, 8%, will you agree on that percentage?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the wage increase is provided in the budget for all employees currently on staff is 8%. There is a further 7% of that for fringe benefits additional costs and certain costs of materials have come up. What I'm saying is that approximately \$130,000 would be on-going program costs. Additional on-going program costs.

Mr. Chamberlist: We've already included that in the \$170,000 that you have said would be

for the additional 14 1/2 people. The fringe benefits are already included in that.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman I was only referring to the fringe benefits for our existing staff, not for the new positions.

Mr. Chamberlist: Are you saying then that the \$170,000 that you referred to does not include fringe benefits for those 14 1/2 people?

Mr. Miller: No Mr. Chairman I didn't say that at all.

Mr. Chamberlist: I just want it recorded because we will be coming to that. Nothing further on that Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Allright, the next item is in the Department of Legal Affairs in the amount of \$116,389. Page 45.

Mr. Chamberlist: I want Mr. Finland here for this one. I want to ask him what his function is within the Legal Affairs Branch.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman he can ask him that when we do the main estimates.

Some Honourable Members: Interrupted.

Mr. Chamberlist: Why don't you sit down? I'm on my feet lady. Sit down now.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman I rather object to the Honourable Member standing constantly and he doesn't give anyone else an opportunity to speak. He just doesn't sit down. I would insist that you insist he sit down.

Mr. Chairman: I'm afraid until he is out of order I cannot so rule.

Mr. Chamberlist: The reason why I want Mr. Finland here, and although I know that I can ask the questions in the main estimate, I want to get some answers in relation to the main estimates from him now. As the answers I will get from him are answers I require from him which I will be relating to a Federal Department. This is why I want these answers. I relate to money, etc. and I want to ask him some specific questions. If it is inconvenient for him to come this evening, we are going to



DEAL WITH DEPARTMENT HEALTH AND WELFARE REHABILITATION TOMORROW AND WE LEAVE THIS PARTICULAR ITEM UNTIL TOMORROW SO THAT HE COMES ALONG AND NOT TO INTERRUPT WITH EVERYTHING TONIGHT, I'M QUITE WILLING TO BE CO-OPERATIVE ENOUGH IN THAT LATITUDE.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman I think we have made our decision that we're not going to have Executive Committee Members here for the Interim Supply. They will come with the Main Estimates. I think the Honourable Member realizes that he is just trying to make an issue.

Mr. Chairman: I would think as I've ruled before that if there are some questions that can only be answered by the Member implied. But I do see Mr. Commissioner here, and possibly he may be able to assist if there are some questions and if they can't be answered we may have to call for Mr. Finland.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman I have asked for Mr. Finland to be here. If he isn't here I can only assume that he has no right to be in this Administration in any event. Now you can't have your cake and eat it. He's either here to answer questions and if he is not going to answer questions or he is incapable of answering questions, I would like to know. I haven't seen him. I would like to know whether he still has his capabilities about him. He has disappeared from people's views for such a long time. I want to ask him questions about this Legal Affairs Branch. I want to know what his function is in the Legal Affairs Branch. Why has there been, in view of certain things that have taken place over the past year relating to Legal Affairs. I want to ask him specific questions relating to the Courts and the various costs here. Nobody should be able to answer but the particular Member of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, can't the Honourable Member just as easily ask these questions when we come to the Main Budget when Mr. Finland will be happy to be here and nobody is trying to protect him. We haven't got the man here. We merely ask for the convenience of Council. We are trying to get some proper, real work done here.

Mr. Chamberlist: Are you suggesting that what I'm doing here is not real work?

Mr. Tanner: Yes Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that you are probably wasting the time of Council--

Mr. Chamberlist:--I'm going to run this time out for you. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make this position very clear. The stupidity and I repeat, of anybody who could suggest that because a Member of Council asks questions relating to the expenditure of Territorial Government funds is a waste of Council time must be recorded. What failure could I be considered if an item totalling \$5,000,000 comes forward and I don't ask questions which are all relative to the amount of money that's been suggested.

Mr. Chairman: Possibly the Honourable Member could ask his questions and we can see possibly if Mr. Treasurer or Mr. Commissioner right here could answer them, inasmuch as they are both here.

Mr. Chamberlist: With respect Mr. Chairman, we've all been told how the concept of the Executive Committee is worked. How each Executive Committee Member is responsible for his own department, how four Members of Executive Committee are sitting here now answering questions relating to their department, how they, three of them are doing their best to protect one Member by not having him answer questions.

Mr. Tanner: A point of order Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, just let me correct the impression that the Honourable Member just spoke is trying to put. Nobody is trying to protect Mr. Finland. Mr. Finland is very able to look after himself. I'm merely suggesting that there are other things we could be doing. We could be going along with this and Mr. Finland hasn't been here, the Chairman has already ruled that we don't need him here and I really don't understand the Member's point of view.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, you know I don't think the point of order is well taken for the simple reason that Mr. Chairman hasn't ruled that he doesn't have to be here, and I have said that if he is unable to be here tonight I'm quite prepared to let that particular item go until tomorrow and then we can deal with it tomorrow. Put certainly, if a Member of this Council wishes to ask questions of an Executive Committee Member as has always been done in



THE PAST, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER HAS BEEN ASKED TO COME IN. NOW I SIMPLY WANT TO SAY TO MR. CHAIRMAN THAT IT IS MY PREROGATIVE TO ASK FOR ANY SPECIFIC WITNESS TO BE CALLED AND MR. CHAIRMAN HAS ALREADY RULED THAT NO MEMBER OF COUNCIL SHOULD BE DENIED THE RIGHT OF A WITNESS IF THERE IS AGREEMENT THAT A WITNESS BE CALLED. THIS IS JUST NOT A CASE OF AN ORDINARY WITNESS, THIS IS SUPPOSED TO BE THE QUASI CABINET POSITION OR BE IT THAT IT IS AN APPOINTED MEMBER WHO IS IN THAT POSITION HERE TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS. ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT IF THE MEMBER DOESN'T WANT TO - - - IF MR. CHAIRMAN DOESN'T WANT TO HAVE MY REQUEST ABIDED BY I WOULD ASK THAT HE RULE THAT MY REQUEST IS DENIED, AND I KNOW EXACTLY WHICH WAY TO GO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT'S NOT THE INTENTION OF THE CHAIR TO DENY ANY MEMBER THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION OR THE CALL OF WITNESSES. THE CHAIR RULED THE OTHER DAY THAT THIS WAS THE OBJECT OF ANY PIECE OF LEGISLATION THAT ALL MEMBERS SHOULD HAVE THE FULLEST AVAILABILITY OF ANY MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATION WHO WAS AVAILABLE TO COME BEFORE US, AND IT SEEMS IMPORTANT THAT WHEN WE DEAL WITH MATTERS FISCAL THAT WE SHOULD ALWAYS HAVE THE TREASURER WITH US. IT HAS BEEN A THING WE HAVE ALWAYS DONE IN THE PAST. IN RELATION TO WITNESSES I THINK I WOULD BEST BE GUIDED IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE BY THE DECISION OF COMMITTEE AS TO WHETHER OR NOT AT THIS TIME MR. FINGLAND SHOULD BE INVITED TO ATTEND COMMITTEE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS A DECISION TO BE MADE BY THE COMMITTEE THEN. YOU KNOW, IF I'VE ASKED FOR - - -

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD JUST SUGGEST THAT THE MEMBER ASK HIS QUESTIONS, AND IF THEY CAN'T BE ANSWERED BY ANYBODY PRESENT, BY ALL MEANS BRING IN MR. FINGLAND.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL BECAUSE THEY ARE DIRECT QUESTIONS FOR MR. FINGLAND TO ANSWER, NOT FOR ANYBODY ELSE TO ANSWER. THEY DON'T RELATE TO ANYBODY ELSE BUT TO MR. FINGLAND. THAT'S WHY. AND AS I SAY, I'M QUITE PREPARED TO LEAVE IT UNTIL TOMORROW SO THAT WE DON'T HOLD UP THE WORK AND GO ON WITH THE OTHER ITEMS. I'M NOT HOLDING ANYTHING UP. WE'LL GO ON WITH THE OTHER ITEMS. WE'VE ALREADY PROMISED, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE'VE ALREADY PROMISED THE GOVERNMENT SIDE THAT THEY WOULD GET THEIR INTERIM BILL BEFORE THE END OF THE MONTH.

THIS HAS BEEN PROMISED THEM AND THAT PROMISE WON'T BE DENIED THEM. BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN BECAUSE THAT PROMISE HAS BEEN GIVEN THAT I'M GOING TO EVACUATE MY POSITION AS A MEMBER OF THIS COUNCIL TO QUESTION THE AMOUNT OF MONIES THAT ARE GOING TO BE SPENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I DO BELIEVE WE'RE TALKING TO THE BUDGETER. ARE THERE NO QUESTIONS THAT COULD BE STATED NOW THAT POSSIBLY MR. TREASURER OR MR. COMMISSIONER COULD ANSWER?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS - - YOU SEE THERE ARE ITEMS IN THIS BUDGET HERE THAT I WANT TO ASK ABOUT AND ON A COUPLE OF THEM, FOR INSTANCE, AS AN EXAMPLE, SEE IF THIS PARTICULAR QUESTION COULD BE ANSWERED. A GENERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THIS PARTICULAR ITEM GIVES AN EXPLANATION HERE TO PROVIDE LEGAL ADVICE AND SERVICE TO THE COMMISSIONER, TERRITORIAL COUNCIL AND ALL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT TO ADMINISTER AND SUPERVISE THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. NOW I WANT TO KNOW WHY, AND THIS IS A QUESTION THAT CAN ONLY BE ANSWERED DIRECTLY BY MR. FINGLAND, WHY HAS MR. FINGLAND CONTINUOUSLY INSTRUCTED THE LEGAL ADVISER NOT TO GIVE ME ADVICE AS A TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR ON TERRITORIAL COUNCIL MATTERS? I HAVE BEEN, ON CERTAIN OCCASIONS, TO MR. LEGAL ADVISER AND I HAVE ASKED HIM CERTAIN THINGS AND HE HAS SAID "I'M SORRY, I HAVE INSTRUCTIONS". FOR INSTANCE, WHEN I ASKED FOR CERTAIN ORDERS - I ASKED THEM OF THE LEGAL ADVISER - THE INSTRUCTIONS WERE "DON'T GIVE MORM CHAMBERLIST ANYTHING, THAT'S MY ORDERS". NOW I WANT TO KNOW WHY HE WOULD, IN VIEW OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS HERE, DENY THE RIGHT OF LEGAL ADVICE ON MATTERS DEALING WITH THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL. WHO CAN ANSWER THAT? THE COMMISSIONER? THE COMMISSIONER CAN'T SAY WHY SOMEBODY ELSE GAVE THE ADVICE BECAUSE IT IS HEARSAY. MR. MILLER CAN'T ANSWER THAT - ARE YOU GOING TO TRY TO ANSWER THAT?

MRS. WATSON: YES I AM, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: GO AHEAD.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL READ IT CAREFULLY IT SAYS "TO PROVIDE LEGAL ADVICE AND SERVICE TO THE COMMISSIONER, TERRITORIAL COUNCIL". IT DOESN'T SAY TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS WHICH IS QUITE A DIFFERENT THING.



MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH. (LAUGHTER)

MRS. WATSON: THE LEGAL ADVISER SITS IN HERE AND GIVES LEGAL ADVICE TO THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL. HE DOESN'T GIVE FREE LEGAL ADVICE TO THE TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: FREE LEGAL ADVICE I DON'T NEED FROM ANYBODY. I ALWAYS LIKE TO PAY FOR THE LEGAL ADVICE IF I NEED IT. BUT WHEN THE SUGGESTION COMES THAT THIS DOESN'T MEAN THAT -

MRS. WATSON: RIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN THE SUGGESTION COMES THIS DOESN'T MEAN THAT I HAVE TO RECALL TO MIND THAT, COUNCILLOR WATSON KNOWS ABOUT IT, THERE WAS ALMOST A FIRING OF THE LEGAL ADVISER BECAUSE FINGLAND HAD COMPLAINED THAT HE HAD GIVEN ADVICE TO COUNCILLOR WATSON AND MYSELF WHILE WE WERE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. NOW YOU KNOW THAT BECAUSE I HAVE A MEMO TO THAT EFFECT ON IT. AND HERE WE ARE, I'M SPEAKING AS A TERRITORIAL COUNCILLOR GOING TO THE LEGAL ADVISER SAYING I WANT CERTAIN COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS FOR THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL SESSION. ISN'T THAT LEGAL ADVICE TO DEAL WITH THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL? WHY WAS THAT REFUSED ME? GO AHEAD.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, CERTAINLY HE DOESN'T NEED TO GET LEGAL ADVICE TO GET COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: UH HUH. THEN WOULD YOU SAY WHY, MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD YOU SAY WHY THEN THAT INSTRUCTIONS WERE GIVEN TO THE SECRETARIAT BY MR. FINGLAND THAT I WAS NOT TO RECEIVE THE TERRITORIAL - THE COMMISSIONER'S ORDERS. I WENT THERE AND ASKED FOR THEM. THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS I WANT TO ASK BECAUSE HERE WE HAVE EXPENDED IN THESE PARTICULAR AREAS WHEN THESE EXPENDITURES WERE DENIED. THESE EXPENDITURES HAVE BEEN PLACED FORWARD FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE AND WHEN I GO TO GET THAT PURPOSE FOR WHICH THIS MONEY IS RAISED I'M TOLD "NO, YOU CAN'T HAVE THEM". NOW, I SEE NO POINT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN TWO ELECTED MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHO, NOTWITHSTANDING THEIR LIKES OR DISLIKES, SHOULD BE ABLE TO SAY TO THE APPOINTEES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE "CUT THIS NONSENSE OUT. THE TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS HAVE CERTAIN RIGHTS. GIVE IT TO THEM." HAVE YOU STOOD UP AND SAID THAT? I DOUBT IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. ORDER PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BECAUSE OTHERWISE I WOULD HAVE HAD THE ORDERS THE SAME DAY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. KINDLY DIRECT YOUR REMARKS TO THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. I AGREE. THIS, IN GENERAL, IS MY REASON AND THERE ARE OTHER SPECIFIC REASONS AS WELL. UNFORTUNATELY, I WAS PREPARING MYSELF FOR IT AND I WORKED LATE LAST NIGHT AND SOMETHING ELSE HAPPENED AND I DIDN'T COMPLETE OR BRING DOWN WITH ME THE INFORMATION ON MANY OF THE QUESTIONS THAT I'VE GOT WRITTEN OUT THAT I WANTED TO ASK MOST OF THE MEMBERS, AND THIS IS WHY I AM BEING VERY LENIENT REALLY BECAUSE I HAVE SO MANY QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT IN THESE AREAS OF THIS INTERIM BUDGET, AND IT IS UNFORTUNATE FOR THE MEMBERS IF I HAVEN'T GOT ALL MY PAPER WORK WITH ME. THIS IS WHY I SAY I'M SO INSISTENT THOUGH ON ASKING TO GET ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS FROM MR. FINGLAND, BUT I FEEL - I'M PREPARED TO LEAVE THIS ASIDE UNTIL TOMORROW. MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN WE LEAVE THIS ITEM AND CONTINUE WITH THE OTHER ITEMS BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO BE DEALING WITH HEALTH, WELFARE & REHABILITATION TOMORROW IN ANY EVENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL THAT IS UP TO COMMITTEE. IS THIS THE WISH OF COMMITTEE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL AT LEAST WE CAN GET ON WITH SOME OTHER ITEMS THEN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: PERHAPS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD LIKE TO RAISE HIS QUESTIONS - - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST WE ACCEPT THE DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS \$116,389.00 AND GO ON AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER CAN HAVE HIS CHANCE AT MR. FINGLAND WHEN WE DO THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO. NO. NO. I'M NOT - - THERE AGAIN - - I'VE ALWAYS COMPLAINED ABOUT CONSPIRACY. I'VE ALWAYS, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'VE ALWAYS COMPLAINED ABOUT CONSPIRACY IN THIS ADMINISTRATION. AND YOU KNOW IT'S MUCH WORSE WHEN YOU THINK THAT PEOPLE ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE ARE PARTICIPATING WITH THE APPOINTEES TO MANIPULATE AND CREATE A CONSPIRACY. AND YOU KNOW, I KNOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THOSE PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITIES THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM



CARMACKS-KLUANE, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH REPRESENT, THEY ARE NOT CLOSING THEIR EARS OR CLOSING THEIR EYES OR THEIR MINDS TO WHAT HAS BEEN TAKING PLACE. I KNOW THAT. AND I KNOW THAT THEY ARE VERY UNHAPPY THAT THE SITUATION HAS DEVELOPED WHERE RECOGNITION TO OTHER MEMBERS OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL IS NOT BEING GIVEN. EVEN IF YOU ARE OPPOSED YOU MUST, I SUBMIT MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU MUST GET IT INTO YOUR HEAD, ALL MEMBERS, THAT NOTWITHSTANDING ANYTHING THAT'S INVOLVED THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL MUST BE THE PRIME BODY IN THIS SO-CALLED GOVERNMENT. AND THERE'S LOTS OF FACT AND RECOGNITION OF THIS PARTICULAR POINT. ALL I WANT TO GET AGREEMENT ON IS TO LEAVE THIS ITEM ASIDE TO CONTINUE WITH THE OTHER ITEMS SO THAT WE ARE ABLE TO KEEP PACE WITH THE PROMISE THAT WE HAVE MADE TO MEMBERS TO COMPLETE THIS BEFORE THE END OF THE WEEK. I TELL YOU - YOU ARE FORCING US TO BREAK PROMISES - YOU ARE FORCING ME TO. I WANT TO KEEP MY PROMISE TO THE ADMINISTRATION THAT I WOULD COMPLETE AND LET THEM HAVE THE INTERIM, BUT IF YOU ARE NOT GOING TO COMPROMISE AND ALLOW THE PROPER QUESTIONING OF AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER YOU ARE GOING TO PUT ME IN A POSITION OF HAVING TO KEEP ON TALKING UNTIL SUCH TIME AS I DO GET THE INFORMATION I AM SEEKING IN RELATING TO \$5,000,000.00. NOW I WONDER, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE CANNOT GO ON TO ANOTHER ITEM. I MEAN WE DON'T HAVE TO GO ITEM-BY-ITEM ALL ALONG. LET'S DEAL WITH THE ITEMS WE CAN DEAL WITH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL I MIGHT SAY FROM THE CHAIR THAT I'M AT THE DIRECTION OF COMMITTEE AS TO WHETHER WE PROCEED TO ANOTHER ITEM OR DEFER THIS ITEM OR CLEAR IT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE CLEAR IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL THEN I'LL BE ON MY FEET UNTIL KINGDOM COME BECAUSE I'M GOING TO HAVE THE RIGHT TO QUESTION MR. FINLAND, AND I'M GETTING MORE AND MORE SUSPICIOUS OF THE ATTEMPTED CONCEALMENT THAT IS TAKING PLACE AS A RESULT OF REFUSING TO HAVE MR. FINLAND HERE. NOW, MR. CHAIRMAN - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, POINT OF PRIVILEGE. I RESENT VERY MUCH THE INSINUATIONS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS BEEN MAKING HERE THIS AFTERNOON. YOU'VE BEEN TOLD THAT MR. FINLAND WILL BE IN HERE WHEN WE DISCUSS MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T CARE AND DON'T SHOUT AT ME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. ORDER PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU DON'T FRIGHTEN ME AND I AM NOT GOING TO BE FRIGHTENED BY - - -

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, POINT OF PRIVILEGE. HE IS NOT GOING TO INTIMIDATE ME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, ORDER, ORDER PLEASE. WOULD BOTH MEMBERS KINDLY SIT DOWN. I THINK IF WE CAN COOL OUR TEMPER AND PERHAPS ADDRESS ANY COMMENTS THROUGH THE CHAIR, ONE AT A TIME, AND KEEP OUR COOL I THINK WE CAN GET MUCH MORE DONE THAN WE SEEM TO BE ACHIEVING AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE BEEN TRYING MY UTMOST TO USE AS MUCH RESTRAINT AS POSSIBLE WHEN DEALING WITH THIS PARTICULAR BILL. I HAVE MADE A COMMITMENT WHICH I INTEND TO KEEP AND I WANT THE HELP TO KEEP THAT COMMITMENT THAT THIS INTERIM BILL WILL PASS BEFORE THE END OF THE WEEK. BUT I DIDN'T COMMIT MYSELF TO, AS I SAID, EVACUATE MY POSITION AS A MEMBER OF THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL BY NOT EXAMINING THE ITEMS THAT I THINK SHOULD BE EXAMINED, AND I AM PREPARED TO GO ON WITH ALL THE OTHER ITEMS THAT ARE SHOWN HERE, AND JUST ASK THE QUESTIONS THAT I THINK ARE DESIRABLE TO LAY THE GROUNDWORK FOR THE QUESTIONING PERIOD THAT WILL TAKE PLACE DURING THE DISCUSSION ON THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND THIS IS WHAT I'M ASKING FOR, AND IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE INSISTS ON NOT ALLOWING ME TO QUESTION MR. FINLAND I'M AFRAID I WILL THEN BE IN A POSITION TO DEAL WITH EVERY ITEM AND THEN DIVIDE THEM BY ONE-TWELFTH. THIS IS THE ONLY WAY I CAN SEE MY WAY CLEAR - BY DEALING WITH EVERY ITEM AND THEN ASKING MR. FINLAND TO BE HERE. NOW WHY THERE SHOULD BE SUCH OBSTINANCE IN AN AREA LIKE THIS I JUST SIMPLY DON'T UNDERSTAND.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL I THINK AT THIS TIME I'M GOING TO HAVE TO GET SOME CLEAR CUT DIRECTION FROM COMMITTEE ON THIS MATTER. IS IT YOUR WISH THAT THIS MATTER BE DEFERRED UNTIL TOMORROW? CAN I HAVE YOUR CONCURRENCE OR OTHERWISE.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: DISAGREE.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN I MAKE A SUGGESTION IN THIS ONE PARTICULAR AREA. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF THAT PARTICULAR ITEM IS GOING TO BE DEFERRED UNTIL TOMMORROW AND IF MR. FINGLAND IS GOING TO BE BROUGHT IN FOR THE INTERIM AND AGAIN IN THE MAIN, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT BILL NO. 3 MIGHT AS WELL BE INTRODUCED TOMORROW AT THE SAME TIME AND THAT BILL, IN THIS PARTICULAR SECTION OF THE MAINS, BE DEALT WITH IN TOTAL TOMORROW IN FRONT OF MR. FINGLAND.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: FINE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THIS AGREEABLE BY COMMITTEE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I HAVE NO OBJECTIONS TO THAT.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, THE NEXT ITEM IS DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WORKS, \$837,417.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF MR. MILLER COULD GENERALLY GIVE US THE SAME OUTLINE WITH REFERENCE TO STAFF PROGRAMMES ETC..

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ADDITIONAL STAFF ASKED FOR IN THIS PROGRAM ARE ONE BUILDING MAINTENANCE MAN, TWO HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE MEN PERMANENTS, FIVE HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE MAN-YEARS CASUAL, TWO ADDITIONAL MAN YEARS IN THE MECHANICAL SECTION AND FIVE WATCHMEN PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO THAT ARE NOW TRANSFERRED TO THE PERSONNEL VOTE AS A DECREASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE THERE ANY PROGRAMS THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THIS MAIN ITEM?

MR. MILLER: THESE WOULD, MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST BE THE ONGOING PROGRAMS OF MAINTAINING BUILDINGS, ROADS ETC. OF THIS NATURE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION, \$33,365.00. I MIGHT SAY JUST IF I MIGHT FROM THE CHAIR POINT OUT THAT I HAVE

VERY GREAT RESERVATIONS ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR EXPENDITURE AND WOULD RESERVE MY COMMENTS FOR MAIN ESTIMATES, BUT I WOULD LIKE THE ASSURANCE THAT IN NO WAY THIS INHIBITS THAT RIGHT SHOULD ANY ALTERATIONS BE MADE IN THE MAINS.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE RESPECT THE CHAIRMAN'S POINT OF VIEW AND YES, IT DOESN'T INHIBIT YOUR RIGHT AT ALL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: PROJECT CAPITAL, \$1,479,104.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT PAGE IS THAT ON? HOW MUCH OF THIS PROJECT CAPITAL WILL NOT BE USED IN THE MONTH OF APRIL? YOU KNOW, THIS IS ONE ITEM THAT CERTAINLY CAN BE CUT DOWN BECAUSE NONE OF THIS MONEY IS TO BE USED AT ALL IN APRIL UNLESS PART OF IT IS FOR A CONTINUING PROJECT THAT HAS TO MEET LIABILITIES. IS THAT WHAT IT MIGHT BE FOR?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN. THERE ARE ON-GOING PROJECTS WHICH - - -

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON-GOING PROJECTS. ARE ANY OF THESE NEW PROJECTS THAT'S INCLUDED IN THIS AMOUNT. FOR INSTANCE, THIS - - -

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE NEW PROJECTS IN THE BUDGET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT WE WOULDN'T NECESSARILY BE USING ALL THIS MONEY. THIS IS WHAT I AM GETTING AT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. MILLER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH OF THIS MONEY WE WILL BE USING BUT THERE ARE NEW PROJECTS INCLUDED IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES IF THAT IS WHAT THE MEMBER IS REFERRING TO. YES, THERE ARE NEW PROJECTS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ALRIGHT, THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS LOAN CAPITAL IN THE AMOUNT OF \$195,833.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS LOAN TO TWO PARTIES. DOES THIS INCLUDE, ARE THERE ANY OF THESE LOANS TO



### THIRD PARTIES GOING TO TAKE PLACE IN APRIL?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ASSUME THAT THERE WILL BE ONE OF THE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THIS LOAN TO THIRD PARTIES AS LOANS ON SECOND MORTGAGES C.M.H.C. THESE ARE BEING PROCESSED ALL THE TIME. WHETHER THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE OR THE TOWN OF FARO, OR THE CITY OF DAWSON WILL BE REQUESTING LOAN MONIES UP TO APRIL, I DON'T KNOW. BUT IT'S POSSIBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS LOAN AMORTIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$392,067.00. CLEAR?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN THE NOTICE OF PRINCIPAL HAS GONE UP, DOESN'T THE INTEREST GO DOWN? IF YOU ARE GETTING YOUR MONEY, YOU'RE GETTING YOUR PRINCIPAL MONEY BACK. IS THIS LOAN MONEY COMING IN?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS LOAN MONEY BEING PAID BACK TO OTTAWA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH, I SEE. ALRIGHT. AND THE LOAN MONEY THAT'S BEEN PAID BACK TO OTTAWA, WOULDN'T THAT REDUCE OUR PAYMENTS ON INTEREST?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, EACH YEAR WE BORROW ADDITIONAL FUNDS SUBSEQUENTLY OUR INTEREST AND OUR PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS, THEY INCREASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEN HOW MUCH MORE ARE WE BORROWING IN - IT IS PROPOSED TO BORROW IN, NO I BEG YOUR PARDON. HOW MUCH MORE DID WE BORROW IN 73/74 TO 72/73 WHICH WOULD INCREASE THE INTEREST PAYMENTS BY ANOTHER \$330,000?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN 1973/74 TO THE BEST OF MY RECOLLECTION WE BORROWED APPROXIMATELY TEN MILLION DOLLARS. IN 1972/73, IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECTLY, IT WAS SOMETHING LIKE SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I SEE, IS THE INTEREST SET ON THE SAME AMOUNT EACH YEAR OR IS IT ADJUSTED ACCORDING TO A BANK INTEREST, A CANADA BANK INTEREST?

MR. MILLER: THE INTEREST, MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ALL THESE LOANS ARE SET ON A QUARTERLY BASIS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AS BEING THE PRIME INTEREST RATE THAT THEY CHARGE ALL CROWN CORPORATIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? I BELIEVE AT THIS POINT THEN WE HAVE GONE AS FAR AS WE CAN ON BILL NO.1 AND I BELIEVE IT IS AGREED THAT TOMORROW WE CAN DISCUSS THE ITEM FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELFARE AND REHABILITATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS. IS IT YOUR WISH THAT I REPORT PROGRESS ON THIS MATTER?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF THE WITNESSES MIGHT BE EXCUSED. THANK YOU GENTLEMEN AND COULD YOU POSSIBLY ATTEND A QUARTER AFTER TEN TOMORROW?

WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. ORDER PLEASE. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: THE COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. MAY WE HAVE A REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES?

MR. TAYLOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER, COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 2:10 P.M. THIS AFTERNOON TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON AND SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER THAT WHEREAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAS FOLLOWED A DISTINCT PATTERN BEGINNING WITH A WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL IN 1908 AND THE SUBSEQUENT INVOLVEMENT OF ELECTED MEMBERS IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE IN 1960 AND THE CREATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCEPT IN 1970; AND WHEREAS IT IS THE INTENTION OF THE PRESENT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT TO PROVIDE FOR AN EXPANSION OF THE COUNCIL AND TO AUGMENT ELECTED REPRESENTATION ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE; NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, IN SESSION ASSEMBLED:

(1) SUPPORTS THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON THE COUNCIL TO TWELVE, AND

(2) REQUESTS THAT THE COUNCIL BE GIVEN THE POWER TO DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF ITS OWN MEMBERS IN THE FUTURE;  
AND BE IT RECOGNIZED THAT THE COUNCIL

(1) IS DISMAYED BY THE ABSENCE OF FURTHER PROVISIONS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM AND THE EVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT FOR THE YUKON IN BILL C-9, AND

(2) AFFIRMS ITS CONTINUING SUPPORT OF MOTION NO. 40 PASSED BY THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ON APRIL 15, 1966 AND MOTION NO. 1 PASSED ON JANUARY 23, 1968, WHICH MOTIONS ARE IDENTICAL TO THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IN WHITEHORSE ON DECEMBER 12, 1973.

AND THIS MOTION CARRIED, MR. SPEAKER. IT WAS THEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT COUNCILLORS MCKINNON AND TAYLOR BE APPOINTED AS COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, CURRENTLY DISCUSSING BILL C-9, AN ACT TO AMEND THE YUKON ACT, THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT.

AND THIS MOTION WAS CARRIED, WITH COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST OPPOSED, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. HUBERDEAU AND MR. MILLER ATTENDED COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 1. I CAN REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL NO. 1. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR AND THIS MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: YOU HAVE HEARD THE REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES. ARE WE AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I BELIEVE IT IS THE INTENTION OF YOUR COMMITTEE TOMORROW TO HAVE FURTHER DISCUSSIONS ON BILL NO. 1 AND IN ADDITION THEY WOULD HAVE THE GENERAL RANGE OF BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I MOVE THAT WE CALL IT FIVE O'CLOCK.

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MRS. WATSON: I SECOND IT.

MR. SPEAKER: IT WAS MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT WE NOW CALL IT FIVE O'CLOCK. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED AND THIS HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW MORNING.

ADJOURNED.



