

MONDAY, APRIL 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 DOCUMENTS OR CORRESPONDENCE TO BE TABLED?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE FOR TABLING THIS MORNING THE PRELIMINARY PLANS OF THE WATSON LAKE HOSPITAL.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEES? ARE THERE ANY BILLS TO BE INTRODUCED? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTION? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? AS THERE ARE NO MOTIONS OF THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS OR MOTIONS WE COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. MADAM CLERK WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR IS AVAILABLE? WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

RECESS

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

QUESTION RE ANSWER RE COMMISSIONERS ABSENCE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS FOR MR. ADMINISTRATOR. MR. ADMINISTRATOR ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17 IN ANSWER TO A QUESTION, "CAN IT BE ASSUMED THEN, MR. SPEAKER, THAT HE IS AWAY SPECIFICALLY TO TAKE A COURSE IN THE FRENCH LANGUAGE?" MR. ADMINISTRATOR YOU ANSWERED, "I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW WHETHER OR NOT SPECIFICALLY WHY HE WAS AWAY."

MR. ADMINISTRATOR, ON FRIDAY I WAS IN TOUCH WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT ABOUT VARIOUS QUESTIONS. THINGS THAT WERE PUT TO YOU. I ASKED OFFICERS THERE WHETHER THEY KNEW OF WHY THE COMMISSIONER WAS AWAY. THEY INDICATED TO ME THAT YOU MR. ADMINISTRATOR WERE MADE FULLY AWARE OF WHY MR. COMMISSIONER WAS AWAY. WHY DID

YOU ANSWER IN THIS MATTER SO AS TO MISLEAD THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, IN ANSWERING THE QUESTION I FELT THAT I WAS TELLING EXACTLY WHAT I UNDERSTOOD THE SITUATION TO BE. THAT IS THAT THE COMMISSIONER AS FAR AS I KNEW WAS IN VANCOUVER ON MATTERS TO WHICH AS FAR AS I KNEW WERE NOT SPECIFICALLY FOR FRENCH. NOW IF THEY WERE SPECIFICALLY FOR FRENCH THEN I MUST SAY THAT I REGRET THAT I SAID WHAT I DID. BUT AS FAR AS I WAS CONCERNED I DID NOT KNOW THAT IT WAS SPECIFICALLY FOR THAT PURPOSE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. ADMINISTRATOR, CAN I UNDERSTAND ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, POINT OF ORDER. THE QUESTIONS MUST BE ADDRESSED TO THE CHAIR. MR. SPEAKER, THE QUESTIONS MUST BE ADDRESSED TO THE SPEAKER AND NOT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE QUESTION IS THROUGH YOU TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR. THE QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER, IS THIS. MR. ADMINISTRATOR INFORMED THIS HOUSE BY WAY OF A SPECIFIC ANSWER. I WONDER, MR. SPEAKER, IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR COULD INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT HE WAS ADVISED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT THAT MR. COMMISSIONER WOULD BE AWAY FOR THE PURPOSE OF TAKING A COURSE IN FRENCH?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, NO I WAS NOT INFORMED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT THAT THE COMMISSIONER WOULD BE AWAY SPECIFICALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF TAKING FRENCH.

QUESTION RE: MR. FLEMING

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, MR. ADMINISTRATOR HAD INDICATED THAT THE ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT INTEND TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS ABOUT MR. FLEMING. DURING MY DISCUSSION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT I WAS INFORMED THAT MR. ADMINISTRATOR WOULD BE TOLD TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS.

I WONDER IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR COULD INDICATE WHETHER HE HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE

DEPARTMENT TO ANSWER QUESTIONS RELATED TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS? MR. FLEMING IN PARTICULAR.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: NO, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE NOT BEEN SO INSTRUCTED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, SUPPLEMENTARY, WOULD MR. ADMINISTRATOR INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT, ONCE HE HAS RECEIVED THOSE INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE DEPARTMENT WOULD HE INFORM COUNCIL ACCORDINGLY AND GIVE ANSWERS TO THOSE QUESTIONS?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD HAVE TO SEE THE INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE I COULD ANSWER THAT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ALRIGHT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE POLICY RE SALE OF LOTS

MR. STUTTER: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR WOULD PROVIDE A POLICY PAPER TO COUNCIL ON THE SALE OF SERVICED LOTS BY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT? WE HAVE A POLICY BOOK IN FRONT OF US AND I AM UNABLE TO FIND ANY POLICY ON THE SALE OF LOTS.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I CAN PROVIDE A PAPER ON THAT SUBJECT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE SECTION 10, SUBSECTION 2 RE CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I SEE WE HAVE NEW REGULATIONS REGARDING THE CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR AND I WONDER WHETHER MR. ADMINISTRATOR CAN TELL ME THE REASON FOR SECTION 10, SUBSECTION 2, "BEER AND ALE SOLD BY THE BOTTLE OR CAN SHALL BE SERVED WITH A GLASS AND SHALL BE CONSUMED FROM THE GLASS."

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, THERE MAY BE MORE REASONS THAN I CAN GIVE JUST OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD BUT MY UNDERSTANDING

IS THAT THE REASONS RELATE TO HEALTH AND HYGIENE. THERE MAY BE FURTHER REASONS AND IF I COULD BE ALLOWED TO TAKE THAT AS NOTICE I COULD FIND OUT EXACTLY WHY. THIS HAS BEEN IN EFFECT FOR A LONG TIME.

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I THINK MR. ADMINISTRATOR WILL FIND THAT IT HAS BEEN IN EFFECT FOR A LONG TIME AND THAT IS THE ONLY REASON FOR IT BEING IN THERE. THE HYGIENE OF THE BREWERY ISN'T VERY MUCH BETTER THAN THE HYGIENE OF THE LOCAL GLASS WASHERS.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

WE WISH TO THANK MR. ADMINISTRATOR FOR HIS ATTENDANCE. AS THERE ARE NO PRIVATE BILLS IN ORDER, NO PUBLIC BILLS IN ORDER MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

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

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL SECOND THAT MOTION.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE, SECONDED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW LEAVE THE CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONVENING IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS PUBLIC BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION.

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE WILL PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME WE WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. I WONDER IF MADAM

CLERK COULD ASCERTAIN IF THE WITNESSES WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR BILL NO. 3. I NOW DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. WE ARE DISCUSSING BILL NO. 3. THE FIRST ITEM IS YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION AND WE GO TO CAPITAL WHICH IS FOUND ON PAGE 58-A. THE ITEM IS PUBLIC HOUSING - \$2,500,000. THERE IS ALSO A BREAKDOWN ON PAGE A-42.

I HAVE A QUESTION FROM THE CHAIR. IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE WOULD NOT BE EMBARKING ON ANY FURTHER PUBLIC HOUSING AT LEAST IN THIS YEAR, BUT RATHER WOULD STAY WITH RENTAL PURCHASE AND I SEE THIS IS UNDER PUBLIC HOUSING. DOES THIS INFER THAT SOME OF THESE HOUSES WILL BE PUBLIC HOUSES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE USED THE TERM PUBLIC HOUSING AND WE WOULD LIKE TO INCLUDE RENTAL PURCHASE AND OTHER FORMS OF PUBLIC HOUSING. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT'S CAUGHT UP WITH US OVER THE LAST YEAR IS SOME PRETTY MAJOR CHANGES IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AND THE RENTAL PURCHASE HOUSING PROGRAM THAT WE WERE OPERATING UNDER SECTION 43 OF THE ACT IS NO LONGER THE ADVANTAGEOUS SECTION FOR US TO USE. WE HAVEN'T COMPLETED OUR REVIEW OF ALL THE CHANGES IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AS YET, BUT WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF DOING THAT. AND IT WOULD APPEAR THAT WE SHOULD BE POSSIBLY LOOKING AT AND USING SECTION 40 A LOT MORE THAN WE HAVE BEEN, WHICH CAN BE EITHER RENTAL PURCHASE NOW OR PUBLIC, OR RENT ON THE PRIVATE MARKET OR SALE. THEY'VE JUST THROWN THE WHOLE ACT TO PIECES AND WE'RE NOT QUITE SURE JUST WHICH WAY WE SHOULD BE GOING IN SOME OF THESE PROJECTS. WE HAVE USED THE TERM PUBLIC HOUSING IF YOU LIKE, TO GIVE US A LITTLE MORE LEeway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YOU STATE ALSO THAT SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING WILL BE BUILT BY A SPONSORING ORGANIZATION IF POSSIBLE. COULD YOU EXPLAIN THIS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE'RE HOPING TO DO, FOR EXAMPLE. WE HAVE A PROJECT IN WHITEHORSE HERE AT THE MOMENT, THAT WE ARE WORKING ON AND THE INTENT WOULD BE THAT THE GOVERNMENT AND C.M.H.C. WOULD BUILD THE FACILITY AND THAT WE WOULD HAVE A SPONSORING ORGANIZATION SUCH AS THE YUKON ORDER OF PIONEERS, ACTUALLY OPERATE THE FACILITY AS THE HOUSING AUTHORITY. IN THE CASE THAT SOME OF THE OTHER COMMUNITIES

SUCH AS MAYO, THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN MAYO HAS BEEN CONTACTED AND THEY APPEAR TO BE WILLING TO AGAIN OPERATE THE SENIOR CITIZENS FACILITY IN THAT COMMUNITY. BUT WHAT WE ARE REALLY HOPING TO DO IS TO GET SOMEBODY OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT INVOLVED IN DEALING WITH SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING IN THESE OUTLYING COMMUNITIES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST A FURTHER QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO THE SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING. WHAT TYPE OF RENT STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN FORMULATED TO ACCOMMODATE PENSIONERS IN THIS TYPE OF HOUSING?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE ONE HERE IN WHITEHORSE, WE ARE LOOKING WITH BUILDINGS UNDER SECTION 40 AND THEN APPLYING SECTION 44 TO IT WHICH MEANS THAT C.M.H.C. WILL PICK UP PART OF THE DEFICIT. THE RENT STRUCTURES WOULD BE BASED ON INCOME SIMILAR TO THE RENT STRUCTURES THAT WE HAVE UNDER THE RENTAL PURCHASE PROGRAM, OR UNDER THE PUBLIC HOUSING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: FOR INSTANCE IF THE PENSIONER IS RECEIVING JUST THE STRAIGHT BASIC PENSION, WHAT WOULD HIS RENT BE FOR SAY A TWO BEDROOM APARTMENT?

MR. MILLER: I'M SORRY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T GIVE YOU THAT ANSWER. SPECIFICALLY THE RENT RANGES FROM \$5.00 PER MONTH TO A MAXIMUM PER MONTH, IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECTLY, SOMETHING LIKE \$120 TO \$130.00 PER MONTH, DEPENDING UPON THE INCOME OF THE INDIVIDUAL. SO THEIR CONTRIBUTION CAN BE AS LOW AS \$5.00 PER MONTH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: AND THIS IS WITH HEAT, LIGHT AND UTILITIES INCLUDED?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE WHETHER THE APARTMENTS COME UNDER A RENTAL PURCHASE ARRANGEMENT AS WELL SO THAT THEY COULD BE SOLD ON A CONDOMINIUM TYPE BASIS TO THE TENANT OCCUPIERS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE TWO APARTMENT BLOCKS THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT IN THE OUTLYING AREAS, SPECIFICALLY WATSON LAKE AND HAINES JUNCTION, THE INTENT THERE IS TO HAVE A PRIVATE ENTREPRENEUR BUILD THE APARTMENTS AND THE HOUSING CORPORATION WOULD LEASE THE FACILITY THAT ARE REQUIRED FOR THE PUBLIC HOUSING PEOPLE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT ISN'T MY QUESTION. WHEN APARTMENT BLOCKS ARE BEING BUILT NOWADAYS AND ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF THE SECTIONS UNDER CENTRAL

MORTGAGE AND HOUSING, WHICH I BELIEVE ARE NOW TRANSFERRED TO SECTION 40, THAT THE APARTMENTS CAN NOW BE SOLD TO THE OCCUPIERS. WILL THEY COME UNDER THE SAME SCHEME OF RENTAL PURCHASE IN THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES AS HAS BEEN INDICATED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS ESTABLISHMENT 2182, WHICH CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THEY WILL BE RENTAL PURCHASE, THERE WILL BE 100 RENTAL PURCHASE HOMES. NOW DO THESE APARTMENTS COME WITHIN THAT CATEGORY OF THOSE HOMES?

MR. MILLER: WELL THAT WAS THE POINT MR. CHAIRMAN. I'M SORRY IF I DIDN'T MAKE MYSELF CLEAR. THE PROPOSAL UNDER 2182 IS TO CONSTRUCT APPROXIMATELY 100 RENTAL PURCHASE HOMES. THERE'S PROVISION HERE FOR 165 UNITS. THE BALANCE OF THE UNITS WILL BE LEASED FROM PRIVATE ENTREPRENEUR BY THE HOUSING CORPORATION RATHER THAN BUILT.

NOW ITEMS SPECIFICALLY ARE THE APARTMENT IN WATSON LAKE, THE APARTMENT IN HAINES JUNCTION AND 24 APARTMENT OR TOWN HOUSE UNITS IN WHITEHORSE, WILL ALL BE LEASED RATHER THAN BUILT BY THE HOUSING CORPORATION. NOW THE UNIT THAT WAS BUILT IN WHITEHORSE LAST YEAR AND IT'S JUST ABOUT TO BE OCCUPIED, THE EIGHTEEN SUITE APARTMENT OVER IN THIS PART OF TOWN OF WHITEHORSE, WAS BUILT UNDER RENTAL PURCHASE HOUSING AND THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT THOSE COULD BE SOLD UNDER THE CONDOMINIUM ORDINANCE. BUT THAT HAS NOT BEEN APPROACHED AS YET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS WHAT I'M TRYING TO ASCERTAIN MR. CHAIRMAN. THE APARTMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN BUILT NOW IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA, ALL WERE BUILT UNDER A RENTAL PURCHASE SCHEME. WHAT MACHINERY HAS BEEN SET UP ALREADY, IF ANY, FOR PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THOSE APARTMENTS TO PURCHASE THOSE APARTMENTS AT THIS TIME?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE HAS BEEN NO MACHINERY SET UP AT THIS POINT IN TIME. THE HOUSES DOWN ON LOT 19 ARE BUILT UNDER SECTION 40. THEY ARE UNDER THE PUBLIC HOUSING SO THEY ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR SALE. THE APARTMENT BEING BUILT OVER ON OGILVIE OR WHATEVER THE STREET IS, WAS BUILT UNDER RENTAL PURCHASE BUT THERE IS NOBODY IN THEM AS YET. WE HAVE SET UP NO MACHINERY TO ATTEMPT TO SELL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL COULDN'T WE GET SOMETHING DEFINITE?

MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT I'M TRYING TO ASCERTAIN IS THE MOMENT A TENANT OCCUPIER GOES INTO THOSE APARTMENTS, DO THEY GO IN WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY CAN PURCHASE THE APARTMENT UNDER THE RENTAL PURCHASE SCHEME THAT THIS MONEY HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I INDICATED THERE HAS BEEN NO MECHANISM AT ALL SET UP AT THE MOMENT. THE BOARD OF THE HOUSING CORPORATION HAS NOT PUT FORWARD A PROPOSAL FOR THIS TO BE DONE. IF THEY COME FORWARD WITH A PROPOSAL CERTAINLY WE WOULD GRANT THEM THAT PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE, JUST FROM THE CHAIR, THAT IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU HAVE TO PRETTY WELL GO TO THREE BEDROOM APARTMENTS FOR CONDOMINIUM. IS THIS NOT RIGHT?

MR. MILLER: NO, I THINK ONE BEDROOM.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M A LITTLE DISTURBED KNOWING THE HOUSING PRESSURE THAT IS IN THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE FOR, I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY WELL OVER 60% OF THE POPULATION OF THE YUKON LIVE, THAT THERE IS SOME 59 UNITS GOING UP IN WHITEHORSE IN THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR AND 106 IN OTHER AREAS AROUND THE TERRITORY. NOW, I THINK THAT IF ANY MEMBER IS FAIR WHEN IT CONCERNS THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON OUTSIDE OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE THAT IT'S THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER, BUT ARE WE REALLY BEING FAIR TO THE PRESSURES, THE VERY REAL PRESSURES, THE GREATEST PRESSURE OF ALL OF THE YUKON WHICH ARE BEING PLACED ON HOUSING IN WHITEHORSE AND I UNDERSTAND TALKING FROM THE PUBLIC HOUSING PEOPLE JUST AT THE END OF LAST WEEK, THAT THE EIGHTEEN UNITS ARE NOW FILLED AND THERE WERE SOME FORTY TO FIFTY OTHER APPLICATIONS ON THOSE APARTMENTS NOW BEING BUILT ON ALEXANDER STREET. IS THIS THE SAME TYPE OF PRESSURE THAT'S BEING APPLIED ON ALL THOSE 106 UNITS THAT ARE BEING BUILT THROUGHOUT THE YUKON TERRITORY NEXT YEAR OR IS IT REALLY DONE ON A LEAD BASIS RATHER THAN, MR. CHAIRMAN, A PRETTY POLITICAL BASIS? I THINK THIS IS ONE THAT WE REALLY HAVE TO EXAMINE IN OUR MINDS AND REALLY COME UP WITH THE ANSWER AS TO WHETHER WHITEHORSE IS BEING TREATED FAIRLY IN THIS RESPECT.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF I COULD JUST ASK THE MEMBER IF HE WOULD JUST EXPLAIN THAT ONE CONNOTATION OF POLITICAL BASIS.

MR. MCKINNON: WELL YOU KNOW WHEN YOU HAVE OVER 60% OF THE POPULATION LIVING IN AN AREA WHERE YOU KNOW THE HOUSING PRESSURES ARE SO GREAT FROM THE EXAMPLE I'VE JUST GIVEN, THAT AREA IS GETTING 59 HOUSES AND THE OTHER AREA OF THE YUKON WHERE 40% OF THE POPULATION LIVES, WHERE TO MY KNOWLEDGE THE PRESSURES AREN'T QUITE AS GREAT AS THE NEED IN THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE, ARE GETTING 106 UNITS. YOU KNOW, NOT BEING FROM

MISSOURI, I WOULD THINK, I WONDER IF THERE IS A LITTLE BIT OF JUGGLING GOING AROUND TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERY AREA GETS A CERTAIN NUMBER OF HOUSES, NOT REALLY TAKING INTO PRIME CONSIDERATION, THE NEED OF THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should also look at all the aspects of it and we do have the Housing Corporation and we do have the Board and a study was made of the housing needs throughout the Territory. It's on the basis of this study the housing needs in the various communities in the Territory, that the Board has determined the allocation of the, should we say public housing for the year 1974-75, with the decision of a Housing Corporation Board.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller did you have anything to add?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the allocation and I was at some of the meetings when this allocation was done, the allocation of the housing for the 74-75 year was done on the basis of the need and demand survey that was completed approximately two years ago. Now as a result of various uncertainties particularly in the mind of some of the Whitehorse people I think, the Housing Corporation Board directed that the need and demand survey be updated so that they would have a better base to work from. They were apparently attempting to get Central Mortgage and Housing Fund a survey which would go beyond the pure public housing need. The biggest problem that we find in Whitehorse is as the Honourable Member has said a very drastic shortage of housing and in spite of the fact, I might add, that Whitehorse is the only place really up to this point where private entrepreneurs have built houses or built apartments too. I think we recognize the Honourable Member's point and I can only say, that the Board made these decisions based on the best information that they had available. Certainly, we may all prove to be wrong. I was at the Board meeting as I say, not as a Member, but as an observer. They were concerned about this as well.

Mr. McKinnon: I wonder how flexible the Board can be once these items are passed the Budget because I think the Members of the Housing Corporation were surprised with the demand of

the number of people who applied for suites in the just completed apartment block on Alexander Street, I believe. I wonder if there is enough flexibility to change where the demand shows itself during the course of a fiscal year or whether you are tied in completely once this Budget is passed with no flexibility to the program.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman I wouldn't propose to talk to the Board themselves but I think their intent would be to acquire these 165 units during this fiscal year. Knowing full well that there may be pressures come as a result of this. Next year's program would certainly reflect those preferred.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman let's have it quite clear. That this Board can do whatever they want. The idea of the Corporation was not to be controlled by the Administration in any manner. If they see in their wisdom that they can change it, there is a need to change it, this Council or the Administration itself shouldn't interfere in any way or any event.

Mr. Miller: I would agree with those comments Mr. Chairman. We impose no restrictions on the Board other than the fact that they have \$2,500,000 to operate with. That is this Council's prerogative. That's really the only restriction, the total number of dollars.

Mr. Chairman: Councillor Stutter.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman I think the Member from Whitehorse West has probably brought up a good point. Also the remarks that have just been made by Councillor Chamberlist are well taken as far as I'm concerned. I think that the Board and the Yukon Housing Corporation should be given a free hand.

I noticed too, in looking at the Budget that the allocation of the lots to the service lots that are to go into the Territory is, I wonder if perhaps the same comment shouldn't have been raised when we were looking at those lots. It does appear that only 200 service lots are being made available in the Whitehorse area and close to 300 in the outer areas.

I wonder if that same flexibility exists in that portion of the Budget so that the make-up of the lots, that it all perhaps remains constant but the make-up of the lots possibly may be shifted around about.

Mr. McKinnon: Over the weekend also, I took advantage of talking to some people in the construction trade and some entrepreneurs and every one of them agreed, without exception, there weren't enough surveyed lots being made available in the Whitehorse area in the next fiscal year. Without exception, there wasn't one and there are people who are trying to get Land Assembly Programs together who are trying to find out where land and lots could be available to put together a project such as trailer courts because of the limited number of lots that were going to be made available in the Whitehorse area.

I'll talk further with the City of Whitehorse fathers on this but I really believe in going through this budget, that the City of Whitehorse is getting shafted again.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing too. That is, that inasmuch as this portion of the budget, the portion that we are now talking about, the making available of lots. Inasmuch as that is an in and out affair and its completely recoverable, if, it seems to me, I've requested this morning of the Administrator that we receive a policy paper on the disposal of these lots. This is part of the reason that I've asked for that paper. I feel that perhaps the policy itself is holding back many of the lots that were being made available.

We were always given to understand before, that there should always be lots available, plenty of them, to cut down on speculation. The fact that the lots are being bought up and used just as fast as they are being surveyed and improved, it seems to me that is an indication right there that there should be more serviced lots made available so that there are always lots available to the public from the Government and not from people who turn around and buy up several lots and turn around and make their profit selling them to the individual.

Mr. Chairman: Will you take the chair a moment.

Mr. Chairman: Councillor Taylor

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether we should do this in O & M or in Capital but I guess we are on the total subject.

Would it not be wiser in face of the pressures that have been indicated by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, and they are indeed apparent all through the Territory. Would it not be wise, as was suggested when we created the Housing Corporation to consider the making of funds to back bank loans on a low interest long term basis for people who do not wish to buy or rent a home from the Housing Corporation, but wish to design, construct a home of their own choice because they are the people who are going to have to live in it, somewhat akin to the program we used to have on the low interest, low cost housing loan.

It seems to me that is where the big need is and if you can't get funds under any of the CMHC programs for housing construction for medium or low cost homes, this is where I think the Housing Corporation could play a very useful and beneficial role to the people of the Territory and I really think that this should be. Funds should be made available through the Housing Corporation on a low interest, long term basis in order to achieve this objective.

I think that if this were the case, and the Housing Corporation simply guaranteed the bank loan, that we could take a lot of these pressures off at this time. If we are going to develop this Territory, we have to have funds available somewhere and if the rigidity of the CMHC program is such that people on smaller incomes or more modest incomes, cannot build houses of their choice and locations of their choice, they will just have to leave the Territory.

There are a lot of people who need housing but maybe would prefer to go into housing of their own choice. I would like to hear some comment from Mr. Miller on this point.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I think as the Honourable Member knows, we had the low cost housing program a number of years ago. It is now defunct and we've now just finished attempting to get a lot of people to finish the houses, draw down the rest of the money and start making payments.

I won't argue the merits of the program or otherwise. I can say though, that CMHC this last year, came out with an Assisted Home Ownership Program which can in the Yukon Territory work for a person earning between \$8,000 and \$13,000 per annum. This program, I know

THERE ARE A NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS IN THE MAIL RIGHT NOW.

TO MY MIND, WE'LL SATISFY A LOT OF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE IN THAT BRACKET. THESE PEOPLE CAN THEN GO OUT AND BUILD THEIR OWN HOMES AND THEY QUALIFY UNDER CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING FOR CERTAIN FORGIVENESSES EACH YEAR. AGAIN DEPENDING UPON THEIR INCOME LEVEL.

THE OTHER THING THAT THE HOUSING CORPORATION HAS DONE AND IT'S JUST STARTING TO GET ROLLING, THEY HAVE REQUESTED THE SECONDMENT OF THE CENTRAL HOUSING AND MORTGAGE OFFICER. THIS OFFICER IS NOW HERE AND HE IS STARTING TO WORK. HIS MAIN PURPOSE IS TO GO AROUND TO THE COMMUNITIES, TALK TO THE PEOPLE WHO WANT TO BUILD HOUSES AND ASSIST THEM IN PUTTING TOGETHER THE MATERIALS NECESSARY FOR THEM TO APPLY FOR A LOAN, TELLING THEM WHAT THEY HAVE TO DO BEFORE THEY WOULD QUALIFY FOR A LOAN.

THIS SEEMS TO BE THE MAJOR COMPLAINT THAT WE HAVE RECEIVED FROM LAST YEAR. THIS COMES BOTH FROM THE BANK INSTITUTE, CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING AND THE PEOPLE. DEPENDING UPON WHICH SIDE YOU WANT TO LISTEN TO, THE MAJOR PROBLEM SEEMS TO BE THAT THE PEOPLE DO NOT KNOW HOW TO GO ABOUT APPLYING FOR A LOAN, WHAT THEY HAVE TO DO, THE FACT THAT THEY HAVE PLANS AND THESE TYPES OF THINGS AVAILABLE AHEAD OF TIME.

I KNOW, I'VE CERTAINLY LISTENED TO A LOT OF THE PEOPLE, FOR EXAMPLE FROM YOUR OWN CONSTITUENCY. BUT CONVERSELY, I'VE GONE AND TALKED TO THE BANK MANAGERS AND THE BANKING INSTITUTES WHO WOULD NORMALLY RECEIVE THESE APPLICATIONS AND THERE IS JUST NO MESHING OF THE PEOPLE AND THE LENDING INSTITUTES.

THE BANK MANAGER DOESN'T HAVE THE TIME TO SIT DOWN WITH THE PEOPLE AND EXPLAIN TO THE PEOPLE THAT THEY HAVE GOT TO HAVE DRAWINGS AND PLANS AND COSTS AND THIS TYPE OF THING BEFORE THEY CAN EVEN APPLY. THE PEOPLE DON'T KNOW THIS. SO THIS CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING OFFICER THAT WE HAVE IN THE TERRITORY AT THE MOMENT IS HERE FOR THAT PURPOSE AND I BELIEVE THAT HE HAS ALREADY HAD ONE MEETING IN WATSON LAKE AND SOME OF THE REST.

HIS PURPOSE WILL BE TO BE HERE FOR SIX MONTHS AND DO NOTHING BUT SELL HOUSING TO THE PEOPLE. THAT IS REALLY WHERE WE STAND AT THE MOMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN COULD MR. MILLER INDICATE HOW MUCH MONEY IS ON TERM LOAN NOW,

WITH THE BANKS. HOW MUCH OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT MONEY IS ON TERM LOANS?

MR. MILLER: THE PRECISE FIGURE, I DON'T HAVE. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT IT IS PROBABLY SIX MILLION DOLLARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I TAKE IT THAT \$6,000,000 IS ON LOAN TO THE BANKS AT 8 1/2%? WOULD THIS BE CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: THAT WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY RIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THERE ANY REASON WHY THE \$6,000,000 COULDN'T BE GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE AT 8 1/2% SO THAT THEY THEN HAVE A LOW INTEREST RATE ON WHICH TO BUILD HOUSING?

MR. MILLER: YES MR. CHAIRMAN, THE \$6,000,000 ARE PUBLIC FUNDS IN THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND. THEY CAN'T BE GIVEN TO ANYBODY WITHOUT THIS COUNCIL'S APPROVAL. BUT DON'T FORGET, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THESE ARE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS OR FUNDS THAT ARE INTENDED FOR A PURPOSE WITH A WORKING CAPITAL BALANCE TO REMAIN TO ALLOW US TO PAY OUR BILLS ON A NORMAL BASIS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, PERHAPS MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE OVER HOW MANY YEARS HAS THIS \$6,000,000 BEEN RESTING IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND BUILDING UP AT THESE LOW INTEREST RATES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE AT ANY ONE TIME DEPEND TO A LARGE EXTENT ON THE PROCESSING OF BILLS AND ON THE RECEIPT OF THE FUNDS FROM OTTAWA.

DURING THE COURSE OF THIS YEAR, WE HAVE HAD AVAILABLE IN THE BANK ANYWHERE FROM, I THINK OUR LOW POINT WAS PROBABLY \$3,000,000 AND OUR HIGH POINT WAS \$8,500,000, OF FUNDS IN SHORT TERM INVESTMENTS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WOULD BE PRETTY SAFE TO SAY THEN THAT THERE COULD BE \$3,000,000 AVAILABLE AT A LOW INTEREST RATE TO THE PUBLIC. IF THIS COUNCIL SO DESIRED IN THAT MANNER TO USE THAT MONEY. IS THIS CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T THINK I COULD AGREE WITH THAT. THE FACT THAT WE HAVE \$3,000,000 AVAILABLE IN THE BANK AT ANY PARTICULAR POINT ONLY REFLECTS THAT BILLS HAVE NOT BEEN PROCESSED TO BE PAID. NOW, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS KNOW, THAT OUR WORKING CAPITAL LEVEL IS APPROXIMATELY \$4,500,000. FROM THAT

WE MUST RUN THE REVOLVING FUNDS, THE INVENTORY FUNDS THAT WE HAVE WHICH TOTAL SOME, I'M TALKING OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD HERE, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME ITS APPROXIMATELY \$3,000,000 OF REVOLVING FUNDS NOW.

SO WE WOULD HAVE \$1,000,000 AND \$1,500,000 AVAILABLE FOR UNFORSEEN ITEMS. FOR EXAMPLE, WE KNOW LATER ON THIS YEAR THERE WILL BE A TEACHER NEGOTIATION OR A SALARY NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE TEACHERS. WE HAVEN'T FUNDED ANY INCREASE IN SALARY FOR THE TEACHERS. SO THAT MONEY IS GOING TO HAVE TO COME OUT OF THESE FUNDS THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE. THEY ARE CONTINGENCY FUNDS. BUT I THINK THEY MUST BE AVAILABLE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AT ANY GIVEN TIME, THERE IS A SURPLUS OF FUNDS IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND. COULD MR. MILLER INDICATE IF THIS IS CORRECT.

MR. MILLER: UNDER CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES, YES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH?

MR. MILLER: I THINK I INDICATED MR. CHAIRMAN, IN ACTUAL CASH DOLLARS IT VARIES FROM \$3,000,000 TO \$8,500,000 OVER THE LAST YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND HAS FUNDS THAT COULD BE MADE AVAILABLE ON A LOW INTEREST BASIS AS HAS BEEN INDICATED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING MORE HOUSES. IT CAN BE SEEN, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IT WOULDN'T MATTER FROM WHOM THE INTEREST AND WHERE THE INVESTMENT WAS, WHETHER IT WAS A BANK, OR FROM THE PUBLIC BECAUSE THEY ARE PUBLIC FUNDS, AS LONG AS THAT INTEREST WAS COMING IN.

NOW, I UNDERSTAND MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE MORTGAGE RATES ARE ABHORING RATES FROM BANKS FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL IS ROUND ABOUT 13% TO 14%. NOW, COULDN'T THIS MONEY, A MINIMUM OF \$3,000,000 BE MADE AVAILABLE IN VIEW OF WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN EXPRESSED BY MR. MILLER, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IT IS UP TO THE COUNCIL WHO VOTE ON THE MONIES THAT ARE IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE HE ANSWERS IT, I THINK YOUR QUESTION WAS BASED ON SURPLUS FUNDS. YES YOU DID. I NOTICED VERY CAREFULLY. THAT DOES NOT SAY THAT THOSE FUNDS ARE NOT COMMITTED FUNDS. WE MUST BE VERY, VERY CAREFUL

WHEN YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT FUNDS. MOST OF THOSE FUNDS ARE COMMITTED FUNDS. YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT SHORT TERM INVESTMENTS, THIS IS WHAT THE TREASURER IS TALKING ABOUT. THE INVESTMENT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS TALKING ABOUT IS CERTAINLY LONG TERM INVESTMENTS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN I CAN SEE THE POINT THAT THE MEMBER IS TRYING TO MAKE BUT I CAN'T QUITE AGREE WITH IT, BASICALLY FOR THIS REASON.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHICH MEMBER ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?

MR. MILLER: I'M SORRY, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST. I CAN CERTAINLY SEE THE POINT THAT YOU ARE GETTING AT. THE THING THAT WOULD CONCERN ME, AND I RECALL THOSE DAYS ONLY TOO WELL. IT WAS JUST A LITTLE LESS THAN TWO YEARS AGO IN THE TERRITORY WHEN WE HAD TROUBLE MEETING OUR BILLS BECAUSE WE DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH FUNDS, ON THE BOOKS WE ALWAYS HAD A SURPLUS. BUT WE DIDN'T HAVE ANY CASH. RIGHT NOW OUR CASH POSITION IS FAIRLY HEALTHY, I'LL GRANT YOU THAT BUT SIX OR EIGHT MONTHS FROM NOW, IT MAY BE AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT PROPOSITION.

OUR CASH POSITION SO DEPENDS UPON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ADVANCES FOR PROJECTS, IT DEPENDS UPON UNFORESEEN ITEMS COMING ALONG SUCH AS WAGE INCREASES OR PRICE INCREASES THAT DO COME ALONG. I WOULD BE VERY RELUCTANT AT THIS POINT TO RECOMMEND TO THIS COUNCIL THAT ANY OF THESE FUNDS SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE.

I'M NOT DISAGREEING WITH THE CONCEPT THAT THE MEMBER IS TRYING TO PUT FORWARD. IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT IF THIS COUNCIL WISHED TO SEE THIS TYPE OF A PROGRAM, THAT WE COULD ENDEAVOR TO TRY AND GET FUNDING FOR IT.

UNDER OUR CURRENT FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS, I WOULD BE VERY, VERY RELUCTANT TO RECOMMEND TO THIS COUNCIL THAT WE USE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE THAT WAS OUTLINED.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD POINT OUT TO ALL HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT IN THE BUDGET SPEECH, THERE IS AN \$800,000 DEFICIT PROJECTED FOR THIS YEAR AND IT HAS GOT TO COME OUT OF THOSE SAME FUNDS. BESIDES ANYTHING ELSE THAT WE'VE GOT TO FIND.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH NO. PERHAPS MR. MILLER CAN EDUCATE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN ABOUT THAT \$800,000 HAVE TO COME OUT OF THOSE FUNDS IF THERE WAS A DEFICIT AMOUNT.

IT'S ALREADY BEEN INDICATED MR. CHAIRMAN BY MR. MILLER, OVER THE PAST NUMBER OF YEARS THAT THERE HAS BEEN FUNDS RANGING BETWEEN \$3,000,000 AND \$8,500,000 WHICH WERE ON TERM LOAN TO THE BANK GETTING ANYWHERE UP TO 8 1/2%. A FEW YEARS BACK IT WAS PROBABLY 6% OR 6 1/2% AS THE BANK INTEREST RATE GOES UP, WE GET THE BENEFITS OF IT. THAT IS A PRETTY STRANGE WAY OF FINANCING, THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH HAS, THAT NO DOUBT IF HE GOES ON IN THIS PARTICULAR WAY, HE WILL NEVER BE SUCCESSFUL IN BUSINESS.

WHAT I WANT TO GET MR. CHAIRMAN...

MR. TANNER: ON A POINT OF ORDER MR. CHAIRMAN

MR. CHAIRMAN: USE YOUR POINT OF ORDER.

MR. TANNER: WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS SAYING HAS NOTHING AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS DEBATE. I AM MERELY POINTING OUT TO ALL MEMBERS THAT THE PARAGRAPH SAYS...

MR. CHAIRMAN: COULD I HEAR THE POINT OF ORDER?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK THAT THE MEMBER HAS ANY REASON TO IMPUTE WHAT I MIGHT DO PERSONALLY IN THIS HOUSE. THERE IS NO PLACE FOR THAT BUSINESS HERE. THERE IS NO REASON FOR THE MEMBER TO SAY IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT I'M TRYING TO ASCERTAIN FOR MR. MILLER, MR. CHAIRMAN

IS A CLEARLY SPECIFIED TYPE OF PROGRAM WHICH THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND CAN BRING FORWARD, BASED ON THE MINIMUM, ON HIS OWN FIGURE OF THREE MILLION DOLLARS, THAT IS AVAILABLE AT ANY GIVEN TIME, AND GET SUPPORT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN CASE THAT AMOUNT SHOULD GO DOWN AND WHERE THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WOULD NEED EXTRA FUNDS TO MEET THIS COMMITMENT. ONE OF THE PRINCIPLES BEING, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT MONEY THAT'S IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND IS PUBLIC MONEY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC AND HERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO ENHANCE ONE OF THOSE AREAS BY SUPPLYING FUNDS AND AT A LOW INTEREST RATE. THE SAME INTEREST RATE THAT THEY RECEIVE FROM THE BANKS TO PRODUCE MORE HOUSING.

NOW, WHAT WOULD BE THE DIFFICULTY, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN MR. MILLER SUGGESTING THAT THIS COULD BE DONE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, HOW TO TACKLE THIS THING. BASICALLY WHAT I'VE INDICATED IS THAT

THE TERRITORY HAS FROM THREE TO EIGHT MILLION DOLLARS CASH AVAILABLE, OR HAS HAD OVER THE LAST YEAR. NOW, OUR WORKING CAPITAL LEVEL STANDS AT FOUR AND A HALF MILLION DOLLARS AND THESE ARE THEORETICALLY, FUNDS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO RUN THE GOVERNMENT. OF THAT FOUR AND A HALF MILLION, APPROXIMATELY THREE MILLION IS NEEDED TO RUN OUR REVOLVING ACCOUNT. NOW THAT LEAVES US A MILLION AND A HALF DOLLARS.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH HAS POINTED OUT THAT IN THIS PARTICULAR YEAR WE HAVE AN \$800,000 BUDGET DEFICIT. THOSE FUNDS WILL COME OUT OF THE FOUR AND A HALF MILLION AND IF ALL GOES WELL WE WILL END UP AT THE END OF THIS YEAR WITH 3.7 MILLION DOLLARS IN WORKING CAPITAL. AGAIN, WE STILL NEED THE THREE MILLION DOLLARS TO RUN OUR REVOLVING FUNDS. SO, IF WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A SURPLUS, AN UNCOMMITTED SURPLUS, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT APPROXIMATELY \$700,000. OUT OF THAT \$700,000 WE HAVE TO, IN THIS PARTICULAR YEAR, COVER AT LEAST PART OF THE TEACHERS' SALARIES NEGOTIATIONS, WHATEVER THEY MIGHT BE BECAUSE WE HAVE NO FUNDING FOR THEM.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT OTHER THINGS MAY CROP UP IN THE COURSE OF THE YEAR BUT IF PRICES CONTINUALLY INCREASE THE WAY THEY HAVE BEEN GOING, WE WILL BE HARD PRESSED BY THE END OF THE YEAR TO HAVE THREE MILLION DOLLARS IN OUR WORKING CAPITAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN MR. MILLER INDICATE NOW HOW MUCH FUNDS ARE IN CASH IN THE GOVERNMENT'S ACCOUNT AT THIS TIME?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS APPROXIMATELY SIX AND A HALF MILLION DOLLARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER HAS ALREADY INDICATED THAT SOME OF THIS IS USED FOR THE MEETING OF ACCOUNTS. HE HAS ALSO INDICATED THAT THERE ARE AT TIMES NOT LESS THAN THREE MILLION DOLLARS WHICH IS AVAILABLE IN CASH AFTER ALL ACCOUNTS HAVE BEEN MET. IN OTHER WORDS, DOES MR. MILLER AGREE WITH WHAT I SAY? THAT FUNDS HAVE BEEN MAINTAINED OVER THE YEARS IN CASH AND NOTWITHSTANDING THAT CASH BEING AVAILABLE THERE HAVE BEEN BUDGETED REQUIREMENTS MADE BY ASKING COUNCIL TO BRING FORWARD TO APPROVE THE BUDGETED AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BROUGHT FORWARD FROM TIME TO TIME AND NOT TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT IS IN CASH. ISN'T THAT CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M SORRY, I TRIED TO GET THE IMPORT OF THE MEMBER'S QUESTION AND I'M SORRY, I MISSED IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER GETS THE IMPORT OF MY QUESTION BECAUSE I'M JUST TELLING HIM NOW EXACTLY WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST NUMBER OF YEARS THAT I HAVE BEEN ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE. THIS HAS BEEN THE EXPLANATION THAT'S BEEN GIVEN BY HIM. NOW IT'S CONVENIENT, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR HIM TO SAY NO HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE IMPORT. MR. CHAIRMAN, THE IMPORT IS CLEAR. THAT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE AT ALL TIMES IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND WHICH ARE CASH FUNDS OVER AND ABOVE WHAT IS REQUIRED BY WAY OF BUDGETED ITEMS.

NOW, COULD HE SAY YES OR NO TO THAT?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE HAVE BEEN FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR THE LAST YEAR AND A HALF IN THIS WAY BUT I CAN RECALL, LESS THAN TWO YEARS AGO WHEN THERE WAS NO CASH AVAILABLE. I CAN RECALL VERY VIVIDLY HAVING TO SCRAMBLE EVERY TWO WEEKS TO BE ABLE TO PAY THE PAYROLL OF THIS TERRITORY BECAUSE WE HAD NO CASH IN THE BANK TO DO SO. NOW WE ARE AT THE POINT, FOR THE LAST YEAR AND A HALF, WHERE WE DO HAVE EXCESS CASH. HOW LONG THAT WILL CONTINUE, I CAN'T PREDICT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER IS, WITH RESPECT I SAY THIS, IS CONVENIENTLY CLOSING HIS EYES TO WHAT IS THE KEY QUESTION THAT HAS BEEN RAISED HERE. THAT IS THE ABILITY OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT TO USE FUNDS THAT HAS BY WAY OF CASH RESERVES INSTEAD OF LOANING IT TO THE BANK AT EIGHT AND ONE HALF PERCENT, TO LOAN IT TO THE PUBLIC AT EIGHT AND A HALF PERCENT SO THERE IS LOW INTEREST MONEY AVAILABLE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES.

NOW, I WANT TO GET FROM MR. MILLER WHETHER OR NOT THAT THIS COULD BE USED IN THAT PARTICULAR MANNER. THAT IS THE SAME MANNER WHICH IT LOANS TO THE BANK, LOAN IT TO THE PEOPLE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I COULD NOT GUARANTEE SITTING HERE TODAY, THAT WE WOULD HAVE CASH FUNDS AVAILABLE TO LOAN TO ANYBODY SIX MONTHS FROM NOW. I WOULD HOPE THAT WE WOULD, BUT I CAN'T GUARANTEE THAT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, SURELY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, THE WHOLE PREMISE OF HIS ARGUMENT IS INCORRECT BECAUSE IF YOU ARE GOING TO LEND MORTGAGE MONEY TO FINANCE ANYTHING, AND IN PARTICULAR HOUSES, YOU'VE GOT TO BE ABLE TO GUARANTEE THAT MONEY PROBABLY OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS. IF THE FUNDS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS TALKING ABOUT ARE FUNDS WHICH SOMETIMES ACCRUE

AND SOMETIMES DON'T ACCRUE THEN THERE IS JUST NO WAY YOU CAN COMMIT MONEY LIKE THAT ON A LONG TERM BASIS WHICH MIGHT NOT BE THERE NEXT WEEK LET ALONE SIX MONTHS FROM NOW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS WOULD BE RIGHT EXCEPT FOR THE FACT THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD SUPPORT THAT TYPE OF LENDING.

MR. MILLER: WITH RESPECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T BELIEVE THE GOVERNMENT WOULD BECAUSE THEY HAVE THEIR OWN HOUSING FACILITIES CALLED CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING. I THINK AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WILL RECALL, WHEN WE HAD THE LOW COST HOUSING PROGRAM, IT CAME TO A DECIDED HALT BECAUSE ITS LEVELS WERE REACHING THE CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING LEVELS AT THAT TIME.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M IN SYMPATHY WITH WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS IN MIND BUT I THINK THE APPROACH IS WRONG. I THINK AS HAS BEEN SUGGESTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF THAT DEPARTMENT, THAT WHAT WE SHOULD BE LOOKING AT IS A PROGRAM PROPERLY FUNDED WITH PROPER SOURCES, PROBABLY FEDERAL, AND A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY WHICH CAN BE LET OUT FOR MORTGAGES FOR HOUSES BUT YOU JUST CAN'T DO IT ON AN AD HOC BASIS AND TAKE WHAT SURPLUS FUNDS WE MIGHT HAVE TODAY AND HOPE WE WILL HAVE SOME INTEREST ACCRUED AND MONIES AVAILABLE TOMORROW. IT WOULDN'T BE FAIR TO THE PEOPLE BORROWING THE MONEY IN THE FIRST PLACE BECAUSE THEY WOULDN'T KNOW WHAT'S IN THE FUTURE EITHER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK AT THIS TIME WE WILL JUST DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER. HAVE YOU ANYTHING FURTHER ON PUBLIC HOUSING, 2182 - \$2,500,000?

WE WILL THEN GO TO O & M ON PAGE 56. THIS IS YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION ADMINISTRATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$105,378.

FROM THE CHAIR, WHEN MAY WE EXPECT TO GET SOME INFORMATION AS TO FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE HOUSING COMMITTEE REPORT? YOU KNOW POLICIES, RENTAL POLICIES AND THIS TYPE OF THING.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT QUESTION WILL BE ANSWERED HOPEFULLY BY TOMORROW OR WEDNESDAY. I BELIEVE THERE IS AN OUTSTANDING QUESTION TO THE ADMINISTRATOR IN THAT REGARD.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS AN ITEM HERE THAT SAYS TRAVEL AND RELOCATION COSTS - GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES. NOW WHO ARE THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HOUSING CORPORATION MANAGER, THE TWO PROJECT OFFICERS AND THE CLERK TYPIST II ARE ALL PUBLIC SERVANTS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S THE POINT THAT I WANTED TO MAKE CLEAR AND GET RECORDED. IT'S NOT A CROWN CORPORATION WITHIN THE MEANING OF CROWN CORPORATION. I HAVE RAISED THIS BEFORE, BUT THEY ARE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HOUSING CORPORATION ACT SPELS OUT THAT THESE PEOPLE WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE RULES AND REGULATIONS. THE HOUSING CORPORATION ACTUALLY THE BOARD, ACTUALLY HAS THE ABILITY AND THEY DO IN FACT DO THE HIRING, THE CHOOSING OF THESE PEOPLE. SO WHILE THEY ARE PUBLIC SERVANTS, THEY DO RESPOND TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION AND BOARD AND THEY ARE CHOSEN BY THEM. NOW WE CERTAINLY ASSIST THEM IN THAT AREA.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE HOUSING CORPORATION WILL THEN REVIEW THE APPLICATIONS FOR THE MANAGERS POSITIONS AND WILL INDICATE WHO THEY FEEL SHOULD BE HIRED?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN AND IN FACT THEY ARE IN THAT PROCESS RIGHT NOW REVIEWING THE APPLICATIONS FOR THE NEW MANAGER AND THE DECISION REALLY WILL BE THEIRS. NOW OUR PERSONNEL PEOPLE ASSIST THEM IN THIS BY RECOMMENDING THOSE THAT THEY WOULD CERTIFY AS QUALIFYING FOR THE POSITION, BUT THE ACTUAL

CHOICE WILL COME DOWN TO THE BOARD OF THE HOUSING CORPORATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS AFTER THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT HAVE TAKEN AWAY NAMES OF PEOPLE FROM THE LIST THAT THEY ARE SUBMITTING, ISN'T THAT CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT WORKS WITH THE HOUSING CORPORATION BOARD MUCH AS THEY DO WITHIN THE OTHER DEPARTMENTS. THEY REVIEW THE APPLICATION AND THEY GIVE AN OPINION AS TO WHETHER THEY FEEL THE PERSON IS CERTIFIABLE. NOW I HAVE NEVER YET SAT ON A HIRING BOARD WHERE THERE WASN'T COMMON FEELINGS BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT, THE APPLICANT DEPARTMENT AND THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT AS TO WHO WAS CERTIFIABLE AND WHO WASN'T. SO IT'S AN ADVISORY ROLE THAT PERSONNEL PLAY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IF THEY SO WISHED COULD ASK FOR ALL APPLICATIONS FOR THE POSITION, COULD THEY NOT?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT AND THEY DO SEE ALL APPLICATIONS. THEY DON'T INTERVIEW ALL THE PEOPLE, THEY GO TO THE SHORT LIST.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THESE PEOPLE IN THE HOUSING CORPORATION AND ADMINISTRATION THAT ARE VIEWING APPLICATIONS AND VERY PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM APPLICANTS, ARE THEY UNDER ANY OATH OR ANYTHING TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR SECRECY IN RESPECT OF THIS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, EVERY PUBLIC SERVANT TAKES AN OATH WHICH PROVIDES FOR THIS TYPE OF THING. AN OATH OF SECRECY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: BUT TO THE PEOPLE INVOLVED AT ANY LEVEL OF THE YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION WHO ARE DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC AND IN FACT EVEN AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL THERE ARE MANY VERY VERY PERSONAL AND PRIVATE THINGS DISCUSSED IN RELATION TO THEIR DUTIES IN APPLYING FOR HOUSING. ARE THESE PEOPLE IN THE HOUSING CORPORATION AWARE OF THIS BY VIRTUE OF AN OATH OR ANYTHING OF THAT NATURE?

MR. MILLER: THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSING ASSOCIATION TO MY KNOWLEDGE DO NOT TAKE AN OATH. THE ADMINISTRATIVE PEOPLE, THE PUBLIC SERVANTS DEFINITELY DO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS IS A VERY VERY INTERESTING SUBJECT IN THAT YOU HAVE PEOPLE AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL, THE HOUSING BOARDS OR ASSOCIATIONS IF YOU

MAY SAY WHO ARE RECEIVING A GREAT DEAL OF VERY PERSONAL INFORMATION AND SHOULD THEY NOT BE REQUIRED TO KEEP THAT VERY CONFIDENTIAL?

Mr. MILLER: WELL I CAN'T DISAGREE WITH THE POINT BEING MADE. AS I SAY TO MY KNOWLEDGE THEY DON'T. NOW IT'S POSSIBLE THAT THEY DO AND I WILL CERTAINLY LOOK INTO THAT MATTER.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, CERTAINLY IT WOULD BE PROFITABLE TO LOOK INTO THAT BECAUSE I AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE. THERE IS A LOT OF PERSONAL INFORMATION ON THOSE APPLICATIONS AND THEY GO TO LOCAL PEOPLE AND REALLY I THINK THAT SOME DIRECTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THESE PEOPLE WHO ARE SERVING ON THOSE ASSOCIATIONS THAT THIS INFORMATION THAT THEY GET IS VERY CONFIDENTIAL. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE SOME DIRECTION THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION.

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'LL TAKE THAT UP WITH THE HOUSING CORPORATION BOARD AND I WILL LOOK IN OUR REGULATIONS AND I'LL TAKE THAT MATTER UP AND SEE WHAT WE CAN DO WITH IT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE SALARY AND WAGES SHOW A NATURAL INCREASE BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT THERE IS A AUTOMATIC INCREASE IN PAY, BUT I WONDER WHETHER Mr. MILLER CAN INDICATE WHY THERE IS AN ALMOST 50% INCREASE IN FRINGE BENEFITS?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T GIVE YOU THAT ANSWER RIGHT OFF THE TOP, I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK INTO THIS MATTER TO SEE. I HAVE AN IDEA THAT WHAT IT RELATES TO IN THIS PARTICULAR CURRENT FISCAL YEAR IS THE FACT THAT ALL OF THE STAFF IN THAT AREA QUALIFY FOR THE YUKON BONUS IN THE ONE YEAR.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: EVEN IF THAT DID HAPPEN, THERE IS JUST FOUR IF ALL OF THEM DID HAPPEN AND IT'S \$250 A YEAR THAT WOULD BE JUST A \$1,000 IF THAT ALL HAPPENED. BUT I KNOW THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE THERE WHO DO NOT QUALIFY BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T BEEN THE DESIRED MINIMUM OF TWO YEARS. IS IT NOT?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, ALL THE PEOPLE THAT WE ARE REFERRING TO HERE HAVE BEEN THERE FOR TWO YEARS OR WILL HAVE BEEN DURING THE COURSE OF THIS YEAR. AND I THINK THIS IS REALLY WHAT IT BOILS DOWN TO. NOW WHEN YOU SAY \$250, IT'S \$200 FOR AN INDIVIDUAL. IN THE CASE OF A FAMILY MAN, ONE OF THE INDIVIDUALS HAS AT LEAST THREE

CHILDREN SO HE WOULD PROBABLY RECEIVE \$550 OR \$600 AS THE YUKON BONUS. AND I BELIEVE THAT'S THE REASON FOR THIS IN THIS PARTICULAR YEAR.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: CAN WE GET THAT FOR SURE?

Mr. MILLER: YES, I'LL GET THAT FOR SURE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON ESTABLISHMENT 1800? I BELIEVE THERE IS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION COMING IN RELATION TO POLICY AND THE ACTIVITIES OF THE BOARD BUT ANYTHING FURTHER AT THIS TIME?

THE NEXT ITEM IS 1801 - OPERATING SUBSIDY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$295,000. THE BREAKDOWN IS FOUND ON PAGE A-39.

IN THE CASE OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE NATIVE PEOPLE WHO ARE OCCUPYING ANY OF THE HOUSES CONSTRUCTED OR OPERATED OR LEASED UNDER THIS PROGRAM, ARE THE DEFICITS IN FACT PICKED UP BY INDIAN AFFAIRS?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IN THE 1974-75 FISCAL YEAR WE HAVE PROVIDED A \$111,000.00 TO COVER THAT ITEM.

Mr. MCKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE HEARD FROM Mr. MILLER EARLIER THIS MORNING THAT SECTION 40 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT WAS THE MOST BENEFICIAL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. NOW WE SEE UNDER OPERATING SUBSIDY, RENTAL PURCHASE OF PUBLIC HOUSING, THAT ALL THE HOUSING WILL BE UNDER SECTION 43 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT WHERE THE DEFICIT OPERATION IS BORNE BY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE POINT I WAS TRYING TO MAKE EARLIER, AND I WILL MAKE THE POINT AGAIN, IS THAT UP UNTIL THIS POINT WE HAVE BEEN OPERATING UNDER SECTION 43. IT'S ONLY BEEN IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS ROUGHLY THAT THESE CHANGES HAVE COME ABOUT IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING INTERPRETATION OF THEIR ACT. WE ARE JUST NOW WORKING ON SOME SORT OF REVISED POLICY AS TO WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING TO GET THE BEST DEAL FOR THE YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND USE THE MOST AMOUNT OF CMHC FUNDS IF YOU LIKE. WE HAVEN'T COME TO A FINAL POLICY ON IT BECAUSE OF THE COMPLICATIONS AND THE CONSTANT CHANGES THAT KEEP COMING FROM DAY TO DAY OR FROM WEEK TO WEEK FROM CMHC. EVEN THEY ARE CHANGING THEIR INTENT AND THEIR INTERPRETATION ALMOST DAILY ON SOME OF THESE. I WOULD HOPE THAT WITHIN THE NEXT COUPLE OF

WEEKS WE WILL HAVE A FORMAL POLICY PREPARED. WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO MOVE ON FROM THAT POINT. AT THIS PARTICULAR POINT I DON'T HAVE IT.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I NOTICE THAT THE TAXES ARE JUST FOR THREE MONTHS FOR VARIOUS UNITS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE LAST ITEM. WHY WOULD WE JUST BE MAKING PROVISION FOR TAXES FOR THREE MONTHS ONLY?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THESE ARE THE UNITS THAT WILL BE BUILT THIS YEAR. CERTAINLY WE WILL HAVE TO PAY TAXES ON THE LAND FOR THE FULL PERIOD. WHAT WE WOULD NORMALLY CHARGE TO THIS APPROPRIATION DURING THE COURSE OF THE YEAR WOULD BE THE FIRST THREE MONTHS OF NEXT YEAR'S TAXES. HE WILL, IN FACT, CHARGE THE TAXES ON THE LAND AS PART OF THE PROJECT COST. ONCE THEY ARE COMPLETED THEN WE CHARGE THEM THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE. THEY WOULD NORMALLY ACCRUE AT THREE MONTHS WHICH WOULD BE JANUARY TO MARCH 31ST OF NEXT YEAR.

Mr. Chairman: ANYTHING FURTHER ON OPERATING SUBSIDY? THIS GIVES US A TOTAL OF \$400,378.00 FOR THE YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION. UNDER PROJECT CAPITAL WHAT ITEMS HAVE NOT YET BEEN COVERED?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, WE HAVE TO MY KNOWLEDGE ONE VOTE LEFT AND THAT IS THE VOTE THAT HAS SOME CAPITAL IN IT. PAGE 58A, ESTABLISHMENTS 2003 TO 2005 IN THE CAPITAL AREA AND THEN THERE WILL BE THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR BOTH.

Mr. Chairman: OKAY. DO WE HAVE THE NECESSARY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I THINK AS YOU REALIZE THE COMMISSIONER IS AWAY. I AM PREPARED TO ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS ALONG WITH THE FIRST, AND IF WE NEED FURTHER ADVICE I GUESS WE WILL JUST HAVE TO GET IT.

Mr. Chairman: ALRIGHT. FIRST ITEM, ESTABLISHMENT 2003 - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BRANCH, \$56,000.00.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I WANT TO MAKE A REMARK ABOUT THIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANT. IT'S A PITY THAT THE COMMISSIONER ISN'T HERE BECAUSE I WANT TO SHOW IN ANOTHER AREA WHERE THERE HAS BEEN INVOLVEMENT IN WHAT HAS BEEN TAKING PLACE IN THIS COUNCIL. SOMETIME AGO A CHILD DAY-CARE CENTRE WHICH IS NOW OPERATING

IN THE HOSTEL OVER AT RIVERDALE HAD COME TO ME AND ASKED ME TO MAKE SOME FUNDS AVAILABLE IN THERE FOR THE CHILD CARE CENTRE. I THEN WENT TO THE COMMISSIONER AND SAID THAT I WANTED TO MAKE SOME OF THIS MONEY AVAILABLE. AS A MATTER OF FACT I DON'T MIND MENTIONING IT, IT WAS COUNCILLOR TANNER'S WIFE WHO WAS DOING A LOT OF WORK WITH THE CHILD CARE CENTRE. I WAS VERY IMPRESSED WITH THE CASE THAT SHE HAD PUT FORWARD. I WENT TO THE COMMISSIONER AND ASKED TO MAKE SOME MONEY AVAILABLE OUT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND. HIS REPLY TO ME WAS "NO, WE CAN'T GIVE ANY MONEY INTO THAT CENTRE AT ALL." ALTHOUGH I TALKED TO HIM ABOUT IT TWICE HE SAID "NO, WE ARE NOT GOING TO PUT ANY OF THIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND IN THERE FOR THIS PARTICULAR DAY CARE CENTRE." IT WASN'T UNTIL A MONTH AFTER THAT I READ IN THE NEWSPAPER THAT HE HAD ALLOWED ANOTHER MEMBER TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE DAY CARE CENTRE. IT JUST GOES TO SHOW THAT WHAT WAS BEING DONE WAS THAT HE WAS ATTEMPTING TO USE MYSELF AS AN AREA OF WHERE HE CAN CREATE SOME DISSATISFACTION BY REFUSING TO ALLOW ME TO PROVIDE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THAT PARTICULAR DAY CARE CENTRE. AS A MATTER OF FACT I WAS ONE OF THE FIRST PEOPLE TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR DAY CARE CENTRES IN THE YUKON. HE THEN WENT AHEAD AND ALLOWED ANOTHER MEMBER TO PROVIDE HIS FUNDS. SO IT LOOKED PRETTY BAD THAT I WASN'T DOING MY JOB IN PROVIDING FUNDS TO THE DAY CARE CENTRE. I AM JUST BRINGING THIS POINT UP BECAUSE IT SHOWS HOW EVEN THE COMMISSIONER CAN MANIPULATE THESE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS IF HE DOESN'T WANT TO APPROVE THEM FOR ANY PARTICULAR COUNCIL MEMBER.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I DON'T THINK THIS IS THE PLACE FOR THIS DISCUSSION. I WILL MAKE THE POINT TOO THAT I HAVE NEVER HAD AN APPLICATION WHICH I HAVEN'T APPROVED, AND INCIDENTALLY I DON'T EVEN LIKE TO HAVE TO APPROVE THEM BECAUSE I DON'T THINK ANY COUNCILLOR SHOULD BE PUT IN THAT POSITION. BUT I HAVE NEVER HAD ANY APPLICATION OR ANY DISCUSSION WITH THE COMMISSIONER ON ANY GRANTS THAT I HAVE GIVEN IN THE PAST THREE AND ONE-HALF YEARS AND THE ONES I HAVE FILLED OUT FOR THE NEXT YEAR. HE HAS AUTOMATICALLY APPROVED EVERY SINGLE ONE OF MINE. I CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR SOME REASON OR ANOTHER HAS DISAGREEMENTS WITH THE COMMISSIONER, BUT I CAN SAY AS FAR AS THE COMMISSIONER AND MY GRANTS

ARE CONCERNED, HE HAS NOT EVEN SO MUCH AS DISCUSSED THEM WITH ME. I HAVE RECOMMENDED THEM. THEY HAVE GONE STRAIGHT THROUGH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S THE VERY POINT THAT I AM RAISING. HE WAS NOT INTERESTED IN HURTING THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN. AS A MATTER OF FACT I REMEMBER EVEN TELLING COUNCILLOR WATSON ABOUT THIS AT THE PARTICULAR TIME THAT IT WAS HIS DECISION NOT TO GRANT MONEY FOR THIS INDIAN HOSTEL. THIS IS THE TYPE OF THING THAT HAPPENS. NO WONDER I HAVE BEEN ATTACKING THE COMMISSIONER. THIS IS THE VERY TYPE OF THING WHERE FOR ME HE SAID "NO, DON'T GIVE ANY MONEY OUT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND. WE CAN'T DO IT THERE BECAUSE IT IS AN INDIAN HOSTEL BUILDING AND THEY HAVE MONEY OF THEIR OWN AND THEY SHOULD GET IT ON THEIR OWN." NOW I'M JUST SIMPLY POINTING IT OUT. I MADE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDS TO BE AVAILABLE AND IT WAS TURNED DOWN BY THE COMMISSIONER. I WAS TURNED DOWN. THIS WAS PRIOR BEFORE - I WAS STILL ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. IT ALL, I THINK, TENDS TO SHOW THAT WHERE THERE WAS A BACKGROUND OF TRYING TO GET ME INVOLVED WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: JUST FOR A LITTLE CLARIFICATION SINCE MY NAME WAS INCLUDED IN THE CONVERSATION, I RECALL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST STATING THAT HE WASN'T PLANNING ON GIVING ANY OF HIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE CHILD CARE CENTRE. SO IF HE CHANGED HIS MIND IN HIS CONVERSATION WITH THE COMMISSIONER, I DO NOT KNOW. I KNOW AT THAT TIME HE HADN'T PLANNED ON GIVING ANY FUNDS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS SUCH A DIRECT LIE. THIS MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN HAS MADE IT CLEAR THAT SHE IS UNABLE TO MEET EVEN A COMMITMENT OF TRUTH IN A SIMPLE AREA LIKE THIS. SHE WOULD HAVE BEEN FAR BETTER IF SHE WOULD HAVE SHUT UP AND REMEMBERED WHAT HAD TAKEN PLACE QUITE CLEARLY AND NOT SPOKEN ABOUT IT. THAT IS AN UNTRUTH. MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT I AM CONCERNED ABOUT MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE IS THAT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS, I FEEL, SHOULD BE GIVEN IN AREAS WHERE THEY ARE WELL DESERVED. LONG BEFORE, MR. CHAIRMAN, LONG BEFORE COUNCILLOR WATSON EVER REARED HER UGLY HEAD IN THIS COUNCIL CHAMBERS, I MADE THE MONEY AVAILABLE TO THE COMMUNITY, THE VERY FIRST CHILD CARE CENTRE. THE VERY FIRST ONE. I MADE MONEY AVAILABLE SO THEY COULD

HAVE THEIR OWN PREMISES. IT'S A POSITION I HAVE ALWAYS SUPPORTED IN THIS AREA. I AM NOT GOING TO GO ON FURTHER WITH IT. I AM SIMPLY ECHOING THAT IT'S AN AREA WHERE PEOPLE, MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL, WHO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS CAN BE TURNED DOWN BECAUSE OF LIKES AND DISLIKES AND NOT BECAUSE OF THEIR PARTICULAR NEEDS. THIS IS ALL I HAVE GOT TO SAY.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DIDN'T THINK I WAS GOING TO HAVE TO SAY THIS BUT I AM GOING TO NOW BECAUSE IT'S THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HERE WHO IS LYING. MY WIFE DID GO TO SEE HIM AND DID ASK HIM FOR SOME FUNDS. HE MADE CERTAIN CONDITIONS WHICH SHE DIDN'T THINK THE ASSOCIATION SHOULD FULFILL. THEN I THINK MY WIFE MADE AN APPLICATION TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST AND I THINK THAT'S WHERE THE FUNDS CAME FROM. THEY DIDN'T COME FROM ME. THEY DIDN'T COME FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER. MY WIFE TOLD ME WHEN SHE CAME HOME, AND I WANTED NOTHING TO DO WITH IT BECAUSE SHE WAS APPLYING TO ANOTHER MEMBER AND IT WAS HIS COMMUNITY FUND; THE WAY I UNDERSTOOD IT IS THE CONDITIONS THAT HE WANTED SHE DIDN'T THINK THE DAY CARE CENTRE SHOULD FULFILL. I DON'T THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE IS LYING. I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST IS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL I HAVE A RECORD OF TELLING THE TRUTH AND OF BEING HONOURABLE THAT BOTH COUNCILLOR WATSON AND COUNCILLOR TANNER CAN COME UP WITH THAT TYPE OF STATEMENT. NOW I SAY TO YOU THIS AND I SAY IT VERY CLEARLY: WHEN I WAS APPROACHED I WAS APPROACHED ON THE BASIS THAT FIRSTLY IT WOULD BE AN ORGANIZATION WHICH WOULD BE PART OF THE SKOOKUM JIM ORGANIZATION. THE NEXT SUGGESTION I MADE WAS DON'T HAVE IT LIKE THAT - SET UP YOUR OWN CHILD CARE CENTRE. I WENT TO THE COMMISSIONER AND LAID DOWN AND SHOWED THE COMMISSIONER THE ACTUAL CORRESPONDENCE THAT WAS BROUGHT FORWARD. HE SAID, "NO, WE ARE NOT GOING TO PUT ANY MONEY AT ALL INTO THAT INDIAN CENTRE WHETHER IT WAS FOR CHILD CARE OR FOR ANYTHING ELSE." THIS IS THE POINT I AM MAKING. I WAS REFUSED TO ALLOW SOME OF THE FUNDS OUT OF MY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND FROM BEING PUT IN THERE. I DON'T LIE. THAT WAS THE ACTUAL, CLEAR THING THAT TOOK PLACE. THE FUNDS WERE NOT ALLOWED TO GO IN THERE BECAUSE THEY WERE COMING FROM ME. I AM TELLING YOU IT WAS FOR ONLY ONE PURPOSE. THE COMMISSIONER WAS TRYING AT

THAT TIME TO FIND WAYS AND MEANS OF WHERE HE COULD PUT ME IN A BAD LIGHT WITH THE FELLOW MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. THIS IS ALL.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE ONLY POINT I WANT TO MAKE IS FIRST OF ALL I THINK THE ILLUSTRATION OF WHY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS ARE WRONG AS THEY ARE ON AN INDIVIDUAL COUNCILLOR BASIS AS HAS JUST BEEN ILLUSTRATED. THIS CONVERSATION SHOULDN'T BE IN THIS HOUSE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WHY NOT? IS SOME MONEY HERE?

Mr. TANNER: THAT'S THE FIRST THING. THE SECOND THING IS THAT IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT IT IS MY WIFE THAT IS INVOLVED. SHE IS WORKING FOR AN ASSOCIATION WHICH SHE FELT, AND I HAPPEN TO FEEL TOO BUT IT WAS HER DECISION, WAS DOING A GOOD JOB. SHE WENT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER AND ASKED FOR SOME FUNDS. I SAY AGAIN HER REPORT BACK TO ME WHEN SHE DID DISCUSS IT AS AN INCIDENTAL - BECAUSE WE HAPPEN TO LIVE IN THE SAME HOUSE - WAS THE FACT THAT SHE COULDN'T SEE THAT TO GET THE MONEY WAS WORTH THE CONDITIONS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WANTED TO IMPOSE. IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT THIS CONVERSATION IS HERE. IT'S ILLUSTRATIVE, AND IN MY MIND OF WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS DONE SINCE HE HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, HE'S ABLE TO CALL EVERYONE ELSE A LIAR BUT NOBODY CAN CALL HIM A LIAR. TO MY MIND NOBODY SHOULD BE CALLING ANYBODY LIARS AROUND HERE. IF THEY ARE GOING TO, THEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SHOULD EXPECT THE SAME TREATMENT HIMSELF AND TO STAND UP AND SAY "I DON'T TELL LIES" IS JUST AS EQUALLY FALLACIOUS AS TO CALL SOMEBODY ELSE A LIAR. I THINK THE CONVERSATION SHOULD BE DROPPED RIGHT NOW. PLEASE GOD WE DON'T GO ON LIKE THIS FOR THE REST OF THE TWO OR THREE WEEKS WE ARE GOING TO BE HERE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I AM NOT GOING TO GO ON LIKE THIS IN THE MANNER THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS JUST SPOKEN. I MADE MY POSITION QUITE CLEAR. I AGAIN SAY AND AS I SAID AT THE BEGINNING, THE WHOLE PROGRAMS OF CHILD CARE CENTRES ARE WELL WORTHWHILE PROGRAMS. CERTAINLY EVERYBODY THAT PARTICIPATES IN THEM SOME WAY OR ANOTHER ARE DOING A FANTASTIC JOB FOR THE COMMUNITY. NOBODY SPEAKS AGAINST THAT. I CERTAINLY OBJECT TO IT BEING SUGGESTED THAT I DID ANYTHING OTHER THAN WANTING TO SUPPORT THE PRINCIPLE OF CHILD CARE CENTRES. I SAY FURTHER THAT THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THAT MONEY WAS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE WAS WHETHER OR NOT THE COMMISSIONER HAD A LIKING FOR ME AT

THAT TIME. THIS IS THE POINT THAT I AM MAKING. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER TO SAY ON IT. I WANT TO ASSURE MEMBERS THAT I AM SPEAKING THE TRUTH WHEN I TELL THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF WHAT HAPPENED.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHEN YOU GET YOUR HANDS INTO THE POLITICAL PORK BARREL YOU ALWAYS GET INTO A POLITICAL HARANG. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO TELL THE MEMBERS HOW THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS DEALT WITH IT. WHEN GROUPS, CLUBS OR ORGANIZATIONS APPROACHED THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR MONEY FROM THE WHITEHORSE WEST SLUSH FUND I ASKED THEM TO SEND ME A LETTER IN WRITING WITH THEIR BUDGET, WITH THEIR ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION, AND I TURN THE WHOLE THING OVER TO THE SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE. WHEN I GET A LETTER FROM Mr. NOBLE, THE DIRECTOR, THAT IT HAS BEEN RECEIVED, AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE THEY LOOK AT THE APPLICATION, THEY RECOMMEND THE FUNDS, SEND ME THEIR DECISIONS BACK AND I AUTOMATICALLY AGREE WITH THEM. I DON'T GET INVOLVED IN ANY NAME-CALLING. I DON'T GET INVOLVED WITH DISCUSSIONS WITH THE COMMISSIONER. I DON'T GET INVOLVED WITH SPECIFIC GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS. I NEVER SEE THE MONEY. I NEVER TOUCH THE MONEY. I NEVER RECEIVE A CHEQUE. Mr. CHAIRMAN, I CAN ONLY RECOMMEND THAT OTHER MEMBERS AVAIL THEMSELVES OF THIS WONDERFUL SPORTS GROUP TO GET THE TAINT OF THE POLITICAL PORK BARREL OFF THEIR HANDS AND MINDS. IT WORKS OUT BEAUTIFULLY. THE ORGANIZATION IS THERE. IT'S AROUND THE TOTAL YUKON TERRITORY. A MAJORITY OF MEMBERS FROM OUTSIDE OF WHITEHORSE, AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED, THEY HAVE DONE A 1,000% BETTER JOB HANDLING MY MONEY THAN I COULD EVER DO IT ON A POLITICAL BASIS. Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE GROUP IS THERE. THE ORGANIZATION IS SET UP. EVERYTHING IS READY. THEY WELCOME YOUR MONEY. GET IT OUT OF THE POLITICAL PORK BARREL HANDS. GET IT INTO THE COMMITTEE WHERE THEY CAN DO SOME GOOD FOR ALL THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND THE TAINT OF USING PUBLIC FUNDS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES WILL NEVER AGAIN CROSS YOUR MINDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHAT I HAVE TO SAY IS THIS. I WON'T NORMALLY AGREE WITH WHAT THE MEMBER HAS SAID. HE DIDN'T GET THE POINT. I'M SAYING THAT THE COMMISSIONER FINALLY MADE THE DECISION. THE COMMISSIONER MAKES THE DECISIONS WITH EVERY ISSUE ON FUNDS. THIS IS WHAT HE DOES, Mr. CHAIRMAN. THIS IS

WHAT HE DOES. THAT'S THE ONLY AREA THAT I HAVE RAISED. THE COMMISSIONER TOOK IT UPON HIMSELF TO MAKE A DECISION. I DON'T TALK TO HIM ANYMORE FOR ANY REASON.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: LAUGHTER.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT ANY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE COME DOWN FROM ANY OF THE OTHER COUNCILLORS, I'M SURE, AND FROM THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HOW THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S FUNDS SHOULD BE SPENT ARE NEVER TURNED DOWN. THEY ARE ALWAYS AUTOMATICALLY HONOURED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEY WERE TURNED DOWN THIS TIME.

MR. MCKINNON: AUTOMATICALLY. BEAUTIFUL WAY TO GET IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ITEM 2004, \$490,000.00 - STAFF HOUSING. THE BREAKDOWN IS ON PAGE A 40. FROM THE CHAIR I THOUGHT THAT WHEN WE CREATED THE YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION THAT THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OVER THIS FUNCTION, AND THERE WOULD BE NO MORE OF THIS TYPE OF ITEM IN THE BUDGET. COULD WE HAVE AN EXPLANATION ON THAT?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. I HAVE JUST RECENTLY, WITHIN THE LAST COUPLE OF MONTHS, TALKED TO THE HOUSING CORPORATION ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WOULD LOOK AT TAKING OVER AT LEAST THAT HOUSING WHICH IS THE GOVERNMENT'S IN NAME, NOT THE LEASED HOUSING FOR EXAMPLE AT TAKHINI. AND AT THAT TIME THEY HAD NOTICE THAT THEIR MANAGER WAS LEAVING AND THEY WANTED SOME THREE OR FOUR MONTHS WITH THE NEW MANAGER TO DETERMINE WHICH WAY THEY WERE GOING TO GO. THE INTENT OVER THE COURSE OF YEARS WOULD BE THAT THE HOUSING CORPORATION WOULD IN FACT TAKE OVER ALL THE GOVERNMENT RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAMS AND OPERATE IT AS A RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM FOR THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY, NOT JUST THE GOVERNMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WAS IT THE IDEA, IT HAS BEEN THE IDEA FOR A FEW YEARS NOW,

THAT THE STAFF HOUSING WOULD BE REDUCED SO THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE LIVING IN STAFF AFTER TWO YEARS WOULD HAVE TO FIND THEIR OWN HOUSING. HAS THIS POLICY CHANGED? I WONDER IF MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE THAT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS POLICY APPLIES IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA ONLY. IT DOES NOT APPLY OUTSIDE THE WHITEHORSE AREA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT IS STILL IN EXISTENCE THEN?

MR. MILLER: YES, THE POLICY IS STILL IN EXISTENCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE IF HE IS STILL LIVING IN STAFF HOUSING.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM STILL LIVING IN STAFF HOUSING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HAS THERE BEEN A SPECIAL PRIVILEGE TO YOU IN THIS INSTANCE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I APPLIED AS HAD OTHER PEOPLE TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PERMISSION TO STAY IN THE STAFF HOUSING. I MIGHT ADD THAT THERE ARE OTHER PEOPLE IN THE SAME CIRCUMSTANCES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW IS THIS POLICY GOING TO BE EXPANDED - FOR WHAT LENGTH OF TIME. IS THIS FOREVER?

MR. MCKINNON: HE NEEDS A RAISE.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. THERE ARE SOME STANDARD REASONS PUT FORWARD BY INDIVIDUALS FOR AN EXTENSION OF THEIR TWO-YEAR LIMITATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WOULD ONE OF THE REASONS BE, MR. CHAIRMAN, AND PERHAPS MR. MILLER COULD ANSWER, THAT HE DOESN'T EXPECT TO BE AROUND IN ANOTHER YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL IT'S UP TO HIM TO ANSWER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. NO I WOULD

DISALLOW THAT QUESTION. HAVE YOU ANYTHING FURTHER ON STAFF HOUSING?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,000,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT CONTRACTS HAVE BEEN MET FOR THIS YEAR, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ONLY CONTRACTS MET AS OF TODAY ARE THE BASEMENT OR THE EXCAVATION. I UNDERSTAND THAT IS TO START THIS WEEK. THERE HAS BEEN A CONTRACT LET FOR THE SUPPLY OF THE STRUCTURAL STEEL. THAT WAS LET LAST FALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH ARE THE VALUES OF THE CONTRACT THAT HAVE BEEN LET?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIGURES I DON'T HAVE AVAILABLE AT THE MOMENT. APPROXIMATELY \$1,000,000.00 TO DATE, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MIGHT POINT OUT THAT THE TENDER FOR THE SUPER-STRUCTURE WILL BE OUT IN THE NEXT TWO TO THREE WEEKS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON THE CAPITAL BUILDING? WELL THIS COMPLETES PROJECT CAPITAL. I THINK AT THIS TIME WE WILL STAND COMMITTEE IN RECESS UNTIL 2 O'CLOCK.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER. WE ARE DEALING WITH VOTE 1 AT THIS TIME O & M. FIRST ITEM IS ESTABLISHMENT 100, YUKON COUNCIL \$111,995.00,

THIS TRANSPORTATION AMONG NON-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IS THE COUNCILLORS TRANSPORTATION?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT FRINGE BENEFITS DO THE YUKON COUNCIL MEMBERS HAVE?

MR. CHAIRMAN: MEDICARE.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE WOULD COVER THE TWO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND IT WOULD COVER THE STATUTORY FRINGE BENEFITS WHICH IS UIC, CPP.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS IS CANADA PENSION PLAN?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS RIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO THEY DON'T APPLY THEN TO ANY OTHER COUNCILLOR. IS THIS WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

MR. MILLER: CERTAINLY UIC WOULD, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE CPP I AM NOT SURE IF WE DEDUCT FOR OTHER COUNCILLORS OR NOT. POSSIBLY WE DO.

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: YES, YOU DO.

MR. MILLER: OK, WE DO. SO WE WOULD SHARE IN THOSE COSTS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT CONSIDERATION IS BEING GIVEN TO A PENSION SCHEME FOR SOME MEMBERS OF COUNCIL?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I LOOKED AT A COUPLE OF PENSION SCHEMES BUT AS OF THIS TIME I HAVE NOT HAD ANY DIRECTION TO PROCEED WITH IT. WE DO HAVE A COUPLE AVAILABLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK THERE IS MUCH PROVINCIAL AND OF COURSE PARLIAMENTARY EXPERIENCE HERE.

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE PENSION SCHEMES FOR THERE LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS. THEY ALL VARY SLIGHTLY.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, SURELY IT IS UP

TO COUNCIL TO BRING IN A PENSION SCHEME. WHEN WE DISCUSSED SALARIES, I THINK ALL MEMBERS WILL REMEMBER, THERE WAS MENTION OF WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD INTRODUCE A PENSION PLAN AND WE DECIDED NOT TO. UNTIL COUNCIL GIVES SOME DIRECTION TO THE ADMINISTRATION THEN I THINK THAT ADMINISTRATION WOULD ASSUME THAT COUNCIL DOESN'T WANT IT UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THEY BRING IT FORWARD OR MAKE THE SUGGESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: FROM THE CHAIR, IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT, FROM THE VARIOUS TIMES THIS HAS BEEN DISCUSSED, THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD TAKE A LOOK AND DO THE LEG WORK AND LOOK AT PROVINCIAL AND HOW IT IS DEALT WITH IN THE PROVINCES AND GET PROVINCIAL EXPERIENCE IN THE QUESTION SO WE WOULD HAVE SOMETHING TO LOOK AT.

I DON'T THINK ANY MEMBER OF COUNCIL HAS THE INDIVIDUAL CAPABILITY OR RESOURCE OF PUTTING IT TOGETHER HIMSELF.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM NOT SAYING THAT WOULDN'T BE TRUE, IN FACT I DON'T RECALL THAT HAPPENING PERSONALLY, HOWEVER THE CHAIRMAN MUST BE RIGHT. SURELY IT IS UP TO COUNCIL TO SAY BY FORM OF MOTION THAT THEY WANT TO INTRODUCE A PENSION SCHEME AND INITIATE THE ACTION ON THE PART OF THE ADMINISTRATION. TO MY KNOWLEDGE THAT HASN'T BEEN DONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD IT NOT BE FIRST NECESSARY TO FIND OUT WHAT THE PROVINCES DO IN THIS REGARD AND IN OTHER LEGISLATURES, IN ORDER THAT WE MIGHT DETERMINE WHAT TYPE OF A PENSION SCHEME OR HOW IT MIGHT BE EMBARKED UPON?

MR. TANNER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN THAT IS NOT THE WAY I SEE IT. THE WAY I SEE IT IS THAT THE COUNCIL BY MOTION OR RESOLUTION SAYS, "WE WOULD WANT THE ADMINISTRATION TO INITIATE A PENSION SCHEME FOR COUNCILLORS." AND THEN LET THE ADMINISTRATION COME BACK WITH SOME PLANS AND LET US DISCUSS IT. BUT UNTIL THAT MOTION IS MADE I DON'T SEE HOW THE ADMINISTRATION CAN DO ANYTHING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I RECALL THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WAS GOING TO DO THAT. I THINK THIS HAS BEEN RAISED A NUMBER OF TIMES. I WAS WONDERING IF ANYTHING HAD BEEN DONE ON IT AT ALL?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN; I'M NOT AWARE AND

PERSONALLY I'M NOT AWARE OF THE ADMINISTRATION HAVING THAT UNDERTAKING. I WILL, IF THIS COUNCIL WISHES, WE CAN CERTAINLY BRING SOMETHING FORWARD. I THINK WE HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION AVAILABLE. I KNOW I HAVE PERSONALLY SEEN A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT SCHEMES - PROVINCIAL. AND I HAVE SEEN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY SCHEME AND I WOULD BE HAPPY TO UNDERTAKE ON BEHALF OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO BRING SOMETHING FORWARD TO THIS COUNCIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD THAT BE DONE DURING THE LIFE OF THIS COUNCIL? SO THAT WE CAN DEAL WITH IT.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T GUARANTEE THAT IT COULD BE DONE AT THIS SITTING BUT CERTAINLY IT COULD BE AT THIS SITTING OR THE NEXT SITTING OF THIS PARTICULAR COUNCIL. WE CAN DO SOMETHING, SURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO YOU AGREE?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING ELSE ON ESTABLISHMENT 100?

MR. RIVETT: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST ONE POINT ON THIS PENSION. IS THERE ANY POSSIBILITY OF LOOKING INTO MAKING IT RETROACTIVE?

MR. MILLER: WELL, THERE IS POSSIBILITY, MR. CHAIRMAN, OBVIOUSLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ESTABLISHMENT 120 - \$425,990. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

THIS WOULD COVER THE WHOLE SECRETARIAT AND EVERYTHING ON THE TOP FLOOR?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS COVERS THE POSITIONS AS OUTLINED ON PAGE 7. IT COVERS THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS (ADMINISTRATIVE) PLUS THE CLERK OF COUNCIL, THE STATISTICAL PLANNING ADVISOR, AND THE INTERNAL AUDITOR. THE REST OF THE STAFF, THE SECRETARIES FOR THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, ALL THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, PLUS THE SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL'S OFFICE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS A QUESTION I WANT TO GO BACK TO MR. CHAIRMAN. THE

TRANSPORTATION OF NON-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES. THIS ITEM, I TAKE IT DEALS WITH THE TRANSPORTATION OF TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHILE THEY ARE CARRYING OUT THEIR OFFICE WORKS. WHILE THEY ARE CARRYING OUT THE DUTIES OF THEIR OFFICE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS WOULD COVER THE MEMBERS, ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. IT WOULD ONLY COVER THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN THEY ARE ON OFFICIAL COUNCIL BUSINESS. WHEN THEY ARE ON ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS, IT IS PART OF THEIR NORMAL FUNCTION THAT WOULD BE COVERED IN ESTABLISHMENT 120.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW THAT IS A POINT THAT I WANT TO GET. I WANT TO KNOW WHY, AGAIN I AM GOING TO RAISE THIS, IS TO WHY AN ACCOUNT SUBMITTED AND SIGNED FOR AS THE FUNDS THAT HAVE BEEN EXPENDED IN GOVERNMENT BUSINESS IS NOT BEING PAID TO ME WHILE I WAS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. CAN I GET AN ANSWER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR?

MR. MILLER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS ASKED THE ADMINISTRATION A NUMBER OF TIMES FOR THIS. I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO THE DEBATE ON THE SUBJECT. AS I RECALL THE SITUATION THE MEMBER HAS AN OUTSTANDING ANSWER TO PROVIDE TO THE ADMINISTRATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS NOT SO. I WANT TO MAKE IT CLEAR NOW THAT AN ANSWER HAS BEEN GIVEN IN THE FORM SUBMITTED WITH MY SIGNATURE ON IT. I WAS ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS. I WANT TO KNOW FROM THE ADMINISTRATION THE REASON WHY THEY ARE NOT MEETING THAT COMMITMENT? CAN HE GIVE THAT ANSWER?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I AM AWARE OF THIS SITUATION, THERE WAS A LETTER WRITTEN TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKING HIM TO ANSWER SOME QUESTIONS AND THOSE QUESTIONS HAVE NEVER BEEN ANSWERED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS NOT SO. MR. MILLER IS SAYING THAT HE IS NOT AWARE OF WHAT THE ANSWERS WERE. LET ME INFORM HIM THAT I MET WITH MR. FINGLAND AND I MET WITH MR. SMITH AND I SIGNED THE FORM SHOWING THE DETAILS OF THE EXPENDITURES THAT WERE MADE.

THIS IS WHY I WANT TO KNOW, IN VIEW OF MY SIGNATURE BEING ATTACHED TO THAT FORM, WHY STILL IS THERE RELUCTANCE TO MEET THAT

COMMITMENT. CAN I GET SOMETHING IN WRITING FROM THE ADMINISTRATION?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS THE ANSWER IN WRITING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I HAVE NOT SO. THAT IS NOT TRUTHFUL AT ALL. IF YOU HAD BEEN TOLD ... I SAY THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF MR. MILLER HAS BEEN TOLD THAT I HAVE AN ANSWER IN WRITING HE IS BEING MISINFORMED. THERE HAS BEEN NO CORRESPONDENCE EXCEPT A LETTER AT THE TIME AFTER I LEFT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ASKING ME TO GIVE A FURTHER EXPLANATION IN WRITING. INSTEAD I WENT AND TOLD MR. FINGLAND THAT MY SIGNATURE ON THAT FORM IS ALL THAT IS REQUIRED. A CERTIFICATION TO SAY THAT I CERTIFY THAT THE EXPENDITURE WAS USED IN THE DUTIES OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE. THAT SIGNATURE IS THERE.

FOLLOWING THAT I SPOKE TO THE COMMISSIONER. HE ALSO SENT ANOTHER LETTER SAYING, "CAN WE HAVE ANOTHER LETTER FROM YOU." IT IS ALL ON THE FORM THAT, THE CERTIFICATION, WITH MY SIGNATURE ON THERE. WHAT EXCUSE IS THERE TO OFFER BEYOND THAT?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY WE GET BACK TO THE BUDGET. THIS ISN'T ...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS A BUDGET ITEM.

MR. STUTTER: THE POINTS THAT ARE BEING BROUGHT UP BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAVE GOT NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS PARTICULAR ITEM IN THE BUDGET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON THE CONTRARY. HERE IS AN ITEM THAT SAYS HERE, "THAT THE EXPENDITURES USED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD COME OUT OF ESTABLISHMENT NO. 120." I AM JUST ASKING NOW WHY, WHEN THE FUNDS ARE PROVIDED IN THE BUDGET, WHY THEY ARE NOT BEING MET. WHY THE PAYMENTS ARE NOT BEING PAID? I CAN'T GET AN ANSWER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. THE BASIC REASON WHY THOSE FUNDS HAVE NOT BEEN PAID OUT, AS I BELIEVE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS, IS THERE IS A QUESTION

OF WHO SHOULD PAY FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S ATTENDANCE AT A NATIONAL LIBERAL CONVENTION, WHETHER IT SHOULD BE THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY OR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HIMSELF.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, LET ME MAKE THIS POSITION CLEAR. I ATTENDED THE LIBERAL CONVENTION WHILE I WAS ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS. MEETING WITH SEVEN FEDERAL MINISTERS AND WITH SENIOR SERVANTS, CIVIL SERVANTS OF FEDERAL PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS IN RELATION TO MY WORK. THE ADMINISTRATION KNEW AHEAD OF TIME THAT I WAS GOING THERE. IN FACT, THE FORMS HAVE BEEN SIGNED BY THE COMMISSIONER ALLOCATING AN ADVANCE IN THAT PARTICULAR AREA FOR THAT PARTICULAR PURPOSE. IT CLEARLY DELINEATES THE PURPOSE OF GOING TO QUEBEC ALONE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FORM INDICATES CLEARLY THAT THERE WERE TRIPS TO QUEBEC AND OTTAWA. IT DOES NOT INDICATE THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS ATTENDING A NATIONAL LIBERAL CONVENTION AT THE EXPENSE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, IS IT SUGGESTED THAT I AM NOT PERMITTED TO ATTEND ANYWHERE ELSE EXCEPT FOR THE PURPOSES I SAID. WHEN THE TWO MEMBERS WENT TO MEET WITH THE STANDING COMMITTEE IF THEY WENT AND VISITED WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MEMBERS THEY WOULD LOSE THEIR EXPENSES BECAUSE THEY DID THAT. HOW LUDICROUS CAN PEOPLE BE WHEN THEY COME UP WITH SUGGESTIONS LIKE THAT? BECAUSE I ATTENDED A CONVENTION AT THE SAME TIME AT NO ADDITIONAL EXPENSE AN ARGUMENT IS BROUGHT FORWARD IN THAT MATTER. I WONDER IF ONE OF THE MEMBERS THAT HAD BEEN THERE DIDN'T INTEND TO MEET SOMEBODY ELSE WHILE THEY WERE IN OTTAWA OR DID YOU JUST MEET THE STANDING COMMITTEE? I WONDER IF MR. CHAIRMAN COULD SAY THAT. YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK TO ANYONE ELSE OR GO ANYWHERE ELSE - HOW RIDICULOUS A SUGGESTION BEING MADE BY THE ADMINISTRATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK THAT'S WHAT THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER IS SAYING AT ALL. HE IS SAYING THAT SOME PORTION OF THE TIME THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS IN OTTAWA ATTENDING THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CONVENTION, HE MUST HAVE TAKEN TIME OUT AND HE MUST HAVE SPENT SOME TWO OR THREE DAYS THERE AND THEY'RE NOT PAYING FOR THAT. THAT'S WHAT I UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM IS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK THIS

IS A QUESTION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION TO HAVE TO ARGUE. THE DECISION WAS MADE. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED FOR TIME TO GO TO OTTAWA TO QUEBEC CITY. HE EXTENDED HIS STAY BY A COUPLE OF DAYS IN ORDER TO ATTEND THE LIBERAL CONVENTION, THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CONVENTION AND THAT'S FINE BUT THE DAYS HE IS ATTENDING A LIBERAL CONVENTION, I DON'T THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY SHOULD PAY HIS EXPENSES WHILE HE IS ATTENDING IT. IT'S FINE TO USE THE GOVERNMENT EXPENSE ACCOUNT TO TRAVEL. HE WAS GOING EAST ANYWAY AND THAT WAS FINE. HE COULD TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ATTEND A CONFERENCE. BUT FOR GOODNESS SALES LET'S NOT BE THAT RIDICULOUS AND TRY AND KID THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY THAT WE SHOULD BE PAYING FOR SOMEBODY TO ATTEND A POLITICAL CONVENTION. AND I WOULD FEEL QUITE UPSET IF I THOUGHT THE COMMISSIONER OR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WAS PAYING THE EXPENSES OF AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER OR ANY MEMBER TO ATTEND A POLITICAL CONVENTION IN OTTAWA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS SO IMPROPER IN THE ATTITUDES ADOPTED FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT I COULDN'T GET OUT OF OTTAWA IN ANY EVENT BECAUSE THE PLANES WERE FILLED UP AND WHAT NOT AND I WAS THERE. I HAD TO REMAIN THERE. MY NEXT APPOINTMENT WAS IN VANCOUVER, SO THAN RATHER OF ME COME BACK TO MY APPOINTMENT WHICH WAS ON TUESDAY IN VANCOUVER, THEY WOULD HAVE RATHER ME COME BACK ON THE SUNDAY NIGHT TO WHITEHORSE AND THEN TAKE ANOTHER FLIGHT OUT AGAIN FROM WHITEHORSE TO VANCOUVER. AN EXTRA ADDITIONAL EXPENSE INSTEAD OF ME STAYING OVER AN EXTRA DAY AT VANCOUVER. OBVIOUSLY THE MEMBERS THAT HAVE SPOKEN DON'T KNOW THE CIRCUMSTANCES OR HAVE THEY LOOKED AT THE EXPENSE SHEETS FOR THE SIMPLE REASON IT SHOWS QUITE CLEARLY THAT THE TIME FACTOR INVOLVED AND WHEN I STAYED FOR FIVE EXTRA DAYS AS A BREAK IN VANCOUVER, I PAID THE SHOT MYSELF. IF THEY HAVE A LOOK AT THE EXPENSE SHEETS AND I WOULD ASK THAT THOSE EXPENSE SHEETS BE TABLED IN THE HOUSE SO THAT THEY CAN BE SEEN. AND JUST TO SHOW HOW THIS MR. FINGLAND AND MR. SMITH, AND NOW ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IS ATTEMPTING TO HARASS ME MORE BY SAYING THAT I HAVE USED GOVERNMENT FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ATTENDING A NATIONAL FEDERAL LIBERAL CONVENTION. NOW WHAT A LOT OF UTTER NONSENSE YOU PEOPLE MAKE OF IT AS IF TO SAY FOR ONE REASON OR ANOTHER I WOULD BOTHER MY HEAD ABOUT TWO EXTRA DAYS IN A HOTEL ACCOMMODATION. IT'S JUST THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FACT THAT MEMBERS COULD GO ALONG WITH THE ADMINISTRATION WHO FIND A WAY TO HARASS ME AND THEN THEY SAY YES, IT'S WONDERFUL. WE DON'T WANT ANYBODY TO PAY FOR

THOSE PARTICULAR SERVICES THAT I'VE BEEN THERE, NOTWITHSTANDING THAT I WAS THERE AND EVERY DAY AND SATURDAY AS WELL, I MET WITH THREE MEMBERS IN THEIR PRIVATE OFFICES. THREE FEDERAL CABINET MINISTERS, ALL ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE YUKON TERRITORY AND THIS IS WHERE PEOPLE SHOULD REALIZE THE FACT THAT WHEN I GO ANYWHERE, I SPOKE FOR THE YUKON NOT FOR NATIONAL FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY OR ANYTHING ELSE. I HAPPENED TO BE THERE AT THE SAME TIME. SO YOU LOOK FOR AN EXCUSE WHEREBY YOU CAN CHISEL A LITTLE BIT OUT OF ME. BUT I DON'T CARE BECAUSE I'M GOING TO TAKE THE MATTER FURTHER AS I SAID. BUT I'M JUST ANNOYED THAT ELECTED MEMBERS OF COUNCIL SHOULD TAKE THE ATTITUDE THAT IT IS WRONG TO ATTEND ON SOMEBODY ELSE WHILE YOU'VE BEEN PAID TO BE DOWN THERE AT A CERTAIN TIME.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M EVEN SURPRISED THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, A POLITICAL PERSON WOULD EVEN HAVE THE GALL TO REPLY TO THOSE TWO DAYS STAY IN OTTAWA AND ACTUALLY THE GOVERNMENT IS RESPONSIBLE WHEN A PERSON IS ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS. NOW IF YOU ARE ATTENDING A NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTION YOU ARE CERTAINLY NOT ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS AS FAR AS Y.T.G. IS CONCERNED. AND I'M SURPRISED THAT YOU WOULD EVEN ASK FOR PAYMENT OF YOUR EXPENSES FOR THOSE TWO DAYS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M NOT ASKING FOR THE TWO DAYS BECAUSE I ATTENDED A FEDERAL LIBERAL CONVENTION AND I WANT TO MAKE THAT QUITE CLEAR, BECAUSE CERTAINLY THE MEMBERS THAT HAVE SPOKEN DON'T FOLLOW LIBERAL PHILOSOPHIES. THAT'S WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT, BUT I WAS THERE SIMPLY BECAUSE I WAS THERE ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS AND ATTENDED THAT BUSINESS AT THE SAME TIME. NOW THIS IS THE POINT THAT I'M MAKING AND THIS IS THE INCREDIBLE SITUATION THAT HAS DEVELOPED WHEN THE ADMINISTRATION TODAY AND HAS BEEN FOR SOME MONTHS NOW, TRYING TO EVADE THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES TO MEET THEIR COMMITMENTS. IT IS A COMMITMENT TO MEET THE EXPENSES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WHO WAS ATTENDING IN OTTAWA ON PUBLIC BUSINESS AND IF HE WAS THERE AND HE DID SOMETHING ELSE WHILE HE WAS THERE, THAT'S NO REASON TO DEDUCT IT. I UNDERSTAND THAT THE TWO HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT WENT TO OTTAWA, THEY SPOKE TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT. YOU'VE GOT NO RIGHT TO SPEAK TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, IT'S RIDICULOUS. THEY SHOULD DEDUCT THEIR TONGUES FROM THEM. WHAT AN ARGUMENT THAT THEY PUT UP WITH THESE THINGS. IT ONLY GOES TO SHOW HOW NIAVE THESE PEOPLE ARE ESPECIALLY COUNCILLOR WATSON WHEN SHE COULD

STAND UP AND SUGGEST THAT I'M TRYING TO GET TWO EXTRA DAYS AS EXPENSES. WHAT DO YOU EXPECT MY DUTIES WERE THERE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT IS HE TRYING TO DO?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

SOME MEMBERS: INTERRUPTIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I LEFT ON THE SUNDAY. IN FACT THE ONLY DAY THAT'S INVOLVED IS THE SATURDAY BECAUSE I HAD MEETINGS PRIMARILY WITH CABINET MINISTERS. AND THAT'S THE STUPIDITY OF THESE PEOPLE. THEY TALK ABOUT ME BEING A POLITICIAN. WHAT NIAVITY EXISTS IN THEIR MINDS WHEN THEY SPEAK IN THAT MANNER. AND IT'S NOT THE \$100 OR SO, THERE IS A PRINCIPLE INVOLVED. AND IT MIGHT OCCUR WITH ANY MEMBER OF THIS COUNCIL THAT THE ADMINISTRATION CAN GO AND DOCK A PERSON SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY WENT AND ATTENDED A PARTY CONVENTION. I DON'T CARE WHAT PARTY IT WAS. IT DOESN'T MATTER. THAT ISN'T THE POINT. BUT TO SUGGEST THAT IF YOU GO TO OTTAWA OR YOU GO SOMEWHERE ON PUBLIC BUSINESS, YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK TO ANYBODY ELSE OR GO ANYWHERE, OR DO ANYTHING ELSE, THAT IS THE MOST CHILDISH STUPID ARRANGEMENT THAT I EVER COULD THINK THAT MEMBERS WOULD TRY TO BRING FORWARD TO THIS COUNCIL.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE CHILDISH AND STUPID ARRANGEMENTS CONCERNS HOW MUCH MONEY APPROXIMATELY?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL \$100.

MR. TANNER: ABOUT \$100?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES.

MR. TANNER: ALL THIS FUSS FOR \$100?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES!

MR. TANNER: THIS IS THE THIRD TIME IT'S BEEN IN THE HOUSE AND THIS IS THE SECOND TIME IT HAS BEEN QUESTIONED AND WHO IS MAKING ALL THE FUSS FOR A LOUSY \$100? AND HE HAS PAID FOR HIS OWN TIME WHEN HE WAS IN VANCOUVER. NO REASONABLE PERSON WOULD HAVE PUT THE BLASTED EXPENSE SHEET IN THERE IN THE FIRST PLACE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BECAUSE OF THE SIMPLE REASON THAT I WAS THERE ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS. THAT'S WHY. IT WAS BECAUSE I WAS THERE ON GOVERNMENT

BUSINESS AND YOU KNOW, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT ANYONE, EVEN MR. MILLER, MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD INDICATE TO YOU THAT NOBODY THAT GOES OUT ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS DOESN'T HAVE TO PUT MONEY IN HIS OWN POCKET OVER AND ABOVE THE - - -

SOME MEMBERS: LOUD DISCUSSIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER! ORDER PLEASE!

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS OFTEN THAT I HAVE NEVER EVEN ASKED FOR MONEY. QUITE OFTEN, QUITE OFTEN I'VE NEVER EVEN ASKED FOR MONEY AND MY RECORDS ARE ALWAYS THERE.

MRS. WATSON: I BLUSH FOR SHAME, FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AND YOU SHOULD TOO. YOU SHOULD HAVE BLUSHED FOR SHAME THE VERY FIRST DAY THAT YOU GOT INTO THIS COUNCIL. THAT'S WHAT YOU SHOULD HAVE DONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT WHEN I RAISED THIS QUESTION IT'S NOT BECAUSE OF THE SMALL FUNDS THAT ARE INVOLVED BUT BECAUSE OF THE PRINCIPLE THAT YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED TO DO ANYTHING ELSE IF YOU ARE ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS GOING TO OTTAWA. AND THIS SEEMS TO BE THE POLICY AND PHILOSOPHY OF BEING A - - -.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU'RE CERTAINLY NOT ALLOWED TO ATTEND AS A DELEGATE ON GOVERNMENT EXPENSE, TO A NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTION. THAT'S AS A DELEGATE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: EVERY MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DOES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'M WONDERING IF NOW WE'VE CONCLUDED DISCUSSION ON THIS.

MR. MCKINNON: OH NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S VERY INTERESTING. OF COURSE I JUST HATE TO GET INTO THIS INTER-PARTY HASSLE OF A FEDERAL NATURE IN ANY WAY SHAPE OR FORM AND I THINK THAT WE SHOULD CONFESS, MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE IT COMES UP TO SOME OTHER METHOD THAT BOTH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE ARE. OH THE SHAME OF IT, MR. CHAIRMAN. WE'RE SEEN IN THE OFFICE OF THE MEMBER OF THE YUKON IN THE OFFICES IN OTTAWA AND I CERTAINLY HOPE MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WE WON'T SEE OUR TRAVEL EXPENSES DOCKED AS A RESULT OF BEING SEEN IN THESE PLACES. BUT TO

GO INTO TRAVEL EXPENSES, THIS IS A HECK OF A GOOD POINT. HOW MUCH DID YOU PUT IN YOUR POCKET. WE FOUND OUT WHEN WE CAME BACK THAT YOU'RE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM OF \$35.00 PER DAY FOR TRAVEL. A HOTEL ROOM ANYWHERE IN CANADA AND NOT GETTING AN INTERNATIONAL SUITE OR ANYTHING IS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF \$30.00 AND ANY MEMBER WHO TRAVELS KNOWS THIS. IT WAS \$28.00 I THINK IN OTTAWA. \$27.00 IN VANCOUVER. SO HONOURABLE MEMBERS DON'T DO ME ANY MORE FAVOURS. DON'T SEND ME ON ANY MORE TRIPS. PLEASE I CAN'T AFFORD IT. THAT LEAVES US \$7.00 A DAY FOR CABS, FOR GRATUITIES, FOR FOOD, YOU DON'T HAVE TO GIVE ANY GRATUITIES BECAUSE YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO EAT ON \$7.00 A DAY FOR TRAVELLING ANYWAY. AT ANCHORAGE WHERE I HEAR HONOURABLE MEMBERS WENT, IT WAS A \$35.00 PER DAY PER DIEM. THE HOTEL ROOM WAS \$34.00 A DAY SO THAT GAVE THE MAGNIFICENT SUM OF \$1.00 FOR MEMBERS TO BE ABLE TO EAT, TO BE ABLE TO TRY TO GET AROUND THE CITY OF ANCHORAGE AND LET'S BE SENSIBLE ABOUT THIS. IF YOU'RE GOING TO SEND A GUY OUT ON TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, YOU EXPECT TO HAVE TO USE SOME OF YOUR OWN MONEY, BECAUSE IT'S DAMN EXPENSIVE TO TRAVEL. BUT CERTAINLY YOU SHOULDN'T BE HITTING MEMBERS THAT COUNCIL SENT OUT TO DO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU'RE WORKING TO HAVE THEM COME UP WITH THEIR OWN MONEY WHEN THEY'RE TRAVELLING ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS AND THE ONLY WAY THAT I CAN SEE THAT WE POSSIBLY CAN COME UP WITH SOME RATIONALITY FROM THE TRIP THAT WE TOOK ON THE REQUEST OF COUNCIL BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE WAS THAT THERE WAS A MOTION PASSED WHERE THE STANDING COMMITTEE WOULD ACCEPT NORMAL TRAVELLING EXPENSES. SO THE TERRITORY DOESN'T LOOK LIKE IT'S GOING TO GET STUCK WITH ONE CENT OF THE TRIP DOWN THERE AND PERHAPS WE ARE GOING TO REIMBURSED A MUCH MORE CLOSER SUM TO WHAT WE ACTUALLY SPEND THAN WE WOULD IF WE WERE TRAVELLING UNDER THE RULES AND REGULATIONS MADE FOR MEMBERS DOING COUNCIL BUSINESS. NOW CERTAINLY MR. TREASURER, NOT EVEN THE LOWLIEST OF CIVIL SERVANTS GETS TREATED IN THIS RESPECT. THEY CAN USUALLY RECOVER AT LEAST THEIR OUT OF POCKET EXPENSES WHICH ISN'T EVEN GIVEN THE RIGHT TO MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL TRAVELLING ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS TO DO. AND I THINK THAT THIS HAS GOT TO BE LOOKED AFTER BECAUSE AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, YOU KNOW, WHO WANTS TO GO TO OTTAWA IN THE FIRST PLACE. IT'S NOT REALLY WHAT I CONSIDER FUN SEEING CANADA TO BEGIN WITH. AND THEN WHEN YOU GO DOWN THERE, YOU CAN'T EVEN AFFORD TO GO OUT AND HAVE A GOOD MEAL, IF YOU CAN FIND A GOOD RESTAURANT IN OTTAWA WITHOUT GOING ACROSS THE HALL.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: COULD WE HAVE QUIET IN THE GALLERY PLEASE.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD POINT OUT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT THE PER DIEM RATE SET FOR THE COUNCIL MEMBERS WHILE ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS WAS SET BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THEMSELVES.

Mr. MCKINNON: WELL IT'S GOT TO BE CHANGED. IT'S RIDICULOUS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON ESTABLISHMENT 120 ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES? THE NEXT ITEM IS LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$95,000. I BELIEVE THERE IS SOME INFORMATION FORTHCOMING ON THIS QUESTION. WHEN IS THIS GOING TO BE AVAILABLE?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'M NOT AWARE OF ANY INFORMATION STILL TO COME.

Mr. TANNER: I THINK WE DISCUSS THAT FURTHER ON IN THE BUDGET. I DON'T RECALL ANY FURTHER INFORMATION THAT WAS REQUIRED.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WHO ARE THEY? YOU KNOW THE TOTAL PICTURE. IT'S ALWAYS BEEN STATED WHEN THE QUESTION HAS BEEN RAISED THAT LATER ON WE WOULD BE LEARNING THESE THINGS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: BUT THAT CAME. NOW I THINK WE ARE LOOKING FOR THE PROFESSIONAL AND SPECIAL SERVICES. HOW WAS THAT BROUGHT ABOUT?

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE'VE TABLED SO MUCH PAPER IN COUNCIL THAT I'M LOOSING TRACK BUT I'M PRETTY CERTAIN THAT WE DID TABLE SOMETHING FOR HONOURABLE MEMBERS BUT WE'RE SHOWING A BREAKDOWN, DIDN'T WE?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: NOT THAT I RECALL.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'M NOT AWARE OF ANY OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS. I REMEMBER DEALING WITH THIS AT THE SUPPLEMENTARY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IN THAT CASE, COULD WE GET SOME INDICATION AND WHAT IS THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR \$45,000 THAT IS INDICATED THAT IS GOING TO BE SPENT?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW IF WE'VE GOT AN EXACT BREAKDOWN OF THIS. BUT THIS WAS FUNDS TO COVER THE HIRING OF FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAD MISS CRUIKSHANK ON STAFF WHO DID THAT

PAPER ON "THROUGH THE EYES OF STRANGERS" AND IT WAS TO COVER A PART TIME LEGAL COUNSEL, NAMELY DAVID ELLIOTT WHO WAS BACK AND WORKING WITH THE LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT AND IT'S FOR THAT TYPE OF STUDY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: \$45,000?

Mr. MILLER: WELL Mr. CHAIRMAN, NOBODY AT THIS STAGE KNOWS EXACTLY WHAT WE MAY HAVE TO UNDERTAKE AS A RESULT OF NEGOTIATIONS, WHAT TYPE OF STUDY. NOW WE HAVE DONE CERTAIN THINGS AND TO THIS POINT WE ARE CONTINUING TO DO WHATEVER WE FEEL IS NECESSARY OR WHATEVER THE LAND CLAIMS SECRETARIAT FEELS IS NECESSARY TO HAVE BACKGROUND INFORMATION AVAILABLE. BUT IF THERE'S SOME PARTICULAR FUNCTION COMES UP OR PARTICULAR SUBJECT COMES UP AFTER THE LAND CLAIMS NEGOTIATION IS TABLED IT MAY REQUIRE FURTHER STUDIES OF A DETAILED NATURE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL Mr. CHAIRMAN, EARLIER ON IN THE SESSION, THE COMMISSIONER HAD INDICATED THAT HE WAS GOING TO PROVIDE SOME INFORMATION ON THE LAND CLAIMS TO COUNCIL AND I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT THAT SOME OF THIS INFORMATION WOULD HAVE BEEN IN THERE, BUT WE HAVEN'T RECEIVED ANYTHING.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I APOLOGIZE TO THE HOUSE AND IT DID MISLEAD THE HOUSE. IT WAS ANOTHER COMMITTEE, WITH SO MANY OF THEM AROUND HERE, SOMETIMES YOU CAN GET MUDDLED UP. THE PAPER THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER REQUESTED IS COMING TO COUNCIL.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I'M WONDERING HOW MANY SALARIES AND WAGES FOR INSTANCE ARE \$27,400 AND FROM THE CHAIR, I'M WONDERING WHO IS THIS COMPOSED OF? WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE A RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR, A DRAFTSMAN ON A CASUAL BASIS, A CLERK TYPIST II CASUAL BASIS PRESENTLY EMPLOYED IN THIS SECRETARIAT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: AND WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE?

Mr. MILLER: THE RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR IS GEORGE PRIVETT AND I'M AFRAID I DON'T KNOW THE OTHER TWO NAMES Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: BUT DIDN'T Mr. PRIVETT TAKE THE PLACE OF DAVID ELLIOTT? HE TOOK THE PLACE OF DAVID ELLIOTT. WHY ARE WE SAYING Mr. ELLIOTT'S GOING TO BE IN THE PROFESSIONAL AND SPECIAL SERVICES IN THE \$45,000 UNIT?

HERE WE ARE DEALING WITH THE SAME OFFICE IN TWO OF THE ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elliott will do professional research and present it to the Secretariat.

Mr. Chairman: Well I for one, would certainly like to see this paper and have some verification as to just what the function of the Land Claims Secretariat is. I think all that we have learned really is that these services are available also to Councillor George Shaw as well as to the Commissioner.

Mr. Miller: That's correct Mr. Chairman, and eventually the material that they are presenting will become public information. But I will follow up on that paper, that the Commissioner committed. . .

Mr. Chamberlist: What rental of lands and buildings are being used in this particular item?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there is office space being rented in the Main Steele Building for the Secretariat. I might point out Mr. Chairman that these funds are 100% recoverable from Indian Affairs.

Mr. Chairman: I think more interesting is is what it's doing and how it's doing.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that will all be in the paper that is to be presented. I will follow up after Council.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I would like to show all members the only reason the paper isn't here right now because it's been such a weight of papers and such a weight of questions that that's just one that we haven't got. But it's on its way.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well I got 19 that I'm waiting for.

Mr. Chairman: Are you clear on Establishment 122?

The next item is Establishment 124, Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee - \$34,980. This is 100% recoverable?

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McKinnon: Well Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly now looking forward with interest to the work of the Federal Interdepartmental Co-ordinating Committee in its first year of operation because it's my opinion that there is less and less co-ordination of Federal and Territorial activity in the North. I think we have seen example after example after example in the last few months of where the Federal Government didn't have a clue as to what the Territorial Government was doing and vice versa. Probably even more often the Territorial Government didn't have a clue of what the Federal Government was doing.

When I see the mass of bureaucrats that are moving into Whitehorse, and just taking over every aspect of Yukoners' lives, there is sure going to be a heck of a lot more money than \$34,980 to try and co-ordinate the activities between the proliferations of departments. I think how many did I catch in this Government activities in the North--some several hundreds of departments. All studying mosquitos and different land use and different mammals. I'm sure that the Territorial Government at the time really doesn't realize and isn't involved enough or worried, the extent of the Federal Government's involvement more and more and more every year in the lives of Yukoners.

Without a doubt there is no question in my mind. In the 17 years that I've been here, that we are further, much further away from the day of Yukoners controlling their own destiny than we were 17 years ago because every time Digby brings in another 20 cats to run around the Yukon and nobody knowing where they are going a law completely unto themselves, then the plight of the Yukoners gets further and further away from some day having some control over their affairs.

As I say, I don't think there is any possible way that the Territorial Government will have one iota more of a clue of what is actually happening in the Yukon Territory. It will be an interesting facet to see whether there can be any control and interesting to see whether there can be any co-operation and any co-ordination between Federal and Territorial activities in the North. I just think, as I say, we are just coming further and further and further away of ever having a say in what should actually be happening in the lives of the constituents we represent.

Mr. Chairman: Clear on this item?

Mr. McKinnon: No, I can't understand it.

Mr. Chairman: The next item is Public Enquiries, \$1. Just from the Chair, how many requests were made of the Government of the Yukon Territory during the last fiscal year, indeed for a public enquiry?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman to my knowledge, one, I'm not sure that was in the last fiscal year. The expenditures were incurred in the last fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman: These are requests?

Mr. Miller: The only enquiries that we've ever carried out under this particular section is the Hobbs Enquiry. To my knowledge, we have never received, we have not received any requests.

Mr. Chairman: The next item is Establishment 150, Plebiscites, \$1. Establishment 160, Personnel Office, \$478,400. A breakdown of some of the information on A-12.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman I wonder if Mr. Chairman could give some direction on a question that I would ask of him. When asking questions about Executive Committee Members, in relation to this particular expenditure, would that be considered to be confidential or personnel matter or would we have the right to question the basis that we are questioning Members of an Executive Committee that purports to be the Government?

Mr. Chairman: I think that would largely depend on the nature of the question proposed. The Government have embarked on a program of security and in doing so they have asked that some Members, certainly of the Executive Committee and the Finance Committee to take an oath to secrecy in some matters. That would be in matters which come to their knowledge which by virtue of the position they hold. It would be rather difficult from the Chair, to give too much guidance in that direction unless he knew really the nature of the question. I would suggest that no one is on trial here and we will just have to take the questions one by one, and deal with them at that time.

Mr. Chamberlist: The reason why I'll put this question is because the detail that shows under the Personnel Office, the reason follows, 'to provide for the operation of

the centrally co-ordinated personnel program and to perform the statutory requirements of the Public Staff and the Staff Relations Ordinance.' This is my question which I won't put it. I will ask Mr. Chairman to say it's a valid question first. It is in relation to the, what purports to be the termination of Mr. Fleming and its relation to the Public Service and Staff Relations Ordinance which has been breached completely. I'll stop and get an opinion from Mr. Chairman. I don't want to press the point if Mr. Chairman feels that I shouldn't be relating the person and Public Service and Staff Relations Ordinance but I'm simply putting it because it indicates that it deals with the statutory requirements of the Public Service and Staff Relations Ordinance that I raise the query.

Mr. Chairman: I think from the Chair, that the question seems a reasonable one. I want to be abundantly fair to everyone but if there is some problem relating to the operation of the Personnel Department in letting someone go and taking some action certainly all Members have a right to question that. I think that one must be very careful that we don't get on a vendetta in doing so, as some question could be out of order. I don't know that until I hear the questions. I would think that it is entirely that every Member is intitled to question any part of the Personnel Office except where they get into confidential areas.

Mr. Chamberlist: I'll let it go Mr. Chairman because I propose to give a file to every Member of Territorial Council dealing with Mr. Fleming's termination. It will give an opportunity to even the Members of the Executive Committee, who I am sure have not read all the correspondence because it has never been given to them both ways as to what, and what manner, the Public Service and Staff Relations Ordinance has been breached. Also the policies of the Commissioner.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Personnel? The next item is Accommodation Services, \$532,509.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman for a Government that once had the policy in mind in attempting to get out of the Accommodations business altogether, we are making some pretty good jumps year by year from \$411,000 in 72-73, to \$532,509 in 74-75, I take it now that the policy intention of the Yukon Territorial

GOVERNMENT IS NOT TO GET OUT OF THE HOUSING BUSINESS. I AM WONDERING JUST HOW FAR THEY ARE PREPARED TO GO. WHETHER IT WILL FINALLY END UP IN THE BUDGET AT SEVERAL MILLIONS OF DOLLARS PER YEAR AS THEY CONTINUE TO PROVIDE ACCOMODATION FOR TERRITORIAL PUBLIC SERVANTS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN OUR POLICY IS NOT CHANGED IN THIS REGARD. WE ARE STILL ATTEMPTING TO GET OUT OF THE ACCOMODATION BUSINESS WHEREVER WE CAN. THE PROBLEM THAT WE ARE CONSTANTLY FACED WITH IS LACK OF HOUSING IN THE YUKON. I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MADE A VERY GOOD COMMENT ON THAT THIS MORNING. I'M TALKING A GENERAL LACK OF HOUSING. WE CAN'T GET HOUSING, WE CAN'T RENT IT FOR OUR TERRITORIAL EMPLOYEES OUTSIDE OF WHITEHORSE, SO WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO BUILD IT.

IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA, WE ARE GRADUALLY AND I SAY GRADUALLY, GETTING OUT OF THE ACCOMODATION BUSINESS. WE HAVE TURNED BACK IN THE LAST TEN MONTHS, SOMETHING LIKE 8 OR 10 OF THE TAKHINI AREA FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS. WE WOULD HOPE TO TURN MORE BACK DURING THE COURSE OF THIS YEAR.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK SOME OF THE REASON FOR THE INCREASE THIS YEAR, IS THE FACT THAT THE TAKEOVER OF THE HOUSES ON THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, WHICH WE ARE CONDITIONED TO THINKING. THAT IS WHY THERE IS AT LEAST \$100,000. I THINK YOU WILL FIND AN INCREASE THERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: LAST YEAR WE DID THAT.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS CORRECT. WE, IN PREVIOUS YEARS, THE ALASKA HIGHWAY HOUSING WAS OPERATED OUT OF HIGHWAY FUNDS, IN OTHER WORDS IT WASN'T APPROPRIATED IN THIS APPROPRIATION HERE. IT WAS APPROPRIATED UNDER THE ALASKA HIGHWAY.

MR. MCKINNON: IS IT STILL RECOVERABLE UNDER THE ALASKA HIGHWAY AGREEMENT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THERE IS A LOSS ON THOSE UNITS, YES. IN FACT, LAST YEAR, THERE WAS A PROFIT ON THE UNITS. IF THERE IS A LOSS, IT IS RECOVERABLE UNDER THE ALASKA HIGHWAY AGREEMENT. WHAT WE'VE ATTEMPTED TO DO IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA IS GET ACCOMODATION SERVICES RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL THE HOUSING THAT WE CAN. AS A RESULT, WE DID TRANSFER A LOT OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY HOUSING. THIS WAS DONE IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY FROM THE ALASKA HIGHWAY APPROPRIATION TO THIS APPROPRIATION.

I MIGHT POINT OUT FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S BENEFIT THAT THE RECOVERIES UNDER THIS PROGRAM ARE \$496,000. SO THE TOTAL DEFICIT THE GOVERNMENT BEARS IS \$36,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT THAT RECOVERY INCLUDES FOR THE, LET ME TRY IT AGAIN. THE RECOVERY IS NOT ONLY RECOVERY FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUT RECOVERY FROM THE TENANTS OR RENT. THIS WAS THE SAME THING IN ANY EVENT WHEN IT WAS ATTACHED TO THE HIGHWAY APPROPRIATION. SO IT IS NOTHING SPECIAL. ITS BEEN TRANSFERRED FROM ONE TO THE OTHER.

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT DOESN'T ANSWER THE QUESTION AS I UNDERSTAND IT FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST. IT SEEMS THAT THERE IS A CONTINUATION OF THE USAGE OF STAFF HOUSING. I WOULD LIKE TO FIND OUT, MR. CHAIRMAN, HOW MANY MEMBERS ARE IN STAFF HOUSING IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA. MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE, WHO ARE THERE OVER THE TWO YEARS THAT THE POLICY REQUIRES THAT THEY BE THERE FOUR, NO LONGER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY FIVE OF US.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO GET AT BECAUSE I UNDERSTAND THAT MR. MILLER IS IN THERE FOR NEARLY FIVE YEARS. I'M JUST TRYING TO FIND OUT WHY THE SPECIAL DISPENSATION IS BEING GIVEN TO HIM BECAUSE IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT IN THE POLICY MANUAL, THERE IS A REQUIREMENT THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER GIVES THE INSTRUCTION AS TO WHETHER THEY CAN STAY IN THOSE HOUSES OR NOT. I WONDER IF HE HAS INSTRUCTED HIMSELF ACCORDINGLY.

MR. MCKINNON: APPARENTLY SO.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN. I'LL ANSWER THAT QUESTION. I WAS DUE TO MOVE OUT OF THE HOUSE LAST AUGUST. I ASKED TO COMMISSIONER FOR AN EXTENSION OF ONE YEAR AND IT WAS GRANTED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS THE SECOND EXTENSION?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS THE FIRST EXTENSION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I UNDERSTAND THAT ITS TWO YEARS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE POLICY WAS BROUGHT IN, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, 2 1/2 YEARS AGO. IT WAS A PHASED IN POLICY.

Mr. Chamberlist: When are you phasing out?

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Establishment 180? That gives us a total of \$1,678,876 for Vote 01. The next item is Loan Capital.

Mr. Miller: Page 67, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: This is in the amount of \$2,350,000. Detail on 67?

Mr. Miller: The detail of loans to the third parties is on page 67 Mr. Chairman. The detail for the Land Development, we previously covered under Project Capital. This may seem a strange way of doing it but we borrow the money needed to develop land. We show it as a Loan Capital Expenditure and a Recovery under Loan Capital and then we actually spend the money under Project Capital.

Mr. Tanner: Its very reassuring.

Mr. Chamberlist: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the City of Whitehorse are only borrowing \$125,000 this year?

Mr. Tanner: \$1,125,000.

Mr. Chamberlist: Just a minute now. \$125,000 over and above what they borrowed last year.

Mr. Tanner: They didn't borrow anything last year.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, they didn't borrow any money at all last year. We had an Appropriation of \$1,000,000 which was available to them. They did not borrow any money.

Mr. Chamberlist: There was no funds made available by way of loans to the City of Whitehorse last year, none at all?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the funds were available but the City didn't request any. These funds, I think as all Members know, we don't draw them down from Ottawa until they are actually requested by the municipalities.

Mr. Chamberlist: Have they indicated that they will be borrowing this amount this year?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I haven't seen any specific requests from the City, knowing their Capital Works Program and assuming that they

will get it under way, I would assume that this may not be enough. Until they actually request it, we just don't know.

Mr. Chairman: Clear? Loan Amortization on page 68. This is in the amount of \$4,714,400.

Mr. Chamberlist: How much of that money, Mr. Chairman, perhaps Mr. Miller could indicate, is in the bank in the Yukon Consolidated Revenue Fund at any one time.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman of these funds, none because these are funds that the Federal Government give us in the case of Federally Amortized Loans to pay them back, the Amortization requirements.

Mr. Chamberlist: That doesn't answer the question I asked. I know this. I said, how much of it is in the bank at any one time.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, nothing.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well surely Mr. Chairman it must go through the bank at one time or another. There is some interest on it.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman we have an arrangement with the Federal Government on this that they pay us each month, the amount of money that we are required to repay to them each month. I might point out, for all Members' benefit that our financial arrangements with Ottawa are subject to change for 1975-76 with regard to Project Capital Borrowing. The proposal which approved by Cabinet a matter of a few months ago, is that the Territories will now be treated, I shouldn't probably use that word. The financing of the Territories in terms of Project Capital and of Crown Corporations will no longer be in the way of Federally Amortized Loans. The Capital funding will now come to us in the way of grants. All of our outstanding Federally Amortized Loans for Project Capital, these would be the items that we are paying the \$4,000,000 back to the Federal Government this year, will be written off the books of the Federal Government as of March 31, 1975.

Mr. Chamberlist: Does this mean then that the balance that is left over from the original sure award system for the City of Whitehorse will be written off by way of a grant?

Mr. Miller: No, Mr. Chairman, because that is a Territorial Amortized Loan, not a Federally Amortized Loan.

Mr. Chamberlist:

IT WAS TERRITORIAL AMORTIZED THAT THE MONEY WAS BORROWED FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT AND THEN LOANED TO THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE. IS THIS CORRECT?

Mr. Miller: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT THIS WILL MEAN IS THAT ANY LOANS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS GIVEN US THE MONEY FOR WHICH FALL INTO THE CATEGORY OF PROJECT CAPITAL, IN OTHER WORDS, WE ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE, OR THE CITY IS NOT RESPONSIBLE, WILL BE WRITTEN OFF THE BOOKS.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER TALKS ABOUT THE WATER AND SEWER, I DON'T HAVE THE DETAILS HERE, I WOULD HAVE TO SEE WHICH CATEGORY IT IS DETAILED IN BUT I HAVE AN IDEA THAT AT LEAST A PORTION OF THAT IS TERRITORIALLY AMORTIZED. BUT I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK UP THE SPECIFIC ITEM.

Mr. McKinnon: WHAT IS THE TOTAL VALUE?

Mr. Miller: THE TOTAL VALUE OF LOANS THAT WILL BE WRITTEN OFF, AGAIN I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT FIGURE BUT JUST A SECOND, I THINK I DO HAVE IT. THIS WAS AS OF MARCH 31ST, 1973 SO IT WILL BE A LITTLE HIGHER THAN THIS BUT IT'S 27.9 MILLION DOLLARS. SO, IF YOU WANT TO USE ROUND FIGURES IT WILL BE APPROXIMATELY 30 MILLION DOLLARS FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. Tanner: MR. CHAIRMAN, PERHAPS THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER WOULD LIKE TO JUST CONTINUE A LITTLE FURTHER TO TELL THE COUNCIL WHAT HE THINKS THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS NEW FEDERAL POLICY IS?

Mr. Miller: - WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE CAN'T OBVIOUSLY FORSEE ALL THE CONSEQUENCES OR POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCIES OF THIS. BUT OUR MAJOR CONCERN IN THIS AREA IS GRANT FUNDS NORMALLY ARE VERY DIFFICULT TO COME BY IN THE FEDERAL BUDGETARY SCHEME, WHEREAS LOAN FUNDS ARE NORMALLY RELATIVELY EASY. NOW, WE HAVE ALL THE ASSURANCES OF OUR OWN DEPARTMENT BUT THINGS WILL CARRY ON AS THEY HAVE IN THE PAST. HISTORY HAS A HABIT OF REPEATING ITSELF AND WE ALL KNOW OVER THE YEARS HOW MUCH TROUBLE WE'VE HAD GETTING SUCH THINGS AS DEFICIT GRANTS INCREASED FROM ONE YEAR TO THE NEXT. WE MAY HAVE A SIMILAR PROBLEM IN OUR GRANTS IN THE FUTURE. WE DON'T KNOW.

NOW, THIS SUBJECT WAS NOT A SUBJECT THAT WAS RAISED BY OURSELVES. THIS PARTICULAR THING RESULTED FROM A LONG STANDING CRITICISM OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL IN CANADA, AND HIS CRITICISM WAS IMPROPER ACCOUNTING TO PUT ON THE BOOKS LOANS WHICH THE RECIPIENT OF THE LOAN NEVER HAD THE

ABILITY OR WOULD PROBABLY NEVER HAVE THE ABILITY TO PAY OFF. SPECIFICALLY WHEN YOU DEAL WITH SUCH CORPORATIONS AS C.P.C., FINANCIAL CAPITAL COMMISSION. THESE WERE SOME OF THE MAJOR BORROWERS UNDER THIS PROGRAM AND THERE WAS NO HOPE OF THEM EVER PAYING OFF THE EXTENDING LOAN.

WE ARGUED THE POINT AS STRENUOUSLY AS WE COULD AND WE MANAGED TO GET THE POLICY CHANGED FOR OURSELVES FOR AT LEAST ONE MORE YEAR. THESE OTHER CROWN CORPORATIONS PARTICULARLY. THE REVISED POLICY CAME INTO EFFECT AS LABELLED FOR '74. HOPEFULLY, AND WE ARE CONTINUING TO WORK ON THIS, WE DON'T LIKE TO LOSE THE POSITION WE ARE NOW IN AND HOPEFULLY WE CAN COME UP WITH SOME BETTER ARGUMENTS AND MAYBE GET IT PUT OFF FOR A COUPLE OF YEARS MORE. IF WE CAN'T COME UP WITH SOME STRONG ARGUMENTS BETWEEN NOW AND NEXT APRIL, WE'RE STUCK WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR NOT.

Mr. Chamberlist: MR. CHAIRMAN, DO WE UNDERSTAND THEN THAT ONCE THIS \$30,000,000 IS WRITTEN OFF BY WAY OF A GRANT, THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WILL NOT OWE THAT MONEY TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AT ALL?

Mr. Miller: IN THEORY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS CORRECT. THEY WERE PAYING US TO DO THIS; PART OF THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT AND THIS IS ONE OF THE THINGS WE ARE SOMEWHAT CONCERNED ABOUT WHICH IS, HAVING WRITTEN IT OFF AND GIVEN US GRANTS, IF THIS TERRITORY IS EVER IN A POSITION TO BE ABLE TO START PAYING ITS OWN WAY, INCLUDING THIS COST ACCOUNTING WILL THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AT THAT TIME COME BACK AND SAY, "WELL, THAT'S NICE HOW ABOUT PAYING US FOR ALL THE PAST THAT HASN'T BEEN PAID OFF BY SOME OTHER APPROPRIATION." BUT THIS ISN'T ONE OF OUR CONCERNS.

Mr. Chamberlist: JUST TO FOLLOW IT UP, SURE. THEN I TAKE IT THAT WE WOULD BE SAVING A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY BECAUSE WE WOULD NOT BE PAYING ANY INTEREST ON THE MONEY THAT WE OWE NOW TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. HOW MUCH A YEAR, AVERAGE OF INTEREST WOULD WE BE SAVING BY THAT?

Mr. McKinnon: AND GIVE YOU THE MONEY FOR THE INTEREST TOO.

Mr. Miller: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, THEY ARE GIVING US THE MONEY FOR THE INTEREST. I THINK, IF YOU WILL LOOK ON PAGE 69 UNDER FEDERALLY AMORTIZED LOANS, YOU WILL FIND THAT 74-75, THE INTEREST IS 2.4 MILLION, THE INTEREST IS 1.6 MILLION DOLLARS. UNDER FEDERALLY AMORTIZED LOANS. NOW THIS IS

THE MONEY THAT THEY WILL GIVE US TO ALLOW US TO PAY THEM BACK.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE WILL ALL BE SQUARE AT THAT TIME.

MR. MILLER: YES, WE WILL ALL BE SQUARE AT THAT TIME EXCEPT THAT

MR. CHAMBERLIST (INTERRUPTS): I'M LOOKING FOR THE TRICK BECAUSE

MR. MCKINNON (INTERRUPTS): WELL THERE IS, THE TRICK IS SO OBVIOUS THAT I'M AFRAID THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HASN'T PICKED IT UP YET BECAUSE WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO ATTEMPT TO DO IS SAY, "NOW LOOKIT, YOU ARE ON THE SAME BASIS AS PROVINCIAL JURISDICTIONS FOR YOUR DEFICIT GRANTS", AND WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO IS WAIVE WHAT THEY SAY ARE THE PROVINCIAL TYPE REVENUES THAT ARE ACCRUING TO THE TREASURY WHICH ARE GOING TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INSTEAD OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT BECAUSE WE ARE NOT A PROVINCE AND THEN SAY, "WE'LL GIVE YOU THESE MONIES BACK IN PROVINCIAL TYPE GRANT. NOW YOU CAN DO WHATEVER YOU WANT WITH THEM BUT THIS IS ALL THAT YOU'RE GOING TO GET."

BY NEXT YEAR WHAT YOU WILL SEE IS BOTH AN OPERATING AND DEFICIT GRANT AND A LOAN CAPITAL GRANT LOCKED INTO ONE PROVINCIAL TYPE DEFICIT GRANT TO THE YUKON. AND WILL THERE BE A SEPARATE LOAN FUND OR WILL IT ALL BE ONE SUM COMING BACK AS AN EQUALIZATION PAYMENT, I THINK THAT IS THE TERM THEY ARE USING CONSTITUTIONALLY THESE DAYS.

MR. MILLER: NOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, FROM A DEPARTMENTAL STANDPOINT AND FROM THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE'S STANDPOINT, THERE IS NO INTENTION OF CHANGING OUR FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS AT THIS TIME OTHER THAN THIS ONE WHICH WAS IMPOSED EVEN ON THEM. THIS WAS A CABINET DECISION THAT WAS MADE AS A RESULT OF THESE PROBLEMS THAT THEY WERE HAVING WITH MAJOR CROWN CORPORATIONS.

THEY WEREN'T THE ONLY ONES HAVING A MAJOR PROBLEM. THEY WERE HAVING A PROBLEM WITH RESPECT TO THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AS WELL BECAUSE THEIR DOLLARS ARE NOT \$30,000,000 NOR \$160,000,000 AND THEY ARE DRAWING INTEREST AT THE RATE OF \$60,000,000 A YEAR. SO THIS IS, FOR THEM AND FOR THE CROWN CORPORATION, GREAT. WE SAY WE DON'T WANT IT BUT THERE IS NO INTENTION AT THIS POINT, AND I MUST EMPHASISE AT THIS POINT, TO ALTER OUR FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS OTHER THAN

TO GIVE US THESE CAPITAL FUNDS IN THE WAY OF A GRANT RATHER THAN IN THE WAY OF LOANS. BUT THE FUTURE COULD HAVE SOME VERY SIGNIFICANT THINGS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THEN WE WOULD HAVE A DEFICIT GRANT FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS BESIDES OUR DEFICIT GRANTS FOR O & M. RIGHT?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT. WE WOULD HAVE TWO SEPARATE GRANTS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THEN REALLY THEY WOULD NOT BE DEALING WITH US AS A PROVINCIAL TYPE OF OPERATION BUT THEY WOULD THEN BE SAYING QUITE CLEARLY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT IS A CROWN CORPORATION, JUST AN AGENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT, WOULDN'T THIS BE?

MR. MCKINNON: WHICH IT IS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, WHICH IT IS. THIS IS THE WAY THEY WOULD BE HANDLING IT.

MR. MILLER: WITH RESPECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT ISN'T THE INTENT AGAIN. ONE CAN DRAW MANY THINGS OUT OF THIS BUT WE HAVE JUST GOT CAUGHT UP AS A RESULT OF HAVING TO CORRECT THE EFFICIENCY IN THEIR OWN SYSTEM. THAT'S BEEN GOING ON FOR SOME EIGHT OR TEN YEARS TO MY KNOWLEDGE AND WE HAVE JUST GOT CAUGHT UP IN THE WHIRLWIND END OF TRYING TO CORRECT THAT.

NOW THIS HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF A COMMENT IN THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORTS FOR AT LEAST SIX OR SEVEN YEARS. THEY FINALLY GOT AROUND TO DOING SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAPITAL PROJECTS UNDER THE OLD SYSTEM HAVE ALWAYS BEEN EASIER TO COME BY THAN THE MONIES FOR THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE DEFICIT GRANTS. NOW, WE'VE KNOWN THAT FOR YEARS AT THE YUKON GOVERNMENT LEVEL THAT YOU CAN SELL THEM A BUILDING LIKE NOTHING BUT TRY AND SELL THEM THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR THE UPKEEP OF THAT BUILDING AFTER YOU HAVE THE THING CONSTRUCTED, IT'S A DIFFERENT STORY.

NOW, YOUR DEFICIT GRANT O & M, AND IT'S GOING TO BE AS DIFFICULT TO COME BY, YOU'RE STILL GOING TO ASK FOR A DEFICIT GRANT CAPITAL AND THAT NOW WILL PROBABLY BE IN THE SAME DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY AS TRYING TO OBTAIN AS THE O & M GRANT WAS IN PRIOR YEARS. WOULD MR. MILLER CARE TO COMMENT ON THAT?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I can't help but agree that that possibility exists now. We have all the assurance of the Interdepartmental Committee that this won't happen but this was one of the things I really don't like about it. I think we will find it may be very difficult to get capital funds or at least more difficult than it has been.

Mr. McKinnon: Has there been any indication at all that the deficit grant in Capital, will it now be expected that the Territory raises the money to be able to pay the deficit grant back or is it in the grant form and the only difficult thing is in attempting to gain monies for capital purposes when it's in a deficit grant or on a deficit grant basis?

Mr. Miller: That will be the major impact. It's just an attempt to get these types of funds for capital. That will be the difficulty that we will experience.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one more question. The amount of the deficit grant that will be given for capital projects every year, would they try to follow the criteria they used for equalization payments for some of the 'non-have' provinces in Canada? Has there been any indication on that?

Mr. Miller: Well, I know that they are looking at funding or the financing of both the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. They have been doing comparisons with some of the provinces to see what we would be like if we were on a provincial basis, including equalization grants and those types. It's a pretty precarious system at the moment, in trying to get all the costs out and the revenue out and do any real proper comparison.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Miller, was there an elected member of the Executive Committee on any of these discussions with the Treasury Board?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there was very little discussion with Treasury Board. Mr. Chairman, with respect, the first we knew of this was a telex from our own Department saying the Treasury Board was going to Cabinet with this proposal. What were our comments?

This was dealt with by both administrative and elected people here and a reply went back and our Minister, in fact, took it up at the

Cabinet level and we got the year postponed.

Mr. McKinnon: But certainly Mr. Miller can see that the difficulty in how the Yukon could get sucked in because just upon every ongoing program that we have discussed in the Budget this year, Mr. Miller has been saying, "lookit, we'll try to sell Treasury Board on a long range project that we are putting forward and we haven't been able to yet but we hope that it will come this summer."

Mr. Chairman, if these projects aren't committed to a long term basis by Treasury Board you can see the writing on the wall and when it comes time for the deficit grant in Capital it's just going to be said that we have never agreed in principle to the ongoing programs that the Yukon Territorial Council and the Yukon Government has set up as a priority in legislation and we don't think the money should be made on a long term basis by a deficit grant for these priorities that the Territorial Government has given in the Yukon and boy, there were a lot of problems inherent in this change by Treasury Board in budgeting capital to the Yukon Territorial Government and next year particularly is going to be a year where there are going to be some real changes or whether ongoing programs are going to be allowed or not. And with the Freshmen Council, Mr. Chairman, there is going to be difficulty.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Miller could, correct me if I'm wrong in this particular thought that I have. The Federal Government when making provincial grants to a province, makes it when it is required as a deficit grant to make up the need. Equalization need. Now, they are doing that by way of capital but they don't do it by way of O & M at this time, as I understand, but when the Federal Government deals with crown corporations they do provide a deficit grant for capital and a deficit grant for O & M.

Are we going to be treated in that category? That is, a deficit grant for capital and a deficit grant for O & M because this, surely, must be the differences in my thoughts. That if they are going to make a deficit for both capital and O & M, we would in fact be in the same category as a crown corporation.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, what we will get is a deficit grant, starting next year, covering

OUR O & M DEFICIT.

ON THE CAPITAL SIDE WE WILL GET A STRAIGHT CAPITAL GRANT COVERING, SUPPOSEDLY, OUR NEED. NOW, OUR NEEDS OBVIOUSLY ARE FLEXIBLE WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT CAPITAL. THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS WE DEFINITELY NEED. THERE ARE OTHERS WHICH CAN BE SHIFTED FROM ONE YEAR TO THE NEXT.

I DON'T ANTICIPATE ANY PROBLEM IN THIS NEXT YEAR. WHERE I WOULD SEE THE PROBLEM IS DOWN THE ROAD AND IT MAY NOT BE THE YEAR AFTER, IT MAY BE FOUR YEARS WHEN SUDDENLY WE HAVE A WHOLE NEW GROUP OF PEOPLE, EITHER AT THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE OR IF WE HAVE A NEW GOVERNMENT AND A NEW CABINET WHO DON'T REMEMBER THE ARRANGEMENTS THAT WERE MADE THIS YEAR. NOW THAT'S WHERE THE DANGER IS ENCOUNTERED, IN HAVING TO EDUCATE THESE NEW PEOPLE IN HOW THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WORKS, HOW OUR FUNDING ARRANGEMENT WORKS. THIS TYPE OF THING. THIS IS THE DANGER. MAYBE IT WILL BE NEXT YEAR, IF WE HAVE ANOTHER ELECTION AND THE GOVERNMENT ...

MR. McKINNON: WELL ISN'T THERE ANY MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING SIGNED BY THE VARIOUS PARTIES PRIOR TO SIGNING OF THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, YES THERE ARE. THERE IS DOCUMENTATION ON THIS BUT AS SO OFTEN HAPPENS, A DOCUMENT BETWEEN ONE PERSON AND ANOTHER IS GREAT PROVIDING BOTH SIDES FULLY UNDERSTAND COMPLEXITY OF THE PROBLEM. IT'S WHEN YOU GET SOMEBODY NEW WHO DOESN'T HAVE THE BACKGROUND THAT YOU CAN GET INTO TROUBLE IN THESE AREAS. FOR THE NEXT YEAR OR TWO I'M NOT TOO CONCERNED AND I WOULD POINT OUT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT IF WE GET TREASURY BOARD APPROVAL FOR SOME OF THE PROGRAMS, SOME OF THE PROPOSALS WE HAVE BROUGHT FORWARD, FOR EXAMPLE THE COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, THAT WILL GUARANTEE US, SUBJECT TO, OF COURSE, NATIONAL EMERGENCY, WHETHER THERE ARE NO FUNDS AVAILABLE. MY ONLY COMMENT IS THANK GOD WE HAVE DONE A HECK OF A LOT OF OUR CAPITAL WORKS DONE OVER THE LAST THREE YEARS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE WE CLEAR ON THIS ITEM?

SOME MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF, ALRIGHT, AT THIS TIME WE'LL JUST BREAK FOR RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT HIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER.

VOTE 2 - O & M PAGE 10.

WE HAVE SOME ANSWERS FROM MR. MILLER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WERE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ASKED. ESTABLISHMENT 200 THE QUESTION WAS ASKED AS TO WHAT WAS THE ACTUAL YEAR TO DATE COST. THE TOTAL COST TO THE END OF MARCH, THE PRELIMINARY COST AND THESE ARE NOT ALL FINAL, BUT THESE WERE BILLS THAT WERE PROCESSED UP TO MARCH 31ST IS \$433,479. I HAVE A BREAKDOWN BY PRIMARY IF ANYBODY IS INTERESTED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, YOU ARE GOING TO SHOW SOMETHING LIKE \$433,000. YOU ARE GOING TO SHOW ABOUT \$40,000 AS NOT BEING USED.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I POINTED OUT THESE ARE NOT FINAL FIGURES. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE ACTUAL FIGURE WOULD BE BUT I WOULD GUESS THAT IT WOULD PROBABLY BE CLOSE TO, WELL LET'S SAY FOR THE SAKE OF ARGUMENT \$440,000, \$445,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AREN'T THE 74-75 ESTIMATES BASED ON A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF THE 73-74?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, BUT I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS THAT THE TERRITORIAL TREASURER POSITION WAS VACANT FOR THE BEST PART OF 1973/74 FISCAL YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WHAT DIFFERENCE WOULD THAT MAKE, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE ACTUAL EXPENDITURES OR THE ESTIMATED ACTUALS FOR 73-74 LET'S SAY \$445,000, YOU WOULD HAVE TO ADD A FURTHER \$26,000 TO COVER SALARY AND WAGES OF THE TERRITORIAL TREASURER PLUS FRINGE BENEFITS. THAT WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY, THAT WOULD PUT THE BUDGET APPROXIMATELY RIGHT ON. THE ACTUAL WOULD BE FAIRLY CLOSE TO THE ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR 73-74.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE WHETHER HE KNEW THAT THERE WAS GOING TO BE ABOUT \$40,000 DIFFERENCE WHEN THE SUPPLEMENTARY WAS ASKED FOR?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I KNEW THAT THERE WOULD BE A LAPSE IN BALANCE IN THIS PARTICULAR ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL THEN WHY DIDN'T WE ASK FOR \$40,000 LESS IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN SUPPLEMENTARIES WE ONLY ASK FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS OR WE FIND OFFSET. WE NEVER VOTE A REDUCTION UNLESS WE USE IT FOR AN OFFSET FOR ANOTHER PROGRAM, WITHIN THE SAME VOTE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AND WE DIDN'T USE THAT AT THAT TIME?

MR. MILLER: NO, THAT'S CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR ON ESTABLISHMENT 200?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN ESTABLISHMENT 201 THERE WAS A REQUEST FOR A BREAKDOWN INTO THE VARIOUS POLICIES THAT MAKE UP THE INSURANCE WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE \$46,000 OF PURCHASED INSURANCE. THE BREAKDOWN IS AS FOLLOWS:

BLANKET AUTOMOBILE POLICY	\$28,000
THE BLANKET AUTO FLEET IS	\$28,000.
FOR AIRSTRIP LIABILITY IT'S	\$3,000
THERE IS A COMMERCIAL BLANKET BOND OF	\$1,000.
WE HAVE BOILER AND MACHINERY AT	\$4,200.
WE HAVE NON-OWNER AIRCRAFT LIABILITY AT	\$600.
THERE IS GENERAL COMPREHENSIVE LIABILITY AT	\$6,400.
AND OUR GROUP ACCIDENT POLICIES AT	\$2,800.
TOTALLING	\$46,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THESE INSURANCES ARE WITH PRIVATE INSURANCE COMPANIES?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON ESTABLISHMENT 201?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HAVE WE EVER MADE A CLAIM AGAINST AN INSURANCE COMPANY ON THE AUTO FLEET BLANKET?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE MANY CLAIMS MADE UNDER THIS POLICY, EACH AND EVERY YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DO WE CARRY OUT THE REPAIRS OURSELVES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS COVERS THE THIRD PARTY LIABILITY. THIS IS WHERE A THIRD PARTY IS CLAIMING ON US. OUR OWN VEHICLES WE SELF INSURE THE REPAIRS. ALL WE REALLY CARRY

IS THE THIRD PARTY LIABILITY BOTH PROPERTY AND PERSONAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WHAT WOULD BE THE COMPREHENSIVE LIABILITY AGAIN AT \$6,400, WHAT WOULD THAT BE PURPOSED?

MR. MILLER: THIS COVERS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE GENERAL LIABILITY OF THE GOVERNMENT IF SOMEBODY FALLS IN ONE OF OUR BUILDINGS AND IS HURT OR THIS TYPE OF THING.

ONE OF OUR PRINCIPLES, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN INSURANCE IS TO REDUCE AS FAR AS POSSIBLE, OUR INSURANCE COSTS WHERE WE HAVE SOME CONTROL OVER THE RISK. WHERE IT'S A POSSIBILITY OF A THIRD PARTY MAKING A MAJOR CLAIM ON US, WE DO COVER THIS BY BUYING INSURANCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DID TRY TO ASCERTAIN, WHY WAS THE DIFFERENCE, MR. CHAIRMAN, SO LARGE THIS YEAR BETWEEN \$67,000 AND \$131,000. I DIDN'T GET THE EXPLANATION AS TO WHY IT WOULD BE INCREASED TO THAT EXTENT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE REASON FOR THAT IS THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION FOR THE PROVISION OF PAYMENT OF SUBSIDY TO PENSIONERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON ESTABLISHMENT 201?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS IN THE VOTE 2 AREA NOTED ON MY PAPERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. STUTTER WOULD YOU TAKE THE CHAIR A MOMENT?

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CERTAINLY HAVE A FURTHER QUESTION IN RELATION TO ESTABLISHMENT 202. ELECTRICAL RATE EQUALIZATION. AND WE OF COURSE DETERMINED ON OUR FIRST REVIEW THROUGH THIS BUDGET MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THERE IS APPARENTLY IN THE FUND, SOME \$1,250,000 ON THAT RATE EQUALIZATION FUND. NOW, IT WOULD APPEAR FROM THE 1972-73 ACTUAL AND THROUGH THE 1973 ESTIMATES THAT WE SHOULD HAVE SOMEWHERE IN THE VICINITY OF \$900 AND SOME ODD THOUSAND DOLLARS OR IN THE AREA OF A MILLION DOLLARS SITTING AROUND IN THAT FUND NOT DOING WHAT IT'S SUPPOSED TO BE DOING AND THAT IS BEING RETURNED TO THE CONSUMERS OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY IN THE TERRITORY, EITHER RESIDENTIAL OR INDEED POSSIBLY ANTI-COMMERCIAL. I THINK AT THIS POINT

IN TIME, IN THIS BUDGET DISCUSSION, WE MUST HEAR FROM THE ADMINISTRATION WHAT THEIR PLANS ARE, MR. CHAIRMAN, AND SHOULD ANY RESOLUTIONS OF COUNCIL BE NECESSARY IN GETTING THESE FUNDS BACK TO THE PEOPLE WHICH THE PROGRAM IS ALL ABOUT, THAT WE SHOULD BE DOING THAT AT THIS POINT. AND I'M WONDERING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF MR. MILLER HAS ANY INFORMATION HE COULD GIVE US ALONG THIS LINE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I RECALL THE DEBATE THAT WENT ON AT THE TIME THAT WE DISCUSSED THIS ORIGINALLY, WE GAVE THE COUNCIL THE ASSURANCE AT THAT POINT THAT WE WERE REVIEWING THE PLAN AND THAT WE WOULD BE COMING FORWARD WITH A SESSIONAL PAPER AND POSSIBLY A SUPPLEMENTARY TO COVER AN EXTENSION OF THIS PLAN. NOW SINCE HAVING DEALT WITH COUNCIL ON THE SUBJECT LAST, I HAVE DONE SOME FURTHER WORK ON IT. I STILL HAVEN'T COMPLETED MY WORK, BUT GIVEN A DAY OR SO, I CAN HAVE THAT DONE, AND I THINK THEN WE CAN COME FORWARD WITH SOME PROPER PROPOSALS TO COUNCIL. THE IMPORTANT THING, AND I THINK I POINTED THIS OUT PREVIOUSLY, WAS THAT IT'S A VERY COMPLEX SUBJECT, WE'RE IN A VERY COMPLICATED PERIOD AT THIS PARTICULAR JUNCTURE WITH THE YUKON ELECTRIC FRANCHISE AREA OR WHITEHORSE AREA FRANCHISE COMING UP FOR THE FIRST PUBLIC UTILITY BOARD HEARING. WE HAVE THE POSSIBLE IMPACT AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE, COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, ASKED IF I COULD BRING FORWARD SOME INFORMATION ON FUEL COSTS WHICH I'M STILL WORKING ON. BUT IT'S A VERY VERY COMPLEX SUBJECT AND I FOR ONE AM QUITE PREPARED TO BRING FORWARD TO THIS COUNCIL A PROPOSAL WHICH WOULD ALLOW US TO SATISFY, I THINK COUNCIL, AT THIS POINT AND YET NOT TRAP US INTO A LONG TERM COMMITMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF MR. MILLER CAN INDICATE HOW MUCH IN INTEREST HAS ACCRUED AS A RESULT OF THIS MONEY BEING IN THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND, MONEY THAT HAS TO BE RETURNED TO THE ENERGY CONSUMERS OF THE YUKON AND WHETHER THIS INTEREST IS ADDED TO THE AMOUNT SO THAT THE MONEY THAT IS CONSUMER'S MONEY IS GOING TO BE DISTRIBUTED INCLUDING THE INTEREST THAT HAS ACCRUED.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE THE FIGURE WITH ME AS TO HOW MUCH HAS ACCRUED BUT I CAN ASSURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT THE \$1,250,000 INCLUDES THE INTEREST THAT HAS ACCRUED TO THE FUND ON A MONTH BY MONTH CALCULATED BASIS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW THIS FOLLOWS THEN THAT WHY THEN IS THIS PARTICULAR ACCOUNT BEING TREATED IN THIS WAY, WHERE THE MONEY IS GOING BACK TO THE CONSUMER AND WHERE MONEY ON A DIFFERENT ACCOUNT IS NOT BEING TREATED THAT WAY.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN INDICATE THAT AT THE TIME THAT THIS EQUALIZATION FUND WAS PUT INTO EFFECT, THIS COUNCIL SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED THAT THESE FUNDS ACCRUE INTEREST. SECONDLY, THESE ARE FUNDS THAT ARE HANDED TO US IN TRUST BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO RUN AN ELECTRIC RATE EQUALIZATION PLAN AND THEY ARE FUNDS THAT COME FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY WE EXPECT THE INFORMATION THAT IS BEING COMPILED BY THE ADMINISTRATION VERY SHORTLY? THAT IS PRIOR TO ANY FINAL CONSENT OR OTHERWISE TO THE MAIN ESTIMATES?

MRS. VATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PROPOSAL THAT WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO COUNCIL REGARDING THE ELECTRIC RATE EQUALIZATION WILL BE SEPARATE AND APART FROM THE MAIN ESTIMATES, AND WE CAN ALWAYS VOTE A SUPPLEMENTARY IF NECESSARY. IT WILL BE A SEPARATE PROPOSAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY FROM THE CHAIR THAT I WILL HAVE PLENTY TO SAY TOO AT THE TIME THAT PROPOSAL COMES IN, BUT I MUST AGREE THAT IT DOES APPEAR TO BE OUTSIDE OF THE BUDGET. THAT IS A SEPARATE FUND AND THAT WE ARE HAVING A PAPER OR A PROPOSAL PUT FORWARD BY THE ADMINISTRATION. AS I SAY, I HAVE A WHOLE PILE HERE OF PAPERS THAT I WANT TO BRING IN AT THAT TIME THAT'S OUTSIDE OF THE PRESENT BUDGET.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PROBLEM IS THAT BOTH MYSELF AND CERTAINLY MOST PEOPLE IN THE YUKON TERRITORY ARE A LITTLE SICK AND TIRED OF HAVING THIS DELAYED ACTION. IT ALWAYS SEEMS THREE YEARS FROM THE TIME YOU EMBARK ON SOMETHING UNTIL YOU GET SOME RESULTS. I THINK EFFECTIVE THIS FISCAL YEAR, RETROACTIVE TO THE FIRST OF APRIL, THAT WE MUST FIRST OF ALL COME IN WITH A PROGRAM OF DISPENSING SOME OF THESE MONIES BACK TO THE CONSUMERS OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY AND IT MAY BE POSSIBLE THAT SOME COMMERCIAL USERS OF POWER COULD GET A BREAK OUT OF THIS AS WELL. I DON'T KNOW UNTIL I'VE SEEN THE PROPOSAL, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THEM RATHER QUICKLY BROUGHT BEFORE COUNCIL SO THAT WE CAN CONSIDER THEM.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the proposals will be brought forward during this session within a matter of a couple of days.

Mr. Taylor: Good. That's all I want to know.

Mr. Chamberlist: I would, Mr. Chairman, like to indicate that we can't say that it's outside the budgetary items for the simple reason that this item is a budgetary item. The provision for payment of equalization to Yukon Electric Company Ltd. Northern Canada, the power commission residential customers, it's dealing, it's a budget item. So to say that we have to deal with it outside the budget items, I think would be incorrect. Certainly the amount of \$1,250,000 is outside the budget items, but the subject matter is within the budget items.

Mr. Chairman: Maybe I misunderstood, but I understood that the \$1,250,000 is the amount of money that we are talking about.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, that's correct and I think that the proposal is that we will bring a supplementary in with the proposal and that's the way we can deal with it, other than what's presently in the budget and the amount that we are going to deal with this time in this vote.

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the amount we're dealing with here is the plan as it now stands. To change that plan, we would propose to bring forward a supplementary estimate.

Mr. Chamberlist: Where is that extra money shown in our government accounts at this time?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, these are shown as trust funds.

Mr. Chamberlist: Have we got an accounting sheet here of trust funds in this budget item?

Mr. Miller: No, Mr. Chairman, we do not.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well I wonder if we can see what other trust funds are in the government's hands at this time? Perhaps the administration would bring forward so that council can be made aware of all the funds that are in trust and being held by the government.

Mr. Tanner: I think the executive member can give us that right from where he is sitting.

Mr. Miller: Well I can't give you the precise amounts Mr. Chairman, but I can give you some indication of what we carry in our trust account. Basically, there are not that many. We handle under our trust accounting the public administrator's estates. We handle funds that are held by the courts, the sheriff or any of the courts go into the trust accounts. The electric rate equalization of course. The workmen's compensation would be in the trust accounts. If you will just give me a moment, I think I can practically give them to you verbatim off the records.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have, and I'll start at the top of this list. We have a general trust account which includes such things as contractor's deposits and this type of thing. There's the public administrator, there's legal affairs. We have some welfare trust funds, funds held for welfare recipients. We have the workmen's compensation. We have some child welfare trust funds. There is a tax sale trust fund. We have some trust funds, monies that were provided by the Canadian Chapter of Fi Beta, what is it? There was a library trust fund of monies provided by the Canadian Chapter of one of the national organizations.

Mrs. Watson: I.O.D.E.?

Mr. Miller: No, we have an I.O.D.E. trust fund for incubators. We have some library trust deposits. We have an I.O.D.E. trust fund for radio-stereos. Scholarship fund for the Northwest Highways system. Yukon Labour Standards Trust. Yukon Voyageurs Trust. Public Housing Trust Funds, that's about it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, why can't the administration provide two members of council with a list of these trust funds so that we have complete information of what the financial position of the territorial government is. If we were to raise any questions specifically on them then we have the opportunity to do so. Would it be difficult, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Miller to give us this information?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we can table a list of these funds.

Mr. Chamberlist: Thank you.

Mr. Taylor: JUST FOR CONFIRMATION AGAIN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE SAID THAT YOU WILL BE BRINGING IN PROPOSALS IN A COUPLE OF DAYS. IS THIS FOR SURE?

Mr. Miller: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, AS SOON AS I CAN GET SOME TIME AT MY DESK I WILL PROCEED TO PREPARE THE PAPER NECESSARY TO BRING FORWARD.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT WILL BE DURING THIS SESSION.

Mr. Miller: YES DEFINITELY.

Mr. Taylor: I SHOULD HOPE SO. THERE IS A \$1,000,000.00 IN THERE Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE AND SHOULD BE GOTTEN BACK TO THE PEOPLE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: NEXT OUTSTANDING QUESTION Mr. MILLER, UNLESS YOU COUNCILLOR TAYLOR WISH TO RESUME THE CHAIR.

Mr. Taylor: YES I WILL RESUME THE CHAIR.

Mr. Miller: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THOSE ARE THE FINAL ITEMS IN VOTE 2 THAT I HAD NOTICED UNLESS OTHER MEMBERS HAVE QUESTIONS THAT THEY HAVE. THE NEXT AREA WAS IN VOTE 3. WE ARE JUST CLEARING UP OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS.

Mr. Chamberlist: WE ARE USING A DIFFERENT FORMULA THEN. I THOUGHT Mr. CHAIRMAN WAS GOING THROUGH EACH VOTE AGAIN AND THEN ASK IF WE WERE CLEAR.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THIS IS JUST AN UPDATE ON QUESTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ASKED. THIS IS THE FORMAT WE HAVE ALWAYS USED.

Mr. Chamberlist: YOU DIDN'T START THAT WAY.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WE HADN'T DONE VOTE 1 BEFORE SO WE COMPLETED VOTE 1 AND ARE NOW STARTING BACK AND GETTING SOME ANSWERS TO WHAT QUESTIONS WE CAN. WE'RE GOING BACK THROUGH VOTE BY VOTE. NOW VOTE 3.

Mr. Chamberlist: LET'S CLEAR THE VOTE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: OKAY. ARE YOU CLEAR ON VOTE 2?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

Mr. Miller: ON VOTE 3 A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS.

Mr. Chamberlist: THIS IS ON EDUCATION?

Mr. Miller: THAT'S CORRECT. THE FIRST ONES WERE IN THE CAPITAL AREA, PAGE 58 A. Mr. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A QUESTION RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT 2301 - MISCELLANEOUS SCHOOL EQUIPMENT. THE INFORMATION THAT WE HAD BACK WAS \$30,000.00 WAS BROKEN DOWN AS FOLLOWS: SCHOOL FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT FOR STUDENTS' AND TEACHERS' DESKS, STUDENT LOCKERS, STUDY TABLES, AUDIO VISUAL EQUIPMENT, \$15,000.00. FOR SPORTS EQUIPMENT, PHYSICAL EDUCATION EQUIPMENT, PING PONG TABLES, GYM MATS, PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT, \$10,000.00. THERE WAS A REPLACEMENT OF BLACKOUT DRAPES FOR VARIOUS AUDIO VISUAL CLASSROOMS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,000.00.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'M LOOKING FOR MONEY IN THIS VOTE TO FIND THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM. HAVE WE BEEN SUPPLIED WITH A SESSIONAL PAPER WHILE I WAS AWAY ON THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM?

Mrs. Watson: NO, Mr. CHAIRMAN, YOU HAVE NOT BEEN SUPPLIED WITH A SESSIONAL PAPER BECAUSE THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM THAT'S DETAILED IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES IN THE EXPENDITURE FOR THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM IS AT THE EXISTING LEVEL. IT'S AT THE EXISTING LEVEL, THE FUNDING THAT IS REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN THE KINDERGARTENS THE WAY WE HAVE THEM TODAY. THE PROPOSAL WHICH WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD WILL BE A NEW PROPOSAL FOR A NEW KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM, AND ALSO AT THE SAME TIME WE WILL BRING FORWARD OUR MEANS WHEREBY WE HOPE TO RAISE SOME OF THE FUNDING TO PROVIDE FOR THE NEW PROGRAMS. IF THE NEW PROGRAM IS ADOPTED, WE HAVE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THE FUNDS THAT ARE BEING PRESENTLY VOTED IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES FOR THE EXISTING KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS. REALLY, THE PROPOSAL HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

Mr. Chamberlist: I BEG TO DIFFER, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER ARE YOU SPEAKING NOW ON THE O & M? I WONDER IF WE COULD CLEAR CAPITAL FIRST AND THEN WE WILL BE GOING TO O & M.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH YES. I THOUGHT THAT WAS CLEAR. OF COURSE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS ONE FURTHER ITEM AND THAT WAS ESTABLISHMENT 2316. AGAIN IT WAS A REQUEST FOR A BREAKDOWN. THE INFORMATION THAT I HAVE IS OF THE \$34,000.00, \$7,735.00 WAS FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF WORN OR OUTDATED EQUIPMENT; \$22,995.00 WAS FOR PURCHASE OF NEW EQUIPMENT TO EXPAND OR UPDATE EXISTING PROGRAMS; \$3,270.00 WAS FOR THE PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT FOR NEW PROGRAMS. THAT'S ALL THE QUESTIONS I HAD ON THE CAPITAL END, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DID WE HAVE AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION FROM THE CHAIR AS TO WHERE THAT PORTABLE POOL WAS TO GO THIS YEAR?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS HAS NOT BEEN DETERMINED. WE WILL ACCEPT APPLICATIONS FROM COMMUNITIES WHO DESIRE TO HAVE THE POOL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR ON CAPITAL?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE WILL GO TO O & M, PAGE 14.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIRST QUESTION THAT I HAVE IS ESTABLISHMENT 321 ON PAGE 17 IN CONNECTION WITH THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL. MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A REQUEST THAT WE REVIEW THE SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS AND THE RELATIONSHIP THEREOF. WE HAVE DONE THAT AND WE HAVE FOUND THAT THE FIGURES THAT WE HAVE ARE THE CORRECT FIGURES. THE REASON THAT THEY DON'T TIE IN EXACTLY TO THE 7% IS BECAUSE WE HAVE PEOPLE ON STAFF ON A CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENT. THOSE PEOPLE DO NOT QUALIFY FOR CERTAIN FRINGE BENEFITS SUCH AS SUPERANNUATION, SOME OF THE MORE COSTLY FRINGE BENEFITS I MIGHT ADD. WE DO DEDUCT THE NORMAL STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS SUCH AS U.I.C., C.P.P. AND THIS TYPE OF THING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT'S MOST DIFFICULT TO BELIEVE A DIFFERENCE OF \$240,000.00 IN SALARIES AND WAGES AND ONLY \$2,000.00 DIFFERENCE IN FRINGE BENEFITS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS CORRECT. I THINK IF YOU LOOK AT THE REASON FOR THE INCREASE OF \$240,000.00, A MAJOR PORTION OF THAT ARE CASUAL, CONTRACTUAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE RUNNING COURSES IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF EIGHT

TO TEN WEEKS OR WHATEVER THE LENGTH OF THE COURSE IS. THEY ARE NOT PUBLIC SERVANTS IN THE SENSE OF HAVING QUALIFIED TO PAY SUPERANNUATION AND THIS TYPE OF THING. WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT U.I.C. AND C.P.P. YOU ARE TALKING OF VERY, VERY LOW FRINGE BENEFIT COSTS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE SALARIES AND WAGES, AND NOW WE ARE BEING TOLD THAT THERE ARE CONTRACTS INVOLVED. WHAT DO THE CONTRACTS FOR THESE PEOPLE INVOLVE? WHAT TYPE OF WORK ARE THEY PERFORMING?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN I REFER TO CONTRACT I SHOULD SAY I'M REFERRING TO A CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENT. IT IS NOT A TRUE CONTRACT. WE HAVE AN EMPLOYER - EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP SO WE PAY THEM OUT OF PAYROLL, BUT THEY ARE TERM EMPLOYEES. THEY ARE THERE TO RUN A SPECIFIC COURSE FOR A SPECIFIC PERIOD OF TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT - THIS IS WHAT I AM TRYING - PERHAPS IF I CAN GET A STRAIGHT ANSWER TO A STRAIGHT QUESTION, I WOULDN'T HAVE TO REPEAT MYSELF SO OFTEN. I WANT TO KNOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHERE THIS \$240,000.00 BEING SHOWN DIFFERENCE FOR SALARIES AND WAGES IN ACCEPTING, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT MR. MILLER SAYS THAT THEY ARE SHORT-TERM EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE A CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP FOR A PERIOD OF WEEKS. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THAT WORK SO AT LEAST I CAN GET - DO A LITTLE FIGURING TO ASCERTAIN HOW THAT \$240,000.00 IS ARRIVED AT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD GLADLY ANSWER THAT QUESTION. YOU ARE LOOKING AT PAGE 21 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL MANPOWER. YOU ARE LOOKING AT COMMUNITY INSTRUCTORS FOR THE ELAKE PROGRAM WHICH I EXPLAINED WHEN WE WENT THROUGH THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET. WE ARE ASKING FOR 17 MAN-YEARS THERE; THAT IS REALLY 24 PEOPLE WHO WILL BE PROVIDING INSTRUCTION FOR A SPECIFIC TERM DURING THE NEXT YEAR. WE ARE ALSO - THAT 17 MAN-YEARS - WE ARE ASKING FOR AN INCREASE OF 4.5 FOR THE HOUSING EDUCATION PROGRAM WHICH IS PART OF THE PUBLIC HOUSING SCHEME. THAT MAKES A TOTAL OF AN INCREASE IN 22.5 MAN-YEARS. YOU ARE LOOKING AT REALLY 24 PEOPLE FOR THOSE 17 MAN-YEARS. THEY WILL BE IN THE COMMUNITY CENTRES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH DOES EACH ONE OF THESE PEOPLE EARN DURING ONE PERIOD OF TIME? I'M TRYING TO TIE IN \$240,000.00, AND I DON'T SEEM TO BE ABLE TO GET THAT.

Mr. Stutter: They are man-years.

Mr. Chamberlist: I know. I want to find out how much money these people are earning.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it also includes the rest of the people on the staff. You are looking at the normal increase that the rest of the people would receive. If you want the information on the rate of salaries, I may just have it with me. I will check. What the community instructors are receiving - I will be able to supply that. They received this year 185 instructional days, and they received \$3.88 an hour and they work a 7 1/2 day week - a 6 1/2 day week. 6 1/2 days right.

Mr. Chamberlist: How much is estimated that these people are going to be earning. I want to try and relate it to the amount of money that is suggested is required.

Mrs. Watson: You may go figure it out yourself.

Mr. Chamberlist: It's not for me to figure out myself. If the Honourable Member is so aware of her situation and figures, surely she has got the figures available. The point that I am making, Mr. Chairman, is this. Surmising that there is a normal increase in wages and salaries without these additional people that are going to be employed, I can see that there might be some justification for the difference in fringe benefits between \$35,700.00, and \$37,800.00. It seems a little bit short. If there are normal fringe benefits of some description that are going to be added to the other \$240,000.00 or so, there must be some amount of money. I'm just trying to find out what are the amounts of money that are involved. I have been trying to find this out for ten minutes. Somebody should have a figure of some description.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that information wasn't asked for when we went through the budget the last time.

Mr. Chamberlist: Oh yes I did.

Mrs. Watson: No, that was not. You asked to review the fringe benefits. Do you want it broken down what we estimate it to be? Well I suppose we can do that too. They are paid \$3.82 an hour and they are working for 185

instructional days. They work 3 hours a day. There are 24 people doing this.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, the question that was originally asked and, you know, when you first look at it, was a very legitimate one. The question was why were salaries going up and fringe benefits not going up. I think the Honourable Member from Whitehorse East asked the treasurer to review it. He has come back and said he has reviewed it and as far as he can determine, there is nothing incorrect about it. The Honourable Member from Carmacks-Kluane has gone one step further and said this is the actual details of it. These are the number of people. Sure that satisfies the Honourable Member that the information shown in the budget is correct.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I have my - the Honourable Member can look at it if he likes - I have my sheet marked; both those items, salaries and wages and the fringe benefits because I ask that they both be related to each other. This is what I am trying to ascertain. I am not suggesting that the money is not being spent. I just want to really find out how the difference between the figure of \$506,000.00 and \$745,000.00 comes about in view of the fact that the fringe benefits are \$2,000.00 difference. There must be fringe benefits including U.I.C. and C.P.P. for person who are on a contractual relationship as employees for nine months. There must be some fringe benefits involved.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the 22.5 man-years increase are all term employees; none of them are permanent employees. None of them would be receiving the excess of fringe benefits which normally accrue to an employee. This is why there is a difference.

Mr. Chamberlist: I don't doubt this. I'm simply trying to point out that between \$35,000.00 and \$37,000.00 that there is insufficient in there for fringe benefits if the other 24 people who were involved were also being consideration for U.I.C. and C.P.P. What I want to know is what is the figure for the amount of expenditure for these extra people?

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I think the treasurer has got the figures for this.

Mr. MILLER: No, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'M SORRY I DON'T.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS WE CAN BRING THAT BACK TOMORROW THEN.

Mr. TANNER: LET'S COME BACK TO THAT LATER ON.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: OKAY. WE WILL COME BACK TO THAT TOMORROW.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, ARE YOU CLEAR?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WAIT. WAS THERE ANYTHING ELSE ON THAT?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THERE IS A QUESTION ON 316.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A FURTHER QUESTION ON 321 ON MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES - GENERAL. THERE WERE QUESTIONS RAISED THERE. WHY THE INCREASE OF \$25,000.00? THE INFORMATION THAT I HAVE IS THAT MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES FOR THE COMMUNITY COURSES, THE BLAKE PROGRAM AND MANAGEMENT FOR ARTS AND CRAFTS IN THE COMMUNITY AND THE BLAKE PROGRAM, WERE, OF COURSE, A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN 1973-74.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NOW I DID ASK TWO OTHER QUESTIONS RE THE HOSPITALIZATION AND INSURANCE SERVICES, AND ALSO THE TRAVEL AND RELOCATION COSTS FOR THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES. ONE OF THEM - WHY ALL OF A SUDDEN WE HAVE HOSPITALIZATION AND INSURANCE SERVICES FOR \$6,000.00 WHEN WE DIDN'T HAVE IT IN ANY PREVIOUS YEARS, AND THESE THINGS ARE USUALLY TAKEN CARE OF NOW, UNDER BOTH OUR HOSPITALIZATION PLANS. THE OTHER ONE WAS WHY THE INCREASE? I THINK THERE WAS AN ANSWER GIVEN. IT WAS FOR THESE EXTRA PEOPLE, I THINK. I'M SATISFIED WITH THAT ANSWER. BUT THE HOSPITALIZATION AND INSURANCE SERVICES ONE - - -

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE ANSWER WAS GIVEN FOR THE HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE SERVICES - NOT HOSPITALIZATION, IT'S INSURANCE THAT WE HAVE TO PAY, THAT WE HAVE TO COVER UNDER OUR AGREEMENT WITH MANPOWER. THERE WAS A FURTHER QUESTION, Mr. CHAIRMAN, UNDER MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES DIETARY WHY IT WENT UP \$4,000.00. THE UNDERSTANDING THAT WE HAD WAS THAT FOOD PRICES ARE INCREASING. THAT'S ALL THE OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS I HAVE ON THAT MATTER, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: DID WE SETTLE THE PROBLEM OF SUBSISTENCE AND MAINTENANCE - THAT \$309,000.00 INCREASE?

Mr. MILLER: YES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, TO MY KNOWLEDGE WE DID. SUBSISTENCE AND MAINTENANCE TO MY KNOWLEDGE THAT WAS CLEARED.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: OKAY. APPARENTLY IN 319 WE HAD A BREAKDOWN PROPOSEDLY COMING FROM RECREATION AND AMATEUR SPORTS. WHEN WILL THIS BE FORTHCOMING?

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE ASKED FOR THAT TO BE PREPARED. THAT IS FOR THE 1973-74 YEAR. I'VE ASKED THAT TO BE PREPARED AND I WILL ALSO TABLE TOMORROW THE GRANTS THAT WERE EXTENDED FOR THIS YEAR OR THE COMMITMENTS THAT WERE MADE FOR THIS YEAR. THAT WILL BE FORTHCOMING.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST HAD A QUESTION RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT 316, KINDERGARTENS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I TAKE THE POSITION THAT WE CANNOT DEAL WITH KINDERGARTENS UNLESS WE DEAL WITH KINDERGARTEN COMPLETELY. THIS IS WHY I ASKED, AND I THOUGHT I GOT THE ASSURANCE, THAT WE WOULD GET THE PAPER SO THAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO DEAL WITH IT AT THE SAME TIME. AS I RECALL THAT WAS THE ASSURANCE THAT WAS GIVEN, THAT WE WOULD GET THIS PAPER. MY POSITION IS CLEAR THAT THERE IS NO REASON TO HAVE TO TAX ANYMORE THAN WHAT WE TAX NOW. THE COMMITMENT THAT WAS MADE BY BOTH COUNCILLOR WATSON AND MYSELF THAT THERE WOULD BE NO FURTHER TAXES OF ANY DESCRIPTION FOR THIS CURRENT YEAR ON NEW PROGRAMS. I SUBMIT THAT THIS IS NOT A NEW PROGRAM. IT'S A KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM THAT IS ALREADY, AND ALREADY HAS BEEN, IN THE BUDGET. WE HAVE TO FIND A WAY WITHIN THE MEANS OF THIS BUDGET TO REQUIRE - TO FIND THE FUNDS TO REQUIRE A COMPLETE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM. Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD EVEN CONSIDER THIS BUDGET AND THIS ITEM, AND PASS IT UNTIL WE HAVE HAD THE KINDERGARTEN - EITHER LEGISLATIVE RETURN OR SESSIONAL PAPER THAT HAS BEEN PROMISED TO US SO THAT WE CAN DEAL WITH BOTH ITEMS AT THE SAME TIME. THIS IS THE FEELING THAT I HAVE.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE ESTABLISHMENT 316 IN THE EDUCATION VOTE PROVIDES FOR FUNDS TO PAY KINDERGARTEN INSTRUCTORS' SALARIES, AND IT ALSO PROVIDES FUNDS TO BUY SUPPLIES AND MINIMAL EQUIPMENT FOR KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS. THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM IS NOT A PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. THEREFORE, WHEN THE MAIN ESTIMATES WERE PREPARED, THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM AS

Mrs. Watson: The kindergarten program is not a part of the school system. When the main estimate were prepared the kindergarten program as it exists now was budgeted for in the main estimate. I will bring forth a paper proposing a kindergarten program being part of the school system as was requested and as was recommended by the Committee on Education when they did their survey.

Almost 100% of the briefs that were presented to Committee on Education were that kindergarten should become part of the school system. And that they should have fully qualified kindergarten teachers operating these kindergartens within the school system.

Therefore I wasn't presumptuous enough to think that the Honourable Members would accept this extra expenditure that would be required, adding the kindergarten into the school system. If we want to change it and put it into the school system we are going to have to do it at considerable extra expense. That is why part of the proposal will be a taxation bill on tobacco to cover some of the cost of the extended program. It will be the decision of this Council whether they leave the kindergarten as it is now in the main estimate or whether they expand it to the extent that will be outlined in the paper.

If they decide to go with making the kindergarten part of the school system then the funds that are voted today in the main estimate will be credited to the expanded kindergarten program. That is why establishment 316 really can be approved at the existing level at this time. Then the new program can be dealt with as a new program completely.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we can accept that because there are three things that are involved now when we are dealing with kindergarten. We have a school ordinance that should be dealt with. We have the kindergarten item that is in the main estimate now and we have a sessional paper that we are walking in the dark. We don't know what is in there.

If the Honourable Member from Carmacks-Kluane would produce the sessional paper then

Members of this Council can weigh the situation and say whether or not it should be part of the main estimate. Whether or not we should find the funds within the existing educational vote.

If we don't do that we are going to be forced to say we are against kindergarten unless we tax on tobacco. This is what is being asked of us. An attempt is being made to force us up against the wall. To agree to taxation just because it would be improper for us to disagree that there is a necessity for full kindergarten arrangements to be incorporated within the education system.

It is not the proper way to do this. It is simply unfair to say, "well," and I know this is probably the thinking I'm am only questimating at this time, "they have to go with us because how can they be against kindergarten." This is the situation that every member of this Council finds himself in. He has to support kindergarten and by that way supporting taxation. Or he has to be opposed to taxation and by that way opposing the expansion of the kindergarten services. It is totally improper for the Executive Committee member to come forth and place this Council in that position. The only way that Council members, Mr. Chairman, can properly assess the situation is to have all the facts before them.

We are being asked now to pass what is in this main estimate for kindergarten and then wait at the pleasure of the Executive Committee as to when they are going to table the sessional paper on kindergartens. That, Mr. Chairman, is quite improper. I would ask members to support the principal that we have to have everything at our fingertips so that we know whether to agree with it or not.

I am not going to say at this time that it is not a sound proposition that is being put forward. I can't say whether it is a bad proposition that is being put forward. I can't say whether it is sound to tax tobacco for this particular purpose. I can't say whether it is not sound to tax tobacco for this particular purpose. I haven't got anything here to make my mind up on. I think that members of Council should be given the right to see what is the sessional papers.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, you are not being asked to make a decision at this time. You are asked to fund the kindergarten program at the ongoing level. Surely there wouldn't be a member here who doesn't agree that at least a kindergarten program shouldn't be funded at the existing level.

That is all we are asking. Many people find our kindergarten program as it exists today quite adequate. They don't want it to become part of the school system. This will be a decision that the Council will have to make when the proposal is brought forward. Right now, since 1968 you have been funding, the Council has been funding, the kindergarten program in the manner which we are proposing in our Main Estimate. You may decide to continue with the kindergarten as it exists in the main estimate. But let's make provision for that funding there.

Also, the Committee on Education, when they made the recommendations to have the kindergarten part of the school system, were very familiar with the cost of the kindergarten program as it exists today. It was at that time that they recommended that when the proposal was brought forward a proposal by which the funds could be provided to pay for this program should also be brought forward at the same time.

The Committee on Education were quite aware of the existing education budget. There were not adequate funds in the existing budget to pay for the type of kindergarten program that will be proposed in the Sessional Paper.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, it is a legislative trap. We have got to face up to it. It is alright to say that you approve what you've got now because it is exactly the same as last year. We have been forewarned in the opening address by the Commissioner that there is going to be a proposed attempt to tax on tobacco for the purpose of having more funds for kindergarten. My position that I am taking now is that when, because kindergarten is to be part of the school system that funds should be found in the Education Vote.

It seems to me most improper to suggest that never mind about what might come later, accept what you've got now. As I've already said that we could easily do that if we weren't forewarned. But we have been warned and I think that it would be very bad indeed for Council, knowing now that there is going to be an attempt to tax for the purpose of expanding the kindergarten system, for us to say, "alright we will go along with what we've got now without looking into everything that is concerned."

I would like to ascertain, Mr. Chairman, from the Honourable Member from Carmacks-Kluane what is the specific objection to supplying the Sessional Paper at this time. So that we can at least ascertain the why's and wherefore's of the program. And how much it is going to be needed for the expanding program, especially if she says whatever will be needed. The \$101,527,000 would be deducted from it and that the balance would be simply what is required. We haven't got those figures until we get the Sessional Paper which I take it would give us all this information.

Once we've got that it might be that we only need to find another \$100,000. As a result we could look at the educational program and see whether or not it can be got out of the education vote without having once more to burden the people of the Yukon with another tax. That is not unreasonable to ask and I can't see the objection to it coming forward.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying that we should accept a proposal to make the kindergarten a part of the school system. That is going to be the decision that this Council will have to make. I'm also saying that the kindergarten program that we have right now quite adequate. A lot of you may feel that it is quite adequate. I do feel, quite strongly, that we should not lower the standards that we have established for our school system within the Territory in order to accommodate a kindergarten program as part of the school system.

I think that it is very, very important to say that we will look at the rest of the education vote to see if we can find money for kindergarten program. If the education vote reflects the standard of education in

OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM, WHICH I DO NOT THINK SHOULD BE LOWERED, AND I THINK THAT IT WOULD BE IT WOULD BE A RETROGRATE STEP TO TRY TO TAKE MONEY, POSSIBLY FROM STAFFING, FROM OUR SCHOOLS TO MAKE THE KINDERGARTEN PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. I THINK THIS WOULD BE VERY WRONG. THEREFORE YOU HAVE TO TREAT YOUR KINDERGARTEN AS IT EXISTS TODAY. THE PROPOSAL WILL BE COMING FORWARD. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS VOTE AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T REALLY RECOGNIZE WHAT THE HONORABLE MEMBER IS SAYING AT THIS TIME. THE OTHER DAY, WEDNESDAY, SHE MADE REFERENCE THAT I WAS NICELY PADDING THE BUDGET OF THE WELFARE DEPARTMENT. I'M NOT GOING TO SUGGEST THAT SHE HAS BEEN PADDING THE BUDGET OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THAT WOULD BE PROPER OF ANYBODY TO SAY. WE ALL TRY AND GET THE BEST POSSIBLE FOR THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THE GOVERNMENT HAS TO SPEND. THE QUESTION IS ARE WE GETTING THE BEST POSSIBLE IF WE DON'T KNOW WHAT IS REQUIRED. AND WE DON'T KNOW THE BACKGROUND, WE DON'T KNOW WHY THE SUGGESTION THAT THE KINDERGARTEN SHOULD BE EXPANDED. IN WHAT AREAS IT SHOULD BE EXPANDED AND HOW MUCH MONEY IS REQUIRED? WE ARE PLACED WITH TRYING TO GET AN AGREEMENT TO PASS WHAT IS EXISTING BY WAY OF \$101,000 ODD DOLLARS IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES. NOW ON THE OFF CHANCE THAT THE COUNCIL MAY OR MAY NOT GO ALONG WITH A FULL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM.

ONCE WE PASS THIS ESTIMATE AND ONCE WE'VE SAID THAT THE EDUCATION VOTE IS SATISFACTORY WE HAVE NO WAY OF GOING BACK AND THEN SAYING THAT THIS MONEY COULD HAVE BEEN FOUND IN THAT PARTICULAR VOTE. THIS IS WHY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I FEEL THAT OTHER MEMBERS SHOULD INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE IN AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE SUGGESTION THAT I HAVE MADE THAT AT LEAST THE SESSIONAL PAPER COME FORWARD SO THAT WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE GOING TO BE FACED WITH AND FOR WHAT REASON WE ARE GOING TO BE ASKED TO SEEK EXTRA TAXES.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D LIKE TO HAVE THE FUNDS FOR THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM, FOR THE KINDERGARTENS TO BECOME PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM CANNOT BE FOUND IN THE

EDUCATION VOTE. IN THE REST OF THE EDUCATION VOTE. WE REQUIRE THE FUNDING. WE WOULDN'T BE ASKING FOR MONEY FOR THE EDUCATION FOR OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM IF WE DIDN'T NEED IT.

NOW, I COULD BE ACCUSED OF TRYING TO SORT OF BACK THE COUNCILLORS AGAINST THE WALL IF WE DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING FOR THE KINDERGARTENS IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES AND I CAME FORWARD WITH A PROPOSAL AND SAID O.K. IF YOU WANT KINDERGARTENS YOU'VE GOT TO RAISE SO MUCH MONEY THROUGH THE TOBACCO TAX. BUT INSTEAD, WE'VE PUT THE KINDERGARTEN IN AS AN EXISTING LEVEL SO IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS TURN DOWN THE PROPOSAL, WE STILL HAVE KINDERGARTENS AT THE SAME LEVEL. ALL THE FUNDS THAT ARE ASKED FOR IN THE EDUCATION VOTE FOR THE OTHER DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM ARE CERTAINLY REQUIRED. THERE IS JUST NO WAY YOU CAN FIND FUNDS FOR MAKING KINDERGARTENS PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM WITHIN THE EDUCATION VOTE AS IT IS NOW.

I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT IS TRUE.

MR. TANNER: A PROPOSITION BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF EDUCATION IS, TO MY MIND, A VERY REASONABLE ONE. IF YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A NEW PROGRAM, IF YOU'RE GOING TO DO SOMETHING QUITE ENTIRELY DIFFERENT FROM WHAT HAS BEEN ONGOING FOR THE PAST SIX OR EIGHT YEARS, THEN IT SEEMS REASONABLE TO KEEP WHAT YOU'VE GOT AND THEN GO ON IF YOU WANT TO. THAT'S THE DECISION OF COUNCIL AND I CAN SEE NO PROBLEM AT ALL ANDY ANY COUNCILLOR GOING ALONG WITH THE \$101,000 THAT IS BEING ASKED FOR THE PRESENT KINDERGARTEN SYSTEM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT COUNCILLOR WATSON HAS INDICATED IS THAT SHE WOULDN'T ASK FOR ANY MONEY IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM UNLESS IT WAS REQUIRED. THIS IS JUST EXACTLY THE SAME AS THE GOVERNMENT SAYING "DON'T BOTHER ABOUT LOOKING AT THE BUDGET AT ALL BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, EVERYTHING THAT WAS ASKED FOR IS REQUIRED. OTHERWISE WE WOULDN'T ASK FOR IT." IT BECOMES A RIDICULOUS SITUATION WHERE IT CAN BE SAID THAT EVERYTHING THAT WAS ASKED WAS REQUIRED. THIS MAY BE BUT WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO LEAVE OURSELVES IN A POSITION OF HAVING TO TAX THE PEOPLE AGAIN FOR SOMETHING THAT WE CAN'T FIND IN THE EXISTING VOTE SO I'M JUST SUGGESTING THAT IF SHE BRINGS THE SESSIONAL PAPER FORWARD, LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT IT. IT MIGHT BE THAT SHE'S RIGHT. SURELY YOU CAN'T DEAL WITH IT UNLESS YOU HAVE THE SESSIONAL

PAPER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY I SUGGEST THAT WE DEAL WITH ANY OTHER OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS THAT ARE IN THE EDUCATION BUDGET FIRST SO THAT WE LEAVE THIS TO THE LAST ITEM?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I THINK WE HAVE.

MR. MCKINNON: HAS IT BEEN INDICATED WHEN THE SESSIONAL PAPER WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE ON THE KINDERGARTENS?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE'RE LEAVING MANY OF THESE PAPERS UNTIL WE FINISH DEALING WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THEY ARE IN THE BUDGET, WE MIGHT AS WELL BRING THEM FORWARD.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK IF THE PAPER IS READY, AS IT SEEMS TO BE INDICATED BY COMMITTEE THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO HAVE IT READY AS SOON AS POSSIBLE SO THEY MIGHT CONSIDER IT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT HASN'T BEEN INDICATED BY COMMITTEE. FORGIVE ME, IT'S ONLY BEEN INDICATED BY ONE MEMBER. I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR THE OPINIONS OF THE OTHER MEMBERS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU HEARD COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE NO QUALMS AT ALL IN AGREEING WITH THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST IN THIS REGARD BECAUSE I AGREE IT WOULD ALMOST BE IRRESPONSIBLE FOR THE HONOURABLE WHO IS PURPORTED HAD A HAND IN PRESENTING HER OPINIONS AND HER PRIORITIES TO BUDGET PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE HAVING THEM ACCEPTED TO NOW COME ALONG AND SAY "OH, THERE'S PARTS OF THIS BUDGET THAT WE REALLY DON'T NEED AND WE CAN FUND OUR KINDERGARTENS OUT OF THAT."

CERTAINLY SHE BELIEVES IN HER OWN MIND AS BEING HEAD OF THAT DEPARTMENT EVERYTHING THAT IS IN EDUCATION BUDGET IS NEEDED AND SHE WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE IF THAT WASN'T THE TYPE OF BUDGET SHE THOUGHT SHE WAS PRESENTING. IT COULD BE, BUT WITH THE PRESENTATION OF THE KINDERGARTEN PAPER THAT A MAJORITY OF THIS COUNCIL COULD SAY, "LOOKIT, WE SET OUT AS A FURTHER PRIORITY AND THE MAJORITY OF US, THAT THIS MONEY COULD COME FROM THIS PART OF THE BUDGET, AND WE DON'T HAVE TO HAVE ADDITIONAL TAXATION AND WE CAN FIND THE MONEY IN THE CURRENT EDUCATION TO BRING ABOUT KINDERGARTENS AS ARE PRESENTED IN THE PAPER.

NOW, THIS JUST ISN'T AN IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION TO

HAPPEN. SO IF IT DOES HAPPEN THAT THE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL AGREED THAT IT SHOULD HAPPEN, AND CERTAINLY THAT IS THE WISH OF THE MAJORITY OF THIS HOUSE AND I SEE NO PROBLEM AT ALL IN BRINGING FORWARD THE POSITION PAPER ON KINDERGARTENS IMMEDIATELY SO THAT MEMBERS CAN EXAMINE IT BEFORE THE FINAL EDUCATION ESTIMATES ARE CLEARED IN THE BUDGET.

I'VE ALWAYS FOUND IT EASY AND I THINK ALL MEMBERS HAVE, WHEN PROGRAMS, NEW PROGRAMS COMING IN AND SESSION PAPERS ARE TALKED ABOUT IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THAT JUST SEEMS TO BE AN EASIER METHOD OF DOING THINGS. THAT WAY ONE GETS A MORE COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF THE TOTAL IMPACT ON THE YUKON IN THE COURSE OF A FISCAL YEAR. IF THE PAPER IS READY I CAN'T SEE WHY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULDN'T BRING IT BEFORE COUNCIL AT THIS MOMENT, PRIOR TO THE CLEARING OF THE EDUCATION ESTIMATE IN THE BUDGET WHICH WOULD BE THE NATURAL, NORMAL THING TO DO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

COUNCILLOR STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M IN A REAL DILEMMA ON THIS ONE BECAUSE I HAVE TO AGREE WITH THE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT I, AS A MEMBER OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AM SATISFIED IN MY MIND THAT THE EXTRA FUNDS FOR THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM ARE NOT IN THE EDUCATION BUDGET BUT AT THE SAME TIME I DO SEE A REAL DANGER IN HAVING THE TOBACCO TAX IDENTIFIED TOO SPECIFICALLY WITH KINDERGARTENS. IF WE DO END UP ACCEPTING KINDERGARTENS THEN ALWAYS FROM NOW ON THE TOBACCO TAX IS GOING TO BE PEOPLE SAYING "THAT'S WHAT IS FUNDING THE KINDERGARTEN." TO MY WAY OF THINKING, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN MUCH BETTER HAD WE HAD PLENTY OF INFORMATION AND LOTS OF TIME, WHICH WAS NOT POSSIBLE PERHAPS, THAT KINDERGARTEN, THE SESSIONAL PAPER FOR KINDERGARTEN MAYBE COULD HAVE BEEN PUT IN WITH THE BUDGET WITH THE ADDED AMOUNT AT WHICH TIME IT WOULD HAVE BEEN UP TO COUNCIL WHETHER OR NOT THEY WERE GOING TO ACCEPT IT AND ALSO THE TAXATION SHOULD HAVE BEEN IN.

Mr. Stutter: Sessional Paper for Kindergarten. If we do accept Kindergarten then always from now on the tobacco tax is going to be said, OK that's what's funding the Kindergarten. It would have been, to my way of thinking, much better had we had have plenty of information and lots of time, which was not possible perhaps, that Kindergarten, that the Sessional Paper for Kindergarten maybe could have been put in with the Budget, with the added amount. At which time it would have been up to Council whether or not they were going to accept it. Also the taxation should have been in the Budget. But now we definitely have a danger where the Kindergarten Program and the tobacco tax are always going to be interrelated.

Sessional Paper, when we are talking about introducing Sessional Papers with the Budget, in this particular instance the subject matter and a hair on guessing. The subject matter of this Sessional Paper really doesn't have anything to do with what is presently in the Budget. The subject matter of that Sessional Paper is outside of the Budget again. Its for a new program or an expansion of an existing program. It doesn't effect any make-up of dollars that are presently in this Budget.

Mr. Chairman: Councillor Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is very true. I was trying to be kind to the Honourable Members to leave the Kindergarten Program in the Main Estimates at the existing level, so that whether we have Kindergarten or no Kindergarten wouldn't be a decision that the Council would have to make. It would be an enriched type of Kindergarten program which is part of the school system.

I would also like to add that when the Committee on Education travelled throughout the Territory, and had briefs presented and had public hearings, that they also asked what source of funding would people indicate that they would be prepared to make, if new programs were brought into the educational system. Because it was their recommendation, quite strongly, the Committee's recommendation, that if the existing school system is enriched at all, then we have to look at the extra source of funding.

In almost 100% of the cases were briefs and public hearings where the public indicated what source of taxation they would be prepared to

accept to fund extra programs, they always reverted to a tobacco tax or a tax on liquor. This is why we've brought forward the tobacco tax. It was the public themselves who suggested this at the public hearings. It was also a recommendation by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman: In light, just from the Chair in light of the discussion in this matter, would the Honourable Member be prepared to table it tomorrow morning?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, with full respect I don't think it has anything to do with the Main Estimates. I would be very happy when the Main Estimates have been cleared through this House, that we will table the Sessional Papers, with the proposals and the Tax Bill and a Supplementary Budget, if the Honourable Members want to go along with it.

As I said before, we have quite a good Kindergarten program at the present time. Its just that its the general feeling of the public. It was the recommendation of the Committee on Education that Kindergartens be made part of the school system. I had to bring it before the Council to make that decision.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, Councillor Stutter was right and wrong in using Mr. Legal Advisor's words. He was right to say it's a program that is outside the Budget. But he was wrong to say that it's a new program outside this Budget because what it is, is an expansion of an existing program.

The fact that it is in this Budget, shows that it is something that we are dealing with. This is why I am being somewhat insistant that one cannot deal with the program and any expansion that might take place, until we know what are the financial reasons for the program to take place. The only manner in which this can be done, is by the Sessional Paper being brought forward.

If the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, from Carmacks-Kluane, is so concerned that the Sessional Paper has nothing to do with what is in the present Main Estimates that we are dealing with, why should she object to having us have the information ahead of time, if there's not concern. This should be the key thing.

WHY NOT LET US HAVE
WITH THAT TOMORROW.

MAN, TO FIGURE OUT THE
IS A COMMUNITY KINDER-
SUBSIDIZE.

ART, THE KINDERGARTEN
ON SCHOOL SYSTEM. TWO
ENT THINGS. THIS IS
ERE WE SUBSIDIZE THE
THE MATERIALS AND

IRMAN, THE HONOURABLE
THAT IF THE SESSIONAL
FROM COUNCIL, THE AMOUNT
TED, WOULD BE HALF OF
REQUIRED TO PUT THE
ECT. SO IT IS FAIRLY
IT ALONE THAT THERE IS
NEEN ONE AND THE OTHER.

BASIS OF WHAT SHE HAS
KN, WE HAVE TO GIVE
TO THE HONOURABLE
VE TO OVERNIGHT. THINK
E RIGHT AND PROPER TO
PAPER FROM MEMBERS OF
CISION THAT SHE MUST
T TO WITHHOLD THAT
WRONG BUT WHETHER ITS
ECIALLY WHEN SOME
SHOWN AN INTEREST IN
WE CAN PUT THE WHOLE
FROM THE REMARKS THAT
HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM
GOING TO BE LEFT IS
CCO TAX WITH KINDERGARTENS.

BER OF COUNCIL WANTS TO
ON, I REPEAT THIS BECAUSE
YING THAT I'M AGAINST
BECAUSE I'M AGAINST TAX-
UL FOR ANY MEMBER TO BE
I WOULD SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN
AT WILL HAVE TO HAPPEN.

MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE
BRING FORWARD THE
WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY
OUT.

CHAIRMAN, I STILL MAINTAIN
IS NECESSARY FOR THE
BRING FORWARD THE

SESSIONAL PAPER PROPOSING TO MAKE KINDERGARTENS
PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. WE WILL LOOK AT THE
FUNDING REQUIRED AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS
WILL THEN BE ABLE TO MAKE UP THEIR MINDS.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE'VE BEEN GOING
AROUND ON THIS ONE FOR ALMOST AN HOUR NOW AND
OBVIOUSLY THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION AND
OBVIOUSLY ITS NOT GOING TO BE SOLD BECAUSE THE
TWO OPINIONS ARE SO FAR APART. I SUGGEST WE
HAVE A SHOW OF HANDS AS WHETHER OR NOT TO
PROCEED, TO DECIDE TO PASS THIS OVER OR NOT
TO PASS THIS OVER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK THE CHAIR IS TRYING TO
UNDERSTAND WHAT THE WISHES OF COMMITTEE ARE IN
RESPECT OF FURTHERING THIS KINDERGARTEN QUESTION
AND THE TABLING OF THIS DOCUMENT. IF A MEMBER
REFUSES TO TABLE A DOCUMENT, THAT'S IT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T THINK THAT'S
A SUMMATION OF THE ARGUMENT. I THINK THE
SUMMATION OF THE ARGUMENT IS THAT THERE IS
TWO DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW RELATED TO THAT
ARGUMENT. IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WANTS
TO PROCEED AND TABLE THE DOCUMENT ON KINDER-
GARTENS OR NOT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH WHETHER
OR NOT WE PASS THIS VOTE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES IT IS.

MR. TANNER: THERE ARE TWO VERY DIRVERSIONED
OPINIONS HERE AND I HAPPEND TO DISAGREE WITH
THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE
OTHER MEMBERS INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT WE PASS
THIS ESTABLISHMENT 316 AND PROCEED WITH THE
BUDGET OR NOT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I REGRET THAT
THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH
SHOULD TAKE THE ATTITUDE THAT WE SHOULD HAVE A
SHOW OF HANDS TO PASS THIS PARTICULAR ITEM.
HE'S PUTTING BLINKERS OVER HIS EYES TO THE EFFECT
THAT THIS WOULD HAVE A RELATION TO THE PROPOSI-
TION THAT WOULD COME FORWARD AFTERWARDS BY WAY
OF A SESSIONAL PAPER. THE POINT THAT I MAKE
AND I MAKE IT STRONGLY, IS NOTWITHSTANDING
WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE
HAS SAID. THAT THE MONEY THAT IS IN THE VOTE
RIGHT NOW IS MONEY THAT IS NEEDED IN THE
EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. I WANT TO KNOW HOW MUCH
MONEY IS GOING TO BE NEEDED IN THE OVER ALL
KINDERGARTEN SYSTEM SO WE CAN KNOW HOW MUCH
MONEY WE WOULD NEED TO FIND IN THAT OVER ALL
EDUCATION BUDGET.

THIS, ONE IS UNABLE TO GET FROM HER. GIVE IT SOME FIGURES FIRSTLY. AT LEAST WE WILL HAVE SOMETHING THAT IS COMING FORWARD WHILE WE HAVEN'T GOT A SESSIONAL PAPER.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN TELL YOU RIGHT NOW HOW MUCH MONEY YOU CAN FIND IN THE EDUCATION VOTE FOR KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS. \$101,527. THAT IS HOW MUCH MONEY YOU CAN FIND IN THE EDUCATION VOTE FOR KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS.

AS I SAID BEFORE, THE EDUCATION VOTE IS FUNDS THAT ARE PROVIDED FOR OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. IF YOU THINK THAT YOU CAN FIND AREAS WHERE YOU CAN REDUCE THE FUNDING THAT HAS BEEN ASKED FOR AND STILL MAINTAIN THE STANDARDS THAT WE HAVE, YOU ARE INTO A VERY DANGEROUS AREA.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO TAKE AWAY, THREE OR FOUR TEACHERS OR FOUR OR FIVE CUSTODIAL WORKERS OR SOMETHING LIKE THIS SO YOU CAN FUND THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM, THAT WOULDN'T BE A VERY WISE MOVE. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO TAKE AWAY SOME FUNDING FOR THE POST SECONDARY GRANTS, YOU'D LIKE TO TAKE AWAY SOME OF THE FUNDING FOR STUDENT ACCOMODATION FOR HANDICAPPED AND RETARDED CHILDREN SO THAT THESE PROGRAMS HAVE TO BE CUT BACK IN ORDER THAT YOU CAN EXTEND ANOTHER PROGRAM?

THIS IS WHY YOU ARE EXTENDING A PROGRAM THAT EVERY OTHER PROGRAM THAT WE'VE REQUESTED FUNDS FOR ARE NEEDED. THE PROGRAMS ARE NEEDED AND THE FUNDS ARE NEEDED. I THINK THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I WONDER IF MR. MILLER COULD GIVE US RIGHT NOW WHAT HAS BEEN THE EXPENDITURE TO DATE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 73-74.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK ALL MEMBERS WILL RECALL THAT WE'VE HAD A SUPPLEMENTARY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO COPE WITH THE AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE FIGURES I HAVE AND THESE ARE NOT FINAL FIGURES, I WARN YOU THAT THESE ARE NOT FINAL FIGURES FOR THE YEAR. THESE ARE ONLY THE BILLS THAT WERE PROCESSED UP TO MARCH 31ST. IT COMES TO \$7,957,465.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN THE YEAR 72-73, THERE WAS AN UNDEREXPENDITURE OF SOME \$225,000.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN THAT WAS THE YEAR 71-72.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I SEE. I SAID THERE WAS AN OVEREXPENDITURE IN 72-73.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN THAT WAS IN 1971-72 AND IN 1972-73 I THINK WE WERE OVER EXPENDED BY \$70,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE GET THOSE FIGURES FROM MR. MILLER, PLEASE?

MR. MILLER: FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING MARCH 31ST, 1973 THE UNEXPENDED BALANCE WAS \$200,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS RIGHT. THAT WAS THE UNEXPENDED BALANCE OF \$200,000.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN THAT WAS AT THE END OF MARCH?

MR. MILLER: YES.

MRS. WATSON: OR WAS THAT AFTER ALL THE ACCOUNTS ON TRANSPORTATION WERE RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT? WE THOUGHT WE HAD AN OVER, WE HAD A SURPLUS BUT I THINK THAT WE FOUND WE HAD \$70,000 OVEREXPENDED.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T KNOW WHAT BILLS HADN'T BEEN PROCESSED. THESE WERE THE ACTUAL BILLS PROCESSED AGAINST THE 72-73 FISCAL YEAR' BUDGET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS WHAT I SAY. I HAPPEN TO HAVE THE FIGURE HERE SO THAT IS WHY I NEW I WAS ON PRETTY SAFE GROUND. WOULD MR. MILLER INDICATE, MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD THE VARIOUS CAUSES OF THE INCREASE FOR THE YEAR 73-74 MADE IT AN OVEREXPENDITURE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT INFORMATION WAS TABLED WITH THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES. IT WAS PRIMARILY THE COMMUNITY COURSES, THE BLADE COURSES AND A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY FOR FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORTS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE OTHER PART WAS THE MATERIAL FOR THE TUTOR PROGRAM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S RIGHT. IT WASN'T THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AS SUCH BECAUSE OF THE SPECIAL PROGRAMS THAT WERE PUT IN DURING THE YEAR AND WE HAD TO HAVE SUPPLEMENTARIES FOR.

THAT IS THE POSITION I TAKE NOW. I SAY THAT WE CAN FIND THE MONEY, THE ADDITIONAL MONEY THAT IS REQUIRED BETWEEN WHAT IS GOING TO BE ASKED FOR IN THE SESSIONAL PAPER, IF AGAIN I HAVEN'T GOT THAT AMOUNT YET.

YOU SEE, I AM TRYING TO ASCERTAIN MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT IS THE OVERALL PROGRAM OF THE COST OF KINDERGARTENS. WE ARE NOT GOING TO KNOW THAT UNLESS WE HAVE THE SESSIONAL PAPER.

MRS. WATSON: IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS IMPLYING THAT THE YOUTH PROGRAMS THAT WERE BROUGHT IN AND PAID FOR IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET, WILL NOT BE CONTINUED WITH IN THE YEAR 74-75, THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS TRYING TO IMPLY. NOW IF HE WOULD INDICATE WHERE HE WOULD FEEL THAT HE COULD TAKE THE MONEY OUT OF, I WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO LOOK AT IT. I'M QUITE SURE THAT HE WOULD HAVE TROUBLE BECAUSE WE'VE CUT OUR SUPPLIES, TEXTBOOKS AND CURRICULUM SUPPLIES THIS YEAR AND STILL HOPE TO PROVIDE FOR THE TUTOR TRAINING PROGRAM. WE'VE CUT THE PER PUPIL ALLOTMENT, IN THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL WE'VE BEGUN THE COMMUNITY PROGRAMS.

I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY PERSON IN THIS CHAMBER THAT WILL DENY THAT IT HAS BEEN NECESSARY TO GET VOCATIONAL TRAINING OUT INTO THE COMMUNITIES. THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO GIVE ADULTS THE OPPORTUNITY, ADULTS WHO CAN'T EVEN READ OR WRITE, THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN THE VERY BASIC EDUCATION. WELL THEN, THEY ARE JUST ONGOING COSTS FOR OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVEN'T MADE ANY IMPLICATIONS AT ALL WITH REFERENCE TO THESE NEW PROGRAMS. THE VERY FACT THAT WE HAVE GONE PAST THEM AND THEY HAVE BEEN APPROVED SHOWS THAT I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THEM. THERE ARE OTHER AREAS ONCE WE KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS REQUIRED.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I SEE THE TIME IS SEVEN MINUTES TO FIVE. I WOULD MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER WOULD NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN JUST ONE MORE COMMENT. I CAN ASSURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THERE ISN'T ANYTHING IN VOTE 3 THAT CAN BE USED TO MAKE THE KINDERGARTEN PART OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. HAD I BEEN ABLE TO DO THIS, HAD I BEEN ABLE TO FIND THE FUNDS IN VOTE 3, WE WOULD HAVE CERTAINLY ENDEAVORED TO PAY FOR THE COSTS OF MAKING THE KINDERGARTENS PART OF THE

SCHOOL SYSTEM. IT HASN'T BEEN A DELIBERATE MOVE AT ALL. THEREFORE, I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT WE PROCEED PAST VOTE 03 AND PROCEED WITH ANSWERING THE REST OF THE QUESTIONS TOMORROW. I WILL TABLE THE SESSIONAL PAPER, THE TAXATION BILL, THE SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET ONCE THE MAIN ESTIMATES ARE COMPLETED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. COULD WE HAVE A SECONDER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECONDER.

MR. MCKINNON: I'LL SECOND THAT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE WITNESSES MAY NOW BE EXCUSED. 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? AGREED?

MOTION CARRIED

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

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 10:15 A.M. TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. MR. MILLER AND MR. HUBERDEAU ATTENDED COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 3 OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES. COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 12 NOON AND RECONVENED AT 2 P.M. I CAN REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL NO. 3. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON 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 WE AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER I BELIEVE THAT IT IS THE INTENTION OF YOUR COMMITTEE TO PROCEED TOMORROW WITH DISCUSSIONS SURROUNDING BILL NO. 3.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. STUTTER: I MOVE THAT WE CALL IT 5 O'CLOCK
MR. SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL SECOND IT.

MR. SPEAKER: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY THE
HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DAWSON SECONDED BY THE
HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT
WE NOW CALL IT FIVE O'CLOCK. ARE YOU PREPARED
FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED?

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED
AND THIS HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 AM
TOMORROW MORNING.

ADJOURNED

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 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.

MR. MCKINNON; MR. SPEAKER I WONDER IF I COULD RISE ON A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE THIS MORNING TO CORRECT SOME OF THE MORE GLARING ERRORS IN VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS. IF THEY CONTINUE AS THEY ARE WITHOUT CORRECTION THEY BECOME COMPLETELY INCOMPREHENSIBLE.

ON PAGE 204, MR. SPEAKER, I SAID, "I HAVE BEEN FOLLOWING WITH INTEREST THE CBC'S SURVEY THAT THEY HAVE BEEN CONDUCTING EVERY MONTH ON THE COST OF TEN STAPLE ITEMS INCLUDING BREAD, EGGS, HAMBURGER, PORK CHOPS, POTATOES, IN SUPER MARKETS ACROSS THE COUNTRY." MR. SPEAKER IN VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS IT READS, "I HAVE BEEN FOLLOWING WITH INTEREST THE CBC'S SURVEY THAT I HAVE BEEN CONDUCTING EVERY MONTH ON THE COST OF TEN STABLE ITEMS INCLUDING BREAD, EGGS, HAMBURGER, PORK CHOPS, POTATOES IN SUPER MARKETS ACROSS THE COUNTRY."

FURTHER, MR. SPEAKER, ON PAGE 414 OF THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS I SAID, "WHETHER IT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT THAT EMPLOYEE BE REPLACED OR WHETHER THROUGH EFFICIENCY OR THROUGH ECONOMY OF SCALE THAT THE OTHER PEOPLE CAN TAKE UP THE WORK LOAD OF THAT OTHER PERSON WHO IS LEAVING." THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS HAVE IT RECORDED THAT I SAID, "WHETHER IT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT THAT EMPLOYEE BE REPLACED OR WHETHER THROUGH EFFICIENCY OR THROUGH ECONOMY AND SCALES THAT THE OTHER PEOPLE CAN TAKE UP THE WORK LOAD OF THAT OTHER PERSON WHO IS LEAVING."

FURTHER, MR. SPEAKER, ON PAGE 474 OF THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, I SAID, "WE ARE GOING TO BRING IT TO THE ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE." I AM RECORDED IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AS HAVING SAID, "WE ARE GOING TO SPRING IT TO THE ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE."

ON PAGE 501, MR. SPEAKER, OF THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS I SAID, "MR. CHAIRMAN, ONCE AGAIN

I'VE GOT A LIST OF ABOUT 30 QUESTIONS I WANT TO ASK THAT GO INTO DETAIL ON PREDITOR CONTROL" I'M QUOTED AS SAYING, "MR. CHAIRMAN, ONCE AGAIN I'VE GOT A LIST OF ABOUT 30 QUESTIONS I WANT TO ASK THAT GO INTO DETAIL ON CREDITOR CONTROL."

MR. SPEAKER, FURTHER ON PAGE 503, OF THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, I SAID, "I THINK IT IS PRETTY OBVIOUS WHY THE INTEREST OF COMMITTEE HAS ALWAYS BEEN SO KEEN ON THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME BECAUSE ALL MEMBERS MUST KNOW, AND IF THEY DON'T KNOW BY NOW THEY REALLY DON'T HAVE MUCH REASON FOR BEING HERE, THAT GAME IS THE ONLY RESOURCE, THE ONLY ONE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAS CONTROL OVER." I AM QUOTED IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AS SAYING, "IF THEY DON'T KNOW BY NOW THEY REALLY DON'T HAVE MUCH REASON FOR BEING HERE, THAT GAME IS THE ONLY RESORT, THE ONLY ONE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAS CONTROL OVER."

I WONDER, MR. SPEAKER, IF THOSE RATHER GLARING ERRORS COULD BE CORRECTED IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

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

MRS. WATSON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE FOR TABLING THIS MORNING LEGISLATIVE RETURNS NO. 36 TO 44. I ALSO HAVE FOR TABLING, MR. SPEAKER, THE YUKON PARTICIPATION IN THE 1974 ARCTIC WINTER GAMES REPORT AS PREPARED BY THE YUKON'S CO-ORDINATOR MR. REBER. IT IS AN EXCELLENT REPORT AND I HOPE THAT EVERY MEMBER TAKES THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ IT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEE? ARE THERE ANY PILLS TO BE INTRODUCED? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION OR RESOLUTION? ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? AS THERE ARE NO NOTICES FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS OR MOTIONS WE COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. MADAM CLERK WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR IS AVAILABLE. WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

RECESS

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

QUESTION RE AMOUNT OF FUNDS OBTAINED FROM
PROPOSED TOBACCO TAX

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, WOULD MR. ADMINISTRATOR INDICATE HOW MUCH THE ADMINISTRATION EXPECTS TO OBTAIN AS A RESULT OF ANY PROPOSED TOBACCO TAX.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: SORRY, MR. SPEAKER, I CAN'T GIVE THAT ANSWER AT THE PRESENT TIME. I DON'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE. WE WILL HAVE THAT INFORMATION WHEN THE TIME COMES TO CONSIDER THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HAS ALREADY INDICATED THAT THERE IS A SESSIONAL PAPER PREPARED FOR A KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM SHOWING THE MEANS OF COLLECTION OF TAXES. SURELY THAT INFORMATION MUST THEREFORE BE AVAILABLE. ISN'T THIS CORRECT?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, THAT INFORMATION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE WHEN THE TIME COMES TO INTRODUCE THE INFORMATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, THE QUESTION THAT I HAVE ASKED IS WHAT IS THE AMOUNT THAT THE ADMINISTRATION CONSIDERS IT WILL BE ABLE TO OBTAIN THROUGH A TAX ON TOBACCO?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I'M SORRY, MR. SPEAKER, I DON'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION AT THE MOMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER THEN, MR. SPEAKER, IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR COULD GO AND GET IT BECAUSE IT IS IN HIS OFFICE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, A POINT OF ORDER. THAT IS AN IMPROPER QUESTION. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS FULL WELL THAT IT IS.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE COST TO TERRITORY OF A KINDERGARTEN
PROGRAM

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, WOULD MR. ADMINISTRATOR INDICATE HOW MUCH IS A KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM GOING TO COST THE TERRITORY?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: AGAIN, MR. SPEAKER, ALL THIS INFORMATION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE AT THE TIME THESE PAPERS ARE CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE QUESTION THAT I AM PUTTING TO HIM IS NOW DOES HE KNOW OR IS HE USELESS AS HE IS TRYING TO SHOW THAT HE IS?

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, A POINT OF ORDER. THE QUESTION HAS BEEN ASKED; THE ADMINISTRATOR HAS ANSWERED THE QUESTION. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER CANNOT REPEAT THE SAME QUESTION TIME AFTER TIME.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, IS IT MR. SPEAKER'S INTENTION TO TAKE DIRECTION FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE OR IS MR. SPEAKER SITTING AS CHAIRMAN OF THIS HOUSE?

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: PROVIDING RELIEF FOR GASOLINE
PRICES

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, IT IS INDICATED ACROSS THE WESTERN PROVINCES THAT THE PRICE OF GAS IS GOING TO RISE APPROXIMATELY 10 CENTS PER GALLON BECAUSE OF THE INCREASED PRICE IN CRUDE OIL. THE PROVINCES OF ALBERTA, SASKATCHEWAN AND MANITOBA HAVE ALREADY INITIATED RELIEF TO THE CONSUMER BY LOWERING THE GAS TAX. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR WHETHER THERE ARE ANY PLANS ON THE BOOKS OF THE YUKON TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT TO HELP RELIEVE THE EXTRA COST TO THE CONSUMER OF THE PRICE OF GASOLINE IN THE YUKON TERRITORY AS ALL OF THE WESTERN PROVINCES AND IN FACT INCLUDING B.C. HAVE DONE.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS A MATTER OF VERY REAL CONCERN TO THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT AT THE PRESENT TIME. WE HAVE NO SPECIFIC PLANS AT THIS PARTICULAR MOMENT BUT I CAN ASSURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT WE ARE TAKING A VERY CAREFUL LOOK AT THIS WHOLE QUESTION, NOT ONLY IN RELATION TO WHAT IS BEING DONE IN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, BUT ALSO WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND OTHER PROVINCES. AND WE ARE IN THE PROCESS JUST AT THE PRESENT MOMENT OF HOLDING CONVERSATIONS WITH THE OIL COMPANIES ON THIS MATTER.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is of such priority I wonder if I could request from the Government that some type of policy in the field of the price of gas, the price of heating fuel and the price of electricity come before Council before the end of this session because it's already estimated roughly that about \$5,000,000 are going to be withdrawn from consumers in the Yukon Territory the next year if the proposed increases in these three areas go. And I can't see how this isn't probably the number one immediate priority of the people or to the elected representatives the people of the Yukon. And I think it would be irresponsible for us to leave this Chamber and not resolve or not at least discuss policy concerning what is going to be a great hardship to the people of the Yukon Territory this winter if we don't act now.

Mr. Administrator: Well I couldn't agree more with the Honorable Member, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of very real urgency to us and we're doing everything we can to determine what is the appropriate position for the Government to take. There is of course going to be a paper on the question of electric rate equalization which will deal with the matter of electricity. I'm not sure if we're going to be in a position to deal with the fuel oil and gasoline question before the end of this session, but I'll certainly endeavour to do what I can, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McKinnon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If, when Council is called together to discuss the Electoral Boundaries Commission report, would Mr. Administrator guarantee that at that time because of the priority of the issue, that the paper will be available and the policy will be available to Councillors at that time and it can be discussed at what will be the last session of this Council.

Mr. Administrator: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously I don't know the time frame in which it is going to be possible for us to develop a policy on this, but I can certainly assure the Honourable Member and other Honourable Members that just at the very moment we can develop a policy and have a paper prepared, we will make it available to Council.

Mr. Chamberlist: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Mr. Administrator could indicate what has been done to this time on this particular point the Honourable Member has raised.

Mr. Administrator: What we have done, as I've already indicated, Mr. Speaker, is to initiate discussions with the oil companies and in fact we have been doing this since last fall. We haven't been doing this just as a result of the recent prices. We are also engaged in sessions with the provinces and the Federal Government to determine just what would be the appropriate course of action for us to take.

QUESTION RE: POLICY FOR THE PROVISION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES IN THE YUKON AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to Mr. Administrator this morning relating to the policy for the provision of air transportation facilities and services in the Yukon and Northwest Territories that was tabled in the House this morning.

It is indicated Mr. Speaker that the long awaited run-way extension from 5500 feet to 6100 feet for Watson Lake and the proposed terminal facilities are indeed embodied in this M.O.T. schedule of improvement of air services. I'm wondering if I could have the assurance of the Administration that in no way will the Administration recommend the deletion of either of these projects from this program when they meet with M.O.T. on this matter in June.

Mr. Administrator: Mr. Speaker, I can most definitely assure the Honourable Member that we don't intend to recommend the deletion of any part of the M.O.T. program. But I think I should in all fairness warn that this program which is a Federal program, is subject to the usual kind of priority in making available the funds required, but we will definitely press for the implementation of their present plan as far as we possibly can.

Mr. Taylor: This is fine. This is what I want on record.

QUESTION RE: COMPLAINTS REGARDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF BOTH THE LANDLORDS AND TENANTS ORDINANCE AND THE CONSUMERS PROTECTION ORDINANCE

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have received complaints constantly from people that the terms and conditions of both the Landlords and Tenants Ordinance and the Consumers Protection Ordinance are not being adhered to and that it is the policy of the Yukon

GOVERNMENT AND IT HAS BEEN A STATED POLICY THAT THEY WILL NOT ENFORCE THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THESE TWO ORDINANCES. I WOULD ASK MR. ADMINISTRATOR WHETHER IT IS THE INTENTION OF THE GOVERNMENT TO FOLLOW UP THE COMPLAINTS AND ENFORCE THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE ORDINANCES OR WITHDRAW THE LEGISLATION FROM THE BOOK OF THE COUNCIL OR OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY BECAUSE THEY ARE COMPLETELY UNENFORCEABLE AND ARE JUST AN EXERCISE IN HYPOCRACY THAT THEY ARE SOME PROTECTION TO THE CONSUMERS AND THE TENANTS IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, WE'RE PREPARED TO DO WHATEVER WE CAN TO THE EXTENT THAT THE LEGISLATION IMPOSES AN OBLIGATION ON THE GOVERNMENT. BUT MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONSUMER LEGISLATION WAS THAT IT DID NOT IMPOSE ON THE GOVERNMENT AN OBLIGATION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN ENFORCEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES. MY UNDERSTANDING OF THAT LEGISLATION, MR. SPEAKER, WAS THAT IT WAS SIMPLY TO BE LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD ENABLE SOMEONE WITH A GRIEVANCE TO TAKE THE MATTER BEFORE THE COURTS OR TO DEAL WITH ANY PARTICULAR PROBLEMS, BUT IT DID NOT LAY ON THE GOVERNMENT A RESPONSIBILITY IN THIS REGARD.

MR. MCKINNON: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, IF I COULD ASK MR. ADMINISTRATOR, HOW IS IT POSSIBLE FOR A LAYMAN TO BRING ACTION AGAINST A LANDLORD OR AGAINST AN OLIGOPOLY CHAIN OF SUPERMARKETS WHEN EVEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS PROBLEMS WINNING IN COURT AGAINST A LOWLY MEMBER OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. HOW IS IT EVEN COMPREHENSIBLE TO THINK THAT THE LAYMAN HAS THE ABILITY TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST THESE TYPES OF CORPORATIONS AND CERTAINLY, MR. SPEAKER, IF THE ADMINISTRATION ISN'T PREPARED TO ACT ON CONSUMER COMPLAINTS THEN THEY SHOULD AT LEAST BE HONEST ENOUGH TO REMOVE THE LEGISLATION THAT MAKES IT APPEAR THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS ACTUALLY MAKING SOME SORT OF PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION TOWARDS CONSUMERS IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

A DIRECT QUESTION. WITHOUT LEGAL AID IN THE YUKON TERRITORY, WHICH THERE IS NONE ON CIVIL MATTERS, HOW IN GOODNESS NAME IS A CONSUMER SUPPOSED TO HAVE THE CAPABILITIES OF BRINGING ACTION AGAINST PEOPLE WHO VIOLATE THE CONSUMERS PROTECTION ORDINANCE AND THE LANDLORDS AND TENANTS ACT?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, WE'RE PREPARED TO DISCHARGE WHATEVER OBLIGATIONS THE LEGISLATION PUTS ON US, BUT WE CANNOT GO BEYOND THAT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, SUPPLEMENTARY TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR. ISN'T IT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT TO ENFORCE LEGISLATION THAT HAS BEEN PASSED BY THIS HOUSE?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: CERTAINLY IT IS IF IT IMPOSES ON US AN OBLIGATION TO DO SO, BUT IN THE CASE OF THE CONSUMERS LEGISLATION AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THIS IS SIMPLY AN ENABLING PIECE OF LEGISLATION FOR THE CONSUMER HIMSELF TO TAKE ACTION.

QUESTION RE: JOB CLASSIFICATIONS OF GAME WARDENS

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION TO DIRECT TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR AND THAT IS THE MATTER OF JOB CLASSIFICATIONS OF GAME WARDENS AND I'M WONDERING IF THE ADMINISTRATION ARE NOW TAKING STEPS TO REMOVE FROM THE JOB CLASSIFICATION FOR GAME GUARDIANS, THE PROVISION FOR EXPERIENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AS BEING NO LONGER NECESSARY FOR THIS JOB.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: NO, MR. SPEAKER, WE ARE NOT PREPARED TO REMOVE THAT FROM THE JOB QUALIFICATIONS. WE CONSIDER THIS TO BE A DESIRABLE PART OF THE JOB QUALIFICATIONS OF THIS PARTICULAR JOB.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY. WOULD MR. ADMINISTRATOR OR THE GOVERNMENT OR THE ADMINISTRATION OR WHOEVER, FEEL THAT IT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAT YOU HAVE A POLICEMAN THAN YOU SHOULD HAVE A GAME WARDEN IN THIS PARTICULAR FUNCTION?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL NO, OBVIOUSLY MR. SPEAKER, WE DON'T. WE WANT THIS PARTICULAR PART OF THE DUTIES OF A GAME WARDEN TO BE ACCOMPANIED WITH OTHER FEATURES OF THE JOB WHICH ARE ALSO IMPORTANT. I THINK PERHAPS THE PROBLEM MAY SIMPLY ARISE BY VIRTUE OF THE FACT THAT THAT APPEARS AT THE TOP OF THE LIST OF QUALIFICATIONS AND PERHAPS IT IS IN THE WRONG ORDER. BUT I DON'T THINK WE WOULD WANT TO REMOVE IT FROM THE LIST OF JOB REQUIREMENTS.

QUESTION RE: FIRST OPPORTUNITY FOR JOBS OFFERED IN THE KLUANE NATIONAL PARK TO RESIDENTS OF THE HAINES JUNCTION AREA

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR COULD ANSWER ME AS TO WHAT ACTION THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAS TAKEN TO GUARANTEE THAT THE FIRST OPPORTUNITY FOR JOBS IN THE KLUANE NATIONAL PARK WILL BE OFFERED TO RESIDENTS OF THE HAINES JUNCTION AREA.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL THIS IS IN FACT A FEDERAL MATTER, MR. SPEAKER AND I WOULD HAVE TO TAKE THAT QUESTION AS NOTICE.

MR. MCKINNON: COULD MR. ADMINISTRATOR ASSURE COUNCIL THAT IT IS THE INTENTION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY TO PRESSURE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ACCEPTING THE FACT THE FIRST OPPORTUNITIES FOR JOBS AS WARDENS AND SUPPORT STAFF IN THE KLUANE NATIONAL PARK SHOULD BE GIVEN TO RESIDENTS OF THE PARK AREA?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL I THINK, MR. SPEAKER, BEFORE ANSWERING THAT QUESTION, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE FEDERAL POLICY IS IN THIS REGARD.

QUESTION RE: NUMBER OF BEDS FOR THE WATSON LAKE HOSPITAL

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT A QUESTION TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF HEALTH, WELFARE AND REHABILITATION. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE PLANS FOR THE WATSON LAKE HOSPITAL HAVE BEEN VIEWED AND INDICATE A COTTAGE HOSPITAL SIMILAR TO WHAT WE HAVE RATHER THAN A GENERAL HOSPITAL AS IS REQUIRED, AND IS AS MUCH AS THE FACILITY PROVIDES FOR ONLY FOUR GENERAL PATIENT BEDS; I'M WONDERING IF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF THAT DEPARTMENT WILL BE MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE FOR AT LEAST FOUR MORE GENERAL PATIENT BEDS FOR THIS MUCH NEEDED FACILITY?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, THIS HOSPITAL HAS BEEN UNDER CONSIDERATION AND PLANS HAVE BEEN DRAWN UP FOR THE LAST SIX YEARS. IT WILL BE MY RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN HEALTH THAT THEY GET ON WITH THE JOB AND AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS, THERE IS ROOM FOR EXPANSION WHEN THE MEDICAL REQUIREMENTS ARE THERE. AND CONSEQUENTLY I WOULD SUGGEST, I HOPE WITH THE MEMBERS' SUPPORT THAT THE HOSPITAL WOULD PROCEED TO BE BUILT THIS YEAR WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DELAYS. AND I SAY ONE THING FURTHER THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS THAT WE WERE IN A POSITION TO BUILD THE HOSPITAL LAST YEAR AND BECAUSE OF REPRESENTATIONS OF THIS GOVERNMENT TO EXPAND THE FACILITIES, IT WAS THE REASON IT WAS DELAYED ONE YEAR AND I WOULD THINK IT WOULD BE IN THE INTEREST OF ALL THE PEOPLE LIVING IN THE WATSON LAKE AREA TO GET SOMETHING BUILT RIGHT AWAY AND THEN LOOK AT THE SITUATION AS IT ARISES AND EXPAND IF WE CAN BECAUSE THERE ARE AREAS WITHIN THE NEW PROPOSED HOSPITAL FOR EXPANSION.

MR. TAYLOR: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, I STILL HAVEN'T GOT AN ANSWER TO MY QUESTION. I'M ASKING IF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER AND THE ADMINISTRATION WILL MAKE REPRESENTATION FOR FOUR MORE PATIENT BEDS IN THAT BUILDING BECAUSE THEY ARE DEFINITELY REQUIRED, OTHERWISE WE HAVEN'T GOT MUCH MORE THAN WHAT WE ALREADY HAVE AT THE PRESENT. WE HAVE GOT ABOUT FOUR GENERAL PATIENT BEDS LEFT.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I THINK I ANSWERED THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S QUESTION. THOSE REPRESENTATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEEN MADE A YEAR AGO AND WHAT YOU SEE IS THE RESULT OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPRESENTATIONS.

MR. TAYLOR: A SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION. HAD THE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF HEALTH, WELFARE AND REHABILITATION SEEN THOSE PLANS AT ANY TIME PRIOR TO YESTERDAY? OR UNTIL THEY WERE TABLED HERE IN THE HOUSE?

MR. TANNER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, I HADN'T SEEN THE PLANS PRIOR TO YESTERDAY. THE MEMBER WHO OCCUPIED THIS POSITION BEFORE HAD SOME INPUT INTO IT. THE COMMISSIONER HAD SOME INPUT INTO IT AND THE DEPARTMENT IS PREPARED TO GO AHEAD WITH THOSE PLANS AND AS I SAY THE GOVERNMENT HAS ALREADY HAD INPUT INTO THAT HOSPITAL.

MR. TAYLOR: JUST ONE FINAL QUESTION, SUPPLEMENTARY ON THE QUESTION. FOR THE RECORD, MAY I ASK THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF HEALTH, WELFARE AND REHABILITATION IF HE IS SATISFIED THAT THESE FACILITIES AS PROGRAMED FOR THIS NEW HOSPITAL IN WATSON LAKE IS QUITE SATISFACTORY AND SUFFICIENT FOR THE COMMUNITY OF WATSON LAKE.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I AM SATISFIED INsofar AS THE INPUT THAT THIS GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN ABLE TO HAVE FOR THE PAST TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS. I WOULD SUGGEST TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKING THE QUESTION THAT HE WOULD PERHAPS BE INTERESTED IN HAVING A MEETING WITH THE PEOPLE IN CHARGE OF NORTHERN HEALTH AND WELFARE HERE AND WE CAN FURTHER DISCUSS THEM. AND JUST AS A FURTHER SIDE, I WOULD ALSO ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IF HE HAS NO PARTICULAR OBJECTION, OR ANY HONOURABLE MEMBER, NOW THAT THE PLANS HAVE BEEN TABLED AND MEMBERS HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THEM, IF WITHIN THE NEXT DAY OR TWO, WE COULD WITHDRAW THE PLANS BECAUSE THEY ARE THE ONLY PLANS AVAILABLE IN THE YUKON.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE, I WOULD LIKE TO INDICATE, MR. SPEAKER, THAT THE PROVISION OF FOUR BEDS IS TOTALLY INADEQUATE, BUT IT WAS AS A RESULT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, NOT WANTING TO PROVIDE ANY FURTHER MONIES OVER AND ABOVE WHAT THEY HAVE PROVIDED, AND THAT'S THE REASON WHY WE'RE ONLY HAVING A FOUR BED HOSPITAL. FOR NO OTHER REASON. MY INDICATION WAS THAT IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN EIGHT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE: GOVERNMENT POSITION PAPER PRESENTED ON THE PROPOSED PIPELINE ACROSS THE ARCTIC

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I WAS WONDERING IF THERE IS GOING TO BE A GOVERNMENT POSITION PAPER PRESENTED TO THE HEARINGS THIS WEEK ON THE PROPOSED PIPELINE ACROSS THE ARCTIC?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE, MR. SPEAKER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER, MR. SPEAKER, IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR CAN INDICATE WHO IS THE PERSON REPRESENTING THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT ON THE PIPELINE COMMITTEE IN OTTAWA?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, WE DO NOT HAVE A MEMBER ON THAT COMMISSION AT THE PRESENT TIME.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE QUESTION JUST ASKED, MR. SPEAKER. DOES THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY NOT FEEL THAT WE SHOULD HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE ON THE PIPELINE COMMITTEE?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER. WE SHOULD AND WE WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO HAVE ONE.

MR. TAYLOR: A FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY MR. SPEAKER, HAS THE GOVERNMENT MADE REPRESENTATIONS IN THIS DIRECTION AND BEEN REFUSED?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MEANS BY REPRESENTATION. WE HAVE BEEN ENDEAVOURING TO OBTAIN SOMEONE TO REPRESENT US AND I MIGHT ADD THAT THE COMMITTEE I'M TALKING ABOUT IS THE PRESENT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE. WE DO HAVE AN INTERNAL COMMITTEE OF OUR OWN, CHAIRED BY MR. BAKER AND THEY HAVE CONTINUING LIASON WITH THIS ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE BUT WE DO NOT AT THE PRESENT MOMENT HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE ON THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE IN OTTAWA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR, MR. SPEAKER. ISN'T IT SO THAT YOU HAVE BEEN

ATTEMPTING BY TELEPHONE AND OTHER MEANS TO GET MR. FLEMING TO ACCEPT THE POSITION AT 50% OF HIS BASIC SALARY BY WAY OF A CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP TO ENTER THAT COMMITTEE?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, ONE OF THE PEOPLE THAT WE HAD BEEN DISCUSSING WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTING US ON THAT COMMITTEE WAS MR. FLEMING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AT 50% MR. SPEAKER, I SAID OF HIS SALARY. ISN'T THAT CORRECT?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: NO, MR. SPEAKER. IT'S NOT CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL TABLE THE DOCUMENT SHOWING THAT IT IS CORRECT.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? WE WISH TO THANK MR. ADMINISTRATOR FOR HIS ATTENDANCE. AS THERE ARE NO PRIVATE BILLS AND ORDERS, PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS, 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 IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS PUBLIC BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED?

CARRIED

I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE WILL PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

CARRIED

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME I WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. MADAM CLERK I WONDER IF YOU COULD NOW SEE IF THE WITNESSES COULD NOW BE AVAILABLE. I WILL DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE ARE DISCUSSING BILL NO. 3. WE HAVE WITH US MR. HUBERDEAU AND MR. MILLER TO ASSIST US IN THESE DISCUSSIONS. WE ARE AT VOTE 03 AND WE ARE DEALING WITH ESTABLISHMENT 316.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I WONDER IF THE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE CAN INDICATE ANY CHANGE IN MIND RE BRINGING FORWARD OF THE INFORMATION THAT HAS BEEN ASKED FOR ON THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM SO THAT WE MAY ASCERTAIN HOW MUCH MONEY THE OVERALL PROGRAM IS GOING TO BE INVOLVED IN.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN I THINK I MADE MYSELF VERY CLEAR YESTERDAY AND MY POSITION IS THE SAME, THAT WE PROVIDED FOR THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM IN THE EXISTING MAIN ESTIMATES AT THE EXISTING LEVEL AND THAT WHEN THEY HAVE THE SESSIONAL PAPER ON THE PROPOSAL FOR EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAM HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE EXISTING PROGRAM. IT WILL BE UP TO THE COUNCIL TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEY WANT THE EXPANSION, WHEN THEY WANT IT OR WHETHER THEY WANT IT AT ALL AT THAT TIME. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN VERY PRESUMPTUOUS TO ASSUME THAT THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM AFFECTS THE MAIN ESTIMATES THIS YEAR, THAT NEW PROPOSAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T INTEND TO GO OVER ALL THAT HAS BEEN SAID LAST NIGHT. I WOULD ASK THAT WE PUT IT TO COUNCIL, TO COMMITTEE IN THIS WAY. I WOULD MOVE THAT THE SESSIONAL PAPER RE THE OVERALL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM THAT IS GOING TO BE PROPOSED, BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THIS COMMITTEE AT THIS TIME. I WOULD ASK THAT PEOPLE SUPPORT THIS PRINCIPLE SO THAT WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. IT DOESN'T INTERFERE WITH WHAT IS IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES AT THIS TIME. IT WOULD INDICATE TO US QUITE CLEARLY WHAT THE OVERALL COST OF AN EXPANDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM WOULD COST. I HOPE I WILL GET A SECONDER FOR THAT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. MCKINNON: I WILL SECOND THAT MOTION MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COULD I HAVE A COPY OF THAT MOTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WILL HAVE TO WRITE IT OUT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: AT THIS TIME, WE WILL CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT THE PREPARED SESSIONAL PAPER DETAILING THE EXPANDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM BE TABLED IN COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES. ANY DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, SPEAKING FOR THE MOTION, I THINK ITS BEEN THE HABIT AND CERTAINLY IT IS THE PREROGATIVE OF ANY EXECUTIVE MEMBER OR ANY MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT TO BRING IN SESSIONAL PAPERS AS AND WHEN THEY THINK FIT.

I WOULD THINK IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, IF THIS WENT SIX TO ONE AGAINST IT, THEY ARE STILL NOT OBLIGATED TO BRING IT IN. HOWEVER, IF YOU WANT TO GO THROUGH WITH THE MOTION, THAT'S FINE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: (LAUGHTER) OH COME ON NOW.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MY ONLY COMMENTS ARE THAT IT IS PARTLY THE REASON, AS NEAR AS I CAN SEE IT, AND AS A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE THAT PART OF THE REASON THAT IT WASN'T ROLLED INTO THE MAIN BUDGET IS BECAUSE OF A COMMITMENT THAT WAS MADE BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER WHO WAS AT THAT TIME, COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST AND COUNCILLOR WATSON, THAT IF AT ALL POSSIBLE THIS BUDGET WOULD BE INTRODUCED WITHOUT INCREASE IN TAXATION. IF THIS KINDERGARTEN HAD BEEN PART OF THE MAIN BUDGET, THERE IS NO WAY THAT COULD HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED. THE MAKE-UP OF THE BUDGET AS IT IS NOW, HAS ABSOLUTELY OR IS NOT AFFECTED IN ANY WAY WITH THIS SESSIONAL PAPER, WHICH WILL PROVIDE A SERVICE BEYOND WHAT HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN THE PAST. FOR THAT REASON, I AM NOT GOING TO SUPPORT THE MOTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANY FURTHER DEBATE? ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY JUST A COUPLE OF WORDS. FIRSTLY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE

RELUCTANCE ON THE PART OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO GIVE INFORMATION AS TO HOW MUCH WOULD THE OVERALL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM BE, THAT IS TO BE PROPOSED, THAT IS SOMETHING THAT IS DISTURBING ME. THE RELUCTANCE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO ANSWER TWO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. ONE, HOW MUCH WAS EXPECTED TO BE RAISED BY TAXATION ON TOBACCO WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN INDICATED IN THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS, WOULD BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPANDING THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM. THE RELUCTANCE OF HIM TO ANSWER THAT. THE RELUCTANCE OF SAYING HOW MUCH THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM WOULD BE ALSO TENDS TO LEAD ONE TO A VERY, VERY SUSPICIOUS STATE OF MIND.

I HAVE GOT A SUSPICIOUS STATE OF MIND IN THIS PARTICULAR POINT BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN INDICATED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON THAT THE REASON WHY THIS IS BEING PUT IN THIS MANNER IS BECAUSE THERE HAD BEEN PROMISES MADE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO EXTRA TAXES IN THIS BUDGET. I SAY THAT ONCE WE KNOW HOW MUCH THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM IS GOING TO COST, WE WOULD THEN BE ABLE TO SAY WHETHER OR NOT IT CAN OR CANNOT BE FOUND IN THIS BUDGET. BUT TO TAKE THE ATTITUDE THAT BECAUSE THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE SAY, THIS IS THE BUDGET, THAT IT SHOULD BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT ANY ATTEMPT TO FIND WAYS AND MEANS OF REDUCING THE BUDGET OR AMENDING IT TO FIT, AN EXPANDING PROGRAM OF KINDERGARTEN, ITS MOST IMPROPER.

YOU MIGHT JUST AS WELL SAY, THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE HAS DECIDED THIS IS THE BUDGET, THIS IS THE AMOUNT OF MONEY AND WE DON'T WANT TO HEAR ANYTHING FROM ANYBODY ELSE.

THIS IS WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO AND THIS IS WHAT WE ARE GOING TO SUPPORT, AND NOTHING ELSE. IT EXPECTS MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO BE ABSOLUTELY SILENT JUST SIMPLY BECAUSE THE ADMINISTRATION WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE HAVE BROUGHT THIS BUDGET FORWARD.

THERE IS A REAL INHERENT DANGER IN WHAT HAS BEEN SAID. THERE IS A GREATER DANGER FOR FUTURE COUNCILS IF THE SAME PHILOSOPHY IS GOING TO BE ADOPTED. IF THIS WAS GOING TO BE AN ENTIRELY NEW PROGRAM, IT WOULD BE AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT MATTER BUT THIS IS AN EXISTING PROGRAM WHICH IS GOING TO BE EXPANDED. THIS IS THE REASON WHY EVERYTHING PERTAINING TO THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL TO MAKE UP ITS MIND ON THIS PARTICULAR AREA.

ITS BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO LENGTHEN OUT THE DEBATE AND IF I EVENTUALLY COME UP WITH THIS MOTION TO SEE WHETHER MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL ARE QUITE PREPARED TO SAY, NOTWITHSTANDING WHAT IS IN THIS MAIN ESTIMATES, THAT IF COUNCIL MEMBERS ARE INTERESTED IN SEEING THE WHOLE PROGRAM, THAT THEY WILL SUPPORT THE POLICY THAT COUNCIL SHOULD BE ABLE TO KNOW WHAT PROGRAM, AN EXPANDED PROGRAM THAT IS ALREADY BEEN INDICATED WITHIN THE MAIN ESTIMATES, IS GOING TO BE PUT FORWARD TO COUNCIL.

THIS IS WHY I PUT THIS MOTION. I WANT PEOPLE TO THINK ABOUT THAT. THIS IS THE ONLY REASON AT THIS TIME, SO THAT MEMBERS OF COUNCIL BECOME AWARE OF WHAT THEY ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO. LATER ON IF YOU DON'T SUPPORT IT THERE IS GOING TO BE AN ARGUMENT PUT UP VERY STRONGLY BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO ARE GOING TO SAY, IT WAS A RESULT OF WE DO NOT WANT TO TAX THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON BY WAY OF A TOBACCO TAX. THEY ARE GOING TO SAY, SEE THESE IRRESPONSIBLE COUNCILLORS. THEY TURN DOWN KINDERGARTENS INSTEAD OF SAYING, THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE COUNCILLORS WHO DON'T WANT ANY MORE TAXATION OVER THE AREA OF TAXATIONS THAT ALREADY EXIST. THANK YOU MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS QUESTION AT THIS TIME? I WILL READ THE MOTION AGAIN. "IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT THE PREPARED SESSIONAL PAPER DETAILING EXPANDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM BE TABLED TO COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES." ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED. DISAGREE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THOSE WHO ARE AGREED KINDLY INDICATE? THOSE DISAGREED? I SHALL DECLARE THE MOTION AS BEING DEFEATED.

MOTION DEFEATED

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER IN VOTE 3?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS ONE OUTSTANDING QUESTION FROM YESTERDAY RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT 321. THE QUESTION WAS RESPECTING BREAKDOWN OF THE SALARIES AND

WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS. THE BREAK-DOWN IS AS FOLLOWS: PERMANENT EMPLOYEES UNDER ESTABLISHMENT 321 -THEIR ANNUAL COST IS \$516,185. FRINGE BENEFITS OF 7% ON THAT AMOUNT IS \$36,130. THE CASUAL AND CONTRACTUAL TYPE OF EMPLOYEES ANNUAL COST IS \$229,573. THEIR FRINGE BENEFITS ARE \$1,678. AND THAT WORKS OUT TO POINT 7%.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I UNDERSTOOD YESTERDAY THAT THIS \$229,000 WOULD REPRESENT SOME 24 AND A HALF PEOPLE. HOW MANY PEOPLE, LET ME ASK THE QUESTION, HOW MANY PEOPLE WAS THAT \$229,000?

MRS. WATSON: IT'S SHOWN ON PAGE 21, IS REFERRED TO ON PAGE 21. 5.5 MAN YEARS, 4.5 MAN YEARS AND 17 MAN YEARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT IS \$90.00 A PERSON PER YEAR CPP. AM I CORRECT MR. CHAIRMAN? RIGHT. SO THAT YOU HAVE 27 TIMES 90. THAT SHOWS THAT IN THAT ITEM ALONE THERE IS \$2,600 AND THIS IS WITHOUT UIC, WITHOUT HOLIDAY PAY WHICH IS A FRINGE BENEFIT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, HOLIDAY PAY IS CHARGED AS SALARIES AND WAGES. THE CPP IS \$90.00 PER ANNUM FOR ANYONE EARNING INDIVIDUALLY SOMETHING LIKE \$9,600, OR \$9,000. THESE PEOPLE OR MOST OF THEM WOULDN'T PAY THE \$90. PER ANNUM BECAUSE THEY WOULDN'T EARN THAT MUCH.

WE ARE TALKING 27 MAN YEARS. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY PEOPLE THAT WOULD COVER BUT PROBABLY IT WOULD BE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF 40 WHO WOULD BE WORKING PART YEARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN THE BREAKDOWN IN 21, BRACKETED YOU'VE GOT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL AS CONTRACT. ARE THEY EMPLOYEES OF A CASUAL NATURE OR ARE THEY UNDER A CONTRACT WITH A FIXED AMOUNT OF MONIES. NOW, THE EXPLANATION WE HAVE HERE SAID THAT THEY ARE CONTRACTUAL EMPLOYEES. NOW, CAN WE GET AN EXPLANATION OF THAT?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. NORMALLY WHEN WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THESE 5 AND A HALF MAN YEARS, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT INSTRUCTORS WHO ARE HIRED FOR A SPECIFIC COURSE FOR A SPECIFIED PERIOD OF TIME AND THEY ARE ON A CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT. THEY ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BECAUSE THEY ARE A FIXED TYPE OF TERM EMPLOYEE FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN THE, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF MR. MILLER CAN INDICATE BECAUSE I HAVEN'T LOOKED IT UP. IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE ARE THERE ANY PROVISIONS FOR EMPLOYEES WORKING UNDER CONTRACT PERIODS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, I DON'T KNOW THE PUBLIC SERVICE ORDINANCE THAT WELL, BUT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THIS ARRANGEMENT HAS BEEN CLEARED WITH THE PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF ASSOCIATION AND THEY ARE IN AGREEMENT WITH OUR METHOD OF HANDLING THESE TYPES OF EMPLOYEES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'M GETTING CONFUSED, WHAT I'M TRYING TO GET AT, MR. CHAIRMAN, ARE THEY CASUAL EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. LET'S DROP THE WORD "CONTRACT" OUT SO THAT WE CAN GET A CLEAR IDEA OF WHAT REALLY EXISTS. ARE THEY CASUAL EMPLOYEES OF THE YUKON TERRITORY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THEY ARE NOT CASUAL, THEY ARE TERM EMPLOYEES. SPECIFIED TERMS, SPECIFIED PURPOSE, SPECIFIED FUNCTION THAT THEY FULFILL. ONE COULD SAY THAT THEY ARE A FORM OF CASUAL EMPLOYEES BUT THEY ARE A TERM EMPLOYEE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD I ASK A QUESTION? IS THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER IN CHARGE, HAS HE GOT A COPY OF LAST YEAR'S BUDGET HERE? I DON'T HAVE MINE HANDY, COULD YOU POSSIBLY SEE WHAT THE DESCRIPTION OF THESE EMPLOYEES UNDER 321 WAS LAST YEAR?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DIDN'T DESIGNATE THEM IN THIS FASHION LAST YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS WHY IT'S SOMETHING DIFFERENT AND THIS IS WHY I AM ASKING WHAT IS THE MEANING OF IT. WE CERTAINLY HAD CASUAL EMPLOYEES LAST YEAR BUT THIS CONTRACTUAL EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP IS SOMETHING THAT I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH AT ALL.

MR. MILLER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER I CAN GIVE YOU A SPECIFIC COURSE BUT LET'S TAKE A HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION. O.K. THE LOG HOUSE BUILDING COURSE. WE KNOW THAT THAT PROGRAM IS GOING ON FOR, LET'S SAY TEN WEEKS. WE DON'T GO OUT AND HIRE A PERMANENT EMPLOYEE OR CASUAL EMPLOYEE TO UNDERTAKE THAT. WE LOOK FOR SOMEONE FROM THE COMMUNITY WHO HAS SOME EXPERTISE IN THAT AREA AND WE HIRE HIM AS A TERM EMPLOYEE FOR THE PERIOD OF THAT TEN WEEK COURSE AT SO MUCH PER HOUR OR SO MUCH FOR THE COURSE

AND THIS IS WHY WE SAY HE IS A CONTRACTUAL TYPE EMPLOYEE. HE ACTUALLY SIGNS A CONTRACT THAT SPELLS OUT HIS TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT, WHAT HE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR, WHAT HIS RATE OF PAY IS GOING TO BE AND THIS TYPE OF THING.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very similar to the type of contract that the Honourable Member was responsible for arranging between the Group Home operators and the Government. It's very similar to that type of contract and I believe you were the Executive Committee Member responsible for initiating that method of employing Group Home supervisors.

INTO THE CONTRACT YOU'VE BUILT THE VARIOUS REIMBURSEMENTS FOR VARIOUS SERVICE THAT THEY PERFORM.

Mr. Chamberlist: Except that the difference was they were actually under contract.

Mrs. Watson: These people are under contract.

Mr. Chamberlist: Just hear me out. They were under contract by way of being paid a per diem rate for the work that was carried on. They had no UIC deducted or they had no Canada Pension deducted. That is an entirely different type of operation. These, as I understand it, this is where I'm a little bit mixed up. These people are people who are actually on a payroll where-as the people who are employed in the Group Homes, under contract, were not on the payroll. Am I correct in this?

Mr. Miller: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. They are slightly different types of contracts but the basic principle that we found with these people at the Vocational School and at one time we did hire them as contractors but the difference that we found was that we do have under the terms of the Income Tax Act and the CPP Act, we do have an employer/employee relationship. As such, we must pay them and deduct income tax and CPP. So we have arranged to handle them in this fashion.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else in Vote 3?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Next vote is Vote 4.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there are no outstanding questions in Vote 4, or in Vote 5.

Mr. Chairman: Just for the record's sake, in Vote 4, I just wanted to get on record, do I take it that the Administration would be considering the division between the responsibilities of Territorial Agent and Liquor Vendor in Watson Lake for next year's estimates?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we continue to look at the problem, apparent problem, and we will do so again next year. It is our intention at some point that these functions be split not only in Watson Lake but in other areas as well when the demand on the agents, combined agents, gets to the point where it needs to be a split function.

Now, I can't give this Council a commitment that we will do anything next year. I will say that we will have another look at it when preparing next year's budget. It's one of these things, we are getting no pressure from our internal departments in this respect and they are the people who have to apply for this, you know.

I will give the commitment that we will look at it again next year.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I didn't hear what the Honourable Member was asking. Was he asking whether we split the function of the Liquor Agent and the Territorial Agent? Is that the question he was asking?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, in Watson Lake. Just a further question, if I may be permitted, from the Chair. Also, I intended, when we dealt with these estimates, to raise the question again of the need for a Territorial Agent in the communities of Teslin and possibly Carmacks. Is this being given consideration and will it be given consideration for implementation next year?

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, these are two items that will be given consideration. I think we will have to review again next year what the circumstances are in those two communities, particularly with regard to availability of space and the real need in the community for the services. Yes, this is an ongoing review that we do every year.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, there is one item. Under Establishment No. 400, it shows the Employment Liaison Officer, one man year. It's my understanding that this transfer to the Terri-

TORIAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT TAKE PLACE UNTIL THE FIRST OF NOVEMBER. WHY ARE WE ASKING FOR THE WHOLE YEAR'S SALARY IN THIS VOTE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS QUITE CORRECT. THE TRANSFER TAKES PLACE AS OF NOVEMBER AND WE MADE PROVISIONS IN THE ESTIMATES FOR ONE-HALF OF THE ANNUAL SALARY FOR THIS EMPLOYEE.

MR. TANNER: AS A MATTER OF INTEREST, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS WILL BE INTERESTED TO HEAR WE USED THE SAME METHOD RIGHT ALL THE WAY THROUGH THE BUDGET. WHERE WE WEREN'T SURE WE WEREN'T GOING TO BE ABLE TO GET A NEW EMPLOYEE UNTIL JUNE OR JULY WE'VE ADJUSTED THE BUDGET, THE FINANCIAL SIDE OF THE BUDGET, TO REFLECT THIS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS IS AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT ITEM. HERE IS A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE WHO IS BEING TRANSFERRED TO YTG EFFECTIVE THE FIRST OF NOVEMBER. NOW, WE ARE ASKING FOR ONE MAN YEAR WHICH IS A FULL MAN YEAR OF THAT MAN'S SALARY IN THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR.

PERHAPS MR. MILLER CAN INDICATE THE FULL YEAR OF THAT MAN'S SALARY, FRINGE BENEFITS, EVERYTHING TOO. MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M ASKING FOR SOME ANSWERS FROM MR. MILLER. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SHOULD NOT BE JUMPING UP LIKE A JACK-IN-THE-BOX UNTIL I GET THESE ANSWERS.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER IS JUMPING UP LIKE A JACK-IN-THE-BOX BECAUSE THE JACK-IN-THE-BOX IS JUMPING UP ALL THE TIME ASKING FRIVOLOUS AND STUPID AND RIDICULOUS AND WASTING TIME ON QUESTIONS. WHAT I EXPLAINED TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, IT MIGHT REFLECT THE MAN YEARS BUT IT DOESN'T REFLECT ON THE DOLLARS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS QUITE RIGHT. HE THOUGHT HE EXPLAINED IT AND HIS THINKING WAS BAD IN THIS AREA. NOW I WONDER IF I CAN GET FROM MR. MILLER THE AMOUNT OF THAT TOTAL MAN'S PAY AND FRINGE BENEFITS.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ANNUAL COST FOR THIS EMPLOYEE WOULD BE \$16,500 FOR SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS. WE HAVE INCLUDED IN THESE ESTIMATES \$8,244.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, HOW DO WE SHOW THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN. WE CAN ONLY ACCEPT NOW WHAT MR. MILLER SAYS IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT HE HAD ASKED FOR ONE FULL PERSON. NOW, WE HAVEN'T GOT A BREAKDOWN HERE SHOWING ALL THESE PAYS AND HOW

THEY HAVE COME ABOUT. PERHAPS WE CAN BE SUPPLIED WITH THAT INFORMATION TO SHOW THIS THING.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING IN A THURSDAY OR FRIDAY OF LAST WEEK, WE CLEARED VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5. WE AGREED TO VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5. NOW THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS ABSENT THOSE TWO DAYS. NOW I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD GO BACK TO REVIEW IN ANY MORE DETAIL THAN WAS DONE ON THE LAST TWO DAYS. THESE TWO VOTES. IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAD ANY QUESTIONS HE COULD HAVE LEFT THEM WITH ONE OF THE OTHER COUNCILLORS TO BE ASKED AND HAVE THE INFORMATION MADE AVAILABLE TO HIM. BUT HE CHOSE TO BE ABSENT. THE OPPORTUNITY WAS GIVEN AT THAT TIME TO THOROUGHLY REVIEW THESE TWO VOTES AND AT THE PRESENT TIME IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING WE ARE GOING THROUGH THE VOTES AND ANSWERING ANY OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS THAT AROSE AS A RESULT OF OUR FIRST REVIEW.

THEREFORE, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE CONTINUE ON TO VOTE 4, 5 AND ON TO VOTE 6, BECAUSE VOTES 4 AND 5 WERE ALREADY CLEARED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST FROM THE CHAIR, IT IS CERTAINLY NOT THE PRACTICE AND IT HAS NEVER BEEN DONE THAT WE REFUSE, AS LONG AS THE BUDGET IS OPEN, FOR ANY MEMBER TO ASK ANY QUESTION IN RELATION TO ANY PART OF IT BUT WE ATTEMPTED TO MAINTAIN ORDER BY TAKING A PRELIMINARY REVIEW AND CLEARING THE ITEMS. WE DO GO BACK AND IN COMING BACK FOR THE SECOND REVIEW, YOU ARE WELCOME AND ENTITLED TO RAISE QUESTIONS IN ANY PART OF THAT VOTE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU'RE SETTING YOUR OWN RULES AT THIS TIME FOR THIS SESSION. NOW, I THINK YOU ARE, YOU CARRY OUT THE WISHES OF THIS HOUSE, I THINK THIS IS THE ROLE OF THE CHAIRMAN AND I RECALL A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON CITY WAS ABSENT. HE WAS REPRESENTING THE GOVERNMENT WHILE WE WERE DISCUSSING THE BUDGET AND HE WAS TOLD HE COULD ASK ANY QUESTIONS BEFORE HE LEFT. IT WOULD ALL BE CLEARED AND WE WOULD NOT (HE AGREED), WE WOULD NOT GO BACK AND REVIEW THE BUDGET AGAIN. I SUBMIT AT THIS TIME THAT IF ANY OF THESE VOTES WERE CLEARED ON THE PRELIMINARY REVIEW, WE SHOULD NOT ENTER INTO A DETAILED DISCUSSION AT THIS TIME IN GOING OVER IT A SECOND TIME. THIS TIME IS TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THAT ARE OUTSTANDING FROM THE FIRST REVIEW.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF TREASURY,

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST ONE MOMENT. I THINK I SHOULD SPEAK TO THAT AS CHAIRMAN. I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS THE IDEA THAT THIS IS OUT OF ORDER. THIS IS QUITE IN ORDER AND ITS ALWAYS BEEN THE POLICY OF COMMITTEE, CERTAINLY AS LONG AS THE 13 YEARS THAT I HAVE BEEN IN THIS HOUSE THAT WHILE THE BILL IS OPEN AND MORE PARTICULARLY IN THE MAIN ESTIMATES, THE BIG PROBLEM IS MAINTAINING SOME SEMBLANCE OF ORDER TO IT AS WE GO THROUGH. THIS IS WHY WE TAKE THE FIRST REVIEW AS ALL MEMBERS AGREED WE WOULD, THEN WE COME BACK AND USUALLY A PERIOD OF TIME EVOLVES IN COMING BACK TO THE ESTIMATES AND INFORMATION CAN BE GOT.

IN THIS CASE, WE HAVEN'T GIVEN THIS PERIOD OF TIME AND WE ARE COMING BACK OVER IT. IT IS COMPETANT FOR ANY MEMBER IN COMMITTEE TO QUESTION ANY PART OF BILL NO. 3 AND WHAT IT CONTAINS. IT ONLY REMAINS THE ORDER THAT WE FOLLOW. THE ORDER THAT WE ARE FOLLOWING, IS THE ORDER WHICH HAS BEEN FOLLOWED IN THIS HOUSE FOR YEARS AND I WOULD IMAGINE IN OTHER HOUSES AS WELL. I COULDN'T SPEAK FOR THEM. I WOULDN'T, PLEASE, BE TOO DISTURBED. PERHAPS MEMBERS ARE A LITTLE UPTIGHT TODAY BUT I THINK AT ANY TIME A MEMBER HAS A QUESTION TO ASK IN RELATION TO THE VOTE, WE ARE NOW CLEARING VOTES IN FACT. IT IS QUITE COMPETANT TO DISCUSS ANYTHING RELATING TO THAT DEPARTMENT.

MRS. WATSON: AS I SAID, WE DISCUSS IT THE WAY THE COMMITTEE WANTS TO DISCUSS IT. I WOULD LIKE TO REFRESH YOUR MEMORY. FOR THE LAST THREE YEARS, THERE WAS NEVER, BUT NEVER, A SECOND REVIEW DONE OF THE BUDGET. WE REVIEWED IT COMPLETELY THE FIRST TIME AND QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED AND MANY TIMES, QUESTIONS WERE NOT BROUGHT FORTH UNTIL AFTER THE BUDGET HAD BEEN CLEARED FROM THE COMMITTEE.

IN FACT, I RECALL I HAD QUESTIONS REGARDING VOTE 03. THE ANSWERS WERE NOT MADE AVAILABLE UNTIL AFTER COUNCIL HAD DISSOLVED AND I SENT THE QUESTIONS OUT TO THE COUNCILLORS AT THEIR HOMES. WE ARE NOT LOOKING AT PRECEDENTS THAT HAVE BEEN SET BEFORE. YOU SORT OF SOUPED YOUR OWN RULES AS WE GO ALONG. I SAY, THAT VOTE 04 AND VOTE 05 WERE CLEARED BY THIS HOUSE ON THURSDAY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I HAVE RULED IN THIS MATTER AND

I HAVE RULED THAT THIS IS THE PROCEDURE THAT WE FOLLOW. PERHAPS, IT WASN'T INTENDED BY THE MEMBER TO INDICATE THAT THERE IS SUPPOSED TO BE ANY STIFLING OF INFORMATION BY VIRTUE AND DUE PROCESS THAT SHE SUGGESTS. IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN AND IT IS PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE TO GIVE EVERY MEMBER EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK INTO ANY QUESTION RESPECTING THE BUDGET OR ANY BILL OR ANY MATTER BEFORE THE HOUSE. IT IS THE DUTY OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE TO ENSURE THAT EVERY MEMBER DOES HAVE THAT RIGHT. TO THIS TIME, WE HAVE NOT DETRACTED FROM NORMAL PROCEDURE AND WE ONLY FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES THAT WERE LAID DOWN IN THIS HOUSE YEARS AGO THAT HAVE BEEN FOLLOWED FOR THESE YEARS.

I WOULD RULE THAT IF ANY MEMBER HAS ANYTHING IN VOTE 04 TO DISCUSS OR ANY VOTE THAT WE ARE GOING THROUGH HERE, NOW IS THE TIME. WE ARE ON OUR SECOND REVIEW.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM GOING TO CHALLENGE THE SPEAKER'S RULING ON THIS BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THE CHAIRMAN IS CORRECT. I WISH THE CHAIRMAN WOULDN'T CONTINUALLY SAY THAT HE IS MAKING A RULE WITHOUT AT LEAST GETTING THE OPINIONS OF MORE THAN ONE OR TWO MEMBERS IN COUNCIL BECAUSE HE IS PUTTING HIMSELF IN THE POSITION WHERE WE'VE GOT TO CHALLENGE HIM BECAUSE I DON'T THINK HE IS CORRECT.

TO MY MIND, WHAT WE'VE DONE IN THE PAST THREE AND A HALF YEARS THAT I'VE BEEN HERE IS THAT WE HAVE HAD A DETAILED REVIEW. WE'VE HAD THE QUESTIONS BROUGHT FORWARD, THE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ANSWERED, THEN WE'VE CLEARED THE ITEM, THEN WE'VE GONE FORWARD WITH AN OVERALL REVIEW OF THE TOTAL BUDGET. ALL MEMBERS HAVE SPOKEN ON ANY PARTICULAR AREA THAT HAS TOUCHED THEM. BUT, MY GOD MR. CHAIRMAN, WE COULD BE HERE FOR A YEAR AND A HALF DISCUSSING THIS BUDGET IF YOU ARE GOING TO GO OVER AND OVER AND OVER AGAIN TALKING TO IT IN DETAIL.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WISH YOU WOULD RETRACT THAT RULING BECAUSE OTHERWISE I AM GOING TO CHALLENGE IT BECAUSE I DON'T THINK YOU ARE CORRECT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. JUST FOR THE EDIFICATION OF COMMITTEE, I DON'T KNOW WHERE EVERYBODY HAS GONE ASTRAY OR WHERE EVERYBODY HAS GONE TO SLEEP HERE FOR THE LAST THREE YEARS BUT THE PROCESS HAS NEVER CHANGED IN COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES FROM THE PROCESS WE ARE NOW FOLLOWING. THERE ARE AT LEAST TWO REVIEWS

OF THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THE FIRST HAS BEEN COMPLETED YESTERDAY. NOW, A SECOND REVIEW IS TAKING PLACE. THERE IS NO CHANGE IN POLICY AND I JUST CAUTION THE MEMBER THAT THIS IS THE SITUATION. IF THERE IS TO BE A CHANGE FROM THIS, IT WOULD BE AT THE DIRECTION OF COMMITTEE. I AM CONDUCTING THIS COMMITTEE IN THE SAME MANNER AND I AM AT THE DIRECTION OF COMMITTEE IN THIS REGARD. I HAVE NOT CHANGED ONE iota FROM THE POLICIES IN THE LAST 13 YEARS IN THIS HOUSE. A SECOND REVIEW OF THE BUDGET HAS ALWAYS BEEN CONDUCTED IN THIS HOUSE. CERTAINLY AS LONG AS I HAVE BEEN IN THE CHAIR, COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE ONLY THING I WAS GOING TO POINT OUT IS THAT IN PART, I WOULD AGREE WITH YOU 100%. WE DO HAVE A SECOND REVIEW BUT IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, THERE IS NO NEED FOR A SECOND REVIEW IN THESE TWO VOTES. AT FIRST REVIEW, FIRST TIME THROUGH THE HOUSE, THEY WERE CLEARED. WE HAVE JUST HEARD FROM MR. ADMINISTRATOR OR FROM THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER THAT THERE ARE NO OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS IN VOTE 04 & 05. IF IT WERE CLEARED THE FIRST TIME, IN MY OPINION THEY WERE CLEARED THE OTHER DAY, THEN WHAT IS THE POINT OF GOING THROUGH THEM A SECOND TIME.

NATURALLY WE GO THROUGH SOMETHING A SECOND TIME IF THERE ARE OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. THE ONLY POINT BEHIND DOING IT THIS WAY, IT IS THE DEMOCRATIC WAY, IT IS THE WAY THAT HAS ALWAYS BEEN FOLLOWED. IF SOMEONE MISSED THE QUESTION IN THE FIRST REVIEW OF THE BUDGET AND RECALLS IT AND WANTS TO PICK IT UP IN THE FINAL REVIEW OR IN THE SECOND REVIEW, THIS IS WHERE THE OPPORTUNITY IS GIVEN TO THE MEMBER TO RAISE THE QUESTION AND GET THE ANSWER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE, MR. CHAIRMAN. MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK ONE CAN LOOK BACK ON ALL MY YEARS IN COUNCIL AND IT IS VERY, VERY RARE THAT I'M AWAY FROM MY DUTIES IN COUNCIL. VERY RARE. I DOUBT WHETHER I CAN RECALL ANOTHER OCCASION WHERE I'VE BEEN AWAY LONGER THAN A HALF DAY FOR ANY PARTICULAR REASON.

I NOTICE THAT A VERY IMPORTANT VOTE THAT I WAS VERY, VERY CONCERNED WITH AND HAVE LOTS OF

QUESTIONS TO ASK, HAS BEEN DEALT WITH. THAT'S THE HEALTH, WELFARE AND REHABILITATION VOTE HAS BEEN DEALT WITH, WITHOUT ME BEING HERE.

NOW BECAUSE I KNEW THAT IT WOULD COME BACK FOR ITS SECOND REVIEW AND AS HAD BEEN THE PROCEDURE, I WAS AWAY, AND IF I COULD HAVE NOT BEEN AWAY, I WOULD CERTAINLY HAVE BEEN HERE. THIS QUESTION MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THIS PARTICULAR VOTE IS ONE QUESTION THAT I ASK AT THIS TIME, I HAVEN'T GONE INTO DETAILS OR ASKED ANYTHING ABOUT ANYTHING ELSE. I KNOW NOW BECAUSE OF THE RELUCTANCE AGAIN, THAT I HAVE PINPOINTED WHERE \$8,250 CAN BE TAKEN OFF OF THIS \$427,200.

MR. TANNER: WHAT IS THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. CHAIRMAN: YOU'VE GOT ME. I'VE LOST TRACK OF THIS THING. IS THIS A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE? MAY I KNOW YOUR QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT'S QUITE SIMPLE. YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE IS THIS. BECAUSE IT WAS AGREED AND HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE CASE THAT SECOND REVIEWS ARE GIVEN OF ALL ITEMS BEFORE THEY ARE PASSED. THAT IS THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE ON WHICH I STOOD UP TO ASK MY SPECIFIC QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST FOR THE EDIFICATION OF THE MEMBER YOU ARE PARTIALLY CORRECT. FIRST REVIEW IS GIVEN ON ALL ITEMS. SECOND REVIEW IS A GENERAL VOTE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S RIGHT. IT'S A GENERAL VOTE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE THAT VOTES 4 AND 5 BE CLEARED WITHOUT FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH WHAT - - -

MR. CHAIRMAN: THAT'S ALRIGHT. IF SHE WANTS TO EFFECT CLOSURE SHE DOES IT AT HER OWN PERIL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S CLOSURE. YOU ALLOW THIS?

MR. STUTTER: I GO RIGHT ALONG WITH IT. THESE TWO VOTES HAVE BEEN CLEARED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT'S NOT. IT'S STILL IN COMMITTEE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: MAY I HAVE THE MOTION PLEASE.

Mrs. WATSON: I MOVE THAT VOTES 4 AND 5 BE CLEARED WITHOUT FURTHER QUESTIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NOW RON LET'S SEE HOW MUCH A MAN YOU ARE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: 5 BE CLEARED WITHOUT FURTHER QUESTION. IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER, THAT VOTES 4 AND 5 BE CLEARED WITHOUT FURTHER QUESTION. HAVE YOU ANY DEBATE ON THE MOTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL I HAVE GOT TO SAY SOMETHING ON THIS ONE. Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT'S A BLACK DAY FOR THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL WHEN TWO ELECTED PEOPLE, AND I'VE INDICATED AT LEAST ANOTHER ONE, ARE GOING TO USE A METHOD OF CLOSURE PROCEEDINGS WHEN DEALING WITH A BUDGET. EVEN IF IT WAS FOR \$1.00 TO CLOSE ANY DEBATE ON IT IT SHOWS HOW IRRESPONSIBLE ELECTED PEOPLE ARE.

Mr. STUTTER: TWO YEARS AGO - REMEMBER?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: SHOUTING.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: CLOSURE NEVER TOOK PLACE BEFORE, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER.

Mr. STUTTER: ON THE WHOLE BUDGET TWO YEARS AGO.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NO. IT WAS ALWAYS DEALT WITH IN COUNCIL. NOBODY WAS EVER STOPPED FROM ASKING QUESTIONS ON IT. NOW, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I SEE THE ACTIONS OF COUNCILLOR WATSON WHO IS SAYING "SIT DOWN. I FEEL EMBARRASSED FOR YOU", AND STUFF OF THIS PARTICULAR DESCRIPTION. IT SHOWS WHAT WEAKNESS THAT THIS COUNCIL NOW EXISTS AND THE SOONER WE PACK IT UP, EVERYBODY PACK IT UP, THE BETTER. IF THEY DO ATTEMPT TO RUN FOR OFFICE AGAIN, IF THEY ATTEMPT IT, THE PEOPLE WILL BE ABLE TO SPEAK AND SHOW WHAT TYPE OF PEOPLE THEY REALLY ARE. Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'M DISGUSTED WITH THESE PEOPLE THAT CALL THEMSELVES REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I'VE BEEN TRYING TO FIND IN THE VOTES & PROCEEDINGS EXACTLY WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE

EAST HAS SAID TRANSPIRED ACTUALLY DID TRANSPIRE BECAUSE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE ASKED DURING THE DEBATE WHETHER VOTE 4 COULD NOT BE QUESTIONED OR NOT BE TAKEN AT THIS TIME BECAUSE HE KNEW THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST HAD MANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THAT VOTE THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO ASK COUNCIL. OF COURSE, IT WAS GONE ALONG WITH AND GONE ALONG WITH ME ON THE KNOWLEDGE THAT IN ALL THE YEARS THAT I HAVE BEEN AT THIS TABLE THERE HAS ALWAYS BEEN A SECOND REVIEW OF THE LEGISLATION. IT'S PRETTY IRONIC NOW BECAUSE I'VE BEEN CLOSED ON MY DEBATE ON BUDGET FROM EVERY MEMBER AND EVERY SIDE OF THIS HOUSE.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST DID IT TO ME SEVERAL YEARS AGO WHEN HE HAD A NIGHT SITTING WHICH EFFECTIVELY CLOSED OFF DEBATE ON THE BUDGET. NOW THE CHICKENS HAVE COME HOME TO ROOST AND THE OTHER RATS ARE GOING AROUND AND CLOSING HIM OFF. I CAN ONLY SAY I HAVE BEEN CLOSED OFF BY ALL THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS. I AGREE WITH HIM ON THIS POINT. I DISAGREED WITH HIM TWO YEARS AGO ON HIS METHODS AND I HAVE ALWAYS STOOD AT THIS TABLE AND BEEN CONSISTENT OVER A LOT OF YEARS HERE THAT DEBATE SHOULD BE ALLOWED ON SECOND READING IN THE BUDGET. WE HAVE GIVEN A FIRST REVIEW. MEMBERS SHOULD BE ALLOWED QUESTIONS ON THE SECOND REVIEW OF THE BUDGET. IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN MY STAND AND I WON'T SWAY FROM IT. THE MEMBERS ARE MAKING A MISTAKE. YOU ARE MAKING A MISTAKE. A MISTAKE WAS MADE WHEN PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS WERE MADE AT CLOSURE. I'M SORRY TO SAY YOU HAVE JUST FALLEN INTO THE SAME TRAP THAT WE WERE LET INTO SEVERAL YEARS AGO TOO.

Mr. TANNER: QUESTION, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED. ARE YOU AGREED? WOULD THOSE AGREED WITH THE MOTION KINDLY INDICATE. I SHALL DECLARE THAT THE MOTION IS CARRIED. YES IT'S ABOUT TIME FOR AN ELECTION.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT A QUESTION TO THE CHAIR. HERE WE HAVE HAD A WAY THAT HAS GONE ALONG FOR SOME THIRTEEN YEARS IN YOUR EXPERIENCE IN COUNCIL. NOW THE WAY THE CHAIR IS TRYING TO CONDUCT THE COMMITTEE HAS BEEN OVERRULED OVER A LONG PRECEDENCE OF TRADITION. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WHAT HIS STATUS OF CHAIRMAN IN THIS COMMITTEE IS. OBVIOUSLY HE NO LONGER HAS

THE CONFIDENCE OF THIS HOUSE. HE KNOWS THE PRECEDENT. HE KNOWS THE TRADITION. HE'S BEEN FOLLOWING IT. HE'S BEEN FOLLOWING IT FAITHFULLY AS TO WHAT I KNOW HAS BEEN THE PRECEDENT AND THE TRADITION IN IT, AND HE HAS BEEN OVERRULED BY THIS COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL. TO ME I CAN'T THINK OF A MORE BLATANT VOTE OF NON-CONFIDENCE IN THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE CHAIRMAN'S FUTURE STATUS AS CHAIRMAN OF THIS COMMITTEE IS.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think before the Chairman is forced to answer this the two Honourable Members from Whitehorse East and West are saying it is a precedent that has been established. I'm saying it is not a precedent that has been established. If the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West will recall, when he was Chairman of the Financial Advisory Committee, that Budget was put through in a matter of should we say hours. First review passed out of Committee without amendments. First review - no consideration given to the second review. Is this precedent for the past thirteen years? You can stand up and talk about precedent all you want to. The Honourable Member, the Chairman, has said time after time we can set the rules that we want for the procedure. When I was accused in this House he stood up and every Member said yes, we can set our own rules. We are saying now we go through for the first review - any questions we will review those questions again in the second review. I don't think we are breaking any precedent that any other Chairman of the Advisory Committee has not broken in the past.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the presentation of the Budget by this Honourable Member was so completely knowledgeable in comparison to the presentation by the present Executive Committee that there weren't questions after the first reading. If there had of been, full leeway would have been given by all Members to ask further questions.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: SHOUTING.

Mr. Chairman: ORDER PLEASE. I WILL CALL

ORDER AT THIS TIME.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman - - -

Mr. Chairman: ORDER PLEASE. THE QUESTION HAS ARISEN - - -

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman - - -

Mr. McKinnon: YOU BUNCH OF POLITICAL BABIES.

Mr. Chairman: MAY I HAVE ORDER IN THE HOUSE PLEASE. I HAVE HAD A PRETTY DIFFICULT TIME OF IT TRYING TO MAKE SENSE AND ORDER OUT OF THIS COMMITTEE FOR THE LAST THREE YEARS. UP TO THAT TIME IT WAS A LOT OF HARD WORK BUT IT WAS A JOY DURING THE TIME I HAVE SPENT IN THIS COMMITTEE I DON'T MIND THE HARD WORK. IT IS A LOT OF WORK. IT ENTAILS YOU COME TO THIS CHAMBER FROM 6 AND 7 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING AND YOU DON'T LEAVE UNTIL 5 O'CLOCK AT NIGHT. I HAVE TAKEN ABUSE FROM JUST ABOUT EVERYBODY IN ONE POINT IN TIME OR ANOTHER. I HAVE HAD THREATS, ACCUSATIONS AND EVERYTHING ELSE AND PERHAPS IN MY OWN WAY I HAVE BEEN SOMEHOW ABLE TO SMOOTH SOME OF THE TROUBLED WATERS IN COMMITTEE AND CONDUCT THE COMMITTEE IN THE MANNER IT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED. WHILE SITTING IN THE CHAIR, THE HOUSE, IN THE LAST SESSION ON TWO OR THREE OCCASIONS IN AN EFFORT TO GET MEMBERS TO SERIOUSLY CONSIDER THE DECOR OF THE HOUSE, PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE, I READ AND CITED FROM BEAUCHESNE. I HAVE CITED THEM ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS OBVIOUSLY TO NO AVAIL. I PERSONALLY IN THE CHAIR CAN'T DECIDE THE ISSUE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. I DON'T LIKE TO GET LOCKED INTO THESE PERSONALITY CONFLICTS. I MUST BE AS FAIR TO ONE AS FAIR TO THE OTHER, AND HAVE ATTEMPTED TO BE SO. AS I STATED EARLIER IN THIS MATTER, THIS HAS BEEN A PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE FOR THIRTEEN YEARS.

IF SOMEONE HAS MISSED IT THEY HAVE CERTAINLY BEEN SLEEPING FOR AT LEAST THE LAST THREE YEARS. THE PROCEDURE HAS NOT CHANGED. THE MOTION THAT HAS JUST BEEN PROPOSED IS IN EFFECT A MOTION OF CLOSURE WHICH IS VERY UNFORTUNATE. WE HAVE HAD THIS TYPE OF THING BEFORE IN OTHER BILLS IN THE LAST TWO OR THREE YEARS - NEVER BEFORE. TO EFFECT CLOSURE ON THE BUDGET IS PRETTY TOUGH. FROM MY OWN PERSONAL PART I AM KIND OF STUCK IN THE CHAIR AND THROUGH THE GOOD GRACES OF COMMITTEE I HAVE BEEN PERMITTED FROM TIME TO TIME TO ASK QUESTIONS. I HAVE A QUESTION IN RELATION TO VOTE 5 WHICH ARISES OUT OF

DOCUMENTS WHICH WERE TABLED ONLY YESTERDAY MORNING IN THE HOUSE. I HAVE NOT HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS ON BEHALF OF MY CONSTITUENTS THE WISHES AND DESIRES IN RELATION TO PROVISIONS - BUDGET - FOR MATTERS MORE PARTICULARLY IN THE TERMS OF THE WATSON LAKE HOSPITAL. I AM NOW DENIED THAT BY YOUR COMMITTEE.

I HAVE BEEN INSULTED THIS MORNING IN RECESS AND MANY RECESSES ABOUT THE QUESTION. WHAT I HAVE REALLY GOT TO DECIDE WITHIN MY OWN MIND IS AS TO WHETHER THIS CONSTITUTES A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE OR NON-CONFIDENCE IN THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE AND DEPUTY-SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE. IT OCCURS TO ME THAT THE BALANCE COULD SHIFT IN THIS HOUSE ONE WAY OR ANOTHER I WOULD SUPPOSE. I MUST GIVE SOME THOUGHT TO THIS QUESTION. POSSIBLY AT A LATER TIME I MAY GIVE YOU A DECISION IN THIS MATTER - WHETHER IN THE INTEREST OF THE CONSTITUENTS I REPRESENT I SHOULD TAKE A PART AWAY FROM THE CHAIR AND LET SOMEONE ELSE DO THE WORK OF THE HOUSE IN ORDER THAT MY VOTE MAY COUNT MORE EFFICIENTLY FOR THE PEOPLE THAT I SERVE OR I MUST DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT IT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE HOUSE TO HANG ON TO THIS COMMITTEE AS CHAIRMAN AND TRY AND HANG IT TOGETHER IN THE INTERESTS OF THE CONDUCT OF THE LEGISLATURE. IT IS IN THIS MATTER THAT I AM VERY PERPLEXED. BOTH ARE EQUALLY IMPORTANT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY. CONSEQUENTLY I WILL NOT GIVE A DECISION IN THIS MATTER AT THIS TIME. I WILL RESERVE IT AND I SHALL ADVISE YOU IN A VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME AS TO WHETHER YOU WILL BE LOOKING FOR A NEW DEPUTY-SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OR WHETHER I SHALL CONTINUE IN THIS POSITION. IN ANY EVENT, IF I AM TO CONTINUE IN THIS POSITION I AM GOING TO NEED A MOTION OF SUPPORT. MAY WE NOW PROCEED TO VOTE NO. 6.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, MIGHT I SUGGEST THAT WE ADJOURN UNTIL 2 O'CLOCK TO GIVE YOU TIME TO MAKE THAT DECISION. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AT THIS STAGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'M GUIDED BY WHATEVER THE HOUSE WISHES TO DO.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN WAS QUITE WILLING TO PROCEED. HE SAID HE WOULD BRING DOWN HIS DECISION. I THINK WE SHOULD GIVE HIM, IF HE WANTS, UNTIL 2 O'CLOCK. IF HE WANTS

ANOTHER DAY THIS IS THE DECISION MR. CHAIRMAN WILL HAVE TO MAKE. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD TRY TO FORCE HIM INTO MAKING - INTO TAKING A POSITION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THEN PROCEED TO VOTE 6.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN VOTE 6 THE FIRST QUESTION RELATED TO THE PROTECTIVE SERVICES BRANCH. THE QUESTION WAS WAS THERE PROVISION MADE FOR A VEHICLE OF SOME DESCRIPTION FOR THE FIRE CHIEF TO BE HIRED FOR WATSON LAKE. THE ANSWER IS YES THERE WILL BE A VEHICLE AVAILABLE TO HIM. THE NEXT QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, RELATED TO ESTABLISHMENT 605.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL JUST AS I STATE HERE, ANY ITEM IN THE ESTIMATE HERE, THE TOTAL ESTIMATE WHETHER THERE IS A QUESTION ON IT OR NOT, HAS ALWAYS BEEN DECIDED. WE'VE NOW CUT OFF VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5 BUT 6 IS WIDE OPEN AGAIN.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE NEXT QUESTION IS - - -

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, POINT OF ORDEF. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW BEFORE PASSING THIS BILL, AND BEFORE PASSING THE ESTIMATE, WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE PERMITTED TO MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO ANY PART OF THIS WHOLE ESTIMATE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS YES, EXCEPT WITH THE DELETION OF VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5. ANY MEMBER IS PERMITTED TO ASK ANY QUESTION IN RELATION TO ANY OTHER PART OF THE BUDGET EXCEPT THOSE TWO VOTES.

MRS. WATSON: IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE WERE GOING TO REVIEW EACH VOTE AS FAR AS THE QUESTIONS THAT WERE ASKED ON THE FIRST REVIEW. THIS WAS MY UNDERSTANDING OF PROCEDURE. NOW MAYBE SOME OF THE OTHER MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK UP ON THE PROCEDURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I HAVE SO RULED ON THIS MATTER IN CONCURRENCE WITH THE PRACTICE OF THE HOUSE IN THE LAST THIRTEEN YEARS OF MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE. I'M QUITE SURE IT WAS NEVER OTHERWISE PRIOR TO THIS. WE ARE NOW MAKING A SECOND REVIEW OF THE BUDGET. IT IS QUITE IN ORDER, AND ANY PART OF THE VOTE WHERE MEMBERS HAVE MISSED QUESTIONS MAYBE IN THE FIRST RUN THIS IS WHY YOU HAVE A SECOND REVIEW. ALSO,

AT THE SAME TIME WE GET THE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE FIRST REVIEW. I HAVE SO RULED; EXCEPT THAT NO MEMBER MAY NOW DISCUSS ANY PART OF VOTE 4 OR VOTE 5. ANY OTHER PART OF THE BUDGET IS STILL OPEN TO MEMBERS TO QUESTION. WOULD YOU PROCEED. WE ARE DISCUSSING VOTE 6.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, may I just ask you a question please. If we check back in the VOTES & PROCEEDINGS, when we have gone through the BUDGET in the PRELIMINARY look at it, any item that the CHAIRMAN says are you clear on it surely Mr. CHAIRMAN DOES NOT REQUIRE A FORMAL MOTION ON THIS FLOOR SAYING THAT PARTICULAR ITEM IN THAT PARTICULAR VOTE IS CLEAR. THE AGREEMENT TO BEING CLEAR, TO MY WAY OF THINKING AND MAYBE I'VE BEEN WRONG THE LAST THREE YEARS, BUT WHEN COMMITTEE AS A WHOLE SAYS THEY ARE CLEAR ON AN ITEM THAT MEANS THAT THEY ARE SATISFIED WITH THAT ITEM. YOU COULD GO ON AD INFINITUM TO KEEP COMING BACK TO AN ITEM UNTIL THE TOTAL BUDGET IS PASSED. CLEAR TO ME MEANS THAT THAT ITEM IS FINISHED WITH.

Mr. Chairman: FROM THE CHAIR FROM MY OWN EXPERIENCE I'VE NEVER HAD ANY PROBLEM. WE'VE WASTED A GOOD HOUR ALREADY TALKING ABOUT PROCEDURES. FOR WHAT REASON THESE PROCEDURES HAVE BECOME SUDDENLY SO GREATLY IMPORTANT IS BEYOND ME. I HAVE YET TO FATHOM THAT. THIS VERY RARELY HAPPENS EXCEPT IN THE ISSUE WHERE SOMEONE TO EFFECT CLOSURE. CLOSURE HAS BEEN EFFECTED IN TWO PARTS OF THE BUDGET. THE BALANCE OF IT, THE SECOND REVIEW - THE FIRST REVIEW, I'LL SAY THIS AGAIN FOR THE LAST TIME, THE FIRST REVIEW WE GO THROUGH ITEM BY ITEM. IN THE SECOND REVIEW YOU CAN ANSWER ANY QUESTION IN RELATION TO THE VOTE IN TOTAL. WE ARE NOT REVIEWING ITEM BY ITEM AGAIN. IF YOU HAVE ANY FINAL QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET, THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL MEMBERS TO ASK THEM AND GET THEIR ANSWERS IS AT THIS SECOND TIME. I'VE SAID THIS ABOUT FIVE TIMES TODAY. IT HAS BEEN A PRACTICE OF THE HOUSE. GENERALLY THESE THINGS JUST FLIP BY. TODAY THERE IS A BIG FIGHT. I DON'T KNOW WHY.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what you just said. THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT I SAID. WHEN WE CLEAR THE ITEMS THEY ARE CLEAR. IF YOU WANT TO TALK IN EACH VOTE AS WE ARE GOING THROUGH WITH THE QUESTIONS ON THE TOTAL THING, THAT'S FINE. WE WERE TOTALLY CLEAR ON THE PREVIOUS TWO VOTES. AS THE HONOURABLE

MEMBER FROM DAWSON SAID, THAT HE'S GONE THROUGH THIS BUDGET, AS YOU CLEAR AN ITEM THAT'S IT. WHAT ELSE IS THERE TO TALK ABOUT? WHAT THE CHAIRMAN IS SAYING IS EXACTLY THE SAME AS WHAT WE ARE SAYING.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that this is the third review we are making of the Main Estimates. When we went into Interim Supply, we went through every vote. If you remember, we went through the Administration vote really quite in detail at that time. In fact the notes I have on that one vote from Interim Supply were much more - many more questions when we went through the first time. So here we are. We are doing the third review of the Main Estimates. Maybe we are breaking precedence when we are doing it for the third time.

Mr. Chairman: I'M GOING TO PUT AN END TO THIS. I HAVE TO BECAUSE THIS IS BECOMING SO RIDICULOUS. UNLESS SOMEBODY HAS SOMETHING VERY VERY DOWN TO EARTH TO SAY ON THIS SUBJECT, LET US CALL IT TO AN END AND GET ON WITH THE WORK.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, there has been some reference made to the calling of the word "clear". When we say clear after the first reading it means it is cleared for first reading. THAT'S ALL IT MEANS. IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT THE WHOLE VOTE IS CLEARED COMPLETELY.

Mr. Stutter: AND IF EACH ONE WAS CLEARED, YOU CLEAR THE WHOLE BUDGET AS - - -

Mr. Chamberlist: No.

Mr. Chairman: ORDER PLEASE. ONE AT A TIME.

Mr. Chamberlist: IF YOU CLEAR FOR THE FIRST READING THIS IS ALL THAT IS INVOLVED. ANYWAYS THERE IS NOT MUCH USE IN TALKING ABOUT IT.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I will get down to the nitty gritty of it. THE NITTY GRITTY IS WHAT THE HONOURABLE CHAIRMAN HAS SAID. HE HAS BEEN DENIED THE RIGHT, ON BEHALF OF HIS CONSTITUENTS, TO SPEAK TO ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ITEMS IN THE BUDGET CONCERNING HIS CONSTITUENTS. THE HOSPITAL AT WATSON LAKE. Mr. Chairman, what we have done is we have ALLOWED THE ADMINISTRATION TO BRING IN THE

PLANS YESTERDAY. YESTERDAY WAS IT? THE PLANS WERE BROUGHT IN. AND TODAY HE IS DENIED THE RIGHT TO BE ABLE TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF HIS CONSTITUENTS FOR THE PLANS OF THE HOSPITAL FOR WATSON LAKE BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN CLOSED OFF FROM DEBATE IN VOTE 5 ON HEALTH & WELFARE.

THAT IS THE DANGER OF WHAT YOU HAVE DONE, THAT IS WHAT THE DANGER OF CLOSURE IS. THAT IS WHAT THE DANGER IS OF NOT ALLOWING PEOPLE TO COME UP A SECOND TIME ON MATTERS IN THE BUDGET WHICH EFFECT THEIR CONSTITUENCY. MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE HAS BEEN DENIED DEBATE ON THE MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT CONCERNING HIS CONSTITUENTS IN THE 1974-75 BUDGET. IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS ARE STILL PROUD OF WHAT THEY HAVE DONE AFTER THAT ONE EXAMPLE ONLY, THEN I DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE THINKING.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT THE MEMBER HAS NOT BEEN DENIED DEBATE ON THOSE PLANS. THEY WERE TABLED YESTERDAY. IF HE WISHES TO PUT THOSE PLANS INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR DEBATE, HE KNOWS FULL WELL THAT HE CAN HAVE A FULL DEBATE ON THOSE PLANS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU HAVE CLOSED THE VOTE. (LAUGHTER). YOU HAVE CLOSED THE VOTE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: LET ME PUT THIS POINT CLEAR. I AM VERY VERY HIGHLY DISTURBED, AS A MEMBER, ABOUT THE LACK OF OPPORTUNITY. I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT THAT AS CHAIRMAN. AS CHAIRMAN I AM DISTURBED THAT SOME MEMBERS, OR THE MAJORITY OF MEMBERS, WOULD EFFECT CLOSURE ON AN ISSUE SO IMPORTANT AS THE BUDGET OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. THERE IS A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO. I'M APPALLED AS AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER THAT I DO NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY ON BEHALF OF MY CONSTITUENTS AS A MEMBER. I AM MORE GREATLY APPALLED THAT THE CLOSURE BEING EFFECTED ON VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5 OF THE BUDGET. MAY WE NOW PROCEED WITH VOTE 6. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO VOTE 6?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WERE A COUPLE OF OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS I HAVEN'T DEALT WITH AS YET. THERE IS A QUESTION RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT 605. THE QUESTION WAS HOW MUCH MONEY WAS INCLUDED IN 605 FOR WORK TO BE DONE IN ROSS RIVER. THE ANSWER IS AS FOLLOWS: WE HAVE PROVISION IN THE BUDGET FOR ROAD WORK IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,560.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF THESE COULD BE TABLED OR IF YOU COULD TABLE ME A COPY OF THESE. THIS WOULD BE BETTER RATHER THAN TAKE THEM DOWN.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THAT BE AGREEABLE TO COMMITTEE IF I GOT A COPY OF THIS THING RATHER THAN WRITING IT DOWN.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS ANOTHER QUESTION RELATED TO ESTABLISHMENT 605. THE QUESTION WAS ASKED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON. THE QUESTION WAS HAS THE WHITEHORSE CITY COUNCIL EVER ASKED FOR AN UPWARD REVISION OF THE POPULATION FOR THE GRANT IN LIEU OF TAXES. OUR RECORDS DO NOT INDICATE ANY FORMAL REQUEST FROM THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE IN THAT REGARD.

MR. MCKINNON: NO. THE QUESTION WASN'T POPULATION, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, EXCUSE ME. EVEN THOUGH THE OTHER MEMBER WANTS IT TABLED COULD THE WITNESS READ THEM OUT BECAUSE I WANT TO HEAR THEM ANYWAY. IF THERE ARE NOT VERY MANY ITEMS, I PERSONALLY DON'T NEED THEM TABLED. IF THAT MEMBER DOES - - -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR THEM BUT I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET A COPY OF THEM BECAUSE I CAN'T WRITE THEM DOWN AS QUICKLY.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. EXPENDITURES WE'RE ANTICIPATING FOR ROSS RIVER ARE: ROADS \$6,560.00; UTILITIES WILL BE \$7,110.00; DOG CONTROL \$600.00; GARBAGE \$600.00; CEMETARY \$300.00; WATER AND SEWER \$3,000.00, TOTALLING \$18,560.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: UTILITIES COVER STREET LIGHTING I PRESUME?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN. AS A MATTER OF INTEREST THE EXPENDITURES FOR 1973-74, AND THEY ARE NOT ALL IN, THEY WERE APPROXIMATELY \$10,000.00 FOR ALL THOSE ITEMS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS, OF COURSE, FROM THE CHAIR IS WHAT GAVE RISE TO THE QUESTION BECAUSE THE MONEYS - ANY MONEYS THAT WERE BUDGETED, IF INDEED THEY WERE LAST YEAR, WEREN'T SPENT IN ROSS RIVER. THEY HAVE ASKED ME THIS YEAR IF

I WOULD GET SOME DELINEATION AS TO WHAT IS INTENDED TO BE SPENT SO THEY KNOW WHETHER THEY ARE GETTING A FAIR DEAL. ANYTHING FURTHER?

Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure if Mr. Miller will check the Votes & Proceedings, I didn't ask whether the City of Whitehorse had asked for a reassessment of the population to get more money. I was asking whether the City of Whitehorse had asked for there to be an upward revision of the per capital grant period.

Mr. Miller: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I obviously misunderstood the question. We will have to do further research to see whether there has been anything requested in that matter.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, in Establishment 605 it shows an increase of \$31,000.00 in salaries and wages with only one additional man-year. Could we get some explanation?

Mr. Miller: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I don't have the actual breakdown of this amount. I will bring it forward to Committee.

Mr. Chamberlist: By the same token could we have the reason for the fringe benefits which have now been multiplied three times.

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: Can we get a breakdown as well in that vote of the grants, loans and contributions which have - - -

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that information is available on page A 28.

Mr. Chamberlist: Page which?

Mr. Miller: A 28.

Mr. Chamberlist: Oh yes. I beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further?

Mr. Chamberlist: Well this will be left open I take it until I get the information that has been asked for.

Mrs. Watson: No, Mr. Chairman. I feel that we should clear this with the information to be brought back to the Honourable Member.

Mr. Chamberlist: LAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a ridiculous request. She wants it cleared without even being able to back up the information that's been asked for. No way.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is this is specific information that is still outstanding. The rest of it has cleared so that when you go back again you don't start opening up the whole thing again.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, this is so unfair. If you will check the Votes & Proceedings you will find that the Executive Committee Member in charge of this Department did misunderstand my question. The most important part to me is the Municipal - the per capital grants to the municipalities. You know, I'm not going to just close the - you know, clear the - - -

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I've said that any specific questions that were outstanding you could come back to them. The rest of it would be cleared. You have a specific question.

Mr. Chairman: It is interesting to note that people get up and say well I said, I said, I said. To me it is a decision of Committee in many of these cases, and if it is possibly better you refer to we said because I think no single Member in Committee sets the policy unless Committee as a whole sets the policy. Will there be anything further in Vote 6? Then we shall proceed to Vote 7.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there were a number of questions in the preliminary of Vote 7 which we still don't have the answers to. We will bring those forward hopefully this afternoon.

Mr. McKinnon: Isn't there going to be a motion to clear this vote too, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Vote 7? Okay Vote 8.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, may I just - on Establishment 701, salaries and wages, there is a difference between \$53,869.00 and \$80,000.00. That's approximately \$26,000.00.

THIS SHOWS JUST ONE AND A HALF ADDITIONAL PEOPLE AND THAT ONE AND A HALF JUST HAPPENS TO BE CASUAL. COULD WE GET A BREAKDOWN AS TO WHY THERE IS THIS AMOUNT OF INCREASE IN SALARY AND BY THE SAME TOKEN THE FRINGE BENEFITS AS WELL.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING ON VOTE 8?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ACCORDING TO MY NOTES THERE WAS ONE OUTSTANDING QUESTION. THE QUESTION, I THINK, WAS ASKED BY THE CHAIRMAN HIMSELF. HE WANTED TO KNOW WHAT CASE LOADS THERE WERE FOR THE WATSON LAKE AREA. I HAVE A LISTING HERE OF CASES BY YEAR SINCE APRIL 1, 1971. I CAN HANDLE THIS IN ONE OF TWO WAYS. I CAN EITHER TABLE IT OR I CAN READ IT OUT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COULD WE TABLE IT SO WE COULD GET A COPY OF IT.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. WE WILL TABLE IT AS SOON AS WE GET COPIES RUN OFF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THANK YOU. ALSO, I THINK THERE WAS ONE OUTSTANDING MATTER. WHEN IT'S AVAILABLE IF WE COULD HAVE THE INFORMATION RELATING TO THE SETTING UP OF "M" DIVISION, R.C.M.P. UNDER POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. AS THAT INFORMATION COMES AVAILABLE IT WILL CERTAINLY BE TABLED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD LIKE TO ASK A GENERAL QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN. MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I UNDERSTAND IT THE SUPREME COURT MAINTAINS ITS OWN FUNDS. THESE FUNDS ARE PAID OUT BY THE JUDGE AS RIGHTLY IT SHOULD BE. I UNDERSTAND FURTHER THAT THE MAGISTRATE'S COURT NOW HAS HAD ALL THE FUNDS REMOVED FROM THEM WHICH ARE FUNDS WHICH ARE PLACED IN TRUST NOT WITH THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, BUT WITH THE COURT. AS A RESULT PEOPLE AT TIMES HAVE DIFFICULTY IN GETTING THEIR PAYMENTS OUT OF COURT. THEY HAVE TO SOMETIMES WAIT FOR A NUMBER OF DAYS. HAS THERE BEEN ANY IMPROVEMENT, MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THIS PARTICULAR PROCEDURE? PERHAPS MR. MILLER CAN ANSWER.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE HAS BEEN. WE HAVE WORKED OUT A PROCEDURE WITH

THE DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS THAT RELEASE OF BAILS OR RELEASE OF TRUST FUNDS HELD IN THE NAME OF THE LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT CAN BE CLEARED OUT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT WITHIN AN HOUR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. OKAY. THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I TAKE IT BEFORE CLEARING VOTE 8 THAT THERE WILL BE AN INTENSIVE STUDY INTO THE DEFINITE NEED FOR A MAGISTRATE IN WATSON LAKE FULL-TIME; A DEPUTY-MAGISTRATE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I RECALL THE ANSWER THAT WAS GIVEN TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THE OTHER DAY I THINK THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER FOR THE LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT INDICATED THAT AGAIN WE CONTINUE TO REVIEW THE NEED FOR DEPUTY-MAGISTRATES AND WE HAVE NO HARD, CONCRETE EVIDENCE THAT WE NEED EVEN A DEPUTY-MAGISTRATE IN WHITEHORSE AT THIS POINT. AS I RECALL HE DID GIVE THE COMMITMENT THAT THIS WOULD CONTINUE TO BE REVIEWED ON AN ON-GOING BASIS, WHEN THE FACTS OF THE MATTER INDICATED A NEED IN WATSON LAKE THAT THIS WOULD BE DONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I MIGHT JUST SAY THAT I WAS DISSATISFIED WITH THE ANSWER AND I ALSO DEPLORED, AS A MEMBER AT THAT TIME, THE FACT THAT I COULDN'T GET THE WITNESS WHO HAS THE INFORMATION TO BACK UP THE FACT THAT THE ADMINISTRATION IS WRONG IN THIS PARTICULAR ONE. THERE IS A DEFINITE NEED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT FOR A DEPUTY MAGISTRATE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT, I THINK THIS IS WHY THIS BREAKDOWN OF INCIDENTS IN WATSON LAKE HAS BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE COMMUNITY OF CARCROSS HAS BEEN FOR SOME CONSIDERABLE TIME MAKING REQUESTS FOR A FULL TIME DETACHMENT TO BE PLACED IN THAT AREA. THERE HAVE BEEN VARIOUS POSSIBLE TYPE OF PROMISES THAT HAS BEEN EMANATING FROM THE ADMINISTRATION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THIS COULD BE DONE. THE CARCROSS AREA AND NOW WITH THE INCREASE IN PEOPLE AS A RESULT OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ROAD TO SKAGWAY, AND AS A RESULT OF MANY REQUESTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE TO HAVE SOME LAW AND ORDER IN THE AREA DURING THE WINTER MONTHS, HAVE REQUESTED THAT A DETACHMENT FOR THE R.C.M.P. BE CONSTRUCTED. I UNDERSTAND THIS IS CONSTRUCTED BY THE FUNDS OF THE R.C.M.P. THEMSELVES.

WE HAVE PROVISIONS IN THE POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DETACHMENTS AS AND WHEN WE WANT. WHAT CONSIDERATION HAS BEEN GIVEN TO MAINTAIN A PERMANENT DETACHMENT IN THE CARCROSS AREA EFFECTIVE FROM, LETS SAY, MAY 1ST WHEN I UNDERSTAND THE DETACHMENT WILL BE OPENING UP?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO MY KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE NOT AS YET, WHEN I SAY WE, THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, HAS NOT YET REQUESTED THE R.C.M.P. TO OPEN ANY PERMANENT DETACHMENTS IN THE TERRITORY. WE CONTINUE TO REVIEW THESE MATTERS WITH THE LOCAL INSPECTOR AND WHEN THE R.C.M.P. FEEL THERE IS THE NEED THEN WE HAVE NEVER OBJECTED TO THIS. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE CURRENT STATUS IS IN CARCROSS. I REALIZE THE DETACHMENT IS NOW OPEN FOR THIS YEAR. WHETHER OR NOT THERE HAS BEEN ANY REVIEW AS TO A PERMANENT DETACHMENT IN THE LAST LITTLE WHILE I DON'T KNOW. I CAN FIND OUT AND BRING THAT FORWARD OR ALTERNATELY WE CAN ASK THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE TO COME DOWN TO COUNCIL AND ANSWER THE QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: EITHER WAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF WE COULD HAVE SOME INFORMATION BROUGHT FORWARD, ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF THE MANY REQUESTS AND INDEED PETITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO THE COMMISSIONER IN RESPECT TO THIS PARTICULAR MATTER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL HAVE SOMETHING BROUGHT FORWARD AFTER LUNCH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I THINK IN VIEW OF THE TIME, I MIGHT SAY BEFORE I CALL A RECESS THAT I WILL HAVE A DECISION FOR YOU THIS AFTERNOON IN RESPECT TO MY FUTURE AS YOUR DEPUTY SPEAKER. I WILL STAND COMMITTEE IN RECESS UNTIL 2:00 O'CLOCK.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCIL WILL NOW COME TO ORDER. PRIOR TO OUR RISING FOR LUNCH WE HAD A QUESTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE CHAIRMAN UNDER REVIEW. I MIGHT SAY I'VE HAD A DIFFICULT TIME IN THE VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME TO CONSIDER THIS MATTER.

I THINK THAT DURING THE DEBATE THIS MORNING THERE WAS VERY STRONG SUGGESTION THAT THE CHAIRMAN WAS NOT FUNCTIONING AS IS HE SHOULD, IMPARTIALLY, AND NOT DOING THE DUTIES OF THE HOUSE TO THE EXTENT THAT SOME MEMBERS WOULD PREFER THAT I DO.

THE QUESTION OF PROCEEDURES CAME UNDER ATTACK. IT WAS IMPUTED THAT I WAS DEPARTING FROM PROCEEDURES IN THIS COMMITTEE AND AS I STATED I HAVE NOT DEPARTED FROM THE POSITION OF THE HOUSE IN RELATION TO CONSIDERING MAIN ESTIMATES, MORE PARTICULARLY IN THE MATTER OF VIEWING ESTIMATES WITH A FINAL OR SECONDARY VIEW.

I HAVE HAD TO CONSIDER WHETHER I SHOULD CONTINUE TO ACCEPT THE INSULTS THAT ARE HURLED AT THE CHAIR DURING RECESSES OR OTHERWISE OF A VERY UNPARLIAMENTARY AND UNCOMPLIMENTARY NATURE. I HAVE TAKEN THIS FOR ABOUT THREE YEARS NOW AND EVEN IN THE FACE OF THAT I HAVE ATTEMPTED TO MORE OR LESS KEEP MY COOL AND PERHAPS TO OFFER TO OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL THE SUGGESTION THAT THEY TOO KEEP THEIR COOL AND THAT WE COULD GET ON WITH THE BUSINESS OF THE PUBLIC.

MY DECISION TO RESIGN, OR THE DECISION WHETHER I SHOULD RESIGN AS DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE IS A TOUGH ONE BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF ABANDONING THE DUTY IMPOSED BY THE HOUSE UPON ME. IT IS YOUR WISH TO CONDUCT THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE IN AN ORDERLY AND IMPARTIAL MANNER CONCURRENT WITH THE RULES AND STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE.

I WOULD LIKE TO DRAW TO YOUR ATTENTION ANNOTATION NO. 4, BEAUCHESNE, AND I QUOTE THE PRINCIPALS THAT LIE AT THE BASIS OF ENGLISH PARLIAMENTARY LAW, AS BOURINOT SO APTLY SAYS, ARE: "TO PROTECT A MINORITY AND RESTRAIN THE IMPROVIDENCE OR TYRANNY OF A MAJORITY; TO SECURE THE TRANSACTION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS IN AN ORDERLY MANNER; TO ENABLE EVERY MEMBER TO EXPRESS AN OPINION WITHIN LIMITS NECESSARY TO PRESERVE DECORUM AND PREVENT AN UNNECESSARY WASTE OF TIME; TO GIVE ABUNDANT OPPORTUNITY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF EVERY MEASURE, AND TO PREVENT ANY LEGISLATIVE ACTION

BEING TAKEN UPON SUDDEN IMPULSE." UNQUOTE.

THE WHOLE MATTER AROSE THIS MORNING OVER DISCUSSIONS OF THE BUDGET WHERE IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT AN ITEM IN THE BUDGET, OR A VOTE, NAMELY VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5 BE CLEARED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION. NOT WITHSTANDING AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF THE HOUSE WAS ABSENT DURING THE TIME THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THOSE VOTES WAS DISCUSSED.

THE DECISION WAS MADE, EVENTUALLY, BY MOTION THAT CLOSURE BE EFFECTED ON BOTH THESE PARTICULAR ITEMS.

I HAVE NEVER BEEN ABLE TO CONDONE AS DEPUTY SPEAKER, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OR INDEED IN THE ABSENCE OF MR. SPEAKER, IN THE SPEAKER'S CHAIR; CLOSURE OF ANY SORT ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS, THE PUBLIC OF THE YUKON. IT IS AGAINST PARLIAMENTARY JUSTICE AND SERVES NO USEFUL PURPOSE IN THIS HOUSE. I THINK I HAVE RULED ON THAT BEFORE.

I WOULD AGAIN LIKE TO QUOTE IN THIS RESPECT FROM BEAUCHESNE WHO REFERS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS WHICH YOU MAY CONSIDER TO BE THIS HOUSE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS ANNOTATION. "WE USE THE WORDS HOUSE OF COMMONS VERY OFTEN WITHOUT PAUSING TO REFLECT UPON WHAT THOSE WORDS MEAN. THE WORD COMMONS MEANS THE PEOPLE. THIS IS THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE SITTING ON BOTH SIDES OF THIS HOUSE AND ON BOTH SIDES OF THE SPEAKER ARE REPRESENTATIVES OF EVERY CONSTITUENCY. COLLECTIVELY, THOSE OF US WHO MEET IN THIS CHAMBER REPRESENT ALL CANADIANS. THAT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY. THAT IS OUR DUTY. OUR RIGHTS ARE IMPORTANT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT THOSE RIGHTS REPRESENT THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES. IF THE TRADITIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE ARE RELEASED, LIMITED OR ARBITRARILY CURTAILED IN ANY WAY IT IS NOT OUR RIGHTS THAT ARE CONCERNED. WHAT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT IS THAT IN THAT CURTAILMENT OF RIGHTS THERE IS A LIMITATION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES. THE FREEDOM THAT WE HAVE HERE TO SHAPE AND GUIDE LEGISLATION, NO MATTER ON WHICH SIDE OF THE HOUSE WE MAY SIT, IS PART OF THE VERY FREEDOM WE CHERISH HERE IN THIS COUNTRY OF OURS. IT IS HERE IN THE HOUSE TO WHICH ALL OF THE PEOPLE MUST LOOK FOR JUST LAWS; PROPERLY CONSIDERED, PROPERLY MADE, THAT CANADIANS IN EVERY PART OF CANADA MUST LOOK FOR THE GREATER PART OF THEIR FREEDOM, FOR THE ASSURANCE OF THAT TYPE OF GOVERNMENT WHICH WILL BE IN ITSELF AN EXPRESSION OF THE FREEDOM THAT HAS COME DOWN TO US THROUGH SO MANY GENERATIONS OF SACRIFICE AND

TREMENDOUS EFFORTS." I CITE THIS FROM BEAUCHESNE IN ORDER THAT MEMBERS MAY DWELL ON THOSE WORDS. I THINK THAT IT CLEARLY STATES THAT WE HAVE A GREATER RESPONSIBILITY THAN WE ARE CONSIDERING WHILE DELIBERATING IN THIS CHAMBERS.

FINALLY I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY THIS. THAT I AM TORN BETWEEN THE DECISION TO RESIGN BECAUSE I'M REALLY NOT A QUITTER. I NEVER WOULD BE AND I DON'T THINK THE PEOPLE WHO SENT ME HERE WOULD WISH ME TO RESIGN ON SUCH AN ISSUE. I ALSO HAD TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION IF I DID RESIGN WHAT POSITION THIS WOULD PUT ME IN IN RELATION TO THE GOVERNMENT SIDE OF THE HOUSE AND THE MAJORITY THAT THEY NOW ENJOY THEY MAY NO LONGER ENJOY. ON THE OTHER HAND, AS I SAY, I CANNOT LET DOWN MY PEOPLE IN ATTEMPTING WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT THE AFFAIRS OF THIS HOUSE IN AN ORDERLY AND UNBIASED MANNER.

I'VE GIVEN THE MATTER A GREAT DEAL OF CONSIDERATION AND MY DECISION WOULD BE THAT FOLLOWING A REPORT OF COMMITTEE THIS EVENING TO THE HOUSE I SHALL ASK FOR A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE OF THE HOUSE IN RESPECT OF MY POSITION AND MY DUTIES AS DEPUTY SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE. I THINK THAT IN FAIRNESS THIS IS THE ONLY WAY THAT ONE COULD CONTINUE. I WOULD ASK MEMBERS TO GIVE THIS CONSIDERATION PRIOR TO THE SPEAKER RESUMING THE CHAIR TO CLOSE THESE COMMITTEE HEARINGS THIS EVENING.

MAY WE NOW PROCEED TO DISCUSSIONS IN RELATION TO BILL NO. 3. WE ARE, I BELIEVE AT VOTE NO. 8. ANYTHING FURTHER ON VOTE NO. 8?

CLEAR?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT VOTE IS VOTE NO. 9- DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WORKS. I BELIEVE WE HAVE SOME ANSWERS COMING.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A FEW QUESTIONS RAISED THE OTHER DAY. THERE WAS A QUESTION RAISED, MR. CHAIRMAN, REGARDING THE BOAT LAUNCHING PROGRAM. WHERE WERE THEY INSTALLED IN 1973 AND WHERE ARE THEY TO BE INSTALLED IN 1974?

THE LIST IS FAIRLY LENGTHY. I CAN HANDLE THIS BY READING THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN, INTO THE RECORD OR I CAN DISTRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF COUNCIL A

LIST OF NAMES. THERE IS SOME 18 INSTALLED IN 1973, AND THE PROPOSALS WILL INSTALL A FURTHER 17 IN 1974.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD COMMITTEE AGREE THAT THESE BE DISTRIBUTED LATER?

MR. TANNER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I AGREE THAT THEY BE DISTRIBUTED LATER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: FINE, PROCEED.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A QUESTION RAISED,...

MR. CHAMBERLIST: CAN WE GET THOSE CIRCULATED NOW THEN SO THAT WE CAN BE DEALING WITH THEM?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE COPIES. I WILL ARRANGE TO GET COPIES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MADAM CLERK WOULD YOU GET THE COPIES?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, PERHAPS AT THE SAME TIME THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER COULD GET COPIES OF THE OTHER INFORMATION THAT HE HAS FOR US.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS ONE ITEM FOR TABLING. THE CLERK NOW HAS IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE NEXT QUESTION WAS RAISED BY THE CHAIRMAN REGARDING PROVISION FOR A ROOM IN THE WATSON LAKE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING FOR THE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT. I AM ADVISED BY THE DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WORKS THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE NEED FOR SUCH A FACILITY AT THIS TIME AND THEY DON'T FORESEE A NEED IN THE FUTURE. HE TELLS ME THAT EVEN WHILE THEY HAD INSPECTORS DOWN THERE LAST YEAR THEY DIDN'T NEED ANY SPACE FOR THE INSPECTORS. IF THERE IS A NEED THERE IS ROOM IN THE BASEMENT OF THE WATSON LAKE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING FOR THIS FACILITY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE LAST QUESTION THAT I HAVE RELATES TO THE AMOUNT OF REVENUE RAISED FROM AVIATION FUEL TAX. THE REVENUE RAISED IN 1972/73 WAS \$51,000. THE REVENUE TO BE RAISED IN 1973/74 WILL BE APPROXIMATELY \$51,000, AND WE DON'T SEE ANY MAJOR INCREASE FOR 1974/ THERE MAY BE A SMALL INCREASE BUT IT WILL BE VERY SMALL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTE 9?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE PROCEDURE, MR. CHAIRMAN, BEING USED FOR ROADS THAT ARE NOW BEING TERMED RECREATIONAL ROADS BEING UPGRADED TO THAT OF TERRITORIAL HIGHWAYS, SPECIFICALLY THE ANNIE LAKE ROAD WHICH NOW HAS SOME TWENTY FOUR FAMILIES LIVING ON THAT ROAD. IT ONLY GETS GRADED ABOUT ONCE IN EVERY YEAR. PEOPLE ARE HAVING TROUBLE GETTING IN AND OUT OF THAT PARTICULAR AREA AS A RESULT OF THERE BEING NO FUNDS AVAILABLE TO GRADE THE ROAD.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS QUESTION WAS RECENTLY RAISED THROUGH COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, PARTICULARLY IN REGARD TO WINTER MAINTENANCE OF RECREATIONAL ROADS. I'VE ASKED OUR HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT TO PUT FORWARD A PROPOSED POLICY PAPER OUTLINING THE QUESTION OF WINTER MAINTENANCE ON RECREATIONAL ROADS, UPGRADE OF RECREATIONAL ROADS AND TERRITORIAL ROADS THESE TYPES OF THINGS. THIS PAPER IS NOT AS YET COMPILED. THERE WILL BE A COST FACTOR INVOLVED WITH IT WHICH WE HAVE NOT INCLUDED IN THIS BUDGET. FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF THE POLICY AND I WOULD ASSUME THE POLICY APPROVAL BY COUNCIL, THIS SORT OF A PROGRAM WILL BE IMPLEMENTED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE FOR THIS DEPARTMENT UP TO AND INCLUDING THE 31ST OF MARCH?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR HIGHWAY AND PUBLIC WORKS AS PROCESSED OF MARCH 31ST - \$9,666,480.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN VIEW OF THERE BEING APPROXIMATELY \$500,000 BUDGETED FOR MORE THAN WAS NEEDED LAST YEAR, WHAT ASSURANCE HAVE WE THAT THE AMOUNT BUDGETED FOR THIS YEAR AGAIN WILL NOT BE \$600,000 MORE THAN HAS BEEN ASKED FOR.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIGURE THAT I JUST QUOTED IS NOT THE TOTAL YEARS FIGURE. IT IS THE PROCESSING BILLS UP TO MARCH 31ST. THERE IS FOR EXAMPLE TWO WEEKS OF PAYROLL TO BE ADDED TO THAT AND THERE ARE A NUMBER OF VERY LARGE OUTSTANDING BILLS THAT WILL BE PAID IN APRIL RESPECTING THE 1973/74 FISCAL YEAR.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I BELIEVE THERE WAS EVEN A SUPPLEMENTARY THIS YEAR.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ONLY SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. TANNER: RIGHT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD WE HAVE SOME INDICATION OF HOW MUCH THOSE OUTSTANDING AMOUNTS ARE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE THOSE FIGURES AVAILABLE. MAYBE THE TREASURER CAN TELL US WHEN THE NEXT TREASURY RUN OF EXPENDITURES WILL BE.

MR. TREASURER: IT'S DUE TO COME OFF SHORTLY.

MR. MILLER: WITHIN A MATTER OF A FEW DAYS I WOULD ASSUME BUT THAT AGAIN WILL NOT BE COMPLETE BECAUSE WE PROCESS BILLS UP TO THE END OF APRIL FOR WORK OR SERVICES THAT WERE PROVIDED UP TO THE END OF MARCH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I JUST NOTICED ON THIS BOAT LAUNCHING RAMP PROGRAM WE'VE GOT KATHLEEN LAKE DOWN FOR A 1974 PROGRAM AND I WAS JUST THERE A COUPLE OF DAYS AGO AND THEY HAVE A BOAT LOADING RAMP.

MR. MCKINNON: GETTING TO WORK QUICK IN THE YEAR.

MR. MILLER: I THINK IT'S A PRIVATE ONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I DON'T KNOW. IT'S A RAMP SIMILAR TO WHAT WE HAVE IN OTHER PLACES IN THE TERRITORY. I DON'T KNOW WHO IT BELONGS TO.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IS IT IN THE PUBLIC CAMPGROUND?

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES. IT'S IN THE PUBLIC CAMPGROUND. RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF IT AND IT'S THE SAME GOVERNMENT RAMP, THE SAME THING THAT WE HAVE AT SIMPSON LAKE AND AT OTHER POINTS. I JUST WONDERED WHY IT WAS GETTING ANOTHER ONE. WELL IT'S IN THE GOVERNMENT CAMPGROUNDS SO IT CAN'T BE VERY PRIVATE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WAS THERE BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT CAMPGROUNDS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER? THE NEXT ITEM THEN, IS YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION. IS THAT VOTE 18?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: VOTE 18.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE ONE QUESTION WHICH WAS OUTSTANDING ON THAT MATTER AND IT RELATED TO THE FRINGE BENEFITS UNDER YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION ADMINISTRATION. THE FRINGE BENEFITS DIRECTLY RELATED TO SALARIES AT \$4,558. THE YUKON BONUS FOR THE STAFF OF THE YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION FOR THIS YEAR IS \$1,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I UNDERSTAND THAT A SEVERAL PAGE REPORT IS NOW BEING UP FOR TYPING FROM THE HOUSING CORPORATION. WHEN THAT ARRIVES WILL WE HAVE COPIES OF IT ALMOST IMMEDIATELY?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, AS SOON AS THAT IS AVAILABLE IT WILL BE TABLED FOR COUNCIL'S BENEFIT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON HOUSING CORPORATION? THE NEXT ITEM IS PROJECT CAPITAL. I BELIEVE THAT WAS PRETTY WELL CLEARED.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE NO OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS LOAN CAPITAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE DURING THE LUNCH TIME TAKEN THE TIME TO ASCERTAIN WHAT MONIES, WHAT INTERESTS ARE BEING RECEIVED BY THE GOVERNMENT ON VARIOUS AMOUNTS OF MONEY THAT HAVE BEEN DEPOSITED IN THE BANK. I FIND THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS NOW RECEIVING 9 3/4% ON AMOUNTS OF MONEY THAT ARE DEPOSITED ON SHORT TERMS UP TO 89 DAYS.

MR. TANNER: ANY AMOUNTS?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ANY AMOUNTS. I HAVE JUST ASCERTAINED THIS FROM TWO BANKS WHO ARE GIVING EXACTLY THE SAME RATE STRUCTURE. AND IT'S BECAUSE OF THIS POINT THAT I MAKE HERE AND I HAVE TO REVERT. I WANT TO ASK MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT AMOUNT OF INTEREST OVER ALL IS THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY RECEIVING ON FUNDS FROM TIME TO TIME? IN DOLLARS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE RATES THAT ARE BEING PAID, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS CORRECT. WE COULD GET 9 3/4% ON 89 AND 90 DAY MONEY. WE DON'T HAVE ANY OF OUR SHORT TERMS IN THAT PERIOD. MOST OF OUR SHORT TERM MONEY IS IN 30 DAY MONEY BECAUSE WE HAVE BEEN ANTICIPATING THE INCREASE AND USING OUR POSITION IN THAT REGARD. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE MONTHLY

INTEREST IS AT THE MOMENT, ALTHOUGH WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO FIND OUT FAIRLY QUICKLY JUST EXACTLY WHAT WE ARE GETTING PER MONTH IN THE WAY OF SHORT TERM INVESTMENT.

IF YOU WILL JUST BEAR WITH ME ONE MOMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE APPROXIMATE AMOUNT PER MONTH THAT WE ARE RECEIVING RIGHT NOW WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY \$55,500. EXCUSE ME FOR A MINUTE. MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY \$46,200 PER MONTH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO WE ARE TALKING ABOUT \$550,000 IN INTEREST. NOW OUT OF THIS MONEY, WHY CAN'T WE GET THE T.V. THAT WE ASKED FOR FOR THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES? IT'S INTEREST MONEY ON MONEY. AND WHY CAN'T WE GET THE OTHER AREAS OF THINGS THAT WE'VE BEEN ASKING FOR? WHY CAN'T WE GET KINDERGARTEN OUT OF THESE THINGS? THIS IS THE REASON WHY I WAS ASKING FOR THE PARTICULAR DOCUMENTATION TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD BECAUSE HERE YOU SEE IN CLEAR LANGUAGE FUNDS THAT ARE COMING IN BY WAY OF INTEREST ON PUBLIC FUNDS AND IT'S NOT BEING DIRECTED IN THE MANNER THAT THIS COUNCIL WISHES TO HAVE IT DIRECTED.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THE MONEY IS BACK IN THE BUDGET AND IT IS BEING USED. IT'S BEING SPREAD RIGHT THROUGH AS AN INCOME THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE BUDGET. NOW IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS SAYING THAT WE SHOULD TAKE SOME OF THE INTEREST MONIES ACCRUING ON SOME OF THE FUNDS AND USE THEM FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES THAT'S A DIFFERENT ARGUMENT THAN HE USED JUST NOW. BUT IS HE IS SAYING THAT THE PUBLIC IS NOT GETTING THE USE OF THE INTEREST ON THEIR OWN MONEY, THEY ARE. THEY ARE GETTING IT SPREAD OUT THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE BUDGET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS NOT SO. BECAUSE THESE INTEREST RATES HAVE CHANGED FROM TIME TO TIME. WHEN THE BUDGET WAS SET UP, IT WAS SET UP ON THE BASIS OF THE INTEREST IT WOULD BE RECEIVING AT THAT TIME ON THE MONIES THAT WERE COMING IN FROM TIME TO TIME, IF THAT AT ALL. BECAUSE NOW, ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF WHAT MR. MILLER HAS ALREADY SAID MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE OCCASION MIGHT BE WHEN THERE IS NO MONEY ON WHICH TO GET INTEREST. THIS IS A CASE OF WHERE WE'VE GOT TO TAKE A LOOK TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT THE FUNDS THAT SHOULD BE PROPERLY APPROPRIATED IN VARIOUS AREAS ARE BEING APPROPRIATED ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF THIS COUNCIL. NOT

THE NEEDS OF THE ADMINISTRATION. THIS IS WHAT I'M SO ANNOYED ABOUT. IT'S JUST A DELIBERATE ATTITUDE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO DEPRIVE THIS COUNCIL OF ALL THE INFORMATION THAT IT SHOULD BE RECEIVING SO THAT THEY COULD ASSIST IN FINDING THE PROPER PRIORITIES FOR THE VARIOUS MONIES THAT ARE COMING IN ESPECIALLY THOSE INTEREST MONIES WHICH ARE INTEREST ON PUBLIC FUNDS.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE THE MEMBER ANSWERS THAT, I AGAIN DO ARGUE WITH THE MEMBERS PHILOSOPHY. I DON'T THINK IT'S TRUE. THESE ARE ESTIMATES AND IN THE ESTIMATES OF THE PREVIOUS YEAR WE ESTIMATED SOME PARTICULAR SUM. I THINK OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD IT WAS 6 OR 6 1/2%. OBVIOUSLY WHEN YOU ARE ESTIMATING WHERE YOUR FUNDS ARE COMING FROM, YOU TAKE IN THE INTEREST THAT MIGHT ACCRUE. AND OBVIOUSLY YOU CAN'T BE CORRECT, BECAUSE YOU CAN'T PREDICT WHAT INTEREST YOU'RE GOING TO GET. AND TO SUGGEST FOR EXAMPLE, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DID THE OTHER DAY THAT WE SHOULD BE LENDING THAT MONEY TO THE PUBLIC, WE WOULD BE MERELY MISLEADING THE PUBLIC BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW FROM MONTH TO MONTH WHETHER IT'S GOING TO BE THERE. WE DON'T KNOW FROM MONTH TO MONTH WHAT THE INTEREST RATE IS GOING TO BE. AND AS I'VE SAID, IT'S ALREADY TIED INTO THE BUDGET AND THE OVERALL PICTURE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS JUST SAID THAT IT'S BEEN BASED ON ABOUT 6 AND 6 1/2% AND HERE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT 9 3/4%. SO THAT'S 50% MORE OF THE 6 1/2%. AND IF YOU TAKE \$46,000 AS THE APPROXIMATION ON WHAT IT IS RECEIVING NOW BY WAY OF INTEREST, AND IF THAT WAS BASED ON 6 1/2%, IT MEANS AT 9 3/4% WE ARE GOING TO BE GETTING A LOT MORE. AND SUPPOSING MY ARGUMENT IS INCORRECT AS FAR AS LOANING THE MONEY OUT FOR HOUSING, CERTAINLY IT'S NOT INCORRECT THAT THE MONEY THAT IS COMING IN ON HEALTH CARE PREMIUMS, THAT MONEY THAT'S COMING IN ON OTHER AREAS, COULDN'T BE USED FOR PROPOSITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT FORWARD BY HONOURABLE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE IN DEALING WITH T.V. FOR VARIOUS COMMUNITIES. BECAUSE HERE IS AN AREA OF WHERE MONEY CAN BE FOUND.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M SORRY. I STILL DISAGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BECAUSE OF THE MATHEMATICAL PROBABILITY OF WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO GET A MONTH FROM NOW. YOU DON'T KNOW. AS ALL HONOURABLE MEMBERS KNOW, IT'S JUST THE BANK RATE WAS PUT UP BY 1% BY THE BANK OF

CANADA JUST THIS LAST TWO OR THREE WEEKS AND THAT INCLUDES THE INTEREST WE'RE GETTING ON OUR PRESENT MONEY. AT THIS TIME RIGHT NOW, WE HAVE NO WAY OF KNOWING WHAT PERCENTAGE OF INTEREST WE ARE GOING TO GET ON THE GOVERNMENT FUNDS THREE MONTHS FROM NOW, LET ALONE A YEAR FROM NOW. IF, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAYS, AND HE'S TAKEN THE MAXIMUM FIGURE AND THE MINIMUM FIGURE, IF YOU'RE SAYING THAT WE CAN SAY NOW WE'RE GOING TO GET 9 1/2% ON OUR MONEY AND CONSEQUENTLY WE ARE GOING TO HAVE THAT MUCH MORE MONEY ACCRUED TO THE YUKON GENERAL REVENUE FUND, IT'S NOT CORRECT. BECAUSE NOBODY AT ALL CAN PREDICT THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY. AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS FULL WELL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE BEEN ADVISED BY THE BANKERS THAT THERE HAS BEEN AN INCREASE OF 4 1/2% IN THE LAST FOURTEEN MONTHS. NOW MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN MR. MILLER SAY WHETHER I'M CORRECT OR INCORRECT ON THIS POINT?

MR. MILLER: THAT WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO THIS IS WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. AN ADDITIONAL 4 1/2% ON MONIES AND HAS ALREADY BEEN SAID THAT FROM TIME TO TIME WE HAVE ANYWHERE FROM THREE MILLION AND EIGHT AND ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS AS A CASH FLOAT IN THE BANK. NOW ON SHORT AT 4 1/2% THIS IS A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT CAN BE USED FOR THE PURPOSES THAT HAVE BEEN REQUESTED. I DON'T THINK THAT ANY HONOURABLE MEMBER SHOULD ARGUE AGAINST THE POINT THAT THESE FUNDS CAN BE MADE AVAILABLE BECAUSE WE ARE GETTING THE BENEFIT OF THOSE INTEREST RATES. AND WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH THAT ADDITIONAL MONEY? AND THIS HASN'T BEEN EXPLAINED AT ALL. I HAVE ALREADY ACCEPTED AS A BASIS, THAT THE BUDGET HAS BEEN BASED ON 6 TO 6 1/2% INTEREST. LET'S SAY THAT IS CORRECT. WE ARE STILL LOOKING FOR ANOTHER 3 1/4% INTEREST. WHY AREN'T WE UTILIZING THAT MONEY? AND I CAN ASSURE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THE WAY THE BANKING SITUATION IS, THERE IS GOING TO BE VERY LITTLE REDUCTION IN PRIME RATES.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE MEMBER THAT HAS JUST SPOKEN AND AFTER BEING IN BUSINESS FOR THE NUMBER OF YEARS THAT HE HAS BEEN IN BUSINESS, KNOWS FULL WELL THAT ANY TIME THAT THE RATE THAT A BANK WILL GIVE FOR MONIES ON DEPOSIT GOES UP, SO ALSO GOES UP THE RATE ON MONEY TO BE BORROWED. AND IT WOULD BE GREAT IF WE COULD SAY IN THE BUDGET - O.K. THE REVENUES ARE GOING

UP BUT THE EXPENDITURES ARE STAYING THE SAME AS AT THE TIME THIS BUDGET WAS PREPARED. THIS IS NOT TRUE. WHEN THE RATES FOR A TERM LOAN OR FOR DEPOSITS ARE GOING UP, SO IS THE RATE OF BORROWING AND I'M AFRAID THAT EFFECTS THE BUDGET ALL THE WAY THROUGH ALSO, PARTICULARLY IN CONSTRUCTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL TO THE CONTRARY, THE POINT IS THIS. THAT THE GOVERNMENT DOESN'T BORROW MONEY AT 11 1/2% OR 12%. THAT ISN'T THE POINT WHAT EVERYBODY ELSE DOES. I'M DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AND THE GOVERNMENT BORROWS WHEN IT DOES BORROW, FROM CANADA, IT GET'S A MUCH BETTER RATE OF INTEREST THAN THE NORMAL BORROWER THAT'S GOING THROUGH A BANK. THE POINT IS THAT THE MONEY THAT IS ON DEPOSIT AT THE BANK FROM TIME TO TIME, GOVERNMENT MONEY IS SHOWING A PROFIT BY WAY OF INTEREST AND THAT MONEY SHOULD BE USED IN THE PRIORITIES THAT ARE REQUIRED TO SUPPLY THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON WITH THE NEEDS WHERE WE CAN'T FIND MONEY ELSEWHERE. BUT IF WE ARE LETTING THAT MONEY FALL INTO AREAS WHERE THE ADMINISTRATION, AT THEIR LEISURE, CAN USE THAT MONEY FOR WHATEVER PURPOSE THEY WANT, THEN I SAY IT'S WRONG.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T INTEND TO ENTER INTO THE DEBATE, BUT I WOULD POINT OUT FOR ALL MEMBERS THAT ON PAGE 70 OF THE ESTIMATES UNDER REVENUE, THERE IS AN ITEM CALLED INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS WHICH IS \$330,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AT WHAT RATE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WOULD WORK OUT AT \$4,000,000. APPROXIMATELY \$4,000,000 AVAILABLE IN THE BANK AT 8 1/2% INTEREST. I CAN'T PREDICT THE INTEREST RATE FROM DAY TO DAY. NEITHER CAN ANYBODY ELSE. BUT THAT'S ROUGHLY WHAT IT WOULD WORK OUT AT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD THE TREASURER TELL US WHAT RATE HE ESTIMATED IT AT LAST YEAR?

MR. MILLER: I'M SORRY, FOR WHICH YEAR MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. TANNER: FOR THE PAST FINANCIAL YEAR.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAD BEEN USING 6 TO 6 1/2% BECAUSE THAT WAS THE RATE IN EFFECT. NOW THIS LAST FEW MONTHS IT HAS GONE UP CONSIDERABLY HIGHER. WHETHER IT WILL STAY THAT WAY OR NOT, I CAN'T PREDICT MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: TAKING \$300,000 AS AN ESTIMATED INTEREST AND YOU DIVIDE IT BY TWELVE, YOU HAVE SOMETHING LIKE \$25,000 A MONTH IN INTEREST. ALRIGHT NOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN ADVISED BY MR. MILLER THAT THE AVERAGE INTEREST WE'RE GETTING NOW IS \$46,000 A MONTH. NOW PERHAPS HE CAN SAY HOW HE RELATES THE AMOUNT OF \$300,000 OR \$25,000 A MONTH WITH WHAT HE HAS SAID NOW THAT WE ARE RECEIVING BY WAY OF \$46,000 A MONTH.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, BASICALLY WHAT I'M SUGGESTING IS THAT AT THE MOMENT WE HAVE SIX AND A HALF MILLION DOLLARS IN SHORT TERM INVESTMENTS. THAT WILL GENERATE \$46,000 PER MONTH INTEREST AT CURRENT INTEREST RATES. I DON'T KNOW WHAT WE WILL HAVE IN THE BANK NEXT MONTH OR THE MONTH AFTER OR THE MONTH AFTER OR FOR THE NEXT ELEVEN MONTHS AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE INTEREST RATE WILL BE. I CAN ONLY GO ON PAST HISTORY AND ASSUME THAT THERE WILL BE THE NORMAL CASH FLOWS AND IN FACT THEY ARE NO LONGER NORMAL BECAUSE WE'RE BEING PRESSED A LOT HARDER TODAY THEN WE USED TO BE TO PAY OUR BILLS. SO, I CAN'T PREDICT. WE HAVE USED AN ESTIMATE OF FOUR MILLION DOLLARS OR FOUR AND A HALF MILLION DOLLARS AT 8 TO 8 1/2% INTEREST OVER THE COURSE OF THE YEAR. BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT WILL BE. A YEAR FROM NOW I CAN TELL YOU.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK IF HONOURABLE MEMBERS HAD ANY CRITICISM OR ANY COMMENT TO MAKE ON THAT PARTICULAR CASE, I WOULD SAY WITH RESPECT THAT THE TREASURER IS PUSHING HIS LUCK A BIT, BECAUSE AS IT'S BEEN POINTED OUT FROM THE MEMBER FROM DAWSON, OUR COSTS ARE GOING TO GO UP, PEOPLE WHO OWE MONEY TO OUR CREDITORS ARE GOING TO BE PRESSING FOR THEIR MONEY MORE QUICKLY. THE LIKELIHOOD OF HAVING THE SAME AMOUNT OF MONEY IN THE BANK CONSISTENTLY AS WE'VE GOT AT THIS VERY MOMENT IS VERY DOUBTFUL. AND ON TOP OF ALL OF THAT, HE'S TAKING IT AT QUITE A HIGH RATE OF INTEREST OF 8 1/2% SO I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT THE CRITICISM WOULD HAVE BEEN, YOU'RE PUSHING YOUR LUCK BABY, BECAUSE IT DOESN'T LOOK TO ME ON MY EXPERIENCE OF WHAT YOU'VE PREDICTED IS GOING TO BE YOUR EXPERIENCE. AS IT'S TURNED OUT LAST YEAR AT 6 1/2% WE CAME OUT AHEAD, BUT IT WAS AN EXCEPTIONAL YEAR AND A VERY FAST BANK RATE GROWTH. BUT FIRST OF ALL, IS THAT GROWTH GOING TO STAY ON? SECONDLY, ARE WE GOING TO HAVE THE MONEY IN THE BANK? AND THIRDLY, ARE WE GOING TO GET THAT SAME RATE? I REALLY DON'T UNDERSTAND THE CRITICISM OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE CRITICISM IS QUITE CLEAR, THAT WE ARE NOT ALLOWING THIS COUNCIL TO MAKE THE DECISION AS TO WHERE THE INTEREST MONEY, THE EXCESS INTEREST MONEY IS GOING TO BE USED AND FOR WHAT PURPOSES. AND THAT IS INTEREST ON PUBLIC FUNDS AND ESPECIALLY DEALING WITH THE HEALTH CARE FUND, IT'S INTEREST ON MONEY BEING HELD IN TRUST BY THE GOVERNMENT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HEALTH CARE FUND MONEY IS NOT BEING HELD IN TRUST. THE LEGISLATION DOES NOT PROVIDE THAT THE PREMIUM PAYMENTS OR THE HEALTH CARE FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA BE HELD IN A TRUST FUND. THEY BECOME PART OF THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND THAT IS DEFINED CLEARLY AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS FULL WELL, IN THE LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OBVIOUSLY AGAIN, I MUST SAY THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HASN'T THE FAINTEST IDEA OF WHAT IS MEANT BY TRUST FUNDS WHEN - - .

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MAY I HEAR THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T FEEL THAT A PERSON SHOULD BE CRITICIZED AND RIDICULED CONSTANTLY BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO SEEMS TO BE KNOWLEDGEABLE IN ALL ASPECTS OF EVERYTHING.

I AM POINTING OUT TO HIM THAT THERE IS NO PROVISION FOR SPECIAL INTEREST TO ACCRUE TO A SPECIAL FUND UNDER THE MEDICARE LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ALL FUNDS THAT ARE PAID INTO THE GOVERNMENT COFFERS FROM THE TAXPAYER ARE TRUST FUNDS THAT ARE BEING HELD BY THE GOVERNMENT AND TO BE DISTRIBUTED AND USED IN THE MANNER IN WHICH THIS COUNCIL DECIDES IN ITS WISDOM THAT IT SHOULD BE USED. THAT IS WHAT A TRUST FUND IS.

ALL GOVERNMENT FUNDS ARE TRUST FUNDS. MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT AT ALL THAT PREMIUMS PRIMARILY ARE MONIES THAT ARE BEING HELD BY THE GOVERNMENT FOR PAYMENT OUT, FOR SERVICES USED IN THAT AREA. I DON'T SUPPOSE THAT I AM GOING TO GET ONE POINT AHEAD ON WHAT I AM SAYING. IT IS A CLEAR INDICTMENT OF THE MANNER IN WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION IS OPERATING THE ACCOUNTS OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, BY NOT RECOGNIZING THAT INTEREST MONEY ON GOVERNMENT FUNDS SHOULD BE USED FOR

THE BENEFIT OF THE PEOPLE IN THE MANNER THAT THIS COUNCIL DECIDES IT SHOULD BE USED.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, with due respect, on page 7 here to 70, interest on investments is \$330,000, is listed as a revenue. The estimated expenditures are based on part of that, on the revenue section. There is no, and as the treasurer told you, he is trying to estimate it as close as he could because of the many unknown sectors involved. The interest is clearly defined as a revenue to offset the estimated expenditures.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman with respect, that Mr. Miller is well aware that there are greater funds coming in by way of interest than what has been suggested here. He knows too, all he has to do is speak to the bankers, they will tell him what the position is in relation to interest money.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, that it is just simply another ploy that is being made by the administration, that is something that I've fought for a long time. They have made up their minds, that they are going to have the say so on how the funds are to be expended. They don't give one damn about this Territorial Council or any of its members.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I just don't buy anything that the last member who spoke says. First of all three members of the Financial Advisory Committee sit on the decisions to spend that money, two members of the Executive Committee sit on the decisive making body that sets the policy. The funds that Mr. Miller has predicated are on his best knowledge of the situation as he knows it, over the next year.

If he isn't talking to the bankers every day or two or three times a week, then you've got a question. I suspect that Mr. Miller is talking to various banks all the time, to get the best deal he can in the circumstances he can with the funds that he has available.

Just one other point, Mr. Speaker. The honorable member made reference to trust funds. In the same way that he is taking a series of figures over a period of a year, both past and coming, and in the same way he is taking a series of interests in the past and is coming and then mixing them all in together and coming up with a conclusion in the same way he is using the words trust funds, in two different ways.

IF YOU WANT TO MAKE A CASE OF THE FUNDS THAT THE PUBLIC GIVES THE GOVERNMENT ARE IN TRUST, BUT WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE WAS SAYING IS, TRUST FUNDS, IN THE TECHNICAL SENSE OF THE WORDS AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE EAST WELL KNOWS. HE IS TAKING A SERIES OF FIGURES, A SERIES OF PERCENTAGES AND A SERIES OF TIME AND MIXING THEM ALTOGETHER TO COME TO HIS OWN CONCLUSIONS. NOW HE IS TAKING VARIOUS PHRASEOLOGIES AND USING THEM IN DIFFERENT WAYS TO MAKE HIS POINT. I THINK, QUITE FRANKLY, THAT HE ISN'T MAKING HIS POINT AT ALL.

THE FUNDS THAT WE ARE GOING TO GET IN INTEREST ARE ILLUSTRATED HERE AS AN ESTIMATE, JUST LIKE THE TOTAL BUDGET THAT YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU IS AN ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION AS BEST SEEN BY THE EXPERTS WE HIRE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE WHAT HE PROPOSES TO DO WITH THE INTEREST FUNDS OVER AND ABOVE THE AMOUNT THAT HE HAS ESTIMATED FOR.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE ARE LUCKY ENOUGH TO HAVE ANY, THEY WILL GO TO THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND INTO THE WORKING CAPITAL BALANCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE YOU HAVE YOUR ANSWER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: HAVE WE ANYTHING FURTHER ON LOAN CAPITAL? NEXT ITEM IS LOAN AMORTIZATION. HAVE YOU ANYTHING ON LOAN AMORTIZATION? ALRIGHT, WE HAVE ONE FINAL ITEM WHICH I NEGLECTED TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION IN THE PROCEEDINGS OF YESTERDAY OR THE FIRST REVIEW OF THE BUDGET, AND THAT IS THE REVENUE SECTION. REVENUE AND RECOVERIES. PROCEED TO PAGE 70. AS A MATTER OF FACT, THE BREAKDOWN IS ON 71.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'VE GOT A QUESTION MARK THAT I'VE PUT AT 69 ON SELF-AMORTIZED LOANS. WITH REFERENCE TO THE INTEREST ON SELF-AMORTIZED LOANS, THIS IS A FIXED INTEREST THAT IS BEING PAID BACK. IS THIS CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS INTEREST THAT WE RECEIVE FROM MUNICIPALITIES PRIMARILY ON DEBENTURES THAT THEY HAVE SIGNED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I JUST WANT TO KNOW, IS IT A FIXED INTEREST THAT WE HAVE AGREED TO AND IT REMAINS CONSTANT?

MR. MILLER: YES, IT IS A FIXED INTEREST AT THE TIME OF SIGNING THE DEBENTURE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU CLEAR ON LOAN AMORTIZATION? THE BREAKDOWN ON REVENUE FIRST. THE FIRST ITEM IS 1974-75 ESTIMATES, PROPERTY TAX, \$359,300. PAGE 71. COUNCILLOR STUTTER, WILL YOU TAKE THE CHAIR A MOMENT?

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN I HAVE A QUESTION RESPECTING PROPERTY TAX. ITS A QUESTION THAT HAS BUZZED AROUND THE COMMUNITY CLUBS THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY FOR SOME TIME NOW, MORE PARTICULARLY THIS WINTER. I WOULD LIKE TO READ INTO THE RECORD, A LETTER WHICH PRETTY WELL STATES IT BETTER THAN I COULD. THIS IS FROM THE TESLIN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, DATED APRIL THE 18TH. IT SAYS, 'DEAR COUNCILLOR TAYLOR: SOME TIME AGO, I DISCUSSED WITH YOU THE ASSESSMENT NOTICE RECEIVED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE LAND AND BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE TESLIN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION. AT THAT TIME, YOU INDICATED THAT YOU WOULD LOOK INTO THE MATTER AND THAT YOU FELT THAT NO TAX SHOULD BE CHARGED, AS IT HAS NOT BEEN IN THE PAST. I AM NOW IN RECEIPT OF TWO TAX NOTICES, ONE FOR \$420 FOR THE HALL AND CURLING RINK AND ANOTHER FOR \$913.92 FOR THE SKATING RINK AND SWIMMING POOL. AS YOU CAN SEE, THESE AMOUNTS ARE QUITE HIGH AND OUR CLUB WOULD FIND SOME DIFFICULTY IN MEETING THEIR PAYMENT. AGAIN, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF THERE HAS BEEN SOME MISTAKE IN ASSESSING THESE TAXES TO THE LAND AND BUILDINGS OF OUR COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION. I LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING FROM YOU AT YOUR EARLIEST OPPORTUNITY. SIGNED, 'KEN NASH, PRESIDENT.'

THIS IS A POLICY CHANGE THAT CERTAINLY HAS NEVER COME BEFORE COUNCIL. AS YOU KNOW WE DO HAVE A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND AND THE IDEA IS TO TRY AND OFFSET SOME OF THE COSTS TO THE COMMUNITY CLUBS. OF COURSE, THROUGH THAT FUND, WE PRIMARILY APPLY THOSE THINGS TO CAPITAL. IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT SOME POLICY DECISION HAS BEEN MADE BY THE ADMINISTRATION IN RESPECT OF THIS, THAT IT SHOULD BE CHANGED. I DON'T REALLY FEEL THAT THE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS SHOULD LABOR UNDER TAX DEMANDS.

I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR FROM MR. TREASURER ON THIS. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW JUST WHEN THIS POLICY WAS CHANGED AND WHY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. MILLER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER ASKED ME THIS QUESTION SOME TIME AGO ON THE TELEPHONE. AT THAT TIME, I INVESTIGATED IT AND I THOUGHT I HAD REPORTED BACK TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER. MAYBE I ERRED IN NOT REPORTING BACK.

MY INVESTIGATIONS REVEALED THAT THIS IS NOT A NEW POLICY. THIS HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE CASE AND THAT THESE COMMUNITY CENTRES HAVE ALWAYS BEEN PRESENTED WITH BILLS. I DON'T KNOW WHEN THEY WEREN'T BECAUSE WE HAVE GONE BACK IN ALL OUR CURRENT RECORDS THAT WE HAVE IN THE OFFICE, WHICH IS APPROXIMATELY THREE YEARS. IT HAS BEEN THERE SINCE THAT TIME.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN ISN'T THE PROCEDURE AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IS SET UP AND I FRANKLY DON'T KNOW THE RESULTS OF THE PROCEDURE, BUT THE PROCEDURE AS I UNDERSTAND IT IS THAT EVERYBODY GETS A TAX BILL. IRRESPECT OF WHETHER IT IS A COMMUNITY CENTRE OR WHAT HAVE YOU. ANY PARTICULAR COMMUNAL FUNCTION SUCH AS A COMMUNITY CENTRE CAN APPEAL TO ASK TO BE RELIEVED OF THE TAXES. THAT IS CERTAINLY THE WAY WE DID IT IN PORTER CREEK BEFORE WE BECAME PART OF THE CITY. IT IS CERTAINLY THE WAY THEY STILL DO IT IN PORTER CREEK, INsofar AS THE CITY HAS TAKEN OVER.

AS I UNDERSTAND IT, EVERYBODY GETS A TAX BILL. THOSE ORGANIZATIONS THAT FEEL THAT THEY HAVE A CASE TO BE MADE SO THEY SHOULDN'T PAY TAXES, THAT'S THE WAY THEY DO IT. WHETHER OR NOT, THEY ARE GRANTED THAT RELIEF, THAT'S A DIFFERENT QUESTION. CERTAINLY, THAT'S THE WAY I'VE ALWAYS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE METHODS WORK.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY ONE POINT. THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT THE TESLIN COMMUNITY CLUB EVER GOT A TAX NOTICE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS DOING. I ASKED THE WATSON LAKE COMMUNITY CLUB IF THEY HAD YET GOT ONE. THE LAST TIME OF ASKING IS NOW SOME WEEKS AGO, AND THEY HADN'T HAD ONE UP TO THAT POINT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEY WILL BILL THEM.

MR. TAYLOR: NONE OF THESE COMMUNITY CLUBS HAVE EVER HAD THEM AND I DON'T THINK THAT IT IS INTENDED THAT THEY EVER SHOULD. I KNOW OF NO COMMUNITY CLUB IN MY ELECTORAL DISTRICT AT ALL THAT EVER, EVER, EVER UP UNTIL NOW, UNTIL TESLIN, RECEIVED A TAX NOTICE. IF, INDEED IT IS THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE PAST,

TO DO THIS, THEN THEY MUST HAVE RECEIVED A TAX REMISSION BECAUSE NO TAX NOTICES WERE ISSUED TO MY I WONDER WHAT IS THE POINT OF ORDER. I AM WONDERING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE SHOULDN'T AT THIS TIME DEAL WITH THIS QUESTION BECAUSE THIS IS ABSOLUTELY BRAND NEW TO THE COMMUNITY CLUBS IN MY DISTRICT.

OBVIOUSLY, THESE PEOPLE CAN'T MAINTAIN THE TAXES ON THESE PARTICULAR ITEMS AS THEY STATE. IT IS TOO HIGH FOR THEM TO HANDLE. EVEN WERE THEY TO GET ANY PART OF THE \$8,000 COMMUNITY CLUB GRANT THAT IS BASICALLY FOR CAPITAL PURPOSES AND YOU KNOW. WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE HELPING THESE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS INASMUCH AS THEY ARE THE FOCAL, RECREATIONAL AND SOCIAL CENTRE OF ANY COMMUNITY.

I THINK A DECISION SHOULD BE MADE HERE THAT THIS DOESN'T CONTINUE AND THAT THESE TAXES BE REMITTED BUT NOT FROM THE, WELL REMISSION, YES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: WELL GO AHEAD.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAYS THAT FROM HIS INFORMATION THAT TESLIN HASN'T GOT ONE IN THE PAST. I CAN CATEGORICALLY SAY BECAUSE I HAD A LOT TO DO WITH IT. IN PORTER CREEK, WHEN WITH A COMMUNITY CENTRE, WHEN IT WAS OUTSIDE OF THE CITY, IT DEFINITELY GOT ONE. TO THE VERY BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THAT THE SYSTEM IS THAT YOU BUILD A COMMUNITY CLUB AND THE COMMUNITY CLUB APPEALS TO THE TAXING AUTHORITY AGAINST THE BILLING. THAT IS THE GENERAL WAY THEY ARE PROCEEDED.

THERE IS ONE OTHER POINT THAT I WOULD MENTION AS FAR AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS CONCERNED, I'M SURE THE SAME THING HAPPENS IN THE COMMUNITY CLUBS IN HIS CONSTITUENCY, HAPPENS IN MINE. THERE IS AN ONGOING AND CHANGING EXECUTIVE ALL THE TIME. IT IS VERY HARD, QUITE FRANKLY, TO GET CONSISTENT INFORMATION AND EVEN KEEP FILES THAT ARE CONSISTENT. TO PUT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER'S MIND AT REST, WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST, THAT WE HAVE A COFFEE BREAK NOW AND LET THE TREASURER CHECK UP AND VERIFY THE FACTS AS I AM GIVING THEM TO THE HOUSE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. TREASURER WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO,

MR. MILLER: YES, IT WILL ONLY TAKE US A MINUTES.

MR. MCKINNON: I WONDER IF WE COULD GET A FEW, GET A COUPLE MORE THINGS. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF

REVENUE IF COMMUNITY CLUBS ARE ASSESSED AND THEY ARE PAYING TO THE TERRITORIAL TREASURER, WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF REVENUE THAT WAS RECEIVED BY PROPERTY TAXES ON COMMUNITY CLUBS IN THE LAST FISCAL YEAR.

Mr. MILLER: THAT QUESTION WOULD TAKE CONSIDERABLY LONGER TO DIG OUT BECAUSE WE WOULD HAVE TO GET NUMBER ONE, THE NAMES OF ALL THE COMMUNITY CLUBS. WE DON'T KEEP THEM IN THAT ORDER. WE CAN GET THE INFORMATION. I'M JUST SAYING, WE CAN'T DO IT OVER A COFFEE BREAK.

Mr. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD WARN ALL HONOURABLE MEMBERS AGAINST CHANGING THE SYSTEM BECAUSE IF YOU SAY WE ARE GOING TO EXEMPT ALL COMMUNITY CLUBS YOU GET INTO A TERRIBLE HASSLE OF DEFINING COMMUNITY CLUBS, SENDING COMMUNITY CLUBS, MAYBE COMMUNITY CLUBS, MAYBE HALF OF THE COMMUNITY CLUB THINKS IT IS A COMMUNITY CLUB, OR A SEGMENT OF THE POPULATION THINKS IT IS A COMMUNITY CLUB. I THINK THAT THE BEST WAY OF DOING IT IS THE ONGOING METHOD NOW. THOSE PEOPLE WHO BELIEVE THEY SHOULD BE EXEMPT FOR COMMUNITY PURPOSES, SHOULD APPLY TO GET THE EXEMPTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WE'VE GOT NO PROVISION FOR IT.

Mr. TANNER: WELL IF THEY ARE NOT GOING TO GET AN EXEMPTION THEN YOU CAN'T IN THE FIRST PLACE NOT SEND OUT THE NOTICES.

Mr. McKINNON: THAT IS THE OTHER QUESTION I WANTED ANSWERED BY MR. MILLER. IS THERE A POLICY NOW, IF COMMUNITY CLUBS ASK THAT THE ASSESSMENT BE WAIVED AND THAT THE TAXES NOT BE PAID. IS THIS THE POLICY FOR THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT TO DO THIS. ITS THE POLICY OF THE CITY GOVERNMENT TO DO IT BECAUSE THEY ASSESSED AREAS AS VARIED AS THE PORTER CREEK COMMUNITY CLUB NOW, SKOOKUM JIM HALL AND THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, THEY ASSESS THEM THEN THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION APPEALS TO THE CITY TO WAIVE THE TAX NOTICE AND IT IS WAIVED. IS THIS THE SAME POLICY THAT IS FOLLOWED BY THE YUKON TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE NO POLICY REGARDING REMISSION OF PROPERTY TAXES. IN FACT THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE DOESN'T HAVE A POLICY. WHAT HAPPENS, IS THAT AN ORGANIZATION APPLIES TO THE CITY FOR A GRANT TO PAY THEIR TAXES. THEY CAN'T REMIT THE TAXES EITHER. THEY HAVE GOT TO DO IT BY GIVING THE ORGANIZATION A GRANT EQUAL TO THE AMOUNT.

Mrs. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, DID WE NOT AMEND THE TAXATION ORDINANCE ABOUT THREE YEARS AGO AND WE TOOK THIS SECTION OUT WHERE TAXES COULD NOT BE REMITTED. I THINK SO.

Mr. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THERE IS PROVISION UNDER THE FINANCE ADMIN. ORDINANCE BUT....

Mrs. WATSON: BUT NOT UNDER THE TAXATION ORDINANCE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE.

Mr. MILLER: NO, BUT THE FINANCE ADMIN. ORDINANCE IS THE SENIOR ORDINANCE AND IT COULD BE DONE UNDER THERE EXCEPT THAT IT IS THE COMMISSIONER THAT MAY REMIT. THE COMMISSIONER HAS NEVER REMITTED ANY TAXES TO MY KNOWLEDGE.

Mr. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN I WANT TO MAKE MY OWN POINT CLEAR. I AM MERELY SETTING OUT THE METHOD AS I UNDERSTOOD IT. I DIDN'T SAY AND I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD REMIT TAXES BECAUSE I'M SURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST HAS SAT DOWN IN THE CITY COUNCIL WITH ME AND I'VE SEEN HIM DOWN THERE MANY TIMES, LABORING OVER THE TERRIBLE DILEMMAS THEY GET THEMSELVES INTO TIME AFTER TIME.

VIRTUALLY WHAT THEY DO IS THAT THEY HAVE \$15,000 OR SOME AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT THEY SET ASIDE FOR GRANTS, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE AND INEVITABLY THEY NEVER HAVE ENOUGH MONEY AND INEVITABLY THEY GET DOZENS AND DOZENS OF APPLICATIONS. I WOULD HATE TO SEE OURSELVES GETTING INTO THAT SAME MESS.

I THINK THE WAY TO APPROACH THE PROGRAM, IS THAT THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES FIND SOME OTHER WAY OF RAISING THE MONEY TO PAY THEIR TAXES BUT I THINK THEY SHOULD PAY THEM.

Mr. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN POSSIBLY WE COULD GIVE MR. TREASURER AN OPPORTUNITY TO DELVE INTO THIS MATTER AND COME UP WITH SOME INFORMATION.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: COMMITTEE AGREED? I DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: At this time I will call Committee back to order. I think the Assistant Commissioner has some information for us.

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected on part of what I said earlier. There had been certain community clubs which had been used for court facilities which were not billed in the past. Conversely they were charged, the courts, a very nominal or low rental for the use of the facility when the courts were in the area.

Other community clubs have been billed on a regular basis and did pay on a regular basis. Now, I don't have an entire list of which ones have and which ones haven't but effectively, a year ago the use of community centres as court facilities was changed to go on a proper basis of paying rent when the courts are using the facilities and the long standing verbal agreement with Legal Affairs and community centres was discontinued. Subsequently they have been billed this year. Some of them for the first time and for taxes.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, we thank Mr. Miller for the information he has provided. This indeed is the first time that our community hall centres have ever been given a tax notice and as I state, it is very difficult, especially for the small communities to raise the revenue because most of the community clubs are always in debt in any event and trying to pay off the interest and the capital they borrowed at the same time and whittle down the capital.

I would like to know from the Administration if they have any ideas on how we can get around this problem so that the community clubs would not be taxed.

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, without having the benefit of having some time to look at this and to look at the Ordinance, the Ordinance does not allow us to exclude them at the present time. Taxation Ordinance I am referring to. I would have to have a little time to consider this matter and try and come up with a solution to it. I would like to do some further research as well as to who is billed and who isn't or who wasn't and the total amount of dollars we are talking about.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just thinking a few moments ago that it is a condition. I believe, certainly, in the case of Watson Lake

and I believe Teslin. No doubt in other communities as well that the lands that have been set aside, the property itself, vested in the community club remain in the community club only as long as the community club exists. It was the intent and this goes back quite a few years, it was the intent of the Administration and the Council at that time that if a community club went belly up for instance, you know, just folded-then the land reverted to the Commissioner to be held for the beneficial use of the community. Or, if it was then a municipality and the thing went belly up the land reverted to the municipality and so forth. Possibly in researching this question we may find an answer surrounding that involvement.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think it really needs some proper research because this isn't the case of all lands or community clubs. Some community clubs have the actual title to their land so I think it sort of conflicts with the problem and it will take a little time to do something with it.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, but we have title-but with that condition.

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman with respect, there are different titles that have been passed. Some have been outright titles, some have been titles with conditions. Some have title with remission so, if you could leave this with me, I will attempt to come forward as soon as I can with something to Council.

Mr. Taylor: This would be appreciated, Mr. Miller:

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, under property tax, Territorial, we have a figure of \$359,300 in the operating revenue summary. For the 73/74 it's \$152,525. Now, could we get an explanation of how this is estimated for 1974/75 to be approximately 2 1/2 times the amount of 1973/74 when the School Tax, Territorial, doesn't show that type of percentage increase.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there was one major factor in 73/74. There was an error in the estimates. The assessment for 73/74 was 25 million dollars and at 12 mills. That would indicate a revenue of \$300,000 Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: A mistake?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A MISTAKE. A REVENUE OF \$300,000 MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A MISTAKE?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS A MISTAKE IN OUR ESTIMATING FOR 1973-74 FISCAL YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN FACT WE RECEIVED MORE THAN THE \$152,525. HOW MUCH DID WE RECEIVE?

MR. MILLER: APPROXIMATELY \$300,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT OTHER \$150,000? WHERE DID WE USE IT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WOULD GO INTO THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND INTO OUR WORKING CAPITAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS UNDER PROPERTY TAX - TERRITORIAL?
SCHOOL TAX - TERRITORIAL - \$474,900.
ANY QUESTIONS?

SCHOOL TAX - MUNICIPALITIES - \$1,030,800.
QUESTIONS?

FUEL OIL TAX - \$2,738,000.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A PROBLEM HERE. IT'S ONE THAT I HAD RAISED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION INVOLVING PROPANE AND I THINK MR. MILLER WILL RECALL HAVING DEALT WITH IT. THAT EARLY LAST FALL, A LOT OF PEOPLE IN AND AROUND THE TERRITORY WERE BURNING PROPANE AND WONDERED WHY THEY COULDN'T GET IN ON THE FUEL EQUALIZATION PROGRAM AND I PHONED THE ADMINISTRATION AND WAS ADVISED THAT THE SIMPLE REASON FOR THAT WAS THAT THERE IS NO TAX ON PROPANE.

IT WAS THEN DURING THE COURSE OF THE WINTER, I GUESS SOMEONE IN THE ADMINISTRATION INADVERTENTLY I'M TOLD, SENT A TAX NOTICE TO CANADIAN PROPANE FOR ALL THE PROPANE THAT THEY HAD BROUGHT INTO THE TERRITORY AND DISPENSED. AND SO WHEN I PHONED I WAS TOLD IT WAS A MISTAKE AND THAT THE MATTER WAS CORRECTED. I JUST MORE RECENTLY HERE IN THE LAST NUMBER OF DAYS, THAT I'VE HAD ANOTHER PHONE CALL ON THIS QUESTION. AND THEY SAY WELL THIS IS ALL VERY WELL AND FINE FOR ME TO SAY, BUT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NOT YET WRITTEN THEM A LETTER TELLING THEM THAT TO DISREGARD IT. AND I'M WONDERING IF THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD DO THAT.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE POSITION AS YOU'VE STATED IS QUITE CORRECT. THE REASON THE LETTER HAS NOT GONE OUT IS THERE'S BEEN AT LEAST TWO APPOINTMENTS NOT KEPT BY CANADIAN PROPANE TO DISCUSS THIS MATTER, BUT THE LETTER WILL GO OUT.

MR. TAYLOR: GOOD. THANK YOU MR. CHAIRMAN, AND I WILL RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON FUEL OIL TAX?

THE NEXT ITEM IS HEATING OIL TAX - \$71,000.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE QUESTION ON EQUALIZATION. DOES THE GOVERNMENT FEEL THAT AT THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR AT THE TIME WHEN PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE PUT IN THEIR EQUALIZATION FORMS THAT THE GOVERNMENT DID A GOOD JOB IN PUBLICISING AND THERE WAS TIME TO FILL IN YOUR EQUALIZATION FORMS? AND DID THE GOVERNMENT RECEIVE THE MAJORITY OF THESE FORMS FROM THE RESIDENTS WHO COULD MAKE APPLICATION UNDER THE FUEL EQUALIZATION FUND?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DID WHAT WE CONSIDERED TO BE AN ADEQUATE ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN. WE HAD IT ON C.B.C. WE HAD IT ON C.K.R.W. WE HAD IT IN THE NEWSPAPERS. WE DISTRIBUTED THE FORMS TO ALL THE FUEL DISTRIBUTORS. WE DISTRIBUTED THE FORMS TO THE TERRITORIAL AGENTS IN ALL THE COMMUNITIES. AND NO, WE HAVEN'T RECEIVED THAT MANY APPLICATIONS AS YET. IN FACT, VERY FEW. I WOULD ANTICIPATE THAT MOST PEOPLE ARE WAITING UNTIL THE END OF THE HEATING SEASON, TO GET THEIR APPLICATIONS IN, WHICH WILL BE IN THE NEXT MONTH OR TWO.

MR. MCKINNON: THAT'S INTERESTING AND ASK THE QUESTION IN A COUPLE MONTHS THEN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW THESE FORMS ARE FOR, REALLY THIS EQUALIZATION IS FOR PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF THE WHITEHORSE AREA.

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS THEY LIKE SPENDING MONEY ON HEATING OIL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS THE DEADLINE, FROM THE CHAIR, IN RELATION TO THIS. IS THERE A DEADLINE BY WHICH YOU MUST HAVE YOUR FORMS IN?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE NOT

IMPOSED ANY DEADLINE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON HEATING OIL TAX?

FUR EXPORT TAX - \$4,000.
CLEAR?

INSURANCE PREMIUMS TAX.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT TO ASK YOU A QUESTION ON THE NEXT ITEM. SEWER AND WATER FRONTAGE TAX. COULD WE HAVE INDICATED WHY THERE IS NO SEWER AND WATER FRONTAGE TAX THIS TIME AROUND?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THIS ITEM IS PURELY AND SIMPLY A TRANSFER. WE TRANSFERRED IT FROM TAX REVENUE TO TERRITORIAL AMORTIZED LOAN RECOVERIES. BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THIS IS FOR. IT'S TO PAY OFF LOANS, MONIES THAT WE HAVE BORROWED FROM OTTAWA TO INSTALL WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS. SO THE RECOVERY OF THE MONEY IS USED TO PAY OFF THAT SELF AMORTIZING LOAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NOW IN WHAT AREAS WOULD THIS MONEY BE COMING FROM? ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THE LOT 19 OPERATION FOR INSTANCE?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT LOT 19. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT PORTER CREEK, MAYO, HAINES JUNCTION, WATSON LAKE, ANY PLACE THAT WE HAVE INSTALLED A WATER SEWER SYSTEM. NOW IN THE CASE OF LOT 19 AND PORTER CREEK, THIS IS COLLECTED BY THE CITY ON OUR BEHALF AND REMITTED TO US.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WHERE WOULD WE FIND THE MONEY COLLECTED BY THE CITY AND REMITTED TO US? WOULD THAT BE IN AMORTIZATION AS WELL?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THIS WOULD BE UNDER LOAN AMORTIZATION RECOVERIES. IT IS INCLUDED ON PAGE 68 UNDER THE RECOVERIES OF LOAN AMORTIZATION AND IT'S PART OF THE \$763,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'M SORRY TO GO BACK TO THAT, BUT WE HAVE NO BREAKDOWN THEN ON WHAT THESE RECOVERIES REPRESENT. THIS IS WHY I RAISED THIS QUESTION BECAUSE AT LEAST HERE WE KNOW HOW MUCH IS FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE. WITH THIS BULK AMOUNT THERE IS NO WAY OF KNOWING FROM WHAT WE HAVE IN FRONT OF US, IN WHAT AREAS THESE RECOVERIES ARE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE \$763,000 IS BROKEN DOWN AS FOLLOWS:

RECOVERIES FROM SECOND MORTGAGE LOANS, THIS IS THE C.M.H.C. PROGRAM - \$35,900.

RECOVERIES FROM THE LOW COST HOUSING PROGRAM - \$182,000.

RECOVERIES FROM THE MUNICIPALITIES - \$255,100.

RECOVERIES FROM FRONTAGE TAX AND SALE OF LOTS - \$290,000.

FRONTAGE TAXES, MR. CHAIRMAN, WILL CONTINUE AT APPROXIMATELY \$40,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

NEXT ITEM IS INSURANCE PREMIUMS TAX - \$22,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: EXPLANATION.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS THE FIRE INSURANCE PREMIUM TAX THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE THE INSURANCE COMPANIES PAYING THIS WITHOUT ANY ARGUMENT OR ARE THEY PUTTING A BEEF UP?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THEY ARE PAYING IT WITHOUT ANY ARGUMENT I MIGHT ADD. IT'S A COMMON TAX IN THE PROVINCES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS LIQUOR PROFIT LICENCES AND SURCHARGES - \$2,000,829.

I'M JUST WONDERING FROM THE CHAIR AGAIN, WILL WE BE RECEIVING, I CAN'T RECALL NOW WHETHER THE ADMINISTRATION CONSENTED TO IT, BUT WOULD WE BE RECEIVING A REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE LIQUOR DEPARTMENT?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A BUDGET HERE, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO DEAL WITH THAT NOW, I'M PREPARED TO TABLE THE BUDGET.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO WE HAVE COPIES FOR ALL THESE? PROCEED.
MADAM CLERK?

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE SMALL POINT. I WONDER WHY THE LIQUOR DEPARTMENT USES AN 8%

FRINGE BENEFIT INSTEAD OF 7% AS IN ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS?

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. MILLER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE NOT REVIEWED THIS BUDGET WITH THEM. I DON'T KNOW WHY THEY USE THE 8%. AS A MATTER OF FACT I THINK OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT YEAR, WE'LL HAVE TO CHANGE OTHER DEPARTMENTS AT 8% AS WELL BECAUSE IT'S BECOMING SLIGHTLY HIGHER THAN 7% NOW AND AT THE RATE IT'S GROWING, I THINK WE'LL ALL BE LOOKING AT 8 WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THESE EMPLOYEES ARE EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THOUGH?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. STUTTER: I WONDER MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE COULD GET MR. THIBAUT TO GIVE US A BLUEPRINT FOR HIS METHOD OF CARRYING ON BUSINESS ANY BUSINESS LIKE HE'S IN CHARGE OF THAT GIVES REVENUE TO THE TERRITORY THE WAY IT DOES AND HE MANAGES TO KEEP HIS EXPENSES IN LINE. I THINK NEEDS TO BE CONGRATULATED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST FROM THE CHAIR, THE LIQUOR BOARD, THE WAY IT SITS, IT SEEMS TO BE REDUCED NOW TO SIMPLY A LICENCING WARD AND IT'S FUNCTION IN PROVIDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW LEGISLATION ISN'T APPARENTLY BEING ADHERED TO BECAUSE THE ADMINISTRATION DO NOT WISH TO OPEN THE LIQUOR ACT. HOW LONG WILL THIS CONTINUE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T WISH TO GET INTO A LENGTHY DEBATE ON THE MATTER, BUT THE LIQUOR BOARD DOES BRING FORWARD RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CHANGES AND I ASSUME THEY WILL CONTINUE TO DO THIS AND AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME THE CHANGES, I THINK THE ADMINISTRATOR INDICATED THE OTHER DAY THAT HE HAD ASKED THE BOARD TO REVIEW THE WHOLE ORDINANCE, IF I RECALL HIS POSITION AT THAT TIME, RATHER THAN JUST AD HOC CHANGES. SO I WOULD HOPE THAT, YOU KNOW THE BOARD WILL BE ABLE TO DO THIS AND BE ABLE TO BRING FORWARD SOME CONCRETE LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: AGAIN FROM THE CHAIR, I JUST RECALL THE ITEM THAT I BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF COMMITTEE THE OTHER DAY ON THE 19TH OF SEPTEMBER, 1972 WHERE THEY STATE - THE LIQUOR BOARD IS PUTTING FORTH RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THIS CLAUSE IN THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR A PROBLEM WHICH HAS

EXISTED SINCE 1972 AND TO WHICH THERE HAS BEEN NO RESOLUTION. AND I'M INFORMED THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAVE NO INTENTION WHATSOEVER TO ALLOWING THE OPENING OF THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. SO THIS IS A PROBLEM NOW TWO YEARS OLD AND I'M JUST WONDERING HOW MUCH LONGER WE HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THE COUNCIL CAN BE GIVEN THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LIQUOR BOARD SO THAT WE CAN AMEND THE ORDINANCE?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M SORRY COULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER EITHER LET ME SEE THE LETTER OR READ THE FIRST SENTENCE. I DIDN'T HEAR THE FIRST THING HE SAID.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I READ IT THE OTHER DAY IN THE HOUSE.

THIS IS A LETTER ADDRESSED TO IRON CREEK LODGE WHO HAD APPLIED FOR A COCKTAIL LOUNGE LIQUOR LICENCE AND THEY'VE BEEN WAITING NOW TWO YEARS FOR THIS BY THE SERVICE OF THE PUBLIC AND CANNOT DO SO BECAUSE THE LIQUOR ACT NEEDS CHANGING. AND THEY STATE AND THIS LETTER IS FROM H. WEIGAND, CHAIRMAN, OF THE YUKON LIQUOR BOARD, STATES THE NUMBER OF ROOMS REQUIRED FOR A COCKTAIL LOUNGE OR TAVERN LICENCE IN POINTS OUTSIDE OF WHITEHORSE HAS BEEN A MATTER OF CONCERN TO THE LIQUOR BOARD FOR SOME TIME. THIS MEANS THAT IT HAS BEEN A PROBLEM EVEN LONGER THAN TWO YEARS AGO. HOWEVER, THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE, AS IT NOW STANDS IS VERY EXPLICIT IN THIS AREA AND THE BOARD IS UNABLE TO DEVIATE FROM THE ORDINANCE. THE LIQUOR BOARD IS PUTTING FORTH RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THIS CLAUSE IN THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. THANKS FOR YOUR LETTER AND YOUR INTEREST. SIGNED.,

AND THIS IS JUST ANOTHER CASE WHERE THE BOARDS ARE BEING IGNORED.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, RATHER THAN MAKE THE STATEMENT THAT THE BOARDS ARE BEING IGNORED ADMITTEDLY IT'S BEEN TWO YEARS, BUT AS I UNDERSTOOD IT, THE ADMINISTRATION HAS ASKED THE LIQUOR CONTROL AND IN PARTICULAR THE LIQUOR BOARD TO LOOK OVER THE TOTAL ORDINANCE AND MAKE THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS OVER THE WHOLE AREA SO THAT WE CAN BRING TO COUNCIL A FULL PACKAGE AND COUNCIL CAN HAVE THE BENEFIT OF THEIR, IF YOU LIKE, INSITE INTO THE SUBJECT. NOW THAT'S ONE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION. AND MAYBE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS GOT A POINT. IT HAS BEEN SOME TIME AND MAYBE IT'S ABOUT TIME SOMETHING WAS DONE ABOUT IT AND IN FACT I AGREE WITH HIM. BUT THIS COUNCIL HAS SPOKEN. THIS IS MY PERSONAL OPINION NOW, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M NOT

SPEAKING FOR THE COMMITTEE, BUT THIS COUNCIL HAS SPOKEN VERY FORTHRIGHTLY I THINK, ON THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE AND I THINK THE SUGGESTIONS SHOULD BE LEFT FOR THE NEXT COUNCIL. AND AS I SAY, I'M EXPRESSING A PERSONAL OPINION. I'M NOT EXPRESSING THE OPINION OF THE GOVERNMENT OR OF ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT. BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF YOU ARE GOING TO MAKE SOME MAJOR CHANGES AND THAT WOULD BE A FAIRLY MAJOR CHANGE, ALTHOUGH THERE WOULD BE EVEN FURTHER MAJOR CHANGES, YOU SHOULD BRING IN THE TOTAL PACKAGE AND DISCUSS IT THEN. AND YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT A GREAT DEAL OF WORK TO DO THE PROPER JOB AND DO THE RESEARCH AND SEE WHAT THE SITUATION IS. AND I THINK THAT'S THE NEXT COUNCIL'S DECISION, NOT THIS ONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL THIS IS SIMPLY A PROBLEM THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH TWO YEARS AGO AND THE ADMINISTRATION HAVEN'T ACTED UPON IT AND COUNCIL CANNOT ACT UPON IT AND HERE'S THE PROBLEM, IT'S GONE TWO YEARS NOW AND IT TWO YEARS OLD AND THESE PEOPLE MADE A REQUEST AND THEY CAN FIND NO RELIEF. AND I DON'T THINK IT'S FAIR TO GO DOWN AND TELL THEM THEY HAVE TO WAIT ANOTHER YEAR, BUT IT APPEARS THAT'S WHAT WE'LL HAVE TO DO.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF I COULD SPEAK TO THAT. YOU'RE SAYING THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NOT MADE ANY EFFORTS TO BRING FORTH AMENDMENTS TO THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE SOME BLAME FOR THAT BECAUSE I PERSONALLY FEEL AS AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER, I WOULDN'T LIKE TO BRING FORTH AD HOC AMENDMENTS TO THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. I WOULD SOONER THAT PROPER WORK BE DONE TO REVIEWING THE WHOLE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. THERE ARE SOME VERY OBVIOUS LOOP HOLES IN THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE AND IF YOU WANT TO CHANGE YOUR POLICY ON LICENCING, YOU JUST CAN'T LOOK AT LICENCING, ONE ASPECT OF THE LICENCE, YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT THE WHOLE THING. AND I THINK I WOULD AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH THAT THE NEXT COUNCIL WOULD ATTACK THE WHOLE LEGISLATION AND BRING IT FORTH. AS A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND AN ELECTED PERSON, I JUST DIDN'T FEEL THAT WE HAD THE TIME TO BRING FORTH A FULL AND DO A FULL REVIEW OF THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE. BESIDES THE LIQUOR ORDINANCE IS NOT THAT OLD AN ORDINANCE AND I THINK IT'S BEEN IN EFFECT NOW SINCE 1969. AND YOU USUALLY LEAVE AN ORDINANCE RUNNING FOR A FEW YEARS UNTIL YOU SEE WHERE THE MAJOR AREAS OF CONCERN ARE BEFORE YOU START ANY THOROUGH REVIEW OF IT. AND I THINK WHEN THE NEW COUNCIL GETS IN, THIS

WOULD BE ONE TASK THAT THEY COULD UNDERTAKE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL I WOULD CERTAINLY HOPE SO. THAT THIS COULD BE RESOLVED BECAUSE TWO YEARS IS A LONG TIME TO WAIT TO PROVIDE A SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC. THEY STILL CAN'T DO IT BECAUSE WE SAY THEY CAN'T DO IT AND IT WOULD BE NICE TO CHANGE IT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I BEG THE INDULGENCE OF THE HOUSE A LITTLE FURTHER. WHAT I WOULD SEE HAPPENING AND AGAIN I MUST EMPHASIZE IS A PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW. MY PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW IS THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD GET OUT OF THE BUSINESS OF SELLING LIQUOR. I'VE ALWAYS SAID THAT CONSISTENTLY IN THIS HOUSE. AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE NEXT CANDIDATES FOR TERRITORIAL ELECTION MAKE THAT A PLATFORM AND I'LL DO IT. AND LET'S SEE WHAT THE REACTION OF THE PUBLIC IS? THAT'S HOW EXTENSIVE I CAN SEE THE CHANGES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'D JUST LIKE TO SEE THESE PEOPLE'S GRIEVANCES REMEDIED. THIS IS WHAT WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE HERE FOR.

ANYTHING FURTHER ON LIQUOR CONTROL?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS TO MR. MILLER. WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT DAWSON STORE FREIGHT AND CARTAGE, IT MEANS FREIGHT AND CARTAGE FROM THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO DAWSON AT \$7,500. AND THIS WOULD APPLY FOR MAYO, THAT WOULD BE FREIGHT AND CARTAGE \$7,500 ALSO FROM THE CENTRAL STORE TO MAYO AND SO, WATSON LAKE \$10,000 FOR FREIGHT AND CARTAGE FROM THE CENTRAL STORE TO MAYO. NOW WOULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME WHAT IT IS WHEN WE SAY THE WHITEHORSE STORE FREIGHT AND CARTAGE \$10,000. IS THAT FROM THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO THE LIQUOR STORE DOWNTOWN?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THERE ARE TWO THINGS INCLUDED IN FREIGHT AND CARTAGE. ONE IS THE COST OF TRANSPORTING FROM THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO THE OUTLYING STORES. THE SECOND ONE IS THE COST OF TRANSPORTING FROM THE STORE OR THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO THE LICENCED VENDOR. IN SOME CASES OUTSIDE OF CERTAIN AREAS, THAT IS PAID FOR BY LIQUOR CONTROL. I DON'T KNOW ALL THE DETAILS OF THIS BUT THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT THAT COVERS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO FROM THE CENTRAL STORE OR RATHER FROM THE WHITEHORSE STORE, WE SERVE THE..

MR. MILLER: I'M SORRY MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE WHITEHORSE STORE, EVERYTHING COMES OUT OF THE

CENTRAL WAREHOUSE. THIS WOULD BE INCOMING FREIGHT FROM THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO THE STORE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: \$10,000 FROM THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO THE WHITEHORSE STORE WHEN IT'S ONLY \$7,500 FROM THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE TO DAWSON?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THE VOLUMES ARE QUITE DIFFERENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE VOLUME? WOULD YOU LIKE TO COUNT HERE. IT COSTS \$10,000 TO SHIP, I HEAR FROM THE CENTRAL STORE TO WHITEHORSE?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: GEE WHIZ, IT'S A HELL OF A NICE CONTRACT FOR SOMEBODY.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DO HAVE ONE MORE GENERAL QUESTION IF I COULD ASK MR. MILLER. I NOTICE THAT THE RENTAL OF LAND AND BUILDINGS VARIES CONSIDERABLY FROM AREA TO AREA BUT I ALSO NOTICE THAT IN THREE PARTICULAR AREAS, DAWSON, MAYO AND HAINES JUNCTION, THERE IS A CONSIDERABLE REDUCTION THIS YEAR IN THE RENTAL OF BUILDINGS. CAN YOU JUST GIVE A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THIS. WHY IS IT DIFFERENT ALL ACROSS THE TERRITORY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN IN THE OPERATION OF LIQUOR CONTROL, WE DO NOT CHARGE BACK AT A SET RATE. OUR POLICY WITH REGARD TO OPERATING THESE FACILITIES OUTSIDE OF THE OFFICE SPACE IN WHITEHORSE, IS THE ACTUAL COST OF OPERATING THE FACILITY.

MR. STUTTER: NO, BUT RENTAL.

MR. MILLER: I THINK, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN LOOKING AT SOME OF THESE, WHAT THE LIQUOR CONTROL DEPARTMENT HAS DONE, THEY HAVE PUT IN THERE EITHER THE ACTUAL RENTAL COST OR THE COST OF OPERATING THE BUILDING. IF ITS PURELY AND SIMPLY THEMSELVES IN THAT BUILDING. FOR EXAMPLE, AT MAYO, THE BUILDING THERE IS PURELY AND SIMPLY A LIQUOR STORE AND NOT QUITE COLD STORAGE OF THIS AT THE MOMENT. BUT THAT IS THE COST OF RUNNING THE BUILDING. ITS NOT RENTAL OF THE BUILDING BECAUSE THE BUILDING IS OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE STORY ON THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE THEN, WHICH HAS RENTAL AND BUILDINGS, NOTHING.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THERE IS NO RENTAL OF THE BUILDING IN THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE. THERE IS COSTS OF UPKEEP.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I UNDERSTOOD THAT WE HAVE A POLICY IN THE GOVERNMENT THAT ALL SPACE IS RENTED AND THERE IS A PORTION PAID BACK. ARE YOU NOT ASSESSING THE RENTAL OF BUILDINGS AT ALL FOR THE CENTRAL WAREHOUSE, WHEN THE STORES ARE BEING ASSESSED?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA, WE HAVE A POLICY OF CHARGING TO ALL DEPARTMENTS, OFFICE SPACE ONLY. NOT SPACE USED IN OTHER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS. ALL WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IS OFFICE SPACE WHEN WE REFER TO OUR CENTRAL STORE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, HAVE WE ANY OFFICE SPACE, THEN THAT WE ARE USING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD? I NOTICE THAT IN THE ADMINISTRATION SHEET, IT SHOWS OF BUILDINGS AS NOTHING AND YOU HAVE OFFICES THERE. ARGUE THAT ONE. YOU ARE DOING PRETTY GOOD MERV.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN IF YOU WILL NOTE UNDER UTILITY SERVICES AND HEATING FOR THE WHITEHORSE AREA, THEY HAVE A CHARGE UNDER UTILITY SERVICES AND HEATING RATHER THAN IN THE RENTALS. BOTH FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND FOR THE WAREHOUSE AND IN THE OUTLYING ONES, THEY DIDN'T HAVE ANY COST UNDER THE UTILITY SERVICES AND HEATING. THEY PUT IT UNDER RENTAL OF BUILDINGS. YES, YOU WILL NOTICE THE DIFFERENCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE OFFICES IN THE ADMINISTRATION.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN THAT WHOLE BUILDING THAT IS USED BY CENTRAL PURCHASING AND LIQUOR CONTROL UP IN THE COMPOUND, WE HAVE NOT CONSIDERED ANY OF IT TO BE PART OF OUR OFFICE SPACE POOL. WHAT HAPPENED IS, THE DEPARTMENT IS CHARGED UNDER UTILITY SERVICES AND HEATING. YOU WILL FIND ON CENTRAL WAREHOUSE, \$7,500. UNDER ADMINISTRATION, \$3,500 AND THE SAME THING APPLIES IN THE CENTRAL PURCHASING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT A LOT OF BOO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON LIQUOR PROFIT, LICENCES AND SURCHARGES? NEXT ITEM IS MOTOR VEHICLE ORDINANCE, \$980,000.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE SOME REMARKS TO MAKE ON THIS. IN FACT I CONSIDERED IT TO

BE OF SUCH AN IMPORTANT NATURE THAT I THOUGHT OF RAISING IT AS A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE, WHERE I FEEL THAT THE RIGHTS OF THIS HOUSE ARE CERTAINLY BEING ABUSED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO DRAW ATTENTION TO ANNOTATION 233 ON PAGE 198 OF BEAUSCHESNE TO PREFACE MY REMARKS. IT STATES THAT IT IS ONE OF THE OLD STANDING PRINCIPLES OF OUR CONSTITUTION THAT THE HOUSE OF COMMONS SHOULD CONTROL THE FINANCES OF THE COUNTRY. THAT IS THE RIGHT, PRIVILEGE AND DUTY OF THE HOUSE AND ACHIEVED BY MEANS OF STRUGGLE LASTING THROUGH CENTURIES BEGINNING FROM THE 14TH CENTURY DOWN TO THE 17TH CENTURY WHEN IT WAS FULLY CONFIRMED. SINCE THEN IT HAS NEVER BEEN DISPUTED. THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLE ON WHICH THE WHOLE OF OUR FINANCIAL SYSTEM IS BASED, IS THAT OF PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL AND BY THIS, IS UNDERSTOOD, NOT THE CONTROL OF PARLIAMENT IN ITS CONSTITUTIONAL SENSE, BUT CONTROL BY THE COMMONS ALONE. UPON THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE LAID DOWN ON THE VERY OUTSET OF ENGLISH PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY AND SECURED BY 300 YEARS OF MINGLED CONFLICT WITH THE CROWN AND PEACEFUL GROWTH HAS GROUNDED THE WHOLE LAW OF FINANCE. CONSEQUENTLY THE WHOLE OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE NEXT TO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO THE COMMISSIONER'S BUDGET ADDRESS. FIRST ON PAGE THREE, 'MR. SPEAKER, THE BUDGET FOR 1974-75 HAS BEEN DRAFTED WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF CONSOLIDATING THE GAINS ALREADY MADE BY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, AND WITH THEREFORE CONTAIN, NO MAJOR NEW PROGRAMS. IT IS BASICALLY A BUDGET OF A HOUSEKEEPING NATURE.'

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO AGAIN DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE 15 OF THE COMMISSIONER'S BUDGET ADDRESS. 'IT IS A FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE BUDGET, DESPITE RECORD-BREAKING EXPENDITURES, OUR PROGRAMS AND PROPOSALS ARE FULLY WITHIN THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THIS TERRITORY. CONSEQUENTLY, NO MAJOR INCREASE IN THE TERRITORIAL TAX STRUCTURE HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR 1974-75. THE BUDGETED DEFICIT AND HERE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WILL BE FINANCED OUT OF FUNDS FROM THE WORKING CAPITAL.'

MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT AN ABSOLUTE BUNCH OF BALDERDASH. MY FIRST INDICATION, MR. CHAIRMAN OF MAJOR NEW PROGRAMS THAT HAD BEEN UNDERTAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY UNDER THE PRETEXT THAT THERE WAS GOING TO BE NO FURTHER TAXATION UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON

TERRITORY WAS OUR COMMERCIAL VENTURE WHICH I MANAGED THAT WE WERE, IN YEARS PAST, WENT OVER AS GOOD CORPORATE CITIZENS FOR APRIL THE 1ST TO APPLY FOR OUR TRUCK LICENCES FOR THE TWO TRUCKS THAT WE USE IN THE OPERATION OF OUR BUDGET.

WE WERE GIVEN THE LICENCES AT THE SAME PRICE WE WERE PRIOR, \$20 TRUCK PLATES. WE WERE SUBSEQUENTLY PHONED MR. CHAIRMAN, BY A GIRL IN THE LICENCING DEPARTMENT, THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO BRING OUR TRUCK LICENCE PLATES IN, TURN THEM IN AND WOULD BE ASSESSED \$18 ADDITIONAL FOR EACH TRUCK FOR THE LICENCE FEES IN 74-75 AND WOULD BE FACING AN ADDITIONAL \$12 FOR VEHICLE IN THE LICENCE YEAR 75-76.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE IMPORT OF THE TAXATION ON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 74-75 IN THE MATTER OF LICENCING IS AN ADDITIONAL \$230,000, ALMOST A QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS FROM \$750,000 TO \$980,000 UNDER THE PRETEXT BY THIS GOVERNMENT THAT THERE ARE NO INCREASES IN TAXATION OTHER THAN A PROPOSED TOBACCO TAX FOR THE RUNNING OF KINDERGARTENS IN THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE TALKED ALL THROUGH THIS BUDGET OF PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT IN WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. AT LEAST THEY ARE PRESENTED IN THE BUDGET EVEN IF THEY ARE A FAIT ACCOMPLI FOR BUDGETS FOR COUNCILS AT LEAST CONSENT AT THE TIME OR REFUSAL. WHAT HAVE WE HAD IN THE AREA OF LICENCING, ANOTHER QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS ADDED TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AND ONE SECTION UNDER LICENCE REVENUE THAT THIS HAS BEEN PUT IN TAXATION UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. WHAT AN ABSOLUTE DENIAL OF WHAT THIS HOUSE IS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING UNDER THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND PREROGATIVES OF LEGISLATIVE DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATURES EVERYWHERE.

THE RIGHT OF A HOUSE. THE RIGHT OF THE ELECTED PEOPLE ONLY TO SET TAXATION UPON THE PEOPLE THAT THEY REPRESENT HAS BEEN ABSOLUTELY RENEGED BY THIS PRESENT YUKON LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

I CAN'T UNDERSTAND THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I CAN'T UNDERSTAND THEM AT ALL, ALLOWING THIS VERY PROVISION OF THE PRIME PRINCIPLE OF THE RIGHTS OF HOUSE TO BE SNUCK IN THIS FASHION. I AM APPALLED THAT THEY ALLOWED THEMSELVES TO BE USED AS THE DUPES WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN BY THIS ADMINISTRATION TO BRING TAXATION IN THE AREA OF ONE QUARTER OF A

MILLION DOLLARS AND THEN BLITHELY STAND BY LIKE FLEECE LAMBS AND LETS THE COMMISSIONER TELL THE PEOPLE THAT THERE WERE NO TAX INCREASES IN 1974-75.

WHAT A BLATANT UNTRUTH AND I SAY IT AS LOUD AND AS CLEAR AS POSSIBLE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO FURTHER TAXATION UPON THEM. THEY HAVE BEEN STUNG TO THE TUNE OF A QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS AND THEY ARE GOING TO GET STUNG AGAIN IN THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR ON TOP OF ALL THE OTHER PROBLEMS THAT THEY ARE TRYING TO FACE. IT'S EXACTLY THE PEOPLE YOU ARE HITTING AGAINST WHO CAN ILL AFFORD TO TAKE THESE ADDED NEW MEASURES OF TAXATION UPON THEMSELVES.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ASK THAT ALL MEMBERS REFUSE THIS BUDGET UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE ADMINISTRATION HAS THE COMMON DECENCY OF BRINGING IN A POLICY PAPER ON THE FURTHER TAXATION UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, WHY THEY THOUGHT IT WAS NECESSARY, WHAT THEY USED AS A GUIDELINE AND A YARDSTICK TO BRING ABOUT THIS EXTRA TAXATION AND WHETHER OR NOT, WHICH I FEEL THAT AN APOLOGY IS OWED TO THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY FOR THIS BLATANT OFFENCE TRYING TO SNEAK TAXATION IN THROUGH THE BACK DOOR ON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. TANNER: VERY GOOD

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN...

MR. TANNER: ONE OF YOUR BEST.

MR. MCKINNON: AND YOU DON'T AGREE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I AM VERY SAD TO HEAR A REMARK FROM MY NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOUR, THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH, BEING SOMEWHAT SARCASTIC IN HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SPEAKER THAT HAS JUST SPOKEN. I AM WONDERING MR. CHAIRMAN, HOW IT IS GOING TO BE POSSIBLE FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FINANCE TO JUSTIFY THE PASSAGE OF THIS PARTICULAR ITEM FOR THE ADMINISTRATION. TO ALLOW THE ADMINISTRATION AND AGAIN I USE THE WORDS, FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CONVENIENCE, TO ALLOW THE LICENCING DEPARTMENT TO COMMENCE THE TAXATION OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON WITHOUT FIRST BRINGING THE MATTER FORWARD TO THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL.

I THINK THAT EVERYTHING THAT COULD BE SAID, HAS BEEN SAID BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE

WEST. I WILL JUST SAY AGAIN, THAT HERE IS A CASE IN POINT OF WHERE THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TODAY HAVE BEEN COVERED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND HIS OTHER APPOINTED PEOPLE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO MAKE THEM FORGET WHAT THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES ARE TO THIS HOUSE.

IT IS QUITE TRUE. IT IS A FORM OF TAXATION WHICH THIS COUNCIL HAS NOT HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO AGREE OR DENY WITH. THIS AGAIN, IS THE DAMAGE THAT HAS BEEN DONE TO THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN I AM DISGUSTED WITH THE TWO PREVIOUS SPOKESTHUMPS TO STAND UP AND SAY THAT THIS EXTRA TAXATION THAT WASN'T BROUGHT BEFORE THE COUNCIL. WHEN BOTH THESE MEMBERS AND PARTICULARLY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO SPOKE LAST, BROUGHT IN THE LEGISLATION THAT GAVE THE POWER TO FIX THESE BY REGULATIONS AND THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS ALSO A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE WHEN THE MOTOR VEHICLE ORDINANCE WAS AMENDED. WHEN THE FEES FOR LICENCING WAS TAKEN OUT OF THE LEGISLATION ITSELF AND PUT INTO REGULATIONS. NOW THEY ARE STANDING UP AND SAYING, HOW YOU SHOULD COME BACK TO THE HOUSE WITHIN THE BUDGET TO GET APPROVAL TO INCREASE THE LICENCING THAT THIS IS A FORM OF TAXATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIXING OF FEES BY REGULATION IS ONE THING, BUT ONCE THOSE FEES HAVE BEEN FIXED, BEFORE THEY ARE PUT INTO THE BUDGET, THEY MUST COME BEFORE COUNCIL. THAT IS THE PROCEDURE THAT IS CONDUCTED IN EVERY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY. THERE IS NO CHANGE THAT HAS EVER BEEN TAKEN ON THAT.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED HERE IS THAT THE FEES HAVE BEEN FIXED BUT THE POWER TO TAX IN THIS WAY HAS NOT BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD TO THIS COUNCIL.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HIMSELF, INTRODUCED THE BILL THAT GAVE THE POWER TO THE ADMINISTRATION TO DO THIS EXACT THING WITHOUT HAVING TO BRING IT BACK TO THE HOUSE. THAT IS A BUNCH OF HOGWASH TO SAY THAT YOU HAVE TO BRING IT TO THE HOUSE TO GET APPROVAL AND HE KNOWS FULL WELL IT IS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I MUST SAY THIS. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE IS LACKING COMPLETELY IN HER KNOWLEDGE OF LEGISLATIVE ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN A POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. I WILL HEAR THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MRS. WATSON: I RESENT VERY MUCH, BEING CRITICIZED ON MY LACK OF INFORMATION WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER STANDS UP AND LIES THROUGH HIS TEETH AND PRETENDS HE HAS THE INFORMATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. I THINK THAT ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE OR ANYTHING ELSE, THIS BUSINESS OF CALLING EACH OTHER LIARS AND THIS TYPE OF THING IS QUITE UNPARLIAMENTARY AND QUITE UNCALLED FOR. COULD WE GET BACK TO THE ISSUE AT HAND.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I REPEAT THAT IT OBVIOUSLY IS A LACK OF LEGISLATIVE KNOWLEDGE WHEN THE MEMBER DOES NOT RECOGNIZE THAT IN ANY AREA WHERE PERMISSION IS GIVEN TO THE COMMISSIONER TO SET FEES, THAT THIS IS ENTIRELY SEPARATE FROM WHERE THOSE FEES CAN BE PUT INTO EFFECT OTHER THAN IN A BUDGET REQUIREMENT. SHE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THAT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HASN'T UNDERSTOOD IT UNTIL AS OF THIS TIME BECAUSE HE HAS APPROVED IT TIME AFTER TIME.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T DISAGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT THIS MEMBER HAS PROBABLY BEEN DUPED AGAIN. I HAVE BEEN DUPED BY THIS ADMINISTRATION ...

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN I RESENT THIS VERY MUCH.

ON A POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. MAY I HEAR THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE. I HAVE NOT BEEN DUPED AND I CHALLENGE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER TO PROVE THAT I ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. I FIND NO POINT OF PRIVILEGE IN THAT YOU CONSIDER A PRIVILEGE BEFORE MEMBERS RISE...

MR. MCKINNON: I SAID THAT I HAD BEEN DUPED BY THIS ADMINISTRATION. I WILL SAY THAT I HAD PROBABLY BEEN...

MR. CHAIRMAN: THERE IS NO POINT OF PRIVILEGE. TAKE YOUR SEAT PLEASE.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY

IN THE AREA WHERE WE ALLOWED THE ADMINISTRATION WHERE WE THOUGHT WERE GOING TO SET THE TAXATION ON PROPERTY FOR ONE YEAR BECAUSE OF THE CMHC TAKING OVER THE HILLCREST HOUSING AND MAKING IT AVAILABLE TO THE YUKON TO BUY. WE SAID IN THIS AREA BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THE COST OF SERVICE WILL BE, NOBODY DOES, WE WANT TO MAKE THE HOUSING AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLE, YOU CAN SET THE PROPERTY TAX ON IT.

THE WHOLE THING WAS HANDLED BEAUTIFULLY. CMHC SOLD THE HOUSES, THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON GOT HOUSING, THE ADMINISTRATION SET A PROPER RATE OF TAXATION ON IT. THE NEXT YEAR, WE FOUND THROUGH THE CHANGING OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE TAXATION ORDINANCE, WHICH WE THOUGHT WERE FOR THIS ONE SHOT DEAL, THAT THE COMMISSIONER HAD GONE A LITTLE FURTHER RAISED THE PROPERTY TAX ACROSS THE WHOLE OF THE YUKON AND TAXED THE PEOPLE WITHOUT FIRST COMING TO COUNCIL.

I STOOD UP IN THE HOUSE AND SAID EXACTLY WHAT I SAY NOW, THAT WE TRIED TO DO SOMETHING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EASE AND WE ARE DUPED BY THE COMMISSIONER WHO USED IT FOR FURTHER TAXATION WITHOUT GETTING THE PRIOR CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. I HAD NO QUALMS, I SHOULD KNOW BETTER FOR THE NUMBER OF YEARS THAT I'VE SPENT AROUND THIS TABLE, BUT I STILL TRY TO BELIEVE THAT WHEN YOU DO THINGS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EASE, LIKE CHANGING A LICENCE FEE FROM \$2 TO \$3 OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE TO COME TO COUNCIL ON EVERY OCCASION.

AND RAISED THE PROPERTY TAX ACROSS THE WHOLE OF THE YUKON AND TAXED THE PEOPLE WITHOUT FIRST COMING TO COUNCIL. I STOOD UP IN THE HOUSE AND SAID EXACTLY WHAT I SAY NOW THAT WE TRIED TO DO SOMETHING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EASE AND WE ARE DUPED BY THE COMMISSIONER WHO USED IT FOR FURTHER TAXATION WITHOUT GETTING THE PRIOR CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON.

I HAVE NO QUALMS, I SHOULD KNOW BETTER FOR THE NUMBER OF YEARS I HAVE SPENT AROUND THIS TABLE BUT I STILL TRY TO BELIEVE THAT WHEN YOU DO THINGS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EASE, LIKE CHANGING A LICENCE FEE FROM TWO TO THREE DOLLARS OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT YOU SHOULD HAVE TO COME TO COUNCIL ON EVERY OCCASION. BUT WHEN I SEE THAT KIND OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATION GIVEN AND THEN THE ADMINISTRATION USING IT ONCE AGAIN TO KNOCK THE POOR TAX PAYER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY SILLY, THEN ONCE AGAIN YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER THAT THIS ADMINISTRATION WON'T CONSIDER ANYTHING OF THAT NATURE AND IT HAS TO BE IN LEGISLATION AND WE WILL TRY AND PUT IT BACK IN LEGISLATION JUST LIKE WE DID IN THE TAXATION ORDINANCE BECAUSE THERE

IS JUST NO WAY THAT THAT LEVER SHOULD BE USED FOR IMPOST OF A FURTHER QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS ON THE TAX PAYERS OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

I'M SURE I GOT SUCKED IN ONCE AGAIN AND AT LEAST I'VE GOT GUTTS ENOUGH TO STAND HERE AND ADMIT IT AND I'M SURE AS HELL GOING TO FIGHT GETTING SUCKED IN ANYMORE BY THIS ADMINISTRATION AND THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PROPERTY TAXATION THE HONOURABLE MEMBER MENTIONS IS A DIFFERENT THING COMPLETELY TO WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT NOW AND IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER RECALLS THE REQUIRED AMENDMENTS WERE MADE TO THE TAXATION ORDINANCE BUT YOU MUST ALSO RECALL THE THEORIES OF ORDINANCES THAT WE WENT THROUGH WERE CHANGED TO READ THE PRESCRIBED FEE AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO IS SITTING ACROSS WAS THE MAN WHO INTRODUCED THE LEGISLATION AND WHO LED IT THROUGH THIS HOUSE. HE SHOULD HAVE TO TAKE THE CREDIT FOR IT.

I WAS A PARTY TO IT BUT TO HAVE HIM STAND UP AND CRITICIZE THE POLICY AT THIS TIME IS JUST SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE CAN'T ACCEPT. I'M PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY. HE HAS MADE DECISIONS LIKE THIS IN THE PAST, NOW HE CRITICIZES THE DECISIONS HE MADE IN THE PAST AND HE TRIES TO BLAME THE ADMINISTRATION FOR IT. THAT LEGISLATION WAS PASSED BY THIS HOUSE AND THAT'S WHERE THE RESPONSIBILITY LIES. THE ADMINISTRATION CAN'T DO SOMETHING THAT WE DON'T GIVE THEM THE POWER TO DO AND IF YOU READ YOUR LIQUOR ORDINANCE, IF YOU READ YOUR MOTOR VEHICLES ORDINANCE, YOU WILL SEE THE POWER TO MAKE REGULATIONS, NOT SPECIFIC REGULATIONS IS GIVEN EVERY INSTANCE. YOU DO IT TIME AFTER TIME WHEN YOU DEAL WITH A PIECE OF LEGISLATION, AN ORDINANCE, THEN YOU COME BACK TO THIS HOUSE AND CRY WHEN THERE IS AN ORDINANCE THAT YOU DON'T APPROVE OF.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WAS A PRETTY GOOD ATTEMPT TO SAY TO MEMBERS OF COUNCIL THAT SHE HAS WRONGED COUNCIL BY DOING WHAT SHE THOUGHT WAS RIGHT AT THE TIME AND DOING WHAT SHE THINKS IS RIGHT AT THIS TIME.

MRS. WATSON: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN. A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. THAT'S A WRONG INTERPRETATION. WHAT I SAID WAS I TOOK THE DECISION, I'M RESPONSIBLE FOR IT AND I THINK IT WAS THE RIGHT DECISION. AT LEAST I'M BEING HONEST WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAYS SHE BELIEVES IT WAS THE RIGHT DECISION, SURELY SHE KNOWS THAT AT THE TIME OF APPROVING THE INCREASE IN THESE LICENCES THAT IT IS A WRING DECISION IN ANY EVENT. PUT AS I HAVE ALREADY SAID THAT THERE IS QUITE A LOT OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE APPROVING OF A PIECE OF LEGISLATION TO ALLOW FOR THE INCREASE BY REGULATION IN FEES, OF SETTING THE PRESCRIBED FEES, BUT WHEN IT COMES TO USING THAT AS AN ITEM OF TAXATION AND PUTTING IT IN A BUDGET REQUIREMENT THAT THERE IS A REQUIREMENT FIRST TO DISCUSS THAT ITEM WITH THE LEGISLATIVE BODY. NOW, THERE IS A DIFFERENCE THERE, A VERY DECIDED DIFFERENCE AND I DON'T SAY I ARGUE AGAINST THE FACT THAT THERE WAS LEGISLATION TO ALLOW, THERE IS LEGISLATION, TO ALLOW THE INCREASE IN FEES.

IT WAS QUITE CLEAR IN MY MIND AND CERTAINLY IN THE MINDS OF THIS COUNCIL AND I'M SURE IN THE MIND OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT THERE WOULD STILL BE A NEED FOR BRINGING FORWARD TO COUNCIL ANY INCREASE IN BUDGET OF AN ITEM OF \$250,000 BECAUSE IF SHE SAYS NO, IT ISN'T SO, THEN SHE IS SIMPLY SAYING WHAT SHE HAS SAID BEFORE THAT SHE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DOING A REAL GOOD SNOW JOB ON THIS TERRITORIAL COUNCIL. I'VE MADE MY POSITION VERY CLEAR, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS THE ONE WHO IS ALWAYS TRYING TO FIND WAYS AND MEANS OF FOOLING US AND I'VE BEEN FOOLED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND I'M NOT EASY TO FOOL. I'VE BEEN FOOLED VERY, VERY OFTEN BY HIM. VERY OFTEN INDEED.

AS A MATTER OF FACT I SHOULD HAVE KNOWN BETTER BECAUSE I'VE KNOWN THE MAN FOR 24 YEARS AND HE HASN'T CHANGED ONE BIT. HE'S STILL EXACTLY THE SAME AND AS I SAY, HE HAS MANIPULATED ME AND HE IS STILL MANIPULATING THE TWO MEMBERS HERE ALTHOUGH YOU ARE PRAISING HIM TODAY. BUT THERE WILL COME A TIME WHEN HE IS CALLING BOTH OF YOU DIRTY PEOPLE. DON'T MAKE A MISTAKE ABOUT THAT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I AGREE WITH THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST MOST EXPLICITLY THAT HERE IS WHERE WE HAVE CREATED THE TAXATION ITEM AND THIS COUNCIL HASN'T HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPROVE IT. NOW SUPPOSING, JUST SUPPOSING, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM MAYO MIGHT MAKE A DECISION TO OPPOSE THIS TYPE OF THING. I SAID HE MIGHT MAKE A DECISION TO OPPOSE THIS TYPE OF THING AND VOTES AGAINST A PARTICULAR AREA LIKE THAT. THEN IT WOULD REALLY BE A CASE OF WHERE THE TERRITORIAL SECRETARY HAS BEEN INCREASING THE MOTOR VEHICLES LICENCES WITHOUT THE AUTHORITY OF THE PEOPLE IN THIS COUNCIL TO DO SO. THAT

WOULD BE AN INTERESTING SITUATION BUT, YOU KNOW, WE KNOW FULL WELL THAT THIS MAY NEVER HAPPEN BUT IT MIGHT BE, IT JUST MIGHT BE AND I HOPE THAT HE WAKES UP TO THE FACT THAT HE IS BEING TAKEN FOR A DUMMY WHICH HE IS NOT.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A FAINT RECOLLECTION THAT THIS EXTRA REVENUE WAS DISCUSSED WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE .

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: No way, no way. This was not so and if she says this I will bring my minutes of up to the time I was on the Advisory Committee and table them here to show you.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I HAD THE DECIDED IMPRESSION THAT THEY WERE ALL SUPPOSED TO BE DESTROYED BY A COURT ORDER.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: No. Only the ones that you were sitting on that I was not sitting on. Not the ones before. So keep that in mind. I have every piece of paper that I've had. I told you that before.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS A REAL QUESTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND VARIOUS OATHS HAVE BEEN TAKEN. THIS MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN HAS NO RESPECT FOR THE OATH HE HAS TAKEN. HE HAS NO RESPECT FOR THE COMMITTEES HE SAT ON. HE HAS NO RESPECT FOR HIS LAST THREE AND A HALF YEARS OF COUNCIL AND HE CERTAINLY HAS NO RESPECT FOR THE LAST THREE AND A HALF YEARS HE WAS ON COMMITTEE . .

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: AND I DON'T HAVE ANY RESPECT FOR YOU EITHER, NONE AT ALL.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ORDER, ORDER PLEASE.

Mr. TANNER: AND WITH EVERY SECOND BREATH HE KEEPS MAKING A MENTION OF SOMETHING ON A POLITICAL AREA OF MAYBE I'LL DO THIS AND MAYBE I'LL DO THAT BUT HE DOESN'T ... WHY DOESN'T HE TABLE HIS MINUTES? WHY DOESN'T HE DO THAT AND THEN WE WILL HAVE A PRIMA FACIE CASE TO SAY HE HAS BROKEN THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE OATH THAT HE TOOK. BUT HE WON'T DO THAT. HE IS ALL SUGGESTION AND INNUENDO.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, YOU KNOW, A MAN BY THE NAME OF JOHNSON ONCE MADE REFERENCE TO ABOUT WAVING THE FLAG AND ALL THESE ROGUES ALWAYS WAVED THE FLAG AND ALWAYS HIDE BEHIND

CONFIDENTIALITY AND THIS IS WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH THESE MEMBERS. THESE MEMBERS, THEY ARE THE ONES WHO HAVE BECOME PIOUS ALL OF A SUDDEN. THEY HAVE BECOME PIOUS IN THEIR DUTIES AND THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH WHO HAS BEEN, WHO THE COMMISSIONER HAS DESTROYED COMPLETELY IN HIS CAPACITY TO BE ABLE TO THINK. ALL OF A SUDDEN HE IS NOBODY'S BUDDY.

I'LL TELL YOU THIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT WHEN A STATEMENT IS MADE BY THE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE THAT THESE INCREASES WERE PUT ON WHILE I WAS A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, IT'S A TOTAL UNTRUTH BECAUSE IT WAS NEVER RAISED. DON'T FORGET I WAS NOT ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AFTER THE, I WAS BUT I WASN'T SITTING BECAUSE OF THE TRICKS THAT THEY PLAYED. UNTIL THE END OF SEPTEMBER AND IT NEVER ROSE BEFORE THAT TIME SO OBVIOUSLY THIS DID COME UP AT A LATER TIME.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, POSSIBLY IT WAS WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS ABSENT SOME TIME, TRAVELLING ON OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT. I WONDER IF AT THIS TIME THAT WE CAN SET ASIDE THIS PERSONALITY THING AND GET BACK DOWN TO THE ISSUES.

ANYTHING FURTHER ON THE MOTOR VEHICLE ORDINANCE?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: I WOULD LIKE TO PUT THAT TO A VOTE WHETHER WE APPROVE THIS OR NOT AND HAVE IT RECORDED, Mr. CHAIRMAN, ON THIS PARTICULAR ITEM.

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WE ARE NOT VOTING ANYTHING UNDER REVENUE. WE ARE PERUSING ANTICIPATED REVENUES AND WE CANNOT CHANGE IT.

THE NEXT ITEM IS BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENCES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$70,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF I MAY RAISE A QUESTION. IS Mr. CHAIRMAN SUGGESTING THAT WE CANNOT VOTE ON WHETHER WE HAVE THESE DEDUCTIONS MADE BY WAY OF REVENUE?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WE CAN'T. THESE ARE JUST ANTICIPATED REVENUES.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: OF COURSE YOU CAN.

Mr. McKINNON: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT'S THE RIGHT OF THIS HOUSE TO DELETE ANYTHING THEY WANT TO IN

THE BUDGET BY A MAJORITY VOTE. IF THE MAJORITY OF THIS COUNCIL FEEL THAT THIS IS AN UNFAIR IMPOST AND AN UNFAIR TAX UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. BY A MAJORITY VOTE THIS CAN BE ELIMINATED FROM THE BUDGET. WE HAVE THAT RIGHT, THAT ONLY RIGHT UNDER THE YUKON ACT. WE CAN'T ADD TO IT BUT WE SURE CAN TAKE IT OUT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NOW THIS IS TRUE. THE WAY THIS, OF COURSE, COULD BE ACHIEVED WOULD BE THROUGH THE REGULATION ROUTE. THROUGH THE REGULATION WHICH CREATES IT WHICH HAS BEEN TABLED IN THE HOUSE. THIS IS THE WAY THIS IS DONE BUT I DON'T THINK THAT IN MY EXPERIENCE, NOW I COULD BE WRONG AND I STAND TO BE CORRECTED HERE ON THIS DECISION BUT IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT REVENUES ARE MORE A MATTER OF INFORMATION AS THEY APPEAR IN THE BUDGET. NOW, I COULD BE WRONG. COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ONLY POINT I WAS ABOUT TO MAKE WAS THAT EVEN THOUGH I AGREED THAT THIS WAS A MONSTER, IT WAS THE COUNCIL BY A MAJORITY VOTE THAT CREATED THE MONSTER AND BY ALLOWING THESE FEES TO BE CHANGED IN REGULATION WE CREATED THAT MONSTER. WHEN THIS INFORMATION IS PUT BEFORE US, WE HAVE ALREADY CREATED THAT MONSTER AND IT'S ENTIRELY UP TO COUNCIL TO CHANGE IT BUT YOU CAN'T CHANGE WHAT'S HAPPENED UP TO THIS POINT AFTER HAVING AGREED TO ALLOWING FEE CHANGES TO BE DONE IN REGULATIONS. UNTIL THAT'S CHANGED, THAT'S THE WAY THINGS ARE.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, CERTAINLY I DISAGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER BECAUSE NO. 1, IF I EVER THOUGHT FOR ONE MINUTE THAT A QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS WAS GOING TO BE RAISED BY REGULATION BECAUSE AS I SAY, I SHOULD KNOW BETTER, I'VE BEEN HERE LONG ENOUGH AND I'VE SEEN THE WAY THESE MONSTERS ARE CREATED AND THE WAY THE ADMINISTRATION JUST WIGGLES IN AS SOON AS YOU LET A CRACK OPEN AT ALL AND TO GETTING SOME MORE MONEY OUT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WHO ARE JUST SUFFERING UNDER THE BURDEN OF TAXATION THAT ARE STAGGERING AT THIS MOMENT IN THE YUKON.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN ONLY SAY THAT THERE IS NO POSSIBLE WAY THAT IF I HADN'T THOUGHT IT WAS JUST FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE EASE IN THE DAY TO DAY ADMINISTRATION OF CHANGING THAT THERE IS NO WAY THAT I WOULD EVER HAVE AGREED TO THE CHANGE OF ALLOWING THE ADMINISTRATION TO SET BY REGULATION OF THAT. FOR ONE SECOND THOUGHT THAT THEY WOULD USE IT TO PUT A FURTHER ONE QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLAR TAX ON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

I FURTHER SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT I WOULD ASK YOU TO LOOK INTO THIS AT YOUR LEISURE AND NOT MAKE A DECISION NOW THAT THERE IS ONLY ONE RIGHT THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAVE AS FAR AS MATTERS FISCAL GO. THAT IS THE RIGHT OF DELETING AND ELIMINATING AREAS OF THE BUDGET THEY DON'T AGREE ON. AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER CANNOT BRING IN A TAX AND IMPOSE LIKE THE ADMINISTRATION COULD UNDER THIS SECTION. WE DON'T EVEN HAVE THE ABILITY, AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER, THAT A CIVIL SERVANT HAS OF BRINGING THIS TYPE OF TAXATION UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. WE HAVE ONE, ONLY ONE SMALL MEASURE OF AUTHORITY AND THAT IS TO TAKE IT OUT. WHEN A POLICY IS SO REPUGNANT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, CUT IT OUT AND MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THIS RESPECT LET'S AT LEAST HAVE OUR VOTE THAT WE ARE CAPABLE OF CUTTING IT OUT TO SHOW THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO GO ALONG BY THIS DECATORIAL RULE OF REGULATION ONE MINUTE LONGER IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST A MOMENT. JUST IN DIRECTING COMMITTEE AS I SAID EARLIER, IT IS QUITE PROPER FOR ANY COMMITTEE OR ANY MEMBER THEREOF TO MOVE MOTIONS AFFECTING THE DELETION OF ANY, FOR INSTANCE, ANTICIPATED CHANGES IN FEES ACCORDING TO REGULATIONS BECAUSE REGULATIONS HAVE BEEN TABLED IN THE HOUSE AND DO DIRECTLY RELATE TO THE ITEM IN THE BUDGET BUT MY POINT WAS THAT YOU JUST CAN'T TAKE, I DON'T THINK YOU CAN, AT LEAST IN REVENUE AND TAKE ANY SECTION AND SAY DELETE IT BECAUSE IT IS AN ANTICIPATED REVENUE EN TOTO. SO, DEPENDING ON HOW ONE MAKES HIS MOTION, YOU CAN SAY YOU DIDN'T WISH ANY ADDITIONAL INCREASE OVER WHAT IT WAS LAST YEAR OR DO ANYTHING BUT I JUST SAY YOU CAN'T, WELL YOU COULD I SUPPOSE IF THE REST OF COMMITTEE SAID ANTICIPATED REVENUES ARE \$4,000 FOR FUR EXPORT, LET'S KNOCK THAT OUT OF THERE, WE'RE STILL GOING TO HAVE IT. SO, IT'S JUST A PROCEDURAL THING THAT'S ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: VOTE ON IT, VOTE ON IT. GIVE THEM A VOTE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT'S QUITE CONFIDENT FOR ANY MEMBER TO PRESENT A MOTION IN RELATION TO THIS AS LONG AS YOU REFER TO THE SOURCE THAT'S ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE JUST HAVE A RECESS FOR JUST A FEW MINUTES?

MR. CHAIRMAN: COMMITTEE AGREE?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, WE WILL JUST DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS.

BEGINNING OF TAPE MISSING.

MR. MILLER: SO THAT'S EFFECTIVELY WHAT'S HAPPENED. B.C.'S RATES ARE \$100.00 A YEAR MORE THAN THE ALBERTA RATES, AND WE ARE STILL \$100.00 OR \$150.00 LESS THAN THE ALBERTA RATES AT THIS POINT ON LARGE VEHICLES.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD I ASK THE WITNESS ONE OTHER QUESTION? HAS THE LICENSING DEPARTMENT RECEIVED ANY NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS, AND IN PARTICULAR HAVE THEY RECEIVED ANY NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FROM THE LARGER TRUCKING COMPANIES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO MY KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY COMPLAINTS FROM THE LARGE TRUCKING OPERATIONS. THAT ISN'T TO SAY THERE HASN'T BEEN ANY, BUT TO MY KNOWLEDGE THERE HASN'T.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE ONE OTHER QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. MILLER. THAT IS HOW MUCH REVENUE WERE WE ANTICIPATING FROM TRUCKS GOING THROUGH THE TERRITORY THAT ARE NOT REGISTERED IN THE TERRITORY AS A FURTHER INCREASE IN THIS AREA?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AGAIN WE CAN'T BE VERY PRECISE ON THIS. FOR EXAMPLE, WE KNOW IF THE ALASKA PIPELINE SITUATION, THE LICENSING THAT'S GOING ON HAULING THESE TRAILERS AND THESE TYPES OF THINGS, THE REVENUE WILL PROBABLY BE SOMEWHERE BETWEEN \$25,000.00 AND \$50,000.00 PER ANNUM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IS THAT ADDITIONAL REVENUE OVER WHAT WE HAD LAST YEAR? YOU ARE ESTIMATING I KNOW. ARE YOU ESTIMATING AN INCREASE?

MR. MILLER: YES. WE WOULD ANTICIPATE THAT MUCH INCREASE DURING THIS YEAR.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE FINAL QUESTION, THE AUTHORITY TO LEVY THIS TYPE OF FEE IN THE PROVINCES RESTS WITH WHAT AREA OF THE GOVERNMENT?

MR. MILLER: IN MOST OF THE PROVINCES, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT RESTS WITH THE CABINET OR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL.

MR. MCKINNON: A FULLY ELECTED ONE, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. TANNER: I AGREE. I AGREE.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS ALL VERY INTERESTING INFORMATION; MOST ENLIGHTENING. MEMBERS ARE MISSING THE POINT OF THE ARGUMENT I'M TRYING TO MAKE. WE HAVE GOT SOURCES OF REVENUE IN VERY LIMITED FIELDS THAT THE COMMISSIONER IN COUNCIL, THE COMMISSIONER WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF COUNCIL HAS CONTROL OVER. OKAY. WE ALLOW THE ADMINISTRATION TO SET BY REGULATION THE FEES AND IMPOSTS JUST AS HE FEELS HE WANTS TO WITHOUT PRIOR COUNCIL CONSENT OR WITHOUT COUNCIL CONSENT EXCEPT AS APPEARING IN REVENUE SECTIONS OF THE BUDGET. WHEN WE COME TO THIS TABLE AND A NEW PROGRAM IS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS - YOU KNOW, NO MATTER WHAT HONOURABLE MEMBERS SITTING ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MAY BELIEVE, THEY REALLY DON'T HAVE ALL THE TALENT FOR INITIATING PROGRAMS THAT THEY MAY THINK THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WANT. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE HAS COME UP ON HIS OWN INITIATIVE WITH A TELEVISION RELAY SYSTEM OF PROVIDING FOR FIVE FURTHER COMMUNITIES IN THE TERRITORY. I DON'T THINK THERE IS A MEMBER IN COUNCIL THAT DOESN'T ADMIT THAT THAT WOULD BE A WONDERFUL THING TO SEE HAPPEN IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. OUR HANDS ARE TIED. WE CAN'T EVEN GO TO THE AREAS WHERE WE COULD GENERALLY GO AS A COUNCIL TO LOOK FOR ADDED REVENUE BECAUSE THE LICENSING FEE IS ALREADY TAKEN UP THROUGH REGULATION IN THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND FOR THE GENERAL INCREASES IN OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. OUR TOBACCO TAX HAS BEEN OUTLINED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO GO TOWARDS AN EXPANDED KINDERGARTEN SYSTEM. GOODNESS KNOWS WITH THE PRICE INCREASE NORMAL IN THE PRICE OF LIQUOR IN THE YUKON TERRITORY - JUST TAKING THAT INTO CONSIDERATION, IT IS NOT VERY LIKELY THAT THE MEMBERS CAN GO TO THAT AREA OF TAXATION FOR FURTHER REVENUE. WHAT WE ARE SAYING IS REALLY ANY PROGRAM THAT ANY HONOURABLE MEMBER, EXCLUSIVE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, COMES UP WITH IS ALMOST POSITIVE OF DEFEAT PRIOR TO EVEN BRINGING THE CONCEPT HERE TO THE TABLE BECAUSE EVERY ASPECT OF TAXATION HAS ALREADY BEEN GIVEN TO THE COMMISSIONER AND

HE'S USED IT TO THE FULLEST EXTENT SO THAT THE PEOPLE MAY JUST AS WELL FOLD UP THEIR TENTS AND CRAWL AWAY HOME. THERE IS JUST NO WAY THAT THEY CAN DO ANYTHING - THEY CAN INITIATE ANY PROGRAMS OR THEY CAN DO ANYTHING THAT THEY THINK THE CONSTITUENTS WHO HAVE SENT THEM HERE TO THIS TABLE WANT IN THEIR VARIOUS COMMUNITIES. IF HONOURABLE MEMBERS HADN'T REALLY TRIED TO SNEAK THIS ONE BY; IF THEY HAD AT LEAST BROUGHT IN A PAPER SAYING THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE AN INCREASE OF \$265,400.00 IN TAXATION IN THE YUKON THROUGH LICENSING UNDER THE MOTOR VEHICLE ACT, AND THIS IS THE REASON FOR IT, AND THESE ARE THE REASONS WHY THE TAX IMPOSTS ARE DONE AT THIS TIME. YOU KNOW, TO GO ABOUT IT IN THIS KIND OF AN OPEN BASIS INSTEAD OF DURING THE LAST DAYS OF THE BUDGET DEBATE ON PAGE 70 TRY TO SNEAK IT THROUGH IN THIS MANNER. I REALLY DON'T THINK IT'S WORTHY OF THEM OR WORTHY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY TO DO IT THIS WAY.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE REASON IT IS IN THIS PAGE IS BECAUSE THIS IS THE PLACE THAT IT APPEARS IN THE REVENUE SECTION IN EVERY BUDGET DEBATE, AND THAT'S WHY IT IS INTO THE BOOK. THERE WAS NO REASON THAT WE BROUGHT IT IN THE LAST TIME OF THE BUDGET. THE MEMBER MIGHT HAVE A POINT WHEN HE SAYS THE HOUSE WAS DUE SOME EXPLANATION. PERHAPS THAT MIGHT BE TRUE. HOWEVER, THE AMOUNT OF MONEY WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IS NOTHING LIKE WHAT ALL THE OTHER HONOURABLE MEMBERS AROUND HERE ARE GETTING EXCITED ABOUT. WHEN YOU GET RIGHT DOWN TO IT IT'S A MERE \$25,000.00 OR MAYBE \$35,000.00. IT'S NOT A QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLAR IMPOST ON THE PEOPLE. I'M TALKING ABOUT THE INCREASE THAT IS GOING TO ACCRUE DIRECTLY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE GOT TO PUT THE MOTION FIRST. THIS IS THE USUAL WAY THESE THINGS ARE USUALLY DONE. MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MOVE, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COMMITTEE THAT THE INCREASES ON MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSES FOR THE 1974-75 FISCAL YEAR BE REMITTED TO THOSE WHO HAVE PAID THEM, AND THAT THE LICENSE FEES FOR 1974-75 REMAIN THE SAME AS FOR THE YEAR 1973-74.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COUNCILLOR MCKINNON SECONDED THE MOTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COMMITTEE THAT THE INCREASES ON MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSES FOR THE 1974-75 FISCAL YEAR BE REMITTED TO THOSE WHO HAVE PAID THEM, AND THAT THE LICENSE FEES FOR 1974-75 REMAIN THE SAME AS FOR THE YEAR 1973-74. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THOSE AGREED KINDLY SIGNIFY. WOULD THOSE OPPOSED KINDLY SIGNIFY. I DECLARE THAT THE MOTION HAS BEEN DEFEATED. ARE YOU CLEAR ON BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSES, \$70,000.00? NEXT IS GAME ORDINANCE, \$170,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HAVE THERE BEEN INCREASES IN THE FEES ON BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSES AS WELL?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE HAVE BEEN NO OTHER CHANGES IN FEES TO MY KNOWLEDGE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL HOW ABOUT TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE OTHER TWO MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE TWO SEPARATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES; THERE IS THE APPOINTED ONE AND THE ELECTED ONE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ARE QUITE AWARE THAT THIS WAS THE ONLY INCREASE IN FEE STRUCTURE AT THIS TIME.

MR. CHAIRMAN: UNDER THE GAME ORDINANCE I'M NOT TOO CLEAR, SPEAKING FROM THE CHAIR, THAT WHEN WE DISCUSSED THE GAME ESTIMATES I BELIEVE IT WAS STATED THAT THEY COULDN'T REPORT AS YET WHAT THE INCREASES IN THE GAME LICENSES WOULD BE AND YET IT IS REFLECTED HERE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ESTIMATE HERE IS ON THE BASIS THAT THERE IS NO CHANGE IN GAME LICENSES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: OKAY. ARE YOU CLEAR? MARRIAGE LICENSES, \$1,000.00.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: LAUGHTER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. NEXT ITEM IS INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS, \$330,000.00. NEXT ITEM IS FINES - TERRITORIAL COURT AND OTHERS, \$70,000.00. UNDER FEES, REGISTRATIONS, ETC., \$135,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO ASCERTAIN AS TO WHETHER THERE HAS BEEN ANY MOVEMENT TOWARDS HAVING THE FEES BEING - RATHER THE FINES THAT HAVE BEEN LEVIED AGAINST PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN CHARGED UNDER THE CRIMINAL CODE, HAVING THOSE FEES GO INTO THE TERRITORIAL COURT COFFERS. AFTER ALL, IT'S THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT THAT NOW IS PAYING - IS MEETING THE COST OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. IS THERE ANY CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN OTTAWA SO THAT WE CAN GET THESE FINES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE CONTINUED TO ATTEMPT TO GET SOME OF THESE FINES. HOWEVER, THE SITUATION IS NO DIFFERENT HERE IN THE YUKON THAN IT IS IN THE PROVINCES. MOST OF THIS MONEY GOES TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO THE RECEIVER-GENERAL OF CANADA ON THOSE ITEMS WHICH COME UNDER THE CRIMINAL CODE OR FEDERAL LAW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AT THE MOMENT AND FOR A LONG TIME TO COME IT SEEMS THAT WE ARE STILL AN AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. HAVE WE PUT UP THE ARGUMENT THAT BEING AN AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IT WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE IF THE MONEY WAS PAID INTO THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND WHICH IS AN AGENCY FUND?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THAT SPECIFIC ARGUMENT HAS BEEN PUT UP.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT'S A GOOD ONE. IS THERE A BREAKDOWN AT ALL OF THESE FINES IN RELATION TO THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WE SEND OUT TO TO THE FEDS. AND WHAT WE KEEP OURSELVES? PERHAPS WE SHOULD BE SPEAKING TO THE MAGISTRATES AND SEE THAT THEY CHARGE A LITTLE LESS ON CRIMINAL CODE AND CHARGE A LITTLE BIT MORE ON TERRITORIAL ORDINANCES SO THAT WE GET MORE MONEY THIS WAY IN OUR FUNDS.

MR. MILLER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M AFRAID I CAN'T TELL YOU OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD HOW

MUCH GOES TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. I CAN TELL YOU THIS MUCH. IT'S A HECK OF A LOT MORE THAN WE COLLECT OURSELVES. IT SEEMS TO ME IT'S IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF \$25,000.00 A MONTH. I'M GUESSING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A MONTH?

MR. MILLER: YES I THINK THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. MCKINNON: OH SURE. JUST LOOK AT THE 250 CLUB FOR CRYING OUT LOUD. INCREDIBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: HAVE YOU ANYTHING FURTHER ON FINES - TERRITORIAL COURT AND OTHERS? NEXT ITEM IS REGISTRATIONS ETC., \$135,000.00. WHAT IS THE DECREASE REPRESENTED HERE?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS WAS A POOR ESTIMATE IN 1973-74. WE OVER-ESTIMATED IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS CAMPGROUND USE, \$45,000.00. NEXT ITEM IS YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YOU KNOW, THIS IS A WAY I CAN GET IT FROM 5. I'LL LEAVE IT FOR TOMORROW. (LAUGHTER)

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS SUNDRY, \$20,000.00. THIS GIVES US A TOTAL REVENUE OF \$10,096,838.00. NEXT ITEM IS ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES UNDER RECOVERIES. THE FIRST ITEM IS HOUSING ACCOMMODATION AND RENTALS, \$495,610.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHERE WOULD WE BE GETTING - WHY WOULD WE BE GETTING MORE BACK THIS YEAR WHEN THE RENTALS THAT HAVE BEEN PAID WOULD REDUCE THE TOTAL AMOUNT, WOULDN'T THEY? THE RENTALS THAT WE GET EACH YEAR IS REDUCED ISN'T IT IN THE TOTAL?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. THE AMOUNT OF RENT THAT WE CHARGE OUR EMPLOYEES NORMALLY INCREASES EACH YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I UNDERSTOOD THAT THEY WERE MOVING OUT. ARE WE SAYING NOW THAT THEY ARE MOVING IN?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. THERE ARE TWO FACTORS INVOLVED IN THIS. CERTAINLY IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA, AND TAKHINI PARTICULARLY,

THEY ARE MOVING OUT. THE NUMBER OF UNITS THAT WE ARE CARRYING ARE LESS. HOWEVER, IN THE OUTLYING AREAS IT'S INCREASING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT IS THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE SECRETARIAT, \$34,980.00. IN TREASURY, THE ELECTRIC RATE EQUALIZATION, \$220,000.00. THE SMALL BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM, \$4,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS ITEM, MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST REPAYMENT ON SMALL BUSINESS LOANS. IS THAT WHAT IT'S FOR?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. THIS IS THE RECOVERY OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PRIMARILY THE BOARD'S EXPENSES THAT IS PAID FOR BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS NET PROCEEDS OF SALE OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT, \$85,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH DID WE RECEIVE BACK LAST YEAR FOR THE SALE OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, GOING BY RECOLLECTION HERE, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT WAS APPROXIMATELY \$90,000.00 OR \$100,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WAS THERE ANY IDEA THAT WE WERE GOING TO BE RECEIVING SOME MONEY BACK?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. AT THE TIME OUR ORIGINAL BUDGET WAS PREPARED WE HADN'T DONE OUR BOARD OF SURVEY AND DECLARED ALL THIS MATERIAL SURPLUS. WE NOW HAVE A STANDARD PROCEEDURE FOR A BOARD OF SURVEY. WE NOW HAVE THE ANNUAL REVIEWS. WE INTEND TO HAVE ANNUAL SALES TO DISPOSE OF THIS EQUIPMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I ASK THIS QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, BECAUSE IT NOW APPEARS THAT IN ONE AREA WE HAD A \$150,000.00 THAT WAS AN ERROR ON TAX REVENUE AND PROPERTY TAX APPROXIMATELY \$150,000.00 THAT CAME INTO THE YUKON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND. IN THIS ITEM WE HAVE \$90,000.00 THAT DIDN'T SHOW UP IN THE 1973-74 SO THAT'S \$240,000.00. THEY ARE BOTH REVENUES. ONE'S A RECOVERY - - -

MR. STUTTER: ONE WAS OVER-ESTIMATED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO, THERE WAS AN ESTIMATE FOR 1973-74 OF \$152,525.00 ON PROPERTY TAXES.

INSTEAD WE RECEIVED ABOUT \$300,000.00 WHICH IS A DIFFERENCE OF ABOUT \$150,000.00. THIS TIME WE ARE TOLD THAT THERE WAS NO ESTIMATE FOR NO RECOVERIES YET WE RECEIVE \$90,000.00. THAT'S ANOTHER \$240,000.00 IN REVENUES OVER AND ABOVE THAT WE HAVE RECEIVED, NOT ESTIMATED, BUT WHAT WE HAVE ACTUALLY RECEIVED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THIS I UNDERSTAND, FROM MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT MR. MILLER HAD INDICATED. HE ALSO INDICATED THAT THIS HAS GONE INTO THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND I WOULD LIKE TO FIND OUT WHERE THAT MONEY WAS USED IN RELATION, ESPECIALLY TO THE FACT THAT WE HAVE TO HAVE A SUPPLEMENTARY WHEN WE RECEIVED AN EXTRA \$240,000, DURING THE YEAR.

WE HAD A SUPPLEMENTARY IN 1973/74, AT THE END OF /74. WE RECEIVED \$240,000 OVER AND ABOVE WHAT WAS ESTIMATED. WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT \$240,000?

MR. MILLER: SOME OF IT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WENT TO SUPPORT THE SUPPLEMENTARY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH OF IT WENT TO SUPPORT THE SUPPLEMENTARY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK I GET WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS TRYING TO GET AROUND HERE. I THOUGHT I HAD MY PAPERS WITH ME ON WORKING CAPITAL, I DON'T. I'M PREPARED TO BRING THOSE FORWARD TOMORROW AND EXPLAIN OUR WORKING CAPITAL POSITION TO OUR HONOURABLE MEMBER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS ONE QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. MILLER IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA. IT WAS IN THE PAPER LAST NIGHT THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS GOING TO SURPLUS A WHOLE BUNCH OF SECOND HAND TIRES AND IT IS STATING THAT THE BIDDER MUST PUT UP A \$50.00 DEPOSIT TO MAKE SURE THAT HE CLEANS THE AREA UP. WHEN DOES THE BOARD OR THE GOVERNMENT MAKE THE DECISION TO WHETHER STUFF SHOULD BE TAKEN TO THE DUMP OR WHETHER IN FACT IT SHOULD BE SURPLUSED? IT SEEMS TO ME THIS IS PROBABLY ONE INSTANCE WHERE THE STUFF SHOULD HAVE GONE TO THE DUMP IN THE FIRST PLACE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS ISN'T QUITE RIGHT. SURPLUS TIRES, DEPENDING UPON THE TYPE OF TIRE, ARE VERY VALUABLE. WE HAVE NEVER RUN A SALE OF THIS NATURE BEFORE, I MEAN Y.T.G. NEVER HAS BUT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS OR CROWN ASSETS HAVE, AND THEY

HAVE RECEIVED VERY GOOD RETURNS. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HUGE TRACTOR AND GRADER TIRES THAT CAN BE RECAPPED. UP UNTIL THIS POINT WE HAVEN'T DEALT WITH THIS SUBJECT BEFORE. THEY HAVE JUST BEEN PILING UP IN A BIG PILE IN THE WORK YARD. WE ARE NOW ATTEMPTING TO RELIEVE OURSELVES OF THAT RESPONSIBILITY. WE ARE TRYING TO SET UP SOME NORMAL PROCESS FROM HERE ON FOR THE DISPOSAL OF THESE TYPES OF THINGS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT \$50.00 IS INSUFFICIENT TO CLEAN UP THE YARD BECAUSE IF SOMEBODY DOESN'T WANT TO CLEAN UP THE YARD IT IS GOING TO COST THEM \$50.00 JUST FOR A COUPLE OF HOURS. IT SHOULD BE A REAL GOOD AMOUNT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS A RELATIVELY SMALL AREA WHEN I SAY THE YARD. IT IS NOT ACROSS THE WHOLE YARD. IT IS AN AREA PROBABLY ABOUT 100 BY 200. I AGREE THEY MAY LEAVE SOME TIRES THERE, THAT IS WHY WE ARE ASKING FOR THE DEPOSIT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS EDUCATION, REHABILITATION, CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN - \$33,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHY WASN'T THERE ANY MONEY COMING BACK FROM THE PREVIOUS YEAR - 73/74?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE WEREN'T ON THIS TYPE OF A PROGRAM, THE REHABILITATION THAT WE HAD IN THE BUDGET FOR THE PRIOR YEAR WAS PURELY AND SIMPLY THE COORDINATOR. WE ARE NOW QUALIFYING UNDER AN AGREEMENT FOR RECOVERIES UNDER CANADA ASSISTANCE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS STUDENT ACCOMMODATION - \$31,500. SALE OF SCHOOL SUPPLIES - \$2,000. NIGHT SCHOOL FEES - \$15,000. TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN - \$3,000. SALE OF MATERIALS, SUPPLIES, AND SERVICES - \$54,500.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE GET A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ITEM - SALE OF SCHOOL SUPPLIES AND THEN SALE OF MATERIAL, SUPPLIES AND SERVICES? WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE TWO ITEMS?

MRS. WATSON: SCHOOL SUPPLIES ARE SCHOOL SUPPLIES AND IT IS A VERY MINIMAL SUM. WE ONLY SELL SCHOOL SUPPLIES IN SOME ISOLATED AREAS. SALE OF MATERIALS, SUPPLIES AND SERVICES IS THE RENTAL OF OUR FACILITIES. THE INCOME THAT WE DERIVE FROM RENTING FACILITIES - THE GYMNASIUM, THE AUDITORIUMS AND THIS TYPE OF THINGS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, WHY...

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS ONE OTHER AREA IN THERE. THESE ARE SPECIAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES FOR VOCATIONAL TYPE PROGRAMS. THERE ARE CERTAIN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AT THE SCHOOLS THE STUDENTS HAVE TO BUY THEIR OWN MATERIALS OR PART OF THEIR OWN MATERIALS. WOODWORKING FOR EXAMPLE. IF THEY WANT TO MAKE SPECIAL THINGS WITH SPECIAL WOOD THEY HAVE TO BUY THE MATERIAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AND DO THEY BUY THEM FROM THE SCHOOL?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN MOST CASES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: CLEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING RECOVERIES - \$750,000. DORMITORY FEES - \$23,000. FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT - \$72,000. FRIENDSHIP CENTERS - \$15,000.

IN VIEW OF THE TIME SHALL WE CONTINUE THIS TOMORROW?

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

MR. TANNER: I SECOND THE MOTION.

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

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I SHALL DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

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

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 10:30 A.M. TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS, AND MOTIONS. MR. MILLER, MR. HUBERDEAU ATTENDED COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 3. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT THE PREPARED SESSIONAL PAPER DETAILING EXPANDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM BE TABLED IN COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE MAIN ESTIMATES. THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT VOTE 4 AND VOTE 5 BE CLEARED WITHOUT FURTHER QUESTION. THIS MOTION CARRIED AND THIS WAS RELATED TO BILL NO. 3, MR. SPEAKER.

COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 12 NOON, RECONVENED AT 2:00 P.M.. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS COMMITTEE THAT THE INCREASES ON MOTOR VEHICLE LICENCES FOR THE 1974/75 FISCAL YEAR BE REMITTED TO THOSE WHO HAVE PAID THEM AND THAT THE LICENCE FEES FOR 1974/75 REMAIN THE SAME AS FOR THE YEAR 1973/74. THIS MOTION WAS DEFEATED. AND ALSO RELATED TO BILL NO. 3.

I CAN REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL NO. 3. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. THIS MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: WE HAVE HEARD THE REPORT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES. ARE WE AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I RISE AS YOUR CHAIRMAN IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO REPORT THAT TODAY IN COMMITTEE IN DEBATE SURROUNDING A MOTION. IT WAS INFERRED BY AT LEAST SOME MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE THAT I HAD MADE A WRONG DECISION AND INDEED THERE WAS QUESTION AS TO MY PARTIALITY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE. MR. SPEAKER MY FIRST DUTY IN THIS ELECTED CHAMBER IS TO THE PEOPLE WHO ELECTED ME TO SERVE ON

THIS COUNCIL. MY SECOND DUTY IN THIS HOUSE IS IN THE ACCEPTANCE AND THE FUNCTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES AND DOING THE WORK OF THE HOUSE ON BEHALF OF THE HOUSE. IN DEFENDING PARLIAMENTARY RULE TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY, DEFENDING PARLIAMENTARY JUSTICE IN DEBATES CONSISTENT WITH THE RULES OF THE HOUSE IN AN ORDERLY AND IMPARTIAL MANNER.

THE IMPARTIALITY OF THE CHAIR IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HAS COME INTO QUESTION. I HAD INTENDED ON RELATING TO YOU MR. SPEAKER, SOME OF THE INSULTS THAT WERE THROWN AROUND THE CHAMBERS AT THAT TIME. THE TONE OF THE DEBATE CERTAINLY INDICATED THAT THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE HAD LOST THE CONFIDENCE OF THE MEMBERSHIP.

FOLLOWING THE NOON RECESS I REPORTED TO YOUR COMMITTEE, MR. SPEAKER, ON THE MATTER AND IT APPEARS TO ME THAT IF I AM TO SERVE THE HOUSE I MUST HAVE THE CONFIDENCE OF THE HOUSE, MR. SPEAKER. IF I AM TO SERVE IT WELL. IF I DO NOT HAVE THE CONFIDENCE FOR THE HOUSE THAN, NO DOUBT, ANOTHER MEMBER SHOULD REPLACE ME IN THIS IMPORTANT TASK.

THEREFORE, MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD ASK FOR A DETERMINATION BY THE HOUSE AS TO THE CONFIDENCE THEY HAVE IN MY UNDERTAKING AS DEPUTY SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

MR. STUTTER: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT I THINK IT IS VERY UNUSUAL FOR A MEMBER TO SEEK A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE. IT IS NORMALLY THE OTHER WAY AROUND, THAT THERE IS A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PUT IN A MEMBER. THIS CERTAINLY HAS NOT BEEN PUT FORWARD AT THIS TIME. I THINK MOST OF US, PERHAPS ALL OF US HERE, FEEL THAT THE MEMBER IS DOING A GOOD JOB AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES. I THINK THAT SINCE THERE HAS BEEN NO VOTE OF NON-CONFIDENCE HE SHOULDN'T TAKE IT UPON HIMSELF TO THINK THAT THERE IS NON-CONFIDENCE IN HIS POSITION.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, IN REPLY TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHO HAS JUST SPOKEN, I THANK HIM FOR HIS REMARKS BUT THE INFERENCE DURING THE DEBATES OF TODAY IN THE COMMITTEE WOULD INDICATE THAT I NO LONGER ENJOY THE CONFIDENCE OF THE HOUSE. THIS IS WHY I COME TO FIND OUT FROM COUNCIL, MR. SPEAKER, AS TO WHETHER I DO OR DO NOT. IF I DO NOT I WOULD BE VERY REMISS IN MY DUTY TO MY PEOPLE BY CONTINUING TO SERVE IN THIS CAPACITY NOT HAVING THE CONFIDENCE OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER: ARE WE AGREED THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES HAS THE CONFIDENCE OF THIS HOUSE?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

Mrs. WATSON: Mr. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THAT MOTION. I AM CERTAINLY GOING TO VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. THERE IS NO QUESTION OF THE IMPARTIALITY OR THE CHAIRMAN'S OBJECTIVENESS IN FULFILLING HIS ROLE. THERE WAS JUST ONE LITTLE THING THAT I THINK IN ALL FAIRNESS A PERSON SHOULD BRING FORWARD. THAT IS HIS BULL-DOGGED STUBBORNNESS. HE INSISTED THAT THERE WAS A, THAT A PRECEDENT HAD BEEN SET, THE BUDGET HAD ALWAYS BEEN REVIEWED TWICE IN THE PAST. I HAVE HERE BEFORE ME THE BUDGET FROM 1968, WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST WAS CHAIRMAN, THE SECOND REVIEW, THE MAIN ESTIMATES WERE GONE THROUGH AND PASSED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT. I HAVE THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE BUDGET OF 1969, WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST WAS THE CHAIRMAN, THE MAIN ESTIMATES AT THAT TIME WERE REVIEWED ONCE AND THEN PASSED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT.

THIS IS THE ONLY POINT THAT I AM BRINGING UP THAT SOMETIMES, POSSIBLY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THINKS THAT THESE PRECEDENTS HAVE BEEN SET, AND HE BECOMES A LITTLE BIT UNYIELDING IN LISTENING TO OUR PLEES FOR SOME CONSIDERATION TO THE TYPE OF CHANGE THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO HAVE.

AS FAR AS HAVING CONFIDENCE IN HIS ABILITY AND HIS IMPARTIALITY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE I WOULD CERTAINLY HAVE TO GIVE HIM MY AFFIRMATIVE VOTE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT WASN'T MY INTENTION TO SPEAK BUT WHEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HAS BROUGHT FORWARD TWO SETS OF VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AND JUST COMMENTS THAT THE BUDGET WAS PASSED WITHOUT AMENDMENT AND DOESN'T GO ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE DEBATE ITSELF IT SHOWS QUITE CLEARLY THAT IT IS AN ATTEMPT TO SAY THAT WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE HAS RULED AS CHAIRMAN IS INCORRECT. I AGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE THAT THE PRECEDENT HAS BEEN FOR OVER A NUMBER OF YEARS. Mr. SPEAKER, WHAT HAS HAPPENED TODAY IS THAT I FIND MYSELF IN THE POSITION OF NOT BEING ABLE TO QUESTION THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER OF HEALTH WELFARE AND REHABILITATION ABOUT THE

MANNER IN WHICH HE HAS CONDUCTED HIMSELF IN LOOKING AFTER THAT PARTICULAR DEPARTMENT. I HAVE BEEN STOPPED FROM ASKING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS IN THAT DEPARTMENT. I HAVE BEEN STOPPED FROM BRINGING FORWARD WAYS AND MEANS WHERE THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON CAN BENEFIT BY HAVING ADDITIONAL AREAS OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE SO THAT THEY GET MORE BENEFITS NOW, Mr. --.

Mr. SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THE MATTER BEFORE THE HOUSE WAS REGARDING THE CONFIDENCE IN THE CHAIRMAN AND I THINK WE ALL GAVE ASSURANCE AND WE HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THE CHAIRMAN. COULD WE NOT LET THE MATTER REST THERE?

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, WITH RESPECT Mr. SPEAKER, ONCE IT'S GONE INTO AN AREA OF DEBATE I COULD BE GIVEN EXACTLY THE SAME LATITUDE THAT WAS GIVEN TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE AND I'M SIMPLY INDICATING THAT THE AREAS THAT I WOULD STOP AND THE AREAS THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE WAS STOPPED IN WHEN HE DEALT WITH SPECIFIC AREAS THAT ARE INSIDE VOTE 5. AND WHAT HAPPENED WAS WRONG, CERTAINLY I SUPPORT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE AS CHAIRMAN AND I THINK THAT EVERYBODY SHOULD. HE DOES AN EFFECTIVE JOB BUT THE VERY POINT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS IN DOING WHAT THEY HAVE DONE SHOW THAT NOW THEY SAY YES WE HAVE CONFIDENCE, BUT IN COMMITTEE THEY SHOWED THAT THEY DIDN'T HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM IN OVER-RULING HIS DECISION.

Mr. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

Mr. TANNER: Mr. SPEAKER I WOULD MOVE WE CALL IT 5:00 O'CLOCK.

Mr. STUTTER: I 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 NOW CALL IT 5:00 O'CLOCK. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

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

ADJOURNED

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 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.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO RISE ON A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE THIS MORNING. I WAS VERY SURPRISED, IN FACT AMAZED TO LEARN THAT THE GOVERNMENT WAS TAKING NO POSITION ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY BEFORE CHIEF JUSTICE TOM BERGER OF THE B.C. SUPREME COURT ON THE PRELIMINARY HEARINGS INTO THE APPLICATION FOR THE PIPE LINE ACROSS NORTHERN CANADA.

MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK WITH COUNCIL'S CONCURRENCE THAT MR. SPEAKER INVITE CHIEF JUSTICE TOM BERGER OF THE B.C. SUPREME COURT TO MEET IN COMMITTEE IF HE HAS TIME IN HIS SCHEDULE TOMORROW AFTERNOON. SO THAT ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL MAY BE MADE AWARE OF WHAT IS TAKING PLACE AND WHAT GUIDE LINES ARE GOING TO BE SET DOWN IN THE HEARINGS WHICH ARE GOING TO FOLLOW FOR THE GAS LINE APPLICATION.

MR. SPEAKER, IT IS GOING TO BE IMPOSSIBLE FOR MEMBERS TO ATTEND THE DUTIES OF THIS HOUSE AND ALSO ATTEND THE HEARINGS THAT ARE BEING HELD ON THURSDAY. I THINK THAT AS A COURTESY TO MR. JUSTICE BERGER AND FOR INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE, KNOWING THE REPUTATION OF MR. BERGER THAT HE SHOULD BE INVITED AS A COURTESY BEFORE COMMITTEE; IF HE HAS TIME SOMETIME THURSDAY TO ADDRESS THIS COUNCIL AS TO WHAT THE BACKGROUND OF THE PRELIMINARY HEARINGS ARE AND TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS COUNCIL MAY HAVE TO MR. BERGER.

MR. SPEAKER: IS COUNCIL AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

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

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, MR. SPEAKER I HAVE FOR TABLING THIS MORNING A FILE MADE UP OF SOME FORTY DOCUMENTS RELATING TO MR. FISHER-FLEMING ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. I HAVE PROVIDED SEVEN COPIES FOR EACH MEMBER OF COUNCIL. ONE FOR EACH MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE ONE QUALIFICATION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE TO THE TABLING OF THESE DOCUMENTS. BEFORE THE DOCUMENT IS TABLED IN THE HOUSE I WOULD LIKE TO INSIST THAT A LETTER BE OBTAINED FROM THE PERSON ABOUT WHOM THE FILE, MR. FLEMING, A LETTER FROM MR. FLEMING INDICATING HIS PERMISSION TO HAVE HIS PERSONAL FILE TABLED IN THE COUNCIL. IF THIS PERMISSION CAN BE OBTAINED IN WRITING FROM MR. FLEMING THEN I WOULDN'T OBJECT TO THE FILE BEING TABLED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, WITH RESPECT, NO MEMBER OF A LEGISLATIVE BODY CAN OBJECT TO THE TABLING OF ANY DOCUMENT IN ANY EVENT. BUT I CAN ASSURE, MR. SPEAKER, THAT I HAVE BEEN IN CONTINUAL DISCUSSION WITH MR. FLEMING WHO HAS GIVEN ME AUTHORITY TO PRESENT TO COUNCIL IN THIS MANNER, ALL OF THE CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO HIS SOJOURN WITH THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT DURING THE LAST YEAR OR SO. I HAVE HIS PERMISSION.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, WHETHER OR NOT THE DOCUMENTS ARE TABLED I BELIEVE WE SHOULD HAVE THAT LETTER PRESENTED TO COUNCIL WITH THE DOCUMENTS, MR. SPEAKER. OR CERTAINLY VERY SHORTLY THEREAFTER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF YOU WANT IT I CAN GET IT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, IN THE PAST FROM TIME TO TIME THINGS HAVE BEEN BROUGHT INTO COUNCIL WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE PERSON THAT IS INVOLVED. I THINK THIS IS A PERSONAL FILE. WHETHER THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAYS HE HAS THE AUTHORITY THEN BY ALL MEANS BRING US A LETTER TO SHOW US THAT YOU DO HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO TABLE THIS PERSONAL INFORMATION.

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

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING SUB-SECTION 2 OF SECTION 3 OF THE TRAVEL FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT OUTSIDE THE TERRITORY REGULATIONS, SUB-SECTION 2 OF SECTION 3 OF THE TRAVEL FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT WITHIN THE TERRITORY REGULATIONS AND SUB-SECTION 2 OF SECTION 3 OF THE TRAVEL, MEDICAL EVACUATION REGULATION.

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

MR. MCKINNON: YES, MR. SPEAKER I HAVE A FURTHER NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING SUBSECTION W OF SECTION 155 OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES ORDINANCE.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY NOTICES OF MOTION FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS? AS THERE ARE NO MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS OR MOTIONS WE COME TO THE QUESTION PERIOD. MADAM CLERK WILL YOU ASCERTAIN IF THE ADMINISTRATOR IS AVAILABLE. WE WILL NOW HAVE A SHORT RECESS.

RECESS

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

QUESTION RE CHILDREN NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL IN PELLY RIVER

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION I WOULD DIRECT TO THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION THIS MORNING. IT HAS COME TO MY ATTENTION THAT FOR SOME TWO MONTHS OR SO NOW THAT CHILDREN HAVE NOT BEEN ATTENDING THE, OR SOME CHILDREN, HAVE NOT BEEN ATTENDING THE SCHOOL IN PELLY. I AM JUST WONDERING IF THE MINISTER OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF EDUCATION WOULD EXPLAIN TO THE HOUSE WHY THE SITUATION HAS EXISTED SO LONG?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SAYS TWO MONTHS. IT HAS ONLY BEEN OVER A PERIOD OF THE LAST FEW DAYS THAT ONLY A PORTION OF THE CHILDREN HAVE BEEN ATTENDING THE PELLY RIVER SCHOOL. THERE HAS BEEN SOME PROBLEM WITH THE SELKIRK BAND AND THE STAFF AT THE SCHOOL.

MR. TAYLOR: SUPPLEMENTARY, MR. SPEAKER, WHAT IS THE DEPARTMENT DOING TO ENSURE THAT THE PROBLEM WILL BE RESOLVED AND ALL THE CHILDREN WILL BE BACK IN SCHOOL AGAIN AT PELLY?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, WE ARE HAVING SCHOOL AS USUAL. WE HAVE COMPETENT TEACHERS AT THE SCHOOL AT PELLY RIVER AND WE HAVE MORE AND MORE CHILDREN COMING BACK TO SCHOOL EVERY DAY.

MR. TAYLOR: THAT HASN'T ANSWERED MY QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER. I AM WONDERING IF THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF EDUCATION WOULD ADVISE US WHAT STEPS ARE BEING TAKEN TO REMEDY THE SITUATION IN PELLY?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I JUST ANSWERED THE QUESTION. I SAID WE HAD COMPETENT TEACHERS AT PELLY, THE SCHOOL IS OPEN, THE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS HAVE BEEN OUT TALKING TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BAND AT PELLY RIVER AND MORE AND MORE CHILDREN ARE GOING BACK TO SCHOOL EVERY DAY.

MR. MCKINNON: SUPPLEMENTARY, MR. SPEAKER, WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM BETWEEN THE SELKIRK BAND AND THE TEACHERS OF THE PELLY SCHOOL?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I DON'T THINK THE PROBLEM IS DIRECTLY INVOLVED WITH THE CURRICULUM OR THE TYPE OF INSTRUCTION WITHIN THE SCHOOL. PART OF THE PROBLEM MAY BE THE FACT THAT THE PUBLIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TEACHERS AND THE REST OF THE PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY OF PELLY IS UNDER QUESTION. I THINK, THAT AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS REALIZE, THAT WE ARE ONLY OBLIGED TO HAVE COMPETENT TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL. MIND YOU WE WOULD PREFER TO HAVE PEOPLE WHO HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMUNITY AND ARE ABLE TO RELATE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMUNITY. THIS IS WHY THE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS HAVE BEEN OUT. WE ARE TRYING TO ADJUST THE CURRICULUM, MAKE THE NECESSARY ADJUSTMENTS WITHIN THE SCHOOL, IN ORDER TO RESOLVE THIS PROBLEM.

THERE ARE CONVERSATIONS GOING ON AT THE PRESENT TIME, AND THERE HAVE BEEN FOR THE PAST MONTH, BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT AND THE TEACHERS AND THE BAND AND THE NATIVE BROTHERHOOD.

MR. SPEAKER: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

QUESTION RE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS PLACED TO THE ADMINISTRATOR RE: MR. FLEMING

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR. HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT IN REFERENCE TO THE ANSWERING OF 19 QUESTIONS THAT WERE PUT TO THE ADMINISTRATION IN THIS SESSION OF COUNCIL?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, WHAT 19 QUESTIONS IS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER REFERRING TO?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MR. SPEAKER, I'M SURE THAT MR. ADMINISTRATOR KNOWS TO WHAT I REFER.

THAT IS THE SERIES OF 19 QUESTIONS PUT TO THE ADMINISTRATION WITH REFERENCE TO MR. FLEMING.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: THE ANSWER, MR. SPEAKER, IS NO.

QUESTION RE ADVISING CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER OF REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION.

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A QUESTION I WOULD DIRECT TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR THIS MORNING. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. ADMINISTRATOR, MR. SPEAKER, IF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE UNDERTAKEN TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER, I BELIEVE HIS NAME IS MR. CASTONGUAY, ADVISING HIM OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION IN THE YUKON TERRITORY AND ADVISING HIM OF OUR CONCERN RESPECTING THE TIME TABLE WHICH WOULD PERMIT A FALL ELECTION ON SCHEDULE.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER. WE HAVE BEEN IN TOUCH THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT WITH THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER AND HE IS FULLY AWARE OF THE TIME CONSTRAINTS THAT ARE IMPOSED ON US ALL IN THIS REGARD. HE HAS A COPY OF THE ORDINANCE AS WELL.

QUESTION RE LAND TRANSACTIONS LISTED IN PAPER

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF I COULD ASK MR. ADMINISTRATOR IF THE LAND TRANSACTIONS THAT APPEARS EVERY MONTH IN THE PAPER IS THE TOTAL NUMBER OF LAND TRANSACTIONS THROUGH INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE MONTH IN WHICH IT APPEARS? THE TOTAL NUMBER. THERE ARE NONE EXCLUDED FROM THIS DIGEST THAT IS PUBLISHED IN THE PAPER?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, I WILL BE GLAD TO LOOK INTO THAT BUT I WILL HAVE TO TAKE THE QUESTION INTO NOTICE TO MAKE SURE THAT IT IS GIVEN AN ACCURATE ANSWER.

QUESTION RE HIRING OF HAINES JUNCTION RESIDENTS FOR STAFFING KLUANE NATIONAL PARK

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE WHETHER SHE, AS THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HAS MADE ANY REPRESENTATION TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ASSURE THAT HAINES JUNCTION RESIDENTS AND RESIDENTS OF THE AREA

WILL BE GIVEN FIRST OPPORTUNITY AS PARK WARDENS AND PARK STAFF IN THE KLUANE NATIONAL PARK.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, THE ANSWER IS YES.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, COULD I ASK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WHAT WAS THE REACTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT TO THE REQUEST?

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, THE ANSWER WAS THAT IF THE RESIDENTS WERE ABLE TO MEET THE JOB QUALIFICATIONS THAT WERE REQUIRED THAT RESIDENTS IN THE COMMUNITY WOULD BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY AT THE EMPLOYMENT IN THE KLUANE PARK.

MR. MCKINNON: SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER. WAS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SATISFIED WITH THE ANSWER? THE REASON BEING THAT THESE JOB QUALIFICATIONS IN THE FORMAL EDUCATION SENSE WILL PROBABLY BE BEYOND MOST OF THE PEOPLE WHO STILL SHOULD HAVE FIRST CRACK AT THE JOBS. IT IS NOT THE FORMAL PART OF THE EDUCATION THAT IS MOST IMPORTANT IN THIS TYPE OF WORK.

MRS. WATSON: MR. SPEAKER, I COULDN'T AGREE MORE WITH THE MEMBER THAT THIS IS THE PROBLEM. THE ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS SEEM TO HAVE SO MUCH IMPORTANCE. IF WE COULD GET THIS CHANGED THEN THE OPPORTUNITIES WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLE.

QUESTION RE: WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD MEETINGS

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR. THE WHITEHORSE GENERAL HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD HAS NOT MET SINCE LAST AUGUST. CAN THE ADMINISTRATOR INDICATE WHETHER HE WILL SEEK INFORMATION AS TO WHY MEETINGS ARE NOT BEING CALLED?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I WOULD BE GLAD TO DO THAT. AS A MATTER OF FACT A MEETING, I UNDERSTOOD, WAS TO HAVE BEEN HELD THE DAY BEFORE YESTERDAY AND FOR REASONS WHICH I HAVEN'T YET BEEN ABLE TO ASCERTAIN, THERE WAS NO MEETING. BUT I WOULD CERTAINLY BE GLAD TO LOOK INTO THAT.

QUESTION RE: ALLEGED RESERVE OF LAND FOR WHITE PASS BETWEEN WHITEHORSE AND CARMACKS

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, SOME DAYS AGO I ASKED A QUESTION IN QUESTION PERIOD OF MR. ADMINISTRATOR RESPECTING THE ALLEGED RESERVE

OF LAND FOR WHITE PASS BETWEEN WHITEHORSE AND CARMACKS AND THE EFFECT IT HAD ON RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ALONG THAT ROUTE. I'M WONDERING WHEN WE MAY BE RECEIVING A REPLY TO THIS QUESTION?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I'M NOT SURE MR. SPEAKER WHEN I CAN SAY THERE COULD BE A REPLY AVAILABLE BUT I WILL CERTAINLY MAKE ENQUIRIES IMMEDIATELY TO SEE IF I CAN SPEED UP AN ANSWER.

QUESTION RE: WHEN TO EXPECT AWAITED REPLY ON THE MATTER OF CHIROPRACTIC FACILITIES IN THE TERRITORY

MR. TAYLOR: THIS IS A QUESTION I WOULD DIRECT TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER IN CHARGE OF HEALTH, WELFARE AND REHABILITATION THIS MORNING MR. SPEAKER. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK HIM WHEN WE MAY EXPECT THE AWAITED REPLY ON THE MATTER OF CHIROPRACTIC FACILITIES BEING MADE AVAILABLE THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY IN OUR NURSING STATIONS FOR CHIROPRACTORS.

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER, I APOLOGIZE TO THE MEMBER FOR THE LACK OF AN ANSWER BUT SOME OF MY OFFICERS HAVE BEEN OUT OF THE TERRITORY FOR SOME NUMBER OF DAYS, IN FACT ONE OF THEM A WEEK AND A HALF. AND I THINK THE MEMBER CAN ANTICIPATE AN ANSWER VERY SHORTLY.

QUESTION RE: HAINES JUNCTION LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF I COULD ASK MR. ADMINISTRATOR WHEN WE MAY EXPECT AN ANSWER CONCERNING THE HAINES JUNCTION LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT.

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, AGAIN I MUST SAY I'M SORRY THAT I CAN'T STATE EXACTLY WHEN AN ANSWER WILL BE AVAILABLE. AGAIN I'M HOPING THAT IT CAN BE WITHIN THE NEXT FEW DAYS. BUT I HAVEN'T ANYTHING MORE SPECIFIC THAN THAT AT THE MOMENT.

QUESTION RE: AMENDMENTS BROUGHT FORWARD TO LEGAL PROFESSIONS ORDINANCE

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. SPEAKER, EARLY IN THIS SESSION, I HAD REQUESTED THAT THERE BE SOME AMENDMENTS BROUGHT FORWARD TO SOME OF THE PROFESSIONAL ORDINANCES SPECIFICALLY TO THE LEGAL PROFESSIONS ORDINANCE. I UNDERSTOOD, MR. SPEAKER, FROM MR. LEGAL ADVISOR THAT HE WOULD BE ENDEAVOURING TO BRING OR TO HAVE

SOMETHING DONE DURING THIS SESSION. CAN WE HAVE SOME INDICATION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THESE AMENDMENTS TO THE LEGAL PROFESSIONS ORDINANCE WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD DURING THIS SESSION?

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: I CAN'T SAY MR. SPEAKER AS TO JUST WHAT WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD, BUT THE MATTER IS UNDER DISCUSSION AT THE MOMENT.

QUESTION RE: MR. MORRISON OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL'S OFFICE ATTENDING MEETINGS ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSIONER IN OTTAWA

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, I HAVE A FURTHER QUESTION I WOULD DIRECT TO MR. ADMINISTRATOR. I NOTED YESTERDAY THAT MR. MORRISON OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL'S OFFICE IS NOW IN OTTAWA ATTENDING MEETINGS ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSIONER. I'M WONDERING IF MR. ADMINISTRATOR COULD ADVISE US WHAT THOSE MEETINGS ARE ALL ABOUT?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: YES, MR. SPEAKER, I SHOULD PERHAPS EXPLAIN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEDERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE WHICH IS THE COMMITTEE HERE IN THE YUKON OF ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES AND IT'S RELATIONSHIP TO A COMMITTEE IN OTTAWA CALLED THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT WHICH IS CHAIRED BY THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND CONSISTS OF A SERIES OF SUB-COMMITTEES. THE PURPOSE OF MR. MORRISON'S TRIP TO OTTAWA IS TO ATTEND MEETINGS OF SOME OF THESE SUB-COMMITTEES.

QUESTION RE: CAMPGROUND MAINTENANCE POSITIONS

MR. MCKINNON: MR. SPEAKER, I WONDER IF I COULD ASK MR. ADMINISTRATOR IF A PERSON IS SUCCESSFUL IN OBTAINING A CAMPGROUND MAINTENANCE POSITION WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, WILL THEY ALL BE HANDLED ON A SALARY BASIS OR WILL SOME OF THEM BE HANDLED DEPENDING UPON THE SUCCESSFUL BIDDER ON A CONTRACTUAL BASIS?

MR. ADMINISTRATOR: MR. SPEAKER, IT'S OUR OBJECTIVE IF WE CAN TO HIRE ALL THESE PEOPLE AS CASUAL EMPLOYEES. BUT IN SOME REMOTE LOCATIONS AND AT CERTAIN TIMES OF THE YEAR WHEN THE REQUIREMENT FALLS OFF, WE DO ENGAGE PEOPLE UNDER CONTRACT.

MR. SPEAKER: AS THERE ARE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WE WISH TO THANK MR. ADMINISTRATOR FOR HIS ATTENDANCE. AS THERE ARE NO PRIVATE BILLS AND ORDERS OR PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS 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. STUTTER: I SECOND THAT MOTION MR. SPEAKER.

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 IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS PUBLIC BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION? AGREED? I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: WILL THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WATSON LAKE PLEASE TAKE THE CHAIR IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL NOW CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER.
AS A RESULT OF A MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED IN THE HOUSE THIS MORNING, I BELIEVE IT IS THE INTENTION OF COMMITTEE TO INVITE TO COMMITTEE THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T. R. BERGER TO ATTEND COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS WITH COMMITTEE, MATTERS RELATED TO THE MCKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE. I WONDER MADAM CLERK IF YOU COULD EXTEND ON BEHALF OF COMMITTEE THE INVITATION TO MR. BERGER IN THIS MATTER AND WOULD COMMITTEE AGREE THAT ANY TIME SUITABLE TO MR. BERGER WOULD BE AGREEABLE TO COMMITTEE?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MADAM CLERK, THE SAME - -.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A LETTER FROM AND I'M SURE ALL THE REST OF THE MEMBERS HAVE A LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD WHO IS HOLDING THE HEARING AND IN THE LETTER HE IS REQUESTING INFORMATION FROM US. SO IF WE SO WORD OUR LETTER THAT WE ARE WANTING TO QUESTION HIM, I DON'T THINK THAT THIS WOULD REFLECT THE TRUE NATURE OF THE THING. I THINK WE SHOULD INDICATE THAT THERE COULD BE A MUTUAL DISCUSSION RATHER THAN A QUESTIONING OF HIM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL I DON'T BELIEVE IF I'D MENTIONED THE WORD QUESTION, I'M QUITE SURE

I DIDN'T, BUT SHOULD I HAVE, I SAID DISCUSSIONS RELATED TO, NOT QUESTIONS.

MADAM CLERK WOULD YOU SO LOOK AFTER THAT CHORE AND ALSO AT THE SAME TIME WOULD YOU INVITE THE WITNESSES TO ATTEND FOR DISCUSSIONS ON BILL 3? WE WILL DECLARE A SHORT RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL NOW CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. WE ARE DISCUSSING BILL NO. 3 AND WE HAVE WITH US MR. MILLER AND MR. HUBERDEAU TO ASSIST US IN THESE DELIBERATIONS. WE ARE NOW AT PAGE 73 - EXPENDITURE AND RECOVERY SUMMARY.

THE NEXT ITEM IS UNDER HEALTH, WELFARE AND REHABILITATION. TUBERCULOSIS CONTROL - \$10,000.

MENTAL HEALTH - \$5,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT ARE THE AMOUNTS IN THE PREVIOUS YEAR'S ESTIMATE? THEY ARE NOT SHOWN. WEREN'T THEY SEPARATED?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST A MOMENT I'LL HAVE A LOOK, BUT I DON'T THINK THEY WERE THOUGH. I THINK IT WAS ONE TOTAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WAS ONE TOTAL. THIS IS UNDER A COMMON GRANT PROGRAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES - \$25,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH DO WE GET BACK FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE? IF I RECALL WE HAD A SEPARATE ITEM OF RECOVERIES, FROM THE DEPARTMENT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH WHAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS REFERRING TO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, I'LL HAVE TO LOOK IT UP. I KNOW THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WE GET BACK UNDER GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES. IT COMES FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

MR. MILLER: UNDER GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ONLY AMOUNT IS IN THE COMBINED GRANTS WHICH ARE PASSED EACH YEAR AS AN ORDER IN COUNCIL. OTHER THAN THAT THE ONLY COST SHARING WE HAVE WITH NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE ON GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES IS REGARDING CAPITAL FACILITIES AND THAT DEPENDS UPON WHETHER WE BUILD THEM OR THEY BUILD THEM. IF THEY BUILD THEM, WE PAY THEM AND IF WE BUILD THEM, THEY PAY US.

Mr. Chamberlist: This Watson Lake Hospital is being built by the Department, the National Department. What was the breakdown between what they are supplying by way of funds and what we are supplying by way of funds?

Mr. Tanner: \$500,000 and \$236,000 to the best of my knowledge. Excuse me Mr. Chairman, that is this year.

Mr. Chamberlist: Is that the total?

Mr. Tanner: No, Mr. Chairman, that hospital is going to run well over a million dollars and it is going to be built over two years, funded over two years.

Mr. Chairman: I believe it is related to that cost sharing schedule. I think we have a copy of it somewhere.

Mr. Chamberlist: This is one of the areas Mr. Chairman, where there has always been difficulty over the years. Although we have put up a considerable amount of the money, we have no say at all in the operation of that particular department.

Mr. Chairman: The figure of percentage figure if this is the sharing ratio should be 47.7% Territorial, 52.3% Federal.

Mr. Miller: That is correct Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chamberlist: That is in capital.

Mr. Miller: Its both, capital and O & M.

Mr. Chairman: Just from the chair, from all of the discussions we've had relating to general health services, do I have it correctly that there is going to be this year, a revision of the cost sharing ratio figures.

Mr. Chamberlist: It's supposed to be on this.

Mr. Miller: Well Mr. Chairman, this subject has been discussed to my knowledge for the last 15 years. We are no closer today than we were back in the '61 period when this was originally developed. I think the practical situation is with the advent of the Yukon region coming into its own. Theoretically, the takeover of this area within the next couple of years, it may just be a waste of everybody's time and

effort to try and change the cost sharing.

Mr. Chamberlist: Just be assured that you are knocking your head up against a brick wall when you are dealing with the Federal Department of Health and Welfare because what happens, is that you get a Deputy Minister agreeing, you get the Minister agreeing. It goes back for review and then it goes to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to have another review. By the time it comes back to the Health and Welfare Ministers, the whole position is changed. I have gone through that three times. I feel so sorry that we are at a position where we are not going to get anywhere at all with this Health and Welfare Department until such time as the Yukon comes of age and takes over everything itself. It is frustrating.

Mr. Tanner: For once in my life, I have got to agree with the Honourable Member. However, we have taken the initial first step of identifying a Yukon zone. As I have said before in the House, you will be answering directly to Ottawa and it will also identify the costs, so we will be in a better position within a year of assessing what it is going to cost the Territory to take it over. As far as the previous remarks about that Federal Department, I've got to agree.

Mr. Chairman: Councillor Stutter.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I notice here in revenue its \$53,000 less than 73-4. Was the 73-4 figure in error in this instance.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we never know from one year to the next, how much this is going to be because its an order in Council based on some formula. As I recall, the amount that we did receive in 73-74 was \$40,000, not the \$93,000 that we had estimated.

Mr. Chairman: Just again from the chair, there are two things that disturb me from general health services very much. One is the prolonging of the, which is now unrealistic, cost sharing formula. The other is that when we get facilities designed by the Federal Government, we are forced to pay our particular share of those facilities. They do things, like for instance, the doctors' residence in Watson Lake. That costs just about the same price as

AL KULAN'S HOUSE IN ROSS RIVER. ITS A PULL ON TYPE BUILDING, SECTIONAL BUILDING, AND IT COSTS I THINK, OVER \$125,000, THE LAST COUNT I GOT ON IT. ITS JUST AN ATCO BUILDING ON A FOUNDATION. THIS TYPE OF THING IS IMPOSED ON THE TERRITORY BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. I THINK IT IS TO OUR ADVANTAGE, NOTWITHSTANDING HOW THE COST SHARING FORMULA WORKS OUT THAT WE PUT ALL THE PRESSURES POSSIBLE ON THE NORTHERN HEALTH TO GIVE US THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR HELP AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE, I WOULD THINK, IN ORDER THAT WE CAN POSSIBLY DESIGN ADEQUATE FACILITIES AT LESSER COST THAN WE'RE BEING IMPOSED UPON.

MR. MILLER: THAT MR. CHAIRMAN, IS OUR OBJECTIVE. HOW SOON WE ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO ACHIEVE THAT OBJECTIVE, WE CAN'T PREDICT AT THIS POINT. BUT THAT IS OUR OBJECTIVE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANYTHING FURTHER ON GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES? THE NEXT ITEM IS YUKON HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES, \$1,253,000. YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLANS, \$683,910. UNDER WELFARE ADMINISTRATION, \$217,000. CHILD WELFARE SERVICES, \$476,000. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE, \$285,000.

ONCE AGAIN, IS THERE ANYTHING THAT CAN OR WILL BE DONE BY THE ADMINISTRATION TO LOOK INTO THIS QUESTION OF PEOPLE WHO ARE STRANDED ON THE ALASKA HIGHWAY IN THESE LODGES AND FORCE THEMSELVES ON THESE PEOPLE. ANY ASSISTANCE THAT COULD POSSIBLY BE RENDERED TO THESE PEOPLE?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I POINTED OUT THE LAST TIME, IT IS ONE OF THOSE SITUATIONS WHERE THE GOOD WILL AND THE CHARITY OF THE PERSON WHO IS HELPING THESE PEOPLE OUT, IS GENERALLY SPEAKING, ALL THE PERSON WHO IS BEING HELPED HAS GOT TO RELY ON. I THINK IT IS OF PARTICULAR MERIT THAT LODGE-OWNERS ARE DOING THIS. AS I SUGGESTED BEFORE THAT WHEN THERE IS AN EXTREME CASE OR WHEN THERE IS A CASE OF UTTER DESTITUTION, SHALL WE SAY, THAT THEY COULD PHONE THE DEPARTMENT. I THINK THE DEPARTMENT COULD GIVE THEM SOME ASSISTANCE OR GIVE THEM SOME INFORMATION AS TO HOW THEY SHOULD PROCEED. REALLY AND TRULY TO SET UP SOME KIND OF POLICY, I THINK WOULD BE ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I AM THINKING MORE THAT THESE PEOPLE WILL HAVE THE PROBLEM OF BEING TIED UP FOR SECURITY REASONS BECAUSE THEY DON'T DARE TO GO TO SLEEP AT NIGHT WITH THESE PEOPLE

ROAMING AROUND AND HITCH-HIKING INTO THEIR PARTICULAR LODGE AND GET DUMPED OFF AND THIS TYPE OF SITUATION.

MR. TANNER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF IT WAS A SECURITY REASON, OBVIOUSLY IT WOULD BE A CONCERN TO THE R.C.M.P. OR THE LOCAL CONSTABULARY THERE. I WOULD PERSONALLY SAY, MIND YOU I DON'T TRAVEL UP AND DOWN THE HIGHWAYS AS THE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, BUT I HAVEN'T HEARD THAT CRITICISM VERY MUCH AROUND IN THE LAST TWO YEARS THAT WE HAVE HAD A LOT OF THESE PEOPLE TRAVELLING UP AND DOWN. IN FACT, IT IS MY PERSONAL OBSERVATION, AS A RETAILER ON MAIN STREET IN THE PAST OF SEEING A LOT OF THESE PEOPLE COME INTO THE STORE, I'M PERSONALLY VERY IMPRESSED BY THE TYPE AND CALIBER OF PERSON THAT THEY ARE. THERE IS ALWAYS GOING TO BE THE ODD ONE THAT IS GOING TO MAKE IT BAD FOR EVERYONE. GENERALLY SPEAKING I THINK THE TYPE OF PEOPLE THAT ARE TRAVELLING THE HIGHWAY IN THIS DAY AND AGE ARE A REMARKABLE GROUP OF PEOPLE.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, NOT VERY OFTEN THAT I DISAGREE WITH THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE NORTH. IN THIS INSTANCE, I MUST DISAGREE WITH HIM, THAT THIS IS A PROBLEM AND IT BECOMES A GREAT PROBLEM SAY, AT BEAVER CREEK WITH THE CUSTOMS WHEN THEY CROSS AND THEY HAVE TO WAIT TO GET CLEARED OR CUSTOMS IS SENDING THEM BACK INTO ALASKA. THEY ARE SITTING THERE, THEY HAVE VERY MINIMAL FUNDING, REALLY THE LODGES ARE AT THEIR MERCY AND THEY ARE AT THE MERCY OF THE LODGES. AREAS SUCH AS WATSON LAKE, BEAVER CREEK, POSSIBLY DAWSON CITY ARE POSSIBLE AREAS THAT SHOULD BE LOOKED AT.

I HAVE SOME GREAT CONCERN BECAUSE OF THE LACK OF HOSTEL FACILITIES FOR THIS COMING SUMMER IN WHITEHORSE. THIS I THINK, THE PROBLEM WILL REALLY HIT HOME IN WHITEHORSE THIS COMING SUMMER IF YOU DON'T HAVE A HOSTEL. THIS IS THE TYPE OF SITUATION THAT THESE PLACES HAVE. I REALLY THINK THAT IT MERITS A LITTLE CLOSER REVIEW THAN WHAT WE HAVE DONE IN THE PAST.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I COULDN'T AGREE WITH THE MEMBER MORE AS FAR AS THE HOSTEL IN WHITEHORSE IS CONCERNED. I'M ASTOUNDED, HAVING COME FROM A COUNTRY WHERE A HOSTEL HAS BEEN IN USE FOR 50 OR 100 YEARS. I AM PERSONALLY ASTOUNDED THAT THERE IS NOTHING LIKE THAT IN CANADA. AS FAR AS THE YUKON IS CONCERNED, I FEEL THAT THE CITY HAS MADE AN UNFORTUNATE DECISION IN THAT IT HASN'T PROVIDED HOSTEL FACILITIES. I THINK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER

IS RIGHT, WHITEHORSE, IF IT IS GOING TO SUFFER AT ALL FROM THESE PEOPLE, IT IS GOING TO SUFFER THIS YEAR.

AS FAR AS THE SITUATION AT WATSON LAKE AND BEAVER CREEK IS CONCERNED, THERE IS REALLY NOTHING OTHER THAN AS I SUGGESTED ON AN IMPERSONAL BASIS THAT MY DEPARTMENT CAN DO. I THINK BASICALLY IT IS AN R.C.M.P. MATTER RATHER THAN A WELFARE MATTER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WAS THINKING MORE OF THE REMOTER AREAS WHERE THERE IS NO POLICE DETACHMENT. ONE FURTHER QUESTION, ARE THE PEOPLE, THE CUSTOMS PEOPLE AT THE BOUNDARY, IN RESPECT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TRAVELLING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ALASKA, ARE THEY INSISTING THAT THE PEOPLE AS THEY COME THROUGH, SHOW PROOF OF SOME MATERIAL WEALTH IN ORDER TO CARRY ON THROUGH?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, YES, THEY ASK FOR AT LEAST \$100 OR PROOF OF EMPLOYMENT IN ALASKA. THEY ARE DOING THAT AT BEAVER CREEK FOR SURE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT IS WHEN THEY CROSS THE BORDER INTO CANADA MR. CHAIRMAN. THEY LOSE IT BEFORE THEY EVEN GET TO THE BORDER.

MR. TANNER: EXCUSE ME, MR. CHAIRMAN, PERHAPS I DIDN'T MAKE MYSELF CLEAR. WHEN, PARTICULARLY RESIDENTS OTHER THAN CANADIANS BUT CANADIANS AS WELL, GET TO THE BEAVER CREEK BORDER AND GO INTO THE AMERICAN SIDE, THE AMERICAN CUSTOMS WANT PROOF OF AT LEAST \$100 IN THEIR POCKET IN CASH OR ALTERNATIVELY THEY WANT PROOF OF EMPLOYMENT. THE EMPLOYMENT HAS GOT TO BE IN AN AREA WHERE THEY CAN GET TO IT REASONABLY CHEAPLY. AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE DECISION, ON THE ALASKA SIDE, SOME OF THESE PEOPLE ARE, AS BOTH THE HONORABLE MEMBERS HAVE POINTED OUT, FLOATING BETWEEN THE TWO CUSTOM HOUSES. SOME OF THEM DO ACTUALLY GET BACK TO THE LODGE. THEREIN LIES THE PROBLEM. PARTLY BECAUSE I CAN'T CRITICIZE WHAT THE ALASKA DECISION IS, BUT THE PEOPLE HAVING GOT TO THE BORDER, AND QUITE FREQUENTLY TO AMERICANS TRYING TO GET INTO ALASKA SURPRISINGLY ENOUGH, THEY ARE REALLY UPSET THAT THEY CAN'T GET BACK INTO THEIR OWN COUNTRY.

THEN THERE MIGHT BE CAUSE, PARTICULARLY AT BEAVER CREEK FOR EXAMPLE, OF SOME BAD BEHAVIOR ON THEIR PART. IT IS AN UNFORTUNATE DECISION WHICH IS NOTHING WITHIN OUR JURISDICTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL IS IT NOT INCUMBENT UPON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN THIS CASE TO ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE STATE OF ALASKA WELFARE PEOPLE AND LET'S SAY GENERALLY AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, TO PUT AN END TO THIS SITUATION.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, EXCUSE ME. FIRST OF ALL, AS I UNDERSTAND THE MEMBER'S QUESTION, IS MORE A MATTER OF POLICING AND SECURITY IN THE LODGES AT THOSE TWO POINTS. PARTICULARLY AT THE BEAVER CREEK POINT. THAT AS I SAY IS REALLY AN R.C.M.P. QUESTION. AS FAR AS THEM BEING DESTITUTE AND HAVING NO MONEY, WE DO HAVE FUNDS OBVIOUSLY AVAILABLE IN WHITEHORSE FOR THOSE PEOPLE. WHEN THEY GET THAT FAR, WHAT WOULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER SUGGEST, THAT THEY HITCH-HIKE BACK TO WHITEHORSE TO GET MORE FUNDS. IT IS REALLY SUCH A DIFFICULT QUESTION, I DON'T THINK THERE IS A CUT AND DRIED ANSWER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT ABOUT CHARGING WELFARE AND CHARGING THE UNITED STATES OR THE STATE OF ALASKA AS THE CASE MIGHT BE FOR ANY CHARGES TO RETURNING THESE PEOPLE FROM WHENCE THEY CAME FROM.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE CAN SEND ANYBODY A BILL BUT THEY DON'T HAVE TO PAY IT.

MR. TANNER: WE WOULD LOVE TO DO THAT, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN FACT THERE HAVE BEEN CASES WHERE THE B.C. DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE HAS BEEN CHARGED FOR PEOPLE OF B.C. WE SEND THEM A BILL BUT THAT IS AS FAR AS IT GOES.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO INDICATE HOW CO-OPERATIVE ALASKA IS. THEY HAUL THEM BACK TO THE CANADIAN BORDER. THEY DRIVE THEM BACK THOSE TWENTY MILES AND DUMP THEM AT THE CANADIAN BORDER TO MAKE SURE THEY GET THERE. THAT IS WHERE THE PROBLEM IS, THEN THEY ARE THERE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THEN SIMPLY THE PROBLEM MUST SURROUND NEGOTIATIONS. I THINK IT IS INCUMBENT UPON THE GOVERNMENT TO ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS TO SEE WHAT CAN BE DONE TO RESOLVE THE PROBLEM.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN I DON'T DISAGREE WITH THE MEMBER AS FAR AS NEGOTIATIONS ARE CONCERNED. PERHAPS THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD SEND A LETTER TO ALASKA OR TALK TO ALASKA ON THAT PART. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE WILL KNOW BETTER THAN I WILL. I SUSPECT THAT THERE ARE ISOLATED AND INDIVIDUAL CASES BUT I DON'T THINK

ITS A GREAT ONSLAUGHT OF PEOPLE. I THINK THERE ARE A FEW PEOPLE, BUT I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY GREAT NUMBER OF THEM.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman at Beaver Creek, there are during the summer months, quite a number of them. They are there and broker. Often if its raining or its very cold, that happens, the lodges do feed them. They put them up and let them work for their meals and they have no place to sleep. They are sleeping in peoples' garages and this type of thing.

Now that the R.C.M.P. are there at Beaver Creek, it may help on a trial basis, for 12 months, it may help. It is really quite a problem for the business community and the people at Beaver Creek. I think that maybe it should be looked into just a little more thoroughly. Maybe there is some way that it could be resolved with some of the local business people.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman I'll give an undertaking to the House to look into the situation to see what we can find out.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Social Assistance? Next item is Categorical Allowances, \$6,000. Social Service Agencies, \$16,000. Children's Group Homes, \$19,000.

Mr. Chamberlist: What is this recovery? Where does this come in?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman this is from Canada Assistance Plan.

Mr. Chamberlist: In what area from Canada Assistance Plan? For what purpose, Children's Group Homes?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman this is our cost of running the Children's Group Homes which hold the welfare recipients or the children under care. That is claimable under Canada Assistance Plan.

Mr. Chamberlist: Since when has this come into force? I don't recall, as a matter of fact, we do not show an item of recovery in the 1973-74 Estimates.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this was in fact recovered in 1973-74 and has recovered every

year but I think what has happened, it has been lumped into the Child Welfare Services rather than as a separate item.

Mr. Chairman: Home and Institutions, it was listed under last year. The next item then is Lodges and Senior Citizen's Homes and nothing in Alcoholism and Drug Abuse.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, that has been moved into Health and that is where the recovery is. It was moved into Health I think during the Honourable Member's tenure in office. It was moved there for a specific purpose as I recall, to get a recovery. That is where it appears above.

Mr. Chamberlist: Right, now where does the recovery show. General Health Services only show the \$25,000 that is the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. It means that there is only \$15,000 up against \$93,000 for the year before. Can we get an explanation of this. This upsets that.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman I don't know the exact details, but I think that what you've got on this total page is a different breakdown in some respects. There is not so much grouping, there is more detail and I can assure the Honourable Member that we are getting the money back and it was a good decision that he made to put it into the Health Department. As to why the difference in the dollars and cents from last year in the Health, perhaps the Treasurer can explain. Generally speaking that whole page is a slightly different breakdown from last year and is the basic reason why it appears that in some areas we are not getting as much.

Mr. Chairman: I believe the figures between the General Health Services for \$25,000 and the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse figure is not shown.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the explanation with me. I will have to get it.

Mr. Chamberlist: Please do. Another point. The difference between the way these recoveries are set up, say, under the Yukon Hospital Insurance Services, that has been set up in exactly the same way as last year. Yet the Health Care Insurance Services, we show the recovery of the premiums including the Department

OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE FOR A TOTAL OF \$1,402,000 AND THIS YEAR WE ARE JUST SHOWING THE \$683,000 WHICH ARE, I TAKE IT, PREMIUMS ONLY.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE \$683,910 IS THE RECOVERY FROM NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE. THE PREMIUMS FOR THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PLAN ARE SHOWN UNDER REVENUE ON PAGE 71.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO NOW, ONE IS REFERRED TO AS AN OPERATING REVENUE AND NOT A RECOVERY

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WHY WOULD THERE BE A CHANGE? THEY'RE A RECOVERY, SURELY.

MR. MILLER: NO MR. CHAIRMAN. UNDER THE DEFINITIONS OF REVENUES AND RECOVERIES THAT WE HAVE ADOPTED, BASICALLY THE CANADA GOVERNMENT SYSTEM, THIS IS THE WAY THEY SHOULD BE SET UP.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO YOU ARE SAYING THEN IN THE LAST TWO OR THREE YEARS WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN DOING IS WRONG. AND NOW YOU ARE CORRECTING IT.

MR. MILLER: WHAT I AM SAYING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS IN THE 73/74 ESTIMATES THERE WAS AN ERROR, YES. IT HAS SINCE BEEN CORRECTED. I MIGHT POINT OUT THAT THAT WAS AN ERROR THE AUDITOR GENERAL ASKED US TO CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HE DIDN'T ASK US TO CORRECT IT THE YEAR BEFORE THOUGH.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, PREMIUMS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN SHOWN AS REVENUE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE HAVE IT THEN THE ACTUAL ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE SHOULD BE \$25,000 IN THIS YEAR NOTWITHSTANDING WHERE YOU PUT IT.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE SHOULD BE A RECOVERY FOR THE ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM. WHERE IT HAS BEEN INCLUDED I DON'T KNOW. I WILL HAVE TO TRY AND FIND OUT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT THE POINT THAT I AM ASKING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS TO GET AN EXPLANATION AS TO WHY THE ESTIMATES FOR RECOVERY IS \$93,000. THIS IS BY WAY OF GRANTS AND IF WE LEAVE OUT THE \$25,000 WHICH IS IN THE GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES, WHICH OFFSETS THE ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE IN THE WELFARE DEPARTMENT, WE ONLY SHOW \$15,000 THIS YEAR IN RECOVERIES. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHY THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN \$25,000 AND THE \$93,000.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL GET THAT EXPLANATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: CLEAR? NEXT IS LOCAL GOVERNMENT, EMERGENCY ORGANIZATION, \$6,000.

MUNICIPAL TAX ASSESSMENT, \$20,000.

PROTECTION SERVICES, \$4,000.

INSECT CONTROL, \$40,000.

SALE OF LOTS, RIVERDALE, NOT INDICATED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ARE WE NOT GOING TO HAVE ANY RECOVERIES FROM SALE OF LOTS AT RIVERDALE WHEN I UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE SOME 90 LOTS AVAILABLE IN RIVERDALE FOR SALE?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. THIS REFLECTS AGAIN, A CHANGE IN ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S STAFF AND WE ARE SHOWING SALE OF LOTS FROM ALL SUB-DIVISIONS. PREVIOUSLY WE HAD SALE OF LOTS IN RIVERDALE IN THIS AREA. THE OTHER SALES OF LOTS WERE IN OTHER RECOVERY AREAS. NOW WE ARE HANDLING ALL SALE OF LOTS AS LOAN AMORTIZATION RECOVERIES BECAUSE WE ARE BORROWING THE MONEY AS THIRD PARTY LOANS TO DEVELOP THE LOTS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM IS ZONE APPEAL BOARD, \$2,000. DUST CONTROL, \$5,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHERE IS THAT RECOVERY FROM?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS WOULD BE A RECOVERY FROM LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS AND MUNICIPALITIES WHERE WE DO DUST CONTROL AND EVERYTHING.

MR. CHAIRMAN: AMBULANCE FEES, \$12,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: HOW MUCH WAS RECOVERED IN AMBULANCE FEES IN THE YEAR 73/74?

MR. MILLER: JUST GIVE ME A MOMENT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL GET THAT FIGURE. MR. CHAIRMAN, RECOVERY FOR THE YEAR WAS \$16,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEN IT IS EXPECTED THERE WILL BE LESS RECOVERED THIS YEAR?

MR. MILLER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE PROBLEM THAT WE HAVE WITH THIS PARTICULAR ITEM IS WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH HISTORY TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT TO EXPECT FROM YEAR TO YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS UNDER TOURISM, CONSERVATION AND INFORMATION. OVERDUE BOOK FEES \$1,000 AND ARCHIVES PHOTO SERVICES \$2,000.

Mr. STUTTER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, MAY I ASK IF THERE IS ANY RECOVERY AT ALL FROM THE, OR MAYBE I SHOULD ASK A DIFFERENT QUESTION. IS THIS THE SAME PHOTO SERVICES THAT WE HAVE APPROVED FOR \$2,000 FOR LENSES AND THINGS UNDER TOURISM?

Mr. MILLER: No, Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE \$2,000 WAS FOR THE PURCHASE OF PHOTO EQUIPMENT UNDER TOURISM. THIS WAS FOR OUR PHOTOGRAPHER. THIS ARCHIVES PHOTO SERVICES WHERE WE SELL TO PEOPLE GOING INTO THE ARCHIVES, COPIES OF PHOTOS.

Mr. STUTTER: BUT IS THERE NOT A RECOVERY THEN UNDER TOURISM, UNDER THE PHOTOGRAPHY PART OF TOURISM?

Mr. MILLER: No, Mr. CHAIRMAN, WE DON'T SELL PICTURES FROM THE TOURISM SIDE. IT'S PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: NEXT ITEM UNDER HIGHWAYS, PUBLIC WORKS. RENTAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, NIL.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT RENTAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY ARE WE TALKING ABOUT? ARE WE TALKING ABOUT RENTAL OF SCHOOL SPACE AND THINGS LIKE THAT?

Mr. MILLER: No, Mr. CHAIRMAN. THIS WAS, I DON'T REMEMBER WHICH BUILDING IT WAS, BUT IT WAS A GOVERNMENT BUILDING THAT CAME UNDER THE PURVIEW OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WORKS, WHICH NOW COMES UNDER ACCOMMODATION SERVICES.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ENGINEERING SERVICES, ADMINISTRATION, \$212,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: CAN WE FIND OUT WHY THIS HAS DOUBLED ALMOST?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Mr. CHAIRMAN. UNDER THE ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT WE USED TO RECEIVE A FLAT \$110,000 PER ANNUM FOR ADMINISTERING ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THE HIGHWAYS, THE CAPITAL PROJECTS, THIS TYPE OF THING. WITH THE ADVENT OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY WE GOT AN AGREEMENT THAT EFFECTIVE 74/75 THE ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT WOULD PAY A PERCENTAGE, CALCULATED PERCENTAGE, OF THE ACTUAL COSTS. THE ADMINISTRATION PERCENTAGE IS 6.25% OF THE ACTUAL COST OF OUR SPENDING UNDER THE ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THE NEXT ITEM IS ALASKA HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, \$335,000.
NEXT ITEM IS DAWSON CITY AIRPORT, \$8,500.

MAYO AIRPORT, \$11,500.

THIRD PARTY SERVICES, \$124,000.

100% RECOVERY, ALASKA HIGHWAY AGREEMENT \$5,152,000.

85% RECOVERY OF EXPENDITURE UNDER FEDERAL/TERRITORIAL ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT, \$3,202,000.

100% RECOVERY OF EXPENDITURE UNDER FEDERAL/TERRITORIAL ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT, \$58,000.

YUKON HOUSING CORPORATION, RENTAL/PURCHASE HOUSING SUBSIDY, OF \$111,000.

WHICH GIVES US A TOTAL RECOVERY FIGURE OF \$14,388,500.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: YOU KNOW, AN INTERESTING QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK AT THIS STAGE. IN THE YEAR 73/74 THE ESTIMATED TOTAL RECOVERIES IS SHOWN AS \$14,190,000. YET, WHEN WE LOOK AT THE SHEET THAT HAS BEEN PROVIDED TO US TODAY, WE FIND THAT THE ESTIMATE WAS \$13,300,703. NOW WHY HAVE WE GOT THE TWO DIFFERENT FIGURES?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THIS REFLECTS THE TRANSFER OF YHCIP PREMIUMS FROM RECOVERIES TO REVENUE. YOU WOULD HAVE A CONVERSE SITUATION IF YOU COMPARED THE REVENUE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS MY QUESTION WASN'T CLEAR ENOUGH. IN THE BUDGET THAT WAS GIVEN TO US IN 1973/74 IT SHOWED THAT THE ESTIMATES FOR \$14,190,000.

IN THE BUDGET THAT WE HAVE BEFORE US TODAY, IT SHOWS FOR 1974/75, RECOVERIES \$14,388,500 AND THE ESTIMATES OR RECOVERIES FOR 73/74 IS \$13,300,703. I'M AWARE OF THE EXPLANATION THAT I HAVE RECEIVED, HOW THE RECOVERIES ARE NOW BEING ADJUSTED. ONE IS BY LOAN AMORTIZATION, ALRIGHT. BUT HERE WE HAVE TWO DIFFERENT FIGURES GIVEN US FOR THE 1973/74 ESTIMATES.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, MY POINT WAS THE YUKON HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PREMIUMS HAVE BEEN TRANSFERRED FROM RECOVERIES TO REVENUE. NOW IF YOU TAKE THE ESTIMATED PREMIUMS THAT WERE IN THE ESTIMATES, THEY WERE \$880,470 AND IF YOU ADD THAT TO THE \$13,300,000 YOU GET \$14,190,173 WHICH I BELIEVE IS THE FIGURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER QUOTED.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: \$190,000 DID YOU SAY?

Mr. MILLER: THAT'S RIGHT, THAT'S CORRECT.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: THERE AGAIN, THEN YOU ARE \$90,000, THEN YOU ARE \$82,000 OUT BECAUSE THE FIGURE, I BEG YOUR PARDON, THAT'S RIGHT. YOU'VE

GOT \$14,190,000 BUT THE POINT THAT I'M MAKING IS THAT THE RECOVERY ALTERATION IS BEING DONE FOR THIS COMING FISCAL YEAR. IS THIS NOT CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHAT WE WERE ATTEMPTING TO DO WAS TO SHOW COMPARATIVE FIGURES. NOW WE COULD HAVE LEFT UNDER THE 73/74 ESTIMATE COLUMN HERE, WE COULD HAVE SHOWN THE YHCIP PREMIUMS AND NOTHING FOR 74/75 IN THE RECOVERY SECTION AND THE SAME SITUATION ON THE REVENUE SIDE. IN OTHER WORDS, THERE IS SOMETHING FOR YHCIP PREMIUMS UNDER 74/75 BUT NOTHING UNDER 73/74.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, THIS IS BOOKKEEPING JUGGLING. NOW, MY QUESTION IS QUITE CLEAR. YOU'VE GOT IT RIGHT HERE. HERE WE HAVE TWO SPECIFIC FIGURES GIVEN FOR 1973/74 ESTIMATES. NOW, I UNDERSTAND WHAT HAS BEEN SAID THAT FOR THIS COMING YEAR THERE HAS BEEN A CHANGE UPON THE ADVICE AND INSTRUCTIONS OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA. I UNDERSTAND THAT. WHAT I DON'T UNDERSTAND IS WHY YOU SHOULD BRING FORWARD A DIFFERENT FIGURE IN YOUR ESTIMATES FOR 73/74 THAN WAS GIVEN TO US IN 73/74. NOW, YOU COULD HAVE JUST AS WELL HAD THE SAME FIGURES SO WE WOULDN'T HAVE TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF WHY YOU ARE DOING IT. IT'S A CASE OF BOOK JUGGLING. IT DOESN'T SEEM TO MATTER AS LONG AS THE OPPORTUNITY THAT NOBODY IS GOING TO SEE IT, BUT IT'S WRONG AND YOU SHOULDN'T DO IT. THE GOVERNMENT HAD NO RIGHT TO TRY AND FOOL COUNCIL AND THIS IS WHY I AM SAYING THIS. I CAN SEE WHAT'S BEING DONE.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS NO INTENTION TO FOOL COUNCIL. THE PREMIUMS FOR YHCIP ARE IN OUR ACTUAL REVENUE FOR 1972/73. THEY WILL BE IN REVENUE FOR 73/74. NOT IN RECOVERIES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE ARE AWARE OF THAT. BUT THE POINT THAT I MAKE AND I REPEAT AGAIN IS WHY GIVE US TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF FIGURES.

MR. TANNER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE TREASURER WHEN HE SETS UP THE BUDGET, HE COULDN'T HAVE BEEN RIGHT EITHER WAY. WHICHEVER WAY, HE HAD TO MAKE A DECISION TO GO ON THE ONGOING SYSTEM OR THE PAST SYSTEM. HE COULDN'T WIN THAT ONE. WHICHEVER WAY HE PROCEEDED I WOULD IMAGINE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WOULD HAVE CRITICIZED HIM.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT MR. CHAIRMAN DO NOW READ THE PREAMBLE AND THE TITLE TO THE BILL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH, WE STILL HAVE ANSWERS TO COME BACK YET. DON'T HURRY, DON'T RUSH.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE HAVE SOME ANSWERS TO COME BACK.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ANSWERS WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THE COMMITTEE. THIS HAPPENED LAST YEAR, THIS HAPPENED BEFORE. THERE IS NO REASON WHY THESE ANSWERS CAN'T BE BROUGHT FORWARD AND THE BILL MOVED OUT OF COMMITTEE SO THAT WE CAN GET ON WITH THE REST OF THE WORK IN THE HOUSE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, COUNCILLOR WATSON HAS GOT NO RIGHT TO TELL THE WITNESS WHAT TO DO AND WHEN TO GIVE THE ANSWERS. SHE IS GOING BEYOND HER CAPACITY.

NOW, WHAT HAS TO BE DONE, MR. CHAIRMAN..

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, A POINT OF PRIVILEGE. MR. CHAIRMAN, A POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. WHAT IS THE POINT OF PRIVILEGE.

MRS. WATSON: I DID NOT TELL THE WITNESS WHAT HAS TO BE DONE. I MADE THE SUGGESTION TO THE HOUSE AND TO THE CHAIRMAN. TO THE COMMITTEE AND TO THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE WITNESS HAS ALREADY INDICATED THAT HE HAS THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS. LET'S HEAR THEM.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE SOME ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED YESTERDAY. TO THE QUESTION RAISED REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT 605 ON PAGE 36 OF THE ESTIMATES, THE QUESTION WAS A BREAKDOWN OF THE SALARIES AND WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS. THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE INCLUDED IN ESTABLISHMENT 605, TWO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORS, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$31,100. WE HAVE A UTILITIES SUPERINTENDENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$14,200.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: CAN WE HAVE THAT AGAIN? TWO?

MR. MILLER: TWO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORS AT \$31,100. A UTILITIES SUPERINTENDENT, \$14,200. WE HAVE THE COST OF THE FIRE CHIEFS IN THE UNORGANIZED AREAS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,254 AND WE HAVE THE COSTS OF PROVIDING ROAD MAINTENANCE AND WORK DONE BY THE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT IN THE UNORGANIZED AREAS IN THE AMOUNT \$10,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT WILL WE HAVE HERE, AS INDICATED, AS THREE MAN YEARS.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. I AGREE AND

THIS IS ONE OF THE AREAS THAT CERTAINLY GIVES US SOME CONCERN IN TRYING TO ESTIMATE MAN YEARS FOR THE FIRE CHIEFS. THEY ARE PAID A RETAINER, I THINK OF, \$50.00 A MONTH AND THEY WORK AS OF WHEN THEY ARE REQUIRED. THESE ARE AREAS WHERE WE DO HAVE CONSIDERABLE PROBLEMS IN DEALING WITH THIS TYPE OF THINK IN ESTIMATING MAN YEARS.

NOW, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I HAVE SUGGESTED WE DO FOR NEXT YEAR IS INDICATE UNDER THE MAN YEAR COLUMN THAT WE DO HAVE ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS BEING PERFORMED IN THIS AREA. WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO ESTIMATE WITHIN A DEGREE OF ACCURACY THE AMOUNT OF MAN YEARS INVOLVED BUT AT LEAST WE WILL BRING FORWARD TO COUNCIL THE FACT THAT THERE ARE THOSE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THIS OPERATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST ONE THING. WHILE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THESE FIRE CHIEFS, I FIND IT INCREDIBLE THAT THEY ARE STILL GETTING \$50, A MONTH. I THOUGHT THIS HAD BEEN INCREASED A LONG TIME AGO.

MR. MILLER: I'M SORRY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I UNDERSTAND IT'S NOW \$100. I'M NOT THAT FAMILIAR WITH THE FIGURES, I REMEMBER THE \$50 FIGURE FROM SOMEWHERE SOME TIME AGO.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL IF IT IS NOT \$100 COULD WE HAVE SOME ASSURANCE THAT IT WILL BE AT LEAST \$100 FOR FIRE CHIEFS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS \$100.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS I NEED A LITTLE MORE ADVICE ON THIS, MR. CHAIRMAN. IF THERE ARE TWO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORS AT \$31,000 AND ONE UTILITIES SUPERINTENDENT AT \$14,000, THAT'S \$45,000. NOW, WHERE DOES THAT INCREASE COME IN FROM \$36,230 WHEN I TAKE IT THAT THE ONLY ADDITION TO WHAT EXISTED LAST YEAR WAS A UTILITIES SYSTEM SUPERINTENDENT? AM I NOT CORRECT IN ASSUMING THAT?

MR. MILLER: THAT'S CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN. IN TERMS OF OVERALL MAN YEARS, THERE IS ONLY THE ONE ADDITION. NOW, THE OTHER THING THAT I FOUND WAS THAT LAST YEAR'S ESTIMATES WERE NOT CORRECT AND MEMBERS WILL RECALL WE DID VOTE FOR SUPPLEMENTARY FOR THIS. BY THIS ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, MY SUCCESSOR WILL HAVE TO WATCH IT FOR THE NEXT YEAR.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE NEXT QUESTION THAT WAS RAISED RELATED TO ESTABLISHMENT 701 ON PAGE 40. IT'S A SIMILAR TYPE OF QUESTION. THE BREAKDOWN OF THE SALARIES AND WAGES AND THE FRINGE BENEFITS AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE MAN YEARS. AGAIN I MUST POINT OUT THAT IT IS A VERY DIFFICULT AREA TO ESTIMATE MAN YEARS AND DOLLARS, MAINLY BECAUSE ALL MEMBERS KNOW A COMBINATION OF CASUAL EMPLOYEES WHERE WE CAN GET THEM OR CONTRACTORS WHERE WE CAN'T. THE MAN YEAR FIGURES THAT WE HAVE QUOTED ARE THOSE THAT WE FEEL WE CAN LIVE WITH AND THE DOLLARS WOULD RELATE THERE TOO. IN LAST YEAR, AGAIN I WOULD POINT OUT THAT WE HAD TO VOTE A SUPPLEMENTARY TO COVER THIS AREA BECAUSE OF THE EXTENSION OF THE LITTER BARREL PROGRAM AND THE EXTENSION OF THE CAMPGROUND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM THROUGH SOME OF THE SHORTER MONTHS. BUT AGAIN THIS IS A VERY DIFFICULT AREA TO ESTIMATE MAN YEARS WITH ANY PRECISION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO, YOU KNOW, IN THE NEXT SESSION OF COUNCIL NEXT YEAR TO SAY TO MR. MILLER, YOU KNOW YOU REMEMBER WHAT YOU SAID LAST YEAR, BUT I KNOW THAT I'M NOT GOING TO BE HERE AND I FEEL FAIRLY KNOWLEDGEABLE THAT MR. MILLER WILL BE BACK WITH BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY BY THAT TIME. SO IT LOOKS LIKE BOTH OF US ARE NOT GOING TO BE HERE, BUT I HOPE SOMEBODY WILL BE WATCHING THESE PARTICULAR ITEMS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD HOPE I WON'T BE WITH BELL TELEPHONE BECAUSE I'VE NEVER BEEN WITH THEM IN MY LIFE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH, WELL WITH SOMEBODY ELSE YOU'VE BEEN WITH.

MR. MILLER: THERE ARE SOME ITEMS IN THE GAME AND IN THE LEGAL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE LAST QUESTION RELATED TO WORKING CAPITAL AND ONE OF THE MEMBERS ASKED THAT WE BRING FORWARD A WORKING CAPITAL STATEMENT. I HAVE JUST PASSED IT OUT. AND I WILL REVIEW IT JUST BRIEFLY. OUR ACTUAL WORKING CAPITAL AS OF MARCH 31ST, 1973 WAS \$4,379,946. OUR 1973-74 ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE, AND THESE ARE NOT FINAL EXPENDITURES THEY ARE STILL ESTIMATED, ARE \$33,000,708 AND OUR REVENUES AND RECOVERIES AND AGAIN ARE NOT FINAL FIGURES,

ARE \$34,079,000 FOR A NET INCREASE IN WORKING CAPITAL THIS YEAR OF \$371,000.

WE ANTICIPATE OUR WORKING CAPITAL BALANCE AT MARCH 31ST, 1974 TO BE 4.7 MILLION.

THE MAIN ESTIMATES AS PRESENTED TO YOU ARE EXPENDITURES OF \$36,049,000.

REVENUES AND RECOVERIES OF \$24,485,000 AND AN OPERATING GRANT AND THIS IS BOTH THE DEFICIT GRANT AND THE GRANT IN LIEU OF TAXES - \$10,633,000 FOR A NET OPERATING DEFICIT FOR 74-75 FISCAL YEAR OF \$936,000 LEAVING OUR WORKING CAPITAL AS OF MARCH 31ST, 1975 AT \$3,814,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, BASED ON THESE FIGURES, THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF INTEREST THAT HAS BEEN INDICATED WHICH IS ABOUT \$313,000 IS A LOWER INTEREST THAN THE GOVERNMENT RECEIVES HAVING THAT TYPE OF WORKING CAPITAL IN THEIR AVERAGE FUNDING DURING EACH MONTH. ISN'T THIS RIGHT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST FOR THE MEMBERS FURTHER INFORMATION. OUT OF THIS 4.7 MILLION DOLLARS WHICH I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS REFERRING TO, WE HAVE REVOLVING FUNDS WHICH WE HAVE TO FUND AND THE REVOLVING FUNDS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

GARAGE PARTS AND MATERIALS	- \$1,000,000
CENTRAL PURCHASING	- \$500,000
DUST CONTROL	- \$1,200,000
LIQUOR CONTROL	- \$350,000

FOR A TOTAL OF \$3,000,000 WORTH OF REVOLVING FUNDS. NOW GRANTED ALL OF THOSE ARE NOT AT THEIR MAXIMUM ALL OF THE TIME.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN YOU HAVE A REVOLVING FUND, IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT THIS IS JUST MONEY GOING OUT BECAUSE THERE IS MONEY COMING IN AS WELL. SO WHATEVER THE AMOUNT OF MONEY IS GOING OUT, THERE IS STILL AN EQUAL AMOUNT OF MONEY COMING IN IN A SHORT TIME SO THAT THE REVOLVING FUND IS INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATED WORKING CAPITAL AT ANY GIVEN TIME. IT'S THE MONEY THAT'S GOING IN AS WELL. ISN'T THAT THE WAY THAT ONE OPERATES? ISN'T IT?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, A REVOLVING FUND IS EFFECTIVELY AN INVENTORY AND REALLY WHAT I'M SUGGESTING, I WASN'T SUGGESTING THAT THE \$3,000,000 WAS REQUIRED ALL THE TIME. WHAT I WAS SUGGESTING THAT THERE ARE PARTS OF THAT \$3,000,000 THAT ARE TIED UP IN INVENTORY AT ANY POINT IN TIME. FOR EXAMPLE IN THIS DUST CONTROL PROGRAM, WE HAVE ORDERED SOMETHING LIKE TEN THOUSAND TONS OF CALCIUM CHLORIDE WHICH WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO PAY FOR. NOW

CERTAINLY AS WE APPLY IT TO THE ROADS, IT WILL BE CLEARED OUT OF THE REVOLVING FUND AND WILL BE CHARGED TO THE ROAD MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT. NOW WHEN THAT HAPPENS, EVERYTHING IS CLEAR. THE POINT IS, FOR EXAMPLE ON DUST CONTROL, WE HAD TO PLACE OUR ORDERS IN FEBRUARY, DELIVERY STARTED IN MARCH, BY THE END OF MAY, WE WILL HAVE APPROXIMATELY \$7 OR \$800,000 WORTH OF DUST CONTROL SITTING THERE WHICH WE WON'T APPLY UNTIL JUNE OR JULY. SO THERE ARE PERIODS WHEN WE NEED CASH, THAT KIND OF CASH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT KIND OF CASH IS REPLACED AGAIN BY THE REVOLVING FUND BECAUSE MONEY GOES BACK AGAIN INTO THE WORKING CAPITAL. IT'S ONLY OUT FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME WHILE YOU ARE PAYING FOR THE GOODS THAT YOU ARE HOLDING IN INVENTORY. ISN'T THIS CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, BUT FOR EXAMPLE AGAIN USING THE DUST CONTROL AS AN EXAMPLE, WE WILL HAVE TIED UP MONEY THROUGH MARCH, APRIL, MAY, JUNE AND JULY IN BUYING CALCIUM CHLORIDE. THE RECOVERIES WON'T COME UNTIL JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER AND POSSIBLY DECEMBER, DEPENDING UPON HOW QUICKLY OUR BILLS GET IN. SO WHAT I'M SAYING, PART OF THAT, NOT ALL OF IT, BUT PART OF THAT MONEY IS REQUIRED. NOW IF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS SUGGESTING THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE 4 MILLION DOLLARS OR 5 MILLION DOLLARS IN CASH IN SHORT TERMS INVESTMENTS, WE ADMITTED YESTERDAY THAT WE WERE GOING TO HAVE APPROXIMATELY 4 MILLION DOLLARS IN SHORT TERM INVESTMENTS ALL YEAR. AND WE HAVE REFLECTED THAT IN OUR BUDGET.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I CAN'T SEE - PERHAPS, MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER COULD INDICATE HOW BASED ON \$4,000,000.00 WHICH WILL BE IN A CASH FLOW AT ALL TIMES THROUGH THE YEAR, THERE IS ONLY \$313,000.00 IN INTEREST - - -

MR. MILLER: \$330,000.00.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: \$330,000.00 ALRIGHT. HOW THAT IS SHOWN - BECAUSE IT HAS ALREADY BEEN INDICATED THAT IN ONE SPECIFIC MONTH LET'S SAY FOR THIS MONTH JUST GONE, WE ARE GETTING \$46,000.00 IN INTEREST. IF WE TOOK THAT AS AN AVERAGE AMOUNT AS I INDICATED YESTERDAY, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A POSSIBILITY OF \$550,000.00 IN INTEREST. THIS HAS BEEN AGREED TO BY MR. MILLER, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE \$4,000,000.00 THAT WE ANTICIPATE HAVING THROUGHOUT THE

YEAR, WE ARE ANTICIPATING THIS. WE HAVE CALCULATED THIS ON THE BASIS OF RECEIVING INTEREST IN THE AMOUNT OF 8 TO 8 1/2% THROUGH THE COURSE OF THE YEAR. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS KIND ENOUGH TO TELL US YESTERDAY THAT THIRTY-DAY MONEY TODAY IS WORTH 9 3/4%.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THREE MONTHS, NINETY DAYS.

MR. MILLER: MY INFORMATION, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS THAT THIRTY-DAY MONEY IS WORTH 9 3/4% AND NINETY-DAY MONEY IS WORTH 9 1/4%. THEY DO NOT WANT LONG TERM MONEY. THE INDICATIONS FROM THAT ARE THAT THE INTEREST RATES WILL DECLINE. WHEN THEY WILL DECLINE I CAN'T TELL YOU. HOW FAR THEY WILL DECLINE I CAN'T TELL YOU. THE THIRTY-DAY MONEY TODAY IS WORTH 9 3/4%. NEXT WEEK IT MAY BE WORTH 9 1/2, 9 1/4%. I DON'T KNOW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT MAY BE WORTH 10 1/2%.

MR. MILLER: IT'S QUITE POSSIBLE. IT COULD BE 10 1/2%. TO THE BEST OF OUR ABILITY TO ESTIMATE WE ARE ESTIMATING, WE ARE USING AN AVERAGE OF 8 TO 8 1/2% WHICH IS A PRETTY HIGH INTEREST RATE BECAUSE LESS THAN ONE YEAR AGO IT WAS DOWN AROUND 7, 7 1/4%.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: LET'S TALK ABOUT THIS TELEVISION PROGRAM. THIS T.V. PROGRAM FOR THE COMMUNITIES. WE KNOW THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE MORE IN INTEREST MONEY COMING IN THAN WHAT HAS BEEN ESTIMATED. WE KNOW THIS BECAUSE OF WHAT WE ALREADY KNOW ABOUT THIS MONTH. WHY CAN'T THAT ADDITIONAL INTEREST MONEY BE USED FOR THAT SPECIFIC PURPOSE THAT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED BY MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T GIVE YOU ANY ASSURANCE THAT WE WOULD HAVE MORE THAN \$330,000.00. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER COULD BE QUITE CORRECT. MAYBE WE WILL. I COULDN'T GIVE YOU THAT ASSURANCE AT THIS TIME. REGARDING THE FUNDING OF THE TELEVISION PROGRAM SITUATION I HAVE ALREADY TALKED TO THE MEMBER WHO HAS PROPOSED THAT MOTION. I HAVEN'T HAD TIME, QUITE FRANKLY, SINCE I HAVE HEARD OF THE MOTION TO TRY AND FIND A SOURCE FOR FUNDS OR TRY TO FIND A WAY OF DOING IT. I HAVE GIVEN MY COMMITMENT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT I WILL DO WHAT I CAN TO TRY AND FIND OUT A WAY AND MEANS OF PROVIDING MONEY OR ASSURANCE THAT SOMEHOW OR OTHER THE GOVERNMENT TAKES SOME ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THIS PROGRAM. I NEED SOME TIME TO DO IT. I HAVEN'T HAD THAT TIME.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN I GET INTO THIS A LITTLE BIT. THE FIGURES THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST IS QUOTING ARE THE MAXIMUM FUNDS AVAILABLE AT WHAT HAS BEEN UP TO NOW THE MAXIMUM INTEREST RATE AVAILABLE. I DON'T THINK YOU CAN EQUATE THOSE OVER THE PROSPECT OF THE NEXT YEAR. WHEN HE TALKS ABOUT \$46,000.00 THAT WE EARNED IN INTEREST IN APRIL, YOU CAN'T POSSIBLY SAY WE ARE GOING TO EARN THE SAME AMOUNT OF INTEREST IN MAY. YOU CAN TAKE A RATIONAL GUESS THAT WE PROBABLY WILL IF THE FUNDS ARE STILL AT \$6,000,000.00 AS THEY ARE NOW. YOU HAVE NO IDEA OF KNOWING WHAT IT'S GOING TO BE IN JUNE AND YOU CERTAINLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT IT'S GOING TO BE IN DECEMBER. I DON'T THINK YOU CAN TAKE A SPECIFIC FIGURE AND A SPECIFIC AMOUNT OF MONEY AND A SPECIFIC INTEREST RATE RIGHT NOW AND EQUATE ANYTHING TO IT OTHER THAN A RATIONAL GUESS, AN INTELLIGENT GUESS, AS TO WHAT'S GOING TO ENSUE IN THE NEXT YEAR. AS I SAID YESTERDAY, AND IT'S EXACTLY THE SAME ARGUMENT THAT I MAKE TODAY, IF ANYTHING I THINK THE TREASURER IS PUSHING HIS LUCK A LITTLE BIT AT ESTIMATING THE NEXT YEAR AT 8 1/2%.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU KNOW NORMALLY I WOULD AGREE WITH WHAT HAS BEEN SAID EXCEPT THE TREND FOR THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS IS FOR A GRADUAL INCREASE IN THE INTEREST RATE. YOU WILL FIND THAT IT IS RARE INDEED NOW, ESPECIALLY IN TODAY'S INFLATIONARY TREND FOR INTEREST RATES TO BE REDUCED. ALTHOUGH WE KNOW THAT AT A GIVEN TIME WE HAVE \$6,000,000.00, AT THE END OF YEAR IT'S PROPOSED ESTIMATE THAT THERE WAS 4 3/4 MILLION DOLLARS IT MAY BE AT ANY TIME DURING THE YEAR - ALSO, IT MAY BE AGAIN THAT WE MAY HAVE \$8,000,000.00 OR \$9,000,000.00 IN THE FLOW FOR A MONTH. IT MAY BE FOR INSTANCE THAT WE MAY HAVE \$20,000,000.00. IT MAY BE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, I DON'T KNOW TO WHAT EXTENT, MAY SAY WELL HERE IS THE MONEY TO MEET YOUR COMMITMENTS IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MAIN BUILDING THAT IS BEING BUILT. THE MONEY RESTS WITH US FOR A MONTH OR SO. THAT GIVES US ANOTHER PIECE OF INTEREST. ANYTHING COULD HAPPEN IN THAT PARTICULAR AREA. REALLY WHAT I AM TRYING TO ASCERTAIN IS A QUESTION, IT MAY BE HYPOTHETICAL. SHOULD THERE BE AN INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF INTEREST COMING IN WHAT IS GOING TO BE DONE WITH THAT INTEREST MONEY? COULD IT NOT BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUPPLYING THE NEEDS OF PARTICULAR COMMUNITIES SO THAT IT CAN BE SET ASIDE FOR THAT SPECIFIC PURPOSE

IN EXACTLY THE SAME WAY AS THERE IS GOING TO BE AN ATTEMPT MADE TO SET ASIDE TOBACCO TAX FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF KINDERGARTEN. IF YOU CAN SAY YOU CAN SET ASIDE MONEY FOR ONE PARTICULAR PURPOSE, WHY CAN'T INTEREST BE SET ASIDE FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUPPLYING T.V. COMMUNICATION TO THOSE COMMUNITIES THAT REQUIRE IT. IT'S A LOGICAL TYPE OF HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION BECAUSE IT MAY WELL HAPPEN.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE THE TREASURER ANSWERS, I DON'T THINK THOSE TWO THINGS ARE - YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT APPLES AND ORANGES. YOU CAN ESTIMATE WHAT THE TOBACCO SALES ARE GOING TO BE. YOU CAN ESTIMATE YOUR TAX AND YOU HAVE GOT A PRETTY REASONABLE ASSURANCE. I'M SURE IF YOU TAKE A CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE YOU HAVE GOT A PRETTY REASONABLE ASSURANCE OF BEING ABLE TO COLLECT THAT TAX. TO SAY WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO GET ON INTEREST AND TO PREDICT HOW MUCH MONEY YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO INVEST TO GET THAT INTEREST IS IN NO WAY RELATED TO HOW MUCH MONEY YOU CAN ESTIMATE ON TAX. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS AS WELL AS I DO THAT THE TWO THINGS ARE NOT COMPARABLE IN ANY WAY AT ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THEY SURE ARE.

MR. TANNER: IF HE'S TAUGHT ME ANYTHING IN THE 3 1/2 YEARS I HAVE BEEN HERE IS THAT WHEN HE GOES WITH THIS LINE OF THINKING THEN HE'S JUST PLAYING GAMES. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HIS PARTICULAR MOTIVE IS RIGHT NOW. IN FACT, I SUSPECT HE WANTS TO PLAY WITH THE CLOCK UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK, BUT OTHERWISE I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE'S GOING ON ABOUT REALLY. HE KNOWS AS WELL AS ANY OTHER MEMBER IN THIS COUNCIL THAT WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT IS NOT REALLY TRUE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S VERY NICE - THE WORDS THAT COME OUT WITH A LITTLE BIT OF KINDNESS OCCASIONALLY FROM THE HONOURABLE MEMBER. THERE IS A PARALLEL BECAUSE IF YOU CAN SPECIFICALLY SET ASIDE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES IN ONE AREA WHEREVER YOU GET IT FROM, CERTAINLY YOU CAN SAY WELL IF WE ARE DOING IT THAT WAY IN ONE AREA, WE WILL GO ANOTHER WAY IN ANOTHER AREA. I KNOW FROM MY OWN EXPERIENCE THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE FACED WITH HAVING AN INCREASED AMOUNT OF DOLLARS AVAILABLE BY WAY OF INTEREST ON THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT IS GOING TO BE ON SHORT-TERM INVESTMENT. I WOULD LIKE TO GET FROM THE GOVERNMENT SOME SORT OF COMMITMENT THAT SHOULD THERE BE FUNDS OVER AND ABOVE WHAT HAS BEEN ESTIMATED; FOR INSTANCE IT HAS

BEEN ESTIMATED THAT THERE WILL BE \$330,000.00, WHAT WOULD THE FUNDS BE USED FOR. COULDN'T IT BE USED FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE THAT HAS BEEN INDICATED. CAN'T WE GET AN ANSWER IN THE AFFIRMATIVE THAT THIS COULD BE THE MANNER IN WHICH THESE ADDITIONAL INTEREST FUNDS BE USED?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD CAUTION ALL MEMBERS THAT WHEN THEY TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC FUNDS FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES THAT THIS IS A VERY DANGEROUS PRECEDENT THAT YOU ARE SETTING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE GOVERNMENT SAID THIS.

MR. MILLER: ONE OF THE BASIC PHILOSOPHIES OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING IN CANADA - I EMPHASIZE THIS - IN CANADA, IS THAT REVENUES RAISED BY TAXATION GO INTO A CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND ALL EXPENDITURES COME OUT OF THAT CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND. THERE ARE NO FUNDS SPECIFICALLY ALLOCATED FOR A SPECIFIC PROGRAM. CONVERSELY, AND I WILL GIVE YOU A FINE EXAMPLE OF THIS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA AND UNDER THE AMERICAN SYSTEM, THEY ALLOCATE REVENUES TO SPECIFIC PROGRAM EXPENDITURES. IF THE REVENUES DON'T COME, THEY CAN'T SPEND ANY MONEY WHETHER THEY ARE NEEDED OR NOT. THEY CAN'T SPEND ANY MONEY IF THE REVENUES FALL SHORT OF THE ESTIMATES. THIS IS WHY I FOR ONE AM VERY VERY CAUTIOUS IN THIS AREA. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND AND FUNDS FOR THE WHOLE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S USE; NOT FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS. NOW ADMITTEDLY THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS. COMMITMENTS CAN BE MADE FOR EXCEPTIONS TO THIS. I WOULD WARN YOU THAT IF YOU GO TO TOO MANY EXCEPTIONS YOU WILL BREAK THE GENERAL RULES OF THE GAME YOU WILL END UP IMPOSING LET'S SAY, FOR AN EXAMPLE, A FUEL OIL TAX FOR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE. IF THE FUEL OIL TAX DOESN'T COME YOU DON'T MAINTAIN THE HIGHWAY. THAT'S ONE OF THE SERIOUS DANGERS IN SETTING FUNDS ASIDE FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM SO PLEASED TO HEAR MR. MILLER SAY THIS. WHAT HAS HAPPENED NOW, WHAT IS HAPPENING, IS RIGHT WITHIN - AND THIS IS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT SET THIS UP, RIGHT WITHIN THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING ADDRESS HE HAS INDICATED THAT THERE WILL BE A RAISING OF A SPECIFIC FUND FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE. THAT IS A RAISING OF A TOBACCO TAX TO PAY FOR KINDERGARTENS.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK THAT IS CORRECT. I DON'T WANT TO DEBATE THIS

ISSUE. I THINK THE INTENTION OF THE COMMISSIONER'S OPENING REMARKS WERE THAT THERE WOULD BE A PAPER PRESENTED TO FORM A KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM TO A CERTAIN LEVEL. TO DO THIS THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE ADDITIONAL TAXES RAISED. THE PROPOSAL WAS THAT A TOBACCO TAX BE INTRODUCED TO RAISE PART OR ALL OF THOSE FUNDS REQUIRED; NOT FOR THE SPECIFIC PROGRAM. IT JUST HAPPENS THAT THEY HAVE TO BE INTRODUCED AT THE SAME TIME, A TAX SOURCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I JUST GOT A LAUGH OUT OF COUNCILLOR RIVETT - THE FIRST TIME.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS VERY EASY TO SAY AND THE PUBLIC I'M SURE, AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON POINTED OUT THE OTHER DAY, THAT THAT TOBACCO TAX IS GOING TO FUND KINDERGARTENS. IN EFFECT THE ONLY SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE TWO THINGS IS THAT THEY ARE BEING INTRODUCED AT THE SAME TIME. THOSE FUNDS GO INTO GENERAL REVENUE AND THEY WILL GO TO FUNDING THE TOTAL PROGRAM, ONE OF WHICH HAPPENS TO BE THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM. NEXT YEAR THEY WON'T BE IDENTIFIED IN THAT WAY AT ALL. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER KNOWS THAT TOO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT A SWITCH HAS TAKEN PLACE NOW. THE DISCUSSIONS ALL THE TIME HAVE BEEN ON THE BASIS THAT THE TOBACCO TAX IS BEING RAISED FOR THE PURPOSE OF KINDERGARTEN. NOW WE ARE TOLD NO, IT'S NOT BEING RAISED FOR THAT. YOU KNOW, IT'S NOT OFTEN THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM MAYO SAYS ANYTHING OR DOES ANYTHING EXCEPT CARRY OUT HIS DUTIES IN THE CHAIR BUT ONE CAN READ FROM LOOKING AT HIM OCCASIONALLY WITH WHAT DISGUST AND AT TIMES WITH WHAT HUMOUR HE THINKS OF THINGS THAT ARE BEING SAID. I'M SURE THAT HE RECOGNIZED VERY VERY CLEARLY THAT WE HAVE JUST BEEN GIVEN ANOTHER SNOW JOB. THIS IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED AGAIN. EVEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON CITY, HE KNEW FULL WELL THAT THERE WAS A DANGER IN THE PROPOSAL THAT THERE WAS GOING TO BE A SPECIFIC TAX FOR KINDERGARTEN. THIS IS WHY HE SPOKE ABOUT IT. NOW, OF COURSE, THE WHOLE THING IS BEING SWITCHED.

MR. RIVETT: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M GLAD THAT SOMEBODY CAN READ MY MIND.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: LAUGHTER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. COUNCILLOR WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, GOING BACK TO THE FACT THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER IS LOOKING FOR FUNDING FOR THE TELEVISION STATIONS IN THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES IN THE YUKON. I HAVE TO AGREE WITH HIM AND WITH ALL THE REST OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS HERE. THIS IS A NEEDED PROGRAM. MY CONSTITUENCY IS THE ONLY CONSTITUENCY WHERE NOT ONE COMMUNITY HAS TELEVISION SERVICES IN ITS COMMUNITY. MINE IS THE ONLY ONE. I AM VERY VERY ANXIOUS TO SEE THAT THIS SERVICE IS PROVIDED. HOWEVER, I DO NOT THINK SINCE TELEVISION IS A RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, I DO NOT THINK THAT WE SHOULD BE USING TERRITORIAL FUNDS UNTIL WE HAVE EXPLORED THE POSSIBILITY OF GETTING FUNDING FOR THIS PROGRAM FROM INDIAN AFFAIRS & NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT. I THINK STRONG REPRESENTATION SHOULD BE MADE TO THE MINISTER TO SEE WHETHER WE CAN GET THE FUNDING FOR THIS PROGRAM FOR THIS YEAR. I AM NOT SO SURE THAT THE ANSWER FROM THE MINISTER WOULD BE IN THE NEGATIVE. I ALSO THINK THAT WE DO HAVE MONEY IN OUR EXISTING BUDGET FOR STUDIES. I THINK THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD UNDERTAKE TO DO THE OUTSTANDING FIELD WORK AS WAS SUGGESTED IN THE STUDY THAT WAS TABLED. I THINK THAT THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD ALSO FORWARD THIS NORTHERN TELECOMMUNICATIONS STUDY TO A CONSULTING FIRM TO HAVE IT VERIFIED AS THE PEOPLE WHO PREPARED THE STUDY WANTED, AND THAT VERY STRONG REPRESENTATION BE MADE TO THE MINISTER. IF FUNDS CAN BE MADE AVAILABLE FROM INDIAN AFFAIRS THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT CO-ORDINATE THE PROGRAM TO SEE THAT IT IS BROUGHT INTO EFFECT IN THE YEAR 1974-75. I LISTEN TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER TALKING ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF HAVING MORE INTEREST IN THE REVENUE SIDE. THERE IS THAT POSSIBILITY. THERE IS ALSO THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE WON'T HAVE \$330,000.00 AS REVENUE.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE EAST THE OTHER DAY WAS TALKING ABOUT THE COST OF FUEL AND THE FUEL TAX THAT WE NOW HAVE ON FUEL IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. WHITEHORSE WEST? EVERYONE OF US HERE KNOWS THAT IN MID-MAY, WHEN THE NEW PRICE OF FUEL COMES INTO EFFECT IN THE YUKON, THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE FACED WITH A REAL BIG PROBLEM. ARE WE GOING TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE TO TAX THE FUEL IN THE TERRITORY AT THE LEVEL AT WHAT WE ARE DOING. THERE ARE MANY MAJOR AREAS OF CONCERN THAT AFFECT THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY AND THAT AFFECT THE COUNCILLORS HERE. I THINK AS FAR AS JUSTIFYING IT TO ALL PEOPLE IN THE TERRITORY, WE SHOULD MAKE EVERY EFFORT POSSIBLE, THE STRONGEST REPRESENTATION

POSSIBLE, TO THE MINISTER TO SEE WHETHER HE CAN EITHER INTERCEDE WITH C.B.C. TO GET THE FUNDING OR TO PROVIDE THE FUNDING FROM THEIR DEPARTMENT; THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT CARRY ON THE STUDIES THAT ARE REQUIRED, AND THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT CO-ORDINATE THE INSTALLATION OF THE PROGRAM IN THE YUKON THIS SUMMER.

MR. MCKINNON: ONE QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, DID THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OBJECT TO THE SPENDING OF TERRITORIAL FUNDS IN EXTENDING THE BEAVER CREEK AIRPORT EVEN THOUGH SHE IS COMPLETELY AND FULLY AWARE THAT THAT IS A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT, THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT, RESPONSIBILITY FOR BOTH THE EXTENSION AND MAINTENANCE OF AIRPORTS IN THE COUNTRY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I BELIEVE THIS IS RECOVERABLE FROM M.O.T., IS IT NOT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE EXPENDITURE ON THE BEAVER CREEK AIRPORT FOR THE IMPROVEMENTS WERE RECOVERED FROM M.O.T.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE BEAVER CREEK AIRPORT WHICH IS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE PAY THE COST OF THAT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE EXPENDITURES OF UPGRADING THE BEAVER CREEK AIRSTRIP IN THE LAST YEAR WAS BORNE BY M.O.T. ON A RECOVERY - - -

MR. MCKINNON: IS THE BEAVER CREEK AIRPORT A TERRITORIAL AIRPORT OR A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AIRPORT?

MR. MILLER: IT'S OPERATED BY Y.T.G.

MR. MCKINNON: RIGHT. IT'S A TERRITORIAL AIRPORT BECAUSE THEY WON'T GO INTO THAT AREA.

MR. MILLER: MY POINT, MR. CHAIRMAN, WAS M.O.T. DID IN FACT PAY FOR THE UPGRADING OF THAT AIRSTRIP.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT ABOUT THE MAINTENANCE?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I BELIEVE THERE WILL BE SOME AGREEMENT WITH M.O.T. FOR THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE AIRSTRIP.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT ABOUT THE MAINTENANCE?

MR. MCKINNON: THE FACT REMAINS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE ONLY WAY THAT THAT TERRITORY COULD HAVE BEEN UPGRADED, THE ONLY WAY THAT THE OLD CROW AIRPORT WOULD HAVE BEEN BUILT, WAS THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT TAKING THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THOSE AIRPORTS AS TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT AIRPORTS BECAUSE THE CROWN CORPORATION WHICH IS DIRECTLY CHARGED WITH THE BUILDING AND THE MAINTENANCE REFUSED TO ACT IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. THAT IS A FACT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH RESPECT - - -

MR. MCKINNON: IT BLOODY WELL IS.

MR. MILLER: THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT IS NOT CHARGED WITH THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL AIRPORTS IN CANADA. THERE ARE AS MANY MUNICIPAL AIRPORTS AS THERE ARE M.O.T. AIRPORTS STILL IN CANADA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE ONES HERE.

MR. MILLER: IN THE YUKON M.O.T. LOOKS AFTER CLASS A AIRPORTS. IF THE TERRITORY WANTS ANYTHING ELSE THEY HAVE TO LOOK AFTER CLASS B AND CLASS C. THEY GET THE FUNDS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE FACILITIES.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS EXACTLY THE POINT I WAS MAKING. THERE WAS THIS ARRANGEMENT WITH M.O.T. BEFORE THE WORK WAS DONE ON THE BEAVER CREEK AIRSTRIP. IF WE HAVEN'T GONE AHEAD AND DONE THE WORK, WE WOULDN'T HAVE HAD THE EXTENSION TO THE BEAVER CREEK AIRSTRIP WHICH WAS BADLY NEEDED. IF WE CAN GET AN UNDERSTANDING WITH INDIAN AFFAIRS THAT THEY WILL FUND THIS PROGRAM, THEN WE CAN GO AHEAD AND CO-ORDINATE IT. THIS IS EXACTLY THE POINT I AM MAKING. IF WE WAIT FOR C.B.C. WE ARE NOT GOING TO GET IT. WE MUST GET SOME UNDERSTANDING TO USE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THIS. WE CAN GO AHEAD AND DO IT, BUT LET'S TRY TO GET THE SUPPORT FROM INDIAN AFFAIRS. I DON'T CARE FROM WHAT DEPARTMENT - C.B.C. I WOULD SAY FROM THE MINISTER, TO GO DIRECTLY TO THE MINISTER AND MAKE OUR REPRESENTATION TO THE MINISTER.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FUNDING FOR THOSE AIRPORTS TOOK ABOUT FIFTEEN YEARS OF DISCUSSION IN THIS HOUSE. I WILL BRING THE VOTES & PROCEEDINGS WHERE MR. COMMISSIONER,

THE PRESENT COMMISSIONER, STOOD UP AND SAID WHAT A FARCE IT WAS TO TRY AND DEAL WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND M.O.T. BECAUSE HE HAD BEEN TRYING FOR ABOUT THAT NUMBER OF YEARS TO GET THE FUNDING FOR THE AIRPORTS IN THE BEAVER CREEK AND THE OLD CROW AREA.

THERE WAS NOTHING BUT DISSATISFACTION AND NOTHING BUT AN ABSOLUTE BUNCH OF BUREAUCRATIC GARBAGE IN DEALING WITH THEM. THE TERRITORY WAS GOING TO HAVE TO ACT THEMSELVES, AND I WAS MAKING THE SAME POINT AS THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT WE SHOULDN'T GET INVOLVED IN DIFFERENT GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS WHO ARE CHARGED WITH RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE COMMISSIONER SAID EXACTLY THE SAME THING THAT I AM SAYING NOW. WHEN YOU HAVE TO WAIT FIFTEEN YEARS TO GET ONE LITTLE PIECE OF ACTION THEN YOU ARE BETTER OFF TO GO AND DO IT YOURSELF. THAT'S WHAT IT TOOK.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST ONE COMMENT FROM THE CHAIR ON THE REMARKS BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE. I DO CONCUR WITH HER THAT WE ARE GOING TO GET NOWHERE WITH CBC. IT IS A FUTILE UTILITY TO EXPECT ANYMORE OF THEM.

HOWEVER IN RELATION TO REPRESENTATIONS TO THE MINISTER. THEY ARE ALREADY ON THEIR WAY AND I SHOULD BE ABLE TO HAVE AN ANSWER SHORTLY IN RESPECT TO THIS.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER AND I MUST CONGRATULATE HIM FOR THE WORK THAT HE HAS DONE IN THIS REGARD. I DO THINK THAT STRONG REPRESENTATION FROM THE ADMINISTRATION AND FROM THIS COUNCIL TO THE MINISTER, AS STRONG AS WE POSSIBLY CAN, SHOULD BE MADE.

I DO THINK THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD UNDERTAKE TO HAVE THE CONSULTANT FIRM REVIEW THE STUDY OF THE NORTHERN TELECOMMUNICATION. AND ALSO TO DO THE REQUIRED, THE EXTRA REQUIRED SURVEY WORK, THAT HE FELT NEEDED TO BE DONE. I THINK THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD UNDERTAKE THIS SO THAT EVERYTHING IS READY TO GO. I THINK THE PRESSURE SHOULD BE PUT ON THE MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, VERY STRONG PRESSURES. I'M SURE, I'M VERY CONFIDENT, THAT WE CAN IN THIS REGARD GET THE REQUIRED FUNDING TO DO THE, TO CARRY ON THIS PROGRAM SO THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO USE TERRITORIAL FUNDS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL, AS I SAY I PUT AN IMMEDIATE PRIORITY ON IT AND THAT IS WHY I AM ENDEAVORING TO HAVE THIS MATTER RESOLVED AT THIS SESSION. CERTAINLY IN THE CASE OF MY ELECTORAL DISTRICT IT WILL BE THERE BY FALL IF I HAVE TO PAY FOR IT MYSELF. I THINK, AS ALL MEMBERS DO, THAT GOVERNMENT ARE THE PEOPLE WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS AND I THINK THAT FUNDS CAN BE FOUND AND MUST BE FOUND BY THE COUNCIL. I THINK A GREATER PRIORITY SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED ON THIS. THIS IS A TOMORROW THING IT SHOULD BE A TODAY THING.

MRS. WATSON: I COULDN'T AGREE MORE BUT I SAY LET US NOT CLOSE THE DOOR WE HAVEN'T MADE. THE COUNCIL HASN'T MADE STRONG REPRESENTATION AND THE UNITED COUNCIL THROUGH THE MINISTER FOR THIS TYPE OF FUNDING. I THINK THIS IS THE ROUTE WE SHOULD FOLLOW. WE SHOULD ALSO INSTRUCT THE ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE AS STRONG REPRESENTATION AS THEY CAN TO GET THE REQUIRED FUNDING FOR THIS PROGRAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS WILL FOLLOW IN DUE COURSE. AT THIS TIME I WILL STAND COMMITTEE IN RECESS UNTIL 2:00 O'CLOCK.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WILL AT THIS TIME CALL COMMITTEE BACK TO ORDER.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, YESTERDAY I ASKED A QUESTION RE: R.C.M.P. DETACHMENT AND YESTERDAY MR. MILLER INDICATED THAT HE WOULD HAVE SOMETHING BROUGHT FORWARD AFTER LUNCH BUT HE DIDN'T SAY AFTER LUNCH OF WHICH DAY. I WONDER IF HE HAS IT FOR TODAY?

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF, WELL LETS PUT IT THIS WAY; THERE ARE THREE BASIC AREAS WHERE THE QUESTIONS STILL REQUIRE ANSWERS. SOME OF THEM I WILL HAND OUT AS PAPERS THE OTHER ONE I WILL DEAL WITH AS A VERBAL. MAYBE WHILE I AM DEALING WITH THE VERBAL MADAM CLERK CAN PASS OUT THE PAPERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MADAM CLERK.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE WAS ONE REMAINING QUESTION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT-- VOTE 6 AND IT RELATED TO A QUESTION ASKED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER. THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE HAD EVER REQUESTED AN INCREASE IN THE PER CAPITA GRANTS. THE AMOUNT

OF THE PER CAPITA AID UNDER THE MUNICIPAL AID ORDINANCE. OUR RECORDS DO NOT INDICATE ANY FORMAL REQUEST FROM THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST BEFORE WE GO ON WITH THAT, IS THIS TO MEAN THAT THERE WAS NEVER ANY REQUEST OF ANY SORT, NEVER ANY MENTION OF THIS, OR DOES THIS JUST MEAN FORMAL REQUEST?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE NO RECORD ON OUR FILE OF A FORMAL REQUEST. WE DO KNOW THAT ALL MUNICIPALITIES HAVE DISCUSSED THIS AND IN THE CASE OF THE TOWN OF FARO, THEY HAVE FORMALLY REQUESTED THAT THIS BE REVIEWED. THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE HAS NOT FORMALLY REQUESTED THIS. WE DO KNOW THAT THEY ARE CONCERNED ABOUT IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ISN'T IT SO THAT THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE DID COME AND ASK THAT PERSONALLY? THEY CAME AND ASKED FOR THIS AT COUNCIL AS WELL. IS THAT CONSIDERED A FORMAL REQUEST?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WAS DISCUSSED IN THIS COUNCIL. ADMITTEDLY THAT IS A REQUEST. THE POINT I MAKE IS THAT WE HAVE NOT A LETTER ON FILE FROM THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE.

YES, WE ARE AWARE OF THEIR REQUESTS ON THIS MATTER.

THE BALANCE OF QUESTIONS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT ARE OUTSTANDING RELATE TO THE GAME DEPARTMENT AND WE HAVE TABLED ANSWERS TO THOSE QUESTIONS.

THE OTHER QUESTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, RELATED TO, BECAUSE OF COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST, A PERMANENT DETACHMENT AT CARCROSS. WE HAVE TABLED AN ANSWER ON THAT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, IS COMMITTEE TO UNDERSTAND THAT THE ONLY MANNER IN WHICH AN INCREASED DETACHMENT WOULD BE MADE IS ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE R.C.M.P. AND NOT OF THIS COUNCIL?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE ARE TWO WAYS TO GET THIS R.C.M.P. SERVICE. ONE IF THE COMMISSIONER OR THIS COUNCIL THROUGH THE COMMISSIONER ASKS FOR AN INCREASE IN WHICH CASE WE PAY 100% OF THE COST OF THAT INCREASE.

THE OTHER WAY IS FOR THE R.C.M.P., THROUGH THEIR NORMAL REVIEW PROCESS, TO RECOMMEND AN

INCREASE. IN WHICH CASE WE WOULD THEN SHARE UNDER THE POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT. RIGHT NOW IT IS APPROXIMATELY 50% - UP ONE THOUSAND.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHAT IS THE COST OF, WHAT WOULD BE THE ADDITIONAL COST OF HAVING THE CARCROSS DETACHMENT MAINTAINED FOR THOSE MONTHS THAT IT IS NOT OPEN AS A DETACHMENT NOW?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE THOSE FIGURES READILY AVAILABLE BUT I WILL SUGGEST THE ADDITIONAL YEAR, PART YEAR THAT IS NOT NOW BEING MAINTAINED WOULD PROBABLY COST SOMETHING IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF \$10,000 TO \$15,000.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I BEG TO CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING FROM WHAT I RECALL THAT THE AVERAGE COST OF A DETACHMENT IS IN THE REGION OF \$10,000 A YEAR. NOW, PART OF THIS YEAR IS ALREADY INCLUDED IN THE CARCROSS DETACHMENT SO IT WOULD BE A PORTION OF THE \$10,000. ISN'T THIS CORRECT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT DOES COST TO MAINTAIN A DETACHMENT. MY GUESS WOULD HAVE BEEN APPROXIMATELY \$20,000 BY THE TIME YOU ADDED VEHICLE EXPENSE, HOUSING AND THIS TYPE OF THING. THAT IS WHY I ASSUMED THAT IT WOULD COST AN ADDITIONAL \$10,000. I DON'T KNOW THE EXACT FIGURES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: COULD WE GET THIS INFORMATION, MR. CHAIRMAN? MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE HOUSING OF A DETACHMENT IS STILL THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE R.C.M.P.. IT IS ONLY THE POSSIBLE SERVICES OF THE CONSTABLE OR CONSTABLES AT A DETACHMENT IS WHAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE TO BEAR OVER AND ABOVE WHAT HAS BEEN APPROVED IN THE POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT. ISN'T THIS THE UNDERSTANDING OR PERHAPS I CAN BE CORRECTED ON THAT POINT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I UNDERSTAND THE SITUATION WE BEAR 50% OF THE COST OF ANY DETACHMENT. I AM NOT PRECISE ON THIS - THE CARCROSS DETACHMENT IS CLOSED DURING THE WINTER WHICH MEANS THEY DON'T HEAT THE HOUSE, THEY DON'T HAVE ELECTRICITY IN THE HOUSE. THEY CLOSE THE HOUSE DOWN. IF THAT WAS OPEN THERE WOULD BE ADDITIONAL COSTS TO MAINTAIN THE HOUSING UNIT.

THE ADDITIONAL VEHICLE CHARGES FOR THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT THE CONSTABLE IS THERE, IN OTHER WORDS, A WHOLE YEAR INSTEAD OF ROUGHLY HALF A YEAR.

WHAT OTHER COSTS OTHER THAN THE CONSTABLE'S SALARY, I DON'T KNOW BUT THERE WOULD AT LEAST BE THE CONSTABLE'S SALARY FOR THAT PART OF THE YEAR WHICH WE HAVEN'T THERE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T WANT IT TO BE IN ANY WAY INTERFERING WITH THE BUDGET ITEM BUT COULD WE HAVE SOME ASSURANCE, MR. CHAIRMAN, FROM MR. MILLER THAT HE WILL BRING DETAILS OF THE COST OF MAINTAINING THE DETACHMENT AT CARCROSS FOR THE BALANCE OF THE YEAR OVER AND ABOVE THAT PERIOD OF TIME THAT HAS BEEN INCLUDED FOR IN THE POLICE SERVICES AGREEMENT, THE SUMMER DETACHMENT.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE WILL GET THIS INFORMATION FROM THE R.C.M.P. AND TABLE IT TO COUNCIL.

MR. CHAIRMAN: FROM THE CHAIR, ON PAGE 7 OF THE ANSWERS RESPECTING THE GAME DEPARTMENT, SECTION 12. THE ANSWER YOU HAVE GIVEN, THE ANSWER THAT HAS BEEN FORTHCOMING FROM THE GAME DEPARTMENT IS IN RELATION TO THIS B.C.-YUKON FUR SITUATION, EXPORT FUR SITUATION; IS THAT THESE B.C. PERMITS ARE AVAILABLE AT TESLIN AND AVAILABLE AT MACINTOSH'S LODGE IN THE UPPER LIARD BUT THIS DOESN'T REALLY RESOLVE THE PROBLEM. THE PROBLEM IS, IT SAYS, "WE DO NOT SEE THIS AS A PROBLEM OF THE GAME BRANCH." BUT INDEED IT IS BECAUSE IT IS THE YUKON GAME WARDENS WHO ARE NAILING THE TRAPPERS AS THEY BRING THEIR FUR IN TO GET THEIR EXPORT PERMITS. THIS IS THE POINT I ATTEMPTED TO MAKE WHEN I DISCUSSED THIS IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. THERE WOULD BE AN INSTRUCTION TO THEM OR A POLICY INSTRUCTION TO THEM TO PERMIT THE TRAPPERS TO AT LEAST GET DOWN TO WHERE THEY CAN GET A B.C. EXPORT PERMIT, OR TO A POST OFFICE TO MAIL THEIR FUR BACK TO B.C..

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I UNDERSTOOD THE QUESTION THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WAS ASKING THE OTHER DAY. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT MR. HOFFES DID NOT GET THE INTENT OF THE QUESTION WHEN HE WAS READING THE VOTES AND PROCEEDING. I WILL DISCUSS THIS WITH THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER RESPONSIBLE AND MAKE SURE THERE IS SOME MECHANISM SET UP, OR ATTEMPT TO SET UP, TO HAVE THIS PROBLEM QUESTIONED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE OTHER QUESTION OF COURSE RELATES TO THE MEETING, PREFERABLE IN WATSON LAKE BETWEEN THE B.C. GAME DEPARTMENT AND THE YUKON GAME DEPARTMENT TO RESOLVE ALL PROBLEMS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, ON ITEM NO. 6 ON PAGE 3 THERE SHOWS A BREAKDOWN ON PRIMARY FOR RENTAL OF LANDS AND BUILDINGS. WHY IS THIS BY 13? IS THERE ANY SPECIFIC REASON?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE USE 13 FINANCIAL REPORTING PERIODS OF EQUAL LENGTHS IN OUR ACCOUNTING SYSTEM. WHAT THEY ARE REALLY SAYING HERE IS THAT IT IS NOT \$506, A MONTH, IT IS \$506, FOR FOUR WEEKS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I SEE. THESE ARE BUILDINGS THAT ARE RENTED FROM THE GOVERNMENT ITSELF BY WAY OF A BOOKKEEPING ENTRY, IS THIS WHAT I UNDERSTAND?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE GLENLYON BUILDING IS A GOVERNMENT BUILDING, THE DAWSON CITY BUILDING IS A GOVERNMENT BUILDING, THE FARO BUILDING IS RENTED SPACE, PRIVATE RENTED SPACE, THE HAINES JUNCTION SPACE IS PRIVATE OR RENTED FROM A PRIVATE SOURCE AND THE WATSON LAKE IS IN THE LYNN BUILDING SO IT IS A GOVERNMENT BUILDING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN THE TWO PRIVATELY RENTED AREN'T THERE RENTALS ON A MONTHLY BASIS OR DO YOU TAKE THE YEAR AND THEN DIVIDE IT BY 13 TO CONFORM WITH THE REST OF THE ITEM. IS THIS THE WAY IT IS BEING DONE?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHY THEN WOULD YOU NOT USE THE SAME PROCEDURE THEN FOR OLD CROW WHERE YOU HAVE PUT IN THERE ONE YEAR ONLY? WHY IS THIS DIFFERENT FROM THE OTHER MATTERS?

MR. MILLER: WELL MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DON'T HAVE FACILITIES CURRENTLY RENTED AT OLD CROW. OUR GAME GUARDIAN WILL GO IN THERE VERY SHORTLY AND WE'RE LOOKING FOR SPACE AT THE MOMENT, BUT WE DO NOT HAVE SPACE AT THE MOMENT AND WHAT WE'VE DONE IS PROVIDED \$4,825 FOR A YEAR. WE FIGURE THAT'S WHAT IT IS GOING TO COST US.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT'S FOR THE YEAR TO COME. THERE IS ONE FURTHER QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK. IN DEALING WITH INVENTORIES OF ANY SPECIFIC DEPARTMENTS, IS THERE ANY VALUATION AT ANY TIME PUT ON THE INVENTORIES OF EQUIPMENT OR SUPPLIES IN ANY PARTICULAR DEPARTMENT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE EQUIPMENT IS CARRIED ON OUR BOOKS AS AN ASSET AND HAS THE

NORMAL, YOU KNOW THE ORIGINAL COST EVALUATION PLACED ON IT. SUPPLIES FOR THE MOST PARTS NOW-A-DAYS OUR SUPPLIES ARE DOWN TO A BARE MINIMUM IN MOST DEPARTMENTS. WE HAD TRAVELLING BOARD OF SURVEY LAST YEAR WHICH CLEANED OUT MOST OF THE OVER SUPPLIED AREAS AND THEY NORMALLY DRAW THEIR SUPPLIES ON A TWO TO THREE WEEKS IN TOWN AND OUT OF TOWN A ONE TO THREE MONTH BASIS.

Mr. Chamberlist: AND WHAT ABOUT THE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION. IS THERE A SET DEPRECIATION YEAR BY YEAR ON EQUIPMENT AND AT WHAT STAGE IS THAT EQUIPMENT?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THE ONLY EQUIPMENT THAT WE DEPRECIATE IS ROAD EQUIPMENT. ALL OTHER EQUIPMENT IS CARRIED ON THE BOOKS AT ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE FOR THE LIFE OF THE EQUIPMENT. WHEN WE WRITE OFF A PIECE OF EQUIPMENT THROUGH THE BOARD OF SURVEY, WE THEN REMOVE THE ENTIRE COST FROM THE BOOKS.

Mr. Chamberlist: THANK YOU, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. Chairman: IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER?

ONE QUESTION, JUST FOR THE RECORD. RESPECTING THE AMOUNT, TOTAL AMOUNT OF BILL No. 3, \$60,862,907. HOW DOES THIS RELATE TO BILL No. 1 WHERE WE HAVE ALREADY APPROPRIATED ONE TWELFTH OF THIS AMOUNT OF MONEY?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION OR INTERIM SUPPLY BILL IS REALLY ONLY GIVING THE GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY TO PAY THE BILLS SUBJECT TO PASSING OF MAIN ESTIMATES.

Mr. Chairman: IT DOESN'T SAY THAT.

Mr. Miller: NO I REALIZE IT DOESN'T SAY THAT Mr. CHAIRMAN AND I LOOKED AT THAT VERY CAREFULLY MYSELF BECAUSE I THOUGHT WE WOULD HAVE TO REDUCE OUR MAIN ESTIMATES. BUT IN FACT IT'S A LEGISLATIVE MEANS WHEREBY THE LEGISLATURE GIVES THE ADMINISTRATION OR THE GOVERNMENT, THE AUTHORITY TO PAY THE NORMAL ONGOING BILLS, ALWAYS SUBJECT TO THE MAIN ESTIMATES BEING APPROPRIATED IN THEIR ENTIRETY. IN THE CASES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, THEY NORMALLY ASK FOR TWO MONTHS INTERIM SUPPLY AND THEN GO BACK AND ASK FOR THE TOTAL MAIN ESTIMATE AMOUNT.

Mr. Chairman: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. CHAIRMAN, AT THIS TIME, UNLESS THE TREASURER HAS ANY FURTHER ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE CHAIRMAN READ THE PREAMBLE AND THE TITLE OF THE BILL SO THAT WE CAN MOVE IT OUT OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. McKinnon: PRIOR TO THAT BEING DONE, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT IS MY INTENTION TO MOVE IF I CAN FIND A SECONDER, THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF COUNCIL THAT ESTABLISHMENT 2911, GROUND IMPROVEMENTS VARIOUS LOCATIONS BE DELETED FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY 1974-75 MAIN ESTIMATES AND THE FUNDS BE ALLOCATED TO THE PROVISION OF T.V. SERVICE IN THE COMMUNITIES OF TESLIN, CARCROSS, CARMACKS, HAINES JUNCTION AND DESTRUCTION BAY.

Mr. Chamberlist: I WILL SECOND THAT MOTION Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. Chairman: DO YOU HAVE A COPY OF THE MOTION?

IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF COUNCIL THAT ESTABLISHMENT 2911, GROUND IMPROVEMENTS VARIOUS LOCATIONS BE DELETED FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY 1974-75 MAIN ESTIMATES AND THE FUNDS BE ALLOCATED TO THE PROVISION OF T.V. SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITIES OF TESLIN, CARCROSS, CARMACKS, HAINES JUNCTION AND DESTRUCTION BAY.

COUNCILLOR STUTTER?

Mr. Stutter: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE MOVER AND THE SECONDER, IF IT'S THEIR PROPOSAL THAT THIS PROGRAM BE DELETED COMPLETELY OR JUST MOVED ON TO ANOTHER YEAR? IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE INTENT WAS TO TRY AND FIND THE MONEY OUT OF THE BUDGET FOR THIS PARTICULAR PROGRAM AND NOT JUST PUSH SOMETHING ASIDE FOR A FUTURE TIME. OBVIOUSLY IF IT'S JUST TO BE MOVED OUT OF THE BUDGET THIS YEAR AND INTO THE NEXT BUDGET YEAR, YOU HAVEN'T ACTUALLY FOUND THE \$100,000 AT ALL. YOU HAVE JUST PUT OFF SPENDING IT.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE ONLY THING THAT I'VE CONSIDERED IS WHAT THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY CONSIDER TO BE A PRIORITY. I THINK THAT I HAVE MENTIONED TO THIS COMMITTEE BEFORE AND I THINK THAT HONOURABLE MEMBERS WHO SAT ON THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE WITH ME WILL AGREE THAT DURING THE PAST YEARS

THIS HAS BEEN AN ITEM IN THE BUDGET, THE GROUND IMPROVEMENTS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS. I CAN REMEMBER ON THREE SUCCESSIVE YEARS WHERE THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND IT WAS LATER APPROVED BY COUNCIL, FELT THAT THIS WASN'T A PRIORITY AS FAR AS OTHER ITEMS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON WERE CONCERNED. I AM SAYING THAT THIS YEAR IN 1974-75 THAT THE COMPLETE PAVING OF THE PARKING AREA OF THE WATSON LAKE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, THAT THE INSTALLING OF A GRAVEL DRIVE, OF PARKING WALKWAYS, GRASS AREAS, TREE PLANTING AND ERECTION OF SIGN AND FLAGPOLES AT THE WATSON LAKE TOURIST CHECK POINT AND WEIGHT SCALE.

THE INSTALLING OF WALKWAYS, GRASS AREAS, TREE PLANTING AND UPGRADING OF THE GRAVEL DRIVE AND PARKING SERVICES AT THE WATSON LAKE JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL, THAT THE FLAGPOLE INSTALLATION TO WAVE THE FLAG ON HIGH AT 21 GRADER STATIONS AROUND THE YUKON COSTING \$8,400. TO INSTALL CHAIN LINK FENCING AT ABOUT SIX DIFFERENT LOCATIONS AROUND THE YUKON TERRITORY DOES NOT HAVE THE PRIORITY THAT THIS COUNCIL DOES NOT THINK IT HAS THE PRIORITY AND THIS COUNCIL WILL NOT VOTE THAT THESE ITEMS HAVE THE PRIORITY OVER BEING ABLE TO PROVIDE A T.V. SIGNAL TO TESLIN, CARCROSS, CARMACKS, HAINES JUNCTION AND DESTRUCTION BAY DURING THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR. THERE IS ONLY ONE HOLDUP AND ONE HOLDUP ONLY THAT WOULD NOT ALLOW IF THE MONEY WERE PROVIDED IN THE 74-75 BUDGET FOR THIS TO TAKE PLACE AND THAT WOULD BE A CROWN ORIENTATED ORGANIZATION NAMELY THE CANADIAN RADIO TELEVISION COMMISSION COULDN'T SIT FAST ENOUGH AND RECEIVE THE APPLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY TO ALLOW THE INSTALLATIONS TO TAKE PLACE DURING THE SUMMER AND FALL MONTHS. THE BACKGROUND CAN BE PREPARED. THE SUPPORTING DATA BY PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING GROUPS AS TO WHETHER THE PROJECT IS FEASIBLE CAN BE DONE IN SHORT ORDER. THE APPLICATION CAN BE FILLED OUT AND SENT TO THE CANADIAN RADIO TELEVISION COMMISSION IN SHORT ORDER AND DEPENDING UPON THE SPEED OF THAT COMMISSION, TELEVISION CAN BE PROVIDED TO THOSE COMMUNITIES THIS YEAR. I'M SAYING THAT IT IS A BOLD, IT'S AN IMAGINATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THAT THE CIVIL SERVANTS, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ARE SCARED SILLY OF INITIATING ANY BOLD, IMAGINATIVE PROGRAMS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. WE CAN PROVIDE TELEVISION SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF THESE COMMUNITIES BY THIS FALL AND THAT THE CHAIN LINK FENCES AND THE FLAG POLES AND THE PAVEMENT AND THE WALKWAYS AND THE GRAVEL PATHS

CAN WAIT ONE MORE YEAR. COME ON. LET'S SHOW THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY FOR ONCE IN THIS COUNCIL'S LIFETIME WHERE WE SET THE PRIORITIES AND THAT WE ARE ACTUALLY GOING TO DO SOMETHING FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY THAT THEY WANT, NOT WHAT THE BUREAUCRATS IN THE YUKON TERRITORY WANT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: COUNCILLOR STUTTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN IT COMES TO PRIORITIES, IF THIS HAD COME BEFORE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET, THAT'S ONE TIME THAT I COULD HAVE LOOKED AT THIS AND DECIDED THAT IT WAS PERHAPS OF MORE IMPORTANCE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY THAN THE BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM. I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THIS. I REALLY WOULD. I'M COMPLETELY IN SYMPATHY AND I WISH THE PROGRAM COULD BE EXPANDED FURTHER TO TAKE IN MANY MANY OTHER AREAS. JUST ABOUT ALL OF THE COMMUNITIES IN THE AREA. BUT I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THAT CAN BE DONE AND BEFORE THE VOTE IS CALLED I WOULD ASK THAT COMMITTEE HAVE A BRIEF RECESS IF AT ALL POSSIBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DOES COMMITTEE AGREE?
I DECLARE A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I NOW CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER. MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE HAVE A COPY BEFORE THEM OF THE MOTION; I'LL REREAD IT. MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST. IT IS THE OPINION OF COUNCIL THAT ESTABLISHMENT 2911, GROUND IMPROVEMENTS, VARIOUS LOCATIONS BE DELETED FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY 1974-75 MAIN ESTIMATES AND THE FUNDS TO BE ALLOCATED TO THE PROVISION OF T.V. SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITIES OF TESLIN, CARCROSS, CARMACKS, HAINES JUNCTION AND DESTRUCTION BAY.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN I THINK ACTUALLY THIS MOTION IS OUT OF ORDER BUT I'M NOT GOING TO ARGUE ON THAT POINT. IT IS VERY SIMILAR TO MOTION 10 THAT COUNCILLOR MCKINNON MOVED IN THE HOUSE AND IT CARRIES THE SAME PRINCIPLE IN THAT MOTION. IN MOTION 18, HE WAS DELETING THE FIRST TEN POSITIONS AND THIS TIME THEY ARE DELETING, HOPING TO DELETE, ESTABLISHMENT 2911.

I WOULD LIKE TO SAY AGAIN THAT I DO NOT THINK THE TERRITORIAL FUNDS SHOULD BE USED FOR THIS. I THINK IT IS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY AND SOME-

HOW OR OTHER WE HAVE TO GET FEDERAL FUNDS TO FUND THIS TYPE OF PROGRAM.

THEREFORE, I WOULD MOVE AN AMENDMENT TO HIS MOTION. THIS IS MY AMENDMENT: IT IS THE RECOMMENDATION OF THIS COUNCIL IF THE ADMINISTRATION, (1) CARRY OUT THE OUTSTANDING FIELD-WORK STILL REQUIRED TO DETERMINE PATHS AND SITE SUITABILITY FOR THE PROVISION OF TELEVISION SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITIES OF BEAVER CREEK, CARMACKS, CARCROSS, DESTRUCTION BAY, HAINES JUNCTION, PELLY RIVER AND TESLIN. (2) FORWARD THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TOGETHER WITH A TECHNICAL BRIEF OF TOTAL NORTH COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED OF WHITEHORSE ON THE SAME SUBJECT TO A CONSULTANT FIRM FOR STUDY AND VERIFICATION. AND THAT THIS COUNCIL AND THE ADMINISTRATION MAKE STRONG REPRESENTATION TO THE HONOURABLE JEAN CHRETIEN, MINISTER OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT TO INSURE THAT FUNDS ARE MADE AVAILABLE TO CARRY OUT THE PROJECT IN THE YEAR 1974-75 AND THAT THE YUKON TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT UNDERTAKES TO CO-ORDINATE AND SUPERVISE THE INSTALLATIONS AND ONGOING MAINTENANCE OF THE PROJECT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I DO HAVE COPIES OF THAT AMENDMENT ALREADY TYPED UP FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST FROM THE CHAIR, I'M NOT SO SURE THAT THIS AMENDMENT CAN BE CONSIDERED. THE AMENDMENT IS NOT RELATED DIRECTLY, TO THE MOTION UNDER CONSIDERATION BUT I WOULD SUGGEST TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT THERE IS A MOTION UNDER CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE TO WHICH THAT PARTICULAR MOTION WOULD LEND ITSELF.

THIS MOTION INVOLVES THE DELETION OF AN ITEM IN BILL NO. 3 AND THAT IS THE SUBJECT MATERIAL OF THE MOTION AND REFERS IN THE SECOND PART OF THE MOTION TO HOW, IF THIS MOTION IS CARRIED, HOW THE COUNCIL WOULD WISH THESE MONIES TO BE SENT. I COULD NOT ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT AS GIVEN BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER UNDER THIS MOTION.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, BUT THEN THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS WOULD HAVE NO TROUBLE DEFEATING THE MOTION BEFORE THE HOUSE AT THE PRESENT TIME AND SUPPORTING THE AMENDMENT TO MOTION 18. IS THIS MY UNDERSTANDING?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE AMENDMENT THAT HAS BEEN STATED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE WOULD BE MORE FITTINGLY ATTACHED AND PERMISSIBLE UNDER MOTION 18 THAN IT WOULD BE UNDER THIS PARTICULAR MOTION.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN I WOULD ACCEPT YOUR RULING BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, WOULD I TAKE IT THEN THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS REALIZE THAT THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE AND THEY WOULDN'T HAVE ANY TROUBLE TO DEFEATING THE MOTION THAT IS BEFORE THE HOUSE NOW.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: (LAUGHTER)

MR. TANNER: IT WAS A GOOD TRY HILDA.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN IT WAS A VERY, VERY GOOD TRY BUT CERTAINLY IT IS A NEW MOTION, IN RELATION TO THIS PARTICULAR MOTION THAT IS BEFORE THE HOUSE, OR THAT WOULD BE A SOUND AMENDMENT TO MOTION 18. YES, IT IS AN ALTERNATIVE BUT NOT AN AMENDMENT TO THIS BECAUSE WE ARE DEALING SPECIFICALLY WITH AN ITEM TO BE REMOVED FROM THE MAIN ESTIMATES.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THAT CASE, I WILL CALL A QUESTION ON THE PRESENT MOTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL WE'VE GOT DISCUSSIONS FIRST.

MR. TANNER: HOW LONG?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL I UNDERSTAND THAT OCTOBER THE 4TH IS THE NEXT ELECTION.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: LAUGHTER

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I REALLY THINK THAT HERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY ESPECIALLY FOR THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CARMACKS-KLUANE TO SHOW CLEARLY AND SPECIFICALLY THAT SHE HAS REALLY HAD THE PEOPLE IN HER OWN CONSTITUENCY AT HEART. RIGHT NOW IT IS A MATTER OF WHETHER SHE IS PREPARED TO SAY, THE CONSTITUENTS OF HER CONSTITUENCY, AND IN FACT, THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON COME BEFORE ANY, AND I USE THE WORDS AGAIN, ANY ADMINISTRATIVE CONVENIENCE THAT CAN OCCUR.

HERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY, I HAVE ALWAYS SUPPORTED, AND I'LL SAY THIS QUITE OPENLY, I HAVE ALWAYS SUPPORTED GENERAL GROUND IMPROVEMENTS OVER PUBLIC BUILDINGS. AT THE SAME TIME, I HAVE ALSO INDICATED THAT WHERE THERE IS PRIORITY IN OTHER MATTERS, AND YOU HAVE TO LOOK FOR AN AREA WHERE YOU CAN DELETE, THIS IS ONE OF THE AREAS WHERE YOU CAN DELETE. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE KNOWS FULL WELL THAT ON OCCASION WE HAVE STOPPED CARRYING OUT CERTAIN WORK WHERE GROUND IMPROVEMENTS

HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED IN THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND GONE TO SOMETHING ELSE WHERE THERE IS MORE PRIORITY.

TO SOME EXTENT, THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM DAWSON HAVING HIS MIND I WOULD SUGGEST, I AM NOT TRYING TO READ HIS MIND. I THINK HE HAS IN HIS MIND, PERHAPS THERE IS REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THIS IS AN AREA THAT HAS MORE PRIORITY THAN GROUND IMPROVEMENTS. HE HAS A DOUBT. I THINK THAT IF ANY BENEFIT OF DOUBT HAS GOT TO BE GIVEN, IT HAS GOT TO BE GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. NOT TO BE GIVEN TO THE ADMINISTRATION BECAUSE IT HAS ALREADY BEEN SET UP AND AT THE SAME TIME, A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE HAS ALSO THE FUNCTION OF REMEMBERING THAT HE IS A MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL AS WELL.

WHEN HE GOES INTO ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HE DOESN'T STOP BEING A MEMBER OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL AND HE DOESN'T STOP SERVING THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA, I THINK WE WOULD ALL BE DOING A SOUND THING TO APPROVE THE MOTION BECAUSE IT WOULD SHOW QUITE CLEARLY THAT ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL ARE CONCERNED WITH PEOPLE REQUIREMENTS.

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE, I'M SURE, IF SHE GOES AGAINST IT SHE WILL SHOW TO THE PEOPLE SHE REPRESENTS THAT SHE DOESN'T CARE ABOUT THEM. ALREADY, MANY PEOPLE FROM HER CONSTITUENCY, ARE ALREADY EXPRESSING THAT POINT, THAT SHE DOESN'T CARE ABOUT THEM. BUT SHE DOESN'T CARE ABOUT THEM. ALREADY MANY PEOPLE FROM HER CONSTITUENCY ARE ALREADY EXPRESSING THAT POINT. BUT SHE DOESN'T CARE ABOUT THEM BECAUSE IF SHE VOTES AGAINST IT THEY DON'T NEED TO THINK ANY MORE THAN THEY KNOW THAT SHE DOESN'T CARE ABOUT THEM. IF THE OTHER EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER, COUNCILLOR TANNER, HE VOTES AGAINST IT, WELL, HE IS GOING TO VOTE AGAINST IT ON THE BASIS THAT HE DOESN'T CARE IN ANY EVENT ABOUT PEOPLE WHO LIVE OUTSIDE OF WHITEHORSE.

IT'S WONDERFUL TO NOTE THAT TWO MEMBERS FROM THE WHITEHORSE AREA; COUNCILLOR MCKINNON AND MYSELF SHOW THAT WE DO CARE ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE AND THAT'S WHY WE ARE PREPARED TO GIVE UP ANY TYPE OF GROUND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE WHITEHORSE AREA SO THAT PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF WHITEHORSE CAN BENEFIT FROM THIS PARTICULAR VOTE AND THIS PARTICULAR MOTION AND THEREFORE I WOULD SUGGEST, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THOSE MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE THAT HAVE HAD ANY DOUBTS SHOULD NOW

RECONSIDER WHAT THEY HAVE BEEN THINKING ABOUT AND SAY NOW THAT THEY ARE PREPARED TO SUPPORT THE MOTION AND HAVE THIS ITEM DELETED FOR GROUND IMPROVEMENTS AND HAVE THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF \$100,000 WHICH, AS HAS BEEN SHOWN, CAN BE FOUND FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING TO COMMUNITIES WHO HAVEN'T THE BENEFITS THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE WHITEHORSE AREA HAVE OF DECENT TV VIEWING. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AFTER THE LAST POLITICAL SPEECH COULD WE CALL THE QUESTION?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY FURTHER --

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, EVERYBODY KNOWS I'M NOT RUNNING FOR ELECTION SO IT'S NOT A POLITICAL SPEECH. BUT CERTAINLY I STILL HAVE THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON AT HEART AND I'M SHOWING IT. THIS IS OBVIOUSLY WHAT THE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE AND THE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE NORTH IS NOT SHOWING. THAT THEY HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE WHITEHORSE AND I HOPE THEY CHANGE THEIR MINDS AND RECOGNIZE THE FACT THAT THEY STILL ARE MEMBERS OF THE YUKON COMMUNITY SO SHOULD SUPPORT THE PEOPLE FROM SMALL COMMUNITIES AND TO GET THIS PARTICULAR AREA OF COMMUNITY IDEA THAT IT'S NEEDED. THEY NEED THIS THING AND THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN TV AS A NORMAL MATTER OF COURSE IN THIS DAY AND AGE.

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE THE QUESTION IS CALLED, JUST A FEW POINTS I WANT TO MAKE. ONE OF THEM IS, OBVIOUSLY THE MOTION IS GOING DOWN IN DEFEAT AS MOST OF THE MOTIONS THAT THIS HONOURABLE MEMBER BRINGS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE DO AND I THINK THAT ONE THING WE SHOULD NOTE THAT WITH THE MOTION'S PASSAGE, TV COULD HAVE BEEN PROVIDED IN THESE SMALLER COMMUNITIES THIS YEAR. OF THAT I HAVE NO DOUBT.

I THINK THERE IS ONE OTHER THING THAT SHOULD BE NOTED. WHEN ONE HAS BEEN IN POLITICS AS LONG AS SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS HAVE BEEN IN THIS HOUSE THEY LEARN THAT THE ART OF COMPRISE AND THE CONCEPT OF HALF A LOAF IS BETTER THAN NONE ARE SOMETIMES THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE THINGS IN POLITICS. I THINK IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE OPPOSITION IN THIS HOUSE HAS FORCED AT LEAST THROUGH WHAT THE AMENDMENT WILL BE TO THE MOTION IN MOTION No. 18. THAT AT LEAST WE ARE FINALLY FORCING THE GOVERNMENT INTO A COURSE OF ACTION THAT NOT THIS YEAR BUT AT LEAST FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR, WE WILL BE SEEING TELEVISION SERVICES BEING PROVIDED TO THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES SO I THINK

THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DAWSON AND OTHER HONOURABLE MEMBERS WHO FORM THE OPPOSITION IN THIS HOUSE CAN TAKE SOME PRIDE IN THE FACT THAT THEY HAVE AT LEAST FORCED THE GOVERNMENT'S HAND INTO THINKING OF HAVING THE PROVISION OF TELEVISION TO SMALLER COMMUNITIES AS PART OF PRIORITY, AS PART OF FUNDING OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT IN FUTURE YEARS.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words because I seem to be the OGRE.

SOME MEMBER: CORRECT.

Mrs. Watson continues: THAT OGRE WHO ALWAYS HAS TO BE SENSIBLE AND RESPONSIBLE AND IF THIS MOTION IS NOT DEFEATED THEN YOUR CHANCES OF GETTING TV ARE REALLY OUT THE WINDOW BECAUSE TV IS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY AND I'M SURE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD NOT LET US INCLUDE IT WITHIN THE BUDGET OR GIVE THE CAPITAL MONEY TO EXPEND THE \$100,000 BY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT. IF WE GO THE OTHER ROUTE WHERE THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT UNDERTAKES THE FUNDING, I THINK OUR CHANCES ARE MUCH BETTER OF GETTING IT THAN THIS WAY. THIS IS WHY I AM GOING TO BE VOTING AGAINST IT.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, just one final word I'd like to say. I'm not giving up hope yet because I think that some imagination in the minds of Councillor Stutter and certainly Councillor Rivett from Mayo. They're thinking a little bit on this now and I want them to think about it because they must recognize that both the members of the Executive Committee are really political babes in the wood. Perhaps on second thought, they are so inflexible, perhaps I should say political wooden babes because they just don't want to bend in this particular area. I'm just not going to give up, I have a little bit of confidence in the Member from Dawson and Mayo and see that if there is a requirement, this particular thing take place.

I'M STILL HOPING. I NEVER GIVE UP HOPE.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I asked for that recess because if I could have reconciled in my own mind that there was a way to do it. The way that has been suggested in the motion, I was more than willing to go along with it. If that couldn't have been done I was going to come back in with an amendment. Up to that point I

FOUND OUT THAT THE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE HAD ALREADY HAD AN AMENDMENT SUGGESTED AND ALTHOUGH I DON'T AGREE WITH EVERY SINGLE WORD IN HER AMENDMENT, NEVERTHELESS I DO AGREE WITH THE INTENT OF IT AND I SUPPORT THAT AMENDMENT FAR EASIER THAN I CAN IN DELETING PART OF THE BUDGET.

SOME MEMBER: QUESTION.

Mr. Chairman: JUST IN RESPECT OF THE AMENDMENT. FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE IN PROPOSING AMENDMENTS IT IS AN IMPERATIVE RULE THAT EVERY AMENDMENT MUST BE RELEVANT TO THE QUESTION ON WHICH THE AMENDMENT IS PROPOSED. EVERY AMENDMENT PROPOSED TO BE MADE EITHER TO A QUESTION OR TO A PROPOSED AMENDMENT SHOULD BE SO FRAMED THAT IF AGREED TO BY THE HOUSE THE QUESTION OR AMENDMENT AS AMENDED WOULD BE INTELLIGIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH ITSELF.

Mrs. Watson: QUESTION.

Mr. Chairman: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED. ARE YOU AGREED?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREED.

SOME MEMBERS: DISAGREED.

Mr. Chairman: WOULD THOSE WHO AGREED WITH THE MOTION KINDLY SIGNIFY. WOULD THOSE IN DISAGREEMENT WITH THE MOTION KINDLY SIGNIFY.

I SHALL DECLARE THAT THE MOTION HAS BEEN DEFEATED.

Mr. Chamberlist: I NOTICE THAT Mr. MILLER DID NOT AGREE WITH IT.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I WOULD NOW MOVE THAT Mr. CHAIRMAN READ THE PREAMBLE AND THE TITLE TO BILL No. 3.

Mr. Chairman: I WOULD THINK THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS BEEN AROUND THIS COMMITTEE LONG ENOUGH TO REALIZE THAT NO MOTION IS..

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I WAS JUST GOING TO ENSURE THAT IT BE READ.

Mr. Chairman: ORDER PLEASE. ORDER. IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER ON THIS BILL BEFORE WE READ THE PREAMBLE?

Mr. Tanner: PROCEED, Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. McKinnon: Oh, shit.

Mr. Chamberlist: Yea, go ahead.

Mr. Chairman: This is the First Appropriation Ordinance 1974/75.

WHEREAS IT APPEARS BY MESSAGE FROM JAMES SMITH, ESQ., COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND IN THE ESTIMATES ACCOMPANYING THE SAME THAT THE SUMS HEREINAFTER MENTIONED IN SCHEDULE "A" OF THIS ORDINANCE ARE REQUIRED TO DEFRAY CERTAIN EXPENSES OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AND FOR THE PURPOSE RELATING THERETO, FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDING THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF MARCH, 1975.

THEREFORE, THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, BY AND WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE SAID TERRITORY, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Bill No. 3, the First Appropriation Ordinance of 1974/75 be moved out of Committee without amendment.

Mr. Tanner: I second that motion.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Councillor Watson, seconded by Councillor Chamberlist, or pardon me, Councillor Tanner, that's the wrong line here.

IT HAS BEEN MOVED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT BILL NO. 3 BE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT. GEE, I WAS THINKING BACK TO THE GOOD OLD DAYS. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

Mr. McKinnon: BEFORE THE QUESTION IS CALLED, Mr. Chairman. I HAVE MADE MY POINT CLEAR DURING THE STUDY OF THE BUDGET THAT FOR SEVERAL AREAS OF IT, I WILL BE VOTING AGAINST THE BILL. OF COURSE THE AREA IN WHICH I FEEL MOST STRONGLY ABOUT WAS THE INCREASE OF SOME QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS IN THE LICENSING REVENUE SECTION OF THE BUDGET WHICH WAS NOT BROUGHT IN BY IMPOST OF THIS COUNCIL BUT WAS BROUGHT IN BY COMMISSIONER'S ORDER. I THINK THAT'S A COMPLETE NEGATION OF WHAT THIS COUNCIL SHOULD BE DOING AND I WILL HAVE MORE TO SAY ON A MOTION THAT I WILL BE PRESENTING TO THE HOUSE TOMORROW AND HOPEFULLY, WILL BE GAINING NOT A MAJORITY, BUT UNANIMOUS SUPPORT FOR IT.

I REALLY THINK WE NEGATED THE DUTIES THAT THE MEMBERS OF THIS HOUSE SHOULD HAVE. I DO FIND IT EXTREMELY DIFFICULT, Mr. Chairman, IN A BUDGET OF \$60,000,000 AND THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THERE HAS BEEN UNANIMOUS ACCORD AROUND THIS TABLE THAT THERE SHOULD BE A POLICY OF SOMEHOW BRINGING TELEVISION SERVICES TO THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES AND WE CAN'T FIND A \$100,000 OUT OF \$60,000,000 TO DO A PROJECT THAT WE KNOW AND ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL AGREED THAT THEY WANT TO SEE IN OPERATION IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

WHAT I SEE, Mr. Chairman, EVERY YEAR, THE ADMINISTRATION LEADING THE BUDGET THROUGH THE HOUSE AND NO AMENDMENTS BEING MADE TO THE BUDGET WHATSOEVER. IT REALLY PROVES, Mr. Chairman, THAT WE HAVE NOT PROGRESSED ONE IOTA TOWARDS ANY SEMBLANCE OF A RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE ANY SAY WHATSOEVER IN WHO PULLS THE FINANCIAL PURSE STRINGS IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT'S THE FEDS ALL THE WAY. LET'S JUST MAKE NO BONES ABOUT IT AND REALIZE THERE IS AN AWFUL LOT OF WORK AHEAD OF US BEFORE THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON TERRITORY HAVE SOME MEANINGFUL INPUT INTO THE BUDGET OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I INTEND TO VOTE AGAINST FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT OVER AND ABOVE WHAT HAS BEEN SAID BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST, I THINK THAT THE WORST POSSIBLE THING THAT HAPPENED IS THAT MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REFUSE TO ALLOW QUESTIONS ON TWO PARTICULAR VOTES PRIOR TO THE ESTIMATES BEING PASSED OUT OF COMMITTEE.

BY SO DOING, THEY DEPRIVE ME IN PARTICULAR, OF MY RIGHT TO ASK QUESTIONS ON THE HEALTH AND WELFARE BUDGET WHICH I COULD WELL SAY THAT I COULD WELL BE TERMED THE CRITIC IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA, HAVING HAD MUCH EXPERIENCE IN IT. BUT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE WAS REFUSED THE RIGHT TO ASK QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HOSPITAL WHERE ALMOST A THIRD OF THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION WAS COMING FROM TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS AND BY THAT METHOD THE MEMBERS WHO NOW SIT ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAVE SHOWN THEIR UNFITNESS IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA TO BE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON. REPRESENTING THOSE PEOPLE WHO ELECTED THEM TO OFFICE BECAUSE THEY HAVE SHOWN THAT THEY ARE NOT INTERESTED IN ALLOWING MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO QUESTION THE VALIDITY OF AREAS OF THE BUDGET AND BY CLOSING OFF THE DEBATE IN THE MANNER THAT THEY DEPRIVED ALL THE PEOPLE IN THE YUKON OF GETTING AREAS ANSWERED IN THE BUDGET WHICH NOW WILL REMAIN UNANSWERED. NO ONE CAN BE ASKED

NOW, AFTER THE BUDGET BECOMES A FACT ACCOMPLISHED, THIS IN ITSELF IS SO BAD THAT I HOPE THE PEOPLE OF THE YUKON WILL REMEMBER WHAT HAS TAKEN PLACE AND WILL MAKE SURE THAT THESE SAME PEOPLE WILL NEVER HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO IT OVER AGAIN. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SOME MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: DO YOU AGREE?

SOME MEMBERS: AGREE.

SOME MEMBERS: DISAGREE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THOSE WHO ARE AGREED, KINDLY SIGNIFY? I MUST DECLARE THAT THE MOTION IS CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WHAT IS YOUR PLEASURE AT THIS TIME? DO YOU WISH TO GO ON TO SESSIONAL PAPERS, BILLS, MOTIONS?

WE HAVE BILL NO. 4, FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF NOW, WHETHER NOW WE COULD GET THE PAPER ON KINDERGARTEN AND THE PROPOSED TAX FROM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD THIS BE AGREEABLE TO THE ADMINISTRATION?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. CHAIRMAN'S SUGGESTION THAT WE GO TO BILL NO. 4 SEEMS LIKE A REASONABLE ONE. I THINK ALL MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO CLEAR THAT ONE UP TOO.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF WE CAN, IF EITHER ONE OF THESE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WILL INDICATE NOW THAT THEY WILL BE BRINGING FORWARD THE PROGRAM FOR THE PROPOSED KINDERGARTENS.

MRS. WATSON: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL BE BRINGING IT FORWARD.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN?

MRS. WATSON: ON A DAY FOLLOWING, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ON A DAY FOLLOWING WHEN? NEXT CHRISTMAS, MR. CHAIRMAN?

MR. CHAIRMAN: COULD THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM CARMACKS-KLUANE INDICATE WHEN THEY WILL BE BRINGING THIS KINDERGARTEN BILL IN?

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS SOON AS THIS IS POSSIBLE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MRS. WATSON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WILL BE DEALT WITH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN?

MR. TANNER: VERY SHORTLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT WE WILL PROCEED FROM THIS GAME TO BILL NO. 4.

THIS IS THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE 1974.

MR. CHAIRMAN READS BILL NO. 4. CLEAR?

MR. MCKINNON: MR. CHAIRMAN, PRIOR TO GOING AND FURTHER, I WONDER WHETHER WE COULD HAVE SOME EXPLANATION FROM MR. MILLER ON THE 30% OF PERSONAL, THE GRANT IN LIEU OF INCOME TAX IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,046,000. THIS REPRESENTS 30% OF PERSONAL AND 10% OF CORPORATE INCOME TAXES ESTIMATED TO BE PAID BY YUKONERS. HOW CLOSE AN ESTIMATE DOES MR. MILLER FEEL THAT THAT AMOUNT IS?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN'T GIVE YOU ANY DEGREE OF CERTAINTY THAT THOSE FIGURES ARE CORRECT. THE FIRST YEAR THAT THIS WAS PUT INTO PLAY FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY WAS THE 1972-73 FISCAL YEAR. I HAVE JUST ASKED THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE TO GIVE US A COMPARISON BETWEEN THEIR ESTIMATES AND THE ACTUAL BECAUSE THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THEY ARE AVAILABLE. INCOME TAX FIGURES ARE NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL TWO YEARS AFTER FILING OF THE RETURNS. NOW I'M ASSURED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE THAT THE FORMULA THAT THEY USE TO CALCULATE THIS GRANT IN LIEU OF INCOME TAX IS IDENTICAL TO THE FORMULA THAT THEY USE IN THE PROVINCES, TO CALCULATE THEIR INCOME TAX ABATEMENT WHICH IS THEN ADJUSTED TWO YEARS AFTER THE TAX YEAR.

MR. MCKINNON: THE POINT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I AGREE THAT THAT WOULD PROBABLY BE A SENSIBLE

FORMULA AS FAR AS THE ABATEMENT IN REGARDS TO PERSONAL INCOME TAX, THE AMOUNT COMING BACK WOULD BE PRETTY CLOSE, BUT CERTAINLY IT'S A WHOLE NEW BALL GAME IN THE FIELD OF CORPORATION TAX WHERE MOST OF THE CORPORATIONS IN THE PROVINCE WOULD BE PAYING THAT CORPORATE TAX IN THE PROVINCE AND THAT WOULD BE REFLECTED BY THE AMOUNT OF REBATE COMING BACK FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. OF COURSE THIS IS NOT TRUE IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM IN THE YUKON TERRITORY WHERE ALL THE MAJOR CORPORATE STRUCTURES ARE PAYING TAX IN OTHER PROVINCES. SO REALLY THE PROVINCES ARE BENEFITING FROM THE FORMULA TO OUR ABATEMENTS AND WE ARE SUFFERING BECAUSE OF IT. AND THE POINT IS THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS MAKING THIS TYPE OF DELINIATION THAT THEY WANT TO BE ABLE TO TREAT THE YUKONERS AS ANY OTHER TERRITORY. IF THEY AREN'T MR. CHAIRMAN, THEN THEY HAD BETTER GET SOME ESTIMATED FIGURES THAT ARE PRETTY CLOSE TO FACT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE CORPORATE INCOME TAX ABATEMENT THAT APPLIES IN THE YUKON TERRITORY IS CALCULATED ON THE SAME BASIS AS CORPORATE INCOME TAX ABATEMENTS FOR THE PROVINCES. I THINK AS ALL MEMBERS KNOW, CORPORATIONS FILE THEIR INCOME TAX STATEMENT SHOWING THE PROVINCE OF EARNING. PERSONAL INCOME TAXES ARE FILED ON THE BASIS OF RESIDENTS ON DECEMBER 31ST OF THE TAX YEAR. SO CORPORATE INCOME TAX, I'M REASONABLY SURE MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT SUBJECT TO A COMPARISON BETWEEN ESTIMATE AND ACTUAL THAT WE ARE GETTING WHAT WE ARE ENTITLED TO. WHERE WE HAVE OUR MAJOR PROBLEM IS THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT IS EARNED IN THE YUKON TERRITORY BY SUMMER SEASONAL PEOPLE WHO THEN LEAVE THE TERRITORY TO RESIDE IN ALBERTA OR BRITISH COLUMBIA FOR THE PERIOD OF THE WINTER AND FILE THEIR INCOME TAX RETURNS DOWN THERE. WE DON'T GET CREDIT FOR THAT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: PERHAPS, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL PUT IT TO MR. MILLER THIS WAY AND I THINK THE POINT THAT HAS BEEN RAISED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST IS SOMETHING THAT HAS DISTURBED ME FOR MANY MANY YEARS. TAKE FOR INSTANCE THE WHITE PASS CORPORATION. THEIR OPERATIONS ARE BOTH IN B.C. AND THE YUKON. THEY DO NOT SEPARATE THEIR EARNINGS BECAUSE THEY CANNOT SEPARATE THEIR EARNINGS. THEY CAN'T SEPARATE THEIR EARNINGS BECAUSE PART OF THE TRAFFIC THAT TAKE PLACE, TAKES PLACE COMMENCING FROM VANCOUVER, B.C. AND PART OF IT GOES WHEN IT'S EARNINGS ARE FROM SKAGWAY INTO THE YUKON. NOW THAT'S ONE COMPANY. NOW THERE ARE MINING

COMPANIES WHO HAVE OPERATIONS AND DO BUSINESS IN VARIOUS PROVINCES AND THE YUKON AND THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. AND CONSEQUENTLY WHEN THEY FILE THEIR RETURNS, THEY FILE THEIR RETURNS FROM THEIR HOME OFFICE. NOW I KNOW THIS, I'VE TAKEN THIS UP WITH VARIOUS PEOPLE IN OTTAWA AND THEY HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE NO WAY OF SEPARATING THESE ITEMS AND IT IS BECAUSE THIS SITUATION HAS DEVELOPED OVER MANY MANY YEARS THAT THERE WAS A REQUEST MADE AND I'M NOT SURE WHETHER I HAVE THE LETTER IN PARTICULAR BUT I THINK I WROTE THE LETTER MYSELF POINTING OUT THE ONLY WAY TO OVER COME THIS IS TO MAKE EVERY CORPORATION THAT DOES BUSINESS IN THE YUKON A YUKON CORPORATION AND THAT THEY FILE THEIR RETURNS SEPARATELY FOR THE YUKON AND IN THAT WAY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT KNOW WHAT INCOME TAX HAS BEEN PAID. AT THE MOMENT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WHITEHORSE WEST IS QUITE CORRECT. WE TAKE A BEATING BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW WHAT CORPORATION TAXES ARE BEING PAID TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM EARNINGS DISTINCTLY FROM THE YUKON. AND THE ANVIL MINING CORPORATION IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH OF IT GOES TO THEIR PARENT COMPANY AS WELL. AND THIS IS SOMETHING. THEY HAVE A PARENT COMPANY. AND THIS IS SOMETHING AS WELL THAT HAS TO BE LOOKED INTO. I THINK THAT THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE PRESSURING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE LEGISLATION THAT ALL CORPORATIONS WHETHER THEY BE CORPORATIONS WITH A NATIONAL CHARTER OR NOT, BE REGISTERED AS CORPORATIONS WITHIN THE MEANING OF OUR LEGISLATION AND FILE THEIR RETURNS ON THEIR PROFIT EARNINGS AND TAX PAYMENTS IN THE YUKON.

MR. MILLER: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I CAN ONLY REITERATE WHAT I SAID EARLIER. CORPORATE INCOME TAX IS FILED BY PROVINCE OF EARNING AND CERTAINLY I'M SURE THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE DOING BUSINESS IN THE YUKON PARTICULARLY WHEN YOU GET TO AGENTS AND THESE TYPES OF PEOPLE, WHERE THE YUKON DOESN'T GET CREDIT FOR THE AMOUNT EARNED BY THE SENIOR CORPORATIONS. BUT WHITE PASS WOULD HAVE TO FILE AN INCOME TAX SHOWING EARNINGS IN B.C., IN ALASKA AND IN THE YUKON TOO. ANVIL MINING CORPORATION FILES AN INCOME TAX SHOWING EARNINGS IN THE YUKON.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: LET ME PUT IT THIS WAY, MR. CHAIRMAN. TAKE THE WHITE PASS CORPORATION WHO HAVE THEIR EARNINGS BULKED. THEIR FINANCIAL STATEMENT EACH YEAR SHOW A BULK EARNING IN EXACTLY THE SAME WAY AS ALL THE CORPORATIONS

THAT HAVE THEIR HEAD OFFICES, THEY SHOW A BULK EARNING AND I HAVEN'T SEEN A BREAKDOWN OF THE WHITE PASS. AND I UNDERSTAND THE WHITE PASS ARE GOING TO HAVE A SHAREHOLDERS MEETING HERE AND I HAVE 24 LITTLE OLD SHARES WITH WHITE PASS, YOU KNOW BECAUSE OF SOME REASON THAT I WANTED TO GET TO SPEAK TO PEOPLE AND THEY DIDN'T WANT TO TALK TO ME AND THE BEST WAY WAS TO BUY SOME SHARES AND THEN I CAN GO TO A SHAREHOLDERS MEETING AND THEN TALK.

AND I'M GOING TO GO THERE AND ASK THEM TO DELINEATE THE EARNINGS THAT THEY GET IN B.C. AND THE EARNINGS HERE AND YOU WILL FIND THAT THE ANSWER WILL BE THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE A BREAKDOWN IN THAT PARTICULAR AREA. THEY CAN'T HAVE A BREAKDOWN IN THIS AREA. AND THIS IS THE SAME WITH ALL CORPORATIONS.

MR. MILLER: I SUBMIT MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THEY CAN HAVE A BREAKDOWN. I CAN DO IT FOR THEM IF THEY GIVE ME THE FIGURES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WHEN THEY CHARGE A RATE STRUCTURE YOU ONLY HAVE TO LOOK AT THEIR RATE BOOK AND THEIR RATE BOOK WILL SHOW A FREIGHT CHARGE, LET'S SAY FROM VANCOUVER TO WHITEHORSE. THEN THEIR RATE STRUCTURE WILL SHOW A RATE STRUCTURE FROM WHITEHORSE TO ALL THE OTHER COMMUNITIES. NOW THIS IS EARNING POWER WITHIN THE YUKON. THEY CAN RELATE THAT, BUT HOW CAN THEY BREAK DOWN THEIR EARNINGS WHICH ARE FROM VANCOUVER ALL THE WAY IN?

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, BEFORE THE MEMBER ANSWERS THE QUESTION, WE'VE GOT AN EXPERT HERE I THINK. HE'S WORKED FOR THE COMPANY WHICH IS EARNING FUNDS ALL OVER THE WORLD. PERHAPS HE CAN GIVE US SOME INDICATION MR. HUBERDEAU HOW HIS COMPANY WOULD HAVE DONE IT IN THE PAST.

MR. HUBERDEAU: CORPORATIONS FILE TAX. HARD AIR FOR EXAMPLE FILES TAX AND GIVES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT A NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AND THE GROSS SALES BURNED IN EACH JURISDICTION. AND THAT'S USED TO APPORTION THE TAX.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: JUST A MINUTE. NOW THAT'S THE GROSS EARNED. ALRIGHT NOW, DO THEY GIVE FOR EACH AREA THE NET EARNINGS AS A RESULT OF OPERATIONS IN THAT AREA?

MR. HUBERDEAU: NO. THE TAXES ARE APPORTIONED ON THE BASIS OF WEIGHTED EMPLOYEES AND GROSS SALES IN THE JURISDICTION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: JUST ENLIGHTEN ME A LITTLE BIT MORE. WHEN YOU SAY ON GROSS SALES IN THE JURISDICTION, IS IT MEANT MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IN SOME AREAS WHERE YOU CAN HAVE GROSS SALES HIGHER THAN OTHERS, THE COST OF OPERATING AND GETTING THOSE GROSS SALES MAY BE HIGHER, ON THE OTHER HAND THEY MAY BE LOWER. SO THAT THE NET PROFITS CAN BE GREATER IN ONE AREA THAN ANOTHER.

MR. TANNER: WELL THAT'S JUST BUSINESS.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THAT AGREED WITH?

MR. HUBERDEAU: IT CAN BE AGREED WITH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. NOW I'M SUGGESTING THEREFORE THAT THE EARNINGS IN THE YUKON BECOME FAR GREATER EARNINGS THAN WHAT THEY ARE IN OTHER PROVINCES WHERE THEY FILE THEIR RETURNS AND THEREFORE EVEN IF IT'S BASED, MR. CHAIRMAN, ON WHAT HAS BEEN SAID BY THE TREASURER, IT MAY WELL BE THAT THE TRUE NET RESULT OF INCOME TAX PAYABLE IS NOT SHOWN BUT AN AVERAGE BASED OVER THE NUMBER OF AREAS THE GROSS SALES ARE OBTAINED FROM. IS THIS CORRECT?

MR. HUBERDEAU: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE JUST INDICATED THE BASIS ON WHICH THE RETURNS ARE FILED BY A CORPORATION. I WON'T TRY TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THAT'S FAIR AND EQUITABLE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: AH! WELL ALRIGHT. O.K. LET'S GO ON FROM THERE. SO AT LEAST WE'VE GOT NOW AN ADMISSION, I WOULD SAY THAT THE METHOD THAT'S BEING USED IS NOT NECESSARILY FAIR AND EQUITABLE. AND I'M SUGGESTING MR. CHAIRMAN THAT THE ONLY FAIR AND EQUITABLE MANNER FOR US IN THE YUKON TO KNOW WHAT CORPORATION TAX IS BEING PAID IS THAT THE CORPORATION FILE ITS RETURN FOR ITS GROSS EARNINGS AND ACCORDINGLY FOR THE TAXES THAT IT PAYS WITHIN THE YUKON. WOULDN'T THAT BE A FAIR AND EQUITABLE MANNER OF ASSESSING THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT'S BEING PAID FROM EARNINGS IN THE YUKON?

MR. HUBERDEAU: I WOULD THINK THAT IF ALL THE SALES ARE MADE OUT OF THE YUKON AND ALL THE COSTS ARE INCURRED IN THE YUKON, THAT IN THAT INSTANCE ALL THE PROFITS WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE YUKON.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS JUST ONE THING WRONG WITH THE THEORY THAT THE HONOURABLE MEMBER HAS PUT FORWARD AND THAT'S THE FACT THAT EACH JURISDICTION IS GOING TO BE LOOKING AFTER ITS OWN AND EACH ONE IS GOING TO BE IN THERE

MAKING SURE THAT THEY GET THEIR FAIR SHARE AND BY THAT METHOD ALONE, OBVIOUSLY THE RETURNING CORPORATION IS GOING TO BE VERY CAREFUL IT DOESN'T TREAD ON ANY ONE OF THE THREE JURISDICTION'S TOES. SO OBVIOUSLY, IF THEY INFLATE IN ONE AREA, IT'S GOING TO APPEAR AS A DEFICIT IN THE OTHER AREA AND SO THE ONE THAT HAS THE DEFICIT IS GOING TO ACCUSE THE WHITE PASS AS NOT PUTTING IN A FAIR RETURN AND CONSEQUENTLY, IT IS GOING TO TAKE THEM TO COURT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SO YOUR ARGUMENT DOESN'T HOLD WATER.

MR. TANNER: I DON'T UNDERSTAND IT. DO YOU MERV?

MRS. WATSON: YES, I DO.

MR. MCKINNON: OUR ONLY HOPE IS THAT YOU GO DOWN TO WHITE PASS MEETINGS AND STRAIGHTEN THEM OUT.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I UNDERSTOOD THE LAST EXPLANATION AS WELL AS I UNDERSTOOD THE EXPLANATION OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR WHITEHORSE --.

SOME MEMBERS: CONFUSION AND LAUGHTER.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAYBE I COULD JUST MAKE ONE POINT THAT WOULD HELP CLARIFY THIS. THIS FORMULA THAT IS USED TO CALCULATE INCOME TAX ABATEMENT IS A FORMULA THAT HAS BEEN AGREED UPON BETWEEN THE FEDERAL AND TEN PROVINCIAL PROVINCES. NOW CERTAINLY WE HAVEN'T HAD ANY INPUT INTO IT BUT WE DON'T HAVE A STAFF OF 200 PEOPLE WHO ARE WORKING ON IT EITHER, WHICH MOST OF THE PROVINCES HAVE. SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT INPUT WE COULD PUT INTO IT AT THIS STAGE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES BUT THE POINT THAT'S BEING MADE!! MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER IS SO CORRECT. HE HAS SAID THAT THE FORMULA WAS CREATED BETWEEN TEN PROVINCIAL JURISDICTIONS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND NOT US! AND WE'RE SAYING WHY AREN'T WE CONSIDERED WHEN THE EARNING POWER IS RIGHT HERE? THAT'S THE POINT. I AGREE THAT WE HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA. AND THAT'S WHAT WRONG. THAT'S THE THING THAT'S WRONG WITH IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE ONLY POINT THAT I HAD NOTICED DURING THIS DEBATE IS THAT IN 1972, THE TOTAL ABATEMENT WOULD HAVE AMOUNTED TO 3.68 MILLION. AND THEN IN '73 IT AMOUNTED

TO A TOTAL ABATEMENT OF 24.6 WHICH IS ALMOST A ONE MILLION DOLLAR INCREASE. BUT NOW IN PROJECTING FROM 73 TO 74, WE'RE PROJECTING LESS THAN A MILLION DOLLAR INCREASE. WE'RE GOING FROM 4.6 TO 5.4. I'M WONDERING WHY? HOW DOES THAT RELATE? A LESSER SHARE OF THE POT?

MR. MILLER: NO IT'S NOT A LESSER SHARE OF THE POT. I THINK WHAT THAT INDICATES BETWEEN THE 72-73 AND 73-74 FISCAL YEARS, IT WAS A LARGER RATE OF GROWTH THEN WHAT'S BEING EXPERIENCED BETWEEN THE YEAR BEFORE.

NOW YOU MUST ALL RECOGNIZE THAT NONE OF THESE FIGURES INCLUDE TAX FROM ANVIL MINING CORPORATION OR WHITEHORSE COPPER OR ANY OF THE MAJOR MINING OPERATIONS BECAUSE THEY DON'T PAY TAX AS YET. THEY ARE STILL IN THEIR TAX FREE PERIOD.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ONE MORE YEAR ISN'T IT?

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS IS THEIR LAST YEAR.

MR. MILLER: WELL ANVIL MINING CORPORATION LAST YEAR SET UP FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ON THEIR BOOKS AS DEFERRED TAX WHICH MEANS THEY ARE OUT OF THE THREE YEAR TAX FREE PERIOD, BUT THEY'VE STILL GOT AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEARS OF ACCUMULATED CAPITAL COST ALLOWANCE AND DEPRECIATION TO USE UP.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A QUESTION I WOULD LIKE TO ASK MR. MILLER. DOES MR. MILLER CONSIDER MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE YUKON IS GETTING IT'S FAIR SHARE OF CREDIT FOR THE TAX THAT IS PAID BY WAY OF INCOME TAX VIA PERSONAL TAXES AND CORPORATION TAXES?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAINTAIN THAT WE ARE GETTING OUR FAIR SHARE UNDER THE SYSTEM THAT IS BEING USED. I QUALIFIED IT. PERSONAL INCOME TAX WE HAVE DETERMINED, THAT THERE IS ROUGHLY 25% OF THE MONEY EARNED IN THE YUKON BY PEOPLE WORKING HERE IS NOT REPORTED AS INCOME TAX IN THE YUKON TERRITORY. UNFORTUNATELY THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT HAS NOT DEEMED IT ADVISEABLE TO, ON PERSONAL INCOME TAX, HAVE ON THE REPORT WHERE THE INCOME WAS EARNED. THEY STILL USE THE RESIDENCE AS OF DECEMBER 31ST. OF THAT AREA, I AGREE WE ARE BEING SHORT SHIFTED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN WHAT AMOUNT OF DOLLARS APPROXIMATELY WOULD YOU SAY?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE'RE PROBABLY TALKING SOMEWHERE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND TO A MILLION DOLLARS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: JUST FROM THE CHAIR AGAIN, I'M WONDERING IF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER COULD ADVISE ME AS TO WHAT THE GRANT IN LIEU OF TAX WAS IN FACT IN LAST YEAR'S FISCAL AGREEMENT WITH OTTAWA?

MR. MILLER: SORRY MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT FIGURE. IT WAS APPROXIMATELY 4.5 MILLION DOLLARS I BELIEVE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'LL JUST ASK MADAM CLERK TO SEE IF SHE COULD SCARE UP A COPY OF THE BILL. I'LL TELL YOU THE REASON WHY. I'M CURIOUS BECAUSE - 4.5? IF IT WAS 4.5 IN THE AGREEMENT WE HAD A CORPORATE INCOME ABATEMENT OF A TOTAL OF 4.6. WHAT HAPPENS TO THE OTHER, YOU KNOW, DO WE AT ANY POINT GET CREDIT FOR THE OVERAGE.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIGURE, I THINK IF YOU'RE READING OFF THE SESSIONAL PAPER THAT WAS TABLED ON THIS MATTER, THAT WAS THE EXACT FIGURE. THAT WAS THE AMOUNT THAT WAS IN THE LAST YEAR'S FISCAL AGREEMENT.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE FIGURE I THINK, THAT YOU ARE READING OFF THE SESSIONAL PAPER THAT WAS TABLED ON THIS MATTER. THAT WAS THE EXACT FIGURE. THAT WAS THE AMOUNT THAT WAS IN THE LAST YEAR'S FISCAL AGREEMENT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WELL HOW COULD IT BE IN THE FISCAL AGREEMENT. WAS THAT STRICTLY COINCIDENCE?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE GRANT IN LIEU OF INCOME TAX, WAS AN ESTIMATED CALCULATED FIGURE. IT IS NOT THE ACTUAL FIGURE. THE ACTUALS WON'T BE KNOWN FOR TWO YEARS AFTER THAT DATE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: BUT IF THERE IS ANY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ACTUAL AND THE ESTIMATED LIKE IN THIS AGREEMENT, FOR INSTANCE IN THIS AGREEMENT, WE ARE GETTING A GRANT IN LIEU FOR 5.4 AND IT IS THEN SUBSEQUENTLY FOUND. THAT INDEED IT WAS 6.4. WOULD WE AT SOME POINT GET THE CREDIT OF THAT EXTRA MILLION.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, OUR AGREEMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, NO WE WILL GET THE BENEFIT OF THAT EXTRA MILLION. BUT CONVERSELY IF IT IS ONLY 4.4, WE WON'T GET STUCK TO PAY BACK THE MILLION DOLLARS. THIS IS A VERY

REAL SITUATION MR. CHAIRMAN. THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN LAST YEAR WAS STUCK WITH PAYING BACK 21 MILLION DOLLARS OF MONEY THEY HAD TWO YEARS BEFORE. IT IS A REAL LIVE SITUATION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER MR. CHAIRMAN, WHILE MR. CHAIRMAN IS LOOKING AT THE DOCUMENTS, COULD WE GET SOME EXPLANATION AS TO WHY THERE WAS A REDUCTION FROM 10% TO 5% OF THE POSSIBLE TRANSFER FROM PROJECT CAPITAL TO, RATHER FROM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TO PROJECT CAPITAL. WHAT WAS THE BACKGROUND OF THAT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS AN INSTANCE WHERE THE OLD AGREEMENT USED TO SAY 10%. WE HAVE ONLY USED THAT SECTION OF THE AGREEMENT, ONCE. IT WAS FOR A MATTER OF \$400,000. THE PROBLEM THAT CAME ABOUT WHICH CAUSED THE CHANGE, HAPPENED WITH OUR FRIENDS ACROSS THE MOUNTAINS WHO USED THE THING INDISCRIMINATELY. I MAY USE THAT TERM. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FELT THEY HAD TO CUT BACK FROM 10% TO 5% TO CONTROL THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES NOT THE YUKON.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WON'T CREATE A PROBLEM.

MR. MILLER: QUITE FRANKLY MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DIDN'T OPOSE THE CHANGE BECAUSE AS FAR AS WE ARE CONCERNED, THAT SECTION OF THE AGREEMENT COULD BE DROPPED ALTOGETHER. BUT FOR CONFORMITY OF AGREEMENTS, THEY WANTED THE THING CHANGED. WE HAD NO OBJECTION TO IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IF WE CAN, IF WE NEEDED TO DO A TRANSFER FROM O & M TO CAPITAL, WE COULD DO IT IN THE OVERALL BUDGET I THINK.

MR. TANNER: IT WOULD BE MORE LIKELY THE OTHER WAY.

MR. MILLER: ACCORDANCE WITH THIS AGREEMENT, THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IN THAT CASE, CAN WE GO FROM PROJECT CAPITAL TO O & M? IN OTHER WORDS CAN WE TRANSFER FROM ONE TO THE OTHER?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS A ONE SIDED AGREEMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: UNFORTUNATELY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'M STILL CONFUSED ON THIS QUESTION OF THESE FIGURES. WHEN WE TALK IN THE BILL BEFORE US OF A FIGURE EQUAL TO \$5,446,000, IS THAT IN FACT THE ESTIMATED FIGURE FOR LAST YEAR?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT REFLECTS THE ESTIMATED INCOME TAX THAT WILL BE PAID IN THE YUKON ON THE ABATEMENT THAT WE WOULD BE INTITLED TO ON INCOME TAX PAID IN 1974.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: SO THIS CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

Mr. MILLER: THE CURRENT TAXATION YEAR, 1974.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WHICH IS A CALENDAR YEAR.

Mr. MILLER: WHICH IS A CALENDAR YEAR EXCEPT FOR CORPORATION.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WHAT I AM HAVING DIFFICULTY EQUATING IS THE FIGURES, HOW YOU CAN FORGET IN YOUR BILL OF ONE YEAR AGO IN 1973, YOU.. THERE IS SOMETHING WRONG HERE SOMEWHERE BECAUSE WHAT YOU DO IS, YOU SAY, SOMETHING IS WRONG EITHER THIS BILL OR I SHOULD SAY THE SESSIONAL PAPER IS OUT OF WHACK. THIS IS WHAT I AM GETTING AT. FOR THIS REASON, YOU SAID THIS BILL WAS ASSENTED TO OF 1973. YOU SAID, AS PAYMENT IN LIEU OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY LEVYING PERSONAL CORPORATE INCOME TAX, AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO \$4,637,000. THIS WAS, AS YOU SAY, PROJECTED. THIS IS WHAT WAS ASSUMED WOULD BE RAISED BY CORPORATE IN INCOME TAX. IS THIS CORRECT?

Mr. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: ALRIGHT, IN YOUR PAPER THOUGH, YOU SAY THAT YOU TAKE PERSONAL INCOME ABATEMENT IN A 1973. WHAT YOU ARE SAYING HERE IS THE ACTUAL INCOME FOR BOTH PERSONAL AND CORPORATE INCOMES WAS \$4,637,196 AGAIN.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN THAT IS THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT. THE ACTUAL AMOUNTS OF 1973 WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE UNTIL JUNE OF 1975. FOR PERSONAL INCOME TAX AND CORPORATE INCOME TAX IT WILL JANUARY OF 1976 BEFORE THE ACTUAL TAX ABATEMENT WILL BE KNOWN FOR 1973.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: SO THESE FIGURES IN FACT ARE BASED ON.....

Mr. MILLER: THAT IS THE BEST INFORMATION THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: BUT IT IS NOT THE ACTUALS?

Mr. MILLER: IT IS NOT THE ACTUALS.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: THAT IS GOOD TO KNOW. I WAS BASING THAT ON ACTUALS.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: DOES THIS MEAN AS WELL Mr. CHAIRMAN, THAT THERE IS AT LEAST TWO YEARS BEFORE WE KNOW WHETHER WE ARE ABLE TO MEET OUR WAY, THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT IS ABLE TO MEET ITS OWN WAY, ITS OWN COMMITMENTS WITHOUT BEING SUBSIDIZED IN ANY WAY ON O & M. IS THIS RIGHT?

Mr. MILLER: NO I DON'T THINK THAT WOULD BE QUITE CORRECT Mr. CHAIRMAN. TO BE PRECISE ABOUT IT, YES IT WOULD TAKE TWO YEARS AFTER THE DAY WE THOUGHT WE COULD MAKE IT. BUT IN MY CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE A COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO WHILE I WAS IN OTTAWA, I HAVE ASKED THEM TO HAVE A LOOK AT THEIR CALCULATION, PARTICULARLY WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR MINING CORPORATIONS WITHIN THE TERRITORY COMING ON THE TAX STREAM, EITHER IN 75 OR IN 76 SO THEY TAKE THAT INTO THEIR CALCULATIONS FOR ESTIMATING PURPOSES RATHER THAN HAVING TO WAIT TWO TO TWO AND A HALF YEARS AFTER THEY GO ON STREAM BEFORE WE GET THAT REFLECT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: WHEN THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE HAVE CONCLUDED THEIR DISCUSSIONS RELATED TO THE BUDGET, WHO IN ACTUAL FACT GOES AND SITS DOWN AND NEGOTIATES THAT BUDGET WITH THE TREASURY BOARD FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY? WHO ARE COMPOSED OF THAT?

Mr. MILLER: NOBODY GOES AND SITS WITH THE TREASURY BOARD. THE PROCEDURE THAT HAS BEEN FOLLOWED FOR SOME NUMBER OF YEARS, EVER SINCE I'VE BEEN HERE AT LEAST, I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED BEFORE THAT, THERE IS AN INTER DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL TERRITORIAL FINANCIAL RELATIONS. THE COMMITTEE IS COMPRISED OF MEMBERS OF THE INDIAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT, MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TREASURY BOARD SECRETARIAT. THE COMBINED BOARD SITS AND ASKS QUESTIONS OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, EITHER THE COMMISSIONER OR MYSELF.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THIS AN INDIVIDUAL OR DO WE SEND DOWN A TEAM OF NEGOTIATORS.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT VARIES. I'VE BEEN THERE WITH THE COMMISSIONER, I'VE BEEN THERE AS TREASURER, I'VE BEEN THERE WITH THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATION, I'VE BEEN THERE WITH FIVE OR SIX DEPARTMENTS HEADS AND THE COMMISSIONER. SO IT VARIES FROM YEAR TO YEAR. RECENTLY, IT HAS BEEN EITHER THE COMMISSIONER AND MYSELF AS TREASURER OR ALTERNATELY THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER AND MYSELF AS TREASURER. RECENTLY WE WERE DOWN. I WAS THERE AND FRANK FINGLAND WAS THERE AND JOHN HUBERDEAU WAS THERE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WOULD IT NOT SEEM REASONABLE, WHAT I AM REALLY GETTING AT, I CAN RECALL SERVING ON SEVERAL FINANCE COMMITTEES IN THE PAST AND IT SEEMS THAT WHEN WE GOT THE INPUT AT THE OTTAWA LEVEL BEFORE THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE THAT YOU HAVE REFERRED TO, THAT WE OFTEN GOT THEM TO CHANGE THEIR MINDS AND WE CAME OUT BETTER FOR IT. WE GOT A BETTER APPROPRIATION THAN WHAT INITIALLY WAS ASKED FOR. I AM JUST WONDERING IF IT WOULDN'T BE ADVISABLE TO HAVE ON THAT COMMITTEE, ONE OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT ALL TIMES, WHEN NEGOTIATING AGREEMENTS WITH OTTAWA.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN IN THE LAST THREE YEARS THAT I HAVE BEEN ATTENDING THE INTER DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS, WE HAVE GOT EVERY SINGLE CENT THAT WE HAVE ASKED FOR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: OH YES, BUT WE WENT FURTHER THAN THAT. WE TALKED THEM INTO MORE MONEY ON CERTAIN PROJECTS AND THIS TYPE OF THING.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ABILITY TO GET MONEY IN THE LAST THREE YEARS HAS ONLY BEEN LIMITED BY OUR ABILITY TO SPEND AND THINK OF NEW PROGRAMS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: WE CERTAINLY CERTAINLY HAVE FOUND SOME NEW ONES FOR THIS TRIP.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T DISAGREE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IN SERIOUSNESS I THINK THAT SOME ELECTED MEMBER SHOULD BE ON THAT BUT OF COURSE THAT IS ONE OPINION.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT ITS THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THEMSELVES, THEY SHOULD BE PRETTY FIRM AND SAY THAT IN FUTURE THERE SHOULD BE SOME POLITICAL INPUT, AT LEAST ONE OF THEM, INTO THE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE TREASURY BOARD ON FINANCE. WHEN I SAY THE TREASURY BOARD, I AM TALKING ABOUT THOSE PARTICULAR OFFICERS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR AGREEING TO THE BUDGET BECAUSE HOW CAN THERE REALLY BE POLITICAL INPUT SIMPLY, AT AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE LEVEL. I KNOW, I WILL SAY THIS THAT I WAS VERY LAX IN NOT INSISTING THAT THIS TAKE PLACE BECAUSE IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN. UP UNTIL ABOUT FIVE YEARS AGO, THERE WERE ALWAYS MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE THAT WERE ABLE TO PUT SOME POLITICAL INPUT IN JUST BY BEING THERE.

IT SHOWS THAT IF YOU MOVE TOWARD A RESPONSIBLE AREA OF GOVERNMENT, THE ONLY WAY THAT YOU CAN REALLY GET RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IS THROUGH THE PURSE STRINGS. AT LEAST HAVING KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT TAKES PLACE THERE WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE SOME CHANGES AND IT IS UP TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO MAKE THAT RECOMMENDATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: HAVE YOU ANYTHING FURTHER ON PART 2? PART 3 (1) SUBJECT TO THIS PART, THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO ENTER INTO AND EXECUTE ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AN AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA WHICH WILL PROVIDE, (A) THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA WILL PAY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY (1) AS AN OPERATING GRANT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1974-75, AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO \$5,187,000. (2) AS A PAYMENT IN LIEU OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY LEVYING PERSONAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO \$5,446,000 AND, (3) IN RESPECT OF THE PERIOD FROM THE FIRST DAY OF APRIL, 1974 THE 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 1975 AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO ALL MONIES OWED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AND BECOMING DUE IN THAT YEAR UNDER A LOAN AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO, PURSUANT TO AN ORDINANCE LISTED IN THE SCHEDULE TO THIS ORDINANCE, MINUS ALL MONIES PAID TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN THAT YEAR IN RESPECT OF SELF-LIQUIDATING LOANS MADE BY THE TERRITORY WITH MONIES BORROWED FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA PURSUANT TO ANY SUCH LOAN AGREEMENT AS CERTIFIED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND (B) CONSIDERATIONS THEREOF, THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WILL SUSPEND AND REFRAIN AND WILL REQUIRE LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS IN THE TERRITORY TO SUSPEND AND REFRAIN FROM THE IMPOSITION, LEVYING AND COLLECTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES, CORPORATION TAXES AND CORPORATION INCOME TAXES IN RESPECT OF THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 1974 AND ENDING ON THE 31ST DAY OF DECEMBER, 1974.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'VE GOT TWO QUESTIONS...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I BELIEVE THAT SHOULD BE DECEMBER, 1975 SHOULDN'T IT? NO, 31ST DAY OF DECEMBER 19....

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I'VE TWO QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES, OK.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: FIRSTLY, THIS LIMITS TO A MAXIMUM OF \$5,446,000 BECAUSE THE WAY IT READS, A PAYMENT IN LIEU OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY LEVYING PERSONAL, CORPORATE INCOME TAXES, AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO. SO THAT DOESN'T GO BEYOND THAT AMOUNT, DOES IT?

MR. MILLER: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: SUPPOSING THAT THE ACTUAL PAYMENTS ARE MORE, WHY DO WE NOT GET THE BENEFIT?

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN AT THE MOMENT WE ARE GETTING A GRANT IN LIEU OF INCOME TAX. IT IS A CALCULATED AMOUNT. IF IT IS MORE, WE DON'T GET THE BENEFIT OF IT. IF IT IS LESS, WE DON'T HAVE TO PAY IT BACK.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT ANSWERS ONE QUESTION. THE OTHER QUESTION IS, I WONDER IF MR. MILLER, MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD GIVE AN INTERPRETATION OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CORPORATION TAXES AND CORPORATION INCOME TAXES.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THE INTENT, I WOULDN'T SEE ANY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE TWO ITEMS, BUT THE INTENT IS THAT WE COULDN'T IMPOSE OR ANYBODY ELSE IN THE TERRITORY COULD IMPOSE A TAX CALLED CORPORATION TAXES WHICH WOULD BE BASED ON INCOME OR ANY OTHER MEANS. THAT IS THE INTENT OF IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: DON'T WORRY ABOUT THE INTENT. LET'S TAKE WHAT IS WRITTEN IN HERE. THERE IS A DEFINITE DIFFERENCE HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS LEGISLATION BECAUSE IF THERE WAS NO DIFFERENCE, IT WOULDN'T BE SAID. IT SAYS CORPORATION TAXES AND CORPORATION INCOME TAXES. I'M TRYING TO ASCERTAIN BECAUSE IT IS IN THE LEGISLATION, WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE. SURELY THERE MUST BE A REASON FOR SOMETHING LIKE THAT BEING PUT IN THERE. UNLESS WE KNOW THE REASON IT IS PRETTY DIFFICULT TO JUST AGREE TO IT.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN I CAN THINK OF ONE INSTANCE WHERE ONE COULD IMPOSE A CORPORATION TAX. IT WOULD PERTAIN PRIMARILY IN THE MINING INDUSTRY. IN B.C. FOR EXAMPLE, JUST RECENTLY THEY IMPOSED A MINING TAX OR A TAX ON CORPORATION IN THE MINING FIELD WHICH IS NOT A CORPORATION INCOME TAX UNDER THE CANADA INCOME TAX ACT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THERE A SUGGESTION THAT NO CORPORATIONS PAY TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME TAXES IN THE YUKON TERRITORY?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN THAT ISN'T THE POINT AT ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT ARE THERE CORPORATIONS THAT PAY TAXES IN THE YUKON TERRITORY OTHER THAN INCOME TAX?

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN THAT ISN'T THE POINT AT ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: BUT ARE THERE CORPORATIONS THAT DO PAY TAXES IN THE YUKON TERRITORY? OTHER THAN INCOME TAX?

MR. MILLER: SURE, CORPORATIONS PAY PROPERTY TAX.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT AND THIS IS WHY I'M SAYING THAT THE LANGUAGE IS NOT CLEAR BECAUSE IT SAYS HERE THAT IN CONSIDERATION THEREOF THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WILL SUSPEND AND REFRAIN AND WILL REQUIRE LOCAL ADMINISTRATION DISTRICTS IN THE TERRITORY TO SUSPEND AND REFRAIN FROM THE IMPOSITION, LEVYING AND COLLECTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES, CORPORATION TAXES AND CORPORATION INCOME TAXES.

I THINK, MR. CHAIRMAN: THERE SHOULD BE A REAL EXAMINATION OF THIS PARTICULAR AREA TAKEN BECAUSE IT WOULD APPEAR WITH THE PASSAGE OF THIS LEGISLATION, IT COULD BE SAID THAT THE LEVYING OF A CORPORATION TAX OF ANY DESCRIPTION WOULD BE IMPROPER. MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. MILLER IS SHAKING HIS HEAD. THERE SHOULD BE AN EXPLANATION GIVEN OF THIS PARTICULAR AREA.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IS NOT THE INTENT OF THIS BILL AT ALL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: ITS THE SAME THING BUT ITS JUST DAWNED UPON ME IN READING THIS.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE CHAIRMAN HAS A COPY OF LAST YEAR'S BILL. DOESN'T IT READ EXACTLY THE SAME WAY?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ITS THE SAME THING.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN IT HAS JUST DAWNED UPON ME BECAUSE THE WAY I READ IT, I HAVEN'T SEEN IT BEFORE, BUT IT JUST DAWNED ON ME. BECAUSE WE PASSED IT LAST TIME, IT DOESN'T MEAN TO SAY THAT IF WE FIND SOMETHING WRONG WITH IT, THAT WE SHOULDN'T TRY AND CORRECT IT THIS TIME.

MR. TANNER: WERE THERE ANY PROBLEMS WITH IT?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS NO PROBLEM. ITS NEVER BEEN RAISED BUT THE POSSIBILITY IS THAT IT CAN BE RAISED NOW.

MR. MILLER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS NO INTENT IN THIS AGREEMENT OR IN THIS ORDINANCE TO DISALLOW ANY PROPERTY TAXES AGAINST CORPORATIONS OR ANYTHING THAT WE WOULD NORMALLY TAX UNDER A TERRITORIAL TAX. ITS JUST THAT WE ARE NOT ALLOWED TO IMPOSE CORPORATION TAXES.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HATE TO BE INSISTANT ON THIS BUT IN THE INTERPRETATION SECTION OF PART 1, ALL WE HAD IS FOR INTERPRETATION, IS AGREEMENT, FISCAL YEAR, LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT. WE HAVE NOTHING BEYOND THAT. I THINK THIS IS A QUESTION THAT WE SHOULD GET SOME LEGAL ADVICE ON BECAUSE OF THE MANNER IN WHICH IT RULES. I WOULD ASK MR. CHAIRMAN IF WE HAVE MR. LEGAL ADVISOR TO GIVE US A CLEAR ENUNCIATION OF WHAT IS MEANT IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA. SOME SMART LAWYER MIGHT GET HOLD OF THIS AND SAY THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT CANNOT TAX A CORPORATION IN ANY MANNER. IT MAY BE AND I WOULD LIKE TO GET MR. LEGAL ADVISOR IN, COULD WE HAVE MR. LEGAL ADVISOR IN MR. CHAIRMAN? THAT IS WHAT HE IS HERE FOR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MAJAM CLERK IF YOU ARE LISTENING WOULD YOU SEND IN MR. LEGAL ADVISOR? WE WILL JUST CALL A BRIEF RECESS.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I NOW CALL COMMITTEE TO ORDER.

(PART OF TAPE MISSING)

MR. CHAMBERLIST: . . . IT SEEMS TO INDICATE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO TAX IN ANY WAY THE CORPORATION BECAUSE IT READS SPECIFICALLY "THAT IN CONSIDERATION THEREOF", AND I WILL INTERJECT THAT MEANS THE MONEY THAT IS COMING BY WAY OF A GRANT, "THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WILL SUSPEND AND REFRAIN, AND WILL REQUIRE LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS IN THE TERRITORY TO SUSPEND AND REFRAIN, FROM THE IMPOSITION LEVYING AND COLLECTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES, CORPORATION TAXES AND CORPORATION INCOME TAXES DURING THE SPECIFIC PERIOD", THAT IS JANUARY, 1974, TO DECEMBER, 1974. I SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, TO MR. LEGAL ADVISOR THAT THERE IS A DISTINCT DIFFERENCE IMPLIED BETWEEN CORPORATION TAXES AND CORPORATION INCOME TAXES. WHAT WOULD THE MEANING OF CORPORATION TAXES BE IN THIS CONTEXT AS IT IS WRITTEN NOW? WOULD WE NOT BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO AMEND THIS PARTICULAR SECTION SO THAT IT'S CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD WHAT WE ARE REFERRING TO AND WHAT WE ARE NOT REFERRING TO.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: PERHAPS, MR. CHAIRMAN. I THINK EVERYONE KNOWS WHAT INCOME TAXES ARE, BOTH IN RESPECT OF INDIVIDUALS AND IN RESPECT OF CORPORATIONS. I DON'T THINK ANYONE CAN SAY IN GENERAL TERMS WHAT IS MEANT BY THE EXPRESSION "CORPORATION TAXES". I WOULD THINK, HAVING REGARD TO THE NATURE OF THE CLAUSE, THAT IT WILL BE TERMED SOME SORT OF TAX EQUIVALENT TO AN INCOME TAX. IT DOESN'T SAY SO. IT'S A GENERAL WORD AND IT'S NOT DEFINED IN THE INTERPRETATION SECTION. PERHAPS IT SHOULD BE. PERHAPS IT SHOULD BE EXPLAINED. IT MAY BE EXPLAINED BY REFERENCE TO THE AGREEMENT ITSELF AS OPPOSED TO THE ORDINANCE ENABLING US TO SET UP THE AGREEMENT. I WOULDN'T LIKE TO GIVE A QUICK ANSWER TO WHAT CORPORATION TAXES EMBRACES. IT'S SET UP HERE AS A GENERAL WORD, CORPORATION TAXES, AND PERHAPS NEEDS DEFINITION.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD I JUST ASK THE LEGAL ADVISOR THEN WHO PREPARED THIS ORDINANCE AND WHY IS IT IN THERE THEN?

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: I DON'T KNOW WHO PREPARED IT. IT'S AN ONGOING THING AND THE FIRST

PERSON WHO PREPARED IT WHILE HE'S PROBABLY DIFFICULT TO COME BY AT THE MOMENT, IT'S HARD TO GET IN TOUCH WITH HIM, BUT I COULD DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT ON SUNDAY AT MASS I SUPPOSE.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: LAUGHTER.

MR. STUTTER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WONDER IF HE COULD ANSWER MY SECOND QUESTION. WHY IS IT IN HERE? WHAT IS THE INTENTION OF THOSE THREE WORDS BEING IN THERE?

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: THERE MUST BE A REASON FOR IT BECAUSE THERE'S CLEARLY A DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN CORPORATION INCOME TAX AND CORPORATION TAXES. ANYTHING I WOULD SAY AS TO THE REASON IT BEING IN WOULD BE HAZARDING A GUESS. PERHAPS THERE IS SOME BASIC CORPORATION TAX THAT IS EASY ASCERTAINABLE IF WE KNEW WHERE TO LOOK. I MUST CONFESS I DON'T.

MR. CHAIRMAN: POSSIBLY IS THERE ANY WAY THAT WE COULD HAVE SOME INTERPRETATION ON THIS, MR. MILLER.

MR. MILLER: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. I KNOW PERFECTLY WELL WHAT THE INTENT OF THE THING IS. THE INTENT IS SO THAT WE OR NONE OF THE LOCAL ADMINISTRATION DISTRICTS CAN IMPOSE A GENERAL TYPE TAX ON A CORPORATION, WHETHER IT'S TIED TO INCOME OR OTHERWISE. BY THE SAME TOKEN IN CANADA YOU CANNOT IMPOSE A PAYROLL TAX WHICH IS VERY PERMISSABLE IN EVERY STATE IN THE UNITED STATES. THIS IS THE BASIC INTENT OF IT. NOW I'LL GO BACK TO THE AGREEMENT AND FIND OUT WHAT THE REAL WORDS WERE THAT THEY USED AND THE LOGIC BEHIND IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I WONDER IF WE COULD HAVE A COPY OF THE AGREEMENT WHILE WE ARE DEALING WITH THIS. AFTERALL WE ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE - NO THIS IS NOT THE AGREEMENT, THIS IS THE ORDINANCE. THIS IS THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE. I WONDER IF WE CAN HAVE THE AGREEMENT THAT THIS ORDINANCE IS DEALING WITH BROUGHT BEFORE US. THE ONE THAT WILL BE FOR THIS - FOR THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE FOR 1974, RATHER THE FINANCIAL AGREEMENT FOR 1974-75.

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO BRING FORWARD THE AGREEMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. THANK YOU. I WONDER

IF MR. LEGAL ADVISER WILL GET AN OPINION ON THIS BECAUSE WHAT I AM AFRAID OF, AND PERHAPS MR. LEGAL ADVISER MIGHT RECOGNIZE THIS, IS THAT, ALTHOUGH THIS HAS BEEN A CONTINUING THING, I PERSONALLY HAVE NOT NOTICED THE DIFFERENCE IN IT. I HAVE JUST NOTICED IT. IT MAY BE THAT AN ACTION COULD BE TAKEN TO THE EFFECT THAT ANY TAX THAT A CORPORATION PAYS TO THE MUNICIPALITY IS A CORPORATION TAX WITHIN THE MEANING OF THIS SUBSECTION. NOW THERE'S A DANGER THAT THIS MIGHT BE INTERPRETED IN THIS MANNER.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: I AGREE THAT THERE IS. WE CAN SEE A SKELETON BEHIND EVERY BUSH. I THINK THIS MEANS CORPORATION TAXES, THE TYPE MENTIONED BY THE TREASURER. A TAX, SUCH AS MENTIONED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER, IS A PROPERTY TAX WHICH IS APPLIED TO CORPORATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS ALIKE. THAT WOULDN'T COME UNDER THE EXPRESSION CORPORATION TAX. A CORPORATION TAX WOULD BE LIMITED TO A TAX WHICH IS IMPOSED ON A CORPORATION BECAUSE IT IS A CORPORATION AND NOT AN INDIVIDUAL.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL I DON'T KNOW WHETHER MR. LEGAL ADVISER WOULD AGREE OR NOT THAT A LICENSE HAS BEEN INTERPRETED AS A TAX IN SOME AREAS. NOW COULD IT NOT BE THEN SAID THAT A CORPORATION THAT PAYS A LICENSE IS PAYING A TAX? I'M JUST TRYING TO ESTABLISH THAT THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT WOULD CREATE A DIFFICULTY AT A LATER DATE. WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY IT PROPERLY AND WE SHOULD GET IT CLARIFIED. THIS IS WHAT I AM CONCERNED ABOUT.

MR. LEGAL ADVISER: PERHAPS, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE SHOULD CLARIFY IT. IT HASN'T CAUSED ANY PROBLEMS SINCE 1898, AND I WOULDN'T ANTICIPATE THAT IT'S GOING TO CAUSE ANY PROBLEMS IN THE FUTURE. BUT ONCE THE POINT HAS BEEN RAISED IT'S GOT TO BE FACED AND DEALT WITH.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I KNOW A VERY HEALTHY MAN. HE WAS 75 BUT THERE WAS NOTHING WRONG WITH HIM. HE WALKED ACROSS THE ROAD AND HAD A HEART ATTACK. YOU KNOW HE WAS ALRIGHT FOR 75 YEARS.

MR. TANNER: WHAT HAS THAT GOT TO DO WITH IT?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE HONOURABLE MEMBER WANTS TO KNOW WHAT THAT HAS GOT TO DO WITH IT. THE SAME THING CAN HAPPEN. YOU KNOW IT

MIGHT HAVE BEEN FINE FOR YEARS AND THEN ALL OF A SUDDEN SOMETHING GOES WRONG.

MR. TANNER: YOU MEAN THE CORPORATION MIGHT GO BANKRUPT?

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. ANYTHING LIKE THAT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE MEMBER HAS MADE HIS POINT. WE'VE HAD A LEGAL OPINION. CAN WE CONTINUE READING THE BILL AND GET SOME ADVICE ON IT SO WE CAN GET TO THE END OF IT.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: RIGHT. AGREED ABSOLUTELY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: YES. THE CHAIR HAS IT THAT THE INFORMATION WILL BE COMING IN RESPECT OF CORPORATE INCOME TAX, AND ALSO COPIES OF THE AGREEMENT WILL BE FORTHCOMING. ALRIGHT, THE NEXT IS SECTION 4. (THE CHAIRMAN CONTINUES READING THE BILL).

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IS THIS SAME SECTION IN THERE ALL THE TIME? I WONDER IF WE COULD - IS THAT THE SAME - BY THE COMMISSIONER?

MR. MILLER: YES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN CONTINUES READING THE BILL, "... ASSUMED BY IN UNDER THE AGREEMENT".

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: SHOULDN'T THAT BE "IT", MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: IT SHOULD BE "BY IN AND UNDER THE AGREEMENT".

MR. TANNER: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN. I THINK IT SHOULD BE "IT", "ASSUMED BY IT".

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE LEGAL ADVISER IS GONE.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WAS FOLLOWING IT WITH LAST YEAR'S ORDINANCE AND IT SHOULD BE "IT".

MR. CHAMBERLIST: A TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR THEN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN CONTINUES READING THE BILL. "15. THE COMMISSIONER IS EMPOWERED TO DO EVERY ACT AND EXERCISE EVERY POWER FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPLEMENTING EVERY OBLIGATION ASSUMED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY UNDER THE AGREEMENT."

MR. CHAMBERLIST: OH. THERE'S SOMETHING HERE. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY CANNOT ASSUME ANYTHING UNDER THE AGREEMENT. IT HAS TO BE THE COMMISSIONER.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WAS JUST ABOUT TO MAKE THE POINT THAT I THINK THAT THIS BILL IS OUT OF ORDER AS THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. THIS HAS ALREADY BEEN RULED ON THAT YOU CAN'T ENTER AN AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT HAS TO BE THE COMMISSIONER.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD POINT OUT TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THAT'S THE SAME WAY THAT IT WAS WRITTEN LAST YEAR.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THAT DOESN'T MAKE IT RIGHT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THAT DOESN'T MAKE IT RIGHT. IN FACT THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT'S A NON-LEGAL ENTITY. IT CAN NEITHER SUE NOR BE SUED, AND THE COMMISSIONER IS THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE TERRITORY UNDER THE YUKON ACT.

MR. TANNER: MR. CHAIRMAN, AS I RECALL, I THINK THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM WATSON LAKE MADE EXACTLY THE SAME POINT LAST YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: IT'S STILL NOT WITHSTANDING - THE BILL IS OUT OF ORDER INASMUCH AS THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: THE BILL IS NOT OUT OF ORDER. IT'S THAT PARTICULAR - - -

MR. CHAIRMAN: UNLESS THE LARGE "G" IS CHANGED TO A SMALL "G".

MR. MILLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA HAVE BEEN APPROVING THIS BILL FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS. I DON'T KNOW WHY THEY WOULD NOW DECIDE TO CHANGE IT. THEY HAVE RECOGNIZED THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: NO THEY HAVEN'T. THE COURTS WON'T RECOGNIZE IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF MADAM CLERK COULD GET MR. LEGAL ADVISER BACK.

Mr. TANNER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T DISAGREE WE SHOULD GET THE LEGAL ADVISER, BUT SURELY IN AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO PARTIES THEY CAN RECOGNIZE EACH OTHER FOR WHATEVER THEY LIKE.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: NO THEY CAN'T.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: NOT ON BEHALF OF THE TERRITORY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: IT WOULD BE THE COMMISSIONER ON BEHALF OF THE SMALL "G" GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT'S UNDER THE YUKON ACT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I WILL COMPLETE THE READING OF THE BILL. THE CHAIRMAN CONTINUES THE READING OF THE BILL AS WELL AS A LIST OF THE SCHEDULES. WE HAVE WITH US Mr. LEGAL ADVISER. Mr. LEGAL ADVISER, THE QUESTION OF THIS BILL BEING IN ORDER IS IN QUESTION OVER THE FACT THAT THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: Mr. CHAIRMAN, THERE IS A GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. IT DEPENDS ON THE PARTICULAR CONTEXT IN WHICH ONE IS SPEAKING; WHAT ONE MEANS BY THE GOVERNMENT. YES, THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY IN ITS GENERAL TERM EMBRACES THE COMMISSIONER, HIS OFFICERS, THE CIVIL SERVANTS, THIS COUNCIL. THAT IS THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THAT A SMALL "G" GOVERNMENT OR A LARGE "G" GOVERNMENT, Mr. LEGAL ADVISER.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: IF ONE IS USING IT IN RESPECT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY, IT'S A LARGE "G" GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: HOW COULD THIS BE, FROM THE CHAIR Mr. LEGAL ADVISER. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: IS THAT A SMALL 'G' GOVERNMENT OR A LARGE 'G' GOVERNMENT?

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: WHEN ONE IS USING IT IN RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY IT IS A LARGE 'G' GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: HOW CAN THIS BE, FROM THE CHAIR Mr. LEGAL ADVISER. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE WHEN THE YUKON ACT DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR A LARGE 'G'. THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT STYLED AND KNOWN AS THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY IN LAW. THERE HAVE BEEN JUDICIAL RULINGS ON THIS. CONSTITUTIONALLY IT DOES NOT EXIST. THERE IS A SMALL 'G' GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY WHICH IS ADMINISTERED

BY THE COMMISSIONER ON INSTRUCTIONS TIME TO TIME GIVEN HIM BY THE MINISTER. THERE IS NO QUESTION IN THE CHAIR'S MIND THAT THERE IS NO LARGE 'G' GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY STYLED OR KNOWN AS SUCH.

Mr. LEGAL ADVISER: A CAPITAL 'G' AT THE START OF A WORD OR A SMALL 'g' IS MERELY APPLICABLE RULES OF NORMAL ENGLISH GRAMMER AND CUSTOM. WHEN YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT AN INDIVIDUAL GOVERNMENT A SINGLE GOVERNMENT ONE CUSTOMARILY USES A LARGE 'G'. WHEN IT IS TALKING ABOUT GOVERNMENTS IN GENERAL OF MORE THAN ONE OR GOVERNMENTS OF A CLASS ONE USES A SMALL 'g'. SO THAT IF YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT GOVERNMENTS OF THE PROVINCES YOU USE A SMALL 'g' IN RESPECT OF ALL THOSE GOVERNMENTS IN THAT PARTICULAR SENTENCE.

THE QUESTION IS WHAT DOES THE WORD MEAN. THE WORD MEANS THE ADMINISTRATION, CIVIL SERVICE, EXECUTIVE CONTROL AND LEGISLATIVE CONTROL, AND JUDICIAL CONTROL OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THIS TERRITORY.

WHERE THE CONFUSION ARISES TO SOME EXTENT IS THAT IN THE INTERPRETATION ORDINANCE, AT ONE TIME DO THE DEFINITION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND IT SAID, "HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE V IN RIGHT OF YUKON TERRITORY." FOR SOME REASON THIS WAS REPEALED MANY YEARS AGO SO THAT THERE WAS NO SPECIFIC DEFINITION IN THE INTERPRETATION ORDINANCE.

IT IS UNNECESSARY TO DEFINE IT BECAUSE WHEN THE COMMISSIONER SIGNS HE SIGNS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT. HE MAKES AN AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT WHICH BINDS THIS HOUSE WHEN HE ACTS PROPERLY.

Mr. CHAMBERLIST: CAN I CONTINUE? Mr. CHAIRMAN, THE QUESTION IS IN SECTION 15 OF THE BILL. IT READS, "THE COMMISSIONER IS EMPOWERED TO DO EVERY ACT AND EXERCISE: EVERY POWER FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPLEMENTING: EVERY OBLIGATION ASSUMED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY."

THE POSITION THAT I TAKE IS THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY DOESN'T ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITIES. IT IS THE COMMISSIONER OF THE YUKON TERRITORY AS THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND THE PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY. THE SMALL 'G' THAT HAS BEEN INDICATED IN THE YUKON ACT, AND THE YUKON ACT TALKS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY

AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION. THE QUESTION THAT IS BEING RAISED IS THIS, ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF SECTION 16, WHERE SECTION 16 SAID, "NO AMOUNT SHALL BE BORROWED BY THE COMMISSIONER PURSUANT TO THIS ORDINANCE." SO IT IS THE COMMISSIONER WHO IS DOING THE BORROWING, IT IS THE COMMISSIONER THAT HAS TO COMPLETE THE OBLIGATIONS. ALL THAT IT NEEDS IN THIS ORDINANCE IS JUST HAVE THE 'G' TRANSFERRED TO A SMALL 'g'. THEN WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS THAT THE COMMISSIONER IS OBLIGATED FOR.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD HAVE NO OBJECTION WHATSOEVER TO REMOVING THE CAPITAL 'G' AND MAKING IT A SMALL 'g'. IT IS MERELY A MATTER OF CHANGING A SYLLABLE. IT DOESN'T CHANGE THE FACTS, THE FACTS OF LIFE.

THE HONOURABLE CHAIRMAN MENTIONED ABOUT NO GOVERNMENT COMES FROM RULING BY MR. JUSTICE'S ASSISTANT WHO WAS TALKING ABOUT THERE IS NO SEPARATE GOVERNMENT INDEPENDANTLY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA.

IT MATTERS NOT FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS ORDINANCE WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS OR WHO IT IS. THE MAIN QUESTION IS THAT THIS ORDINANCE BINDS THAT GOVERNMENT. THE COMMISSIONERS SIGNATURE IN RESPECT TO THE AGREEMENT ALSO BINDS THE GOVERNMENT WHOEVER IT IS. IT IS NOT REALLY NECESSARY FOR US AT THIS POINT TO ENQUIRE WHO MAKES UP THAT GOVERNMENT. I HAVE NO OBJECT TO PUTTING A SMALL 'g'. BUT, OF COURSE, IT WILL MORE THAN LIKELY BE CONVERTED TO A LARGE 'G' ONCE IT LEAVES THIS HOUSE BECAUSE TYPISTS AND SUCH LIKE WILL BE CARRYING ON GOVERNMENT AND SPELLING OF GOVERNMENT IN BOOKS AND IN PAMPHLETS AND EVERY THING ELSE BECAUSE OF THE RULE OF ENGLISH WHICH REQUIRES WHEN YOU ARE USING A SINGLE ENTITY YOU USE A CAPITAL AS THE INITIAL LETTER IN ORDER TO INDICATE THAT FACT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WOULD THINK THAT IN CONSTITUTIONAL SENSE THE CHAIR WOULD HAVE TO TAKE THE POSITION THAT THE BILL IS OUT OF ORDER WITH THE LARGE 'G' GOVERNMENT. CONSTITUTIONALLY THIS IS QUITE INCORRECT.

IF IT IS CONSIDERED THAT THIS WILL BE RETYPED AND THAT THERE WILL BE NO REFERENCE TO A LARGE 'G' GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: I DON'T THINK THAT IS NECESSARY. I THINK WE RECOGNIZE THE FACT THAT

IT IS AN ADMINISTRATIVE SITUATION. WE WILL JUST TREAT THIS AS A TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR AND JUST PUT THE SMALL 'g'. IT IS THE COMMISSIONER WHO SIGNS THE CONTRACT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION. WE JUST DON'T WANT TO BE LED TO BELIEVE THAT IT IS A POLITICAL GOVERNMENT INSTEAD OF A DEFACTO ADMINISTRATION.

MR. LEGAL ADVISOR: I WOULD BE HAPPY TO, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF ALL OUR PROBLEMS WOULD BE SOLVED.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: YES, IT WOULD BE A SIMPLE WAY OF DOING IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THIS WOULD BE IN CONFORMITY WITH THE YUKON ACT. BECAUSE THERE IS NO GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY STYLED OR KNOWN AS SUCH.

IS THIS AGREED.

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I WONDER IF THE WITNESSES COULD BE EXCUSED AT THIS TIME? THANK YOU GENTLEMEN.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THE MATTER OF EXCUSING THE WITNESSES WITHOUT ASKING THE CONSENT OF THE HOUSE.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: WELL, HE KNOWS WHAT HE IS DOING.

MRS. WATSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WAS DISCIPLINED FOR THIS YESTERDAY AND THE HONOURABLE MEMBER DID THE SAME THING TODAY.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. THANK YOU. I JUST ASKED, "I WONDER IF THE WITNESSES COULD BE EXCUSED AT THIS TIME" AND IT WAS AGREED. NOW DOES SOMEONE DISAGREE.

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: NO, WE AGREE WITH YOU MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHAMBERLIST: MR. CHAIRMAN I MOVE THAT MR. SPEAKER NOW RESUME THE CHAIR.

MR. STUTTER: I SECOND THAT MR. CHAIRMAN.

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?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: QUESTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ARE YOU AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION CARRIED

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

MR. TAYLOR: MR. SPEAKER, COMMITTEE CONVENED AT 10:25 A.M. TO DISCUSS BILLS, SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS. MR. MILLER AND MR. HUBERDEAU ATTENDED COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS BILL NO. 3. MR. HONOURABLE JUSTICE T. R. BERGER WAS INVITED TO ATTEND COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS MATTERS RELATED TO THE MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE INQUIRY. MADAM CLERK WAS ASKED TO CONVEY THE INVITATION TO JUSTICE BERGER. COMMITTEE RECESSED AT TWELVE NOON AND RECONVENED AT 2:30 P.M.. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MCKINNON SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST THAT IT IS THE OPINION OF COUNCIL THAT ESTABLISHMENT 29-11 - GROUND IMPROVEMENT, VARIOUS LOCATIONS BE DELETED FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON TERRITORY 1974/75 MAIN ESTIMATES. THE FUNDS TO BE ALLOCATED TO THE PROVISION OF T.V. SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITIES OF TESLIN, CARCROSS, CARMACKS, HAINES JUNCTION AND DESTRUCTION BAY. THIS MOTION WAS DEFEATED. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR WATSON SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TANNER THAT BILL NO 3 BE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT AMENDMENT. THIS MOTION CARRIED.

I WILL REPORT PROGRESS ON BILL NO. 4. IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERLIST SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR STUTTER THAT MR. SPEAKER DO NOW RESUME THE CHAIR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: WE HAVE HEARD THE REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES. ARE WE AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE.

MR. TAYLOR: I BELIEVE TOMORROW IT IS THE INTENTION OF YOUR COMMITTEE TO PROCEED WITH BILLS AND SESSIONAL PAPERS AND MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER: MAY I HAVE YOUR FURTHER PLEASURE?

MR. TANNER: MR. SPEAKER I MOVE THAT WE CLOSE AT 5:00 O'CLOCK.

MR. SPEAKER: IS THERE A SECONDER?

MR. STUTTER: YES, MR. SPEAKER I WILL 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 O'CLOCK. ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THE QUESTION?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBER: QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER: AGREED?

SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: AGREED.

MR. SPEAKER: I DECLARE THE MOTION CARRIED. THIS COUNCIL STANDS ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW MORNING.

MOTION CARRIED

COUNCIL ADJOURNED

