



COUNCIL OF THE  
YUKON TERRITORY  
CANADA

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

AND

SESSIONAL PAPERS

Second Session 1971

Volume I

I N D E X

1971 (Second Session)

Volume 1 - Pages 1 to 21 & Sessional Paper

Session Date - Wednesday, May 26th, 1971

<u>BILLS</u>	<u>1st &amp; 2nd READING</u>	<u>DISCUSSED</u>	<u>3rd READING</u>	<u>ASSENTED TO</u>
1. An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance	3	4 - 16	17	21

<u>SESSIONAL PAPERS</u>	<u>TABLED</u>	<u>DISCUSSED</u>
1. Commissioner's Opening Address	3	

<u>CORRESPONDENCE &amp; DOCUMENTS</u>	<u>TABLED</u>
1. Regulations, Interpretation Ordinance	3

<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Oral Questions</u>	
Student Summer Employment	17
Labour Standards Ordinance Amendments	18
Air Transportation Increases	19
Telegraph Rate Increases	19
Lands Policy	20

<u>Witnesses</u>	<u>Page</u>
Bill No. 1	
Mayor A.J. Wybrew	5-16
Mr. R.L. Byron	5-16

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY

Page 1.  
Wednesday, May 26th, 1971.  
10:00 a.m.

The Second Session of the Council for the year 1971, being the Third Session of the Twenty-Second Wholly Elective Council of the Yukon Territory, was convened in the Council Chambers at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, May 26th, 1971.

The Members present were:

Mr. Norman S. Chamberlist, Whitehorse East  
Mr. J. Kenneth McKinnon, Whitehorse West  
Mr. Ronald A. Rivett, Mayo  
Mr. Michael G. Stutter, Dawson  
Mr. Clive Tanner, Whitehorse North  
Mr. Donald E. Taylor, Watson Lake  
Mrs. Hilda P. Watson, Carmacks-Kluane Lake

The Clerk read the Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker enters the Council Chambers, announced by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Speaker: Please be seated. Mr. Clerk, is there a quorum present?

Mr. Clerk: There is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Third Session of the Twenty-Second Wholly Elective Council of the Yukon Territory will now come to order. Mr. Clerk, will you please ascertain when the Commissioner might be available to give his Opening Address to Council?

Mr. Clerk leaves the Chambers to confer with the Commissioner and returns.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner will give his Opening Address in the Territorial Court Room in ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Council now stands adjourned to hear the Commissioner's Opening Address in the Territorial Court Room.

ADJOURNED

ADJOURNED

Mr. Speaker and the Councillors were escorted to the Territorial Court Room by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

The Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, Mr. James Smith, is ushered into the Territorial Court Room by his Aide-de-Camp.

Mr. Commissioner gave his Opening Address. (Set out as Sessional Paper No. 1)

Mr. Speaker and the Councillors returned to the Council Chambers.

Mr. Speaker: I now call Council back to order, and I wish to advise you that I have a copy of the Commissioner's Opening Address. What is your

Mr. Speaker continued.....  
pleasure at this time?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the Commissioner's Opening Address be considered on a day following.

Mr. Stutter: I second that motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Watson Lake, seconded by the Member for Dawson, that the Opening Address of the Commissioner be taken into consideration on a day following. Are you prepared for the question? Agreed? I declare the motion carried.

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

MOTION CARRIED

*BILL #1  
INTRODUCED*

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Councillor Watson, for leave to introduce a Bill entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse East, seconded by the Member for Carmacks-Kluane, for leave to introduce Bill No. 1, entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance. Are you prepared for the question? Agreed? I declare the motion carried.

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: Council now stands in recess until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

*RECESS*

RECESS

Mr. Speaker: Council will now come to order.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling, pursuant to the Interpretation Ordinance, the Regulations of the Yukon Territory. Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Sessional Paper No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: What is your further pleasure?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, in order to proceed with the business of Council, in respect of Bill No.1, I would move that Standing Order No. 41 be suspended in order that Council may proceed through several readings of Bill No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Mr. Tanner: I will second the motion.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Watson Lake, seconded by the Member for Whitehorse North, that Standing Order No. 41 be suspended in order that Council may proceed with several readings of Bill No. 1. Are you prepared for the question? Agreed? Are any disagreed? I declare the motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be given First Reading at this time.

*BILL #1  
FIRST  
READING*

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I second the motion.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse East, seconded by the Member for Carmacks-Kluane, that Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be given First Reading at this time. Are you prepared for the question? Agreed? I declare the motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Councillor Watson, that Second Reading be given to An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, Bill No. 1.

*BILL #1  
SECOND  
READING*

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member for Whitehorse East, seconded by the Member for Carmacks-Kluane, that Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be given Second Reading at this time. Are you prepared for the question? Agreed? Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would move that Council resolve into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing Public Bills.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, are we not going to carry through routine Orders of the Day, so that we are able to at least ask the Commissioner a few questions in this period of this Council Session?

Mr. Speaker: Not at this time. No. Is there a seconder for the motion?

Mr. McKinnon: No way. Let's have a Question Period.



Mr. Chamberlist: I second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Watson Lake, seconded by Honourable Member for Whitehorse East, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the purpose of convening in Committee of the Whole to discuss Bills. Is the House prepared for the question? Agreed? I declare the motion carried.

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Watson Lake will please take the Chair in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Taylor takes the Chair.

*BILL #1*

Mr. Chairman: The first item of business before Committee today is Bill No. 1. We will proceed with the reading of the Bill.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, the Explanatory Note on the first page of the Bill reads, "The purpose of the Bill is to provide for the amalgamation of the Whitehorse Metropolitan Area and the City of Whitehorse. Ancillary sections are required by the amalgamation. Certain provisions apply to all municipalities." Mr. Chairman, it will be seen, during reading of this Bill, that certain of these sections apply specifically to the Whitehorse area and the others apply generally to the whole of the Municipal Ordinance.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Committee if it is their intention to call any witnesses from the Municipality of the City of Whitehorse before Committee at this time.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair would be amenable to anything Committee might suggest.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would make the suggestion that the Mayor of the City of Whitehorse, Mr. Wybrew, and the City Manager, Mr. Byron, be invited to join Committee in their deliberations on Bill No. 1.

Mr. Chairman: Is that the desire of Committee?

Mr. Tanner: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't really see much purpose in it. Could the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West tell us why we need to? Surely, having gone through a plebiscite, we have ascertained the wishes of the people in the City.

Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman; with regard to the extension of the City boundaries, if Honourable Members can't tell me that there is going to be some discussion and some deliberation and some debate on the sections pertaining to the qualifications of electors and those able to hold office, which is a change in the Municipal Ordinance, and a very far-reaching debate, then I think that they are only fooling themselves. I think that it is incumbent upon Council to ask from the elected members of the Municipal Council, particularly, their feelings on this subject. If it's the Mayor or one of the Alderman who should be called before the Committee, then I think it is the responsibility of this Council to ask one or either of them, before Committee, for their views and City's views on a very far-reaching implication that we are making, if we accept this Ordinance, as I see it at this time.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure Members of Council will have no objection if the people who have been suggested appear before Council.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the wish of Committee, then, that we invite, to join with us in this discussion, Mayor Wybrew and Manager Byron? Mr. Clerk, would you so do? I will declare a brief recess.

*RECESS*

RECESS

Mayor A.J. Wybrew and Mr. R.L. Byron in attendance.

Mr. Chairman: I now call Committee back to order. We have with us Mayor Wybrew and Manager Byron, of the City of Whitehorse, to assist us in discussions relative to Bill No. 1. At this time, we will proceed with the reading of the Bill, section by section. (Mr. Chairman reads section 1.) BILL #1

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask a question of both Mr. Commissioner and Mr. Legal Adviser. Why the change from section 238 of the present Municipal Ordinance, in both the -- or particularly, in the part which states that the person has to be "a rate-payer, spouse of a rate-payer; occupier, spouse of an occupier; or is liable for payment, directly or indirectly, of a yearly rental of not less than \$180". I'd like to have the background of the thinking that makes the franchise virtually unlimited, as far as voting in a municipal election in Whitehorse in December of 1971 is concerned.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, the Members of Committee are well aware that the Administration is committed to bringing forward for their deliberation and consideration, a completely new Municipal Ordinance at the Fall Session of Council. Certain basic philosophies will be contained in that Ordinance, and I think, suffice to say, that the liberalization and the extension of the franchise will be one of those basic tenets that will be in that Ordinance. In this particular instance, we felt it grossly unfair to ask Council to change, throughout the Territory, by means of an amendment, such a basic tenet as this, and we are asking Council to give consideration to it only as it would apply to the December, 1971 elections here in the City of Whitehorse. This is the basis of it. Now, the further thinking to go with this, Mr. Chairman, is that the days when the vast majority of people owned their own homes or were in the process of being homeowners have been taken over by a day and age when the vast majority of people are tenants, or they are renters. The interpretation that is presently placed in the Municipal Ordinance, I believe, the wording indicates that rent either paid by the individual or one who has rent paid on his behalf, I believe that is the wording -- Councillor McKinnon has it right there in front of him at the moment and can correct me if I am wrong on this, on whose behalf is paid the sum on money. Really, we feel this is being misinterpreted in certain areas of the Territory in municipal elections. We feel that, really, what this says is that anyone who lives in a home, either of their own or who is a renter or on behalf of whom rent is paid, includes everyone, to all intents and purposes, in the Yukon Territory. We are simply eliminating this possibility of misinterpretation at the election official level. So, really, what we are saying to you here is, by suggesting this simplified wording, that we are only clarifying what is really meant in the Municipal Ordinance at the present time. I trust that that, Mr. Chairman, will be satisfactory explanation to the Honourable Member for this. This is a simplification of the background behind it. As I also said, this will be the philosophy that will be contained in the new Municipal Ordinance, when it comes forward for Council's consideration.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, when you go in such a liberal manner, I would like to know, if they are going to drop the rate-payer part from the Municipal Ordinance, why then, was not the limitation, as in the Plebiscite Ordinance, put to twelve months residency on this qualification for a person to be able to vote? It seems to me that we had reached a rather sensible compromise in the Plebiscite Ordinance which gave a wide franchise that we, however, limited to a certain extent by putting a twelve month residency prior to the election. It means, now, that a person, to vote in the December election, could be any one of the transient workers who comes up here in the summer period for a period of six months, has absolutely no stake in the community whatsoever, is never going to spend a winter in the Yukon and I don't think anybody is really a resident of the Yukon until they have put in at least one winter, and yet, is being given the right and the ability to be able to control the future of the amalgamation area. It seems to me

BILL #1

Mr. McKinnon continued.....

absolutely too broad, altogether. There is absolutely no limitation put on it.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I think what the Honourable Member says has a certain amount of merit to it, but likewise, I think that what we are proposing here has equal merit. Mr. Chairman, it is up to Council, in their wisdom to decide which track they wish to approach. But, I think that you are attempting here to encourage people to participate in the government of this area, and in order to do so, I think it is incumbent upon this body to give full consideration to extending and liberalizing the ability of people to participate in that government as widely and as fairly as is possible and practical. This is what we feel is being proposed here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the Honourable Member that I, basically, agree with him; because we have taken away the rate-payer condition, the duration of living here should be longer. But, I would also point out to the Honourable Member that, in this particular instance, if we make it twelve months, we are going to disenfranchise all the people who are coming into the City, if amalgamation goes through. Everybody in Porter Creek, or in Crestview, or in Marwell, or in the Indian Village won't have resided here for twelve months.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, they get completely around this technicality which just has been thrown at me by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North in section 6, by saying "From the coming into force of this Ordinance until the 1st day of January, 1972, except with the approval of the Commissioner, the by-laws of the Council of the City of Whitehorse shall not apply in respect of the area described in Schedule B to this Ordinance, but shall apply in respect of the area described in Schedule B of the Municipal Ordinance in force immediately prior to the coming into force of this Ordinance." Now, certainly, with the brain of the Honourable Legal Adviser, the same type of amendment can be worked into the Municipal Ordinance that says that for the period of the election, December, 1971, it shall be deemed that the new Schedule B of the Ordinance -- immediately prior twelve months to the date of the election, shall be the date eligible for the person to cast a vote at the election. Certainly, if he can do it in section 6, he certainly has the capability of being able to do it for the qualification of electors. To tell me that this is impossible to word is even getting more ridiculous as we go along.

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the suggestion was that it is impossible to word, but, there are two additional reasons why the six months was chosen. One is that six months appeared as the residency qualification already in Whitehorse; so, we took an existing qualification. On analysis, this appeared to cover two seasons, a summer season and a winter season. So, it was felt that the migratory summer worker would not be remaining for the election, but if he did, then he would genuinely become a resident within the terms of the existing section in the Municipal Ordinance.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go the other way now. I'm going to ask the Mayor of the City of Whitehorse what he feels of the section 238A, as it is drafted; whether he feels it is too wide; whether he feels that the people of the City of Whitehorse would be happy with it.

Mr. Chamberlist: Don't you know the answer already?

Mayor Wybrew: Well, I think I am permitted to say one thing, and one thing only, in regards to your proposed amendment and that is that City Council feels that the Steering Committee which was composed of Federal, your Executive Committee members, City Council members, and so on and so forth, they went along the line that to hold the status quo regarding the number



Mayor Wybrew continued.....

of members on Council, there shall be an award system; the term of office shall remain the same, etc. etc. They feel that the same object should be maintained in regards to qualification to serve on Council, that is to stand for election. This status quo should be held too, for the first two years of the Metropolitan Area, as was agreed by the Steering Committee in all other aspects. BILL #1

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the first section. I wonder if the Mayor would indicate to the many remarks that have been made by Councillor McKinnon with reference to the first section that we are dealing with now; that is, the voting.

Mayor Wybrew: Well, I can only tell you that this wasn't discussed to any length by the City Council members, except the qualifications in regards to rate-payers. This was their main concern. If you are asking a personal opinion...

Mr. Chamberlist: No, no we're not.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I think, in the first section here, and I'm sure that the Mayor would agree with me on this, that really, we are talking here about the eligibility of a voter, the ability to vote and at the present time, the Municipal Ordinance only calls for him to reside in the municipality for six months.

Mayor Wybrew: This is correct. In answer to a remark made by yourself a little earlier, that some people are having problems to exercise their franchise, I've yet to run into a problem of this nature. No one is denied the right to vote within the municipality. You know, a Voters' List, Mr. Chairman, I might point out, is just a list of names of people who may or may not have the right to vote. You can be sworn in at any time to vote if you legitimately have the right to vote. No one is denied this right. We received a communication to this effect which was completely wrong.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, I take it Mr. Chairman, that from the remarks that have been made, the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West now agrees that there is no objection to section 1 as it is.

Mr. McKinnon: As far as I understood, the Mayor said that he would like to, as far the qualifications of voters go, see it remain as it is for the first two years of the expanded municipality. Perhaps I'm wrong in taking this interpretation.

Mayor Wybrew: This was the feeling of Council.

Mr. McKinnon: It was the feeling of City of Whitehorse Council that this should remain as in section 238, "a rate-payer, spouse of a rate-payer" resided within a municipality and is liable for payment in rent?

Mr. Chamberlist: Yes, but it also says "an occupier, spouse of an occupier" as well.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I think, with respect, on analysis you will find that a proper interpretation of the way the Municipal Ordinance is written now and the simplified wording before you at the present time are basically one and the same thing. There's no -- you add up to exactly the same thing, the same individuals having the capability of voting.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to Honourable Members that this is, to the best of my knowledge, the only jurisdiction, certainly, in western Canada which doesn't allow everybody to vote. The wording of most of the Acts are similar to that. This just clarifies the situation as it should be in the rest of Canada in the Yukon.

BILL #1

Mayor Wybrew: I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that City Council, quite some time ago requested that it be reduced to nineteen years of age.

Mr. McKinnon: This was done during the last Council.

Mr. Chairman: Well, have you any further discussion on section 1? Are you clear?

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would be very much happier if it would be ordinarily resident within a municipality for at least twelve months. We keep throwing the argument; we keep hearing around the Council table, they do it in Alberta, they do it in B.C. I'm so sick and tired of hearing the way that they do it in Alberta and B.C. and Manitoba, I think I'm really going to regurgitate if I hear it once more around this table. The reason I'm here is because, for God's sake, I hoped we were still a little different than they are in other areas of the country. That's the reason that we are still a bit unique and don't have to follow suit to every other part of the country. It seems to me that in the Yukon, where it has been proven statistically that we have the higher rate of transiency compared to any other area of Canada, this is the area where we should be looking to make an exception so that we won't have an influx on transients having the franchise to dictate how we are going to control our affairs for the next -- rather, for time immemorial. I think, in this instance, and I'm going to stick with it, that it should be, if it is going to be liberalized, still tough enough that a person has to live here twelve months immediately prior to the date of election to be able to vote. I just can't see it being made this liberal at this time, considering the well known transient rate in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the Honourable Member that both he and I sat on the administrative sub-committee of the Steering Committee that brought this through, and looked into the whole amalgamation issue. If he will recall, both he and I, particularly he and I, made that plebiscite as liberal as we possibly could. And, if the Honourable Member will recall, I have just previously said that I personally agree with him on this twelve month bit. But, in this particular instance, in this election that is coming up in December, the only way to put it through -- admittedly, there are alternatives within this Ordinance, but this Ordinance becomes dead on the first of next year. In this particular instance, this is the only way that we are going to give the franchise to practically the whole of my constituency in the new City election.

Mr. McKinnon: The only thing I can say is that the Honourable Member has nowhere near the faith in the Legal Adviser that I have, because if he were directed to make an amendment to the Ordinance, allowing for people in what is now going to be the Metro Area the right to vote if they were resident in that area twelve months prior to the first election of the amalgamated area, there would be no problem whatsoever in him coming up with the wording of it. I'm positive of this, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member will agree that this could be done. I think that this is what should be done.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I would make one further comment if I may. When discussion comes forward in the Fall Session, or whenever it is, regarding the re-writing of the present Municipal Ordinance, I will personally, and I give notice to all Councillors, I will personally fight to have these same stipulations and these same conditions of the voting public in any municipality in the whole of the Yukon -- I don't think that it should be in just one area now. I understand that in these particular circumstances, it should. I don't really see the Honourable Member's point in changing this particular section, or making a change right now, just for the sake of a consistency in this Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Have you anything further on section 1? Are we clear.  
(Mr. Chairman reads section 2.)

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Whitehorse Mayor for his comments on this particular section. I know the feelings of the Mayor and Aldermen in Dawson, at the moment, and I am pleased to see that this particular Ordinance is particularly aimed at the problem in Whitehorse at the moment. At least, it is in the extension of the boundaries. But, I would like to hear his comments, because, I'm sure that by Fall, when the whole Municipal Ordinance has been re-written, there will be briefs presented, or at least strong arguments presented by the Council of Dawson against this particular clause. I would like to hear the Mayor's comments.

Mayor Wybrew: The City Council of Whitehorse feels that the Ordinance, as it presently reads, should remain the same for at least the first two years of the Metro system; that a person who stands for election should be a rate-payer, or a taxpayer, if you wish, of the area concerned; and, not permit at this time someone, or several, perhaps, to set the cost of living, as far as the City operation is concerned, who has no investment within the community. This is the feeling of the City Council, that the status quo be held as the Steering Committee is held in all other respects.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of Committee that when Mayor Wybrew says that it is the Council's wish that it should be a rate-payer or a taxpayer, there seems to be an omission. The present Municipal Ordinance, and this is something that I disagree with, also has that the spouse of a rate-payer or a taxpayer is also eligible to become a candidate. Now, as far as I'm concerned, this is a bad piece of legislation for the simple reason that if the City was able to sue a rate-payer, it could not sue the spouse of a rate-payer for a debt incurred by the rate-payer. That, in itself is bad; just as bad, if it wants to be put this way, as a person who is not a rate-payer at all. A wife or husband of a rate-payer is also not a rate-payer. I think that it is weak argument that is being put up here in this particular instance. As has been indicated, Mr. Chairman, this is an interim piece of legislation, for this specific purpose. As has been indicated by the Honourable Member for Dawson, there will be suggestions made and brought forward and probably strong arguments brought forward when the new Municipal Ordinance is brought before Council. As it is now, I can see no valid objection, especially in view of what remarks have been made by the Mayor.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on section 2?

Mr. McKinnon: I would be interested in hearing the desires of the Mayor and the Aldermen of the City of Dawson, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say is that if this particular Ordinance was now concerned with a forthcoming election in Dawson, we would fight it, and particularly this one clause. But, I feel a bit like a fish out of water, in that this is primarily for your coming election here in Whitehorse. I would certainly object, and so would the Council of Dawson object if it were our election.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, in section 238A, we have liberalized and given the right to vote to anybody who has been six months in the Territory and is a Canadian citizen or other British subject. Certainly, in section 240, the wishes of the people of the City of Whitehorse should be heard at this time. Further amendments to the Municipal Ordinance that are asked for by the expanded Council or by the Metro Area, or by any of the municipalities, then, Council can listen to the wishes of the Metro Council and amend the Municipal Ordinance. Why do we have to amend section 240 at this time? Why can't we have a sensible compromise where we liberalize the franchise to the people eligible to vote, yet we control, because of the unique circumstance we find ourselves in, those people at this time who are eligible to run for election. Certainly, it is not really that oppressive on a person to be able to run for



BILL #1

Mr. McKinnon continued.....

election in the Metro Area, to have to have value of property in the assessment area of \$1,000. Why can't we strike a balance between the two? Amend section 238A, if Council wants to, and leave section 240 in as it stands, on the wishes of the City Council. It would seem to me to strike a rather sensible compromise and a balance between the extremes of liberalizing and being too oppressive.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, what must not be forgotten is that if it were left as it is, you would find that everybody from outside the existing City boundaries, whether they had property or not, would be ineligible because they would not be a taxpayer within the City of Whitehorse at that time. To be a taxpayer, they would have to be registered on the last assessment role, and the people from outside the City of Whitehorse at this time would not be on the assessment role. They would be on the assessment role of the Territorial Government, not the City Government. This is another reason, here, why this should take place. Perhaps, the Honourable Member, not understanding this particular feature, can now see the necessity for this. This is another point that has to be examined. Now, quite frankly, this must be understood. This is just for this particular election, an interim amendment. There should be no objection at all.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the arguments that Honourable Members are using are purely semantical and deal with terminology. There is just no great...

Mr. Chamberlist: It deals with law.

Mr. McKinnon: No. There is no great obstacle for the terminology in the Ordinance to be worded that if they were resident within the area that is going to be Schedule B and paid taxes to whoever they paid taxes to on assessable property of \$1,000 or more, then they are eligible to run for office. You just can't convince me with this type of argument that it is anything but purely a technical term of drafting, and nothing else, that these wishes can be met. They can be met. The Honourable Member knows that they can be met and he is just trying to confuse the issue with a semantic argument that just doesn't hold water. I'm really amazed at the Honourable Member for trying to snow Council that this can't be done for the lack of being able to come up with the proper wording. I just won't buy it. I'm surprised that the Honourable Member would use this.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's no surprise to me that the Honourable Member is surprised at anything that I say.

Mr. McKinnon: I never cease to be surprised at what you say, and you'd better believe it.

Mr. Chamberlist: I take this for granted. However, it's unfortunate that he doesn't understand sufficient of municipal law to recognize the fact that a person cannot be placed in the position of being eligible who is not a taxpayer. This is why this section -- one of the main reasons why it has been put forward, so that it takes away that specific area where there would be a nuisance value attached to those people living outside the existing City boundaries. The promise was to give the people outside the City boundaries the right to vote and the right to elect people of their choice. There is nothing to fear from it at this time for the simple reason that if any rate-payer feels that he is afraid of somebody who is not a responsible person getting into office, there is an opportunity at the election to go out and vote and to elect the people of his choice. So far, I, quite frankly Mr. Chairman, find the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West has been very, very weak in his arguments and hasn't put anything substantial forward at all.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West how, if we leave the Municipal Ordinance as it is, and don't change it like this -- the following people can vote: anybody who lives in an old age



Mr. Tanner continued.....

home, anybody who lives in an apartment, anybody who lives in the Indian Village, anybody who lives in a trailer, -- they can vote, but how can they run and why shouldn't they run. What you are saying is that people are transient here. But, what about the people who have spent forty years and do now not own property, but choose to live in an apartment? They have got the time, and they have put in the time to be able to run for an election for an office. Why shouldn't the people who have lived here longer than any of us in the Indian Village run for an office?

BILL #1

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I'm making the argument that there is really much dissention in the public of the whole of the Metro Area at this time, and that is how to arrive at a sensible solution to what peoples' minds think is far too liberal in both the franchise qualifications and the qualifications to be able to run for office. There is that other group of people who think that the franchise and the qualifications should be just a day's residency in the Yukon. All you are trying to do, as we did at the time of the plebiscite when exactly the same arguments -- we should make it very rigid and only allow rate-payers to vote or make it that anyone who has lived in the Yukon for just a day or a month should be allowed to vote. Now, we compromised; we came up with a twelve month period and made the franchise universal. That is exactly the same thing that I am trying to find at this table. I think that we are going far beyond the wishes of what most people want, who are going to be in the Metro Area. I think that they were worried about the expansion of the City boundaries, and all that we were doing was giving them assurances, all the way along the line, that all of a sudden their lives and the futures wouldn't be taken over by a group who really didn't have the best interest of the expanded community at heart. Now, Mr. Chairman, I just think that we should be attempting to come to some rationalization between the two extremes that are being purported. I think that in section 238 and section 240 as they now stand, there is just too much liberalization of what has been traditionally the qualification of electors and the qualifications of those eligible to run. I think this is amenable with the way that the franchise is being expanded to people, that this will come about in the next few years. I should say, at this time, it is just too -- considering all the situations, considering the trepidation that people went into Metro for and the assurances that we gave them on the platform, I think through this type of legislation we are going far overboard from what they expected. Now, the Honourable Member from Whitehorse East was nowhere near at the time of the plebiscite, so how can he gauge what the feeling of the public was. I would never be so unkind as to tell him, or to verify the rumour that so many people said, that the Commissioner wanted the plebiscite so badly that he sent the Honourable Member on holidays and away from here, the municipality at the time of the plebiscite. It is true that the people did take a risk and those people who would be guiding their political future, and I think it is incumbent upon us and our responsibility, not to go overboard in the liberalization of franchises to the public in the expanded area. I know that it can be arrived at through amendments to this Ordinance, that if you do liberalize the franchise as we have done, and leave that section 240 as is, though it applies to the expanded Metro Area, this is not impossible to do legislatively. It is not impossible to do through the language of legislation. This would satisfy the majority of the people who voted for amalgamation. I've made the statement over and over again during the meeting that the principle and the concept of amalgamation is fine, but I really -- I'm really faced with trepidation when the concept got into the politic hands. Already, through this type of legislation, I'm being fearful of what we can expect in the expanded boundaries. I think we're just going too far too fast against the wishes of those people, elected people, who represent the City of Whitehorse as it now exists.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest two things. First of all, the Honourable Member is being inconsistent, just as he was on the Liquor Ordinance, when he wants to liberalize everything except we don't want to let

BILL #1

Mr. Tanner continued.....

them drink on Sundays. This is completely inconsistent with it, and he is just as typically inconsistent here. I'm sure, personally, the Member himself goes along with this legislation and you are elected to make the decision. I think you should make the decision. One further thing; the only person who I have heard object to this is a member elected by the landowners or property owners in this City. How do you know what the people who haven't had a chance to vote before us think? How does the Honourable Member know? Does he have an oracle or a ball that he can look into and he knows? He listens strictly to what an elected member of the property owners who have elected him in the past. I say that, in my opinion, he's not speaking for the majority of the people, and he's definitely not speaking for the people in Whitehorse North.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I generally listen to the representatives of the people and, so far, listening to that voice, I've been rather successful. The Honourable Member, somewhere along his political career, if it lasts for any length of time, is going to have to learn that this is the voice that you eventually have to listen to if you want to remain at this table.

Mayor Wybrew: I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be some things slanted here and I disagree completely with some of the remarks. In the first place, it should be pointed out that the Steering Committee said that the right of franchise should be extended to everybody in the Metropolitan Area. There were those on the Executive Committee who opposed this. It was the Mayor of the City of Whitehorse who cast the deciding vote to extend the right to everybody in the Metropolitan Area to vote. I think this should be very clear, and dispel these innuendos that are going about. The people in the City of Whitehorse, and I am talking about the City Council, say that the people in Porter Creek, Hillcrest, anywhere, who are rate-payers shall be allowed to run for office in this election this coming December. There are inferences here that this is not to be. This is not the feeling of the City Council of Whitehorse, and I want that very clear.

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make a very, I think, valuable point. The next City Council has a greater responsibility for the future of Whitehorse than the present City Council, because, Mr. Chairman, the present City Council's obligations and conduct are for the existing boundaries of the City of Whitehorse. The next one takes in the overall picture. Let it be for them to decide, for the newly elected people to decide, what the position and what the stand is. I concur, although I am a rate-payer and perhaps a very heavy one, too, in this area, with what the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North has said; that, at present, the City Councillors who have been elected have been elected on the basis of they being rate-payers. So, they not necessarily do have the majority of the people who are supporting them. Now, the Ordinance that has been put up, and perhaps put up very well and very vociferously by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West who is capable of being vociferous in certain areas...

Mr. McKinnon: There's a pot calling the kettle black.

Mr. Chamberlist: He knows that there is no possible way that he can argue against the suggestion that liberalization of any legislation is a bad thing, because I have for years, seen him stand up on these changes and speak loudly, "Let's widen this; let's open this; let's not play with semantics; let's do this right". We're doing it right now. We are making it clear that everybody is getting an opportunity for this particular election. Mr. Chairman, I think that we should just continue to go on with the reading of the Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on section 2?

Mayor Wybrew: Once again, Mr. Chairman, if I might. It's inferred, very

Mayor Wybrew continued.....

lightly. I want it very clearly understood that the City Council of the City of Whitehorse does not wish to take away the franchise right from anybody who lives in the Metropolitan Area. They want them to have the right to vote. Now, get that very clear. It was the City Council of Whitehorse that forced the issue through the Steering Committee, to give everybody the right to vote in the Metropolitan Area. Now, get that clear, too.

BILL #1

Mr. Stutter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Mayor one thing. You have referred continually to vote. In this particular section, we are talking about eligibility to run. Is it still the feeling of the Whitehorse City Council in as far as candidacy is concerned?

Mayor Wybrew: City Council feels that the status quo should be held in regards to the candidacy right. Whether they live in Hillcrest, Crestview, Valleyview, I don't care where you wish to name, if they are rate-payers, they have the right to run in the forthcoming election. We want them to run.

Mr. Stutter: The emphasis is on rate-payer.

Mayor Wybrew: Right.

Mr. Tanner: And a \$1,000 worth of property. Mr. Chairman, one final thing on this. I don't want to have an argument with our witness, but what he is referring to, I think, I'm not sure, is the deciding vote, the tie vote which he broke on who should vote in the plebiscite and it didn't concern who should vote in the election thereafter. The second thing is that I, personally, gave a commitment which I completely and utterly believe in to the people in the Indian Village and the people in trailers and the people from every platform that I spoke, that they would have the right to run. That's the only way they got it and that's in the legislation here. There is no way that that should be amended, taken out or changed.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on section 2? Are you clear? (Mr. Chairman reads section 3.)

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Chairman, just a word with the Legal Adviser when he gets through talking to the Chief. Mr. Legal Adviser, I've read this a couple of times and I'm quite sure it is obvious, but I don't see the difference to what we have in the old Ordinance and what we have in the amended Ordinance.

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, there is a major change here. Under the old system, a Council was elected for different periods, so that there was an overlap when some Councillors remained in office. Council will recall agreeing to a change so that it became a question of all in and all out at each election. This is merely a technical change to make this possible.

Mr. Chairman: This is transitory, only?

Mr. Legal Adviser: It's not transitory; it's permanent, because the old section read that the candidate with the highest number of votes gets the longest term. This puts them all in and all out.

Mr. Chairman: Are you clear on section 3? (Mr. Chairman reads section 4.)

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, this is a similar type of section.

Mr. Chairman: Are you clear on section 4? (Mr. Chairman reads section 5.) I wonder if we could have an explanation of that.

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, this is a section put in at the request



Mr. Legal Adviser continued.....

BILL #1 of the City so that they will be able to escape the liability which they otherwise would have if we didn't put in this section, of maintaining, repairing and improving the Alaska Highway and the North and South Access Roads.

Mr. Chamberlist: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Mayor would like to comment on that; whether he is agreeable on this particular item.

Mayor Wybrew: If you had been present, instead of on holidays, you would know that we negotiated this.

Mr. Chamberlist: Well, I just simply asked, Mr. Chairman, if the witness could give that information.

Mr. McKinnon: Thank the Lord for small mercies.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Mayor Wybrew?

Mayor Wybrew: I thought I answered it. We negotiated this. We're for it, of course, or we would never have attempted to negotiate it.

Mr. Chamberlist: It seems to be an offense to have a holiday these days.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Are we clear on section 5? Next section. (Mr. Chairman reads section 6.) Mr. Legal Adviser.

Mr. Legal Adviser: Mr. Chairman, the intention and the statements that were made during the preliminaries leading up to the plebiscite were to the effect that the outside areas would not be subject to City by-laws until an eventual day, which is the 1st of January. The City officials were nervous in case there may be a particular by-law here or there to enable them to expend money, or to say, build a street lamp or something, and they might require to put into force a particular by-law with the consent of the local people. This is to provide, in general terms, that the by-laws will not apply, but we have to take a precaution in case one or two may have to apply.

Mr. Chairman: Are we clear on section 6?

Mr. McKinnon: I wonder if we could have a comment from the Mayor on this section, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor Wybrew: Well, I'm still trying to get this bit. The position of City Council, again, I don't think it applies in this respect. This one is whizzing by a little bit. We know that there are perhaps by-laws in effect that will work a hardship, and this the City Council doesn't want in certain areas. These will be amended. As a matter of fact, all the by-laws are being studied now by the two Governments, or the two Administrations, to see that there are no hardships and that there will be a smooth transition.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, maybe Mr. Legal Adviser can correct me if I am wrong, but from what I understand of the section, it means that none of the by-laws of the City of Whitehorse will have any effect in the expanded City area until January of 1972. If you want any of the City by-laws to apply to the expanded area, you have to get permission from the Commissioner to allow them to come into effect. That's what I understand.

Mayor Wybrew: No, I can't agree to 1972.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, could I have His Worship's comments on this.

Mayor Wybrew: This is being worked on now, and the progress, apparently, is excellent. There will be no problems. Why an extra year, I don't know.



Mayor Wybrew continued.....  
Many of the people who are in the ...

*BILL #1*

Mr. Chamberlist: What extra year?

Mayor Wybrew: Oh, I'm sorry. Right. Well, that's alright. That's fine.  
No trouble there. I'm sorry, I'm out twelve months. No problem.

Mr. Chairman: Clear on section 6? (Mr. Chairman reads section 7.) Are  
you clear on section 7? I think at this time I will declare a brief recess.

RECESS

*RECESS*

Mr. Chairman: At this time, I will call Committee back to order. The next section is section 8. (Reads section 8 of Bill No. 1). Are you clear? (Reads section 9 of Bill No. 1). Forms KA, LA and RA are as enumerated. Are you clear on section 9? (Reads section 10). Are you clear? Have you any further questions to ask of Mayor Wybrew? I wonder then if it is the wish of the Committee that these gentlemen be excused? Thank you very much gentlemen for assisting us with these deliberations. Thank you very much. What is your pleasure in relation to this bill?

*BILL #1*

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be reported out of Committee without amendment.

Mr. Tanner: I second that motion.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Councillor Chamberlist, seconded by Councillor Tanner, that Bill No. 1 be reported out of Committee without amendment. Are you prepared for the question? Are you agreed? Those agreed kindly signify? Those disagreed kindly signify? I declare the motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

Mr. Chairman: What is your further pleasure?

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Chairman, I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a seconder?

Mr. Tanner: I second this 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? Are you agreed? I declare the motion as carried.

MOTION CARRIED

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: We will now call the Council to order. May we have the report from the Chairman of Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, Committee convened at 2:10 p.m. this afternoon to discuss Public Bills. Mayor Wybrew and Manager Byron of the City of Whitehorse attended Committee to discuss Bill No. 1. It was moved by Councillor Chamberlist, seconded by Councillor Tanner, that Bill No. 1 be reported out of Committee without amendment. This motion carried. It was moved by Councillor Chamberlist, seconded by Councillor Tanner, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair. This motion carried.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committee. Are we agreed? I declare the motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED

*MOTION  
CARRIED*

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Chamberlist: Mr. Speaker, I move that Third Reading be given to Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance.

Mrs. Watson: I second this motion.

BILL #1  
THIRD  
READING

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member from Whitehorse East, and seconded by the Member from Carmacks-Kluane, that Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be given Third Reading at this time. Are you prepared for the question? Are you agreed? I declare the motion carried.

MOTION  
CARRIED

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title of Bill No. 1?

Mr. Chamberlist: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the title to Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance be adopted as written.

Mrs. Watson: I second this motion.

BILL #1  
TITLE  
ADOPTED

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Member from Whitehorse East, seconded by the Member from Carmacks-Kluane, that the title of Bill No. 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question? Are you agreed? I declare the motion carried, and that Bill No. 1 has passed this House.

MOTION  
CARRIED

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: What is your further pleasure?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is the first day of a session, and there is no order paper, it has been expressed by some Members, that they are desirous of a short question period with Mr. Commissioner. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if Council would agree, if we could not indeed have a short question period with Mr. Commissioner prior to prorogation procedures?

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask Mr. Commissioner how one of the clauses of Bill No. 1 appeared in a copy of the local press prior to the bill being given to Members of Council?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, there are many times when the abilities of the members of the press don't always appear, and I would suggest that this is one of those times. I simply do not have the answer to the Honourable Member's question.

QUESTION RE  
STUDENT  
SUMMER  
EMPLOYMENT

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if Mr. Commissioner was aware of the student hiring programme under the Secretary of States Office, and that the Yukon River has been designated as one of the rivers that students are being hired to clean up as part of the summer's work activities?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the information supplied by the Honourable Member in its simplicity, results in this very simple situation happening. We have had a considerable amount of correspondence and various other communications with the Secretary of States Office, and other government agencies purporting to provide money for certain student hiring projects during the summertime of the year, and so far, I may say that none of them have resulted in anything that I am aware of in coming into actuality. I hope that some of them do in the very near future. While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would say that in this connection, I am hopeful that we can have permission to make a public announcement of a contribution that has been made directly to the Yukon Territory by a private company. It is doing this on a national basis, but we were included as part of their national distribution of funds that will provide, certainly a minimal amount, but a very -- what I consider a very significant kind of contribution towards summertime employment for students in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Commissioner could check my information that I have received as of last Friday, that the Yukon River has been designated, and that out of 15 students hired, 14 are coming at government expense from outside. Only one is to be hired from the Yukon Territory, and that in effect we are paying 14 other students to clean up our back yard. There have been applications from many Yukon students asking that they be employed as part of the team that will be cleaning up the Yukon River this summer.

QUESTION RE  
STUDENT  
SUMMER  
EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly check on the veracity of the Honourable Member's information, but I would certainly feel that this is a pretty typical situation of all hiring practices going on here in the Yukon Territory at the present time, and it would certainly be a conundrum of the Federal Government doing anything different than everybody else is doing. They seem to think that this is some kind of barren uninhabited land here, where nobody answers -- you know, to anything, or nobody knows anything about anything, and that is roughly the picture on the situation. It may well be that the Honourable Member from Carmacks-Kluane might have something further to add on this as far as student hiring is concerned, but basically speaking, I wouldn't doubt it at all but that your information is absolutely correct.

Mr. McKinnon: Well, this naturally leads into my next question, Mr. Speaker, that we asked for protection of Yukon employees to be hired. As far as I understand it the amendment to the Labour Standards Ordinance has not yet been proclaimed by the Commissioner, which is the very thing that we were seeking, to protect the Yukon labour force, and from my phone everyday listening to complaints from Yukon employees, that help is just pouring in from outside when available help is present in the Yukon. I wonder why the proclamation has not been issued yet, to this date?

QUESTION RE  
LABOUR  
STANDARDS  
ORDINANCE  
AMENDMENT

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately in the haste to put this together at the closing time of the last session of Council, there has been certain questions raised about the format in which we made this proposal. I am sorry that it would not appear any more likely that we can give assent to this now than it was at the close of the last Council Session. The Legal Adviser may be better equipped than I am to give you the problems that are inherent in this. As a consequence of not being able to give assent to the full Ordinance, we likewise find ourselves in a rather untenable position with regard to raising the minimum wage that Council wished to be raised to \$1.75 an hour. I do have before me a possible solution to this, and it may well be that the Honourable Members might like to have some discourse on this before prorogation actually takes place, but the hiring practices situation, generally, I couldn't agree more with the Honourable Member, that it is completely out of hand. I have had communication with the senior people in the Canadian Labour Congress, and I expect to have one of their senior people from Vancouver here in the Territory within the next week or ten days. I am hopeful that we can at least deal with the union side of these practices at that time, but that still leaves wide open the practices of government and the practices of non-union employees, and I couldn't agree more with the Honourable Member concerning the wishes of Council, but I am afraid that our wishes were not put into a form that is too practical under the circumstances. You might like to ask Mr. Legal Adviser more about this aspect of it.

Mr. McKinnon: Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, from the Commissioner's answer, that if we were to remain in Council, that perhaps legislation could be passed at this session, protecting employee and employer hiring practices in the Yukon Territory?

Mr. Commissioner: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to mislead the Honourable Member. This is not the case. What we could do, if the Honourable Members wish to, is that we could accommodate, by certain



Mr. Commissioner continued ...  
amendments the \$1.75 an hour minimum wage coming into affect, but I am afraid that the other side of the coin is just beyond our legislative competence at this time.

QUESTION RE  
AIR  
TRANSPOR-  
TATION  
INCREASES

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. Commissioner, if any representations were made from the Yukon Government to the Board of Transport Commissioners? Company officials, both C.P. and Air Canada, admitted before a House Committee the other day that the Toronto - Vancouver return economy fare, including three stopovers each way, would cost \$343 now, this year, compared with \$240 a year ago. Two rate increases and a new rate structure making stopovers cost more have brought the rise. Mr. Speaker, I tried to get the corresponding figures for Vancouver to Ottawa flights with stopover privileges which were part of the ticket package before, and I couldn't get them from C.P. at noon hour, but I imagine that if it is \$103 more between Toronto and Vancouver, it would be in the neighbourhood of a \$150 more between Whitehorse and Ottawa. I was wondering if there is ever going to be a stop to these discriminatory fare increases because of our dependence on transportation in the North, and whether representations are being made to the Board of Transport Commissioners on such type of very discriminatory fares, where we depend so much on transportation and on stopover privileges.

Mr. Chamberlist: Are you running for Federal election or something?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part of these discriminatory fare increases is that they are put into effect, and we read about them in the local newspapers. I have made representations to my minister, and that surely to goodness there should be some opportunity for representations to be made, not only by the Yukon Territorial Government but by interested individuals and organizations, to the Board of Transport Commissioners on these things that affect us here, and I am sure that my minister has in turn passed these requests on to the proper authorities, but literally speaking, their attitude is that we are small and far away, and they appear to care less. I see no attempt on the part of any of these hearings to be brought here to the Yukon where proper representation could be made. These are just the simple facts with which we are surrounded, and one of the things that we are making strong representations on at the present time is an anticipated tax, I believe, that is to be placed on fares. I am not too sure whether they are just within Canada or without of Canada, but they would apply to fares from the North here, and we are making strong representations now to the Treasury Board to see that they are not applied in this particular part of Canada.

QUESTION RE  
TELEGRAPH  
RATE  
INCREASES

Mr. McKinnon: Are any representations, Mr. Speaker, being made to the Federal Government as to the increase of telegraph rates, which are again extremely discriminatory to the people of the North, who depend so much on communications for their livelihood and their business to go.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have heard of any potential changes in telegraph rates. The only rates that we are familiar with, working internally in government, are the telex rates, and they seem to stay fairly constant. But, if the Honourable Member would supply me with information on this, I will certainly undertake to see that representations are made to protect our particular communication level of ...

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, they are going up, and the further the distances between points, the more the increase is going up in the telegraph rates charged by C.N. Telecommunications. Yes, and Mr. Speaker, I would just like to end my series of questions, by asking if Mr. Commissioner, when the Prime Minister returns to Canada from Russia, whether Mr. Commissioner will invite him to the Yukon in order that he may apply the philosophy of development of the Russian

Mr. McKinnon continued ...

North, that he is so impressed by, to the Canadian North.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, we have an open invitation to the Prime Minister to come to the Yukon at anytime that he so desires, and I am sure that when the opportunity presents its self, he will be returning with or without an invitation, and I would certainly be very hopeful that some of the things that the Prime Minister appears to be impressed with in Russia's North, will indeed stimulate some thinking at the Federal level that they might take a hard look at applying them here in Canada.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the Commissioner. I would like to know what progress has been made by the Administration formulating and coming up with a land policy which will enable people moving into the Yukon or living in the Yukon to obtain land. It seems that we have a land freeze in the area now, and can we have something more specific on what is the target date for that intimation.

QUESTION K  
LANDS  
POLICY

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, land disposal policies within the Metropolitan area, the status quo as they apply in the regulations at the present time will remain. It is not our intention to make life any more difficult than what it is right now for the incoming Metropolitan Council, and it is not our intention to make any changes to those disposal regulations until such time as there is a Metro Council, and we can seek their advice and work in harmony with them in this regard. As far as land disposal policies outside of the Metro area, the vast majority of the land is controlled by the Federal Government, and my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is far too easily obtainable, because it is being handed out for the most part by authorities who do not have to live with the consequences of their decisions, and the taxpayers of the Yukon Territory have to pick up the tab. We are fortunate in having good liaison with the federal Lands people at the present time, and I am very hopeful that many of the problems of the past will not be repeated in the future. But if the Honourable Member's question is, are we going to hand out land completely indiscriminately just because somebody walks in an office and says that he wants a 160 acres of land in order to settle on, the answer is no. They are going to remain as much as we possibly can to encourage people to buy surveyed land within townsites, and within settlements that can be serviced properly with municipal services that people demand at this time.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, in relation to land disposal policies, it has always been my understanding, of course, that this is a matter for this Legislature to decide, to determine upon the advice and the information given it from time to time by the Administration. May I have the assurance, Mr. Speaker, from the Administration today, I would ask if they are prepared to give this assurance, that this policy -- that these policies will not be changed until such time as this Legislature has been informed, and prepared to discuss the changes?

QUESTION L  
LANDS  
POLICY

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, the policy in the past has been to discuss these matters with the Legislature. I am not aware of any particular changes that -- in fact, I have simply said that there will not be any changes, and we have no intention of making any across-the-board changes without prior discussions with the Legislature, or at least if they apply to a particular area, with Members of Council who particularly represent that area. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give some kind of blanket assurance that nothing is going to be changed, because this is exactly why you have two elected people who sit on the Executive Committee, and certainly I would feel that they are more than adequately informed and participate fully in any changes in policy that take place.

Mr. Speaker: We wish to thank Mr. Commissioner for his attendance. We will now have a short recess.

RECESS

RECESS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now come to order. Mr. Commissioner, the Council of the Yukon Territory has, at its present sitting thereof, passed a bill to which, in the name and on behalf of the said Council, I respectfully request your assent.

*BILL #1  
ASSENTED TO*

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to give my assent to Bill No. 1 being, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance,

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Clerk: It is the Commissioner's will and pleasure that this Council be now prorogued and this Council is accordingly prorogued.

*PROROGUED*

PROROGUED

May 26th, 1971.

SESSIONAL PAPER NO. 1 - 1971 (SECOND SESSION)

MR. SPEAKER,

MEMBERS OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL OF  
THE YUKON TERRITORY

I HAVE THE HONOUR TO WELCOME YOU TO THE THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WHOLLY ELECTED COUNCIL OF THE YUKON TERRITORY, AND TO INFORM YOU THAT IT IS THE INTENTION OF MY ADMINISTRATION TO PLACE BEFORE YOU AT THIS SESSION AMENDMENTS TO THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE THAT ARE REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT THE EXTENSION OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE BOUNDARIES AND PROVIDE FOR THE ELECTION OF A CITY COUNCIL TO GOVERN THE NEW AREA, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1ST, 1972.

AS YOU ARE AWARE, A PLEBISCITE SEEKING THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE RESIDENT IN THE METRO AREA RESPECTING THE EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES WAS HELD ON MAY 10, AND THE RESULTS INDICATE A DEFINITE DESIRE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ONE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE ENTIRE AREA.

IT WOULD DO WELL TO REVIEW THE MANY STEPS THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE TO BRING US TO THE POINT IN YUKON'S HISTORY WHERE WE ARE PROPOSING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MUNICIPALITY WITH AN APPROXIMATE AREA OF 165 SQUARE MILES, AND AN ESTIMATED POPULATION OF 10,000 PEOPLE.

IN APRIL, 1959, A RESOLUTION WAS PASSED BY THE TERRITORIAL COUNCIL ASKING THE THEN MINISTER OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES TO HAVE AN INVESTIGATION UNDERTAKEN BY



SUITABLE QUALIFIED EXPERTS ON MUNICIPAL MATTERS TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF INTEGRATING WITHIN THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE BOUNDARIES THOSE PERIPHERAL AREAS DEVELOPED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO HOUSE BOTH MILITARY AND FEDERAL PERSONNEL. THE RESOLUTION ALSO REQUESTED THAT THE EXPERTS PREPARE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY PROVIDING FOR BOUNDARY EXTENSIONS TO ALLOW FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND CONTROL OF EXPANSION.

AS A RESULT OF THIS RESOLUTION, A REPORT COMPILED BY THE INSTITUTE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, WAS TABLED IN COUNCIL IN NOVEMBER, 1960, RECOMMENDING "THAT A METROPOLITAN PLAN BE PREPARED BY THE CITY, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER, TO CONTROL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN TEN MILES OF THE CITY".

AT THAT SESSION OF COUNCIL, A MOTION WAS PASSED ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY QUEEN'S, AND REQUESTING THE ADMINISTRATION TO TAKE THE NECESSARY STEPS TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

AT THE REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES, THE CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION UNDERTOOK, ON JANUARY 12, 1961, TO PREPARE THE METROPOLITAN PLAN WHICH, WHEN COMPLETED IN FEBRUARY OF 1963, DELINEATED THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPOSED WHITEHORSE METROPOLITAN AREA AS THOSE THAT ARE BEING PROPOSED FOR THE NEW CITY BOUNDARIES TODAY.

THE WHITEHORSE METROPOLITAN AREA WHICH, IN ADDITION TO HILLCREST, VALLEYVIEW AND TAKHINI, THE MAIN CONCERNS IN 1959, NOW INCLUDED CRESTVIEW AND PORTER CREEK; WAS ESTABLISHED BY COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1964/65, SIGNED ON JULY 3, 1964, AND SUBSEQUENTLY WAS AMENDED BY COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1966/65, SIGNED ON MAY 31, 1966, WHICH ESTABLISHED THE REGULATIONS RESPECTING AREA DEVELOPMENT IN THE WHITEHORSE METROPOLITAN AREA.

IN 1966, A PLEBISCITE ASKING THE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE IF THEY WISHED THE BOUNDARIES EXTENDED TO INCLUDE TAKHINI, VALLEYVIEW AND THE C.N.T. AREA WAS HELD, AND THE VOTERS OF THE DAY WERE OPPOSED TO ANY EXTENSION AT THAT TIME.

IN 1969, REED, CROWTHER AND PARTNERS LIMITED, CONSULTING ENGINEERS AND PLANNERS, WERE RETAINED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF YUKON TO PRODUCE A PROGRAMME OF OBJECTIVES AND STAGED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROPOSED BY C.M.H.C. IN 1963. THEY STATED IN THE INTRODUCTION TO THEIR REPORT WHICH WAS RECEIVED IN 1970, THAT THEY FOUND PRACTICALLY ALL THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN 1963 HAD EITHER BEEN CARRIED OUT OR WERE STILL VALID IN 1969. THIS REPORT ALSO PROJECTED THE LAND REQUIREMENTS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY TO 1980 AND RECOMMENDED THAT THE METRO AREA, AS DEFINED IN COMMISSIONER'S ORDER 1966/65 BE MAINTAINED.

AS A RESULT OF EVER INCREASING DEMANDS FOR MUNICIPAL TYPE

SERVICES IN CRESTVIEW, PORTER CREEK AND HILLCREST, AND MY ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY OF PROVIDING AS MANY OF THE AMENITIES OF A BETTER LIFE TO THE RESIDENTS OF THESE AREAS AS POSSIBLE, PARALLEL FUNCTIONS FOR THE SUPPLY OF SERVICES WERE BEING CREATED BY THE CITY ON ONE HAND, AND THE TERRITORY ON THE OTHER.

IN MY OPENING ADDRESS TO THE SESSION OF COUNCIL IN DECEMBER, 1969, I ADVISED COUNCIL THAT AN AMENDMENT TO THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE WOULD BE PRESENTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION THAT WOULD, IF ACCEPTABLE TO COUNCIL, HAVE THE EFFECT OF MAKING THE CITY BOUNDARIES IDENTICAL WITH THE WHITEHORSE METRO AREA. AT THAT TIME, I STATED THAT "THE OVERLAPPING NEEDS AND RESPONSIBILITIES THAT ARE PLAGUING BOTH THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT AND THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN DEALING WITH THIS, THE MOST POPULATED SECTION OF OUR TERRITORY, ARE CREATING IMPOSSIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS". I WENT ON TO SUGGEST THAT EITHER THE CITY BOUNDARIES WOULD HAVE TO BE EXTENDED OR A SPECIAL DEPARTMENT OF THE TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE TO BE CREATED TO ADMINISTER THE METRO AREA. AFTER DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS, A MOTION WAS PASSED BY COUNCIL DELETING THOSE PROVISIONS FROM THE AMENDMENTS THAT WOULD HAVE ALLOWED FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES.

UPON REVIEWING THE DISCUSSIONS IN COMMITTEE, THE FACT THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO PRIOR DISCUSSIONS OR DETAILS WORKED OUT WITH THE CITY SEEMED TO EMERGE AS THE MAJOR OBJECTION OF THE COUNCILLORS TO THE PROPOSAL PLACED BEFORE THEM. AS A RESULT, I CONVENED A MEETING ON JUNE 16, 1970, IN THE ELK'S HALL TO



WHICH WERE INVITED INTERESTED MEMBERS OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL, THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION, REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORIAL RELATIONS BRANCH IN OTTAWA, THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, THE INDIAN AFFAIRS BRANCH, CANADIAN NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS, THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES.

THE STATED PURPOSE OF THE MEETING WAS TO ASSESS THE DESIRABILITY OF EXTENDING THE CITY BOUNDARIES AND IF IT WAS FOUND DESIRABLE, TO DETERMINE A COURSE OF ACTION TO BRING THIS MATTER TO A SATISFACTORY CONCLUSION.

IT WAS AGREED BY RESOLUTION OF THOSE PRESENT AT THE MEETING THAT THE BOUNDARY EXTENSION WAS DESIRABLE AND IN THE BEST LONG TERM INTERESTS OF THE CITY AND THOSE AREAS INCLUDED IN THE WHITEHORSE METRO PLAN. IT WAS ALSO RESOLVED THAT A STEERING COMMITTEE, CONSISTING OF THE COMMISSIONER AND THREE TERRITORIAL COUNCILLORS, THE MAYOR AND THREE CITY ALDERMEN, AND A SENIOR REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BE FORMED TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSIONER ON ALL ASPECTS OF THE BOUNDARY EXTENSION. THE TARGET DATE FOR EXTENSION SET BY THE MEETING WAS MARCH 31, 1971.

I WISH AT THIS TIME, TO PAY PARTICULAR TRIBUTE TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND THE SUB-COMMITTEES THAT WERE ESTABLISHED, AND TO EXTEND TO THEM ON BEHALF OF ALL THE CITIZENS IN METRO WHITEHORSE OUR THANKS FOR THE MANY HOURS OF DEDICATED SERVICE THEY GAVE TO ENSURE THAT NOT ONLY WERE

ALL OF THE QUESTIONS BEING ASKED, BUT THAT THE FACTUAL ANSWERS WERE ALSO FORTHCOMING.

THE STEERING COMMITTEE, AFTER SOME NINE MONTHS OF DELIBERATIONS AND FACT FINDING, RECOMMENDED TO ME THAT THE CITY OF WHITEHORSE BOUNDARIES SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE ALL OF THE AREA KNOWN AS THE WHITEHORSE METROPOLITAN AREA, PROVIDING THE RESIDENTS OF THE AREA INDICATED THEIR AGREEMENT WITH THE EXTENSION PROPOSAL BY PLEBISCITE.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED AT THE LAST SESSION OF COUNCIL IN MARCH, AN AMENDMENT TO THE MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE TO ALLOW FOR THE EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES AFTER THE PLEBISCITE WAS HELD, AND PROVIDING THE RESULTS WERE FAVOURABLE. IT WAS SUGGESTED, THAT IF THE AMENDMENT WAS PASSED BY COUNCIL, IT WOULD NOT BE NECESSARY TO HOLD A SPECIAL SESSION. IT WAS COUNCIL'S FEELING HOWEVER, THAT THIS MATTER WAS OF SUFFICIENT IMPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY TO JUSTIFY THE CONVENING OF ANOTHER SESSION, IF THE PEOPLE OF THE AREA INDICATED THEY WISHED THE BOUNDARIES EXTENDED.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL, IT GIVES ME GREAT PLEASURE TO ADVISE YOU THAT OUT OF AN ESTIMATED 4,000 ELIGIBLE VOTERS IN THE WHITEHORSE METROPOLITAN AREA, 2,050 BALLOTS WERE CAST; 1,311 WERE IN FAVOUR OF THE EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES; 680 OPPOSED; AND, 59 BALLOTS WERE REJECTED. IN THE TWO WEEKS SINCE THE PLEBISCITE, OFFICERS OF MY ADMINISTRATION HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH THE CITY ADMINISTRATION AND REPRESENTATIVES

OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS TO PLAN AND CO-ORDINATE THE ADMINISTRATIVE DETAIL FOR THE ORDERLY HANDING OVER OF RESPONSIBILITY TO THE CITY GOVERNMENT. THE MANY SERVICES THAT ARE INVOLVED IN THE EXTENSION CANNOT BE ABSORBED BY THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ALL AT ONCE WITHOUT CAUSING UNDUE HARDSHIP, SO, BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT, A PLAN OF PHASING IN THE RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN NOW AND JANUARY 1, 1972, WHEN THE FIRST COUNCIL SHOULD BE ELECTED, IS BEING IMPLEMENTED.

I WISH TO EMPHASIZE THAT THE PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED BETWEEN NOW AND JANUARY 1ST ARE MAINLY ADMINISTRATIVE AND THE SOLUTIONS CAN BEST BE FOUND BY THOSE PERSONS ON THE TERRITORIAL AND CITY STAFF WHO HAVE BEEN DEALING WITH THE MYRIAD OF PROBLEMS ON A DAY TO DAY BASIS IN THE PAST, ALONG WITH SUCH EXPERTISE AS THEY MAY REQUIRE.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A WHITEHORSE METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMITTEE, WHICH I PERSONALLY FEEL WILL BE REQUIRED TO ADVISE THE CITY COUNCIL ON THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE AREA, SHOULD BE THE PREROGATIVE OF THE NEW MUNICIPAL COUNCIL. WE HAVE TOLD THE CITIZENS IN THE METRO AREA THAT, IF THE BOUNDARIES WERE EXTENDED, THEY WOULD HAVE THE RIGHT AND PRIVILEGE OF GOVERNING THEMSELVES, AND I DO NOT THINK THAT THE TERRITORY, AS THE SENIOR GOVERNMENT, SHOULD USURP THOSE RIGHTS AT THIS TIME BY EVEN SUGGESTING THAT SUCH A COMMITTEE BE FORMED BY ANYONE OTHER THAN THE COUNCIL ELECTED TO REPRESENT THE ENLARGED CITY AND TO WHOM THE COMMITTEE WILL ULTIMATELY REPORT.



MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF COUNCIL, THE AMENDMENTS THAT WILL BE PLACED BEFORE YOU, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE LOWERING OF THE VOTING AGE, ARE STRICTLY TRANSITORY IN NATURE AND ARE DESIGNED TO APPLY SPECIFICALLY TO THE DECEMBER, 1971 ELECTIONS IN THE METRO WHITEHORSE MUNICIPALITY. I TRUST THEY WILL MEET WITH YOUR APPROVAL. MY OFFICERS AND I STAND READY TO ASSIST YOU IN ANY WAY WE CAN.

J. SMITH,  
COMMISSIONER.