

Property of  
M. L. A. Lounge



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 12

2nd Session

23rd Legislature

---

## Debates & Proceedings

Thursday, March 20, 1975

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor



# Yukon Legislative Assembly

The Yukon Legislative Assembly is a unicameral legislature consisting of 12 members elected from 12 constituencies. The members are elected to a four-year term, with one-third of the members being elected in each of the three years following the first election. The Assembly is presided over by the Speaker, who is elected by the members. The Speaker's duties include presiding over the Assembly, maintaining order, and representing the Assembly in its relations with the executive and the judiciary. The Assembly has the power to pass laws, approve the budget, and oversee the government. It also has the power to censure or remove the government from office. The Assembly meets in the Yukon Legislative Building in Whitehorse, Yukon.

# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Thursday, March 20, 1975

Mr. Speaker reads daily prayer

Mr. Speaker: Madam Clerk, is there a quorum present?

Madam Clerk: There is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will now call this House to order.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the Order Paper this morning, I would at this time like to draw the attention of the House to the presence in the public gallery of Councillor Tom Butters of the Council of the Northwest Territories, who is now serving his second term representing the constituency of Inuvik. I would like to welcome, on your behalf, Mr. Butters to this sitting of our Assembly and extend to Mr. Butters and his colleagues on behalf of all Members, our best wishes for every success in your new endeavours.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Are there any documents or correspondence for tabling?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today Legislative Return Number 4.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Reports of Committees?

Introduction of Bills?

Are there any Notices of Motion or Resolution?

Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Member from Whitehorse South Centre, regarding Motor Vehicles Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion or Resolution?

Are there any Notices of Motion for the production of papers?

We will then proceed to Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker: Madam Clerk, I wonder if you could determine as to whether or not Mr. Commissioner could attend Council -- or pardon me, the House this morning, to enjoy in the Question Period?

Madam Clerk leaves room

Mr. Speaker: At this time I will declare a brief recess.

## Recess

Mr. Speaker: At this time we will call the House to order, and may we proceed now with the question period?

## QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Have you any questions this morning? Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I was asked yesterday morning by Councillor Hibberd as to how many copies of the Commissioner's annual report were printed. I have to advise that a total of 4,000 copies of the report were printed for distribution.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

## Question re: Tailings Pond Spillage

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Commissioner, I think this could be classified more as an inquiry than a question, I was wondering if he knows of any progress as to the tailings pond spillage at Anvil yesterday, and of the amount of damage to Vangorda Creek? That's the spillage of the tailings pond yesterday morning.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this particular problem, but if the Honourable Member would be kind enough to give me time on this, I would be happy to provide an answer as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre.

## Question re: Jack Hulland School

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. It has been my understanding Mr. Minister, that Jack Hulland school was originally built, in terms of shop facilities, et cetera, to accommodate Grade 9 students. I understand also that



they are now accommodating Grade 8 students only. Is it true that they are cutting back so that there will be no Grade 8 or Grade 9 students in that school next year?

**Hon. Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any plans along the lines that you mentioned.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre.

**Dr. Hibberd:** Could the Minister be so good as to avail us of that information?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

**Question re: Coverage Plan for Day Care**

**Mrs. Whyard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Welfare. Yesterday, in Committee, the Minister provided us with copies of Policy Guidelines relating to the provision of day care services for children under the Canada Assistance Plan.

My question to the Minister is, now that this information is available, although I see it is dated March, 1974, would the Minister assure us that discussions will now be ongoing for the possible formation of a coverage plan for children requiring day care in the Yukon, so that it can be incorporated into the budget for 1976-77, which I understand must be finalized next month, and will these consultations include officers of the Yukon Child Care Association and, as I note in this paper, consultants and other technical staff of the Department who are available to assist provinces upon request?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman I believe, I really believe that it's a typographical error, the dating, I believe that's March '75, because we just received that the other day and it follows very closely with the outline of the plan that Mrs. Veale had in speaking to the Department in Ottawa.

At the present time, we do have a policy, Sessional Paper of 1970 which advises that we do subsidize child care for people in need, and the government establishes the criteria for need, in some instances the need -- the same criteria for social assistance, but there is some leeway within the policy of the Canada Assistance. We have already started talking to the child care people. In fact, we had a meeting last night to, in order to make them aware so that we can implement the existing policy to its fullest extent, the one that was adopted in 1970, so we already have started these meetings.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further questions?

I would like to thank Mr. Commissioner for assisting us in Question Period this morning, and inasmuch as there are no Bills for processing, may I have your further pleasure?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there a seconder?

**Mr. Fleming:** I second that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions. Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall declare the Motion as carried.

**Motion Carried**

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale will take the Chair in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker leaves Chair

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call the Committee to order and declare a 10 minute --

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, prior to going into the formal work of the Committee this morning, I wonder if I could request during Committee discussions on the Capital Assistance Program, that the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Miller, could be present. He was involved in the formulation of the policy and of the program and the legislation. I feel much like a guy who's called in at the ninth inning with two strikes on him and expect him to hit a home run, with my Charlie Brown complex, I'm afraid that I might strike out without a little help, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think we can agree on that. Agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee to order and declare a 10 minute recess.

**Recess**

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call the Committee of the Whole to order, and I think Mr. McIntyre--

**Hon. Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Chairman, I have the



answers to some questions that were asked the other day on Territorial employees and upgrading. No government employees, including Crown corporations, are eligible under the Canada Manpower Training regulations. Territorial assistance may be granted, but the person would not receive full wages while taking the course, only the amount allowed under the Assistance Program.

Regarding the Interprovincial Welding Certificate, I'm informed that there is no interprovincial welding certificate and that Yukon uses the B.C. Public Works standard.

The Yukon Territorial Government Manpower Allowances, there is about a \$2.00 a week difference at present, but there will be an adjustment in July by both Manpower and Y.T.G. The current \$5.00 difference occurs only in the case of a single person with no dependents living at home and not out of school a year.

I have some further material in response to questions that were asked during the discussion of the budget and I would like to distribute them among the members. They are too long to give orally.

#### Bill Number 19

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McIntyre. We will be dealing today with Bill Number 19, "The Community Assistance Ordinance", and we have with us today, Mr. Lucier, Mr. Mayes and Mr. Mitchell, the mayors respectively of Whitehorse, Dawson and Faro, and Mr. Miller. Perhaps the best way of starting out on this topic would be for Mr. Miller to give us some general background on this subject.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, this particular subject goes back approximately 18 months, almost two years, I guess in some cases.

We found ourselves at that point trying to deal with each and every request from a municipality or a local improvement district or a community with capital funds for projects. The criteria that we tried to adopt at that point in time was to try and get some block funding so that we wouldn't have to go to Ottawa on each occasion to get specific funding for each project that we wanted to do.

To start this off, we hired Stanley and Associates to do a survey, and a study of the services in each community. That was completed, with some deficiencies; I think we must admit that the book is not entirely accurate in all cases. But the study was done, and regardless of its inadequacy in each particular community, we were then able to put together what we thought was a reasonably sound policy paper at the administrative level.

We did that, we took it off to our friends in Treasury Board, and we requested seven year block funding. This was approved in, if my memory serves me correct, August or September of last year, and what you see before you now in the form of this Bill is the result of roughly that two year effort. The major objective, as I stated, was to try and get block funding so that we wouldn't have to fool around for 18 months after a project was asked for to see whether or not we could get the funds to support it.

Theoretically the funds are now there. We know they are not always going to match the needs of the

communities, but we have a total of some 21 million dollars available to the Government of the Yukon to provide these facilities in all communities in the Yukon over a seven year period, so we have a three million dollar limit per annum, and that's about the sum and substance of it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Miller. Mr. Lucier, do you have any general comments about this subject before we go into a clause by clause reading of the Bill itself?

**Mr. Lucier:** Well just, Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your Yukon Legislative Assembly.

We're kind of in a tough situation. We realize that we were given a program that would be very interesting if we were dealing with the --probably if we were one of the provinces, we would think that this is a great program, but somehow we are having an awful time trying to make it fit the people that we have to deal with, and as we go through the program, we think that we will be able to bring up some points that will bear this out.

I would just like to say that the Mayor of Faro and of Dawson, as you can see are here, and will be speaking for themselves. We represent different communities with different problems, and I'm not capable of presenting their point of view so they will be doing their own--representing their own areas.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Lucier. Mr. Mitchell, do you have anything to lead off with?

**Mr. Mitchell:** Mr. Chairman, last year in November, late November, representatives from Yukon Municipalities met with the Territorial Government to discuss this Capital Assistance Program. And at the conclusion of these meetings, the the Honourable Flo Whyard made this comment: "I don't know what these guys are grumbling about."

I believe the Honourable Member and perhaps many others, fail to understand what we are grumbling about, us and most municipalities throughout Canada. We--I mean, Faro, believe the senior governments to be quite generous in their contributions towards shared cost capital programs, though they are not thought to be sufficient. For these programs are largely insensitive to true local financial requirements, especially in providing for the maintenance of capital investments within the municipal operating budget.

Now Faro is near five years of age and already we are very concerned about the high debt load our municipality carries and the ever greater tax load piling up on the private property owner.

Municipalities need help, but mostly, I think, in the area of operating costs. Faro supports a population of 1200 people and every time I see that 1200, it seems always to be underscored. We represent a population of 1200 people who provide a substantial portion of the Yukon's growth output of goods. These residents paid an estimated two million dollars in income taxes in 1974.

In the current fiscal year our direct grants from the senior governments will be a mere eleven percent of our revenue received by the Town of Faro.



In 1972 the private property owner contributed 31 per cent of the total revenue received by the Town and in the current fiscal year these same taxpayers will be contributing 39 per cent of the total revenue received by the Town and within that same period we increased our water rates by some 75 per cent and also other areas where we obtain our revenues as to business licences, et cetera.

It is interesting to note that in 1972 our Unconditional Grant was \$39,700.00 which at that time was 21 per cent of the total revenue that the Town of Faro received.

In the current fiscal year our Unconditional Grant will be \$39,700.00 This 21 per cent figure has reduced itself to 11 per cent of the total revenue that the Town of Faro will receive.

We are milking the property owner and real property tax is not a equitable taxation method. It is regressive because it has no relation to the ability to pay, unlike income tax. It is not responsive to the real needs of the people.

The senior governments reap almost all of the fiscal benefits through their comprehensive taxation system, even though it is the municipalities that provide the physical necessities for business.

Now, the revenues of the senior governments grows automatically where the municipalities have no alternative but to increase property taxes simply to meet inflationary cost increases without providing any improvement in the services.

I know that the good Minister will say, "well, where is the money going to come from? Take it out of one pocket and put it in the other." The municipalities must exist under an outmoded system of financing that is no longer related to the real needs of the citizens or their ability to pay. The tax revenues collected by senior governments all come from the same citizens, the people that we represent. The fixed formula of grants must give way to sharing the revenue with other levels of government.

Gone are the days when a municipality's main concern was to the passing and enforcing of bylaws. If we are to remain in a healthy and viable position, the senior governments must recognize the fact that we are a distinct entity of government.

Now if we don't expound our problems there will never be anything done about them. I don't suppose that you have heard anything new from me, just now, that you haven't heard before, and I don't think anyone of the three of us will ever turn down the opportunity to repeat ourselves.

Now as far as Bill 19 goes, as I said, we think the senior governments are quite generous, but we in Faro are quite encouraged by Item number 27, entitled Cemeteries, which appears to be 100 per cent financed and probably a little bit thrown in to boot for digging a few holes.

As are all are aware, or perhaps you are not aware, Faro, up to now does not have the luxury of owning a cemetery. Until Bill 19 is passed the people of Faro, particularly the taxpayers, can't afford to die.

(Laughter)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mayes?

Mr. Mayes: The only comment, Mr. Chairman, I have is to what Assistant Commissioner Merv Miller has said. He says that the Capital Assistance Program and Bill 19 were based on an inadequate study and there was no input from the communities, so how could he come up with a policy without having any input in an inadequate study.

I think, really, that if we had of met like this before the Bill was drafted up, or the Capital Assistance Proposal was drafted up, we probably would have a more probable assistance program for what our needs are now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Mayes.

Mr. Chairman: We will now go through a clause by clause of Bill 19. I think what I will do in going through it is read a Section and entertain questions from the Honourable Members, and then I'll ask the witnesses if they have any comments. We have got to be rather careful in procedure because really the Members of the House are allowed debate on the points, and your function really is to provide information and expertise.

Clause 1(1):  
(Reads Clause (1))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: 2(1):  
R(Reads Clause 2(1))

Mr. Chairman: 2?(2):  
(Reads Clause 2.(2))

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions or comments on this Section?

Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I take it here that 2(1), "capital project costs means the actual cost of the project and includes any planning and engineering costs directly attributable to and approved for the project but does not include any administration costs and overhead charges of the applicant;" I can't quite get that one clear, it may be a Local Improvement District or such, but as I understand it in the program that it is -- the costs are included by the government. Here it says no.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, really what we are saying, the only costs we won't pay are the normal administrative costs of a municipality or a Local Improvement District, such as the cost of their manager, or part of the cost of their staff that they currently have on their establishment. So we won't allow a chargeback to a capital project of any of the



normal administrative costs that they would have as an ongoing charge against the municipality.

**Mr. Chairman:** Miss Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I am confused on the definition of "unorganized area". It says "pursuant to Section 60". I would presume that's of the Municipal Ordinance, not this one, is that correct, because Section 60 in this doesn't have any definition?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, that reference should be to Section 61, of this Ordinance.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Miller. We will take that as a typographical error.

Any further questions or comments on Section 2?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, back 2(1), I don't think the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua is satisfied yet. In the case of a Local Improvement District, the administration costs, if it was a capital project that entailed a charge upon the people of the Municipality, what you are really saying is the cost of finding out the wishes of the Local Improvement District would be borne by the Local Improvement District under the normal course of events, rather than by the Territorial Government. That's their problem and their administrative problem?

**Mr. Miller:** That would be correct, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Fleming:** I understand. That is all I wanted to know.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any comments from the witnesses? 3(1):

(Reads Clause 3(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 4(1):

(Reads Clause 4(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lang?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Mayor Lucier. Is it my understanding that this five year capital budget of the municipality is going to be stretched into a seven year period? It is my understanding that --

**Mr. Lucier:** Seven years has come up fairly regularly in conversation.

Well we feel that the five years is kind of a pipe dream. We can make it seven if you want, we are just extending something that really is non-existent. There's no way you can plan on five years now. So I just honestly don't know how we are going to do it.

You know, if -- I would like to think that we are going to stick to a five year projected budget, you know.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, maybe I could just comment on that point. The five year plan is included in the Municipal Ordinance and there's no intention to change that to any other period, that I'm aware of, at least.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Lucier anything?

**Mr. Lucier:** No, that's --

**Mr. Chairman:** Any other questions?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 5(1):

(Reads Clause 5(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Again it's probably a drafting question, but why is it necessary to restate 4 in 5? Why could not 4 and 5 be combined, or have I missed something here?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, that's very possible but the legislative scheme within which this draft was produced, was to attempt, wherever possible to have a package, so that a person in a municipality could read through the relevant sections and parts of the Ordinance and get exactly what appertained to him, and the same way with the other two types of Districts.

There is a lot of repetition in the Ordinance, but it's to make it easier for the people who are operating it to read that we have done this.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments?

6(1):

(Reads Clause 6 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** We have a number of Indian villages here in the Territory. Are those villages also eligible under the unorganized areas? I really don't think those people own the land where they live on.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, the intent is to apply this Ordinance across the Yukon. If there was a village, regardless of whether it's an Indian village or a white village, they would be eligible providing they can meet the criteria that are laid out for the various projects under unorganized areas.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** But the question --my understanding is the Federal Government owns the land at the present time; how would the Territorial Government ever get any money back out of this particular area?



**Mr. Miller:** Well Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government, if they own the houses on which that land is placed, they pay a grant in lieu of taxes. So we get the money, it's just a question of whether you get it from the resident or from the Federal Government, really, is what they are saying.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Miller--I was at the--a comment first, I was at the program they had down here for a couple of days, and I understood there though that in the case of a village, I think we must have an example somewhere to go by here to get your answer is that, I will use Carmacks, the unorganized community with a village across the river and a village on this side.

Now, while one part of the town more or less is being subsidized by the Federal Government with the Indian Department behind it, the Department of Indian Affairs, in this case, as I understood it down there, you couldn't put this program into effect in most areas, because they are not going to--even an unorganized community, you know there's money coming from two different sources who already supply certain things in that area.

In this case I would like to know the answer to that one, and then of course there's the other ones like Teslin, a different area again. This is what I'm interested in, unorganized.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, in the definition of an unorganized community in Section 61, we say that it will be designated by the Commissioner as an area which is not contiguous to another unorganized community.

Now, in the Carmacks case, I would hate to debate that one on the floor as to whether the Indian village is contiguous to the Village of Carmacks. That we will have to wait and see, but in the case of Haines Junction and Teslin, they are contiguous so there will only be one set of facilities provided by this government, to the total community. It won't be a separate set for the use of the Indian people on their land and another set for the use of the white people on their land.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** I would ask Mr. Miller though in this case, what does happen in the future, providing that we don't join forces with the native population in these areas, and I'll say again Teslin, for instance, if they are going to go their way and we are going to go our way, what happens then, in this case? You would give it to one community or the other, you say, which community?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, what we would provide in the case of Teslin, it's in an L.I.D., it's a little different situation, but we would provide one set of the things that would be available to an L.I.D., not two, one set, one sewer and water system, one community centre, one garbage pick-up service, not two. It would be provided through the L.I.D., not through any other organization.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I see this in several ways, that one, is fairly clear to me that this is the potential for the Commissioner to in fact impose Local Improvement Districts on communities throughout the Yukon.

You might say that capital funding for unorganized areas is generally contained in the budget, there's no requirement, of course, for participation other than through general taxation. If an unorganized community wishes to embark upon a capital project, own a provision of a truck water service, of sidewalk construction or road construction possibly, of street lighting, do I have it that they will not receive these facilities in the manner they have, but in order to get them now that they will have to come under the provisions of this Bill?

I would just like some clarification on that. If not, then I see it as nothing more than a lever to force communities who are not yet able to, willing to or indeed wish to become L.I.D.'s, to become L.I.D.'s in order to get these improvements.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I look at it completely the other way. If you go to the unorganized community section, I think probably one of the wisest things would be for the municipalities and the L.I.D.'s to declare themselves as unorganized communities because of the very nature of the unorganized communities and the government's knowledge of the limited tax base. They actually get treated in a better manner than either the L.I.D.'s or the Municipalities for the reason being that it's a heck of a lot tougher to live in those unorganized areas, than in larger areas that have the ability of having more amenities for the people to live, and if the Honourable Member looks at the unorganized areas section and how they apply and how they get their funding, he will find that the reverse of what he says is actually true, and I think that that's a good policy of the government, to allow it to be easier for people in unorganized areas, where it is tougher to live than in any other section of the Yukon, that they have the easiest facility of obtaining amenities in the communities and in the unorganized areas in which they live.

**Mr. Chairman:** For the record, Mr. Lucier is vigorously nodding his head.

(Laughter)

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, then do I take it that these capital projects will be a 100 percent funded by the Territorial government in unorganized areas?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Read it --

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** It doesn't say.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor, do you have something further?



**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare says "read it". I am just looking at it and I can't see where my question has been answered.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I think we have got a little off base, if I might suggest that, the unorganized area Funding and the provisions for it start at section 61. This is a general condition that we are dealing with in Section 6. I think once we get to Section 61 it will become clear to all Members what is in fact provided for unorganized areas.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Miller.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Mr. Fleming:** No.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Not quite clear due to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that (b) here, to find out more or less how (b) is operated you have to go back to about 105, I think, for an unorganized area. "An application for a capital project in an unorganized area may be commenced by an application in a prescribed form signed by not less than 10 residents of the area."

**Mr. Chairman:** Well, Mr. Fleming --

**Mr. Fleming:** I have to ask this question ---

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming what I propose to do is, if you wish, when we get there you can ask questions and I will leave it open for you to come back to this question for some further comment of questions, if you like. I think to get through this Bill we should proceed, at this stage, and if you find that when you get to Section a hundred or whatever it is, that you are still unsatisfied with (b) of Section 6, I will certainly entertain further questions at that time on this section.

**Mr. Fleming:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** There is one question that came about -- or some clarification on the problem that the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua seems to be having on the supply of Capital Projects in areas which are predominately Indian.

I think that if you will notice through the total thread of the legislation, as it applies to people in the Yukon Territory, that it applies across the board. You have noticed that in the Local Government Section where there is monies available for the grading and up-grading of streets in the Upper Liard Village and the Old Crow Village.

This applies to the total thread of the community development Ordinance also where there is absolutely no discriminatory sections as they apply to areas that

are predominately Indian. They have exactly the same ability to go about funding projects and rather than recovering on a tax basis we will recover from the Federal Government who the Indian responsibility is in a grant in lieu of taxation. If the Indian people through their own decision decide that they want to be separate from the program of the Department of Local Government, that is certainly their prerogative and their decision, but it is not the decision, and not the policy of the Department of Local Government which considers the total population of the Yukon Government which considers the total population of the Yukon to be under the same programs, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you.  
Clause 7(1):

(Reads Clause 7).

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Subheading Municipalities, Piped Sewer and Water Systems.  
8(1).

(Reads Clause 8)

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** Two things that we would like to know about here, Mr. Chairman, one is, the Commissioner may, I am just wondering if this has to be or is it -- is this proper, I am not sure?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Legal Advisor?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, if it is shall it conflicts with other portions of the Ordinance which have regard to the fact that this House must first vote the money. It is tantamount to saying the Commissioner shall if the money is available.

**Mr. Lucier:** The second question, Mr. Chairman, is, it says that they shall pay 90 percent of an approved piped water system, who is involved in approving the piped water or sewer system?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Miller would have an answer.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, the intent here is that our municipal engineering people will have a look at the city's plans, out Department of Local Government will be involved in looking at the details of it. As long as they meet generally accepted engineering standards we are not going to argue with them. It is really that simple.

We thought we better have it in there because some municipalities don't have engineers of their own.

**Mr. Chairman:** I would just like to go back one step,



this Section 7(1), I thought the Territorial Council had the power of -- that is set forth in that Section anyway.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Section 7 exists in the Financial Administration Ordinance, this is merely put in as a caution because people will be taking this Ordinance, without the Financial Administration Ordinance, and using it. This brings the position home to them of the Privileges of this House.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I just have a question I would direct to Mr. Legal Advisor and ask him if the Interpretation Ordinance provides for the use of the name Territorial Council, because indeed, this Legislative Assembly is also known as the Council of the Yukon Territory. I wonder where this Territorial Council comes into it? Is that provided for?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Without looking it up immediately, Mr. Chairman, I use the words interchangeably, but perhaps the Member can check in the Interpretation Ordinance.

**Mr. Chairman:** While we are waiting are there any further--Proceeding then, Subheading, Distribution and Collector Systems.

9 (1)  
(Reads Clause 9)

**Mr. Chairman:** Any comments from the witnesses?  
10 (1)  
(Reads Clause 10)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman there is a typing error in sub-section 2, it should be "cost of the construction" not a contribution, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Any questions, any comments--Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, we would like to know when will the costs, as referred to in this Section be calculated, and when will they be made known?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I would assume that we could make these costs--we could do the calculations and have them known to the municipalities, probably by the end of a calendar year, because the construction season normally ends about the end of October at the latest. It shouldn't take us any more than two months to get the calculations done and the costs known.

**Mr. Lucier:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further comments or questions?

11 (1):  
(Reads 11 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Have the witnesses any comments?

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading "Roads", 12 (1):  
(Reads Clause 12 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I may be out of order. I would like to go back to Section 11 (1) if we may.

**Mr. Chairman:** Fine.

**Mr. Berger:** I am looking at this section here and it reminds me, in Dawson, for example, we are in a very peculiar position where the Federal Government actually owns and operates the water and sewage system, and one section of town, the water system at present is too small to serve the whole area.

Now, if the City of Dawson wants to develop that area further, does that mean that the City of Dawson has to bear the costs of upgrading the present inadequate facility too, which actually was a misplan in the first place by the Territorial Government?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, as the Honourable Member has indicated, we own the water and sewer system. I guess if we have to upgrade the water and sewer system, we have got to upgrade it.

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, it

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Mayes, any--

**Mr. Mayes:** Mr. Chairman, it comes to mind the fact that most of the Bill here that the Local Government and Territorial Government's administration has a say whether the lines should be improved or not. Now, their opinion and our opinion might differ, and an existing line that is not adequate to us might be adequate to them, and there should be a standard set for service to a property, so you have a guarantee of water pressure, to do with water--the size of a line for a sewer line. This is the problem in Dawson, is that we have a small line, inadequate lines for water pressure. We don't have water pressure, and it is bordering on property that is not serviced, but if people want to be put onto the service, they have to bear the cost of putting in a new line, which actually the water line is there, it's just inadequate, and we feel that we should--like property owners shouldn't be obligated to improve the service which is supposed to be supplied originally, you see.

Even in the case of Whitehorse, it could be--he could pay for it twice, in a matter of a short period of time, and if the street is extended and they find out that the line servicing the existing street and the street is extended, and they have to put in a larger line, then the property owner has to bear the cost of putting in an extra large line.

Our feelings are that there should be a standard set for any pressure, for pressure of the water.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?



**Mr. Miller:** Well, to my understanding, Mr. Chairman, there are accepted engineering standards for this. Now, I am not suggesting by that that all of the facilities in the Yukon have been built to those standards, but as I understand the municipal engineering field, distribution mains are normally of such and such a size.

There may be a reason for the particular point why they weren't put into that size, but there are essential standards developed.

I'm familiar to some degree, with what the Honourable Member--or what the Mayor is referring to here. I think Mayor Lucier would also agree there are inadequate facilities in certain areas of Whitehorse that were put there some time ago. You will never get around that problem, when you are introducing a new program.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further--Mrs. Whyard?\*

**Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, under 12 (1), "recoverable cost means an estimate...(including curbing, sidewalks...but not including footcrossings, bridge-culverts or embankments)..."

I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether this is an intentional omission or only because the subject has never been raised, of footcrossings, overcrossings, crosswalks which are beginning to be a necessity in such an area as Metropolitan Whitehorse, where the Alaska Highway is a real hazard to children trying to get to school and/ or to areas such as the Whitehorse Recreational Centre?

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mrs. Whyard?  
Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Member has the thing backwards. The inclusion there of those words takes the cost of those things away from the local person who is served and throws it onto the Commissioner's share.

**Mrs. Whyard:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments on Section 12?

13(1) ;  
(Reads Clause 13 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions? Do the witnesses have any comments?

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, we have -- one part of our presentation is dealing with a piece of paper that I believe was circulated concerning community assistance ordinance, and the 90 percent and the 80 percent in the residential paving, I think it's right there in front of you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** You're looking at --

**Mr. Lucier:** Yes, I have a copy of it here.

**Mr. Chairman:** --- Because you were looking at

something else when you were speaking.

**Mr. Lucier:** We -- I don't know what point we would want to deal with this, Mr. Chairman. We have set up an example here of what it would cost a homeowner in an area in Whitehorse, he could use Porter Creek or any other area.

Quite frankly, what our submission is that the cost sharing of the 90 percent, 10 percent, while it looks great in some areas here, it's just going to be an unworkable program, and I don't know if this the time that we should be discussing that or later on. I just don't know. I just don't want to leave here without making the point that has to be made, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Well perhaps what we ought to do is continue with the clause by clause and leave it open towards the end of the day to go into this in detail.

**Mr. Lucier:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairmasn:** Be sure and remind the chair by 4:30.

**Mr. Lucier:** I am sure we will.

**Mr. Chairman:** Are there any questions relating to this section, aside of course from the general policy statement?

Section 14(1):  
(Reads Section 14(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?  
15(1):  
(Reads Section 15(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 16 -- I'm sorry, Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, this is on the assumption that the next stage down from a trunk road is an arterial road, is this not correct, and I would assume that there would be no intention by the administration of taking what is now considered a trunk road or a highway and having it redesignated by Mr. Commissioner into an arterial road.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, the basic four types of roads that we looked at are highways, which we accept the responsibility for; arterial roads, collector roads and local roads.

Now, there's no intention to redesignate any highways, highways are the government's responsibility.

**Mr. Chairman:** Are we clear?  
16(1):  
(Reads Section 16)

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions? Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Just for clarification, you say the road must be not less than 32 feet wide. Is this top or is this to ditch, or what does it include?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, my interpretation is



shoulder to shoulder.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Calculated on the basis of carrying four cars, and leave room--on the travelled portion of the highway.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments? Have the witnesses any comments?

17(1):  
(Reads Section 17(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions or comments? Have the witnesses any --

Sub-heading, "Community Facilities", 18(1):  
(Reads Section 18 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 19(1):  
(Reads Section 19)

**Mr. Chairman:** Are there any questions? Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, under 19(1) and the itemizing of the maximum amounts, to build these certain facilities, I note in (e) we say "enclosed swimming pool for summer use". Why is it not possible to participate in this plan with a program of a year round indoor swimming pool for a community?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, as far as I understand, it was not an accepted capital work by the Treasury Board when the application was made by the Government of the Yukon for the monies available, mainly because of the cost. You wouldn't have much left out of \$21,000,000.00 with an enclosed Olympic sized swimming pool in one community. I think the Mayor has a pretty good idea of what the costs of one such facility is in the neighbourhood of. I think it would be approximately half of the monies available over the seven year program for that one project.

I would like to comment a bit further on 19(1), (2) and (3), and this is where the newly elected Council I think some meaningful input.

As you know, the figures were on a 1973 basis when projects for the plan first began, and we were successful in arranging an almost 20 percent increase in the amounts payable by the Government of the Yukon Territory in these areas, to realistically reflect the increased cost of building. In fact, they probably don't realistically reflect the increased cost of building, but at least there was an upwards revision of about 20 percent.

The other important item, I think is 19(3), and although I don't understand the wording, I'm guaranteed that that means that there is an escalator clause included now in the Capital Assistance Program, so that say that a community had a project that they wanted to go, that there wasn't money available in that certain year of the community program and they had to wait a year, well that increase would be reflected in the grant available to the community in the following year, so I think that those are pretty meaningful and rational ideas on which to base the community assistance program, at least in the field of capital developments for social im-

provement in the communities are concerned, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Mayes?

**Mr. Mayes:** Mr. Chairman, in Dawson we've just had a new gymnasium built and it is the property of the Territorial Government, the Department of Education, and I was wondering if the policy for the Department of Education changes so that the building is not open to the public and strictly for school use, would that make us ineligible for a gymnasium if the time arises?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that would be the intent. Really what we are saying in sub(2) there is -- using Dawson as an example, we have a gymnasium there. Our policy is that that gym should be used 24 hours a day if at all possible, and we wouldn't like to have to fund or share in the funding of another gymnasium.

But if our policy changed, where we started closing our gymnasiums to general use, I would assume, Mr. Chairman, that we would be happy to allow the community to build another one.

**Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, if I might refer my remarks to His Worship, the Mayor from Faro, the quotation attributed to me in his opening address is quite correct, but out of context. The remark I made, which I must stress was a personal comment, had to do with the amount allowed for skating rink construction, and it was based on my long residence in the north and dated back to the days when we used to have to build our own with our own sweat and blood, and I felt that 250,00 was a pretty good start towards an enclosed skating rink.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mrs. Whyard. We won't allow any debate between the witnesses and the members. I am giving you special latitude, Mrs. Whyard?

**Mr. Fleming?**

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I see that Mr. Miller is not here right at the moment, so maybe I guess I can't very well ask him this question.

**Mr. Chairman:** Possibly, Mr. Fleming, if you could just --

**Mr. Fleming:** Oh, Mr. McKinnon then. In the case of a municipality such as Whitehorse under these regulations, it says if you do have a gymnasium, you are not allowed to have another gymnasium.

Now, in this sense maybe the school would not be able to supply even though they are open, enough gymnasium facilities. In this case, would they be able to apply for more -- a grant to build another one, say?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I'm involved pretty totally with gymnasiums in the City of Whitehorse, and at this moment and with the policy of the Territorial Government, there is really no shortage of gymnasium space for any group or any facility who wants to use it. If the policy of the Department of



Education changed, and it was only about half a dozen years ago where we fought this out pretty brutally on the Council floor, of whether the gymnasiums were there for the convenience of the janitors or the convenience of the people of the Yukon, and we made the point that they were there for the convenience of the people of the Yukon who paid to build them, if that policy changed, then I see some merit to the Honourable Member's statement.

But as long as the gyms are here, as long as they are open, as long as they are available at a reasonable cost, at the moment the necessity is not here.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Berger is next.

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre. He stated that construction budget was increased to 20 percent.

As we all know, and I think the Honourable Member from South Centre himself said many many times, you cannot believe Statistics Canada, why are we basing those figures on Statistics Canada and what was the reason in it to come up with those figures. I mean, I am just thinking again of Dawson City where the construction costs, on the average, runs about 35 per cent higher than here in Whitehorse. Those figures are definitely inadequate to construct anything of this size here. I disagree with the Honourable Member, Mrs. Whyard that the costs are enough because we are talking about skating in 60 and 70 below weather on an all year round basis. We are talking about a heated skating rink if possible.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, it's nothing more than politics being the art of the possible and the compromise that we were able to come up with the monies available.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Legal Advisor.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** The booklet referred to in that section is a booklet which deals with percentages, and it publishes, in respect to every month, percentage increase or decrease of construction costs as an average throughout Canada.

Now, if you assume the cost in Dawson is \$120.00 for a particular piece of construction and \$100.00 in Edmonton, when Canada publishes this booklet in that particular year, it says the average construction prices have risen by 10 percent, there will be added \$12.00 to Dawson and only \$10.00 to construction costs in Edmonton.

The actual cost of construction is not mentioned in that section, just the percentage increase over the previous year in Dawson.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I even question if Statistics Canada takes Dawson into consideration, because as far as I am concerned, the Statistics Canada figures, Dawson is not even on the map.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Legal Advisor, I'm a little

confused by the wording of sub-section (3). When you get down to the end of the word 'year' in the third line, it goes on to say "...as a percentage in accordance with changes". Do you mean by a percentage equal to changes?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I would be agreeable to say 5 per cent.

**Mr. Chairman:** And are you saying equal or in accordance? Do you mean the same as, equal to, the percentage in the --

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Well according to means up or down. If we want to put in that, we have got to break it up into a long section rather like an income tax section, which might run to a page.

Perhaps the best thing to do is to make available, after lunch, a copy of this booklet we are talking about which is in Mr. Ragunathan's office and which we intend to use, and then you can get the figures and see what we are talking about.

**Mr. Chairman:** We're agreed to changing the word "as" to "by" then, at this point.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Anything arising, or a further comment? Mr. Lang is next and then Mr. Taylor.

**Mr. Lang:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask Mayor Lucier, if I may, what has taken place as far as the proposed arena, which is proposed to be located in Porter Creek, and how much is it going to cost, and what is going to be the arrangement between the Territorial Government and the city?

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, as close as we can figure, now we are trying to come up with, which I think is going to give you some indication of what these figures are doing. We are trying to come up with a very basic arena for Porter Creek. We are not looking for anything very fancy, we are looking for a minimum of seating, maybe 3 or 400 people, with very few facilities, and we are having an awful time getting it under \$600,000.00

Now, I just fail to realize how we can be discussing -- you say in paragraph 18(1), "the Commissioner may pay to a municipality 90 per cent of the approved cost of building a community social and recreational facility".

You might as well just leave it right there. If we are going to give us 90 percent, give us 90 percent of what it's going to cost. If you are not going to do that, you might as well forget it.

**Mr. Chairman:** The skating rink, Mr. Mayor, is it containing an artificial ice making machine?

**Mr. Lucier:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is that a large portion of the cost?



**Mr. Lucier:** No, it's probably 70, \$80,000.00 of the total

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lang?

**Mr. Lang:** Well, Mr. Chairman, from what the Mayor says, what you are saying is that city will not be able to build the arena?

**Mr. Lucier:** Well in this particular instance, by the city being able to incorporate, I think, three grants because of our population, I think it's based on somewhere down here it says for \$4,000.00 and plus 4,000.

Actually, what we are doing, we are committing everything that we are going to do for the next X number of years to the Porter Creek arena, but you know really, being realistic, Mr. Chairman, you're giving us a policy where as I said, on the previous page you say we will pay you 90 percent of building an arena, and here's an arena that you can't possibly build for less than \$600,000.00. We will give you 90 percent of 250. It just doesn't work out, and you can't -- you know, either give us 90 percent of what it's going to cost to put the thing up or forget it.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, as much opportunity that I've had to go into the background of the Capital Assistance Program, and you know, being as bluntly realistic as His Worship, the Mayor of Whitehorse is, that the Government of Yukon Territory went to Treasury Board and said, you know, we need certain monies for certain capital projects, and this is the plan that we had, and then there was the debate between Treasury Board and the Government of the Yukon Territory as to what would be acceptable, and what monies would be available, and the cost sharing programs that were worked out and the 90 and the 80 percent and the 75 percent category and in some instances as His Worship, the Mayor from Faro has said, that 100 percent category as far as cemeteries are concerned, that these were the blunt realities of the compromises that were worked out between the Treasury Board and the Government of the Yukon Territory.

Now, I would be the first to admit that in the field of certain areas of taxation and certain areas of grants, that the Government of the Yukon Territory is behind many of the provinces in dealing with the Municipalities, but I have also taken it upon myself to look in the field of Capital Assistance Program of the various provinces, and I think I can safely say in this field alone, without much fear of contradiction, that this is one of the most generous Capital Assistance Programs per capita that I can find anywhere in the country, the \$21,000,000.00 over a five year program in the area of 20,000 people is a pretty heady amount and a pretty heady program.

I think the realities and the facts of the situation are that these are the monies, and these are the agreements that were made between the Treasury Board of Canada and His Worship has had dealings with the Treasury Board and know how they deal, and I think that these are the facts of political life in the Yukon, if that's what was agreed to, and that's what we

are going to be able to get and the parameters that we're going to be able to work in, and that's just the cold hard realities of the situation.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** Just a parting shot, Mr. Chairman. Just so long as no one thinks that we are leaving here considering this adequate, it just isn't. You know, it might be something we are going to get, it might be the best that somebody could do at the time, but again, I can only say that when you get 90 percent of \$250,000.00 for an arena that's going to cost you \$600,000.00, you're in trouble somewhere along the way. People can tell us of all the great deals that we are getting up here, and I agree with the Minister in many areas, we are getting a great deal, but when we get to this piece of paper, we are going to be able to show you that if everything goes right and we don't raise taxes and we do everything right, that a taxpayer in Porter Creek who wants the very great luxuries of a piece of blacktop in the front of his house and water and sewer, is going to be paying about \$1,400.00 a year in taxes.

Now, that's before we start looking at arenas and any of the other things that are going to cost, it's going to cost \$1,400.00 a year in taxes to live in Porter Creek, and you know, just again, Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure it's understood that 90 percent of 250 on something that costs you 600 might have been a good deal for somebody, but it's not a very good deal for us.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Lucier. The only comment I would make is the 90 percent portion won't exceed 250, it's really 90 percent of 275 or something.

**Mr. Lucier:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** The way this reads, correct me if I'm wrong, is that the 90 percent would total \$250,000.00?

**Mr. Lucier:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment on the amounts of money that are allocated in Section 19. While I agree they're not as realistic as we would want them to be, I look back at the situation as it existed a year or two years ago, when there was no Capital Assistance for recreational facilities within the municipalities. They had to provide it themselves. When I look at the unorganized communities and the L.I.D.'s, there was absolutely no assistance whatsoever. There was \$8,000.00 in the Slush Fund to be divided amongst six communities, which was enough just to get them into trouble, and these people couldn't even go and borrow money from the Territorial Government.

So, it may not be what we would like to have, but it's a lot better than what we had. I don't think anyone wants to turn that \$250,000.00 back --

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mrs. Watson.



**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** -- because if you do, we will use it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Again, I don't want this to be generated into a debate between the Honourable Members and the witnesses who are here to supply us with information and comments.

Mr. Taylor is next.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I see, as much as I know about this program to date, I see it as simply another means of taxation upon these people, where before all these capital projects, these sewer and water systems and so forth, were provided for, at least on a Territorial wide basis, in the budget, in the capital budget of the Government of the Yukon Territory. They have simply extracted all these possible future systems and said now we will give them a great big deal, we will let them think they are getting a big bargain, and we will let them pay 10 to 15 percent or whatever it is.

This is in reality what has gone, but certainly it has opened the door. For instance, in Watson Lake, they have endeavoured now for better than two years to provide themselves with a hockey arena, in the interests of getting children playing hockey and this type of thing, and providing this service to the area. They have never been able to. What could you do with our community development grant of \$8,000.00 a year, and distributing that between three or four communities.

Their ability to raise revenues just wasn't there, the ability to pay interest on the revenues that would be required would be just beyond their capabilities. Now, perhaps, there's \$250,000.00 available, this would build our arena because we wouldn't need the seating capacities, and you know the type of thing that Mayor Lucier has suggested would be required in this larger centre, but what I am really interested in at this moment is, what, Mr. Chairman, is the pecking order?

Now we have got three million dollars a year, we are told and if the municipalities, the three municipalities decided in this first year, or the second year to embark upon major programs of involving sewer and water systems, does this mean that the municipalities would get the first chunk of the money, then revert back to the L.I.D.'s to have a portion of what's left in the unorganized areas, the balance, or could I -- could I be informed as to what the pecking order is, as I say, or if that is not the case, by what method will priorities be established, and who will establish them?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt in our minds that there are going to be problems in certain years with this program. There is no pecking order, if I can use that term per se. It will be a question of the planning being done, the applications being submitted, and in some years, certain things just aren't going to get done, because we won't have the money, but we should be able to indicate to any municipality or unorganized area, when we can have the money for that particular project.

I think we are just going to have to wait and see how

the demands come on this, before we can, you know, face the major question of who's going to get what.

We all know that the construction industry in the Yukon is somewhat limited, so when you start talking about spending three million of government money -- I'm talking in terms of the Territorial Government's share, we're probably talking of a 5 million dollar project. That's a pretty big demand on the construction industry in the Yukon in any one year, in addition to all the other things that are going on.

So, until we get faced with the major problem of too much demand for the money that's available in a particular year, we just won't know how to handle it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming? Sorry, Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Just one final question.

Could we have any indication as to at what level these decisions -- will they be made at, for instance, the Ex. Com. level or the Financial Advisory Committee level, this is what I am interested in knowing at this point.

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman --

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, they will be made at an Ex. Com. decision, as far as the Department of Local Government is concerned, with the Department of Local Government having the final say, as they will be the overall developers and the people who will be looking after the program, and we're not going to have -- and you know, we're not trying to fool ourselves, we don't even have a clue as to what the demands are going to be made on the program until we have a year of operation and see what projects come into the Department of Local Government, and at that point in time when we see the amount of projects and the amount of dollars concerned, is the time when we are going to have to set priorities and deal specifically with the Local Improvement Districts, the unorganized areas, and the municipalities being able to say, "Look it, is this a higher priority, or can you agree that you can wait for a year for this, because so and so", and it's going to be a problem and no one is under-estimating it.

But we are not going to have any knowledge of what extent the problem is going to be, until we get the program in operation and see what the first year's demands are on it.

It may be a problem that is bigger than we anticipated, or it may be one that doesn't even come to a head, we don't know.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming is next.

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member almost answered the question I was going to ask, although I must comment at this time I sympathize with the Mayor of Whitehorse in the sense that something for \$250,000.00 can't be built for 10,000 people.

I'm wondering whether there was any thought went into this plan as to a per capita basis in the sharing of the monies to build. In other words, I can see in this program where the Mayor of Whitehorse could not get any more than \$250,000.00 to build something for 10,000



people whereas Teslin with 300 people can get the same amount, possibly, if we go through the channels, to build an enclosed skating rink and so forth, for 300 people, in this program. I see that.

I ask has there been any thought as to how you are going to more or less arrange this if we do ask for this?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming, possibly when we get to Section 25 --

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could answer at this time. That is exactly correct, and it is made that municipalities with a population greater than 4,000 will be permitted one additional grant for each of the additional -- each of the additional facilities, each of the facilities referred to in this 19(1).

So the Mayor of Whitehorse already has a letter from the Department of Local Government saying that he is eligible in the case of the Porter Creek rink, for a double grant so the contribution from the Yukon Territorial Government is now up to \$500,000.00. He has got a pretty good case if he comes again for a triple grant, so he's up to the neighbourhood of \$750,000.00 from the Government of the Yukon Territory.

And he's correct, that ties up his capital funds for a certain amount of time, but this is the -- this is the type of policy that was made in the Capital Assistance Program to take care of exactly the thing that the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua raises.

**Mr. Fleming:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** Are we clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any final comments from the witnesses, without getting into a debate?

**Mr. Lucier:** It's very difficult.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clause 20(1):

(Reads Clause 20(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clause 21(1):

(Reads Clause 21(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, is this considered to be the actual cost of labour or is there a scale of some sort that the government would follow in terms of -- oh I see, I am sorry.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments?

22(1):

(Reads Clause 22(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** I'm sorry -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chair-

man. I think I have the answer now, but I was wondering what members of the public -- I am presuming at whatever trade --

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Any further questions or comments?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 23(1):

(Reads Clause 23(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** 24(1):

(Reads Clause 24(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

25(1)

(Reads Clause 25(1))

(Reads Clause 25(2))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Do I read this, Mr. Chairman, would this not mean then that in fact for instance in the case as suggested by Mayor Lucier, that it may be possible to lump two skating rinks into one and receive \$500,000.00 rather than \$250,000.00?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Correct, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to -- we certainly agree with this and we think that this is a good clause. We would just like to make sure that it is understood that, at least, that our impression is that this then cuts out, you know, your future grant. I think the point that Mr. Fleming was making that you can get one grant of two hundred and fifty thousand for one arena for three hundred people, you know, with twelve thousand people, or eleven thousand, whatever we have, we have to use all of our grants to build one arena. Obviously you are going to need more arenas with twelve thousand people than you are going to need with three hundred.

It is a pretty good deal, but it is going to catch you sooner or later.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Mr. Mayes?

**Mr. Mayes:** Mr. Chairman, also in the case of a smaller municipality such as Faro or Dawson, where you don't have the extra monies for the extra population the arena is going to cost the same amount for Dawson so whereas Whitehorse could put the three grants together for one arena to cover their costs. Arena still is not that much less expensive in a smaller community than it is in a town or city the size of Whitehorse.

In a Municipality such as Dawson, the facility costs six hundred thousand and we are allowed two hundred



and fifty, we have to find three hundred and fifty thousand plus our ten percent, which is actually impossible. That part of the assistance program we can throw out the door. This is where the 90 percent right across the board, to me, is the only answer.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Ms. Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Is it understood in this section then that an additional 10 percent levy on the community would be imposed, in other words, 20 percent if a five hundred thousand dollar grant was given?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Really what we are saying is that we would pay 90 percent of the cost up to a maximum of two hundred and fifty thousand per facility. The municipality would be responsible for the balance of it regardless of what that balance was.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller, surely the 10 percent applies in both cases. It works out to 10 percent of five hundred thousand, not 20 percent?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, that is right, Mr. Chairman, it would be, you know, fifty thousand instead of twenty-five thousand is what you are talking.

**Mr. Chairman:** Then it is 10 percent?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Ms. Millard anything arising?

**Ms. Millard:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments on 25?  
26(1).

(Reads Clause 26)

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions or comments? Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** In view of the time, I will declare a recess until two o'clock and I will ask the witnesses to come again at that time.

#### **Recess**

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee to order. We are continuing on the clause by clause reading of Bill 19 and we're on page 7 of that Bill, and we just concluded Section 26.

**Mr. McCall,** you asked whether you could comment further on Section 25(1), I believe?

**Mr. McCall:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to go back to 25(1) if I may. I'm a little curious and I would like some clarification here, under this particular part of the Ordinance it says "A municipality with a population greater than 4,000".

Now I'm curious as to who came up with the figure of 4,000; when one considers that we have three municipalities in the Yukon, two of the municipalities' populations, according to some statistics are wrong, they are less than 4,000.

Now, I'm just wondering if the government is anticipating the municipalities in this case are increasing their population to over 4,000 in order to be eligible for certain priorities in this Ordinance. I find it a little unrealistic, this established figure of 4,000, and I would like some clarification on it if I may. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman - I don't know whether I can add anything to it in terms of where the 4,000 came from. It seems to me that we stole that one from somewhere else, and I don't remember where else we stole it from now, but you know, we felt that we had to provide something in there for municipalities with populations greater than something. 4,000 was the number we picked.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, the rationale was that one arena would serve up to a population of 4,000 people, and over that population, that there wouldn't be enough -- there wouldn't be enough of a facility to serve a population greater than that. I think that that's fairly obvious from once Whitehorse grew over about a 5 or 6,000 population, that one ice surface and arena just didn't serve the community, where it did quite well prior to that time.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Well, I find it very difficult to believe, Mr. Chairman, that this established figure is going to assist any municipality in the Yukon, as far as acquiring grants. I would suggest that the figure should be more like 400 and not 4,000.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McCall. Any further comments or questions on that point? Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** I would like to ask Mr. McCall on his reasoning behind the statement he just made. I think it would be sort of interesting.

**Mr. McCall:** Well, Mr. Chairman, yes, I'm curious as to this Capital Assistance Program, who is going to benefit?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. McCall, in what you're saying, you're saying that a municipality of a population greater than 400 may receive a payment for one additional facility, so you're talking about a covered skating rink, an arena, where you feel that if you have a population of 500 or 600 or 800, you should be eligible for two? That's what you said.

**Mr. McCall:** Well, Mr. Chairman, when one considers the population of the municipality of



Whitehorse, they are eligible for two.

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** They are.

**Mr. McCall:** The municipalities of Dawson and Faro are not. You see, there's a blank here, there are too many riders on this Ordinance, when one goes back to what the Mayor from Dawson was stating this morning, about the 90 percent of any grant. It should be across the board and not restricted. We have restrictions under this Ordinance.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McCall. Miss Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm inclined to agree with Mr. McCall about this sort of thing. It's restricting an awful lot of--well every other municipality except Whitehorse, and I should point out that actually you have to have 7,000 people, simply because it says that for each additional population of 3,000, so that each municipality of over 7,000 in the Yukon certainly aren't in great numbers these days.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, who could afford to operate an arena for every 400 people? You know, it would be extremely expensive, 400 people, they don't all skate, they don't all use the arena all the time. I think that's a very good criteria that is being used.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Mr. Berger has something to say.

**Mr. Berger:** I think I could straighten the Honourable Member from Kluane out on this. I don't think the argument is about the population, I think the argument is that the arena cost in Porter Creek is \$600,000.00 right now, and the same cost is going to be incurred in Dawson City or in Faro. But Whitehorse can get the arena because they have a population of 7,000 and over, while Dawson or Faro has not the population. I think this is what the argument that the Honourable Member from Faro wants to bring across to you.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, but it does also make the provision for Whitehorse. Now, Whitehorse chooses to take the funding for two arenas and put it into one, but it does also give Whitehorse the opportunity to have one smaller arena in Porter Creek and build another one, say at Riverdale or upper Hillcrest. This is the idea behind it, it's choice that the municipality has to make.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** This has nothing to do with the population, that's another question of zoning.

In 26 (1) (d), it says "the building and the site conform to the zoning regulations of the municipality".

Now, Dawson is waiting for over a year now to get zoning input from Synergy West and say Dawson wants

to get that grant right now and there is a possible chance the zoning input is going to be held up for another year, what is Dawson going to do then?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, that's only if they are purchasing existing facilities under 26 (d). If the community, rather than building a new building, there is a building within the municipality that they want to buy for their community centre or an existing facility, an arena that already exists, then those regulations apply under Section 26.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think also the current zoning would be the ones looked at, the current regulations.

**Mr. Berger:** We are still waiting for that Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Well then you have none, so--

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, maybe to clarify the query here. Over a year ago, Synergy West started a study on the zoning by-law in Dawson City, and we were put off from month to month, and I think the present situation is still the same. Next month we are going to come up with a report on it, next month we are going to do this. Up to now, the next months never came.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Berger.

**Mr. Miller:** I beg to differ, Mr. Chairman. The mayor just informed me that the City Council last night gave their final approval to the draft plan and they are now back to final plans, so--planners can only work as fast as the people in the communities sometimes.

**Mr. Mayes:** I hate to say final approval, Mr. Chairman. It's not final approval, they have gone over the draft copy as submitted by Synergy and have given them their comments so they can come up with a final draft of the by-law, but it has not been made final.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Mayes.  
The next heading, sub-heading is "Cemeteries".  
Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we rush on, I would like to get some clarification on the flexibility under 26, sub-section (1) and the sub-paragraphs of that, some explanation as to the flexibility under that particular section?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the--unless I'm mistaken, the way I read the sub-paragraphs, before a municipality, or before we'll share in the costing of a building that a municipality wants to purchase that's already on site, those four criteria must be met.

Now, when you talk about flexibility, the National Building Code is a pretty minimum standard of construction, so there's lots of flexibility there. The other items are estimates, they're not --or item (b) is an estimate. It's a question of judgement, I suppose. I think if it came down to the final analysis where the Municipality said "We think that it has this life, and we



think that it justifies the investment of funds," I guess we are not going to argue too strongly, unless we have substantive reason, technical reason to argue with the Municipality.

So if that's the type of flexibility the Honourable Member is referring to, it's there.

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So that what you are saying, in this particular case where there is an existing building in a municipality and the codes, et cetera are fulfilled up to standards, the municipality can put themselves in a position where they can buy or purchase these particular buildings and be assisted in this particular type of a project, is this correct?

**Mr. Miller:** That is the idea, Mr. Chairman, yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, (2) of 26 it says, "...the amount owing and unpaid by the community or community organization owing the building."

Does that mean that you can't buy it from a private owner, does it have to be a community organization that owns the building?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** This is merely to deal with the situation where it is owned by the community organization

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Would you explain that a little more, Mr. Legal Advisor?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Well suppose --

**Mr. McCall:** I am not quite sure --

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** -- it being a factual situation that the Whitehorse Curling Club is owned by an organization which is called the Whitehorse Curling Club, supposing the building cost a hundred thousand dollars to put up, and supposing that the curling club now owe fifty thousand dollars on a mortgage in respect of that building, that could be purchased by the City but the amount to be sanctioned for the purchase would only be \$50,000.00 the amount owing. Then the building would become the property of the city and would be operated as a - part of a complex or something, whatever the city wanted to do with it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Does that also included private enterprise?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** That restriction doesn't cover private enterprise. If it happened to be that some individual owned the curling club then he could be paid the cost price of it in the normal way, subject to the restrictions, of course, on the amounts of money in the earlier sub-sections.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I take it, Mr. Legal Advisor, then that the building is worth one hundred thousand dollars, the mortgage is fifty thousand dollars, you buy the building it is then the property of the Territorial government, when they get the loan that fifty thousand equity they had in there that applies to 10 percent of the loan then would it be considered?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** No, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing now with a municipality so the Territorial government would not become involved. The city would do the negotiations and arrange to buy the building. The intention will be that the city will become the owners and operators of that building. Then they fund the purchase -- they pay the normal value in the normal way, if it happens to be privately owned, but if it happened to be the Whitehorse Curling Club owned the building, then that is a community organization and they wouldn't be looking to make a profit on their demise, so they would get 50 --- They would pay off the debt.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Legal Advisor, this says "a community", also a community, in the case of a community what would be the circumstances then, what if the Territorial government does take over the community?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** A quick answer, Mr. Chairman, is to wait until the next chapter. The situation is slightly different when you are dealing with a Local Improvement District and when you are dealing with an unorganized area. In that case the Territorial government operates them and therefore it would have to become the owner in some way or else transfer it to a community organization or the Local Improvement District Board for operation and different conditions would apply. In general those four sub paragraph conditions would apply and also the fact that in payment to a community club to take it over that the gross amount to be paid would not exceed the amount of the debt.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I think what is causing the problem if you look at 26(2) you will find that it says "...shall not exceed the amount owing or unpaid by the community or community organization."

I would think that what we have got is a typographical error and "community or" should be removed. "The amount unpaid by the community organization owning the building."

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Definitely.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you Mr. Miller, that makes sense to me as well.

**Mr. Lucier:** did you have something further?

**Mr. Lucier:** No, thank you Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** The next sub heading is Cemeteries. 27(1).

(Reads Clause 27(1))



**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask, would this apply to a new extension to an existing cemetery, or would this just be for a new cemetery?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if the city were talking about a cemetery that they now own and they want to extend that, if that's going to be the cemetery, then it would apply.

**Mr. Lucier:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** 28(1):  
(Reads Clause 28(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, just one question that I would like to ask. If the cemetery, or the nature of the sub-soils and so forth do not permit a cemetery within the municipality, or for some other reason that a cemetery is not desirable within a municipality, the municipality must go outside its municipal boundaries to establish a cemetery for the community, is this still covered under this program?

**Mr. Miller:** I would think so, Mr. Chairman. I would see no reason--providing it's the municipal cemetery, they could put it anywhere. We would have no hang-up with it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Next sub-heading is "Waste Disposal". 29(1):  
(Reads Clause 29 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions? 30(1):  
Reads Clause 30(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (2): --Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like some clarification on this compaction equipment. What does it entail?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it's whatever the Municipality decides to use for compaction. If it happens to be a D8 cat, then it's a D8 cat. If it happens to be a special type of compaction equipment, then it's that special type of compaction equipment, whatever the municipality uses to compact its garbage.

We are not talking about a unique and special type of equipment only, we are talking of what the municipality uses to compact garbage, if it happens to be a D8 cat, then it's a D8 cat, and the Territory will pick up the 50 percent on it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Anything arising? Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, would this--could this be interpreted to mean a piece of equipment for compacting like car bodies and things like this, or--

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** If that is what the city wants to use it for, for its piece of equipment for compacting,

yes. If it's a specific compacting piece of equipment. That doesn't happen to be what the city wants to spend it on, for their one-shot deal, if it happens to be that they find they get a lot more efficiency out of using a D8 cat for compaction purposes, then that is what the grant will apply to.

**Mr. Chairman:** Does Mr. McKinnon have a D8 cat?

(Laughter)

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** A TD-24--

(Laughter)

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions? Sub-heading, "Community Planning". 31, sub-section (1):  
(Reads Clause 31(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 2:  
(Reads Clause 31(2) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 3:  
(Reads Clause 31(3) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I take it then if they start today, there is no way that anything can start progressing for at least one year, on the last of (b)?

**Mr. Miller:** That would be correct, Mr. Chairman, but all the communities now have plans in the process, or have had them done, so I don't see any big problem with the one year.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Mitchell?

**Mr. Mitchell:** Mr. Chairman, in the case of Faro we had a community plan which was done in the early stages of Faro, probably 1969. It is not a comprehensive plan as I have seen done, I believe, on Carmacks, Watson Lake. Which category would we fall under, item (1) or (2)?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it wouldn't make any difference, because they go through much the same exercise to do (1) and (2). There is probably a little more work done in number (1) than there is in number (2), but I think basically what we are saying is we will pay the cost of it, so I suppose if the Town of Faro wants a new plan done, all they have got to do is go through the exercise of applying for it and we will see that it's done in the near -- you know, as soon as we can get it done, is what it boils down to.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you.

**Mr. Mitchell:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** Anything arising? I would now like to turn to page 18 and carry on with Municipalities, if that's agreeable, and then the witnesses can be excused.



**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** So we are turning then to Page 18, sub-heading "Operation and Maintenance Assistance, Municipalities, Water Delivery by Truck". 82(1):  
Reads Clause 82(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (2):  
(Reads Clause 82(2) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?  
Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Under (b), "for three deliveries a week to a unit having a storage capacity of over 500 gallons, not less than \$15.00 per month". In other words, they could have a 300,000 gallon, but then they are going to be charged accordingly I take it. Per gallon?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman - what the municipality decides to charge for the water delivery, we don't care. All we are really saying is that we will not share in the deficit unless they charge a minimum of \$15.00 per month.

What in fact they charge, decide to charge the people, that's up to the municipalities.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor, did you --

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading, "Transit Operation", 83(1):  
(Reads Clause 83(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (2):  
(Reads Clause 83(2) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section 3:  
(Reads Clause 83(3) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just curious, I suspect that a slight variation in language as to the section of water delivery by truck and this transit operation. If we go back to the water delivery by truck, it states with the language, "within the municipality".

Now, I'm curious when we go down to the transit operation. It does not say within the municipality. Now, I'm just curious as to this explanation, or could I have an explanation, or could I have an explanation? Does it mean outside the municipality or between the municipality or inside the municipality or what?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, in the transit operation, any city that was running a transit operation, they may want to go behind their boundaries, their immediate boundaries. We wouldn't hope that they would go from Whitehorse to Faro if they were doing it, you know, but within the immediate boundaries, we wouldn't prohibit them from doing that.

I don't think there's really any significance in the thing. In the water delivery, I'm not sure whether you are delivering outside of the City of Whitehorse or not. There may well be. We are not going to split hairs on the thing, if that's the question.

**Mr. McCall:** It's our problem, Mr. Chairman, but I'll let it go.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you. Anything arising or any further questions or comments?

Sub-heading "Cemetery Maintenance". 84, sub-section (1):  
(Reads Clause 84 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** I'm just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the government is anticipating a small amount of deaths in the Yukon?

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments?

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment on that. I certainly believe \$300.00 is a very low sum. I am sure that one funeral in Dawson in the wintertime probably costs that amount.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lucier?

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, we were questioning whether the \$300.00 figure is correct. Was that intentional, because, you know, it kind of looks like we would be burying them with post hole augers for \$300.00.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McKinnon?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** I got problems with that \$300.00 one since I've seen the ordinance. It seems more like an insult than anything else, I mean \$300.00 in the winter for one hole.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller, do you have a comment?

Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** It doesn't pay the cemetery--certainly on the end of this section that I am very curious how come there is only--in the yellow book, in the Capital Assistance, it was set only \$400.00 provided for as a municipal share to the Capitol Assistance program to buy all the equipment. I mean, the share of the Territorial Government is absolutely nothing. Where does the \$400.00 come in for the Municipalities?

**Mr. Chairman:** I'm sorry, I think we had better stick to cemeteries at this point, thank you, Mr. Berger. Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I'm still not clear. Obviously the draughtsman has draughted this Sec-



tion, sub-section (2) of 84 stating that "60 per centum of the cost of operation..." or \$300.00. Now there had to be a reason for the \$300.00, and that hasn't been explained yet to the House, and possibly Mr. Miller could explain, and if there's no good reason for the \$300.00 why have it in there at all? Why not just 60 percent of the cost of operation?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, as I recall this particular section, again we probably--and I'm pretty sure we have stolen this from one of the provinces, and that's the type of assistance that they give to their municipalities in respect to cemetery operations.

Now, when we are talking--we are not talking about, you know, the cost of one funeral, because what we are talking about is the operating deficit of the municipality in operating that cemetery. There is a charge imposed for opening a grave, you know, and closing it. So what we are talking about is the annual operating cost of the municipality in operating the facilities. That's net cost, not gross.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering whether any of the Mayors remember bringing it up during the Yukon Association of Municipalities meeting, because the legislation is the same as it appears on Page 20 of the Capital Assistance Program, and the "municipality--100 per cent development costs" and "O & M Assistance- \$300.00 annually each cemetery based on an estimated minimum of \$500.00 O & M expended by the municipality", and I didn't question it at that time and I didn't hear any of the Mayors questioning it.

I don't know the rationale behind it. We sound like we come out pretty good when we say we are going to pay 100 percent of the development costs of the cemetery, then at the next--in the next instance we say on O & M, 60 percent, but only up to a maximum of \$300.00. It sounds pretty clear.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lucier?

Mr. Lucier: Mr. Chairman, I was just informed by our Treasurer that we have a \$9,000.00 deficit budgeted for our 1975 cemetery operations, just to give you an idea of what your \$300.00 looks like.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Committee would allow me to look at the reasoning behind the appearance in the Capital Assistance Program as it is and in the legislation. I don't have an answer for it.

Mr. Chairman: Is that satisfactory to the Members, or do we have a Motion on that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I don't think a Motion is required, but it certainly is a point that maybe I think that the administration should look at, and it may be that they can bring back a proposal which would accommodate the type of situation as has been expressed by Mayor Lucier, because indeed as was pointed out by Mr. Miller, Mr. Chairman, this may be all well and fine in the provinces, but we are not a province, we are a territory, and maybe we should have a better program than the provinces.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. We will then carry on to the next page, under Procedure, under the heading "Procedure in Municipalities" and we are at clause 91 (1):

(Reads Clause 91 (1) )

Mr. Chairman: 92 (1):

(Reads Clause 92 (1) )

Mr. Lucier: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if we could go back to Page 19. 87(1), "Community Septic Tank Pump-out System". I am just wondering why something like that couldn't be applied to the municipalities that are requiring this service as well.

Mr. Chairman: I will allow that question. Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, what we were trying to do with this program was to not have overlapping services. Where there is piped water or sewer system in a community, we felt that we were sharing some of that in capital. You know, why should we share on another type of system, so that's why it is restricted to where there is no pipe sewer system in the community.

Otherwise, what we'll end up with, I'm afraid, is we will never have anybody in municipalities wanting to put in sewer systems if we can get it pumped out for them.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lucier?

Mr. Lucier: Mr. Chairman, if I'm allowed a little debate on this, I would just like to point out that the reason we have this condition right now is because we have inherited it from the Territorial Government. We took it over from them and I kind of like to think that since they were the ones that permitted it in the first place and allowed people to build where there was no sewer and water system, that they should contribute to the same equipment to look after the problem as they do in any other community. We didn't allow any subdivisions with this condition, that it was done for us.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Lucier. Are there any other comments about that?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, with the completion of the sewer and water project in Porter Creek and if Crestview goes ahead, how many homes within the city limits will then be on a pump out. Would it be enough to keep one adaptor truck busy hauling complete for those systems?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lucier?

Mr. Lucier: Probably not, Mr. Chairman. You could probably use the same truck that you are using in Carcross and the other communities to do Whitehorse. The only difference is that, you know, if we -- if the Canyon Crescent subdivision were to come on-stream, that might be that type of a situation again. I don't know, it's just -- you know, for one thing, the Porter Creek subdivision is not completed yet, nor is Canyon



Crescent -- or Crestview next to it. You know, that could be two or three years away yet, and it's quite a problem for the people in that area.

I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that they are paying 45 mills for something -- the outlying areas are paying about half the mills and getting the service that they can't get.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** We are prepared to look at that, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McKinnon.

**Mr. Lucier:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** We are back at 92(1). Are there any comments on that clause?

93(1):

(Reads Clause 93(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

94(1):

(Reads Clause 94(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions or comments?

95(1):

(Reads Clause 95(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

96(1):

(Reads Clause 96(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** 97(1):

(Reads Clause 97(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 98(1):

(Reads Clause 98(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

99(1):

(Reads Clause 99(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** 100 sub(1):

(Reads Clause 100(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Well that is it for the clause by clause, so far as the three witnesses are concerned, and we promised Mr. Lucier that we would give him a chance to explain his concern with the program and give us an explanation of the document which has been handed out to each member, and so we will hear that now.

**Mr. Lucier:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman,** first of all the twenty-one million dollars that we're talking about, I take it that's three million dollars of Federal money coming into the Territory over the next seven years, is that correct?

**Mr. Miller:** Essentially correct, Mr. Chairman; it's three million dollars per annum starting in 1974-75, and running from that point to seven years from that date.

**Mr. Lucier:** And that's for the whole Territory, so there's --

**Mr. Miller:** That's correct.

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, the paper that you have before you gives you an example of a non-services existing subdivision of which as you know, a couple in the City of Whitehorse.

Really what it breaks down to, and this is at 45 mills, now this is what we are presently at in Whitehorse and it certainly is not going to stay at 45 mills. We all know that we are going to be going beyond 45 mills with our next budget.

What we are showing is that to give a person who lives in Porter Creek, you know it is fine to say they have hundred foot lots, but again we didn't build the hundred foot lots, this was subdivided by the senior levels of government and they were sold as such. We have got them and we are not complaining about it, but we are saying that there is not point in saying they have got a great deal because they have a hundred foot lot.

The fact remains, to give the people in Porter Creek water and sewer and some pavement with some sidewalks, which you know is not considered all that very luxurious in any other part of Canada, and we would like to think that we are just as important as everyone else is, a person owning a very modest home with an assessment of \$10,000.00 on his home and \$5000.00 on his property, which is what the assessment should be after the improvements that we are suggesting, would be looking at a tax bill annually of close to \$1400.00.

Now it will be 1336, is the figure that you have before you, at 45 mills, but as I said this 45 mills can't possibly stay where it is. Now, we are looking at an arena in Porter Creek, as just a, you know, something that comes to mind very quickly, an arena in Porter Creek, we are looking at sewage treatment, we are looking at different things that are really going to -- maybe the bridge, give a little shot to our mill rate over the next couple of years.

It just seems to me impossible to expect a person living in an area like that to pay 13,14 hundred dollars a year in taxes for the bare necessities.

What we are trying to say is that while the Capital Assistance Program looks very generous we feel that there have to be places where it can be improved. There are some areas like the water and sewer out of the \$40.00 that it will cost per front foot, the anticipated annual cost of \$40.00, \$20.00 for the water and \$20.00 for the sewer. The Territorial government share of that is \$7.50.

Now, in any of these costs we haven't included the cost that the person from Porter Creek is going to -- the expense he is going to have to go through to get that



water from the street into his home. We would really like to know if something can't be done to change this program somehow to come up with a better percentage, a better way of giving the people who live in the municipalities of the Yukon; you know, what everyone else considers just a normal way of living without bankrupting him. Which is exactly what we are going to do here.

Black topping for instance, the paving. You know as far back as the early 60's which is ancient history around here, we had a very primitive system then in Whitehorse if you wanted to pave a street you get 50 per cent, now you get nothing.

We get 90 per cent and the arterial roads, or 80 per cent on collectors or arterials, I am not sure just which is which right now, but on the actual residential streets there is no assistance at all. That is the one point.

The other point is, that three million dollars a year for the whole Yukon, when we are looking, we just got a letter from the Water Board that says within a very short while we are going to be looking at a sewage treatment plant that is probably going to cost in the area of five or six million dollars just for Whitehorse. I would imagine that this money is going to be part of this capital Assistance program. It is going to come out of capital assistance funding. Now that is two years for the whole territory gone in one project.

We haven't looked at any of the others yet.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to enter into a long debate on this subject. I just would like to point out two things in response to the Mayor.

Number one, on the handout that the mayor gave us, the property owners share of \$5350.00, if anybody is buying a lot in Whitehorse today they are paying approximately \$5000.00 for a 60 foot by a 110 foot lot, which includes the cost of water and sewer, paved roads, curb and gutter.

The people in Porter Creek bought their lots for three and four hundred dollars. I am really just getting some facts out so that we have some comparable numbers.

The second question with regard to the total available in the Community Assistance Fund the supposition that the Community Assistance Fund will pay for the Whitehorse sewage treatment facility is probably correct. Although in the original documents that we went to Ottawa with there was a million and half dollars in the Community Assistance Fund for sewage treatment for Whitehorse, not four to five million.

We could rationalize if the decision finally comes that it is a four to five million dollar project, we could rationalize additional funding from Ottawa for that particular project. Whether we will get it and when we will get it is another matter. Certainly we would rationalize it as being over and above the 21 million dollars, if we can get our hands on it.

**The Chairman:** Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to go back to the first point that Mayor Lucier

brought up. Could the Assistant Commissioner give us a breakdown of this 20 million dollars?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, the twenty-one million dollars we are talking about are 21 million dollars of Federal funds, flowing through the Territorial Government to the communities.

**Mr. Chairman:** Anything further?

**Mr. Lucier:** Just, Mr. Chairman, just to sum up, I would just like to say that it seems kind of strange to come here when someone is offering you something and complaining because it isn't enough, but you know, really we are just concerned that the program is going to get us into more trouble than we are already into, if that's possible.

You know, it's very difficult. We have people in the City of Whitehorse right now with a river running right through the centre of the city. We have hotels that are paying \$500.00 and \$600.00 a month in water bills. If there's anything that can be done to alleviate these situations, I think that -- you know, we have to do it. I think it's very important that we start looking at these things very seriously, because something has to be done.

You know, our grant structure, we get \$450,000.00 a year from the government in grants, and we pay you back three-quarters of a million just in the school tax that we collect from our people and give it back to you. We are giving you back half again what you are giving us. So you are giving us, a little bit of money on one hand and taking back twice as much with the other hand.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Lucier. If there's no -- oh, sorry.

**Mr. Mayes:** Mr. Chairman, just to follow up with what Mayor Lucier has said. In a small community you rely on the local people to help out the community to operate, such as you have volunteer fire departments, and the community people are involved in the committees for recreation and planning for recreation facilities, and they also donate a lot of time for community functions, such as building up parks and what not, and after these people donating their time and helping to encourage the communities, you are asking them to -- you are going to supply the basic service to them at 12 or \$1300.00 a year, which I think will break the back of the community people and the community spirit.

People are going to say well I pay my 1,400 or \$1,200.00 taxes, why should I participate. You hire the people to do it for you, and it will break the back of the people that are involved in the community. This is my opinion.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Mayes. Mr. Mitchell?

**Mr. Mitchell:** Yes, I wouldn't mind repeating myself.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, you sure can't argue with the statement that was made this morning by the



Honourable Mrs. Watson, that it is sure a heck of a lot better than what we have had in the past, and the 20 million dollars, spread over 20,000 people sounds real good, and everybody sitting here is aware of what that really means, and it really isn't that bad.

But when Joe Blow gets his tax bill, that doesn't mean a damn thing. I think this whole program in the area of capital expenditures, where that capital expenditure is necessary, and I mean it's necessary to the point that it's something we would do, whether this program was available or not, then the program, of course, is fine.

I think in the areas of supplying any of the finer things in life to our people, it's not worth a dime.

I don't think I can add to that, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** I was hoping you couldn't.  
Mr. McKinnon?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, just arising out of the conversations that we've had and the information that we've had from the Mayors of the Municipalities within the Yukon, I think that what they are saying is the same thing that we say over and over, around this table, that it's pretty hard to kick a gift horse in the mouth, but sometimes you have got to be aware of the gift horse bearing these gifts, Mr. Chairman.

Of course, the problem is that I don't think this Community Assistance Program would have ended up in quite the format and quite the legislation if the Elected Members of this House had the same ability as those given to the municipal officers under the Municipal Ordinance of setting, actually, the priorities of budget that we feel should be set, and of course, all of our budget that we want to set, comes with very long and very harsh strings attached to it by the Federal Government and by the Treasury Board.

Of course, the Mayors know of what I speak, so we would like to be able to say that, you know, this Capital Assistance Program is the concept and the idea totally of our own initiative, and it comes with no fetters or no strings attached, but unfortunately, the funding of the Yukon Territorial Government doesn't work that way. So what the Territorial Government is saying is that's the best program that we could come up with the money that we were able to garner from Treasury Board, and it's better than anything we've had before.

You hear people talking about restrictive programs. Sure there's strings tied, and sure, there's some restrictions, but certainly where \$250,000.00 was not available before to have the ability of somehow saying there is that lump sum of a quarter of a million dollars available now, perhaps there is some way that we can utilize it, where there was no hope before. I think that that's the area in which we have to be looking.

I think that the other area that we have to look at is, can it work, or is it an impossible program with these strings and the attachments on it to work? I think it's probably the responsibility of my Department, if after two or three years we find that it's just unworkable and there is no possible way of spending the money that has been allotted by the Federal Government, that then we have to make a further submission to Treasury Board

and say "Look, with the strings and with the restrictions that were attached to the program, that we just can't spend the money in the communities that was allotted". Hopefully, this won't be the case. Hopefully the initiative of the people of the Yukon, in which I have so much faith, will allow the monies under the program to be spent, and if not, then it's back to the drawing board.

But you have to realize that we have to go cap in hand at least, we are not hypocritical enough to apply the same fetters under the Municipal Ordinance to the people of the municipalities in setting their budget priorities, they at least get a free hand, which is still a right denied to the Elected Representatives around this table, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McKinnon. I would rather not get involved in a debate at this point, Mr. Taylor, but if you want to add to that.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, as I note the debate is drawing to its conclusion, and I couldn't help but rise to say how pleased I am with the atmosphere that prevails, at this point, with the new Assembly, between the municipalities and this Legislative body.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I have spent many years in these Chambers, and I have seen every time we get near the Municipal Ordinance, or anything affecting the Municipalities, a great deal of confrontation and strife, and I certainly don't blame the municipalities for that, but I hope that whether or not these laws that we are being asked to approve or amend, meet all the requirements and demands of the municipalities, the people of the municipalities, who indeed are the people that we represent as well at a different level, of course, of government.

The municipalities can leave this table and this Committee knowing that any time anything does arise affecting the municipalities, that the Committee I would hope, and of course I am speaking very personally on this subject, but I would hope that the Committee would give them every latitude and welcome any input they could give us in making these most necessary and important laws upon our people.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Dr. Hibberd?

**Dr. Hibberd:** Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to ask the witnesses if they do consider this a workable program?

**Mr. Chairman:** Dr. Hibberd likes debates, gentlemen.

**Mr. Lucier:** Mr. Chairman, it's not really a debate. As far as we are concerned, I think I can speak for the other two members on this, that while we would certainly like to see some changes in the program and we are going to work to that end, we certainly think that it is a workable program, and you know, we are going to take advantage of what's in it that we can use, and we are going to come after you for more where we see that there's some room for movement, that is all.



**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Lucier. Any further comments?

I would like to thank the witnesses for their assistance today, and really agree with everything that Mr. Taylor said. I hope it was--it is understood that we want to work with you in every way possible, and thanks again for coming, gentlemen.

**The Witnesses:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** I'll declare a 10 minute recess at this time.

**Recess**

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call the Committee to order.

In going through the bill, we will then turn back to page 9, sub-heading "Local Improvement Districts, Piped Water and Sewer Systems", 32(1):  
(Reads Clause 32(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 33(1):  
(Reads Clause 33(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 34(1):  
(Reads Clause 34 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading, "Distribution and Collector Systems", 35(1):  
Reads Clause 35(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 36 (1):  
(Reads Clause 36 (1) )

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little clarification on that, "improvement by means of a frontage charge against the lands benefitted or deemed to be benefitted". By "deemed to be benefitted", do they mean all the lands or all the lots and so forth in that -- in that district or Local Improvement District?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Not in Section 35, Mr. Chairman. In Section 35, what we are talking about is that a water or sewer main will run past the front of a property. Some people would connect into it, but there will be people who may not connect into it. They will have the opportunity of doing it at any time, so they are deemed to be benefitted. The people who connect in are benefitted.

**Hon. Mr. McKimmon:** Mr. Chairman, I think the easiest way to explain it is that if the Local Improvement District goes for a sewer and water system, if a person -- it runs past his property and he doesn't want to hook up, he still has to pay the frontage charge, because he is deemed to be benefitted. He has the ability to hook up when he wants to.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I mean all the people

and all the lands in that district are deemed --

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** On the line, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. McKimmon:** On the line, yes.

**Mr. Fleming:** So therefore I take it that lots that are -- and I have to show you the map of an area, Teslin actually, to show proof of what I am trying to say, but there is lots that are behind that are not adjacent to the line, the water line, there's lots there.

Now, this in your sense, even though they are in town there and can hook to that line, if they don't hook to it they are not deemed -- for the assessment in other words, eh?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** For the assessment, anyone who is within the capacity to hook up, he's benefitted, or deemed to be benefitted. But there are people who are a mile away from the line, they won't be charged for the service which is not available to them.

**Hon. Mr. McKimmon:** Any one can hook up.

**The Chairman:** The words, I take it, "a frontage charge" are the awkward words, fronting on the line? It's a frontage charge only.

36(1): -- if there's nothing arising:  
(Reads Clause 36(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 37 (1):  
(Reads Section 37 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 38 (1):  
(Reads Clause 38 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading "Roads", 39 (1):  
(Reads Clause 39 (1) )

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I come back to the same question I raised the other day in respect of parallel access roads, and more particularly in the case of Watson Lake

I think at that time I pointed out to the House, that these access roads -- if you look -- as a matter of fact if you look in your yellow book you'll find a sketch showing types of streets, and this particular Bill provides for four types of streets; (the highway or trunk highway, the arterial street,) the collector streets down to the local or residential streets, but there is another type of street mentioned here, a parallel service road, which is not provided for in this Bill. My problem is that these access roads in Watson Lake, and I have been informed that it may be the intention of the Administration when, for instance, paving or this type of thing is done on these access roads, that they may be indeed charging the people who have bought on this service, a frontage charge for this. I don't really feel that that is fair. In the case of the arterial road, yes, but in the terms of the parallel access roads, they were put in there at the insistence of the Department of National Defence, as a matter of



fact the Brigadier said if he didn't -- if the Government of the Yukon Territory did not put in those access roads, Mr. Chairman, he was prepared to move the Alaska Highway around the community. And so that's why those access roads went in there. I still don't feel, I still don't feel that it would be fair to levy a frontage charge for improvements on those roads against the people, you know, who have bought along them.

Those roads are in there to--they virtually form a part of the highway, they take a lot of the stress and strain and more particularly, to limit the access from the Alaska Highway. I couldn't emphasize too strongly my rejection of the premise that people should be charged frontage taxes along that road. I would like to know, maybe the Honourable Minister may be able to advise me, if some consideration would be given to ensuring that 100 percent of any work done on those access roads is the responsibility of the Government of the Yukon Territory.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I just took it naturally the other way, that because there was no special deal made for parallel service roads, that any improvements would be 100 percent costed by the people abutting them, and that was my understanding of it, unless the Assistant Commissioner has--

**Mr. Miller:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman, those roads are there to serve the businesses fronting on them and for no other reason. There is a certain safety factor involved in access to the highway, but that's what they're there for, and that is the intent, is that the people fronting on them will pay the cost of any improvements thereto.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I must take exception to the statement that has been made by the witness at this point. That is not the reason the access roads are there. The access roads are there to limit access off the Alaska Highway. There are residences and homes and businesses and all sorts of things for the one sole purpose of limiting access to the Alaska Highway and taking some of the heavy traffic off the highway at that point.

They were not there, designed for businesses to develop along, that is incorrect.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

Anything further?

40, sub-(1):

(Reads Clause 40 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 41 (1):

(Reads Clause 41 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Do I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that those people living on the Alaska Highway or living off the Alaska Highway are now going to be

charged a frontage charge within L.I.D.?

**Mr. Miller:** No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the intent, we're not talking about highways there. We're talking about arterial collector roads, not highways.

**Mr. Chairman:** 42 (1):

(Reads Clause 42 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Maybe we could have some clarification on this, "before the surface improvements are made". Does that mean when the road is considered to be--the surface of the road is considered to have been brought up to standard, like crush gravel or paving or whatever it might be?

**Mr. Miller:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman. What we are really saying is, we would like all the underground utilities placed one year prior to the completion of the road to the final standard to be eligible under this plan, because otherwise you get all sorts of deficiencies in the road surface if you try and do it all in one year.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I am just thinking in the back of my mind that in the case of, for instance Watson Lake, where they have never finished a road, in other words, they have never put crush gravel on it and it's never been completed. They would be for the purposes considered here, they would be considered incomplete for the purpose of this Section until indeed there was a layer of crush gravel and this type of thing placed upon them, is that correct?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't speak with reference to the Watson Lake roads -- but basically what we are saying is where there is a road improvement going on, and improvement is defined, the cost of placing the underground utilities, if they are to be considered as part of the cost of that road improvement, they must be placed one year prior to the road improvement taking place, or being completed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when we get deeper into this thing, I imagine there's more strings than one could imagine behind it, but I'll leave it go at this point.

**Mr. Chairman:** Anything further? Section 43 (1):

(Reads Clause 43 (1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section 2:

(Reads clause 43 (2))

**Mr. Chairman:** Any questions or comments on that section?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?



**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I just have one general question and I would like to ask it if since this Bill was introduced in the House, if there has been -- copies have been transmitted to the Local Improvement Districts?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, on my instructions there were copies sent to all municipalities, all Local Improvement Districts and all unorganized areas in the Yukon.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading, "Community Facilities". 44(1):

(Reads Clause 44(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** 45(1):

(Reads Clause 45(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 45(2))

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (3):

(Reads Clause 45(3))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear? Sub-section (4):

(Reads Clause 45(4))

**Mr. Chairman:** And I take it that the same change will be made in sub-(3) as -- substituting "by" for "as". Any further questions or comments?

46(1):

(Reads Clause 46(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

At this time I would like to turn the chair over to the Deputy Chairman of Committee, Mr. Lang.

Mr. Lang becomes Chairman

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Phelps.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Disagreed.

(Laughter)

**Mr. Chairman:** 47(1):

(Reads Clause 47(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 48(1):

(Reads Clause 48(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** 49(1):

(Reads Clause 49 (1) )

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** I'm sorry the Commissioner just disappeared. I had a question I wanted to ask about this point, and that is where we have community clubs, community property in the name of the community clubs, I think in most cases there is a condition attached to the lease or the ownership of the property that should, for instance, the community club ever fail, and -- that the property would revert to -- if there was a municipality to the municipality. At that time the L.I.D.'s weren't in existence, but I assume it would follow that the property would then revert to the L.I.D., or you know right back to the Government of the Yukon Territory. I'm wondering if this is still the case. I will tell you the reason I am asking the question, is because if a community wished to build a structure of any kind on ground which was set aside for recreational purposes, would the L.I.D. have to purchase -- would the community association have to sell the property to the L.I.D. or would those safeguards inherent in the original agreement make it possible for the Local Improvement District to construct a facility on the community club property? That's my question.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I think in most cases the community clubs now are operating on leased land. There are some exceptions to this where they have title, but the majority of them are operating on leased land and that is the condition in the lease, that if the club ever fails, the property and improvements revert to the government, regardless of whether there's an L.I.D. or the government of the Yukon Territory, but they revert to the government.

If the L.I.D. wants to build on that property, I guess they can build on it, with the agreement of the community centre, Mr. Taylor.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, this was the point I wanted to clarify because -- then because of the terms -- you see, I understand that for an L.I.D. to construct a facility, that they must first acquire the land, and secure the land upon which the facility is to be constructed, but I felt that inasmuch as the land still reverts to the Commissioner should anything go wrong, that it would not be necessary for the L.I.D. to buy land or to make arrangements, other than by mutual agreement in order to put the structure on the community club property, and I think I have that straight then, if I understand what Mr. Miller has just said. There should be no problem.

**Mr. Miller:** There shouldn't be any problem, no.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Okay.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Miller about the same question in regards to land



that is owned by title, by a community organization now?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the community organization if they have the title land, they can do what they like with it. They can allow somebody else to build on it, they can sell it, they have got the title. There's no caveat on it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think he quite got the picture. This program is being made available for, to enhance, say, a community hall. Now, as you say, sure we can do anything we want with the hall, but if we go into this program, what happens to the title to the land that this is built on? That we enhanced by this program, if we do own the title now?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, the intent of the program in the L.I.D.'s, and I think this is what we are really down to, is that only the L.I.D. will be eligible for the benefits under this plan. Only the L.I.D. Board of Trustees, so if they want to enhance a current building which is owned and on title land by a community organization, the community organization is going to have to transfer that title to the L.I.D., so that the L.I.D. can take advantage of this program.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson, did you have something to say?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I think it also applies to Mr. Taylor's question, and there is an item of taxation if the title of the property, the land, is in the name of the L.I.D., then it's not liable to taxation, but if it's in the name of the community club, then they would have to pay the taxes for the land, and not necessarily the improvements, but certainly for the frontage costs, so it would be to their advantage to transfer it to the L.I.D.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, just be that as it may, I believe that we are still undertaking to resolve the problem of taxation on community clubs, notwithstanding whether they sell their land or transfer their land to the L.I.D. or not.

The answer that was just given by Mr. Miller indicated that it's only -- this is only in titled land where the L.I.D. must acquire the land. It is not in the case of leased land. Is that correct?

**Mr. Miller:** No. Mr. Chairman. If the L.I.D. wants to take advantage of this program, and get capital grant funds for any purpose, they have to have the right to that land, either title or lease.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, then the club -- the portion of the land that the improvement would be on, it would then necessitate a survey to

subdivide that portion of the land and sell that, or transfer that to the L.I.D., is that the way it has to be done?

**Mr. Miller:** If that's the way that they want to do it, yes. What I'm really saying is before an L.I.D. can take advantage of this program, they have to have some right to the land, whether that's by lease or by title.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Well would they not have that through the lease that states it reverts to the Commissioner if anything goes wrong with the operation of the club?

**Mr. Miller:** No, Mr. Chairman, because that's a conditional situation. If nothing ever goes wrong, it never reverts.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?  
50, sub-section (1):  
(Reads Clause 50(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 51, sub-section (1) )  
(Reads Clause 51(1) )

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 52, section (1):  
(Reads Clause 52(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty with 51.

"The commissioner shall not make a payment pursuant to section 44 in a district for more than one facility of the same kind..." -- oh I'm sorry, yes it's okay. I misread that.

**Mr. Chairman:** That's okay, Mr. Taylor.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Right.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?  
53, section (1):  
(Reads Clause 53 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 54, section (1):  
(Reads Clause 54 (1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, this is the one I think that was I trying to get the answer to before, and I did get some of the answer from the Legal Advisor. If the community property now is worth \$100,000.00, and they assess it at -- there's a \$50,000.00 debt against it, I take it that the government pay the \$50,000.00 debt and does



this not have any effect on the grant that is then given to enhance the premises and so forth and so on?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, they pay \$50,000.00 and that's a \$50,000.00 grant.

**Mr. Fleming:** That would be taken, Mr. Chairman, from the actual grant itself then, in the amount of say \$80,000.00 you would get 30 more to enhance the building, I take it that would be the way?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I would prefer Mr. Miller to answer that part.

**Mr. Miller:** I think what the question really boils down to is if there is a building in a community, owned by, say the community centre and the L.I.D. wanted to take that over and enhance that facility, upgrade it to another standard and it qualified for a grant of, let's say \$125,000.00, of which 50 of it was possibly owing as debt to clear the title on it, yes, it would qualify.

Now, the community still has to put up their 10 percent.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, this I would like to clarify, Mr. Chairman, too.

The building is actually worth more than what the mortgage is, so when the government takes it over, is not their 10 percent still there providing they have that amount left in the building?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** The next section, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, Section 55, I think deals with that.

**Mr. Fleming:** Oh, pardon me.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 55, Section (1):  
(Reads Clause 55(1) )

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** Miss Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Just something I noticed back in Section 54(1), we crossed out "community or" in the part referring to municipalities. Will that be done for the Local Improvement Districts also?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I prefer to leave the point alone, and not discuss it, because a couple of people have expressed to me caution about taking out that "community or", because there may be a building here or there which is owned by some grey area organization, which may not be a proper organization, and maybe want it taken over.

**Mr. Chairman:** Okay, thank you, Mr. Legal

Advisor. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 56, section (1):  
(Reads Clause 56(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 57, section (1):  
(Reads Clause 57(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I would have difficulty with this one, a flat-out two mills seems to me to be rather excessive, and may be raising far more revenue than is actually required for the purpose. Is that not possible?

**Mr. Miller:** It's not exceeding two mills, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Oh I'm sorry, yes.

**Mr. Miller:** The intent would be to impose a mill rate which would only cover the deficit operation of the building, that's what we are talking about.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Is it then agreed, Mr. Chairman, that once the deficit is covered, that the mill rate will cease to exist, or will it continue to be imposed?

**Mr. Miller:** It's an annual levy, Mr. Chairman, and it's a conditional levy. Only where the user charges that have been agreed upon by the trustees and the Commissioner don't meet the costs of the operation of the building, so it's an annual levy, it's not an ongoing thing.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a levy for the operation and maintenance costs which would be required every year, not exceeding. The other one is a three mill levy not exceeding three mills on the capital expenditure, which will be liquidated after the amount -- the money owing is paid for, by the community -- and I shouldn't say owing, the amount that they were deficient in there to 10 percent, so there is an end to the three mills, but on operation and maintenance, no.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, what is not expressed is not implied. I think that to make it clear, that there should be a further subsection in these sections indicating that when these revenues, sufficient revenues have been raised to meet these situations, that the mill rate will cease to exist. I think that's pretty important, because it's all very well for



the Administration to come here at this point in time and say, "Now this is what we intend on doing with the Bill", but then other Administrators may come along and not feel the way that the current Administrators do, and at least the people could have the protection of an Ordinance which spells it and makes it clear.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** There's a little expression hidden in the fifth line which says "...the user charges are insufficient in any year to meet the charges..." the Commissioner shall impose a levy. So we are talking about a single year. When they are insufficient in any year, then the following year comes the levy. If they are sufficient in that year, then there's no levy the next year. It's in each year. It's taken by itself.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman it's still not -- it's not clear to me. As I say what is not really expressed is not implied. It says "in any year", but I still feel that there should be some sort of a sub-section that makes it clear that once the debt has been liquidated, it is not then necessary to apply any further mill rates.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** It may be, Mr. Chairman. The deficit may be something which would require five mills, so in a particular year there's a deficit which would require 5 mills in any year to pay for it. The next year the Commissioner is limited to two mills; the next year to two mills, and the third year he would impose presumably on mill, all in respect of the first year, so we can't cut off the mill rate because the deficit may never be caught up.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, let us take the "presume" as Mr. Honourable Legal Advisor says. He's using the word "presumably". Let's take the "presumably" out of it and then spell it out and tell it like it is in the Ordinance.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I hate to get into the debate, but it seems to me that the Ordinance is quite clear.

"...and the user charges agreed upon between the trustees and the Commissioner are insufficient in any year to meet...the heating, lighting and maintenance of the building, the Commissioner shall pay the insufficiency and impose an annual levy..." Annual being once, not an ongoing. All of our taxation is imposed on an annual basis.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** It all depends on how you read it, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor, please address the chair.

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I think it could be solved by just adding at the end of that sentence, "until the insufficiency is covered", or something like that.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I don't want to do that.

**Mr. Chairman:** It appears quite clear to me, from

what I have read here, I really can't notice anything out of place. If you want to discuss it on the revote, that will be fine.

Is it clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Waste Disposal, 58, Section (1):

(Reads Clause 58(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Is that clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Now, at this point I will turn the chair back to the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Phelps becomes Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you; sub-heading, "Community Planning", 59, sub-section (1):

(Reads Clause 59(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 59(2))

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section (3):

(Reads Clause 59(3))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I think I brought this up before, I still have some problem with "not less than twelve months' notice of the application is given to the Commissioner..." The application I take it, is when you turn in an application to do a certain thing. Now as my answer was given to me before, they said you know, that this has been going on for so many years, six months, three months or nine months or something before, and it has no effect to this here. I take it that if we wish to start something now, we must put this in writing and this application forward and then we must have a year before we can actually start. Is that right?

**Mr. Miller:** Starting at this point in time, that would be correct. The District would have to apply to have a plan done, a community plan done or redone, and it would take a year. In other words, it wouldn't be done in this fiscal year, it would be done in the next fiscal year, that's really what we are saying.

Really the intent of it is we need a year's time to get the money.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments?

Section 60(1):

(Reads Clause 60(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Okay, 60(2):



(Reads Clause 60(2))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear? Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** I would like to just add to what the Mayor of Whitehorse spoke about in the problems whereas they are going to put in a sewer and you have a few outlying areas that won't have that sewer system and it is not provided for, I don't think in this plan to date, and he did say he would appreciate it if it was looked into it and I would say the same thing.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** You don't have to worry in an L.I.D., Mr. Chairman.

As far as I understand the legislation, Mr. Chairman, 60(1) means that an L.I.D. where there is no piped sewer system. That means that if some parts of the L.I.D. have the piped sewer system and others don't, then this section will apply to those areas that don't have the piped sewer system. That's correct, is it not?

**Mr. Miller:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, this is a service which is being provided at the present time and the reason they are doing it is so that there will be a uniform charge across the Territory. For example, yes, this is the present program that we now have for sewage education. Two trips to each community per year and there is a standard rate. The government subsidizes the educator truck going to the various communities.

Now, 60 sub (2) is a different situation. Maybe Mr. Miller could explain that situation? It doesn't apply to many communities in the Territory.

**A Member:** It doesn't apply to --

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** No, it doesn't that is where they have the tanks under their houses.

**Mr. Miller:** 60 sub (2) is really dealing with a situation where in some communities we could get into a holding tank situation rather than a septic tank situation. What we would intend to do where there are holding tanks is to provide within the community a truck sewage pump-out service which would be made available on more than a twice yearly basis.

What we are really saying there where we do make it available, the charge shall not exceed \$5.00 per month for that service.

There are two different -- slightly different things there. One is the sewage education service, as Mrs. Watson says, which we now provide at a uniform rate throughout the Territory.

The other will be where we have a community where we don't have a piped water system and we have a truck sewage pump-out service, a holding tank operation.

**Mr. Fleming:** I am very clear on the matter on the paper here it is just that I am not clear on what they are talking about, all the other communities, I will see them later.

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading Unorganized areas. 61 sub 1.

(Reads Clause 61 (1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Ms. Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** I would like to know if this definition includes so called company towns, such as Clinton Creek?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, Clinton Creek is a company town we have no control over it. So nothing in this Ordinance applies to Clinton Creek or any other company town, per se.

**A Member:** Except Faro.

**Mr. Miller:** Faro is not a company town.

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr --

**Mr. Miller:** Faro is an open town formed under the Municipal Ordinance of the Yukon Territory.

**Mr. Chairman:** Ms. Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, under this definition it would apply whether -- you don't have another definition saying excluding company towns.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller, how do you like that?

**Mr. Miller:** I suppose one could read it that way. That is certainly not the intent.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Legal Advisor?

**Ms. Millard:** My problem is what if I go to Clinton and they say they want to operate under this by-law, can I say that in the plan it says company towns are excluded.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** No, but perhaps you might be able to inform your constituents that the government policy is not to utilize this Ordinance for company towns. We can write it into it but then we would have to have a definition of company towns.

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have found that difficulty before this and it may be a wise move.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments? Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** I wonder if the Legal Advisor could get us a definition of a company town?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** There may be five or six but none I think that would be satisfactory for all purposes.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading "Community Facilities." 62 (1)



(Reads Clause 62 (1))

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 63 (1)

(Reads Clause 63 (1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I think we should re-structure 62 sub 1. Heating room, changing room and lighting. Is the lighting in the changing room or in the outside in the rink. It's just not very clear. "Heated changing room and lighting."

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I can redraft it, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Together with lighting in the heated changing room.

**Mr. Chairman:** Perhaps we could ask Mr. Miller what the intent was.

**Mr. Miller:** The intent is to provide a heated changing room and lighting of the ice surface.

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Surface right, but we are not saying it.

**Mr. Chairman:** It would seem to me that this would cover that situation.

**Mr. Miller:** Plus it would also light the heated changing room.

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** The heated changing room and lighting.

**Mr. Chairman:** 64 subsection 1,

(Reads Clause 64 (1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Subsection (2),

(Reads Clause 64 (2))

**Mr. Chairman:** Subsection (3),

(Reads Clause 64 (3))

**Mr. Chairman:** Again, that word will be changed, I presume.

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman--

**Mr. Chairman:** Miss Millard.

**Ms. Millard:** -- just as a matter of conformity here. Under the L.I.D. and the Municipalities, the item (e) Swimming pool, is this the enclosed swimming pool for Summer use in those parks and this one just says closed. Is it assumed that this is the same type of thing?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman we would treat that as a typographical error.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why the 63 -- in 63 (1). "Commissioner may pay amount not exceeding 90 per centum of the approved costs." Why in the case of L.I.D.'s and Municipalities it pays 90 percent of the cost, why in this case does he pay an amount not exceeding 90 per centum of the approved costs. Why the difference?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I just don't know, Mr. Chairman, nobody asked me before.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, maybe if you looked at 44 (1) and relate it now, the same thing to 63 (1) you might see the difference there.

Section 26, page 131-134

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member is correct, may we treat that correction as a typographical error.

**Mr. Chairman:** Agreed.

**Some Member:** Agreed.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, would that not require redrafting?

**Mr. Miller:** I think, Mr. Chairman, what it could read would be The Commissioner may pay in an unorganized area 90 per centum of the approved cost of building the Community social and recreational facility.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** I'm not sure what I thought Mr. Chairman, but in practice the Commission would be paying 100 percent of the cost. And attempting to recover 10 percent back. So we might have to redraft the thing in that thought if we take it back.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, we will bring it back in the final form reflecting the wishes of the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McKinnon. 65(1).

(Reads Clause 65(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 66(1):

(Reads Clause 66(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.



Mr. Chairman: 67(1):

(Reads Clause 67(1))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: 68(1):

(Reads Clause 68(1))

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard.

Ms. Millard: This has been my difficulty with this thing from the beginning when you first read it. How is this 3 mills going to be applied in an unorganized Community?

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, the levy will be set by Commissioner's Order applying to a particular area of the Territory, and it would be, you know, the unorganized area that we are referring to.

All of our levies of taxes are by Commissioner's Order on an annual basis.

Ms. Millard: And it can be done on an unorganized area?

Mr. Miller: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, we tax everything outside a municipality.

Ms. Millard: Without a referendum or anything?

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, the conditions on which the people in the community acquire a community facility are laid out a little further on.

Ms. Millard: Yes, I notice the 10 people. Certainly 10 people shouldn't have the control over what taxes should be levied.

Mr. Miller: No, it's 10 people who -- can commence an action by an application. It's not 10 people who decide. If there's to be a levy, it would have to be done under 107(1). "The Commissioner will consult with the residents of the area...before and during construction as circumstances permit," so if it takes a special plebiscite, that is what it would take, and that would be done of all the taxpayers in the area.

Ms. Millard: Perhaps I will wait until we get to Section 107. I just don't think it's --

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Miss Millard. I think that rather than taking a further coffee break, we should just plough ahead and Members can feel free to leave to replenish your coffee cups, if that's agreed.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Hopefully one or two at a time. I would hate for the Members all to miss my reading of these sections.

Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, do I have it that there are no situations whereby a public service, a member of the public service would be paid one rate for living in Whitehorse, and another rate for living outside of Whitehorse? That in other words, the rates paid by the public service for labour or you know in trades, are equal all over the Territory?

Mr. Miller: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. We have one standard rate of pay.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.  
69(1):

(Reads Clause 69(1))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Section 70, sub-section (1):

(Reads Clause 70(1) )

Mr. Chairman: Clear? 71(1):  
(Reads Clause 72 (1)

Mr. Chairman: Clear?  
72(1):  
(Reads Clause 72(1) )

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: 73(1):  
(Reads Clause 73(1) )

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: I still have problems I asked before, in an Indian community, irregardless of the majority of the people residing in the area, the -- asking for something, the land owner is still the Federal Government, and irregardless of what the people want, it's going to be the Federal Government again who will make the last decision if they can get this and I cannot see this type of logic could be applied in an Indian Community.

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Indian band can get the lease on the property for the purposes of putting up the community facility, and the arrangements can be arrived at between the government and the people of that community, the total community regarding user fees and this type of thing, they're eligible. It doesn't make any difference, the land doesn't have to be owned by the community. It could be leased.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?



**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Berger is indicating that in a referendum probably the Department of Indian Affairs would turn it down. Is this what you are implying?

**Mr. Berger:** Well this is --

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** -- as a ratepayer?

**Mr. Berger:** That is correct, Mr. Chairman, because I can't really see how this could be possibly applied in an Indian community.

**Dr. Hibberd:** Mr. Chairman, it -- the passage reads, persons -- "approved by a majority of the persons resident in the area". It doesn't refer to ownership of the land.

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not really referring to this particular point. I just brought it up because it was applicable here. I mean, there's many points in here you could apply the same question to it, I mean in the book pages again...at least 10 residents of the particular area apply for it. So, it is not this particular section I am questioning here. I am questioning the whole program here.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I think I understand what Mr. Berger's predicament is and I agree with it. We haven't got the answer yet either. The answer I ask for is this, if there is a user charge or any other charges to be charged against the community, and in other words, the community taxes, the Federal Government own all of the land, except, as you say, you get the lease.

Where do you apply for the two mills or anything else? Who to? Where? You don't owe anything?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the two mills is applied against the total assessed value of all properties in the area, all properties, whether they are owned by Y.T.G., whether they are owned by the Government of Canada, or whoever they are owned by, so if we have to levy a special levy, it will be applied against all properties. And if the Government of Canada wants to pay for it, I guess they pay for it, that is really what it boils down to, assessed against them.

**Mr. Chairman:** Miss Millard?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Section 80 Picks up that point.

**Mr. Miller:** That's right.

**Ms. Millard:** What if the Indian Affairs and Northern Development decide they don't want to pay for it after the community has decided they want it?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Then it's their onus, it's their responsibility, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Millard:** Who is they?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. If the people of the Yukon Territory want to apply under this program, and they can arrange a lease on land, and the Territorial Government says "Fine", because your responsibility under the Indian Act, we are going to assess the property and the homes and apply the bill to the Department of Indian Affairs, and the Department of Indian Affairs says that we don't refuse to pay, or we refuse to pay, then the onus is on them for stopping any community development under this plan within that jurisdiction.

Let them be responsible for it.

**Mr. Fleming:** That clears it up for me.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** There is just no way, Mr. Chairman, that any community in the Yukon hasn't got the ability under this program of taking advantage of any one of these facilities, and the only thing that will prevent them from taking advantage of them is someone who has the ultimate responsibility of refusing to go along with it.

In the case of an Indian village that responsibility is the Department of Indian Affairs, not the Territorial Government.

**Mr. Chairman:** Miss Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, the Indian villages I know of, Indian Affairs have probably set up their own community hall anyway, or a lot of these things that are available, supposedly available under this plan. I just don't think it's a very relevant plan for unorganized communities, the ones I know of.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Miss Millard  
Anything further?

74(1):

(Reads Clause 74(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-heading "Waste Disposal",  
75(1):

(Reads Clause 75(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** 76(1):

(Reads Clause 76(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear? 77, sub-(1):

(Reads Clause 77(1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section 2:

(Reads Clause 77(2))

**Mr. Chairman:** sub-heading, "Community Wells",  
78(1):



(Reads Clause 78(1))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Sub-heading "General", 79(1):

(Reads Clause 79(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 79(2))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, there may be one qualification here and that is where I can see an operation and maintenance he can recover, but it may be a situation whereby a sewer or water system or both were provided in a community, and the community sold the system on the basis of a specified capital cost, based on a front footage amortized over 20 years or 15 years, or whatever it is, and we are told what their operation and maintenance costs on a monthly basis would be, their user fee. And I wouldn't think that the Commissioner would have the right to alter that fee, if the system was sold to the residents of the community on that basis.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the frontage charge that was imposed when those systems went into effect will stay as it was when we put the system in. The operation and maintenance costs will vary from year to year, depending upon the costs that are incurred in operating that system.

That's always been the intent on every water and sewer system.

Mr. Chairman: 80, sub-section (1):

(Reads Clause 81(1))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: We will now go on to page 19 to sub-heading "Local Improvement Districts". 85(1):

(Reads Clause 85(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section 2:

(Reads Clause 85(2))

Mr. Chairman: Clear? Sub-heading "Water Delivery by Truck". 86, sub-section (1):

(Reads Clause 86(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 86(2))

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Sub-heading "community Septic Tank Pump-out System". 87, sub-section(1):

(Reads Clause 87(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 87(2))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Sub-heading, "Unorganized Areas, Water Delivery by Truck", 88, sub-section (1):

(Reads Clause 88(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 88(2))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Sub-heading, "Community Well". 89(1):

(Reads Clause 89(1))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Sub-heading, "Community Septic Tank Pump-out System", 90, sub-section (1):

(Reads Clause 90(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (2):

(Reads Clause 90(2))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, just a comment. I find it very hard to understand, but there's always -- not less than \$10.00 per month, not less than \$15.00 per month, and a minimum charge of \$5.00 a month. Nowhere in any Ordinance have I ever seen any place where it says that you won't go over some dollars a month.

In other words, you could be paying some day, providing the Commissioner or whoever -- in this case the Commissioner says you will pay \$40.00 a month, we will pay \$40.00 a month for 500 gallons of water and have no voice in it.

Of course down the road here I would take three deliveries a week and I would only pay the actual cost in this case.



**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Fleming? Any comments or --

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason of course that there is a maximums set is that the whole thrust of the Ordinance is an attempt to, on a normal basis, not exceed what people are paying in the municipalities. What we are trying to do as in so much of the legislation, that is getting before the Council these days, is to try and set some sort of basis where you are equalizing the cost of services throughout the Territory, whether it's a municipality, an L.I.D. or an unorganized area.

We realize that this is an impossibility, depending upon the volume of the user, but it's an attempt where people, you know -- are attempting to be efficient, that they won't really have too much of a cost over areas like the major metropolitan areas in the Yukon. It's an attempt to do it.

I think it's, you, know, it's relatively successful.

**Mr. Fleming:** I hope so --

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McKinnon.

We are now -- we now turn to page 22 of the Bill, sub-heading, "Local Improvement Districts, Procedure". 101 (1):

(Reads Clause 101 (1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, this raises a question of timing in relation to this fiscal year. I'm wondering if the Administration have established somewhere within themselves a deadline by which time they will sit down and review any applications that they have received from L.I.D.'s and municipalities and this type of thing?

In other words, at what point will the Administration in this fiscal year, be able to start allocating funds to projects?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think as we recall when going through the budget, most of the funds have already been allocated for the current fiscal year. That doesn't mean that we won't accept applications and that we might not be able to do some of the things that the L.I.D.'s want to do, but our general experience has been by the time somebody starts to talk about the need for a capital project, and the time they get around to getting all the work done, you are looking at 12 months down the line anyway. I would doubt very much that there would be much forthcoming in this particular construction season.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, certainly there are projects, certainly the Watson Lake project, which is to get underway this year and be completed by fall. Am I told now that there are no funds out of this three million dollar annual allotment for this year under this program, for this year?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest in the case of the Watson Lake proposal, that the L.I.D. should be getting together and getting their application in, subject to the approval of this Ordinance, of course, and that we will try and do what we can.

I can't guarantee we'll have the money, but my reaction is that we probably could find it this year, because I don't think some of the other things we planned are going to be as far advanced as we think they will be.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson?

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, just as an ongoing -- this year is a different thing, but we are now having a requirement under Section 5 that Local Improvement Districts have to include their proposed projects in an approved five year capital budget of the District.

Now they weren't required to do that, that isn't a requirement under the Local Improvement District Ordinance, but it's been put in here so that they do their planning, and after this year, after the first initial year is over, they will have their five year planning done and it will be in with Local Government, and then they will be able to set their priorities.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, if -- also they've got to go to plebiscite before, you know, before this is accepted, but there is some problems here. As I say, there more strings attached to this operation, and we haven't got around to the strings at all, and probably never will.

But, for instance, if a community such as Watson Lake wished to build a facility, they can't build it themselves. The Government of the Yukon Territory will have to call tenders on it, so the only way that I can see that a community club can build a building of its own design and what it wants and effect any economy where government couldn't, they could; is to almost, the community associations themselves must bid the contract. This is the only way I can see it can be done, because -- for instance, in the case of a hockey arena, the government under this plan, I understand, would call tenders once everything is settled to that extent. They would call tenders, and people across Canada could submit proposals.

This is not the sort of thing you could put a design tender on, you just call for proposals, and the prices that would come in would be absolutely outrageous, whereas the community association itself has a price, a price to them, not to government.

Now, in order for them to get the building they are looking for without having to pay a whole bunch of money for a big, fancy edifice that they didn't want in the first place, they are forced into a position of having to become contractors for the purposes of bidding on it themselves. This is the only way I can see it, unless you allow the L.I.D.'s to call tenders themselves.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Miller?



**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman the L.I.D.'s have authority under the L.I.D. Ordinance to buy, sell. They can tender themselves if they want to. In the case of the L.I.D.'s we have said we will help them, we will provide whatever help we can. If they want us to do it, we'll do it. But if they want to do it themselves, that's fair ball, they can do it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor.

**Mr. Taylor:** This is great news. Someone was down telling us we couldn't, that the Government had to tender all these contracts.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Mrs. Watson.

**Hon. Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, that has been a misunderstanding. I believe that the Mayo L.I.D. and I know our L.I.D. have been thinking the same thing. That it is going to be necessary for the Government to do the tendering. I'm very glad to have that clarified here.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further comments or questions arising?  
102 )  
(Reads Clause 102(1). Clear.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 103 )  
(Reads Clause 103(1).  
104((10)  
(Reads Clause (104(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Taylor.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** I just want to slip back just a minute to 102(1). When you speak of where a consent is required to a capital project, are you inferring here that this -- where a plebiscite may have been held.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** It is a requirement, Mr. Chairman, under the Local Improvements Ordinance.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, but Mr. Chairman shouldn't you be -- aren't you trying to make the point in this legislation that consent is in fact required for all capital programs under this?

**The Legal Advisor:** No Mr. Chairman, we are not departing from the consent in respect to the Local Improvement District or a Municipality. They are required by their parent Ordinance. Or we are attempting not to.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** I see, okay.

**Mr. Chairman:** Subheading - Unorganized Areas, Procedure 105(1).  
(Reads Clause 105(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 106(1).  
(Reads Clause 107(1) )

**Mr. Chairman:** 107 (1).  
(Reads Clause 107) )

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I feel I must make an objection here. Since it says "With the residents of the area or a committee of the residents of the area. "Does that not conflict with having to have approval of all -- it's back here somewhere -- 73(1). "It shall be a condition of a payment...it is approved by a majority of the persons resident," and then 107(1) or "a Committee of the residents." A Committee could consist of three people.

**Mr. Miller:** Really what we're referring to here, Mr. Chairman, is following the decision by all the residents of the Community to proceed with the construction of a particular building. You wouldn't necessarily want to go back and deal with all the residents of that area with respect to the construction details.

**Ms. Millard:** It is clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you.  
108(1)  
(Reads Clause 108) )

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Are any regulations available at this time?

**Mr. Miller:** No Mr. Chairman, there aren't any and we don't see any need for any at the particular moment.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or comments? 109(1)  
(Reads Clause 109) )

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Now, Mr. Fleming, do you have any questions relating back to section 6(1)(b) or was it clarified for you.

If you will recall I left that open for you if you wanted to go back.

**Mr. Fleming:** No, Mr. Chairman, I think that was clarified when we were speaking of the native districts and so forth, I think that is clarified.

**The Chairman:** I think before we move the Bill out of Committee we ought to see some of the rewording that has been promised. Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I believe there is some possible amendments coming in the reshaping of certain sections. May I suggest that at this time that we report progress on the Bill?



Mr. Chairman: Yes, is that agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard, did you wish to--

Mrs. Whyard: I'll get my question answered elsewhere, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, Mr. Miller, thank you for your assistance today. And can we have a motion.

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

Mr. McCall: I will second that Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. McCall that Mr. Speaker resume the Chair. Question.

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are we agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Motion carried.

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: At this time I will call the House to Order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Phelps: Yes Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole convened at 10:20 a.m. to consider Bills, Papers and Motions. We had Mr. Lucier, Mr. Mayes, Mr.

Mitchell and Mr. Miller as witnesses. The Committee recessed at 12 p.m. and reconvened at 2:05 p.m.

I can report progress on Bill 19.

It was moved by Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. McCall that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair and this Motion was carried.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees, are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: What is your further pleasure?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we call it 5 o'clock.

Ms. Millard: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie that we now call it 5 o'clock. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the Motion as carried.

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

**Motion Carried**

**Adjourned**



LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO.4

[1975 Second Session]

March 19, 1975

Mr. Speaker  
Members of Council

On Thursday, March 13, 1975, the following questions were asked in Council by Mr. Berger:

1. How much meat, in pounds, is salvaged and exported by a non-resident hunter:

From:

- (a) Moose
- (b) Caribou
- (c) Sheep
- (d) Goat

2. And how much meat is used from each of these animals by outfitters:

Answers to the above questions are as follows:

1. We are unable to state definitely just what portion of each animal taken by non-residents was exported. Our records for the 1974 season show the following meat was removed from the Territory by non-residents under permit.

The following export permits were issued to non-residents during the 1974 season to export game meat from the Yukon.

Moose	-28 permits	-Total pounds	5,762
Caribou	-13 permits	-Total pounds	1,010
Sheep	-25 permits	-Total pounds	1,010
Goat	-nil	-Total pounds	nil
Grizzly	-1 permit	Total pounds	16

2. Records of game meat used by big game outfitters are not kept. Experience shows, however, that except during a brief period at the beginning of the season, most outfitters use only game meat in their camps

P.J. Gillespie,  
Member, Executive Committee