



Property of
M. L. A. Lounge

The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 7

4th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Wednesday, December 3, 1975

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Property of
the Yukon Legislative Assembly



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Printed and Published by the Queen's Printer for Yukon

Yukon Legislative Assembly

Yukon Legislative Assembly

The Yukon Legislative Assembly

December 3, 1975

December 3rd, 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 the House to Order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed with the Order Paper. Are there any documents or correspondence for tabling this morning?

The Honourable Member for Whitehorse North Centre?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker I have for tabling today Legislative Return Number 3.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker I have for tabling today Sessional Paper Number 7, Rent Control.

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

Are there any reports of Committees?

Introduction of Bills?

The Honourable Member from Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River that Bill Number 5 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if the Honourable Member would allow we can pick it up later on in the order Paper?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Oh, I am sorry. I am a little disorganized this morning.

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

Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

We will then proceed under Orders of the Day, to the Question Period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker: Madam Clerk could you ascertain

whether Mr. Commission will be available to the House this morning?

(Madam Clerk Leaves Room)

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

Recess

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: At this time I will call the House to order.

Have you any questions this morning? The Honourable Member from Pelly River.

Question Re: Teachers at Faro

Mr. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I received information this morning of the situation that has developed out in Faro. What is the opinion of the Minister of Education on the situation concerning the teachers out in Faro?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is pretty difficult at this time to make an opinion, Mr. Speaker, I learned, probably the same way the Honourable Member from Pelly River learned of what occurred at Faro, I turned on my radio this morning. That is about as much as I know.

I do know that when the Executive Committee went through Faro there was a major concern with the maintenance of housing, and it is my understanding that the deficiencies were fixed, promptly after we left. What has occurred up to now, I don't know. We are looking into it and once I have an opinion to give to the Honourable Member from Pelly River, I will give one.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

Question Re: Adequate Housing for Teachers in Faro

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education another question, which has been asked many, many times by many of my constituents, why is there not adequate housing for our teachers in Faro?

Hon. Mr. McCall: Adequate?

Mr. McCall: Housing.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker the Housing Authority is taking care of this and they are doing, to my knowledge, as much as they can that is humanly possible to accommodate the teachers in Faro. Apparently there will be three units ready here in the middle of December. It is not really our fault that it has taken so long, apparently, they had to fix up the trailer park area.

I would also like to say that we were not responsible for burning down one of the units. This does have an effect. They are doing the best that they can, at least to my knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Question Re: Telephone service in Watson Lake

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This morning I have a question on behalf of the Honourable Member of Watson Lake, and it's directed to — it's an oral question, directed to the Minister of Local Government. I'm wondering if the Minister could advise the House as to what progress is being made towards the provision of telephone services to the new subdivision in Watson Lake, and maybe further to that, I would also ask the Minister of Local Government if he could assure the House that all service connections will be installed in the new Watson Lake subdivision early next year, in order that underground power and telephone cables may be installed?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the easy one first, which is the second one. Everything is well in order as far as the service connections go. There was nobody who wanted to move or build in the new subdivision in Watson Lake during this building season, who wasn't able to because service connections were't available, and it is a priority of Local Government and Municipal Engineering, that all service connections to the property line be a first item of priority next year. So that's well in hand.

The telephone issue is another one, and the Department of Local Government has exhausted every avenue in attempting to provide telephone communication to the residents of Watson Lake in the new subdivision this fall. We just can't go any further, and it's going to be a matter of whether the Local Improvement District can prevail upon the corporation that provides telephones through some method to provide that service to the residents in the new subdivision.

I might say that even though the Department of Local Government really didn't have the responsibility of providing the communications, they didn't make the decision for underground services. That was a decision of the L.I.D., not the Department of Local Government. We still moved in every field to try and persuade the people providing the service that they should on a

temporary basis, provide the services to those people that moved into the new subdivision.

It's interesting to note that after the experience in Watson Lake, there has been other subdivisions that have been developed by the Department of Local Government, where the original plans were for underground services, the Department of Local Government convinced those people that they should go to the standard overhead services, so that they wouldn't find themselves in the difficulties that the people have in the Watson Lake subdivision.

I'm sorry to report, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way that the Department of Local Government can pay the additional costs for these services on a temporary basis, because we have already subsidized the lots in Watson Lake to the tune of a thousand dollars because of the problems developed there with sewer and water, and it's obvious that the Corporation supplying the communication services does not want to provide those services on a temporary basis and put up that money, so it's an impasse, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, I have a question on my own behalf, this morning, of the Minister of Local Government.

Question Re: Land Policy

Over the past few months, I've had a number of individuals ask me about a land policy for the Yukon Territorial Government. They have said that when they go to the Lands Office here, they are usually given the statement that the Yukon Territorial Government is working on a policy, and I just would like to ask the Minister of Local Government if in fact we are, and are working on a new policy or is it in place, or is it ready to be tabled in this House, or just what is the situation with regard to that?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker?

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

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It's pretty obvious to anybody who's been in the Yukon for any length of time, that there is no overall land policy in the Yukon Territory, and just go try to purchase a piece of land somewhere in the Yukon and you will get the run-around, and you will know that as well as most of the other citizens of the Yukon.

One of the first priorities when I became involved in Local Government was to second a professional land planner from the Government in Manitoba, a person in the name of Mr. Lyn Chambers, who has been working and working assiduously at the task, which is an impossible task, and 18 months of preparing an overall land policy for the Government of the Yukon. The reason being is that we have sat around this table for as long as I have been here, and yelled and screamed at how shoddy the policies were of the federal government concerning land in the Yukon, but we never took

the initiative and went to the federal government and said "look it, here's what we see as an overall plan that we have prepared". It's got to be better than yours because you ain't got one, so how about passing on the service rights of unalienated land in the Yukon over to the Y.T.G. that at least has got a plan, has put some zoning thoughts into it, and will apportion the land under these recommendations.

So it's being worked on, yes, it's almost an impossible task. In the 18 months that Mr. Chambers is here, he's doing a good job, he's going to have an extremely helpful plan, I think available to the Yukon Territory by the time he's finished, and the moment that it is available, of course it will be tabled before the Members of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Question Re: Timing Of Land Policy

Mr. Lengerke: Would there be any timing on that, Honourable Minister? Have you—

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: He has approximately a year to go, Mr. Speaker. He's been working for a little more than six months at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Question Re: Fuel Tax Exemption

Mr. Lengerke: It's a new question, Mr. Speaker, and that will be my last question.

Again, directed to the Honourable Minister of Local Government, maybe he could give me a little advice here or a little information as to the fuel tax exemption. I believe that municipalities used to be exempt on this a number of years ago, and I was just really wondering if he could give me a little information as to why that was eliminated?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The Honourable Member from Riverdale is correct under the old Municipal Ordinance, the municipalities were exempt from fuel tax. Under the new Municipal Ordinance, they were picked up and it would be a majority resolution of this House needed to change the Municipal Ordinance to once again eliminate them from that tax.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question Re: Training Program with Arctic Gas

Ms. Millard: I have a question for Mr. Commissioner.

Last spring, my information was that there were 74 trainees from the north working for Arctic Gas, particularly in Alberta. How many are from the Yukon,

and does the government have any control over this training program?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: No, Mr. Speaker, I will have to seek the information to be able to reply to the Honourable Member.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question Re: Referrals to Welfare Appeal Board

Ms. Millard: A question for the Minister of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation.

How many referrals have been made to the Welfare Appeal Board since it was instigated, and does she feel that recipients are being adequately advised as to their rights along the procedures?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, at present there have been none since we established that Appeal Board. I will check and see what the most recent figures are.

Certainly all our professional workers advise any of our clients of their rights and privileges under this Social Welfare claim.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane?

Question Re: Aishihik Power Project

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Commissioner and he may take it as a written question.

Since the Yukon consumers of electricity will be paying for the Aishihik power project.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Through the nose.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Commissioner, could you—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Commissioner, could you ascertain from N.C.P.C. (1): The total construction cost of the Aishihik power project? (2) The cash compensation being paid to individuals and-or bands for property or other damages created by the project, and such other terms and conditions that have been negotiated as part of the compensation, and (3) The cost of the Haines Junction transmission line?

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions this morning?

We will then proceed under Orders —

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, excuse me, I have an answer to a question that Councillor Lengerke asked on December 1st concerning the situation with

Porter Creek sewage treatment lagoon.

Mr. Speaker, the present status of the lagoon is that the construction plans have been submitted by the Territorial Municipal Engineering Branch and are presently being evaluated by the technical staff of the Yukon Water Board. The plans will shortly be submitted to the Water Board for their decision as an amendment to the present water use licence.

Mr. Speaker: Have you any further questions?

We will then proceed on the Order Paper to Public Bills.

PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

Bill Number 5, First Reading

Hon. Mr. Lang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River that Bill Number 5 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, that Bill Number 5 be now read a first time.

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: When shall the Bill be read for the second time?

Bill Number 5, Second Reading

Hon. Mr. Lang: Now, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, that Bill Number 5 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, that Bill Number 5 be now read a second time.

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

Madam Clerk has brought to my attention that I have overlooked Motions on the Order Paper this morning, so we will at this time proceed to Motion Number 7.

Motion Number 7

Mr. Speaker: Moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that the number of single trip permits as presently allowed under regulations of the Motor Vehicles Ordinance, the Commissioner's Order of 1974-22 schedule 2, 4(b), be limited to two permits per vehicle per year.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I moved that particular Motion because we are now dealing with the Motor Vehicles Ordinance, and I think it's a timely situation that at least discuss some of the regulations under it, and there's one that does concern me, because it is of concern to the Transportation Association, the Yukon Transportation Association, and many operators in the Yukon, and maybe this House would like to discuss this further in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker I would move that this Motion Number 7 be moved to the Committee of the Whole and I believe this will be seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that Motion Number 7 be referred to Committee of the Whole.

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: May I have your further pleasure at this time?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole to discuss Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions.

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve

in the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing 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 carried.

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Pelly River will take the Chair in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I will call this committee to order and call a five minute recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call the Committee to order. Order please. I would like to turn the Chair over to the Chairman, Mr. Hibberd.

Mr. Hibberd resumes Chair.

Bill Number 9 continued

Mr. Chairman: We will proceed with clause by clause reading of Bill Number 9, Motor Vehicle Ordinance.

Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, are we going to deal with the motion that I had.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we will. Before the Bill is completed we will be dealing with that motion.

Mr. Lengerke: The reason I ask that, I do, at the wish of the House, I do have a witness here and he could be available along with Mr. Taylor and Mr. Gillespie to deal with the motion.

Mr. Chairman: If that is the wishes of Council.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Can we bring the witnesses forward please?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman I would like to take the opportunity to introduce to the House Mr. Ron McRobb, he is the proprietor of Pacific Northwest Moving. He is also the immediate past president of the Yukon Transportation Association.

I was very fortunate in being able to have Mr. McRobb here this morning. There are other members of the Yukon Transportation Association that could have appeared as witnesses, however, they do have

busy schedules, and as I say Mr. McRobb was available. Certainly he can speak very well. I think, for the transportation industry, especially with respect to the subject that I have put before you through the Motion Number 7, that is dealing with the single trip permits. That again is under the Motor Vehicles Ordinance, Schedule under Commissioners Order 1974-22.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, I think we will proceed with the clause by clause reading and get to your motion at the end of it.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: We are on page 16.

31. Section 79 of the said Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:
(Reads subsection 5)

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: 32. The said Ordinance is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:
(Reads 80.1)

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to 31(5) regarding the speed limit. I think the legislation, the law is here, but I think some of us are concerned about the enforcement. I think that there are various areas in the Yukon where we could have more of an enforcement program of this.

I am wondering if there is any way that this Council can put on pressures that there should be more enforcement of this section?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie do you have any comment?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that the administration is in full agreement with the message that Mrs. Watson has delivered. All we can do at this point in time, is to approach the R.C.M.P. and I will undertake to do that, and seek more enforcement than has been the case in the past in this particular area.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. 33. Subsection 95(3) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
(Reads sub-section 3)

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: 34. Subsection 101(2) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
(Reads sub-section 2)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: I am a little confused about that piece of language there. Is this saying that we are going to eliminate stop signs.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, from a private laneway there isn't a requirement now to have stop signs, and we would cover entry onto a main road from a private laneway, by this as well, so people can't come on from their own property onto a highway without stopping. This would be the effect of this.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: I'm still curious. Mr. Gillespie just made a point about removing all stop signs on secondary roads. I think they should be, as well as on highways.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, the old Section read, "he shall yield the right-of-way". This is adding the word "stop" and saying he shall stop and yield the right-of-way. That's the change that is made here.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. During the discussion on the last three sections in particular, each section brought to mind the use of snowmobiles and their applications in these sections, and I just simply would like to know if the administration have taken into account the relationship between snowmobile type vehicles and their application under the Motor Vehicle Ordinance, and whether or not there are any specific regulations coming down as to their use on public highways.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, there is a section that I don't believe we have come to yet. In 38(1)36, we're talking there — we will be talking there about an air cushioned vehicle, but that does not answer the question that is being put by Mr. Taylor.

I will have to refer the question to Mr. Herb Taylor.

Mr. Herb Taylor: Mr. Chairman, there aren't any specific regulations now dealing with the operation of snowmobiles on highways, and therefore, they are obliged to obey all the regulations that apply to automobiles equally.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the question was you know, have the administration given any consideration to bringing down regulations which would more or less specifically place additional controls upon the use of snowmobiles on public highways?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge we haven't addressed ourselves to that particular question up to this point in time, but clearly it is something that we are going to have to do in the future, particularly as we see the way the provinces are responding to what is a real problem there in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That's fine, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: 35, the said Ordinance is further amended by adding thereto the following new sub-section: 107.1:

(Reads Sub-section 107.1)

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, my question is simply and then what happens?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, the peace officer writes it down.

Ms. Millard: There's no ticket or anything? There's no fine for walking across the middle of the highway?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, in spite of my facetious remark, the peace officers indicated to us — the R.C.M.P. indicated to us that they had some difficulty of getting the name of a person who was violating the Ordinance in the past, and they have just asked us to put this particular Section in so that they are able to at least be able to get that person's name, and be able thereby more effectively to deal with the infraction.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I would direct a question to Mr. Legal Advisor, and ask him in Section 35 of this Bill if perhaps this should not also apply to Local Improvement Districts who do make by-laws respecting the roads within the improvement district?

Mr. Legal Advisor: I'm not aware that they have the power to make by-laws respecting roads. As I understand it, the Commissioner makes the regulations which apply in respect of highways within Local Improvement Districts, but if they in fact get that power, then the pedestrians should be required to give their names and addresses on the demand of a peace officer.

Mr. Chairman: 36, Subsection 111(1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(Reads Subsection 111(1))

Mr. Chairman: 37, Subsection 115(1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(Reads Subsection 115(1))

Mr. Chairman: 38, the Said Ordinance is further amended by adding thereto the following new sub-section: 136.1(1))

Mr. Chairman: 39, Section 158 of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(Reads Subsection 158.(1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):
(Reads Subsection 158.(2))

Mr. Chairman: 40, Subsection 164(2) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (2):
(Reads Subsection 164.(2))

Mr. Chairman: 41, Subsection 171.(1) of the said —
Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Just one question arising out of 40. What happens to the plates after the officer takes possession of them? Is there anything laid down in the existing Ordinance? I just don't have it at hand as to what he does with those plates? I think he turns them into the Motor Vehicle Office, the nearest Motor Vehicle Office.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman my question would be described in the Ordinance and the other procedure you say here the officer takes possession of the licence plate but we make no provision, apparently, as to what he does when he receives those plates.

Mr. Herb Taylor: There is another section, I think —

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, there is a section.

Mr. Herb Taylor: There is a section, it shall be turned into the Motor Vehicles Office.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I must ask a question that really has something to do with safety in this case, but I don't see it right where we are at the moment, and I have been almost to the end and I haven't found it. I am wondering is there any provision, which I can't find in the regulations for vehicles such as buses, I will use the instance of buses especially, is there a regulation that controls what model, not necessarily the model, but the quality of the tires that are used on a vehicle such as this?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Mr. Chairman there are safety regulations pertaining to school buses and there are general vehicle safety regulations. I believe that point is covered, I am not positive of that. There are vehicle safety regulations.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have read through the regulations and I just can't find anything in there under this. I find all the lights and all the things that we need for safety and I am quite concerned about the tires because I have had a few drivers come to me and say, and I will not quote any, you know, who or what, say that, you know, we have a problem these people don't quite keep the tires on this bus and we are a little afraid to drive it too fast and so forth and so on. My feeling is that it is something that really should be looked into, if it is not there now.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman we will undertake to look into the regulations to ensure that this point is properly covered.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Gillespie.
Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have to rise in support of the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua. I would even go one step further in this There is absolutely nothing in there either to cover taxi operations. We are quite concerned about having proper licence plates and things like this, but there is absolutely nothing in there that specifically spells out the safety of the car.

I think taxis running around in this Territory shouldn't be on the road at all, not even for private use. I think it is quite a concern. If somebody goes in the business of transporting people I think it should be spelled out in an Ordinance what vehicle he can use, and what shape it should be in, and I would go one step further, buses and taxis and school buses should go for a check up every six months to make sure that the vehicle is in safe condition.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I nearly overlooked something I spotted earlier. I did want to ask a question in relation to section 40, as well and that is, where an officer has had reason to believe that plates were wrongfully on a vehicle and took possession of the licence plates and then it was found after this fact, that in fact, the person did have a right to the plates, what provision is made for the return of the plates to the person who owns the vehicle.

Mr. Herb Taylor: We didn't make any provision for that. We couldn't foresee the officer making such a stupendous mistake as that.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring us back to Mr. Berger's question about motor-vehicle inspection, especially public transport. Is there any thought in the administration to establishing a motor vehicle inspection area?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Periodically the R.C.M.P. do put on a check for all vehicles on the highway and check them for everything, and check the operator for his authority too. They are doing that at least once a year now. I don't know just how often they plan on doing it.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman just a supplementary. Is that just in Whitehorse or are they doing that through the whole Territory and is there a chance of having it done more often than once a year?

Mr. Herb Taylor: I am not sure whether they do it in all areas of the Territory, but on the highway they

make their periodic checks some place. We can ask them to do it if you wish.

Ms. Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like them to take note of that anyway. It is my feeling that it should be done more often, certainly for public transport.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, it raises another point. I don't think that a direction from one member can be considered a decision of the whole Committee, and I think that any such direction to the administration should be done by substantive Motion or by a vote of the Committee, and I wouldn't want the witnesses to think that that is a direction of the Committee.

Again back to Section 40, it has been indicated by the administration that no consideration had been given to the return of plates to an owner where, in fact, he was entitled to have them back. I would ask if the administration might consider while they are reviewing other sections of this Ordinance, that they would take a look at Section 40 with a view, perhaps, to remedying this. Because you have offered no protection for the person whose plates have been, perhaps wrongfully, picked up, and perhaps as has been indicated, the officer having taken the plates under his possession, that there is provision elsewhere in the Ordinance for their return to the Registrar.

But if in fact that's not clear, perhaps that should be spelled out as well.

Mr. Chairman: Is that a direction of Committee or of an individual member, Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, if you notice I asked a question of the administration, if they would be prepared to do that in the review of the Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Legal Advisor—

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm quite prepared to suggest to this Committee not to pass this Ordinance until we have a proper safety standard in this Ordinance. If somebody wants to make a Motion to the effect or anything like this, I am quite prepared to—because I am more concerned about the safety of public transportation, than the licence plates on the vehicles.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Just in keeping with the Honourable Member from Klondike, I was just wondering, I was looking through the Ordinances and not being familiar with them all, I was looking for a Public Vehicles Ordinance, or a taxi cab or a livery Ordinance, that does spell out specifications as to how the—what conditions the vehicle should operate and what they have—and what requirements they have to meet before they are licensed.

I do think that we should be looking towards some sort of a Public Vehicles Ordinance that does spell out

specifications, conditions to operate buses and taxis. I concur very much with Mr. Berger that we should bring some legislation forward to strengthen that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, if the House will permit us, what I would like to suggest is that the administration first make a close examination of the regulations that we have, examine where they are deficient in this very regard, and then alter those regulations to take into account the concerns that have been expressed.

Once again, I'm concerned about timing here, and the prospect of holding up this whole Bill while we perform this examination and prepare the necessary amendments to the regulations to give effect to these concerns.

Mr. Chairman: Is that satisfactory to the members of the Committee? Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I can't speak for all Committee, but I would like to make this comment, that I can appreciate Mr. Gillespie's comments there. I do think that there is legislation, there are regulations that the provinces have that we could take a look at, but the timing on that wouldn't be all that long, would it?

You could probably get back before this Session closed, with some sort of a report, because certainly the safety situation, I don't think will be too hard.

Mr. Gillespie: Well we can certainly attempt to do so.

We will look into it right away.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought the Honourable Member from Klondike brought up a good point, Mr. Gillespie brought up a good point. Maybe we should complete reading this Bill, and then just report it in Committee until we have got further information.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder about the capability of the administration to bring that back while this Session is still in.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, what we are proposing to do is to look at the regulations themselves. We are not at this point, proposing to look at changes to the Ordinance.

I'm wondering, if it is the view of the House that it is critical, that we have it ready before this Session ends. It will depend partly on how long this Session takes before we get this information.

We are having enough difficulty as it is with obtaining material from the provinces through the postal system. Before we concluded our examination of this, I think we would want to have in hand some of that material from the provinces. I would not like to give an undertaking that we will have those regulations—regulation changes ready before the end of this session.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In view of what Mr. Gillespie has just said, I think a compromise can be reached whereas we can consider the time element here and maybe, if there is no objection from the Members, we could expect to review these regulations in the next sitting.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I only rise—about ten questions back I asked a question, I wonder if I can now have an answer in respect of Section 40, and I asked if the administration would review or intend on reviewing Section 40 in light of the remarks that I made on this subject.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, in the old Section from which this is an amendment, it said that the officer may seize and hold them pending receipt of instructions from the Committee. I think that might be a suitable phrase to carry forward with the amendment in the totality of it, and perhaps we might be able to review it in the light of that possibility.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No that is okay.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, regarding the safety regulations that we were discussing, and I realize there is quite a time element involved and it would take quite a comprehensive review, but that doesn't prevent each one of us, as individuals, for reviewing the regulations themselves, and I must admit that I haven't read them for some time, in fact I am sure I haven't read some of them, period.

So as an individual Member, I think I should take it upon myself to read these and then we could indicate the areas in which we feel there are deficiencies in the regulations and ask the administration to look at them and see whether they can correct these deficiencies. If the regulations are really quite extensive and have profound effects, I think that before they are put into effect, they should be brought back to the next Session of Council. I don't think we can expect a completed package before we adjourn this time. But we can certainly indicate the specific areas where we feel there are deficiencies, and at this present time, I can't say where there are deficiencies, because I don't know what the regulations are. So everyone of us better read them and study them.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite willing to compromise because I realize that there's lots of work involved. I would like to have the assurance from the administration that something will be done in the next session. I went through the regulations, there's absolutely nothing in there, even the school bus regulations as far as I'm concerned is not strong

enough, doesn't spell it out strong enough, the responsibility of the school bus owner, what to do. If the administration could give me the assurance I'm quite willing to compromise.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make the suggestion that we move ahead, complete the Bill, we report it at such, and with specific instructions to the administration to look at and report back as quickly as possible on the safety regulations with respect to school buses and taxis.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could we carry on with the reading please?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this, I would like to echo the words that the Honourable Member from Kluane said. I think the onus lies on some of the members as well, to go through those regulations, and if they have a specific recommendation, get it to the administration and we will see what we can do about it.

Some Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the thing that I am worried about is that we get into this kind of debate all the time, and all these things are very nice in a provincial type area, but I always look as to who is going to finally pay the costs of the system of inspection.

Now, the Government of the Yukon Territory spent in their contract with the constabulary last year was pretty close to one million dollars to the taxpayers of the Yukon money.

Now, are we willing at this time to set up another completely separate different branch of government, an Inspections Branch which has a building, mechanics, the total inspection type of personnel that are available in the provinces for people to have their — the buses, the cabs, the cars and the trucks of everybody in the Yukon tested. Is this a priority of government, or are we going to bring in stringent regulations once again that spell out all these beautiful things of trying to pass off to the public that these things are available to the people of the Yukon Territory, when there is no money, there has been no money voted, and nobody is willing to vote the money.

Come on, let's stand up and be honest about what we are prepared to do. The administration needs a directive from the Council that they consider this from the Assembly, as a priority of this Assembly, and that they are willing to pay X amount of the taxpayers' dollars to be able to set up this program, over and above, the extent of monies that are paid every year for the policing of this Yukon Territory, which will next year be over one million dollars.

You know, we can sit here all we want and say these

things should be done and those things should be done, don't we have a responsibility of saying this is a priority as far as monies are concerned, and you find the monies and take another program and set this one up as a priority, and delete the other one.

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the Yukon is going to promote tourism I think it is very, very important, I don't want to say it happens right now, but I have seen it in the past when there was a bus run in existence and the bus goes down the road and the door fell off. In the winter time at 60 below the buses on the road, there is absolutely no safety equipment on the bus, endangering the lives on the bus.

A taxi picking up people from an airport and the hood falls off. The seats are in shreds, in pieces, the pilot ends are ready to fall off because there is no stringent regulation in the Ordinance to spell out what shape the vehicle should be in.

I am quite willing to spend enough tax dollars to install a new enforcement branch.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly sympathize with the remarks of the Honourable Minister with respect to dollars. I don't think there is anybody else more aware of the budgetary constraints than I am. I would just like to say this, and I would like to emphasize this. I think, that if in view from what we have heard from the witnesses, if in view of what we have heard of the comments around here, that there are lacking regulations with respect to safety, and I say specifically with respect to safety of buses and public service vehicles, that I think we should be doing something about it and we should write it in there so that we do in fact give our law enforcement people some back-up on that.

I certainly don't want to be the one that answers when a school bus or something is found to be running down the road with scab tires on the thing and it shouldn't be operating. I think this is the point we are trying to make. We are not looking for a mountain out of a molehill. We are not trying to defer legislation from going through.

I think that there is some simple pieces that have to be added, and obviously it was said. That is what we are looking for.

Mr. Chairman: Can I take it then that the administration is undertaking to review this, and will bring this back.

Mr. Herb Taylor: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: 41. Subsection 171.(1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(Reads Subsection 171.(1))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman there is a typographical error here, it is not quilty, it is guilty.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman what was the original penalty in the original Ordinance I just don't have it in front of me.

Mr. Herb Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the penalty was, for the first offence, one hundred dollars; for a second offence, one hundred and fifty and for a third and subsequent offence, two hundred dollars, maximum.

Mr. Chairman: 42. Section 175 of the said Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

(Reads Subsection (3))

Mr. Chairman: 44. The said Ordinance is further amended by adding thereto the following new section: (Reads section 176.(1))

Mr. Chairman: We will now deal with Motion Number 7.

Motion Number 7

Mr. Chairman: I will read the motion: That the number of "Single Trip Permits" as presently allowed under the Regulations of the Motor Vehicles Ordinance in Commissioner's Order No. 1974-22, Schedule II 4(b), be limited to two permits per vehicle per year.

Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, there is a thought occurred to me, and I don't know if this appropriate or not, but I would like to move, or I would like to suggest and addition to that particular motion. I would like to say this, on the tail end of that that two permits per vehicle per year except in the case of an emergency or circumstances effecting the public well being. I could maybe explain this.

If the House allows me now, I will make a few comments about the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lengerke: I am not an expert in the transportation field by any stretch of the imagination, but, in my time in Yukon and speaking to numbers of truckers and people involved in the industry, I found that at the present time, they do obtain operating authority — just before I carry on, I would ask any of the witnesses here to interject if I sort of get on the wrong track as to the terminology, because we can maybe square this up a little but.

I know they do obtain operating authority and I think this is under P.S.V., Public Services Vehicles licences. I don't know all the Regulations that are concerned obtaining this kind of a licence. But I do know that along with, or in addition to obtaining an operating authority in the Yukon Territory that there is such a thing as a Single Trip Permit allowed. This is really a vehicle available to say, a trucker operating from outside of the Territory who wants to carry certain items through or into the Territory and he can

obtain a permit to do so.

Now, there is no limit on the number of permits that are available at the moment. This then, as you can probably obviously see, is that you can have a trucker from outside of the Territory that could obtain ten or twelve permits per year, or whatever, and provide transportation into the Yukon, where in fact, he should be probably interlining with a Yukon operator, or at least be limited. What we are really trying to do is strengthen the transportation industry in the Yukon.

I would ask that either Mr. Taylor or Mr. McRobb, maybe you could probably give a little more background on the way these trip permits are used, and again just back to the case of the emergency or circumstances involving public well-being, I just say that there may be a case where permits have to be issued more than two permits per vehicle, or there may be an emergency situation arise where we would have to give authority to truckers, in the case of a civil disaster to operate, and that's why I added that line.

Mr. Taylor, maybe you would have a comment further to this?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Well, yes, Mr. Chairman, the permit limitation was removed several years ago. As a matter of fact, it's quite a number of years ago when there used to be such a body as a Transportation Bureau under the old Board of Trade in Whitehorse. There are still one or two of the operators who were on that Committee, and members of the Yukon Transportation Association today, and it was at their request that the permit limit was taken off, and the fee was raised to \$100.00 for a trip permit into the Territory, and \$50.00 for a permit to go through the Territory.

Prior to that it was around \$12.00 per trip, and it was at their suggestion that it was raised to \$100.00, and it was their suggestion that we take the limit off the number, and we did used to limit it to three per operator, not per vehicle. You realize that the reason for that was that there are several operators outside of the Territory, for instance Consolidated Freightways or Lynden's or large companies that have several hundred vehicles, and they would just merely send another vehicle up here if we had a limit on the permits per vehicle.

So possibly you might consider changing it to read per operator or per owner, but it was at their request that it was changed, and we don't have any, as far as I am aware, any hard feelings about changing it back to a limit per operator, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Maybe now I could ask Mr. McRobb, and you could maybe comment the same way. I am not going to prompt you in any way, because I would like to just really hear what the facts are, how you feel about that?

Mr. McRobb: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how this all got started, Herb, who has been around the government for quite a few years, and I'm surprised to see that maybe the forerunners of our Transportation Association possibly initiated this \$100.00 permit.

However, it turned out there was some lack of foresight or thinking when this was initiated, because for a hundred dollar fee, any carrier who is not licensed under the Transport Public Utilities Ordinance, in other words, has no operating authority, can come in here as many trips a year as he pleases by paying \$100.00.

Now, it already costs us up here to operate in the Yukon, maybe \$1,200.00 for a plate, so another operator can come in here 12 times with one truck and he is no worse off than we are. In other words, actually he is better off coming in on permits, and things have changed a lot in the last few years. There has been more applications than ever for people trying to get operating authority, on the grounds that maybe some day there is going to be a big boom in the Yukon, but it hasn't happened yet.

But what happens is that every carrier in Canada basically has operating authority in here, by paying this \$100.00 permit. I think it's a very unfair advantage against a Yukon operator, by the fact that we cannot go outside and buy permits. If we want to go into B.C. we are restricted to possibly three permits a year, and Alberta has a restriction on the number of permits per vehicle, and after you run out of permits, you apply to the Board, the Transport Utilities Board for operating authority, and you have to show approved public need.

In other words, why you are hauling it and other licensed carriers can't be doing the business, and you have to go to a hearing, where here it's not necessary. \$100.00 on a long haul like the Yukon, we are 1,654 miles from Vancouver, which would be one direction which would be one supply depot, and the other one would be Edmonton, which we are 1,276 miles away.

Now in this day and age, \$100.00 on a load of freight coming out of Vancouver is not going to make any difference. In other words, just to give a name here, look at Yukon Freight Lines. If he is running—uses one tractor and can run one trip a week per tractor between here and Vancouver, he can make, let's say 50 trips a year. That would be the maximum.

Now, if he buys a licence plate in the Yukon, it could cost him \$1,200.00 and so if he buys permits it costs him \$3,800.00 per year more to run all year.

Now running an operation like that, \$3,800.00 just in a year—you can't even come close to budgeting that. What happens, the net effect is that we get loads that are available in Yukon, and other truckers, they just happen to have some equipment down at that moment or they buy their payroll, so-called, during the winter time and they can come in on these permits quite successfully.

It is our feeling that a restriction should be made on the permit. The permit is under the Motor Vehicles Ordinance, and yet the regulations governing the fact that you have authority to come in as under the Transport Public Utilities Board now. All we want is to put a restriction on the number of permits. Also, we even thought that some thought could be given to even raising the fee, even though we have the highest fee per permit in Canada now.

There's one jurisdiction, let's say Alaska, it's impossible to buy a permit in Alaska. They have an emergency type of permit, in other words if there's an

earthquake, they may let a Canadian carrier come in there, and I use the word "may", otherwise no. You apply to the I.C.C. in Washington, and maybe \$25,000.00 later and legal fees, you may get operating authority to go to Alaska.

Not so in the Yukon, these people can come in for \$50.00, they can come to, really what I call a small town P.S.V. board, compared to I.C.C. that's what it's got to be, and you either get operating authority and buy a plate, or failing that, they got in for a \$50.00 permit, and we can't get into Alaska.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman, there are probably a number of amendments that probably the Transportation Association would like to see made, and I have spoken to them, and I would be hopeful that at some other point in time they will appear before this House or make some suggestions as to other amendments.

At this point, though, we are dealing with the permits, and I know Mr. Taylor made a comment that kind of interested me, and I would like Mr. McRobb's reaction to it. In the Motion I've got that if you allow two permits per vehicle per year, is this really satisfactory, or should it be two permits per operator, or maybe it should be four permits per operator, but this is something that concerns me.

Mr. McRobb: I think as a witness I would like to go back to my Association, and I think in something like this if it was possible, some thought should be given. I would seem to favour two permits per vehicle, and not limit to a company—because you can have one company that's always got one or two trucks, and sure you might have a larger company, but in the case of a real public need, it could happen that we would have to bring all the rigs up here or something like that, and you would need 40 or 50 trucks. There's got to be some way of these loads being brought in, I would feel.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, in view of what Mr. McRobb has said, and I don't want to waste the time of the House and certainly we are not doing that by discussing this, but he just made the comment that he would like to maybe talk to the Association further on this, I think there must be some question in his mind. In view of that, I would suggest that we maybe leave this Motion over. We should not deal with it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: While we have the witnesses here. I have a question, and correct me if I am wrong, we are talking, we are discussing the permits of other jurisdiction's carriers coming into the Yukon.

Now, I have talked to various truckers who lived in the Yukon for X amount of years, and finally have decided to invest in a truck. Now, my understanding is that the P.S.V. has more or less created a closed shop. In other words, the small guy that's finally got a few bucks together and is going to go into business, it's

almost impossible for him to get a Public Service Vehicle licence.

Now, am I correct in saying this? I have talked to three or four truckers that have had this problem, and then I understand as well that some of these people who are selling trucks, they are not of that much value, but their company is worth that much more because they have the P.S.V. operating authority.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, I want to know if that's correct.

Mr. McRobb: Well Danny I for one am against people selling P.S.V.'s, this business of going and getting an authority and then selling it tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Is my statement correct, what I have said more or less?

Mr. McRobb: Not quite, Danny. If a small operator wants to go buy a truck and put it on the road tomorrow, it may sound harsh that we prevent—this man is prevented from hauling, let's say he's starting a freight haul between possibly here and Faro. It's for his good, and the public's good that he has to prove his case, because there's the other edge of it, you can have a different guy with a different truck every week, with a broken down truck, and nothing but difficulties. Is this what the people want in outlying communities, or do you want proper service, and the fellow who wants to buy a truck and drive it himself, there's opportunity in the Yukon for him to put it on lease with a company and concentrating on what he does best.

In other words, he wants to drive the truck, he wants to own the truck, there is no problem doing that. If he wants to get into the trucking business, he has to prove public need, I would feel.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Thank you.

This is my point, is that okay, hypothetically I'm a trucker and I want to start my own business. I don't want to go under lease to White Pass. Now how good a case do I have to put forward to the Public Service Vehicle or Utility Board or whatever it is? This is my point.

If I want to go into business and I have lived in the Yukon, I've paid my taxes, I should have that opportunity. I shouldn't be snuffed out because White Pass has collected two or three P.S.V.'s by subsidiary company.

Am I not correct in —

Mr. McRobb: Well, Mr. Taylor—

Hon. Mr. Lang: — saying that the P.S.V.'s, there's X amount of P.S.V.'s?

Mr. McRobb: Mr. Taylor happens to be the Chairman of the P.S.V. Board —

Hon. Mr. Lang: I realize that, I'm sorry, I'll direct the question —

Mr. McRobb: He could possibly answer that question, how hard it is to get a P.S.V.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well Mr. Taylor, I want an answer to my question.

Mr. Chairman: You're engaging in debate with the witness.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad you realized that.

In view of what Mr. Lengerke has stated, I think it would be an appropriate time if we put this Motion over and allow the witness to discuss this with the Association, and then maybe before the end of this Session, we could get together with the Association.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll withdraw my Motion, with the approval of the seconder, the Honourable Member from Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Okay, I will withdraw the Motion, but I have a question for Mr. Taylor —

Mr. Lengerke: And I would hope that the Association would be able to provide further information later before the end of this Session.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Mr. Taylor, and if I do get into debate with him, please don't —

How difficult is it for me as a private individual to get a P.S.V.? How, how — in other words, what do I have to show as good case or good cause in order to get an operating authority?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the conditions under which the Board operate are set out in the Transport Public Utilities Ordinance. There are, I think there's three main points that the Board must consider when they receive an application.

One of them is the effect that the issuing of the operating authority may have on existing companies who are providing the same service, and another one is they must consider the ability of the applicant to provide proper service, and I'm not sure what the third one is, but it is not absolutely impossible to get an operating authority.

The only criticism that the Transport Public Utilities Board has received from anybody is that they have issued too many operating authorities, and when I say that, I mean from anybody.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Criticism by whom, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Well the only criticism they have received by anybody is that they have issued too many operating authorities, and when I say that, I mean from anybody.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Criticism by whom, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Well the only criticism they have received by anybody is that they have issued too many operating authorities. One year alone we cancelled 75 operating authorities that hadn't been used that year. I have that list in my office, and I as a matter of fact, sent a list of the operating authorities that had been cancelled to the Transportation Association, because they were the biggest critics of the Board for issuing too many authorities.

However, it's not impossible, but let's say it's hard, and it should be, that's why the Board is there, is to protect the public from fly-by-night operators that will buy a truck that's sold off by some company, and try to get into the transportation business which is something that they shouldn't be doing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this has always been an interesting subject. What would be wrong with proposing that any Yukon resident, or any Yukon based company, or anybody — and what I am trying to say is that lives in the Yukon, being able to go down, just like any — like picking up a driver's licence or a set of licence plates for his car, be able to go and say yeah, I see opportunity in the transportation business, I can haul just a little bit cheaper than the other fellow, and I can make things a little — I can make a few dollars here, and why can't — why shouldn't he be permitted to go down and get a P.S.V. licence, and leave the Board to regulate over all P.S.V. holders on what they must do to maintain their licences, I suppose, in terms of public safety and public service.

But why not? Why should we offer to just a few transportation companies in the Yukon, you know, the right to have P.S.V. licences? In other words, I think the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek has a good point. Then if outside truckers want to come in, put them under the purview of the Board and make them make application in the normal route. But why not give a Yukoner a chance, and why allow monopoly in the Yukon?

I would like to hear some comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have a question of Mr. Taylor. P.S.V. licence, how long can an operator hold onto a P.S.V. licence without using it actually. I am aware of some cases where there is people holding onto P.S.V. licences and have absolutely no truck or vehicle to use it on, except a pick-up maybe, a half ton truck or so?

Mr. Herb Taylor: Well in the Public Utilities Board the opportunity is set out for anybody to complain to

the Board as to how the operating authority that a person holds or that a company holds, is operated. If evidence is supplied to the Board that a company has ceased to exercise the privilege of this operating authority then the board has the authority to cancel it. This is what I meant when I said in one year we cancelled 75 operating authorities. Those were mainly because the operator had not purchased licence plates. We have in the past reviewed operations that complaints were received on the method of their operation. If you know of any case where somebody has a P.S.V. licence just to hang on to it, well the Board would be interested in that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am looking for some direction from the Chair on this one. I don't want to lose this motion to this Session, and I am wondering if I should ask for a minute recess and ask for some point of reference.

Mr. Chairman: I will declare a five minute recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Order.
Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the motion be left in Committee, and that is my request.

Mr. Chairman: On that note I think I will terminate debate for the present time.
I will now stand Committee in recess until 1:30.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order.

Amendments to Bill Number 2

We will proceed with the Amendments to the Legal Aid Ordinance.

"The following are amendments to Bill Number 2, Legal Aid Ordinance": 4.(14):
(Reads Section 4.(14))

Mr. Chairman: 17:
(Reads Section 4.(17))

Mr. Chairman: 9.(1)(d):
(Reads Section 9.(1)(d))

Mr. Chairman: 9.(1)(e):
(Reads Section 9.(1)(e))

Mr. Chairman: Delete 9.(1)(f) and substitute with 9.(2). 9.(2):
(Reads Section 9.(2))

Mr. Chairman: 12.(4):
(Reads Section 12.(4))

Mr. Chairman: 14.(1)(a):
(Reads Section 14.(1)(a))

Mr. Chairman: The addition of the "or" is the only correction there. 14.(2):
(Reads Section 14.(2))

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Perhaps you could determine if there's any further debate on this Bill, if not I will make the appropriate Motion.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further debate on this Motion?
Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe Section 20(3), were we not going to make some amendments to make it possible for us to have reciprocal agreements with other jurisdictions other than just Canada?

Mr. Legal Advisor: This was thought so, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Gillespie, as I understood it, said to the House at that time, that he thought perhaps it might be done by regulations or through the administration.

There will be no difficulty in producing a similar section to the one which is in the Highways Ordinance.

Mrs. Watson: Yes.

Mr. Legal Advisor: If this is the wish of the House, we could do this.

Mr. Chairman: Is this the wish of the House?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I think in view of the Member's remark earlier in discussion of this Bill, it's of concern to her that citizens of other countries may be affected, and this would be an enabling portion of the Ordinance.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to see a similar section to that section in the Highways Ordinance inserted in here. If we have to use it, fine, if we don't have to, at least it's there.

Mr. Legal Advisor: If it please the House, you can report progress and we will bring it back to you again.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This morning a letter was circulated to members from the Consumers' Association. I was just wondering if any of the members — I'm just drawing it to the attention, if any of the members took note of comments made there if they thought there was any merit.

I think it had something to do with the disciplining committee or so on. There may be some concerns and there may not be.

Mr. Legal Advisor: I believe that's legal professions.

Mr. Lengerke: I'm sorry, okay.

That's not Legal Aid, that's correct, I'm sorry, I'm in the wrong Bill, and I apologize to the House.

Bill Number 10

Mr. Chairman: We will now turn to Bill Number 10.

Mr. McCall: What Bill is that, Mr. Chairman?

...Mr. Chairman: Bill Number 10, Public Health. 1: The Public Health Ordinance is amended by repealing subsection 9 (1) and substituting the following therefor: 9. (1):
(Reads Subsection 9. (1))

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this change is being brought in as a result of a request from the City of Whitehorse.

The present Ordinance, the Public Health Ordinance, limits the membership of his Health Board to five members, which is the Health Officer plus four rate payers, and since amalgamation into the metro area, the City of Whitehorse felt that in fairness to the various areas of the city, they needed greater representation on the Board, and it's a simple matter of changing this Section to allow them to do so.

Mr. Chairman: 2: The said Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following new section: 22. (1):

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that there is going to be some member object to the Section.

Mr. Chairman: 22. (1):
(Reads Clause 22. (1))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if maybe perhaps I could direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation, and find out from her as to whether there is any machinery to be implemented in order to bring into force this Ordinance, or is (2) necessary?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: No, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member is absolutely right. There is no necessity for this Section in this particular Ordinance.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I would then move that Section (2) of Bill Number 10 be deleted.

Mr. Fleming: I second that Motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I will now read the preamble and the title to the Bill.
(Reads Preamble to Bill)

Mr. Chairman: An ordinance to amend the Public Health Ordinance.
Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Bill Number 10 be moved out of Committee as amended.

Mr. Chairman: Seconder?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I will second that.

Mr. Chairman: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: We will proceed to Bill Number 12.

Bill Number 12

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman: may I just say how happy I am to see this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman: The Pharmaceutical Chemists Ordinance is amended by repealing Schedules 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the said Ordinance, and substituting the following therefor: Schedule 1(
(Reads Schedule 1)

Mr. Legal Advisor: There was an occasion, and as Mr. Speaker is aware, on which it was suggested to the House that a Motion be passed deeming a portion of a Bill to have been read, and that Bill on being adopted, then says certain things were deemed to have been read.

I am just pointing that there is a precedent for it.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Legal Advisor.

Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the Legal Advisor is quite correct, and in some Bills of a highly technical nature, indeed, I must confess in the Consumer Bill, the Bill was deemed to have been read by the House. I think it would be appropriate in the case of this Bill, and at this time to move that Section 1 of the Bill Number 12 be deemed to have been read.

Mr. McCall: I will second that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I won't vote against the Motion and delay the House, but I thought that it would have been apropos in this instance that the Chair had it passed from Member to Member, so each member would have had an opportunity to involve himself as Chairman of Committee. It would have been an opportune time, I think, to have that take

place.

Some Member: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: In view of what the Honourable Minister has just stated, I further object to that suggestion he made, simply because I have great difficulty with my pronunciations now, without getting in to that sort of thing.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Member is at least willing to admit it.

All those in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Who seconded the Motion?

Mr. McCall: I did, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can get a clarification here. The Motion that was made was for Section 1 which included all schedules.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. McCall: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I will now read the preamble and the title to Bill Number 12.
(Reads Preamble to Bill Number 12)

Mr. Chairman: An Ordinance to Amend the Pharmaceutical Chemists Ordinance.

Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Number 12 be moved out of Committee. I should say reported out of Committee without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Seconder?

Mr. McCall: Maybe you should have made a Motion.

Ms. Millard: I will second it.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved that Bill Number 12 be moved out of Committee without amendment.

Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, just one question on this Bill. I don't like voting for yeah or nay for something that I don't understand at all, but I know it's a necessity, but where does one get -- where did you get the list to put into the legislation? Does it come from the Federal Food and Drug Act, or you know, surely you must have had this list given to you.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, it's been supplied by the Department of Health with a request that we update the list of various drugs and how they can be handled, and substitute schedule for schedule the different classifications that we have in our present Pharmaceutical Ordinance.

They are now becoming an agreed list throughout Canada, and this is the up-to-date list supplied to us by the Department of Health for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, again another question and it's generally -- poisons, now these are not just medical poisons. They are poisons that are used in agricultural purposes, and this type of thing. These are not just drugs that are used for medicine. Am I correct?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, there's a list -- there's a Schedule 5 which is not being amended, and that Schedule, which is found in the original Ordinance, are certain poisons which can be supplied by stores or persons outside a radius of beyond five miles from where a pharmaceutical chemists' shop will be found.

Such drugs as Formalin, and some things like that, that are necessary in everyday life or for farming purposes. These poisons can be supplied by hardware stores outside, say, in this case, the City of Whitehorse.

The other drugs are each described in lists, according to the schedule. Some can be supplied by prescription; some can be supplied in certain mixtures, and occasionally it would be less than a five percent solution, can be supplied to any person by any person for certain purposes. Each one has a classification set out at the commencement of the schedule, which is of a technical nature, but is a clear description to a person dealing in drugs, as to what his rights are.

This does not include for any legal purposes, the drugs which are forbidden by the Narcotics Act, or the Food and Drug Act. They are not dealt with in a legal sense in this particular thing. We are only dealing with what pharmacists and such like people can do with drugs, or what people in everyday stores can or cannot do in relation to drugs.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one more question. The reason I'm asking these questions is because very recently outside of the Yukon Territory, I went to buy a package of Mousecide, and in the past you used to be able to go pick it up off the shelf, and buy it.

Now it's locked up and you have to sign for it. Is this true in the Yukon Territory? Is this what we are updating, to do this sort of thing?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't recognize Mousecide without giving it a correct, accurate description. Mousecide I'm sure is a trade name.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, you will have to excuse my ignorance on many of the names here, but does this affect, by any chance, any cold medicine? For instance, I'm quite concerned about outlying communities where there are no drug stores, and right now some of the stores are able to carry a certain amount of medicine. I was just wondering if there's anything in there which restricts the sale of the thing in the outlying communities.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Some will be affected, Mr. Chairman, but affected in an up-to-date way in that general, proprietary medicines can be sold. This is in general, things like Aspirin and so forth can be sold in any kind of a store. It doesn't need a druggist, if this is what you are talking about. They won't be locked up, but ones which should normally be sold on prescription, they would not be available in an ordinary store.

But they should not have been in the first place, even before these lists were along.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Legal Advisor —

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: If I could just reassure the —

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Honourable Member from Dawson City, Schedule 4 which lists all the drugs that may be supplied by any person, contains as far as I'm aware, as a housewife and mother of three, all the usual normal preparations for anybody's cough, cold and-or.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman —

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: — you might as well talk Chinese to me when I read this Section here, because I don't know anything of the Latin names.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: They are not Latin, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman No, they are worse.

Mr. Legal Advisor: A lot of them are in English.

Mr. Berger: A lot of them are in English, but in the same token —

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Castor oil, for example, iodine, turpentine.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Legal Advisor, when was this list last updated?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: '58.

Mr. Legal Advisor: 1958, Mr. chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Am I to understand then that these

drugs that have been coming to you since 1958, have not been on the list, have not been on the list, have not been legally prescribed?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I see. I see on page 6, half way down, Methamphetamine and its salts. From my understanding, that is no longer legally prescribed in Canada.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Well the schedule says that it can only be sold on prescription of a medical practitioner. We are supplied with this information, and this doesn't tell us whether it can be legally sold, prescribed by a medical practitioner, but nobody can sell it except on a prescription.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Legal Advisor. I cannot sell that — those drugs by prescription.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Under the Food and Drug Act?

Mr. Chairman: Under the Food and Drug Act.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Legal Advisor, shouldn't we make sure that this is consistent with the Food and Drug Act? We have already seen one inconsistency, and I just think it's senseless to have legislation on our books which is really inconsistent with the Food and Drug Act.

If it's banned, the sale or the prescription of it across the country, certainly we shouldn't have it in our schedule that in the Yukon it can be prescribed by a physician and surgeon in the Yukon. This is inconsistent.

Mr. Legal Advisor: With respect, not necessarily, Mr. Chairman. This is a list which is being adopted by all the jurisdictions in Canada. If Canada wants to make representations about particular drugs or its own special rules, then of course, it is at liberty to do so, but it may come on the market again, it may be a ruling in respect of a drug from Canada, that although it's on this list, Canada says we will put it in our schedule and forbid it, or not forbid it as the case might be. They have different rules governing it.

But I think we should stick with the advice that we have, which is supplied by the Department of Health and they ask us to go to this list which is the up-to-date list coming across the provinces.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: I think Mr. Legal Advisor just answered my question. I was going to ask if they had the same list in the other provinces, again my concern is in the outlying districts, that when a store orders a certain amount of drugs, and if they have a different listing, say, in British Columbia, they won't be able to sell this type of drug, and we won't be able to purchase the thing. I think you answered the question that we have a similar list in the provinces.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned by the apparent conflict here between a list provided by the Federal Department, and information that medical practitioners are informed by that same Department that certain of those drugs are not to be used?

If it's the wish of this Committee, I think perhaps we need a little assistance on this from the Federal Medical Officer.

Mr. Chairman: With respect, Mrs. Whyard, I don't think that anyone is in a position to review this list, locally, and it would take a good deal of time and effort to do that.

We can either accept the list as is, or we will be unable to accept it during this Session. I would also—I would suggest that we proceed with acceptance of the list. I think the one exception that I did mention is a minor one.

Any further discussion? Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I was just simply going to clarify in my own mind that this follows the practice of the uniformity of legislation across Canada.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Not that particular content, Mr. Chairman. It's at a different level, but it's the same kind of idea that they are trying to get a uniform list throughout Canada, and we are supplied with this list with a request to pass it, and at the same time, by the Department of Northern Health point out to us that we haven't revised our list since 1958, so we have got a double reason for passing the list at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: It was moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Ms. Millard, that Bill Number 12 be reported out of Committee without amendment. Question?

Some Members: Agreed.

Motion Carried

Mr. Chairman: I will now declare a five minute recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I shall now call the Committee to order.

We will proceed with the clause by clause reading of Bill Number 5, "An Ordinance to Amend the Game Ordinance".

(Reads Clause 1)

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Section 2: —Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: The first section, on the definition of "big game", and I'm wondering why there was an amendment to it. Certainly there are reasons for bringing in amendments an in big game, the only difference I can see they have added "wolf" and "coyote" as big game. Now, why did they do this? Why is it necessary to have this amendment?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, it's to give these animals the protection which is given to other big game animals. It's no longer legal under a hunting licence to shoot wolf or coyote. Prior to this, they were regarded as predators and they were at anyone's mercy, with or without a licence.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: I'm not too sure on this, whether this is a valid question or not, but will you require the tags to hunt wolf and coyote?

Mr. Legal Advisor: I don't think you require tags for them, but you need a licence.

The game people would know that specific question better than I would.

Mrs. Watson: But Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the answer to that specific question.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, we are unable to obtain witnesses at this time. Can we take that under advisement?

Mrs. Watson: Fine.

Mr. Chairman: 2: Section 2 of the said Ordinance is further amended by adding thereto the following new definitions:
(Reads Section 2)

Mr. Chairman: 3. (1). In the following subsections and paragraphs the expression 'game guardian' is repealed and the expression 'conservation officer' substituted therefor:

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, why are we going to this trouble? Why are we substituting the name 'game guardian' and substituting 'conservation officer'?

Mr. Legal Advisor: I'm not sure of the precise reason, Mr. Chairman. I think it's because this is becoming a common designation in other places, and is readily understood by tourists, and in addition I think it may be pride in the job by the officers who will be bearing the title.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there's also another reason. The Honourable Member from Watson

Lake has for many years asked that the game guardians of the Yukon be classified as conservation officers, to probably take away the narrow and restrictive enforcing type of attitude that most people of the Yukon had towards the game guardians, and I was sympathetic with him at that time, and I think that it is much more consistent with the total conservation practices of the provinces, and that we should be moving in this direction also.

Mr. Chairman: The list is as appended
(2):
(Reads Section 3. (2))

Mr. Chairman: Again the list is appended.
(3):
(Reads Section 3. (3))

Mr. Chairman: 4: Section 7 of the said Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection: (3):
(Reads Section 7 (3))

Mr. Chairman: 5: Section 8 (1) of the Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 8 (1):
(Reads Section 8. (1))

Mr. Chairman: 6. Paragraph 8 (2) (c) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (2) (c):
(Reads Section 8 (2) (c))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I would hope that conservation officers in dealing with this Section 6 would take into account the unpredictability of game and more particularly in reference to our highways, where game can come out of the bush or out of the right-of-way and get, you know, tangled up in a vehicle, often before people can do anything about it.

I just hope that when the conservation officers deal with this Section that it's not misused.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I don't think there is any indication of this at all in any way, shape or form. As you know, amendments such as this were attempted in the Game Ordinance about, I think maybe, half a dozen years ago, and at that time—it was at the time when snow machines were just becoming common practice, and we felt that enough was not known about them and their ability in the wilderness, to make legislation such as Section 6.

We have instances now recorded that would make you sick, of instance after instance where wildlife has been harassed, pursued and killed using snow machines and other vehicles, in manners that any human being would just object to. I hope that before this legislation sees third reading, that the witnesses that are expert in this field are able to relate some of

the instances that they have recorded, and that they know of that makes this type of legislation now mandatory in the Yukon.

I think all of us who have been here for any period of time are kind of sad that this day has come to the Yukon, when this type of legislation is absolutely necessary, and a must for the preservation and conservation of our wildlife population.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask Mr. Legal Advisor as to the authorities here on this very subject we are speaking of right at the moment, and how it carries over to the native peoples in the Territory.

Does this legislation also -- or is this legislation enforced against them too, as to the hunting, and harassing animals with snowmobiles and such?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I can't say about active enforcement, but I can say that this section is of general application, and applies to every person in the Territory. But that's just the legal section we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, just to assure the Member from Hootalinqua, it is definitely enforced for Indian people also, because I know of several cases.

Mr. Chairman: 7: Subsection 14 (1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 14 (1):
(Reads Subsection 14 (1))

Mr. Chairman (2):
(Reads Subsection 14 (2))

Mr. Chairman: (3):
(Reads Subsection 14 (3))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this Section causes me a little concern inasmuch as the trapper, in order to feed his dogs -- there's one question, particularly I believe in the constituency of Ogilvie, where caribou meat is employed -- I believe they still must feed dogs caribou meat in Old Crow, and this type of thing.

I don't think that we should take the right of a trapper, or take away from the trapper the right to feed game to his dogs in the bush.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Those dogs, Mr. Chairman, are not considered domestic animals under the Ordinance.

They are working dogs, and those animals are excluded. It's only domestic dogs which are included in the Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well this is fine.

Mr. Chairman: 8, Section 18 of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 18 (1):
(Reads Section 18 (1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):
(Reads Section 18(2))

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, this is good as far as it goes, but I don't really feel it goes far enough. I really think that it's time in the Yukon that we start thinking about the game that's available and the high cost of living up here, and we should start making regulations and thinking about trying to implement a program as they have in the Northwest Territories, of legally selling meat that is harvested in the Yukon Territory.

Could we ask the administration if this is being considered at all, and if it is being considered, when can we expect some kind of reaction to it?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, it's being considered as far as sub (2), "Where the director may, subject to any condition he may impose, permit the meat of wildlife to be had and possessed and served in hotels, restaurants, public dining rooms or clubs or other organizations on special occasions (2) and (3), and that is the limitation at this point that is being placed on how broad this exemption is.

We have had, to this point, no application to the government for the serving of wild game on a restaurant basis, and I think that we should wait until such application is made, or such indication is given, that there is an organization or a group who want this permission, the ability to do so prior to amending the Ordinance.

You will notice that the majority of the Ordinance is more restrictive than it was prior. This is for a very good reasons. The Honourable Member from Watson Lake remembers, and I can remember defending him on the need for a game count to be done for biologists, for proper game management people that could actually do a survey of what we had in the Yukon as far as game was concerned.

We know that in certain sections now of the Yukon, and the reason why there was some restrictions put in the big game management zones, is that in those areas without some protection there is no longer in the Yukon, a viable wildlife population.

Now, this Council has a responsibility, and a choice, because game is the only resource that we have under our control, that we can handle it properly and responsibly, and make restrictions so that we can assure in perpetuity, a viable game population, or we can open the Ordinance wide open, kill off all the game and then don't have to worry about it for the rest of our lives.

The present government feels that we are restricting in some instances, the wide openness of the Game

Ordinance up to this point in time and we think that we have sound arguments, and there are reasons for doing so. I don't think that we should open it to any wider interpretation until such time as it has proved necessary and someone can give the government and the Members of this Assembly, a valid argument why it should be opened any further, and I think that we are prepared to look at that eventuality on sound game management practices when that request is made.

Mr. Chairman: Supplementary, Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Yes, I would just like to point out to our Honourable Member, that as usual he has gone black and white, it's all or nothing, and I really think that we have the ability to control it enough so that we are not going to deplete the stocks of caribou or moose that are here.

We obviously are knowing enough to set up game regulations and game reserves, so we should know enough, at least on even a restricted level. I'm not talking about just in restaurants, but I mean it could be available as fresh meat in stores, and as it is in Inuvik, so I can't see why not.

The experience in the Northwest Territories has certainly proven good, and why can't we use their experience and try to impose the same thing here, at least look into it. I don't feel that they are serving it with the permission of the Commissioner once in a blue moon is really going to have any effect on the cost of living in the Yukon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the answer was direct. I'm sorry if I give direct answers, instead of beating around the bush, and saying nothing. I am saying the government has looked at it, at this point in time, and we are not prepared to open the Game Ordinance to the extent that the Honourable Member wants.

It takes a simple motion of this Assembly to change that opinion of the government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Well actually I have the same proposal I think that I made it last time already. I'm not asking for opening the Game Ordinance.

My concern is about harvesting the present stock we are doing right now and not using it, and I think by having a place, an outlet, where this meat could be sold, I think we could further the whole process of game management, because we would make complete use of the game. Right now we are not. I mean, we are going to go to Section 17, and again we are talking about enforcement, with no monies for enforcement.

I think we should look into the possibility of making full use of the game we are harvesting right now. Don't open the Game Ordinance any further.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to

comment on some remarks made by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, and obviously she must be referring to the caribou -- pardon me, to the reindeer meat which is available in Inuvik, but this is a domestic meat over there. These are domestic herds, and it's far different than taking wild game, and selling it.

As a matter of fact, I can recall that they from time to time send in buffalo meat even up to Old Crow, which is also taken from a domestic herd in a park situation, but I agree with the comments made by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that it's taken an awful long time to build up the Game Department, and my little pet has always been the development of big game management areas, so that you can open an area or close an area as it requires. And to this point, I am reasonably pleased with the attention that has been given to the Game Ordinance and the game population, and though I may find fault with a section or two of the Ordinance, I generally agree and I commend the administration for the work they have done thus far in this field.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add that from the point of view of this Department of Health, the ramifications of public sale of game meat are simply appalling. I know that many northerners have enjoyed the opportunity to have buffalo steaks which were imported from Woods Buffalo Park from time to time as the Honourable Member said. But these were killed under government supervision, and cleaned and cut up in a government abattoir near, at or near Fort McMurray, and are closely supervised between the time of the killing and the time of consumption by the retail consumer.

My understanding has always been, although, I haven't looked into it recently, that if you go into the field of selling meat for public consumption, you are then immediately under all the restrictions of Food Acts and Consumers' Protection devices, and you would have to immediately have a government abattoir and government employees and licences and inspection of all of this meat before it could be sold for public consumption.

Mr. Chairman: 9, The title to Part III and section 21 of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: Part III, Special Prohibitions and Restrictions, Game and Game Birds. 21(1):
(Reads Section 21(1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):
(Reads Section 21(2))

Mr. Chairman: 10, Section 22 of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 22(1):
(Reads Section 22(1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):
(Reads Section 22(2))

Mr. Chairman: (3):
(Reads Section 22(3))

Mr. Chairman: 11, Subsection 23(2) of the said Ordinance is repealed.

12. Section 24 of the said Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following: (2):
(Reads Section 24(2))

Mr. Chairman: 13, Sub-section 25(6) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (6):
(Reads Subsection 25(6))

Mr. Chairman: 14, Subsection 26(1) and (2) of the said Ordinance are repealed and the following substituted therefor: 26(1):
(Reads Subsection 26(1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):
(Reads Subsection 26(2))

Mr. Chairman: 15, Section 27, of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 27(1):
(Reads Section 27(1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):
(Reads Section 27(2))

Mr. Chairman: 16, Subsection 45(1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 45(1):
(Reads Subsection 45(1))

Mr. Chairman: 17, Subsection 58(1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 58(1):
(Reads Subsection 58(1))

Mr. Chairman: 18, Section 58 of the said Ordinance is further amended by adding thereto the following new subsection: (3):
(Reads Section 58(3))

Mr. Chairman: 19, Section 61 of the said Ordinance is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection: (2):
(Reads Section 61(2))

Mr. Chairman: 20, Subsection 62(1) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 62(1):
(Reads Subsection 62(1))

Mr. Chairman: 21, Subsection 66(2) of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (2):
(Reads Subsection 66(2))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Under the direction of this Ordinance, Mr. Legal Advisor, would

you say that an American citizen possibly — I see the two years, but could an American citizen of any kind right now, be able to have an assistant trapper's licence?

Mr. Legal Advisor: He can at the moment, but the House will recall that we amended the trapper's licence requirements a fairly short time ago, to make it compulsory that you must be a Canadian citizen. We forgot to amend the assistant trapper's licence so that the assistant trapper has to be a Canadian citizen also. This is the change which has been made here, in correcting what was overlooked.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would also like to ask the — Mr. Legal Advisor one more question pertaining to the trapper's regulations. In the case of a trapper's licence now, can they form a group of say, a family group of people, maybe native, maybe otherwise, but in any group to trap on that area for which that one licence registration was given.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I prefer not to answer that question directly, because a lot depends on what you mean by family in various situations. It would be a difficult question to answer just off the top of my head at the moment.

I would prefer to discuss it in relation to a specific case, or what the practice is.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I would go further on this question from the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, and especially say, for example, there's one Canadian in the group, and two foreign citizens, and they form a partnership, and legally the Canadian is entitled to the assistant trapper's licence, but can the American or foreign citizens legally attend the trap line?

Mr. Legal Advisor: I would think probably not, but again it would depend on the individual circumstances. It is not intended that American citizens have the right to be trappers in any way.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Legal Advisor, but I also think that we should be sure that this does happen. I'm not trying to give direction, I'm merely saying that I feel that we all should be sure that there is no American citizens working on our trap lines, because in the past it has been done.

The trappers are very concerned about it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: There could be a point there that possibly that licence should be — certainly it should be made clear that it's only issued on an individual basis, and anybody — you know, if they are talking of a partnership of three or four people, that everyone should be a holder. I think —

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that partnerships do exist in relation to trappers, but what happens amongst the privacy of a family is a difficult thing to control. I'm not aware that there are partnerships, I think it's a family matter, and a person is issued a licence to trap in an area, and it's registered in his name.

If he happens to be married to an American citizen or something like that, it's very difficult for the Director of Game to stand in the middle of the bed between a man and his wife. But these things being said, I don't think there are any difficulties, other than to cure at the moment, this particular anomaly dealing with the assistant trappers.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, you must admit it may be fun.

Mr. Chairman: Pardon?

Mr. Lengerke: It may be fun.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes.

Mr. Lengerke: To stand in the middle of the bed.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I can't let this opportunity pass, Mr. Chairman.

I view with sadness the changing climate of the residents of the Yukon in this regard. There was a time when everybody who lived in the north felt that running a trap line was part of the way of life. I recall with affection, such characters as old Mrs. Wilkinson at the Pelly, who ran her own trap line for many, many years, as did each member of that family.

She was a little bit of a thing, about five feet tall, as I recall, and the day that she received her first Old Age Pension cheque, she decided she didn't have to run her trap line any more. Them days is gone forever, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: 22, Section 77 of the said Ordinance is repealed and the following substituted therefor: 77(1):

(Reads Section 77(1))

Mr. Chairman: (2):

(Reads Section 77(2))

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Just on that section, because I think I am still going to harp a bit about this selling wildlife. I can't see how we can allow on an application and an issue of a licence to take wild wildlife for propagation, display, or export, when we are not allowing anything to be done with the dead wild life, which could be a real help to a lot of people in the Yukon.

Why couldn't we just have the same thing for the meat? If it is available alive on the hoof, why isn't it available dead?

Mr. Legal Advisor: It depends upon whether it is a legal point or a policy point. As far as I know it is only

in exceptional cases that a licence would be issued under this section. Some of the time it would be for scientific purposes, some of the time it might be in response to an application from an organization in Alberta on an exchange basis of some sort, and it needs to be subject to control.

The only policy change that is being made in this is to change the word "animal" for "wildlife" in response to the earlier definition. There is nothing being changed in part.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, it is still not really answering what I asked. I think that there could be special applications, special licences for people to sell it. What if there is an over abundance of caribou in one area for a certain period of time. We could regulate it so that application was made and little shops could be set up. They could be inspected by the Medical Health Officer, certainly there would be certain risks involved. I know now that wildlife is sold and that it is being done illegally.

When there is an over abundance somewhere—thank heavens they are not just leaving it out in the bush or throwing it out in the garbage. They are trying to pass it on and a lot of times it is paid for. We should have some means that we can carry on. I understand, I was answer this before from the Honourable Member from Watson Lake about the things—what is happening in the Northwest Territories?

I understand that caribou are specifically exempted in the Northwest Territories under the Game Regulations, so that it is available for sale in the Northwest Territories. Certainly, reindeer don't even come under that definition because they are domesticated.

I think that we could really consider this seriously at this point in time.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong, but the way I interpret this section, people can make application to capture for zoos or this type of thing, live wildlife for the Yukon. I believe the Game Department is very, very careful before they allow these types of things to occur, and also for propagation where they may want to see whether wildlife will, certain kinds of wildlife will, how they survive in various areas. They can put them on Game Farms and this type of thing.

I don't think it is the taking of wildlife to kill it to use the meat, that is not the purpose of this section, whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Perhaps I am not very clear because I was certainly not questioning the Game Department on whether or not they take care of wildlife which may be exported from the Yukon Territory. I certainly agree, that they no doubt thoroughly investigate something like that. It probably has never happened. I certainly have never heard of any circumstances where wildlife has been taken for propagation in the Yukon or outside the Yukon from here.

What I am questioning really is why do we have this section and we don't have a section which would cover wild meat?

Some Member: Being sold?

Ms. Millard: Yes, being sold, well for display, well not for display, we could have it for sale, certainly. Under certain regulations, under certain conditions, there should be a licence that would be available. All I am asking is that it could be considered and that we could have some background brought to us on this. What is happening in the Northwest Territories, why can't it be applied here, and whether or not we could legislate for, perhaps the spring or next fall.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I rise to say that I disagree with the Honourable Member from Ogilvie. Everybody that is a Yukon resident has the opportunity to go get a licence to kill his moose, or whatever, one a year, or whatever it is. I just disagree with that philosophy. I have to agree with the Minister of Local Government that this is a resource that we have to husband and we have to harvest it.

I don't think we are going to do it by selling it down at Super-Valu.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I understand this Ordinance, and if I am wrong — in any case — I understand it to read here and I start at 7, 14(1) it is against the law to abandon any meat, fresh or otherwise — if you kill an animal it is against the law to abandon it there. In this now I am only interested in what game is being killed today, which is one of the questions Mr. Berger brought up.

They are not allowed to abandon such meat and then we go on into the Ordinance and find another paragraph, 2 — 18, the Director may, subject to any condition that he may impose, permit the meat of wildlife to be had in possession and served, which I feel does give that individual, or hunter, or game guide, or whatever a possibility if he feels something that he can't handle at all, it does give him a chance to get rid of something that may spoil.

No? Well I understood it this way. I felt that this covered, or does cover any problem we would have with anything being killed today, as long as it is policed.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer that there was no mistake about this. The basic policy of the government is that there shall be no trafficking in game, alive or dead.

That is the basic policy.

This Ordinance sets out certain exceptions to this, which are set out, which in effect proves the rule. That is anyone who wants to make an exception to this must come in, account for himself, obtain a permit and then he is given permission to do that exceptional thing. Which is, Game Outfitters have their annual banquet, or there is some such occasion, they can ask for a

permit and they can serve, at that banquet, certain forms of game which are available.

Under no circumstances is game permitted to be bought and sold in the Territory that is just a no, no.

The same thing with transporting animals from here to an Alberta Zoo or a foreign zoo.

It can happen, basically for scientific purposes, which is a modern purpose of a zoo. It is an exceptional case and it has to be controlled very, very tightly.

All jurisdictions in Canada are now controlling this, and in fact, throughout the world. They are controlling it very very tightly.

This is the government policy here and it is represented in this Ordinance.

So far as I know it is not the government's intention to depart from that strict standard of control of this resource.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Legal Advisor, I realize this, and yet I am in sympathy with the two members that are working on this, because I would like an instance of a game guide that goes hunting in the fall, and he shoots. He is not, I don't think jeopardized in any way as to the amount of huntes he takes out. If he is there, he will handle it, therefore he gets twenty hunters and he goes out, and he kills 20 large game animals.

He is obliged by law to do something with them. I'm sure he can't eat them all himself. I would like an answer as to what could he do with them today?

Mr. Legal Advisor: In the first instance, Mr. Chairman, the game guide is employed by an outfitter. The outfitter is controlling the operation, he is renting his facilities as an outfitter, to usually non-resident hunters. Each of those individual people who go out with him, must have his own licence, his own fees, and they must the quite heavy fees in order to get permission to shoot the animals.

The outfitter himself would normally shoot nothing, except under his own personal licence. He gets no privileges whatever in relation to shooting the game, therefore, any game that is harvested, is the property of the individual hunter who pays perhaps \$250.00 or \$300.00 a day for the privilege of being allowed to do just that. He owns it.

He can take it with him back to Arizona or California, or Santa Barbara. He can take it, but he cannot sell it, but he can give it away. He can give it to a hospital or a place in need, but under no circumstances is he permitted to sell it.

The game outfitter does not become the legal owner of that meat, but as a favour to the client, he might convey it to a hospital or a mission or to some friend, or something like that, but under no circumstances can he sell it.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, just as a suggestion, perhaps if the outfitter knew he was going to get 50 cents a pound or a dollar a pound for edible meat, he would have more incentive to bring it in out of the bush instead of leaving it out there, because he's not going to make the effort to bring it in and give it to a hospital or

someone in need.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, but the general feeling of the government is they prefer to pay the outfitter 50 cents a pound to leave the game on the range and in the mountains, rather than pay him anything to bring it in.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, in light of what Mr. Legal Advisor has just said, in other words, the government is encouraging the outfitter to break the law.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Is it against the law.

Mr. Berger: It is against the law to leave the meat there, Mr. Legal Advisor just said that the government pays them 50 cents or a dollar to leave the game there.

In order to get away from that, and to answer Mr. Lang's suggestion here, because that was actually ill taken to me any stores can only operate in the hunting season, it's illogical to say that a wild game store should operate all the year around, if you haven't got no game.

I don't know how you people would feel if I bring an example in from other countries, but there's other countreis in this world who have big game stores, where you can walk into any store, a wild game store and you can purchase a bird, you can purchase a wild boar, you can purchase a rabbit, you can purchase deer meat. Those people living there for 2,000 years, they are not dead yet.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member has quite a valid argument there, but it's all based on the policy of the Government of the country he's quoting, and the amount of wild game they have available.

I have been in countries where they actually hire people to kill deer. In New Zealand they do this, because there is a plethora of that particular type of animal and they are a plague. They are a plague, and they are a nuisance, and they have to be gotten rid of, but in this country the situation is not that. We are not trying to get rid of our wild game.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member misunderstands me. I'm quoting the European countries, where you have about a quarter of the area of what the Yukon Territory consists of, you have sixty million people living there, yet there is more game in that area than you have in the Yukon Territory right now, because there's proper management.

The people could harvest game. For the last 2,000 years and longer and still have game, and still manage to fill the game stores. That's what I am talking about. Those Game Ordinances here, we are encouraging outfitters to leave the game out there, because there is no incentive to bring it in here. We encourage the

foreign people to come in here for \$120.00, \$150.00, to go out there to kill something, take the horns and leave the rest of the carcass out in the bush for bait for grizzly bear. That's what we are doing right now.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I think this debate is going far beyond what the terms and the government policy was in bringing the amendment to this Game Ordinance down.

The Game Ordinance was so asinine, before these amendments, that it was against the law if a big game outfitter served the meat of the animals that were shot on the hunt, in the camp. That's the truth, that's the simple facts of the law as it was.

I know for a fact that it wasn't followed, big game outfitters were breaking the law, because it seems pretty senseless that when you have gone out and hunted these animals that you can't even use the meat in the camp, and that's how stupid the law was. This amendment cures that. It is now within the law for the person, the big game outfitter to serve the meat that his hunters have shot in that camp.

That's at least a step in the right direction; it's not breaking the law to use some of the meat which the hunters have shot. I agree with many of the statements that have been made about the harvesting of big game in the Yukon. It's been only a five year period where the Government of the Yukon Territory has gone into any big game management techniques in any way, shape or form. The honest facts of the matter are, since the first day that there was a government of the Yukon Territory, that they didn't have a clue as to what was actually there in the way of big game and how it should be harvested.

Now, certainly all these things can and should and probably will come to pass at some time in the future, but we have made more steps, and positive steps, in big game management within the last five years in the Yukon, than have been done in the last 100 years.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that with the addition of the amendments that we now see, we are setting a policy which at least brings into some form of contemporary thinking, wildlife management in the Yukon, and everybody admits, and the Game Department will be the first to admit, that we still have a long way to go, but thank God, we are getting on top of it in 1975, rather than 20 years down the pipe, because we wouldn't have the ability of sitting here and talking about big game harvesting and management, because we wouldn't have any animals to talk about, if we had let it go any further.

So we have got a long way to go, but at least we are cognizant of the problem. We have got the people that can do something about it, and we are bringing in legislation that reflects that policy. We shouldn't be attacking Section 77 as we are, in the area of the sale of wild game, that's a completely different policy situation. Section 77 allows for Al Ohming, or the Calgary Zoo or anybody else to come to the Government of the Yukon Territory and say look it, we would like to have a Dahl sheep from Sheep Mountain. Can

you let one go when they lamb, so that the people in Edmonton, Alberta or Calgary or Toronto can have the ability of seeing a Dahl sheep in our zoo, and these are the terms and the conditions and the regulations that we will import it under, if the Director of Game says yes, that's fine. We think that you should have that opportunity, and if you handle it this way and that way, you may have a lamb Dahl for your zoo.

So you know, if we are talking about a different policy of looking further from what we are doing now into the harvesting of game eventually for sale, sure, that's a completely different policy. I think we are going in the right direction with the amendments that we have now, and are one sight better than we were talking about ten years ago in this House, and that's for sure.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. McKinnon.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: It is now time—we have other obligations. The Chair will now entertain a motion for Mr. Speaker to resume the Chair.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I make that Motion.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a seconder?

Mr. Berger: I will second that.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I had something quite significant to say on this today.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved and seconded that the Speaker now resume the Chair.
Are you agreed?

Mrs. Watson: Disagree.

Mr. Chairman: I'm sorry, are you agreed?

Mrs. Watson: Disagree.

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?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, Committee convened at 10:45 this morning to discuss Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions.

Mr. Gillespie, Assistant Commissioner and Mr. Taylor, the Territorial Secretary and Mr. McRobb, Past President of the Transportation Association were present as witnesses during the review of Bill Number 9.

I can report progress thereon.

Motion Number 7, regarding Single Trip Permits

was discussed.

The Committee recessed at 11:45 a.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. to consider amendments to the Legal Aid Ordinance, Bill Number 2.

I can report progress on Bill Number 2.

The Committee then considered Bill Number 10, an Ordinance to Amend the Public Health Ordinance. It was moved by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Fleming that section 2 of Bill number 10 be deleted and this Motion carried.

It was moved by Mrs. Watson and seconded by Mr. Taylor that Bill Number 10 be moved out of Committee, as amended, and this motion carried.

The Committee then read Bill Number 12, An Amendment to the Pharmaceutical Chemists Ordinance.

Section 1 of Bill Number 12 was deemed to have been read on motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. McCall.

It was moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Ms. Millard that Bill Number 12 be reported out of Committee without amendment, and this motion carried.

I can report progress on Bill Number 5.

It was moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Berger that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair and that motion was duly carried.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees, are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?
The Honourable Member from Klondike?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it five o'clock.

Ms. Millard: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Klondike, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that we do now call it five o'clock. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the motion is carried.

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Adjourned

LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 3
(1975 THIRD SESSION)

December 2, 1975

Mr. Speaker,
Members of Council

On December 1, 1975, Councillor Millard asked the following question:

"In Issue 24 of the Minutes of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development Mr. Digby Hunt stated that: Mining groups in each Territory have agreed with us to establish an employment Committee in their chamber and to try to seek out ways and means of increasing the number of people employed who originate in the north.

- (a) Has this been done?
- (b) Who is on the Committee?
- (c) What success do they claim?

The answer is as follows:

The Yukon Chamber of Mines has recently established a Committee entitled "Yukon Mining Industry Committee for the Employment of Northern Canadians". The Committee was initiated through a joint effort by DIAND and the Yukon Chamber of Mines. The Committee is composed of:

Mr. M.P. Phillips Yukon Chamber of Mines, Chairman
Mr. D. Tenney Chief Geologist, Whitehorse Copper
Mr. R.E. Van Tassell Exploration Superintendent U.K.H.M.
Mr. V.V. Jutronich Manager, Whitehorse Copper
Mr. P. Frankish Employment Liaison Officer, YTG
Mr. J. Fournier DIAND, Ottawa
Mr. E. Standish Manpower and Immigration, Whitehorse
Mr. C. Ogilvy Yukon Chamber of Mines, Manager

The Committee has only recently been formed and meetings to date have been of an organizational nature therefore it is not possible to establish a success rate.

J. Smith
Commissioner

**SESSION PAPER NO. 7
1975 (3rd) SESSION**

December 1, 1975

**Mr. Speaker
Members of Council**

Landlord & Tenant Ordinance

Rent Control Amendments

On October 13 last the Prime Minister announced publicly that the Government of Canada was, through its own legislation and with the co-operation of the provinces, proceeding to control wage and price increases throughout Canada for the purpose of ending the upward inflation spiral. At a federal-provincial housing officials meeting on November 24 the federal government proposed an 8 percent rent increase ceiling for all jurisdictions across Canada. All provinces have either passed or are in the process of

developing rent control legislation. British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario have selected the 8 percent level, Prince Edward Island has opted for 10 percent. The other provinces have not yet indicated their intentions. The territorial government is acquiring the pertinent legislation as it becomes available.

Rent control legislation will not be introduced in the Yukon until it can be determined whether it is in fact needed and, if so, how alternative legislative measures might affect the Yukon and what sort of administrative machinery these options would entail.

The territorial government will monitor rental rates by registering complaints made to the Territorial Secretary's office. Rent control legislation will be introduced if the government finds that landlords are not remaining within the spirit of legislation adopted by the federal government and neighbouring provincial jurisdictions.

**J. Smith,
Commissioner.**



