



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 9

5th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Tuesday, March 2, 1976

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, March 2, 1976

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory

Tuesday, March 2nd, 1976.

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

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: Just before proceeding with the Order Paper this morning, I would like to advise the House that we have in the Public Gallery this morning a very, I feel, distinguished visitor in the person of Mr. Tom Barnett, M.P., retired. Mr. Tom Barnett served on the Standing Committee on Indian and Northern Affairs for many years and began his career in the House of Commons in 1953. Certainly, I'm sure that other members, including myself, who have attended the Committee have always found him extremely understanding, interested and sympathetic to the causes that the Legislature of the Yukon have taken before the Committee.

I would like to, on behalf of all members, welcome him to these Chambers today and wish him a joyful visit in our beautiful Territory.

(APPLAUSE)

Are there any documents or correspondence for tabling this morning? Introduction of Bills? Are there any reports of committees? Are there any Notices of Motion or Resolution? The Honourable Member from Klwane.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give Notice of Motion that the existing government assistance for child care be continued at the same level in 1976-77 as in the current financial year. And that, before the assistance is expanded to cover persons of our higher income level, that information be provided to the House respecting the cost of assistance for child care covering both working and non-working parents within the scale proposed.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion or Resolution? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Notice of Motion moved by myself and seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly, whereas at a recently held federal provincial Ministers of Health and Welfare conference, the attendance of Yukon's Minister of Health and Welfare was reported to be limited with respect to the degree of meaningful and active participation in the discussions and presentations of material. And further the Yukon's Minister of Local Government attendance at a forthcoming conference dealing with the problems of municipal government has been limited to that of observer. Therefore be it resolved that the Yukon Legislative Assembly strongly protest this limited type of recognition of Yukon's members of Executive Committee and now appeals to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Honourable Judd Buchanan, to clarify with his ministerial colleagues of cabinet this situation and then to state his position forthwith by letter of direction so that future attendance of Yukon's elected representatives of the Executive Committee at federal provincial meetings or conferences will be assured not as status recognition but by active and full participation, hopefully for the benefit of all citizens of Yukon.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further notices of motion or resolution? The Honourable Member from Klwane?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give notice of motion that family allowances paid to the Director of Welfare on behalf of children in care not be paid to group home or foster home parents as at present, but instead an allowance be paid to such parents bearing with the age and requirement of the children in accordance with regulations to be made for the purpose.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further notices? Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers? We'll then proceed to the question period. Questions, Mr. Commissioner?

QUESTIONN PERIOD

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I have answers to several questions that I was kindly given time to seek your answers to. I wonder if I may proceed?

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Commissioner: On Tuesday, February 24th, Mr. Berger asked whether a Game Branch report on Granite Canyon can be made available to members.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that one copy of this is the only one that exists and it is practically impossible to copy as it contains many colour prints. I would like to ask if members would be satisfied with being able to see this as Council members at the Game Branch at any time that they wish to call over there. I would add also, Mr. Speaker, that the conclusion reached in the report are those of the authors, Mr. G. Orty and Mr. J. Jack and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Territorial Government.

So, I would be hopeful that that would be a satisfactory answer under the circumstances to this particular report, Mr. Speaker.

On February 25th, Mr. Fleming asked about tourist vehicles entering Yukon. The question being as to how many tourist vehicles entered Yukon in the last year. The answer, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Tourism and Information compiles figures on the number of vehicles entering the Yukon during the May to October tourist season. Based on figures collected at U.S. border crossing and the Watson Lake Tourist Information Centre, it is estimated that 50,000 private vehicles entered Yukon during the 1975 summer tourist season. Unfortunately, a similar estimate for the winter months is not available.

On February 26th, Ms. Millard asked a question re art at the new Territorial building. The question being what percentage of the artists asked to present proposals for art in the new building were Yukon artists and she also requested their names. I think that you will remember, Mr. Speaker, at the time I questioned the propriety of making the names available and the answer is this, Mr. Speaker: four Yukon artists and seventeen B.C. artists were invited to submit proposals for three possible art works for the new Territorial building. We have been asked by certain of these artists not to divulge their names and therefore we cannot answer the second part of Ms. Millard's question.

On March 1st, Mr. Fleming asked what the Territorial Government is doing regarding road sign policy in view of the up-coming tourist season. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that a comprehensive highway sign policy is in the process of being developed. Because of a number of technical questions that need to be answered, together with the time it will take to construct and place any new territorial signs that are required, it may not be possible to implement the new policy this summer.

This policy, together with an indication of how and when it will be implemented, will be announced once these decisions have been made, with adequate notice involved to those who would be affected, Mr. Speaker.

On February 26th, Mr. Lengerke asked, well, who are the current or present members of the Federal Advisory Committee on Northern Development? Is it correct that Y.T.G. has a representative on that Committee and who is that member? The answer, Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Committee on Northern Development is composed of representatives of the various Federal Departments and agencies having representatives and responsibilities in the North.

In addition to the general committee, there are a number of supportive working committees on which Yukon is represented. I have here, for members' information, a list of all current members of these commit-

tees and I would deposit it with the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be circulated for the benefit of all members of Council.

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

Question re: Northern Canada Power Commission

Mr. Hibberd: I have a question for the Commissioner this morning. In view of the remarks that were on the news this morning made by the Honourable Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs in which he expressed that Yukoners appear to express their lack of confidence in their ability to handle their own affairs, and he was in particular suggesting that there are hearings forthcoming regarding N.C.P.C., am I to infer from his remarks that N.C.P.C. is willing to submit to the Yukon Electrical Public Utilities Board?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect I have no comment at all with regard to the context that my Minister has to say. I wish to make that abundantly clear. The second part of the question concerning whether or not the Northern Canada Power Commission is prepared to submit to the Yukon Public Utilities Board - this, I think, has been the subject of discussion and debate and comment and what-have-you for many, many years. The Honourable Member would, I think have to take two questions that are related to each other here and if he would be good enough to give me time on this I would be very happy to delineate these particular things and bring them back here.

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

Question re: Resident Yukoner

Mr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have another question regarding remarks that were made by the Minister this morning. This House yesterday passed a motion regarding their wishes that the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory be a resident Yukoner. In view of the remarks made by the Minister, I am wondering if the Minister is clear on what we mean by what is a resident Yukoner.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Speaker, once again I think I am being asked to interrupt or amplify my Minister's remarks. This I am certainly not prepared to do. I think if there is any question in the House's mind as a consequence of the comments that were made by the Minister that members feel need clarifying, the way to clarify it would be by a supplement to such motions or such indications as they have already given to him. So that there can be no doubt then that the message coming from the Council here, if there's any mistake about it or any possible misinterpretation as what the House is meaning when they are speaking to the Minister.

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

Mr. Hibberd: With respect, Mr. Commissioner, I think the motion that was passed yesterday by this House was quite specific in what it called a resident Yukoner.

Mr. Speaker: I must advise the Honourable Member that is not a question, it is an argument. Are there any further questions this morning? The Honourable Member from Klwane.

Question re: Functions of Public Utility Boards.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Commissioner regarding some of the comments that were made regarding the functions and authority of our public utility board.

Almost implying that our public utility board has the authority to do a full investigation and inquiry. My question is, would the Commissioner have his administrative officers assess some of the other public utility board's function in other jurisdictions to determine whether our legislation is lacking in the authority that we have granted this board?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to do so. This is going to take a bit of time. I wouldn't be able to promise to get an answer back maybe as promptly as the Honourable Member would like. I would refer the Honourable Member it might be a good idea to take a look at the Votes and Proceedings at the time that that Ordinance was passed through this House and the very great difficulties that were encountered by the administration of the day, who had the Ordinance rejected completely the first time that it came before the House, Mr. Speaker, and the second time around if I remember correctly had considerable difficulties in convincing Honourable Members of the desirability of this type of legislation. But I will be very happy to do as is requested by the Honourable Members.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, perhaps the question is phrased in such a manner as it may have created an impression that it was the direction of the House, but I think it would be considered as a courtesy to the member rather than the direction of the full House.

Have you any further questions? As we have nothing on the Public Bills, what is your pleasure at this time?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I now call this committee to order and declare a brief recess.

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: We will now call this Committee to order. Mr. Miller is present with us this morning as a witness. We will continue with the clause by clause reading of Bill number 6. Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there were some comments made in debate yesterday afternoon and, due to the lateness of the time, I didn't have time to respond to which I would like to at this time.

I think that we are running into a very great difficulty, as I mentioned yesterday afternoon, in trying to think that specific taxes are being put to specific programs. I wrestled with this last night and I said, you know, how one can answer this problem that members are faced with.

Well, I could use the same argument in another method by saying there is 400,000 other dollars being raised in taxation this year. There is \$200,000.00 being raised in the liquor tax. There is \$140,000.00 being raised in the tobacco tax. There is \$100,000.00 being raised in the insurance premium tax; which comes to a total of \$440,000.00 too.

So, if I were using your arguments, I could say that is the money that I am using for the Home Owner Grant and I am not using any of the taxable increase. My colleagues are using that money for their programs. My money is coming out of these increases in taxation.

So that the fallacy of trying to use that type of argument. The Yukon Territorial Government came up with a total budget which was so much money for the programs that were in that budget, we needed this amount of money through extra taxation to provide these programs and services. \$400,000.00 of this \$800,000.00 that was needed came from increased property taxes, came from increased minimum taxation. \$400,000.00 came through liquor taxes, through tobacco taxes and through insurance premium taxes.

There was also some discussion, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the Executive Committee had not done their homework as far as business licences and taxation were involved. Mr. Chairman, I think that we did as well as we possibly could. We went to our two

sister provinces, to B.C. and Alberta, to see what their type of taxation was on a comparable type establishment.

We took a unit at Fort Nelson which was comparable to some units in – which we felt in the Yukon and we found that their total taxes on units were something in the area of \$4,626.00, where the taxes with the combined business licence increase and the mill rate on a similar type Yukon premise would be in the neighbourhood of \$1,300.00 or \$1,400.00.

We took a look at areas in Atlin where there is no garage, no restaurant, no nothing but just cottages, where the taxes were \$1,554.00, where a similar – which a much larger establishment in the Yukon, that had full facilities, garages, restaurant facilities, motel units, with the increased property tax and the increased licencing would be less than that. It would be \$1,363.00 on the Alaska Highway, not far removed from the traffic as the business in Atlin would be. And we went to Whitecourt and Grand Prairie and looked at the Alberta situation. So, we did our homework on this situation. We do have figures to support, even with the increased taxation, that the Yukon businessman is better off than his Alberta or B.C. counterpart on the same highway and removed from the Alaska Highway.

So we are still willing, with the work that we did, and we went into looking at the business licence taxes in certain areas and saying, you know, perhaps we went too far. We don't think we did because we did our homework and we have these facts and figures and statistics, but if you take a look at the total business licence increase and the classes that we went through, there are very few areas and very few people that are really getting hit to the extent that the members are trying to make out.

We think we have done our homework. Now, we ask for the members of this Legislative Assembly to help us and work with us and do their homework also on these questions and we are willing to co-operate in any way that we possibly can.

I think it's also misunderstood that the portion of the business establishment that is taxed for resident use is applicable for the Homeowner Grant, under the proposed legislation. I don't think that this was brought out in the questions. I don't think it was understood and I think that this should also be mentioned at this time, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, we feel that most of the questions as we go through the Ordinance that were raised and with the explanations that we have tried to give will be answered. We still feel that there is further work that we can do on improving certain aspects of the total taxation package, that we're willing to sit down with our fellow members of the Assembly and do this.

We don't think we've been unfair. We don't think we've gone and tried to get a certain class of Yukon people. We think rather that we've tried to present a package that is going to benefit the majority of Yukon people, that it has just, Mr. Chairman, too long been ignored by this government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to

take the opportunity to speak with respect to the Bill, too.

I probably would have preferred a form of financial relief to taxpayers via an increase in the per capita and conditional grants to municipalities. But it's probably difficult to provide any relief to persons in unorganized areas through this system. Therefore, this form of direct benefit to the Homeowners via the Homeowners Grant is really acceptable to me at this time. Also, the Homeowners Grant can be enjoyed by 70 to 80 percent of Yukon's population. I'm very pleased, very pleased indeed, to see that owners of mobile homes can benefit, because they can certainly benefit if they are situated on title property or title to the owner-occupier of the mobile home or by virtue of agreement for sale.

But more important, if they are located in a recognized mobile home park and registered under the Taxation Ordinance. Certainly I would have insisted on this being in this Bill because they represent a very large segment of our population and it's a mode of living accommodation that has to be recognized and certainly relieved of some of the taxes.

I admit the tax increase, probably of this ten mill increase, comes at the wrong time. I think it should have been imposed a few years, in lesser increments. Sure, we can now delay it, but I'm sure this will really mean a greater increase down the road. I'm prepared to face that responsibility now. We're so often quick to cite other authorities for not facing up to the increased cost of labour and materials. Just in the case of Yukon's three municipalities, Dawson, Faro and Whitehorse. They've had to increase their general tax mill rate each year in order to cover increases while unorganized areas have benefited from no such increases.

Although the cost of providing even basic administrative and enforcement services has increased proportionally and been borne by all Yukon taxpayers, I like the incentive that the Homeowner Grant package offers to one because it's really a responsible action. I'm in accord with the fact to be eligible you must produce evidence that your current taxes are paid in full. I agree with the owner-occupier concept which allows only one payment regardless of how many properties one person may own. I like the idea of obtaining a portion of revenues from our major resources, our major resource industries. It may reflect a source of satisfaction to people like, say, Whitehorse Copper, located within the City, who have had to pay the full tax levied. For example, in 1975 44.2 mills and in 1976 45.8 mills, while not really receiving any better level of service than other comparable industries in Yukon. I think I accept the premise that this grant, coupled with other available incentives, will encourage people to purchase, to build, their own homes, which should have a stabilizing effect on our population.

I think it will encourage growth of Yukon's outlying communities as these communities will then really have to improve their delivery, their delivery of services, of services available now because people will be more inclined to remain within the bounds of those communities rather than try to gain land and locations immediately adjacent to those boundaries in order to escape the higher taxes.

In other words, really a much more equitable and

long-overdue situation. I have examined the effect of the Homeowner Grant to the tax payer in the Yukon and I think that, really, a decrease in taxes can be realized to them all if the new tax rebate formula is applied. I think I can assure this House that I would not have supported this Bill if I was not convinced that it reflects a responsible and an acceptable approach and a form of relief by redirecting some of the senior government revenues to a precise majority group located across Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Fleming

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am very amazed, too, at some of the comments around here today. I can assure you I won't be voting for the Bill as it is put before me and I see a half a dozen more lying there waiting for my vote too. I would like to start first with 70 or 80% of the population gaining from this Bill. Then I would like to ask maybe the Minister or somebody just how many home owners are in the Yukon Territory and how many people are in the Yukon Territory. I don't think we are going to get the majority of home owners in the Yukon Territory. In fact, I would say that we won't get much more than a couple of thousand out of the 20,000 or otherwise we would be raising a lot more than \$400,000.00.

I can see where possibly the government needs \$8,000.00 or \$4,000.00 and so forth to run this country, but I can't see asking for \$4,000.00 to pay this and another \$4,000.00 for something else in the Bills that are before me here now.

Why don't we ask for \$4,000.00 and forget about this one here. That's my opinion. I would like to start at the top where you say you are going to get money from the large organizations, such as mines, such as big companies, anything that has land and I say again our system is going the wrong way.

If you want to tax the large owners and corporations and so forth, bring forward some corporation tax here at the top of the heap when the profit is made and I will go along with that. If it is possible, okay. If it isn't possible, I can't help it. But that is the only way that this government and our federal government or anybody else is going to hit the big corporations and the big companies without hurting the tax payer and every tax payer, whether he has land or doesn't have land, because if you are going to raise his taxes at the bottom of the ladder he is going to pass that on through the company and up to the top and you are going to pay for that product when you get it and it don't make any difference. We have been doing it for years and years and you see the situation we are in today.

As for the home owner himself, and I have spoken to quite a few home owners right in this town of Whitehorse in the last couple of days just to get a few views, I haven't found one yet that is too interested. From what I gather amongst the home owners, many of them are looking at the situation the same way I am. We have seen these things come into effect. We have seen where we are going to get something back from the government and it has been voted and everybody said yes, we will take it, but when you take it you are going to pay for it.

There is no way that a home owner is going to get

this grant of money because his taxes are too high, due to the government putting them too high somewhere along the line, and not pay for that. There is no way he is going to because that money has got to be there and somebody has to pay for it. We are either going to get it in the taxes that are coming up here, he is going to pay for it there and he is also going to pay for it in everything else that rises in this town or in any part of the country, due to the fact that there are taxes to pay. So, he is not going to gain. Naturally, the fellow without a home in this Territory and I am going to say it a little different than the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, I am saying that the majority of the people don't own a home in this Territory and have had a problem getting a home in this Territory and they are still having a problem getting a home and this may be a little initiative if they don't look at the whole picture.

They can look at the picture and say I am getting \$200.00 back next year. It's a wonderful thing but if they look at the whole picture where they are going to pay that \$200.00, probably a lot more than that out in taxes and in the price of everything rising in the country, then they will take a little different look at it.

As for the small business, and I am not speaking of them on the highway or anywhere else and I am not splitting the highway and this town and the municipalities and the L.I.D.s because they are all people. I, as a small businessman myself - and this is the only place that I disagree with the member, the Honourable Member from Kluane, other than that I agree with everything she said yesterday except that I don't think it is going to hurt them very much because if that taxes are passed on to me to pay Homeowners Grant, to pay anything. I don't care whether it is Homeowners Grants or what it is, but if there is taxes passed on to me, I am going to raise the price of the product that I am selling and the people that are paying for that product live right here in this Territory and they are going to have to pay the bill. It isn't going to hurt me that much as a small businessman but it is going to hurt a lot of other people if all us small businessmen do this, which we will have to do.

I just can't vote for a Bill like this at all. If Bills are brought before this House that are essential need, hospitalization, schooling, anything like that, I will be the first one to step up and pass any tax we can get, only I hope that it starts at the top.

We can take the tax off of the rich to pay it, not just off of the people at the bottom of the pile. I say, consequently, I will not be voting for the Bill. I have read it.

Mr. Chairman: I think we will continue with reading of the Bill at the present time. Mr. Taylor, do you have ...

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with reading of the Bill, I'd like to say that I express the same concern as perhaps has been outlined by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua. Over the course of the weekend, and more particularly last evening, in making some inquiry I have met the same proposition from those members of the general public. I've even had telephone calls on it as recently as this morning, that they are not, and I repeat not, prepared to accept a

proposition which would increase taxation more particularly in 10 mills on real property at this time. They agree that, while this Homeowner Grant program may perhaps be a good thing, that it is a new program and that it is not now the time to embark upon it.

More particularly, the reason being the spiraling inflationary period we're going through. If we're looking around in ways to save money in government to avoid taxation, I think a real good place to start would be with this government. Perhaps an efficiency study into government, reduction perhaps in unnecessary staff, streamlining of procedures and increase in productivity between coffee breaks. Perhaps maybe we could find that we could save sufficient monies there to avoid taxation in these other fields.

The Minister has stated this morning that, while the 10 mill increase isn't really applicable to the Homeowner Grant, he says that the people who are going to pay the additional liquor tax and the people who will pay the tobacco tax and the insurance tax will, perhaps, fund the program and of course as we all realize these people might be paying if that be the basis but not getting anything back for their money because perhaps they're not home owners.

In any event, I think it basically comes down to the fact that it is a new program. Once we embark upon the program, it's going to be difficult at some future date to take it away. I think that argument was pointed out earlier. Perhaps this should be deferred until the time when we are in a better financial position as a Territory to offer this program. Again, I say it relates as far as I'm concerned to the 10 mill, proposed 10 mill increase, in general taxes. I will be voting in opposition to the Bill, notwithstanding what is said at this table, and I hope that's sufficient.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor, I think we had better get on with reading of the Bill. If you have further objections to raise, would you bring them forth later. We haven't even had a chance to get into the reading of the Bill yet.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, with the deepest respect to the Chair, it is my right and by the Rules of this Legislature and by the mandate given me by the people I serve to stand in this House, I can debate as long as I stay within the Rules of the House, with respect Mr. Chairman, for 30 minutes if I so wish to choose to take the time. That has always been the inherent right of a member and I would not wish, Mr. Chairman, for this to be curtailed.

Mr. Chairman: No-one is wishing to deny you of that right, Mr. Taylor; we just want to get on with the reading of the Bill.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, will we be given the opportunity to speak on the principle of the Bill again?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you.

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

Mr. Chairman: 2(1).

(Reads Clause 2)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the question of the Minister of Local Government as to the eligibility of people who do. I heard a remark yesterday about cottages and so forth, who do own cottages and so forth, that they are not a permanent resident at that cottage and possibly not a home owner anywhere else, that are spending possibly six months a year at that cottage under a lease agreement, which is the only thing you can possibly get. I would ask, is there any way that he is eligible for anything?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: If it is their principal residence, Mr. Chairman, and they spend more than 183 days there, they are eligible even if it is on leased land for a Homeowners Grant if the taxes come under the formula of being over the minimum tax. Minimum taxes are not eligible for a Homeowners' Grant; anything over minimum taxes are eligible.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask on your definition of taxes. I've looked through this several times and it might be my ignorance. I've looked through the back-up material and there seems to be a conflict. Possibly not. I'd like clarification. Taxes levied on lands and improvements - are we talking about property taxes, or property and school taxes together?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Both, Mr. Chairman. We consider the school tax to be a tax on property also, the 22 plus 16, which would go into effect with the amendments to the Taxation Ordinance. The total 38 mills is a property tax. Some of the property tax is used for schools 16 mills, some of the property goes into the consolidated revenue fund.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Further to that, this deals with another Bill but it is exactly the same thing. When we go to the Bill on the minimum tax of \$100.00, now does this include, that's your property tax and school tax, a total of \$100.00?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a question specifically concerning Dawson on land owners, property owners like the low-cost housing units. I see the

assessment in Dawson is raised to -- typical assessment is \$7,000.00. To my knowledge, the typical assessment in Dawson runs around \$2,000.00 and, because of old homes in Dawson - I mean, the average house in Dawson is about 60 years old - the assessment is very, very low on those houses and I believe, and I maybe stand to be corrected, but if assessment is \$7,000.00, is taken a little too high because of the low-cost housing units that is being considered in that.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we weren't trying to do an average assessment in that exercise. What we were doing is taking a normal three bedroom modern house in Riverdale and if that same house, which is assessed at \$12,500.00 in Riverdale, showing what that type of house would be assessed at by the application of the Hamlet Allowance in every area of the Yukon Territory and there is no possible way that we meant it to indicate that the average assessment of a home in Dawson would be \$7,000.00. But we said if that home, a modern three bedroom house, was assessed at \$12,500.00 in Riverdale, which it would be, that same house put lot, stock and barrel in Dawson City would be assessed at \$7,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Well, then, I am sorry to say this but all the figures in here doesn't reflect the true situation in Dawson because, like I say, the assessment in Dawson is way, way lower than \$7,000.00 because of the old houses in Dawson. The figures that we have got here, the 174 homes, owner-occupied, and I am quite sure there is a large percentage of them below the \$7,000.00 figure given to us.

So, I think the benefits to this Bill received to the home owner in Dawson are just about nil, actually, and the other question that I have actually is what is the Territorial Government as one of the largest land owner and property owner in Dawson stand to benefit under this Bill because of all the low-cost housing units and the duplexes in Dawson?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: They are not eligible in that Homeowners' Grant, Mr. Chairman. The other - what we are saying that if that house and, Mr. Chairman, from what I have seen in my latest travels to Dawson, there are getting to be better and better homes in the City of Dawson every year. But what we are saying, if that type of the modern three bedroom home was assessed at \$7,000.00 in Dawson, the figures that we used, is that home would be eligible for \$143.00 rebate.

The Honourable Member is perfectly correct, if the house is of lower assessment, they are not going to benefit as greatly as the house with that \$7,000.00 assessment. One of the concepts of this program is that we would like to see people have some kind of impetus to improve their housing situation and as their assessment goes up, they are going to be eligible for more rebate from the Home Owners' Grant Ordinance and we are

looking to this program as one small incentive of both home improvements and home building and actually it is in conjunction with the program, such as the Employees' Buy Back Plan.

We want people to have incentive to both improve their single family residence and also to build a single family residence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger? Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: On this again, I have to rise again because I have an old home myself in Dawson and I have put in about \$15,000.00 in the last few years in that house --

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: You better call the assessor.

Mr. Berger: -- but the thing is that I have been on the appeal board of assessment and everything like this. I am fully aware of what goes on in assessing the the quotation I had from the assessor was, it doesn't matter how much money you put into this house, basically it is an old house. It's 70 years old and we cannot raise the assessment figure.

My house is valued at less than \$2,000.00 assessment and so -- like I say again, I have to say again the majority of the homes are nice looking homes and so on but they are old houses and the basic assessment cannot be raised because the main structure is still old.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, if that is true and your assessment is \$2,000.00, then you have to be blessed even at 55 mills with a very low tax bill, You know, I wouldn't mind my tax bill being under \$2,000.00 because even at 55 mills, what does that work out to? Something like \$110.00 for the year. We better look at the municipal grants to Dawson City.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing this point but the thing is, I think that the figures presented to us are misleading to the people who are not aware of what really goes on in Dawson.

Mr. Chairman: I think Mr. Miller has a statement.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, maybe for clarification, Schedule B in the package that was handed out for Dawson City indicates and this was taken from a detailed study of the tax records, that there are 174 residency owner-occupied properties in Dawson City that would benefit on an average of \$143.00 per annum. And these are taken from a detailed review of the Assessors cards.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I just can't agree. I think these figures are misleading. We look at the number, we look at the average assessment of a three bedroom home, and I know that the typical three bedroom home in Riverdale, the number we have in Haines Junction, I can count on one hand, one finger almost, there is one. Here you say we have 29. Are you including

the low cost houses or this type of thing? The government employees houses, you are not because they are not eligible for the grant.

I think, that really, the people -- I think your calculations are wrong on the number of people in each community who will benefit and by the amount of money that they will benefit. If just doesn't tie in with the tax notices people receive.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, maybe for clarification again, Schedule A of this package indicates the effect of the proposed mill rate increase, assuming, that you look the modern three bedroom home in Riverdale and put it in each of these communities. That is all that is demonstrating. Nothing more. Don't relate that to Schedule B.

Schedule B is demonstrating an actual study of the tax rolls, and shows, in the case of Haines Junction, that there are 29 residences that would benefit from the Home Owners Grant at an average benefit of \$90.00 per residence.

Don't confuse the two schedules. They are not meant to be look at --

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Miller: -- in that light.

Mrs. Watson: On the contrary, they are not meant to be confusing but they are confusing. You say that you benefit Haines Junction by \$90.00 from the Home Owners Grant, if we put a ten mill increase on it. If you don't put the ten mills on and leave it the way it is you are practically, the only difference is, and I have it worked out, I have done my homework, oh the Minister isn't here, \$13.00, that is if you have a modern three bedroom Riverdale type of home you benefit by \$13.00 in Haines Junction By \$4.00 in Mayo, -- I beg to differ it is thirteen on your calculations. That is if we get the ten mill increase --

A Member: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mrs. Watson: If you don't get the ten mill increase and leave it the way it is, fine.

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is a different philosophy than I have heard from the Honourable Member lately.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I see, so many times the same things, we are not basing it on fact, we are basing it on a dream. I wonder why, I would ask the witness why Teslin is not included in here. I would like to have a look at our own place where I live, and I feel it probably wasn't in there because there aren't many home owners and it wouldn't show very good, I know that.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the

main reason of this Bill, is to encourage people to build. I mean, I may be a little stupid, because I stand here and the Honourable Member says this isn't going to help anybody. At least read the explanatory note, it says "the purpose of this Ordinance is to enable a grant to be paid to home owners who are taxpayers", I think we should underline that four times. There is still a few of us around.

For the Honourable Member to say well we will leave the mill rate in Haines Junction the same as it is but we will take the Home Owners Grant, this seems to be the basic philosophy around here. I think the Commissioner should get down to Ottawa, bring the mint up here and get it duplicating money. Obviously, we are going to need lots of it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mrs. Watson: I said we don't want it, we hoe potatoes too.

(Laughter)

Mr. Chairman: Order, Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have to rise because I am not voting for this motion, didn't intend to. When they speak of the tax payers, and I am one of the tax payers, and have been for many, many years, I don't know, they seem to -- what I am opposed of is when you take money from this pocket and try and put it over in that pocket with the same hand and dump half of it on the floor while we are getting there.

You know, it is going to cost money for this program, that we haven't thought of yet, maybe they have thought of it, I seen the figure five thousand dollars, which I think is another dream. Once it is proposed and if it is passed we will have that extra money being passed back and forth somewhere to look after the grant. It is just another thing that they have forgotten. As a tax payer I think I will just stay the way I am, I will vote against it.

Mr. Chairman: Three, one. Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, further comment on the incentives to the home owners in these small communities. This is true we don't have that many home owners in these small communities. I think the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, yesterday, made a very good point, we have had more home owners if more land would have been available so that people would have had to purchase land and make the improvements on the land so that the land wouldn't have been available on a speculative basis, at all.

I think there is where, ten years ago, this government went off the track and the land wasn't put there, people weren't able to build their own home. This, you know, a grant type of thing I don't look as an incentive.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If I may at the risk of being cut off Mr. Chairman, ask a question --

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If I may ask a question respecting mobile homes or trailers. May I ask the question as to whether or not, you see in section 10, you say the Commissioner may make regulations, and that is where this whole Ordinance will go flat on its face on the cement when these regulations start being machined out, will a trailer have to be on a foundation or can it be sitting on wheels in a trailer court and be eligible for a Home Owners Grant?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. Legal Advisor the legal question.

Mr. Legal Advisor: I think the reason the Taxation Ordinance and it will be a trailer which is taxable as a residence. That's the kind of trailer which is defined in the Taxation Ordinance.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, it still doesn't -- I have asked the question, if a trailer is parked in a trailer park or anywhere for that matter and is sitting on wheels and is not on a permanent foundation, can it still be considered or can its owner be considered eligible for a Home Owners Grant?

Mr. Legal Advisor: If it's taxable and the taxability depends on its moveability. If it is taxable, it gets the grant. If it is not taxable, it does not get the grant.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I still had a question why Teslin was not on this list and if I could maybe just find out which one I may refer to here, that would in some comparison, some comparison possibly.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we would be happy to break down the other. We were trying to give an indication of the homes that would be available without the total list of breaking down, Burwash, Destruction Bay, Teslin, but we would be happy to break that down totally. You are included in the 425 other. I see Mr. Miller is kind of putting his hand to his head as if that is not possible to do.

Mr. Miller: Well, I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that's not possible. It is possible. As I recall it took us two to three weeks with one person to dig out what we did dig out. Now, to dig out the rest and break them down by each tax role, it's going to take us time. That's my only concern and you know, time is money.

We had to, in fact, go out and hire someone to do this for us. We had to take on a casual employee for three weeks just to break this down.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my other question at this point is that are the regulations -- copies

of the draft regulations which will append this Ordinance available and if so, could they be distributed to the members of the Committee?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, they are not available at this moment. They are not going to be all that difficult because there was no way that I was going to go into a program that wasn't really simple to operate. This one couldn't be simpler because all you have to do is fill out a form testifying that you have paid your taxes with you tax receipts, send it into the Territorial Treasury. He checks it off and sends you out the rebate that you are eligible for. If there was a difficult and a costly delivery system and another program and another sky-rocketing bureaucracy that we are going to put in place for the provision of this program, this program wouldn't have come before the Assembly at this time. It is so simple and we can go from the experiences of all provincial authorities who are into this program. It is an easy one to operate. The onus is on the home owner tax payer and believe you me, they are going to make sure they are going to get this rebate.

Mr. Chairman: Three, 1.

(READS CLAUSE 3 (1)).

Mr. Chairman: Two.

(READS CLAUSE 3 (2)).

Mr. Chairman: Four, 1.

(READS CLAUSE 4 (1)).

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I would ask the Minister -- I am not quite clear on that. Is it delivered to the Territorial Treasurer not later than the 30th of September in the year in respect to which the application is made. Now, if you are making an application for this coming year, 1976, the taxes are due and payable at the first of September is it or in there or you are, yes, they are due and payable somewhere in September, October and maybe the end of July even and from there on, you do pay a penalty if you don't pay the taxes.

Now, mind you, there is nobody to force you to pay the taxes until at least January 1. There is nothing that could be done to you because you are paying taxes in advance. We all do pay taxes in advance if we don't want to get penalized.

Now, I am asking about a person who, possibly right at that time don't have the money to pay those, therefore, he can't turn in his application or his application may be turned in but it may be no good to him, what happens in this case?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might answer that. The Commissioner is supposed to have set the rate of taxation outside Whitehorse, yesterday, today. The taxes become payable at that point but notices start to be sent out. The assessments have already been made so the people know or can find out how

much they will pay. They can pay without penalty up to a date which I think is in June, without penalty. After that, they start incurring the 10 percent penalty.

So, the date on which they must pay in order to make a claim in respect of this year, the taxation year is a calendar year, not a financial year. So, we are talking about the year 1976. They can send their receipts into the Treasurer before September 30.

Now, subsection 2, which has not been read yet, sets out, where because a person has not for some reason been able to pay the taxes, maybe they haven't been a resident 183 days in order to qualify. They can get an extension of time and pay them after that. But the average person should have paid his taxes in mid-year and should have plenty of time in which to send forward his receipt to Treasury by September 30.

We are talking about all the time about a year and not a financial year.

Mr. Chairman: Four, 2.

(READS CLAUSE 4 (2)).

Mr. Chairman: Five.

(READS CLAUSE 5).

Mr. Chairman: Six.

(READS CLAUSE 6).

Mr. Chairman: Seven.

(READS CLAUSE 7).

Mr. Chairman: Eight.

(READS CLAUSE 8).

Mr. Chairman: 9 (1)

(READS CLAUSE 9 (1))

Mr. Chairman: (2)

(READS CLAUSE 9 (2))

Mr. Chairman: (3)

(READS CLAUSE 9 (3))

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like a little clarification on that (2) where building mentioned in sub-section 1 is taxable as a unit. The Territorial Assessor shall compute the share of the taxation applicable to the residence. In other words he is going to an assessor is going to try to difference between what the owner part is business and what part is his home and come up with a figure in there for that.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: That is entirely correct.

Mr. Chairman: 10 (1)

(READS CLAUSE 10 (1))

Mr. Chairman: (2)

(READS CLAUSE 10 (2))

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question regarding 9 sub 3, and 2. I refer you where you are not going to take into account the land. Then I refer you to your definition of eligible resident, section sub 1 of 2. A parcel of land, eligible residence, means a parcel of land shown as a separate taxable parcel on a taxation roll. So in essence you're saying that in order to be eligible you have to have a separate taxable parcel of land. Then in 9 you are saying you are still eligible but we're not going to take into consideration this separate taxable parcel of land. Are you not?

Mr. Legal Advisor: No, Mr. Chairman, Section 9 must be read distinctly from the definition portion because it's merely the splitting artificially by the assessor of that single taxable parcel. If there were two taxable parcels, we wouldn't have any difficulty one would be commercial, one would be private. But the situation right is where a person is living upstairs above their shop. Now the assessor will then look at it and he will take the taxation, the assessment and split it. One is private and one is commercial.

But when he's doing that he's only dealing in the proportions that the building represents, not the fact that there is a residential garden at the back..

This will only happen where you have a single taxable parcel. If you've got two parcels, he doesn't have to make this artificial split.

Mrs. Watson: Actually then Mr. Chairman, you're only eligible for the improvement part that applies, that is used as a home. You're not going to get any of the benefits of even a portion of the land, one single parcel. The whole parcel of land the taxation on that parcel of land will be attributed to the business part of it. Only the improvement, the tax on the improvement, a certain portion of the improvement, will be attributed to the Homeowner part of it.

Mr. Legal Advisor: I wouldn't think so, Mr. Chairman. Supposing that the evaluation was a \$100.00, and portion is private and portion is business. He will make a split, but the split is made, not on the portion of the land, but on the portion of the improvement alone. So the taxation on that portion is \$100.00, he would split 50-50, 60-40 or 30-70 and that's how it turns out.

If there happens to be ten acres of residence, he doesn't say there is residence and then there are two portions of buildings. He doesn't split into three. He just splits it into two.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I hate to belabour this but you're not saying that.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I think the intent of this particular section is as the member has stated it. If you have a single parcel of land with an improvement on it which comprises both a residence and a commercial, within one structure. The assessor will split the improvement in proportion, but he will not allocate any of the land. In other words the land will be deemed to be used for the commercial purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, on this very point, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that anybody better take the chance of being a homeowner under that present system there, in his own business. That type of homeowner, we know, if we pass this Ordinance, that we do have to pass other Ordinances too in respect to taxation to get that tax to pay the bills. So if he is going to get a Home Owners Grant for a mere portion of his business which is sitting on top of maybe his store or whatever, very fine to say he's going to get back a little bit, but his land taxes are going to jump so much farther that that person will probably end up paying more for taxes than he will be getting back for his Homeowners Grant.

Mr. Chairman: Eleven.

(READS CLAUSE 11)

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I must again rise in my objections to the Bill. I have to support, to a certain degree, what the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua said this morning. I think that basically we carry the same philosophy, that we're opposed to grants. I don't like the word grant. That's right and there is no such thing as a gift. I look at grants to child care, I look at grants to this and grants to that. Grants to Home Owners, somebody has to pay for them. As the Honourable Member said how can you vote for a Home Owners Grant if you're not going to vote for a whole group of other taxation.

I am basically opposed to additional taxation at this time. I realize that government requires more money to operate because all other costs have increased. But I would much sooner, and I think, many people in the Yukon and in the country as a whole, would be prepared to accept government cutting their services and not going in for increased taxation.

It seems to be a sort of a system that we've got into. Every year we go for new programs, so we go for more taxation so we go more grants, so we go for more taxation. It's just a never ending cycle. I would like to say stop, you know, we've got this much money, we're going to live with it. Don't bother coming to us and asking for more assistance, there isn't more money. We may have to cut out completely some programs. Fine, you wouldn't hurt my feelings if you cut out Legal Aid. Not one bit.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Not even for controverted elections -

Mrs. Watson: You wouldn't hurt my feelings if you cut out you Arctic Winter Games. \$120,000.00. Imagine

how many mills it takes from the outlying areas to raise \$120,000.00. Where are our priorities?

You know, we get sort of lost. We get pushed by, we have to have remedial tudor we have to have this and we sort of panic. Do we really have to have them? You can rest assured that your municipality will be increasing your mill structure. They know they are not going to get a squack from the home owner, but the business is sure going to get wacked and he is going to raise his prices and he is going to pass it back on again.

So, it is just a vicious circle. Again, I will disagree with the member with Hootalinqua. He disagreed with me. He said it isn't going to hurt the small business. I say it is. He says he is just going to pass it on to the guy who buys his services but we are getting to the point where people cannot afford to buy these services and there is going to be quite a reduction of the amount of business that is carried on.

So, I would very much oppose the Home Owner Grant for the simple reason that, you know, the word grant just gives me goose pimples. I can just see another deduction, another tax to pay.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to rise in opposition to this Bill also. I find it hard to separate in my mind, despite all the exhortations to the opposite, the raising taxes and this grant.

They seem to be intertwined a lot more than a lot of people are willing to accept. It may just be that this is being offered at the wrong time but I really feel it is the wrong time. It is an irresponsible action, because, in this time of inflation, I would really like to know the calculations on how much this enhances inflation rather than fighting it.

I don't feel that it is looking at the whole economic system properly at all. I feel with the Minister or the Honourable Minister from Kluane that there are other areas in the budget which could use this \$400,000.00 and the emphasis is in the wrong place, as usual. It has been my argument through the whole budget.

I feel this Bill discriminates in many areas. It discriminates against the poor because it emphasizes that if you only have a minimum tax, which an awful lot of people in the Yukon do, you are not going to get any grant. The minimum tax itself, which we will be discussing later, discriminates against the poor again. It is pretty obvious.

Also, the licence increase recently announced and the 10 mill increase discriminates against the working poor. The poor people who have to make a struggle and the small lodges along the highway and little places in Mayo that are just keeping themselves together.

It discriminates generally against the poor in the areas outside of the municipalities. On the basis of this, I cannot support this Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, related to this Bill, of course, are all the other matters of taxation, which I don't know whether we are talking about carts before horses or just where we sit in relation to this.

Perhaps the Bill should be shelved until the matter of the other tax matters have been considered. It is my intention in any event, to vote against the Bill.

You know, I have been browsing through a report, Mr. Chairman, made for the Government of the Yukon Territory some years ago by a Donald Fields, a Professor of Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration in the University of British Columbia, which is titled, "A Research Report Prepared for the Government of Yukon Territory", and just in portion of their general summary and conclusions, he states, "one conclusion easily reached as a result of this study" -- and I might say this was written in 1972, Mr. Chairman. "The one conclusion easily reached as a result of this study was the function of Government in the Yukon is at present being carried out sensibly and efficiently and with a careful eye to the public purse.

With respect, it would seem unwise for the Federal Government to risk jeopardizing in any way this satisfactory state of affairs with what may appear to some to be unwarranted or incompletely documented demands for substantial tax increases." I leave you with this thought and this was written by a man who made a very, very detailed study of the Yukon.

I have the report here and there is pages and pages and pages of it and I just have not, because of the Rendezvous, perhaps had an opportunity of fully sitting down and taking the time to get through the whole thing. I really honestly feel that now is not the time for a Home Owners Grant.

As far as I am concerned, it is window dressing. It is having the effect of imposing a further taxation, however you want -- whatever source you want to talk about, whether it comes from real property, whether it comes from tobacco, from hotel rooms, from whatever you are proposing here, which we haven't got to those taxes as yet.

It is not a time when the people of the Yukon are crippled, with even by D.B.S. figures, some 36 or 38 percent higher cost of living than our neighbours in the provinces to the south. Paying higher fuel costs, for instance, than other Canadians. We are saddled. It is becoming too expensive to live in the Yukon, Mr. Chairman. That is the simple fact of the case. There is, in fact, an exodus of people leaving the Territory who find that they can no longer live in the Territory. I cannot accept the argument that simply all we have to do to stop this exodus is to produce a Home Owners Grant and this is a fallacy and I won't be taken in by any suggestion if that suggestion be made.

The simple facts of the case are, it is becoming too costly to live in the North and if it means that we must curtail a program, which perhaps might be desirable, a Home Owners Grant program for a year or two, until perhaps we find that we are in a better financial position to offer this program, fine.

We have got along without a Home Owner Grant program so far. Let us, in the face of these high costs and these spiraling costs and they are still going up -- bu next fall, God only knows where we are going to be sitting in terms of costs here in the Territory. Let us leave this program be, defer it and also defer the taxation which is required to operate the program.

For those reasons basically, Mr. Chairman, I would

be voting contrary to the Bill and I would urge all members to vote contrary to the Bill at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to speak in favour of this Bill for a number of reasons.

I have sat and listened to a number of Members, this morning and yesterday afternoon, contradict themselves, make themselves look very foolish. One Honourable Member said, the only reason why he will not support this type of legislation is because he don't believe in grants.

Another member feels it is the wrong time. I think this type of legislation, when it is presented, will always be at the wrong time, if we want to play with short sightedness. I think the principle behind this Bill is very good. The concept of it is to enable some of our residents in the Yukon to gain a relief.

When we consider the burden which is put on, shall we say, private enterprise, I find this very unique. It is about time. Fortunately, I am not responsible for the Yukon government otherwise there would be a lot more taxation against private enterprise, because, in my opinion, they have had an easy ride.

The situation in the Yukon has reached a period of time where on one hand we are saying we should be recognized as a government that can take on responsibilities, and on the other hand we are all scrambling to get through the door first to avoid the responsibility. I often sit back and wonder when we are firing motions and letters of protest to our federal people in Ottawa, about why we have not got this, or why we have not got that, or we should have this, they must sit back and scratch their heads and wonder what is really going on in the Yukon.

We come up with a small piece of legislation like this that does not have a great deal of repercussions within the Yukon, and everybody is crying the blues. Everybody is weeping tears. Another grant, another piece of tax legislation. Why not? We are the government, lets get it through. It is about time we started standing up to be counted.

If I was private enterprise I would be prepared to pay the tax, the ten mills of whatever. If you want to establish some sort of programs in the Yukon, somebody has got to pay for it. We are not going to start, or keep on trying to squeeze more and more dollars out of the federal government, not if we are going to become, as everybody is hoping, a responsible government. It is ludicrous. We will all just finish up like hypocrits.

And this is the way we are going. There is other tax legislation coming up. We might as well throw that out, if we're going to throw this out. Why not throw out the whole budget? Let's all go home.

I'm getting tired of the childishness because I wonder what are we doing here? We're all hung up on a piece of legislation that's going to cost, I don't know, a few hundred thousand dollars. If you looked at the revenue that's gone out of the Yukon itself, its close to two hundred and some odd million dollars. A million, whatever and we're crying about this. The private enterprise is crying, I don't think so. If they are they have no right to be.

So I say let's get on with it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You wish to speak, Mr. Hibberd?

(Mr. McCall becomes chairman)

Mr. Hibberd: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think I'm going to have the opportunity to vote on this Bill, so I would like to rise in support of this Bill.

I've heard various statements made this morning which do disturb me. One of them is the fact that there is discrimination that has been brought up. I think the Bill does discriminate and I like the way it discriminates. It discriminates against the person who is not willing to go to work, not willing to build his own house, not willing to observe his own lot in the Yukon, not willing to become a part of the fibre of this community. That's who's being discriminated against and I'm all for that.

It has also been mentioned that the timing is not right. We can't afford the grant at this stage of the game. That's very interesting. We could have used that all along the way about the various grants that have come forward, various programs that have been issued and initiated. We could very well say at one time we can't afford hospitalization. We can't afford medicare. Now these programs are part of the fibre of our community, we just couldn't do without them. The same argument could have been raised then.

I think that this is relevantly not as expensive a Bill as those are and we will do a good deal towards stabilizing our community. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Hibberd. Any further questions? Just hold on, Mr. Hibberd, the chair.

(Mr. Hibberd becomes Chairman)

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a little late now. I had a number of thoughts while the Honourable Member from Watson Lake was speaking and it may not be appropos because of his status. The immediate thought that crossed my mind was that there is never a convenient time to have a baby either. Ask any parent.

There's never a convenient time to put any kind of legislation through which involves money. The Honourable Member from Faro, got in ahead of me and said exactly the same things. He said them very well. I am a little surprised at the members sitting around this table today though, because I have a very clear recollection of standing up alone, as the only person who opposed half a million dollars going into a buy back plan, which would benefit maybe three or four civil servants in this country.

Well Mr. Chairman, there was very little support in that opposition but the same members today are happily opposing a smaller amount of money which is going to benefit every Home Owner in the Yukon.

The reasoning behind this Bill is that it is to benefit home owners who are taxpayers. Several other times,

earlier in this session we have stood up and said it is time we did something for the guy in the middle, who is trying to make his way, work at a job, pay his taxes and buy his own home. This is one way we can do it. Now it is not going to matter a great deal to some of the people around this table, but on the other hand I have also heard some of them working out how much it is going to cost them because they own three or four pieces of property in the Yukon. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to think that there was a member of this Council who would make a personal reflection like that effect the way he was going to vote on a Bill which is going to benefit every home owner in the Yukon.

If they are proud and happy and luxurious enough to own three or four pieces of property in the territory, god bless them. They should not be complaining that somebody else is going to get a break out of this Bill. I am the first one to say, that it is about time we raised the minimum tax on property in this beautiful country to a hundred bucks a year, to sit and look at some of the most beautiful scenery in the whole world. I can't think of anywhere else in the world that you would be given that opportunity for twenty-five bucks as they have been all these years.

Come on, let's get down to reality, Mr. Chairman. You are looking at a home owners rebate. If there are members here that can't swallow the word grant, fine, don't call it a grant.

You are going to get a rebate on the taxes you pay, and you are not going to get it until you pay the taxes. It is about time that we had a few of these salt and pepper, common sense rules around this country, Mr. Chairman.

How anybody with any sense of responsibility to their constituents, and to the people of this Yukon, can oppose this piece of legislation, I cannot understand.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I must rise to say that the Honourable Member could be wrong when she said nobody opposed the buy back plan. I certainly opposed it and would still oppose it.

As for the Honourable Member from South Centre, I agree with some of the things he says, but I do not agree that the plan is relevant as our Medicare Plan, as hospitalization and so forth. That is a plan, and a necessary plan and the essentials for the people and all of the people in the territory, not just a segment of them that do own homes. I must take exception to that. Other than that, I just do not agree with any plan that does cause more money to be taken to give to somebody else and I—they stand up and they just seem to put it forward to us that this plan can be put into effect and that it won't take any more money and yet, in the budget back here, they say we okayed these—this thing and that thing and all sorts of children's group homes, lodges and senior citizens—we agreed to all of this. I must say that some of it I agreed to reluctantly. I think one Minister got up the other day and say that we spent a half a million dollars in this House and all day we couldn't spend a nickel because we don't have any say in it anyway, only to wipe it out and not have it possibly, which I wouldn't do to some things that are essential, even though I didn't

agree with them.

But this one here is not essential, it is not for all the people. It is going to hurt a lot of people and therefore, I am still going to vote against it. Let's get on with it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just very briefly wanted to make one point in reply to the remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Health, Welfare and Education and when she was talking about a buy-back scheme for the Government of the Yukon Territory and that was the fact that during that budget I certainly can't recall talking about the imposition of taxation in order to fund the program as we are in this occasion. I think there is a vast difference between the two.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: That is quite so, Mr. Chairman. There is a difference but the common underlying basis for both plans was to provide some incentive for people to stay in the Yukon, to provide some stability in their home situation, to provide some encouragement to build modern homes and to stay here and make their life here. That's the point Mr. Chairman, and this is another small effort in the same direction.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, it is strange that I agree with so much of what the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua and the Honourable Member from Kluane has stated and yet on the Bill, naturally, I will be in favour of it while they say that they are voting in opposition.

I am as sick and tired and as fed up to the teeth with the drips and the lips and the dree and the free that are going into every aspect of the community except the guy who is paying the total bill for all these programs that are going along.

You are right and the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre hit it right on the head when he said this is discriminatory legislation. I am really happy because just about the toughest thing in the world to be in this day and age is a tax paying home owner, mortgage paying, family rearing person in any area of the Yukon in this day and age. To try and keep it all together, and try and keep it all straightened out, with the inflationary spiral and the pressures that are being put against people on fixed incomes, thank goodness that finally the government is coming down with a program to help that class of people who has just been ignored, under-rated. The only time anybody wants them is when it comes time to pay the bills and pay the taxes and pay the utilities and pay the whole gamit of demands that are placed upon his fixed income. Mr. Chairman, if we through this Ordinance, in some small way, and I have heard over and over again, the people calling and meeting on the street and saying, boy are we ever glad that there is going to be a different 250

club than the one that we are used to, one that we don't pay out to but one that we are going to get something back from. That's the type of person, Mr. Chairman, that we are trying to help in this Ordinance.

It discriminates, discriminates against me. Now, I make no bones that I tip back the odd bubbly and I smoke the odd cigar. Sure, it is going to cost me more. Fine. That's my right and my privileges. I am not scared to donate a few more dollars out of my pocket to help the home owner of the Yukon Territory. Sure I have a small piece of property for a summer cabin. It is going to discriminate against me. I am just so damn lucky that I have that small piece of land and that summer cabin where many other people don't have the opportunity under the land policies which are now in effect by the Federal Government.

I am more than happy to pay a hundred dollars and the \$25.00 minimum. What a steal, Mr. Chairman, the public of the Yukon has been getting away with on the minimum properties at \$25.00 when we can raise them to a \$100.00 and raise over \$150,000.00. For people to complain about living, some of them squatting in the Yukon Territory, of being raised to \$100.00, boy that's pretty nice rent as far as I am concerned and I sure as heck wish that I had that advantage that many other people are taking in the Yukon Territory.

We're discriminating against the resource extracting industries, boy oh boy, I like that discrimination too. I'm happy to see that we're making them pay their way the same as Whitehorse Copper, as the Honourable Member from Pelly has had to pay their way as a good corporate citizen of the municipality of the City of Whitehorse.

Look at what the municipalities are paying in their mill rate; Whitehorse, with their increase this year, will be up in the 45 mill bracket; Dawson, poor old Dawson, up in the 55 mill bracket; Faro up in the 45 mill bracket. What have the communities outside of Whitehorse been affected with? They've been affected up to this point with a 26 mill rate and they will go up to this to 38 not anywhere near the municipalities. If we could justify that there are no services being provided in the smaller communities, but this is no longer true. The Honourable Member from Kluane, the Honourable Member from Mayo, have to admit that this government has been putting money into the smaller areas, has been putting great amounts of money into the Local Improvement Districts. Has been providing the capital services and have been expecting disproportionate effect of the taxpayers' money of the Yukon, outside of the Yukon municipalities in the unorganized areas and in the Local Improvement Districts. This is a policy that we agree on, the philosophy we agree on, and it's a policy that will continue to be a philosophy of this government, if it remains in office any longer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the elected members of the Yukon Legislative Assembly on the Executive Committee have had a say in this Homeowners' Grant. We nurtured the idea from the first moment we went into that Executive Committee that there had to be something done for the public, who is just being ignored by this government far too long. We thought the most equitable way would be in the field of the Homeowners' Grant and that is the method that we used to redistribute some of the money

that is being raised in the Yukon Territory to the person who we felt that most needs some help at this time.

It is our idea, it is our legislation, it is our money bill, it is our taxation bill and as the member in charge of local government and I'm sure that I speak for my two colleagues we're proud of the idea; we're proud of the legislation and we're proud of the distribution concept to go to the home owner taxpayer of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we have no delusions of grandeur of sitting around the Executive Committee; we know that there is responsible, hardnosed decisions to make and, Mr. Chairman, we have no qualms whatsoever in taking those responsibilities and making those decisions and standing or falling as a result of the decision that we make, which we think are for the greater benefit of the people of the Yukon and for the people as I've said over and over again who I feel have been much too long ignored by government at all levels. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A member: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question? Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I move that we should leave Bill number 6 in Committee until we handle some of the other Bills that have an effect on Bill number 6. Whether we could just leave it in Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I can't see any point in delaying. I think that everybody's had adequate time to look at it. I think that the Minister of Local Government has put the points across very well. I wonder at the logic of some of the members in regards to the outlying areas, why they don't want to bring in a Homeowners' Grant which will encourage people to build in the outlying areas, which I think is very important in order to stabilize our population.

We have seen people around this table vote for teacher training program which is to help stabilize our population. This is another way of helping to stabilize our population.

I must come from an area that is rather different in the Yukon, I guess. There is a lot of people that would benefit from this Ordinance. I recall one particular member around this table saying that she always appreciated talking to these people from Porter Creek because they paid their bills, owned their own homes and never bothered anybody. I think it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that all members look at this and I think we should call question and say okay, let's see who is going to stand up for the guy that is paying the bills in the Yukon.

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: The Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, by and with the advice and consent of the Council of the said Territory, enacts as follows: Homeowners' Grant Ordinance. Are you ready for the

question?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that there has yet been a motion to call question on. So perhaps, before we just rush this thing through, someone should make an appropriate motion.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill number 6 be reported out of Committee without amendment.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. Lang, that Bill number 6 be moved out of Committee without amendment. Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I don't like to see what is going on here. It's lunch time and I think it is appropriate not to rush things through like we are doing. The reason I didn't speak on the Bill is I get a split personality. On one end of my riding, I have got home owners that would benefit from the Bill; on the other end of the riding, I have got people who protested - they phoned me last night. In-between, there is people in business that are losing their shirt. I don't know how I am going to go home. That's pretty serious to me. I mean, the Honourable Member from Porter Creek has a pretty wise saying that there is a lodge owner we don't consider in this particular business.

The people sitting around on the high risks providing us with services twelve months of the year, that their only livelihood comes about three months of the year; the rest of the time, they sit around and scratch just a meagre existence out of the business they have.

I am quite concerned in Section 9.3 when it says that we are only going to consider a portion of the improvements on the land. I heard some Honourable Member saying, well, they own too much land. As a lodge, he needs land because he needs to provide service. He needs to have parking facilities. I think it would be just appropriate enough to have enough land set aside also under 9.3 for the improvements on it.

I think those things are the things we are not considering. We are going on principle. In principle, I can agree with the Bill. I have nothing against it, but I think we have to look in a little deeper into the whole concept of the thing and this is what I don't like to see, things rushed through.

At least give us another hour and a half and think about the implications on the people on the highway. I am not concerned with the people in unorganized communities, L.I.D.s and municipalities because the other two groups maybe from a municipality, create their own tax structure, but it is the people on the highway who are never really going to have a chance to really benefit on any of these things here.

These are the ones we are really condemning and this, I think, I would like to see thought through a little further.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger, are you considering the possibility of bringing forth an amendment with regard to Section 9.3?

Mr. Berger: If any way possible at the time, yes.

Mr. Chairman: In which case I will call recess until 1:30.

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: I'll call the Committee to order. Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I've been asked to bring to this Committee, to the attention of this Committee, the fact that a Resolution was unanimously passed today at noon, at a meeting of the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce. I'm sorry Mr. Chairman that I don't have it in writing yet from the Chamber. But the Resolution asked that this Committee defer the vote on the Home Owners Grant in order to provide time for members of that Chamber to contact their Members of this Legislature.

The feeling was that there had been insufficient time to study this Ordinance since it only came into Committee yesterday. The gist of the Resolution Mr. Chairman is that they are asking to have this decision deferred.

I would so move Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: That's exactly what I wanted to stand up for, to propose a thing like this. I don't know which member it was, but somebody spoke about horses and carts and other moveable material and so. I think what we did in the last day or so is discuss the cart first before we even got to the horse. I think the whole concept was completely wrong. We took the candy first before we took the medicine, if you want to put it in other words. This is what I wanted to propose, let's think about the whole thing, what is in that Bill, what the effects on the residents of the Territory. There are lots of people who don't realize what the real effects are on people who are living in the Territory.

Mr. Chairman: We have a Motion on the floor, regarding Bill Number 6. The motion was proposed by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. Lang that Bill Number 6 be moved out of Committee without amendment. If they are willing to withdraw their motion, we might be able to consider this further motion.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not willing to withdraw the motion, but I will withdraw the motion with the consent of my seconder. I'm the type of person who likes to know where I stand at any given moment and not to procrastinate and put things off. If that's the wish of Council for more time, the Assembly for more time, I've never been one either to go against

the wishes of my fellow members on the Assembly that I can still consider myself to be on of them. Mr. Chairman I would certainly be happy to support a motion for deferral and withdraw the original motion if that's what my fellow members of the Assembly would request and desire.

Mr. Chairman: That has yet to be voted on Mr. McKinnon. We're merely asking you to withdraw your motion for the moment. The motion has then been withdrawn.

The motion now before the House, are we agreed that that motion—

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: The motion now before the House it was moved by Mrs. Whyard, seconded by Mr. Lang, that we report progress on Bill Number 6. Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are You agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary? The motion is carried.

(Motion Carried)

Mr. Chairman: We will return to further consideration of Bill Number 2. Under consideration are the estimates for the Department of Local Government, page 58, Establishment Number 605, Municipal Services Branch, \$2,384,745.00, Appendix, Page 23, Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, for some time, both, with this constituted Legislature, and the formerly constituted Council, members, and indeed myself among those members, have questioned the per capita grants made available to the various municipalities based on Statistics Canada Census figures. I believe the case in Faro was an excellent example, where indeed, I believe, at that time where we were talking about something in the area of 1200 people and the grants that are being paid to Faro indeed were only based on 863 people as we see under the appendix on A23.

Now, I would like to know in the interval, between the last time we discussed this at the last budget and now, during the period of this last years, what efforts have been made by the administration and the department to have another census undertaken at the community level under the supervision of Census Canada and what responses have been given to any efforts that have been made in this regard?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Very positive results, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that there will be what is called a mini-census in the Yukon by D. B. S. this summer and the Federal Government is willing to accept the results of that mini-census, between the overall censuses to accept the figures that will be given this summer as the population that will be eligible for the money that they

will pay to the Yukon Territory in the O & M Grant to allow for grants to the municipalities. Also, because the results will not be ready until early in the new year, we were able to prevail upon the government to also look at a one-shot windfall grant to cover this year that will be well in line with the census figures that are coming up by the mini-census, which will take place this summer.

So, what we are saying, in effect is, next year the grants, per capita grants will be on the new census which will take place this summer. We are prepared next year also to go into a one time grant basis to the municipalities that will be fixed also, on the results of the census for next spring.

The reason for that being is that we realize that the municipalities have been suffering by the lack of the census over the last few years. So, I just want to say that the results have been very positive. We are very pleased with the results that we were able to get from a problem which has been a very difficult one over the last few years and I have supported the members on while I was on the other side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, this just relates to the municipalities and does not—the census does not have any application elsewhere in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Miller: No, that is not correct, Mr. Chairman. The census is taken throughout the Yukon and in fact throughout Canada.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The Per Capita Grant—

Mr. Miller: The Per Capita Grant does not effect but the census will be taken throughout the Yukon, which I think was the member's question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, then for clarification, it was my understanding that the census, the mini-census would be taken in order to properly assist the municipalities in getting their proper grants for the amount of people that are in the municipalities, and certainly, another general census will take place following this.

I do not believe that there is a general census this year, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: This mini-census will cover the whole of the Yukon. It will be accepted by D. B. S. and the Federal Government for all programs that are cost shared by Federal Territorial cost sharing relations and it will also effect the municipalities in the Per Capita Grants, that is under the Municipal Aid Ordinance to the municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: This is good, yes. This is fine, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just as a matter

of curiosity the Minister McKinnon could probably answer this. What magic did the City of Yellowknife have over the federal government in getting recognition in conducting their own census and getting that figure recognized. Why do we have to go through the form of a mini census.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The Per Capita Grant, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, went from \$40.00 to \$50.00 in Yellowknife. I think that is the figure. The figure they are now at is \$50.00 at any rate. What I am told by my colleagues in Yellowknife, is that that does not form part of their O & M Deficit Grant. That it's considered to be money that comes exclusively out of Northwest Territories Government revenue. We could have accepted that type of a program too, but we don't feel that because of the reluctance of the federal government to accept our census figures, which we have a closer tab over the Y.C.H.I.C. that even the census will prove, that we should be paying the full shot out of our revenues for the Per Capital Grants to municipalities.

Mr. Lengerke: I thank the Minister for that answer, that's the first time that I've ever had any clarification on that, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if it would be too difficult for the administration to provide any members who are interested with the budgets for the L.I.D.s this summer? I assume that is what that refers to.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well I think the \$2.00 shows our optimism, Mr. Chairman, that the land claims settlement will be in effect and that there will be start ups of new Local Improvement Districts. Obviously they are Ross River and Carmacks who both have applications pending for the creation of Local Improvement Districts in to the Government of the Yukon Territory at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions on L.I.D.s. This establishment of new L.I.D.s, I really can't understand why the Honourable Minister can delay, in all honesty, establishing the LIDs of Ross River and Carmacks, dependent upon the settlement of the land claims.

This could be another year, two or three before all of the details are ironed out so that you can go ahead and establish an L.I.D.. Why does the member penalize these people by almost withholding from them the opportunity to have local government? Why have you considered letting them establish an L.I.D. within the restricted boundaries that they are suggesting, and we all hope that the land claims will make it possible then to expand L.I.D. boundaries in order to make viable communities that are both, take in the white community and the Indian community. But why do you deny these people, it's been a year now, and we've been waiting for a report apparently, that the Minister was doing. Are you

going to deny it to them for another year or two?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a very basic principle. I've been absolutely candid with the total population of the Yukon including the people of Carmacks and Ross River. It's just a simple and basic as any principle that I've ever tried to espouse to my constituents and to the people of the Yukon.

It just simply is this - that there is supposed to be an agreement in principle by March 31st of this year on the land claims. The Indian people of the Yukon Territory have asked that no more Local Improvement Districts be established until they see the land claims package. Once the agreement's principle has been signed, the Indian people of the Yukon Territory have, by letter, stated that depending upon what is involved in the land claims settlement, that they would be more than willing, ready and able to join the Government of the Yukon Territory in establishing L.I.D.s that would encompass all the people of the Yukon Territory.

I just will not let myself be used, the department of government be used, or I will not be a party to a government that by legislation creates and apartheid type situation in the Yukon when we seem to be this close to settlement. It's as simple and basic to me as that. Some people for a certain period of time in this intervening period, are being denied their basic democratic rights. I say that there is a greater principle involved, as the principle of whether the Yukon is going to be able, all peoples of the Yukon, to join together in local government institutions or create a state within a state in the Yukon Territory.

I will not be a part of any government that creates the apartheid situation. If the majority of this House feel that we should go ahead in establishing Local Improvement Districts, where only the white residents of the area join the Local Improvement District at this time, then I will not be the Minister of Local Government.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman. I think the Honourable Member is taking a wrong view point on this. The Indians have objected to being included in the L.I.D.'s of Ross River and Carmacks. They didn't want to be included in the L.I.D. as it is structured now by our law. There is nothing wrong in establishing, by our law, a L.I.D. where people wanted and then after the agreement in principle, you can work out your details of accommodating both of them. You're going to have to do it anyway, but you're just sort of denying one group of people while this is going on. I could see it for a few months, but when it's a year now and it could go on to another year quite easily. These people are looking for a form of local government and I think they should be given consideration.

Now my next concern is on appendix A 23 and it's regarding the grants to the LIDs. I'm not criticizing the administration, nor am I criticizing the L.I.D.'s, I'm just going to express a concern for the future.

I'm looking at the grants that we are making to the L.I.D.s and they are quite substantial. They're becoming more substantial every year. My concern is that I

feel that possibly these people are almost being led down the garden path. They're sort of being given quite considerable sums of money and when the day arrives and it can't be that much further along, when they have to take over and form a municipality or a village or whatever you have and operate on the revenue that they tender from their own tax structure plus a Per Capita Grant likely from the government which might be adjusted to meet their special needs. These people are going to be faced with a very difficult situation. I think we are leading them into too easily building another type of government bureaucracy, which will be entrenched by the time they take over and have to be responsible for a greater share through their own tax revenue.

It does concern me and I think it does concern quite a few people within the L.I.D. They are saying you know, this isn't going to last. Are we going to have to eventually take over and fund it to the extent that it is being funded now?

I am not criticizing the administration. They have endeavoured to get local government established by giving them some financial assistance. I think we are getting to the point where we have to be careful, and possibly even do some relations, between the grant and the revenue that comes from the local tax payers. There is one area that I would like to express my concern, that L.I.D.'s are just beginning and they are another form of government.

The Yukon Territory is famous for the number of government employees, people who are employed by one form of government or another, compared to the whole ratio of the work force. I am sure that it is fairly high, comparable to other areas in Canada.

So, here we have an L.I.D. We are establishing another type of government structure with equipment, with personnel, with office managers and I am wondering whether we should be looking at other methods, whether the government should be encouraging more contracting to private enterprise, more contracting with the government facilities that are there.

I am thinking of acquiring equipment, graders and so on. I am thinking of acquiring various trucks. I am thinking of acquiring the storage, the garages that you have to have. If you get enough of it, you are going to have to have a mechanic and on it goes. I would really like to see this government look at the alternatives and present them to these L.I.D.'s. So that they can check out the feasibility of going to on a contracting, either with private enterprise or even contracting with Y.T.G., who is established with their equipment in many of these communities.

I don't like to see another form of government start to grow. We have got a chance to stop, we have got a chance to look at alternatives. I would like to have this government show a little leadership in this direction with the junior forms of government.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I am acting in a responsible way, for a member who represents areas that has L.I.D.'s, to stand up and say, maybe we should look at the method that we are funding these people. These local government establishments require a little bit of responsibility also but I am looking to the future.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree more with the Honourable Member and that was one of the exercises in the mill rate going from 28 to 38 mills in the unorganized areas and the Local Improvement District to at least start to reflect part of the cost of services that the L.I.D.'s and the unorganized areas are receiving from all of the Territorial Government tax payers.

The question of responsibility in either the L.I.D. contracting or buying equipment or putting it out to a private contractor or to government agencies, is exactly the type of responsibility that we have tried to initiate in all the Local Improvement Districts. The Honourable Member well knows that the ability was given in the Haines Junction L.I.D. just this fall, to either contract out to private entrepreneurs, the upgrading and grading of the roads or if they got a better deal from government in using their equipment on third party, that they could also do it that way. The L.I.D. made the choice of giving it out to private contractors to do, for which the Territorial Government was fully in agreement with.

We hope that we are starting to give the Local Improvement District their heads. I know that I get phoned constantly by people in the Local Improvement Districts and I tell them to take their problems to their duly elected members in the Local Improvement District and work it out. There is no way that I can look after problems in Teslin or Mayo or Haines Junction or Watson Lake from my office on the third floor in Whitehorse in the Federal Building.

I don't think that any local improvement trustee or chairman can accuse me, since I have been in the Department of Local Government, of sticking my nose in business, which I have no business sticking my nose into.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I agree. I don't think the local government minister should be interfering with the Local Improvement District operation and administration. Neither should any member here. This is absolutely true.

But I am looking to the government to be providing incentives to go the route of contracting rather than providing the capital expenditure for equipment and shops and this type of thing, to calculate it and to show the various alternatives there are and that the benefits that they might even receive through an operation and maintenance budget. These will be going for capital expenditure.

This is the route that I would hope your department would take in the leadership they provide for the local government, for the L.I.D.s

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree with the member more. This is exactly the type of leadership that we think we now have in the Department of local Government. We now have three local government advisors. Those of you who are familiar with their work in the Local Improvement District, I am sure that you admit that they have the capabilities of doing exactly the thing that the Honourable Member from Klauane suggests and that's what we want to do.

We want to give the expertise and the help in all of these areas to the Local Improvement District and to the unorganized areas. I think that we are starting to get into place and that's the job that we are accomplishing. I happen to feel, personally, that the three government advisors that we have in staff are pretty cognizant now of the problems in the communities. They all have the responsibility for different communities within the Yukon Territory and the leadership, that the Honourable Member speaks of, is exactly the type of thing that we hope is coming and going to continue to keep coming from the local government advisors and the Department of Local Government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, one of the items I mustn't let by - I have raised it now for four or five years when we talk about L.I.D.s - I am wondering if, finally, within this budget there is a dollar of the amount of money available to Watson Lake L.I.D., if there is a dollar amount in there to pay for the vehicle. The paid fire chief, who we couldn't afford even a little red bicycle for last year, and this has been going on for four or five years. We have been promised a panel type of station wagon for this office and to act as a back-up ambulance

Mrs. Watson: For government.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: ... and it was to come from one of the assetted vehicles or about to be assetted vehicles in Whitehorse. We'll take some junk if necessary as long as it will run. Will this happen this year and is there a dollar available to pay the Territorial Government for it in this budget?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, this is the perfect example of what I am talking about, about getting involved and what should be L.I.D. business. The Honourable Member asked me that in the last session. I said, in reply to the Honourable Member, that you ... I am so confused on this issue anyway. Everybody says that somebody else promised, somebody else did and somebody else didn't. All I would ask for is for a motion from the duly elected members of the Local Improvement District that this is what they want and I will start the wheels in motion to make sure that we do everything in our power to get the equipment that the Local Improvement District is asking for. I have still not, to this day, received such a motion from the Local Improvement District. My department and myself stand ready to move, at a moment's instance, the day we get that motion from the duly elected members of the Watson Lake Local Improvement District.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Will it still be for a dollar, as was the original agreement?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It is not the money, Mr. Chairman, it is the principle of the thing.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: It's a dollar and a half this year.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest it is up to the Local Improvement District to negotiate the price, Mr. Taylor. Are we clear? Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, before we leave Municipal Services, I wonder if the Minister has a list of the money that will be available to provide Municipal Services in communities that are neither municipalities or L.I.D.s?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have a total breakdown of every unorganized community and what we expect to spend in them, and I would be more than happy to bring that information to all members of Committee or members of Committee who so desire.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, a question with respect to the utility systems superintendent. I see that position has been eliminated and I would just like a little history or a comment.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, on one of the votes in the budget, there is a vote for training programs and we thought that this would be more beneficial in bringing people into an area where the expertise in all areas of service were available and holding training sessions so that those people would be completely competent in the sewer and water services and the problems that they are facing in the L.I.D.s and in the unorganized areas. So, we thought that we could do a better job and probably cheaper than others.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, under either the L.I.D. or the Community Assistance Ordinance, I am not sure where this question falls, but as I am sure some members are aware, certainly the Honourable Minister, the problems that exist with the Watson Lake sewer and water system and will continue to exist for some time.

My question is, as a result of the poor planning and the poor engineering and the poor performance by the contractors, and the fact that this has caused nothing but excessive, and I mean extremely excessive, cost to the Government of the Yukon Territory, and in fact, in view of the fact that they are still digging on it, it's a summer and winter redigging operation, repatching, repairing, remaintaining, and this sounds like it is going to be a tremendously expensive thing before it is over, is it anticipated that the L.I.D.s or the people of Watson Lake will have to pay for all this poor engineering, poor planning, etc. etc.?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, you are assuming that that is the largest portion of the cost. Let's get this answer. I cannot go any further than this, Mr. Chairman, because as I understand the matter is sub-judice at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, perhaps though that the matter is such, is it anticipated though that the people with Watson Lake will be charged by taxation, by frontage tax or otherwise, for all these terrible misgivings that are perpetrated upon them by the Government of the Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very unfair statement. It is one that we shouldn't even attempt to comment on at this time. I wouldn't like that statement to go unchallenged because that's exactly what is happening at this point and time. It is saying who is responsible for the schmozzle at Watson Lake. I think it is dangerous for anybody in this House to try and pinpoint the responsibility at this time because I have much more information actually than is available to the Honourable Member and I wouldn't be making accusations of this type.

I think it is a dangerous area to get into to where this whole question is at this time.

I have to point out though that, regardless of whose fault it was, the territorial government forgave one thousand dollars on the development of the lots in Watson Lake on the sale price because we felt, regardless of whose fault it was, that the people of Watson Lake shouldn't pay for the total part of all the problems that went about in the installation of the sewer and water system in Watson Lake.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Honourable Minister has stated; however, I am very concerned that the L.I.D. have sufficient funds irrespective of what may come out of any judicial action that be taking place at this time. I am concerned that there are sufficient funds being provided by government to the L.I.D.s to compensate the L.I.D.s for all the maintenance and digging and all this type of stuff that has to be done in the maintenance of this thing, irrespective of who wins or loses this ball game.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I can only add that the budget of Watson Lake L.I.D. has gone from ninety thousand dollars in 75-76 to a hundred and thirty thousand dollars in this fiscal year. The majority of that reflects the added cost because of the capital projects that have been installed in the Watson Lake area, namely the sewer and water system.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I think as far as the Teslin L.I.D. is concerned, and I suppose I should speak of it because it is one of them, I think they are doing a very good job there. Furthermore, getting along very good in the human relationship too with other people in the territory.

However, I think you must remember that the people that are on these Boards are the people that are going to do the job and you can't always win. You know, sometimes you get the best and sometimes you get someone that is maybe not that good. We have to go along with that, the same as we do in the Council.

However, I was wondering if the Member of Local Government could tell me as to the effect the Department of Public Works, or the Department of Highways, have in the L.I.D.s in some cases. I think possibly you probably know what our problem is. Say, for water we have a problem of hauling water from there. They are more or less one government and we are the other. I guess they would probably be considered a senior government, but can you see where the L.I.D. is going to have maybe more control over the situation?

The re is a small difference there whereas the Department of Highways don't seem to be under the L.I.D.s and yet they are in the L.I.D.s and they are the people that live there. There is that - I don't know what you would call it - you have a difference there and the L.I.D.s themselves I don't think are quite aware of just what their power is in this case?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, you might get a dual answer from this and I think you should probably ask the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Highways and Public Works the same question you are addressing to me, following my answer.

I have no problems at all, in stating that I hope, eventually, the total community, such as the Teslin L.I.D. which includes the Indian Village, the Town of Teslin and also the highway establishment, will come completely and totally under the control of the duly elected members of the Local Improvement District of Teslin.

I think two segments of that population are already in that category, and I would like to see the third segment, namely the Department of Highways and Public Works, fully in co-operation and under the control of the duly elected members of the Local Improvement District of Teslin.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I would concur with that and one of the objects that we have been trying to accomplish for the last two or three years is to break up the government compound and to put the government staff in the normal residential sub-division. We have managed to accomplish that in two L.I.D.s at the moment. I am hoping that this next summer we can accomplish at least one more. The Teslin one gets a little more difficult, in terms of timing, because we also have M.O.T. and C.N.T. involved. It would be my hope that we can accomplish that one move all at once. That is the object of the exercise.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have another question for the Minister of Municipal Services for Indian Villages and Communities. Who is responsible for providing these municipal services? For example, where a village is on the outskirts of an L.I.D. does the territorial government provide these services and are they reimbursed by the Department of Indian Affairs? What is the arrangement, both by having the work done, who does the work and who pays the bills?

Hon. McKinnon: We are providing the services, Mr. Chairman, and we are paying the bills.

Mr. Fleming: I don't like to contradict the Minister because, you know, he is right in some sense, some instances, but I do know ...

Mr. Chairman: That is nice to know.

Mr. Fleming: ... that in the area such as water and so forth that the L.I.D.s do have the authority to charge for the water.

Therefore, it is paid for by either the Indian Affairs or the people themselves and they are reimbursed. In the case of Teslin, for instance, they are reimbursed through Indian Affairs if they are elderly or so forth and so on. That is the way it is done in that L.I.D. Now how you would do it in an L.I.D. that didn't include itself in a community, I have no idea.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there are certain cost-shared operations which are recoverable, such as in Old Crow with the sewage education truck, that are charged back to the Department of Environment. But the fact of the matter still remains that, in Old Crow last year, we spent \$77,289.00. I think if you used the taxable assessment on property you would get something like a dollar and sixty-eight cents back in revenue from the assessable property in Old Crow. The territorial government has no choice because we are responsible for providing services to unorganized areas of picking up the tab to these communities.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes. Under appendix on A-23, we notice under E, Community Assistance Ordinance, we have a community plan for Faro and a community plan for Whitehorse \$25,000.00 and \$40,000.00. How are those FIGURES ARRIVED AT? Are those being negotiated, have they been tendered? Is that a locked-in figure or just how did they come about?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, those are the estimates from the City and that's the cost-sharing program under the Capital Assistance Program, our share of those costs, which have been received for both Faro and the City of Whitehorse.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Further to Municipal Services to Indian communities: does the federal government pay a grant in lieu of taxes? Particularly property taxes on behalf of the Crown Land that is held in trust for the Indian people for their communities.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, if we get it on the assessment roll, we get a grant in lieu. Now that's been part of the problem of identifying all of this property and the buildings on them, but that, in fact, does happen where our assessor has identified properties and improvements, in the name of the Crown we get a grant in

lieu of taxes on those properties.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under E as well. Whitehorse Transit System \$70,000.00. I just wonder if we could have a brief explanation of how this money is to be spent and whether this transit system will, in fact, be coming back every year for more monies or will it run on its own, be self-sustaining?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, under the Capital Assistance Ordinance which was passed by this House, there is a formula under the program where deficit for transit systems will be picked up under the terms of the Capital Assistance Program. If the transit system continues to operate and continues to operate at a deficit, this will be a yearly charge unless the Capital Assistance Program is changed upon the taxpayers of the Yukon.

Mr. Charman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman. Perhaps then, I believe, this is the first year of operation of this system. Perhaps we could be provided with, when the next budget rolls around, with somewhat of an analysis or report as to how this system is operating.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Yukon Territorial Government is part of an evaluation committee which also constitutes the city people, mini-bus system and federal people who are all involved in the funding and that evaluation report will be tabled before members of the Assembly if they so desire.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, a question to Mr. Miller, it was with respect to the federal grants in lieu of taxes. What formula does the federal government use? This is what I'd be interested in. My experiences indicated to me or showed that they come up with any formula that they please. You almost have to accept it. Have you made any progress in this regard, Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge the federal government is now accepting the assessment that is arrived at by our Assessor.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman. I think that it would be really advantageous for us to have a complete assessment done of these areas, particularly if we pass the minimum tax legislation of \$100.00 for each piece of property. It might be well worth our while to get an up-to-date assessment done of these areas. It might be quite revealing.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there is an update of the assessment on a five-year basis. Things happen within that five years which the assessor can't catch. But as he does a re-assessment in a particular area, he catches

everything that is there in that point in time. It may be five years later before he gets around to catching it all again, but anything that comes to his knowledge in the meantime is reflected on the assessment roll.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure we weren't even aware of some of the reserve lands five years ago.

Mr. Miller: I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, these are done on a total five-year basis. They're done on a systematic year-to-year basis. So we may still have missed a few, but by the time the five-year cycle is finished, we have caught them all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Under C - Federal Historic Sites Grant \$2,700.00, is this for the whole territory or is this just for one specific area?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this is in respect of Dawson City only.

Mr. Chairman: \$2,700.00?

Mr. Miller: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. This is a grant. The federal government is not permitted under the Municipal Grants Act of Canada to pay any taxes on historic sites, anywhere in Canada. Because of the unique situation in Dawson, we have arranged, I believe we did this three years ago, we arranged to get the money from the federal government to give to the City of Dawson as a grant in lieu of taxes on behalf of the federal government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Under the allotment for municipal cemeteries, which five were provided for, are these strictly related to the municipalities or, in fact, are they providing also for the L.I.D.s?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would have to check the Capital Assistance Program, but I think it is both L.I.D.s and municipalities that are included in the cemetery grant.

Mr. Chairman: Just municipalities?

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is just a specific grant for municipalities. In the case of L.I.D.s, their monies for maintenance of cemeteries would be included in their budget items.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, perhaps I would like to assure myself that the monies are available within L.I.D.s for the maintenance of their cemeteries. I know in the

case of L.I.D.s , their cemeteries are not necessarily within the boundaries of the L.I.D.s themselves.

They are removed therefrom. But I would like to insure that there are always some funds under the Community Assistance Ordinance, at least, to assist the L.I.D.s in the maintenance and upgrading and surveying of their cemeteries.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that provision is included in the Community Assistance Ordinance. It was in when we started and it is included in the L.I.D.s budget.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, could I go back at this point to 603? We were talking about ...

Mr. Chairman: You will have another chance to take a crack at that later.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Are we clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Just the Whjitehorse frontage tax, is that what the government has to pay to the City of Whitehorse for sewer and water installation in government buildings or what is it?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I am glad the Honourable Member noticed that because, not only under the Capital Assistance Program do we pay 90% of the cost of the main, but then because our property goes by the serviced area, we also have to pay the frontage charges along with it and we pay it in a one-shot deal rather than amortizing it over the life of the project.

It is much cheaper for the government, that it is an added bonus to the City of Whitehorse of \$120,000.00 from the Government of the Yukon.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, then why don't you have it for Dawson or don't you have any government buildings or have you paid it all out?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, there was no ... if they built a new project that went by territorial buildings, then we would have to pay the frontage charges in the municipalities just as we did in the City of Whitehorse. No, we wouldn't have to because we own the sewer and water system in Dawson City.

But in any municipality like Faro where we don't own sewer and water systems, the very same formula would apply. We would have to pay the frontage charges that the municipally-owned systems charged against the user, which would be the Territorial Government, the same as any other individual.

Mr. Chairman: Are we clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Ambulance Service, \$248,504.00. Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I might ask a question. I don't know whether it is in line here or not. I am wondering about the ambulance service now that it is handled by the Department of Highways, I know in our area, I don't know how it is everywhere else; but I am wondering under the L.I.D. system, possibly, if they had a qualified person who was hired for, say, water delivery and so forth and so on, would it be possible for them if they wish to take over the ambulance service as such themselves?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we are making the first step in this direction next year. You will see that there is a \$15,000.00 addition in operation and maintenance. That is because the ambulance at Beaver Creek, Haines Junction and Teslin and Destruction Bay, which are presently the responsibility of the Department of Highways and Public Works, will be turned over to local government in 1976-77 and we have provided the operation and maintenance funds for that turnover.

The Department of Local Government has no objections at all to looking into what contractual arrangements could be made with the Local Improvement Districts if it was mutually beneficial in the area of ambulance service.

Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Mrs. Whyard: I would just like to speak in support of the Department of Local Government when they take over this service and ask if somewhere in their hearts they could find the means and support to provide a cushion or a stool on which a nurse can be seated while accompanying a patient along the rough highways in those ambulances. I have seen some of those vehicles, Mr. Chairman, and there is nowhere to sit, if you are looking after a patient on a stretcher, unless you sit on the floor of the ambulance.

If you put a chair or a stool in there, your head hits the roof of the ambulance. At least one public health nurse, to my knowledge, has provided herself with a tiny little three-legged stool which, I might say, has no cushion, on which she perches while she is looking after the patient on those long rough miles and, you know, perhaps we better pass the hat and take up a collection and provide a stool for some of these vehicles.

Mr. Chairman: I would submit, Mrs. Whyard, perhaps the nurse could lie down on the other stretcher.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to work out a quid pro quo for something that I want from the department.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps

when you're looking around for our vehicle for the Fire Chief, we could find some cushions for the Honourable Minister.

I noticed in this time going through the budget we're not considering capital with each section as we used to. I notice that there is a provision in capital for \$16,000.00 for new equipment. What I'm wondering is are we talking about adding two new ambulances? I somehow have that picked up from somewhere, and if so where would those ambulances be going and how would they relate to the operation of ambulance service under 606?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I haven't got my capital information here with me, but I think it's for replacement of the Fire Marshall's car and one ambulance, if I remember correctly. I will have all the pertinent information when we deal with the capital side of the budget. But I think that's what it is.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little confused. We have quite a refined ambulance service with thirteen employees, and of course, supervisors. However, we do have a medical evacuation scheme defined by regulations. The government does provide evacuation by ambulance and sometime by aircraft. Now maybe it's just bookkeeping, but are we sort of paying for this medical evacuation twice. Are we paying for the maintenance and operation of an ambulance system and are we again paying for the medical evacuation under the medical evacuation vote?

The reason I ask is because I was looking for money here in case somebody had to be evacuated by aircraft rather than ambulance, that's evacuation. So are we paying, are we voting money twice? Whoever can answer?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, a medical evacuation, whether in territory or out of territory, is charged to medical evacuation. There are recoveries against this particular establishment. In other words if there is a medical evacuation that requires an ambulance, it is charged to the medical evacuation vote and shown as a recovery against ambulance services.

Mr. Chairman, shown as a recovery total \$22,000.00.

Mrs. Watson: What's its cost per mile for an ambulance evacuation compared to evacuation by aircraft? I'm sorry to be so specific but I'm trying to compare the two, because I'm sure that ambulance evacuation is fairly expensive today too. Would it be cheaper to do it by aircraft?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman the figures that I have for last year. There were that 968 total calls and the ambulance service cost \$205,938.00 so say a thousand calls for \$200,000.00 would be what \$200.00 a call, roughly that it's costing so it's an expensive service, you better believe it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon has there been any consideration given to relocating the centre of the ambulance service other than at the Whitehorse General

Hospital?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have Mr. Nairn, who is in charge of the ambulance service and the Yukon Fire Marshall presently investigating all the possibilities to try and bring down the cost of \$200.00 a call out to the Government of the Yukon Territory. I find that high.

Mr. Chairman: Included in that investigation is looking for other headquarters is it?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I'm wondering if you could shed any light Mr. McKinnon, on the criteria for hiring of your ambulance attendants?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask Mr. Nairn to bring that criteria to the attention of members of Committee and we'd be most happy to bring it forward.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. McKinnon. I have specific reason for asking of course, because I believe there have been some inconsistencies involved in that program.

I would also like to ask you, Mr. McKinnon, if there is any, what criteria of training do the attendants require in First Aid and what type of a continuing educational program with regard to First Aid is carried on? Would you include that?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I would expect this to be included in the information that the Honourable Member wanted.

Mr. Chairman: A further question, Mr. McKinnon. On page 61 it is cited is the switchboard operator's ambulance attendance. I presume that this is a cost sharing basis with the Northern Health Services. Are you in a position to give us a break down regarding this cost sharing program?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there is no cost sharing in respect of that. We provide these three man years to help them and in lieu we get some free space. That's the cost sharing if you like. There is no money transfers hands.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, another thought has occurred to me, are there now telephones placed in each ambulance in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Not in all of them, but we are getting there. I think the Dawson was the last one to receive one, Mr. Chairman. The areas where the ambulance attendants have really found it of absolute necessity, and have been going after the Department of Local Government, I think those areas are slowly getting their communications system worked out.

This is another shared responsibility between the

Department of Highways and Public Works and myself. I believe there were some difficulties in obtaining the equipment that was to go into the ambulances the last time I spoke to Mr. Baker and Mr. Campion.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there is no problem getting the equipment. All the ambulances where there is V.H.F. are now equipped. There are certain areas in the Yukon where we still do not have V.H.F. highway coverage, so there was no point in putting that equipment in.

It is in the process and as we get the V.H.F. system operating on all highways they will gradually be put into the ambulances.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I was thinking particularly where the C. N. system exists?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller .; Well, Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge they are there where there is a V.H.F. system in operation.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, that depends on the question you are asking as to how this thing relates. I asked the other day about V.H.F. and I was informed, well gee, you know at night time there is nobody in government around the V.H.F. systems. Now I am talking about ambulances, and I am talking about somebody being around the clock and that is why I am talking telephones. What is the answer?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there is a base station at Whitehorse General Hospital which is used by ambulance service and to my knowledge it will provide inter-connect from the C.N.T. system into the base station.

Now where we have some problem where we have our own V.H.F. system it does not have inter-connect as yet, and secondly, where our V.H.F. system does not provide coverage on the highway. What I am suggesting is where there is V.H.F. equipment providing inter-connect to the main at the hospital, that is available in those ambulances.

Mr. Chairman: Are we clear?

Department of Local Government, \$3,360,504.00.
Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Before we leave this establishment I would like to go back to 603, if I may. I have one question of the Minister of Local Government or Mr. Miller.

I would like to know if I am correct in this assumption, that assessment charges are made to the various municipalities for assessing services, and I would like to know what portion of the total charges is recovered. I believe that this year some of the municipalities are experiencing rather a -- the receipt of a large bill for these services. I want to know if they were given prior knowledge of this, was there a schedule of fees provided? Can you give me a little detail on that?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there are Commissioner's Orders available on this. There is a provision in the Taxation Ordinance that the municipalities are liable for this fee, the amount of the fee on a per hour, or per day basis is set out by Commissioner's Order. There was some problem in 1975 in that there was two years billed in one. In 1976 the Municipality of Whitehorse particularly is going to have a fairly hefty bill because we are going the total re-assessment. The proportion of charges that will be billed out in 1976 or are estimated to be billed out in 1976, of the hundred and thirty-nine thousand dollars expense, we are anticipating a one hundred thousand dollar recovery because we will be spending the majority of our time in the municipalities during the 1976 year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: At a time convenient I would like a detail of how you are recovering that hundred thousand, what from Whitehorse and what from -- just at your convenience.

Mr. Miller: We could try and get an estimate of how this was built up.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, section 9 sub 1 of the Taxation Ordinance states. "that the taxing authority for which the assessment was prepared shall pay the cost of the work done by the Assessor to the Commissioner". One of the first things that happened when I got into the office next door was a little note by the Commissioner saying, "are the taxing authorities for which the assessment was done, are they paid the cost of the work done by the assessor?" The answer, Mr. Chairman, was in the negative, though it was bound by law for the Commissioner to make such charges and under the Commissioner's Order now in effect, they are paying those charges.

Mr. Chairman: We are now complete with the discussion of Vote Number 6.
Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we can clear this vote as yet, because of 605, the one item that nobody considered was the Home Owner Tax Relief item of \$400,000.00 which would be in abeyance until some decision is made on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I have the Yukon Mosquito Control program which I haven't read into the record.

Mr. Chairman: I will now declare a brief recess.

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. We will continue with the discussion of Vote number 7, Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information. We now have Mr. Peter Gillespie with us as a witness. Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before we start into Vote Number 7 if I could distribute some answers to questions raised the other day with regard to the Territorial Secretary's Department and these have to do with revenues from lottery sales, revenues from weigh scales and policies and forms for motor vehicle and medical examinations. If I could just pass these around Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: By all means. I refer you to page 63 and Appendix, page 25. Administration, \$850,403.00. Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the drastic reduction in the advertising and public promotion section of this Establishment. To me, this is one of the most important aspects of this administration and when you think of the difference between '75 - '76 estimates and '76 - '77, there is \$51,000.00 more in the budget, after the revised supplementals, but we are getting half the advertising and public promotion.

Now, I wonder is this going to -- is the benefit from the advertising and public promotion going to go somewhere else or is there just a straight cut down of services there?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this is the point to describe what we are trying to do overall within this total tourism and information budget. Within that budget, there are basically three activities, one is parks and campgrounds, the second is information services. And finally, there is tourism.

Information services, will to all intents and purposes, carry on as they have during the course of this year with the addition of any inquiry center for the new territorial building. Campgrounds and parks will likewise carry on at pretty much the same level of activity as has been the case of this year -- during the course of this year.

Tourism, however, has been the subject of some very, very, close examination by the Executive Committee and this has resulted in a complete reordering of priorities within that tourism budget. Along with that priority reordering, a reallocation of resources primarily taken from the advertising and promotion area into the planning area.

Within the advertising and promotion, while the sum of money has decreased from \$234,000.00 to \$119,000.00, the hope is that with that \$119,000.00 we can maintain the number of tourists that have come into the Yukon during this year, during next year and in subsequent years. This is a hold the line budget with regard to the number of tourists.

Up until now, the main thrust of the tourism activity has been to go outside the territory and by means of promoting and advertising to push tourists into the Yukon. Little attention or relatively little attention has been paid to the amenities that we have here, to the services that we provide, to the attractions that we have, to rationalizing all these things and indeed, to determine what it is that the Yukon wants to have in the way of a tourism industry, what it is that the people

want to have by way of recreation and indeed what it is that the tourists are expecting and hoping to find when they get here.

Little work has been done in that area and we have come to the realization that it is time now that we started to find out what it is that we need to do within the Yukon and spend our money and our efforts in that area rather than going outside and spending our money pushing tourists into the Yukon. We want to develop a situation where we have the kind of tourism plant in the Yukon that Yukoners want and that this tourism plant be good enough in its own right to pull people in so that we don't have to go out and spend all our money outside.

The value and the worth of the facilities and attractions that we have here should do their own selling. What this amounts to is a planning phase within the Tourism Department, where first of all we will need to conduct an inventory of what it is that we have, find out secondly what it is that the Yukon wants.

Do we want to, forever and a day, increase the level of tourism at a rate of 15 percent a year or 25 percent a year or do we want to keep it at approximately the level we have now in order to retain the fabric and the atmosphere of the Yukon as it exists today?

Secondly, what is it that the residents want by way of recreational facilities? What is it the tourists want when they get here? What are the problems that we have in this regard and what opportunities do we have to move into?

Once we have identified these things, we can then move into a planning phase very quickly to determine how we go about correcting the wrongs that we have around us and bringing these into an implementation. So, our budget, as you see it before you here, is one that is designed in the area of tourism to retain the level of tourism that we have had in the past, but to bring about a whole new thrust in terms of how the people within our Tourism Department spend their time.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, perhaps Mr. Gillespie could then comment on the professional and special services which is a tremendous increase and the other part that interests me is the grants, loans and contributions, \$20,000.00 to Yukon societies. To whom are they going?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, the professional and special services is mainly--will be mainly used for consultants to the extent that we find that we need them to carry out an inventory of the services and attractions, the accommodation that we have. First of all that inventory. Secondly, what supply problems do we have in relation to that which is being demanded by Yukon residents and the tourists. Thirdly, it is important for us to know more than we do now about the expenditure patterns of tourists, where the economic impact of these expenditures really falls on enterprise with regard to taxation, on construction and so on.

An examination of things like manpower training, for the lodges, we are offering very little at the moment by way of training for management and staff. There has been a report by Synergy done I think two years ago,

which proposed a model concept for the consolidation of attractions and services in various areas around the Yukon. That needs to be examined and this kind of thing.....

We haven't at this point in time, fully determined how we are going to spend that money to the extent to which it can be done by the people we have in our own staff. But we have limited staff resources and we will be needing to bring in consultants to help us out in some of these areas.

Ms. Millard: The other part was the grants.

Mr. Gillespie: Oh, sorry. The grants in Appendix A25, I believe they are listed there. Oh, okay, the difference between last year and this year, the \$6,000.00 is the \$6,000.00 that was provided to the Klondike Visitors Association which will not be provided to them this year.

Ms. Millard: May I ask you where did the other part go?

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard:

Ms. Millard: Sorry.

Mr. Gillespie: The other \$20,000.00 or the \$20,000.00 is distributed on the advice of the Tourist Advisory Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, on that subject also I was wondering, it is very interesting the change in the philosophy in this department and it certainly has my support in principle that you are looking into the whole tourism field and trying to assess what we have and why we attract people and whether we can do it without spending as much money, which is an excellent point of view.

I was wondering if there has been any input from the Tourist Advisory Board in that regard? Do they have much to say on that to you or has that been decided without their advice?

Mr. Gillespie: Up to this point in time, well, there has been a meeting of the Tourist Advisory Board. The Board has dealt with a number of the problem areas and identified a number of the problem areas that they see in the tourism industry here in the Yukon and these matters that I have mentioned to you have been discussed at some length by them and we have their recommendations in this regard.

For example, they noted that training is a serious problem in the Yukon. So, that is one problem that we are hoping--or planning to look into in this coming year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am quite pleased to hear Mr. Gillespie say that there is going to be a re-emphasis or some change of priorities with respect to the tourist industry. It is so often that many of the provinces have said and gone out on a promotion

program of saying we have facilities, we want you to come and they spend a lot of money in the states promoting and then when you go to the north country and Yukon is an example of this, the facilities are not there.

I would like to see and certainly would welcome a real major thrust with respect to providing some incentives to whatever form they may be, to the local lodge owners, to the people that are interested in getting in the business, to help them update those facilities, possibly to eliminate some of the facilities that we do have right now that shouldn't be in existence because they too are a thorn probably in the industry.

But I would like to really know and I ask the question of Mr. Gillespie of how are you going to involve Yukoners in deciding what they want for Yukon and the tourist industry? How physically--how are you going to do this? How are you going to let people be in on the decision making?

Mr. Gillespie: In a number of ways Mr. Chairman. First of all, there is the Tourist Advisory Committee or Council and their views will be sought extensively on how this should be done. Secondly, whereas in the past, our tourism staff has spent a considerable amount of time outside the Territory promoting tourism in the Yukon. The same staff will be spending much of that time travelling the roads of the Yukon, meeting with the operators, meeting with the people who are using the campgrounds and so on and getting their input.

So, while the travel budget this year is pretty much the same--in this coming year, it is pretty much the same as it is this year. Most of that money is intended to be spent within the Yukon as opposed to flying outside the Yukon.

This is how we hope to get that together with seminars and whatever else may be appropriate to help us out, in getting a feel what really it is that Yukon wants.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, about two years ago this summer, there was an announcement made by the Federal Office of Tourism that some three million dollars would be assigned to the Northern Territories for a tourism study. A study of tourism problems I believe was how it was described. I remember hearing this announcement on my car radio out at Haines Junction, I thought "Yipee, if they would just hand over the three million to the tourism operators we could solve all the problems". I have been making an attempt ever since to find out what happened and was there such a study, has this government ever received any benefit from that study? I've never had any information, Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if Mr. Gillespie might be able to assist us?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, not much by way of information to help you out with your question. C.G.O.T., the Canadian Government Office of Tourism last year cost shared in the study that we conducted. There was some of the Synergy studies relating to historic sites and this kind of thing. They helped us out with those studies by providing us with funding.

However, that funding we are now told has gone by

the wayside for this coming year, and the Canadian Government Office of Tourism's budget has been severely cut back along with this general financial constraint program of the Federal Government. So I don't expect that we're going to be seeing much more than moral support coming from that source in this coming year.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Well, Mr. Chairman I'm sure it would be an unanimous opinion of all tourist operator along the Alaska Highway that all they needed was an eight cent stamp and they could have given them the answers to most of the problems.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, while we're on the subject of advertising and public promotion, another annual question has the administration as yet looked into the possibility of providing commercial industrial advertising in an effort to encourage industry as well as tourists to come to the Yukon, to settle in the Yukon. Perhaps provide some of the facilities as referred to by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Gillespie: The closest thing that I can come to that, that I'm aware of that is ongoing in our program is an attempt that is being made and will be made to bring in more conventions into the Yukon. That's the kind of tourist entrance into the Yukon that provides resources during the shoulder seasons, as they call it, early in the spring or late in the fall when most of the other tourists have gone.

I don't think—in terms of industrial development Mr. Chairman, directly I think we're providing very little by way of direct advertising or certainly incentive in that area. We're hopeful to the extent that they can do so, the Chamber of Commerce for example in the City of Whitehorse, will do more than they have been able to do in the past in this area for one thing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, that really doesn't answer my question. My concern lies in the whole area of encouraging industries into the Yukon to come here and base industries, secondary industries, oh, I could think of many things resulting from the forest products industry and the manufacturing of certain items. Utilizing our forest products, encouraging more in service and supply areas, and this type of thing and encouraging people to settle, not necessarily in Whitehorse, but to develop the other regions and communities and areas of the Yukon.

It is here that I express my concern and I've done this about every year. It seemed to me at one point in time, that the administration were giving some very serious consideration to this, some years ago. I think it's important that if we have the manpower and if we have the funds and we can get some productivity going along this line that we should be doing this. This of course is what gave rise to my question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on some things that the witnesses said regarding doing an analysis of facilities and the attractions we have in the Yukon as far as the tourist industry, that a lot of the operators will have to upgrade and possibly expand some of their facilities. And that's why I was on my feet yesterday regarding the 10 mills. Let's give this industry, these businesses a chance to get going, and get expanded and then let's look at an extra taxation structure.

Some Members: Hear, Hear.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if it's possible for the administration to give us copies of the Resolutions which were passed by the Tourist Advisory Board in the last meeting?

Mr. Gillespie: By all means.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Question for Mr. Gillespie: has this Department explored, and I am sure you have but I would like to know to what extent and what results you have had, have they explored the possibilities of the funding that is available through the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce for the tourist industry. The special ARTA programs that are directed at people who want to develop lodges and utilize Indian help, native help, there are some very good programs this way that are available.

I ask also, how about the Dree Program, the incentive side of the Dree program, and I can see Mr. Miller sitting there shaking his head because I realize, you know, maybe we have a Minister that doesn't want some of these other departments in here. There are some hang-ups with getting this kind of incentive and this kind of assistance. We have talked around this table many times but there are programs available that do offer some real assistance to individuals in the form of financial aid and I don't just want to give financial aid for the sake of giving it. I want to see some results where there is a true updating of facilities and there has to be an input by that individual.

There is no way that I want to give a free handout. I like to see 60, 70% of somebody's input and then he can get some aid, but there are programs available like this and I would like to know really, have we explored those possibilities and what sort of answer have we got on them and what is your department's feelings about it?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can answer the question put by Mr. Lengerke and that by Mr. Taylor together at the same time by saying that we are concerned about the lack of development or economic development activity or attention being paid by this government at this point in time and we are not doing very much directly with industry to promote their entry into the Yukon once they are coming, to ease their way into

the Yukon.

We don't have incentive programs. Frankly, if we started to do this now, moved into a program of this sort, we would botch the job because we lack the expertise, we don't really know exactly where it is that the Yukon should be going economically and nor do we know how to get there and in this coming year we have put in our budget at an earlier -- I think it's in Vote 1, an economic position.

Now, the object of that position is to start to provide us with some of those answers so that we know where we are going before we start to go there. The questions that you have raised, that you have both raised -- the questions that have been raised by both members, are the reason that we are bringing in this man so that we can start to answer those very same questions.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Under professional and special services, since the tourist information office is no longer residing in Dawson City any more and K.V.A. is in the process of hiring a general manager with the specific ideas that Mr. Gillespie outlined to us to study the needs and everything, especially in the Dawson area and the Yukon as a whole.

Can K.V.A. charge back some of the costs incurred during this study to this government and the professional and special services?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, discussions are currently going on between K.V.A. and our tourism people on that very subject that Mr. Berger has raised.

While we are not going to have a man stationed full-time in Dawson this coming year, we are hoping and have every assurance that the K.V.A. will provide us with assistance by way of advice in answering many of these questions that we would like raised and dealt with.

In return for that help, we are negotiating with them right now with the idea of providing somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5,000.00 towards that person's salary, the one that the K.V.A. is planning to hire this year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: A supplementary, I was thinking, instead of coming up with an outright grant system, I think it would be better off to come up with a cost-sharing basis because some of the programs K.V.A. is going to do and some of the programs that the Territorial Government are going to do in this particular field is going to overlap and I think it would be much better off to outline the program specifically first and then share the costs of it somehow or another.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, that may well be the outcome of these discussions that are going on between K.V.A. and our tourism people at this point in time. The last I heard, they hadn't resolved entirely how they were going to effect this but it could be it will end up in the way in which you suggest.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, under grants, loans and contributions, I see we have a reduction from \$26,000.00 to \$20,000.00 and I understand it just says contributions to the Yukon's societies.

Does this relate strictly to society promoting tourism or would it also affect museums in fact?

Mr. Gillespie: If, Mr. Chairman, if a museum contributes towards the development of tourism, then it would qualify for this grant. Now, this is an operating grant. Any monies towards construction of museums will be handled separately under a Capital Museum Grant which is shown here as \$30,000.00, but it could go to museums, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of concern to me the development of some funds being made available to museums in relation to the tourism aspect because, of course, it is the tourist that we like to see go through our museums and perhaps view a little of our history that is found there.

It is also, though, a concern to me that many museums are attempting to hold on to materials that should properly remain in the Territory but can't purchase these materials because they simply don't have the funds to pay the individuals who have these collections and this type of thing. It's a concern to me that these materials are leaving the Yukon and, indeed, I'll say this: many Americans in the State of Alaska, they virtually looted the Dawson area. Some people of our own as well have looted the country and carted this stuff out and it now resides in rumpus rooms and things of this nature across Canada.

It is a tragedy to see this part, or any part, of the history of our Territory disappearing in this way simply because there are no funds available to compensate the people who would be willing to part with this material. That's what gave rise to my question upon which societies would be eligible for any part of this small \$20,000.00 grant, and whether museums would be considered.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, the purchase of artifacts would be a capital item as opposed to an O & M item. We agree entirely as an Executive Committee with Mr. Taylor's sentiments. This year, for the first time, you'll see on page 99 capital item Museum Construction Contributions in the amount of \$30,000.00. In the past, this was to provide funds in aid of construction of new museum buildings and the expansion of existing museum buildings only. That's all that was provided for in the vote wording.

This year, we've added in the vote wording and for the acquisition of historical artifacts and the reason that we put that in there is just the very reason that you've described, that we're concerned about the disappearance of artifacts and our inability to purchase these in some way or another and get them into our museums where they belong, as opposed to either private residences or outside of the territory where they can only go illegally but they nevertheless get there.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Yes, my question is under Museum Construction 2709 and under that area where it says museum construction contributions. I presume that's a percentage of the \$30,000.00 since the general guidelines are only for O & M in the first place. What would the percentage be towards construction of new museums of the \$30,000.00 or is that completely up to the Tourist Advisory Council?

Mr. Gillespie: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all it's not completely up to the Tourist Advisory Council, I want to make this very clear. The Tourist Advisory Council is there to advise the government and the government, generally speaking, would take the advice of the Tourist Advisory Council but we bear the responsibility for the decisions that are made. Therefore, we accept advice, not decisions, from them.

The Tourist Advisory Council -- we expect the Tourist Advisory Council will help us decide on how this \$30,000.00 will be allocated. We don't know to what extent that money will go toward construction of new museums, the extension or expansion of existing museums or the purchase of artifacts. This is something that we don't know the answer to yet. But very substantially less, very much less, will go to museum construction under this here.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: So we can presume that less than fifty percent of the \$30,000.00 will go to new construction?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that question until we've seen the application, the request for funding.

Ms. Millard: I'd just like to put a little plug in here for Old Crow. They have asked for a museum which has nothing to do with tourism and I think it's something that really needs to be considered and needs to be looked at very thoroughly and already has been by the Tourism Department for about a year actually. They want to start a museum of natural history which takes into consideration the archaeological findings outside of Old Crow which are some of the best in North America. It doesn't come under any of these priorities.

It seems to me last year that there weren't this many detailed general guidelines discussing tourism all over the place, because it was much easier for a description of a natural museum to come under this. But in this one, it says the grants are depending upon the importance of the project with respect to tourism development, must have a specific application to the tourism industry, etcetera. It rather frightens me. I'm just wondering if I could have some assurance that the application from Old Crow will be considered on its own merits.

Mr. Gillespie: The criteria set out for museum, for contributions to Yukon Societies, refer to the O & M aspects of it. We don't have similar criteria for museum construction, which tie as clearly to tourism per se. So they'll take their chances there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I am very, very glad to hear the Administration say that they are looking into the possibility -- some way of helping the tourist establishments to make it better for the tourists when they do come to this country I am in full agreement with the philosophy that what you have here, is the best advertising promotion you will ever get, because you'll get most of it for free. In fact you are being paid for, instead of paying yourself for it.

Hopefully through the Advisory Committees and so forth, boards, that you will find what is actually needed in the territory. I've lived here many, many years and I have yet to see, on the whole Alaska Highway or any where in the Yukon actually, there has ever been anything to actually help a small businessman get started to put in a good tourist establishment. I worked here when we had to sell our gasoline for nothing, due to circumstances that we couldn't control. I've been through the era where we have had the tourist starting to come into this country, and they are coming into this country quite a few of them now. Myself, I have had letters and all of us have had letters and letters from the Tourist Bureau, as I call it, saying that we could do this to upgrade our establishments, we can do something else to upgrade your establishment, and you would promote the industry for the government and so forth.

But never have I seen where there was some advice as to what we would use to do this with, or where we would get it. The only thing that I have seen in the Yukon Territory is the Small Loans Act which came in that helped in the odd place get started. Again I must commend the administration, I'm all for that system if we can find a way.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Matson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, The witness, have you any plans for increasing the number of information centres you will be operating this year or will you continue at the same level and at the same place that you've operated in the last fiscal year?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, there are no plans to change, to establish new information centres or to change their locations in this coming year.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a further question. I understand that you are not having a tourism officer, program officer in Dawson City. You haven't decreased your man years, where will this position be now located?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, that position will be moved to Whitehorse to help with this overall planning effort that I was talking about earlier.

That position will travel the territory, in other words, and meet with lodge owners and so on.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: A further question then. The information centre, again and, of course, you probably realize the reason I asked the question is the Burwash Museum

is planning on putting sort of an information centre in there. Now if the government is not going to be establishing the centre, then the society will have to establish their own and request a cost sharing on the operation and maintenance costs of that centre.

Mr. Gillespie: That's correct. I'm not sure at this point in time, I can't honestly say how we would respond to such a request when it came.

It could be a matter for a contribution by the territory. It could be a matter if they're doing things, on our behalf, that we would otherwise do, that we could share out of our own budget, from other parts of our budget. We would have to examine that one when the request comes.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe you had the request for two months already.

Mr. Gillespie: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I will have to look into that.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, while we're taking a close look at the whole running of tourism in the Yukon and everything else. I'd just like to comment on what it is like to live in a tourist town. I'm hoping that the department will take a close look at this, because it's very important to people who live in Dawson, the number of tourists who come in, the population is doubled every day. It becomes harder and harder to live there as a citizen of Dawson City.

I've noticed over the past few years there has been a lot of bitterness on the part of people living in Dawson towards the tourists. I'm wondering if the government will consider encouraging the local people to take part in the whole tourism industry. Particularly in a place like Dawson City where Historic Sites is coming in and putting millions of dollars into the place. They're becoming one of the largest employers in Dawson City. They're employing outside people. I know their policy is to hire locally, but they do hire outside people, in certain jobs. So we're overwhelmed in the summer time by Historic Sites employees, by tourists from California and God knows where else. The poor little guy who lives in Dawson is having a hard time adjusting to all of this.

I know about this, personally, because I live in a little cabin that the tourists stop by all the time. I'm finding it harder and harder to be polite to them. I think that if the government would look at it closely there is a great amount of energy and interest in Dawson, in the local citizens there, in the tourism industry if it can be encouraged if small business, under the small businesses loans if they were encouraged to set up a little tea shop or anything like this, or even just to have some training so that they know more about their own town so they can answer tourists in a polite way, with some interest in the town itself.

It's a very important aspect I think because people, more and more, I find in Dawson in the summer, are leaving Dawson for the summer. It used to be that they'd leave for the winter, but now I know on the weekends myself, I'm glad to get out of Dawson because there are too many tourists.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps, Ms. Millard you could solve the problem by uping the admission fee to your

cabin.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, we're hoping to conduct impact studies, I think I mentioned this earlier, both in the Kluane area and in the Dawson area. Both we and the Federal Government, we're encouraging them to do this, and I think they're planning to do this in any event, to determine what will be the effect of a tremendous increase in the numbers of tourists in these areas. In fact whether the people there want them and whether the Yukon wants them.

From what we learn from those studies, perhaps we can develop plans to do just the kind of thing that Ms. Millard was talking about, and that is involve the local citizens in more constructive way, if that's what indicated. We don't have those answers now. I must honestly admit we have to do this prior work before we have them.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I have an observation just to make on the comments of the Honourable Member that certainly Dawson is one of the areas where I think I was talking of incentives and all the rest of it. I think certainly there are lots of incentives there for anybody that is interested in getting into the tourist business because certainly there is almost a captive market there for the customers certainly.

But I have a question for Mr. Gillespie with respect to Yukon House and I would like to know what the cost is to operate that facility, the total cost, not just manpower but if there is any rental accommodations and the rest of it, and I think I have some idea of what do but I would like to hear it from you what exactly they do and if it's really the - is it the intent to someday along the line to expand that operation or curtail it or - can we have a comment there?

Mr. Gillespie: All my answers seem to be pretty much the same. We have been examining or in the process right now of examining the whole Yukon. You are just going to have to take this as a matter of faith.

What we are doing now is providing liaison with tourists that seek information from Yukon House about the Yukon. We also provide information to any industry that plans to move up here and wants to know anything about the Yukon. Some promotional work, some advertising work is done out of Yukon House but that has been the role for the last several years and we are, at the present time, questioning that role.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I am glad to hear their questioning it and I hope they question it pretty fast because, you know, with all due respect, I am sure I don't even know the people that staff Yukon House but I have certainly been on the receiving end of inquiries coming from Yukon House asking for information that I thought that they should be providing and I would hope that, you know, really what is the sense of having a place down there. I would rather see the money that is used to maintain Yukon House and the salaries go to the help of some lodge operator that wants to add a room on or something.

You know, I hope that you are questioning this and questioning it fast and not spending dollars more and

more years in examining these things.

I have another question also. What percentage of loans, of the loans, as granted under the Small Business Loans Act, I guess it is, have really been for the direct involvement or benefit of the tourist industry? In other words, how many lodge owners, how many facility owners has it actually helped and what are the amounts of money? What is the maximum you can get? Is it a \$50,000.00 maximum in there or it is \$100,000.00?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the maximum under the present loan situation is \$50,000.00 and without going back and looking at all the loans, from memory, my suggestion would be that about 50 percent of that has gone into tourist industry. That would probably represent something in the neighbourhood of \$600,000.00!?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Just further to that, Mr. Chairman, I make this observation. I say that if you are going to update facilities and try to encourage this to happen in the tourist industry, that \$50,000.00 isn't enough per facility, per loan and I think that some special effort should be made, maybe a special category should be provided under the small business loans to increase that amount of money if you are going to be involved in the tourist industry because after all, it is number one or number two industry and I think some funding should be available there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the intent of the Small Business Loan Act was not to get into the big lending field. That money is available through I. D. B. or the New Federal Development Bank and I can give you a number of instances, I won't, but I could give you a number of instances where I. D. B. has put over a half a million dollars into a particular facility. There is four or five and in my view, they are able to offer a much better program than the Small Business Loan because they have got the whole expertise of I. D. B. behind them.

Mr. Chairman: Like the A & W Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: I will not comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to get at here is this, that sure I. D. B., there is many lending agencies that will lend money to somebody who wants to get in, you know, into a lodge or a -- but what I would like to see is if we, as a government, make some money available specifically for this, and it is coupled with the loans that are available by I. D. B. or the other lending agencies but we can attach some further -- what do we say -- priorities or standards or requirements with that.

In other words, we really want to focus on what kind of facilities we want down that highway and I think we should be looking at a few key facilities.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I might remind all

members that Small Business Loan Act is an act of Parliament, not the Territory, we administer it for Canada and that is all.

Mrs. Watson: Under their regulations?

Mr. Miller: Under their regulations. So, we really have very little say in this. At one time, it was a very useful thing in the Yukon. In the last couple of years, there have been very few applicants who were granted loans. You know, the number of applicants is decreasing because the other lending institutes are picking it up. The interest rate is the I. D. B. interest rate, and as I indicated earlier, we can't help them in any other way. We have never placed any restriction on them as to what they were going to build or where they were going to build, if they had the title as long as they met the National Building Code standards and that's all we felt that we could do.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Just for clarification, isn't it true that you can use the combination of the Small Business Loan and the I. D. B. and I think this is what the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale is actually referring to and I don't think that the Small Business Loan needs to be expended if you already can use the facilities from one side and then go on the other side and go one step further.

Mr. Miller: Well, we have got a dozen loans out that I am aware of where I. D. B. or some other lending institute, has another loan on top of ours. So, we started the thing and let's go on and they had to go elsewhere to get further funding. But, yes, certainly it can be combined.

Mr. Chairman: I would be interested Mr. Miller in whether there is a significant rate of failure of recovery as far as these loans are concerned.

Mr. Miller: From the Small Business Loan position, Mr. Chairman --

Mr. Chairman: Yes, that's what I meant.

Mr. Miller: -- to my knowledge to date, we have had two write-offs totalling some \$9,000.00. We have a couple of others in the mill at the moment, where we are trying to dispose of assets, and it would appear that we are not going to lose anything on those.

So, I think for all intents and purposes, to date, and I realize that there is a fair amount of delinquency in payment, but that's part of the program, we will extend time where there is adequate reason to extend time. The interests continues in spite of the extension of time, but, to date, we have not really had a bad failure rate.

Mr. Chairman: That is very commendable. Mr. Gillespie, what is the monetary -- Mr. Gillespie? What is the monetary contribution of the Department towards the Yukon Day at the races?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the figure at my finger tips. Mr. Miller tells me it is -- I believe it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1,500.00. Our intention for this coming year, though, is to drop that

contribution. It is something that we can't afford at the present era of constraint.

Mr. Chairman: Very good. I am glad to hear it. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, when we were considering supplementaries a number of days ago, I raised the question about exit survey and I don't recall getting any clear answer on it.

At this point in time, I would like to ask if it is the intention of the administration to continue this exit survey? I would also like to know what the results were of the exit survey last year and whether or not it really, in a cost benefit sense, was of any value to the Territory, the Travel and Publicity Department, and or whether it was just a place to put some young people to work.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the visitor exit survey that was conducted last spring will be of very real value to our tourism people when they are in the process of planning. The difficulty at the moment is that we don't have the results of that survey because it was funded totally by the Federal Government, although we provided the local supervision and management of the survey. They provided the money and they are also providing the computer services that are going to take the results and convert these into statistical findings resulting from the survey.

This has to take its place in the line of other surveys that have also been conducted by the Federal Government. When they get around to putting our cards into the computer, then we'll get the answers to that. We are told that we probably won't get that before May this year. When we have those answers, we'll have a much better idea as to their value. I believe, Mr. Taylor, you were also asking whether this is a survey that we would plan to repeat in the future. The answer is that, hopefully, the Federal Government, with our assistance, our administrative assistance, will repeat this from time to time in the future so that we get some kind of idea of trends as they develop.

We may be getting one kind of tourist today seeking one type of amenity and another kind of tourist coming tomorrow or two years down the line. So, we are hopeful that they will conduct a survey on a periodic basis but the extent to which we hope that will depend upon how valuable we find this first survey.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering if it is intended that this would continue this year for sure. I think that in a way that perhaps I would agree that maybe every, say, three years or something this could be of value. I was going to say, if it is for any reason continued this year, we should also determine how many people are pulling out of the Territory as residents for other reasons than, you know, if they are going to stop vehicles and they are going to stop Yukon vehicles as well, I would suppose, maybe they could determine how many people are leaving the Territory because of the high cost of living in the Territory at this time and there is lots, believe me.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, the study will not be repeated this year. We are in the throws of discussing with the parks people the possibility of another study

and that is a study on the recreational demands and desires of Yukoners. That study, I don't expect though, will provide the answer to the particular question that you have raised with regard to departures from the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, since your Department is examining things this year, maybe you could let me know if your Department will be working in conjunction with the National Parks Branch in co-ordinating the planning the development of the park and planning for any other development that the Territorial Government will be providing in that area and how long are you going to be examining and how long is the park going to be planning until we have some actual action?

Mr. Gillespie: That will be a long process, Mr. Chairman. It has been a long process, I will agree, and the nature of the parks development is such that we have no control over the pace at which they develop but we have arranged and now have under way a Committee with representation from the Kluane area, from the National Parks Service and from the Territorial Government. So that all three levels of government are appraised of these plans as they develop and the implications for all the Federal, Territorial and Municipal agencies that might be affected by these plans as they develop. But I think I can assure you that this is going to be a long process and I can give you no assurance that it can be speeded up. We are at their mercy, entirely, when it comes to the speed of development of Kluane National Park and of Dawson City for that matter.

But in both places, we are trying to keep ourselves attuned to all the implications of all their planning.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: The Honourable Member - what do you represent? May I ask the witness, he may not be able to answer it, but there has been some public notice, I believe, by the National Parks that they will be preparing - will be presenting - some major plan within the next year, and that they will be presenting it to the people of the territory. That's all that I had ever been able to obtain. Would your branch have more information? Would the government have more information on that?

Mr. Gillespie: We have had no concrete information as to exactly when this plan will come out, that I can recall, other than that they hope to announce their provisional plan for the first major access corridor into Kluane National Park sometime this spring. Beyond that, I have no firm information on when the overall master plan will be made available to the public.

I do know though that, once it is made available to the public, there will be a series of public hearings on that plan.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, while we are talking in the general area of tourism and more particularly around national parks, I have had a lot of representation

to me about the area around Kathleen Lake and the concern with residents there of the cottages and this type of thing.

Another concern is that the danger of perhaps the park people encouraging people to use boats and this type of thing on Kathleen Lake. The nature of the lake is one that gets sudden winds and it is very, very easy to drown people on this particular lake. I am wondering if any consideration has been given to the withdrawal of Kathleen Lake from the National Park and putting it under territorial control?

Mr. Gillespie: This is not a consideration that has come to my attention. I don't think there are any plans to do that -- that certainly that the Federal Government has. At the time though, they come out with what they call their provisional master plan and that is the plan they bring to the public for public hearings.

There will be an opportunity, then, for concerned citizens to express these worries that you described and to get them to include in their regulations that this is what is required, stipulations, restrictions, as required, to keep people out of those dangerous situations.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me with the rigidity of the National Parks Act and the problems I've seen in other provinces - I was, for instance, in Waskesiu in the Prince Albert National Park last summer - and they have no end of problems with people who were resident there before the park existed and successors of people who were residents there before the park existed.

It seems to me that the Government of the Yukon Territory should be in some position before this whole thing is finalized to negotiate for people who are going to be caught up within the park boundaries and negotiate on their behalf, you know, setting down conditions of agreement with the National Parks Branch before this whole thing gets off the ground. These people are just going to get booted out of these and I don't think they should. I think they're good Yukoners, a lot of them have been here a long time. I think it behoves the Government of the Yukon Territory to accord them in final negotiations with the park people. Some security of tenure, shall we say, that the work and effort that they've undertaken within the park will not be destroyed as it has been in some other national parks, where these considerations were not given.

Chairman: Perhaps I best declare a brief recess. We seem to be going on in this for some length. So let's have a recess.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. In discussion of establishment 700. Are we clear?
Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: I'll bow to the Honourable Member from Riverdale.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I have to repeat my comments earlier. I listened to Mr. Gillespie provide us with an insight into what the policies, what the objectives or what some of the objectives might be, with

respect to this establishment.

I'd like, at this time, in fact, I would say this, my own opinion on this is that I would not be willing to clear this establishment until I've got in my hand some kind of a written policy, program by objective. I'd like to really know what's going to happen by the end of this year with respect to all these dollars. And certainly with respect to the new policy in program that Mr. Gillespie has outlined. As I said I commend him, I commend him wholeheartedly for the complete turn around on this but I'd really like to know where the hell we're going to be at the end of this year with respect to this?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie is it possible to accommodate the member from Riverdale?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, the answer is not, the short answer is no. Mr. Chairman we've gone through the agonies of determining what it is we're going to be trying to achieve over the next year or two. It is as I described it earlier on. We haven't yet gone through the exercise of determining precisely the steps that we're going to take to achieve that. I don't have those answers and I don't expect to have them in terms of precisely what studies are to be undertaken by whom toward what objective when. Which is the way to answer properly the question Mr. Lengerke has raised. I cannot provide those answers now. We're not at that stage of development.

Mr. Chairman...: Mr. Gillespie, you're talking more like a politician less like an administrator ever day.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we voted him 27 man years to help him do that job. Would it not be possible to come out with an outline, at least, as what you want to accomplish this year. Rather than just speaking completely in generalities. You're expecting us to be quite generous, I think, to the tune of \$323,000.00, I think we would like something a little bit more specific. I'm sure with a little bit of effort this could be brought forward. Oh it's \$850,000 almost a million dollars.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, a couple of points here. First of all that \$850,000.00 is partially to be spent on our information activity, partially to be spent on tourism and thirdly for administration. So a good deal less than the total of \$850,000.00 is for tourism, but that's not the point that Mrs. Watson is making.

As I mentioned at the outset, we're hoping to the extent that our funding and manpower will allow us to do so, to conduct an inventory of the services, attractions and accommodations and so on that we have. We're hoping to conduct a number of studies which I outlined, but we don't yet know whether the extent to which we can carry these out with the staff that we have in our tourism establishment and the extent to which we're going to have to bring in consultants, or summer students, to help carry these things out

These details have not yet been worked out and I would be misleading you, if I said I could come back with a fast answer that would satisfy that question.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: That's really my problem, Mr. Chairman, is that when you are cutting back a program and you have got a complete turn around, and there is no reduction in staff, I just really would like to know, what that staff, how they are going to be employed what their duties are going to be with regard to the new objectives and goals that are laid out and I would like to know, you know, if we are going to accomplish this only by hiring a consultant or two, what are the rest of the people doing?

So, that's what I am trying to get at Mr. Gillespie and maybe I am not explaining myself very well, and I have that difficulty, I realize that. I really would like to know what the director and what the assistance director and what the information officer and the tourist program officer are going to be doing with respect to the new goals and objectives? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Gillespie: I can provide fairly quickly, Mr. Chairman, a breakdown of the activities and the amount we plan to expend towards each of these activities in this coming year. You will have to recognize though that there is—we'll have to be flexible within the dollars that are allocated among those.

We have an idea but as I say, I hesitate to say that we are going to be spending it on this, when it is going to change but I will bring something in. I will bring it in in the next day or two on that with no problem at all.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We'll leave establishment 700 until you bring that information forward. Campground maintenance, \$323,211.00. I refer you to appendix, page 26. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I understand from the Commissioners, or I should say the Speech from the Throne that the campground fee is to be increased this year, but that Yukoners will be excluded. I believe a Yukon licence plate is now the requirement for release from the fee. I just cannot recall what the increase in that fee was. Before I continue, could I have that information?

Mr. Gillespie: It is now \$5.00. It will be \$10.00.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think I would exercise again concern over the increase in this campground fee. I really think, as I have stated before in this House, that the House has lost sight of the real idea behind campgrounds. The original concept in campground development was to attempt to keep the tourists and the traveller off the little byways and the little side trails and gravel pits and so forth around the country for the purpose of forest protection, to try and keep camp fires in controlled places and thereby, you know, exercising a real effort to reduce the incidents of fire loss in terms of our forestry, which of course, effects our game and the aesthetic value of the country. I am really concerned that by increasing fees in these campgrounds, you are going to chase more people out of the campground. You are going to have them camping on these little side roads. You are going to lose control on camp fires and we have been reasonably fortunate in the last number of years in having climatically reasonable summers, wet summers and cool summers. But if we get one hot year this summer, I will lay you odds right at this table right now, this country will burn again

as it did back in '58. When this country burnt then, it burnt everywhere, even when we had controls.

So, I have a real genuine concern about this and I am wondering as to the advisability of raising the campground fee to \$10.00 at this time for this specific reason. I am wondering if the administration have really given any consideration for this at all.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, the possibility raised by Mr. Taylor is always there and it is just a calculated risk. We can't tell at this time what effect raising those fees will have. It is our hope and it is our judgment that the people will continue to use the campgrounds as they have in the past. We won't know what effect that increase in fees will have until the first season is over. At that time, we will be assessing whether it was a good idea or whether it was a poor idea, but we have no way of telling now other than to use our judgment.

Mr. Chairman: With reference to that, do you have any idea on how much of your collection in your—your revenue from campground fees was from tourists and from Yukon residents? Is there a breakdown?

Mr. Gillespie: \$25,000.00 is the total that we received during the course of the last year. The fees for both residents and non-residents was the same. So, we don't have a ready way of telling how much was contributed by residents and non-residents.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, there is a very distinctly direct relationship between here and the operation of the Forest Service, the Federal Yukon Forest Service, and I don't know. I think—I have raised this before and I have raised it, as a matter of fact, over the last two or three budgets and I have expressed this same concern. I really think it behooves the administration to get immediately in contact with the Forest—Yukon Forest Service and if not, this Committee and make a determination as to these facts that I have related here today and alluded to.

I am quite confident that if we are discouraging people from using these campgrounds, they are going to go and camp someplace and they are going to camp in very unsafe areas, in and along the highway. We have a probability of fire loss so great that it is a matter of very grave concern and I think it behooves the government to really look into this thing and with a view to perhaps reducing or in fact, eliminating the camp ground fee.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the witness. First, I would like to comment on Mr. Taylor's comments more or less.

My concern is not that they will go out and burn up the country but if the collection is done or the tax or whatever it is has been done right. In the past years, I don't know about last year, but the year before last year, when we first started the program, I know the tax collection or the—I shouldn't say tax—the campground maintenance fee was picked up by some of the collectors of garbage in the campgrounds. They used to go to the campgrounds in the evening or whenever or whatever and try to catch these people, with their pants down, so they could get the money before they got away.

This is the way the money was collected. If that situation still exists, there is no doubt that these people will camp somewhere else.

But if the collection is made properly somewhere before they hit the campgrounds, I think that those people would spend that \$10.00 for that campground, will very likely want to use it and get his money's worth. I think that's where the problem might lie.

I would like to ask how is the collection going to be made this year?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, in past years, we have used the campground maintenance people to collect and we have used the information centres to sell campground stickers. This has not worked all that well and our intention this year is to hire summer students.

The hope is that with the additional revenues derived from the fact that we have summer students going around and collecting from every non-resident that uses our campgrounds, that this will more than offset the cost.

Mr. Chairman: Well, Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I rise once again in utter amazement.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: You are getting amazed a lot.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Almost speechless in fact. You know, I almost forgot what I was saying. I find it very difficult to understand how the Honourable Member from Watson Lake intends to run a campground service and have nobody pay for it.

It's equivalent to going to Disneyland and everything is free. Things don't operate that way. I would like to say that it is the first time that Yukon people can go into the campground and not worry to have to catch a bill when they are going in and I think the people from outside have to be caught.

We look at the idea of actually a toll at the south end and the north end and apparently legally a person cannot do that. This is our only substitute for that. The other thing I think is very important is that it is going to give employment to our summer students which I will—I don't think we are going to make any money out of this but I would suspect that we are going to come close to breaking even

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Just in answer to the Honourable gentlemen who has just spoken before, I can only say that what he—before he became speechless, he perhaps should have given consideration to the fact of where all this garbage is going to be scattered because you are going to make one massive garbage dump across the Yukon. Also reconsider the question of fire loss and loss of wildlife and so forth, by chasing people out of campgrounds and putting them in the bush all over the Yukon and that is what you are talking about with the imposition of the \$10.00 fee.

You are talking at least to some extent of this and it's important.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just more or less a supplementary to what I was saying before or my question before until I got lost somewhere.

The Honourable Minister from Porter Creek says that they are going to hire some students to run around collecting—I don't like that word run around collecting. I would like to know and I asked this question, how that collection is going to be made and where it is going to be made?

Is it going to be just running around in the evening, just chasing the tourists until we catch them or is it going to be at a specific spot on that highway and those people are going to be there 24 hours a day or just how are we going to do this?

Mr. Gillespie: There is three ways, Mr. Chairman. The information centre will sell stickers. Local businessmen will sell stickers, if they are prepared to do so for a fee in return, and the summer students will travel, they won't run, they will travel to selected campsites along the Yukon highways which are most frequently used by outside residents.

In other words, we are not going to hire a student to go to some outlying campground that is almost never used by outside residents, that are used by non-Yukoners, I should say, because it just wouldn't be worth their while.

So we are picking out the key campspots throughout the Yukon, having our summer students go there and sell tickets to those that haven't already bought them at either an information centre or from a private entrepreneur.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, like my honourable Colleague Member from Porter Creek, I'm not speechless but I am totally amazed. I'm just trying to figure out whether this is still my friend, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake who, he and I stood toe to toe, and arm and arm against this Goliath of a government. I remember the ringing speeches we both made of taxation without representation, double taxation. If you're going to spend \$323,000.00 of the taxpayers money, on campground maintenance, then go and assess them a further charge, when they arrive at the campground. How we clapped and how we cheered and how we pounded the table when we finally got the government to see the error of their ways and and revenge on the campground for Yukon citizens and they put it back on again the next year. And once again the Honourable Member from Watson Lake and myself, we stood toe to toe against the government and we said it's double taxation and there's no way the government should apply this.

I thought the Honourable Member from Watson Lake was going to get up at this point in the budget and commend the government of the Yukon Territory for finally seeing things his way, which we have done. We have brought that idea, that philosophy to the Executive Committee and now Mr. Chairman, we're getting clipped over the barrel for doing exactly what the Honourable Member told us we should have been doing for the last years.

Mr. Chairman, \$10.00 for the total summer that the Yukon resident, or the non resident Yukoner can

spend in the Yukon is nothing. Even if he only spends three nights through the territory, \$10.00 is nothing for a campground. It seems that everybody against everything this Session for what reason I can't understand.

Here we're allowing the resident Yukoner access to the campground which he should have. I did my own surveys. I used the campgrounds. The guy who was paying was a Yukon resident. There was more stickers on a Yukon cars and campers than there were on any other cars. It was because by moccasin telegraph everybody knew that hey, nobody collects in these campgrounds, you don't have to pay. Everybody knew you didn't have to pay. It was the old Yukon sucker obeying the law who paid for the campground sticker, about three out of every four were Yukon cars that had paid.

Mr. Chairman, it just seems so logical for me to raise the campground sticker to \$10.00 remove the fee from the Yukon resident, have a systematic collection agency that would supply work for Yukon summer students in the summer. I don't think that the problems you mentioned are going to be there at all.

Then the other argument that we always heard around this table from those people who were representing and made the speeches on behalf of the small tourist entrepreneur in the Yukon Territory, that the campgrounds were killing the tourist's place on the highway. Nobody stopped any longer because the government wasn't charging enough money. So we've done everything that I can see that the Honourable Members wanted. We folded completely. You had some input from the elected members on the Executive Committee on this and now we're being condemned for it, Mr. Chairman. I just don't understand it at all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I just rise for one comment. After today I am more than convinced that we are going to have to get that duplicating machine down at the Commissioner's Office and start running out that money.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In reply to the Honourable Member I am not sure if, perhaps he was asleep when I began my comments about the Yukon resident being excluded from the program. Of course, and naturally I am very pleased and I was — it is nice he is awake again, Mr. Chairman. In respect of the other matters raised by the Honourable Member I can only say again, I can't take, I cannot take an attitude of levity towards the situation. I am concerned over Forest and Wildlife losses in the territory as a result of these fees. That is my sole reason and also the fact you are going to have a tendency to scatter garbage all over the territory with people avoiding these camps. It is as simple as that. If you can find levity in that, great, I simply can't. I have given my reasons here for about the fourth time, and those are my reasons.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Before I make the appropriate motion I would like to comment. There is one item the Honourable Minister has overlooked in trying to accommodate the Honourable

Member from Watson Lake. Maybe the next time we come around to the Budget Estimates, maybe we should just move the campgrounds down to B.C. and Mr. Taylor would have no need to complain anymore.

I will make the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Are we clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Thanks Mr. Chairman, I won't take long. It is merely I would like to see some other members comment rather than just battling against one member that has probably got a little bit of interest too, in the territory and what may happen to it. Possibly his idea, the collection, you know of \$10.00 is nothing wrong, it is not adequate, we can collect some more.

I am still concerned in the way we are going to collect it. I still haven't really got that answered. I would like to know how we are going to collect the money? That is one of the problems it is going to cause the exact thing he is speaking of.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming, I think Mr. Gillespie did answer that specific question.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, where are they going to be, anywhere?

Actually, Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. He did answer that question. In other words I am not quite satisfied with that type of collection. I would like it known that I am not satisfied with that type of collection that they go to the camp grounds and look for these people. The same thing happens, as the Honourable Member has mentioned here, they will be going to some other place to camp as soon as they find that is true. I am saying, can you find a better way, where you can catch those people as they come into the territory and tax them, sorry Danny, collect the fees from every individual that is not a Yukon Territorial resident. If you can't, but I would hopefully think you could somehow.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, in the past we have had some difficulty with the maintenance people collecting these sticker fees. It is a matter of attitude. A good maintenance man does not necessarily make him a good fee collector. When we hire these students we will be bringing them together at the outset, at the beginning of the summer to train them on how to go about doing it properly and with the right kind of attitude.

Mr. Chairman: Do you mean, Mr. Gillespie, you train them in catching them with their pants down?

Mr. Gillespie: For a fee Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, once we have trained them in how to collect these fees I would hope that they would go with the proper attitude and approach the tourists that are coming and using our camp grounds and not antagonize them in the manner in which they go about collecting those fees.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, could we just report progress on this and continue this very interesting discussion tomorrow.

Some Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman: If necessary, Mrs. Watson.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: The witnesses are excused.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Mr. Speaker now resume the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: It was moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Berger that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair. Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Motion carried

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER RESUMES THE CHAIR

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Committee convened at 10:45 a.m. to discuss Bills, Sessional Papers, Motions and reports. Mr. Miller was present as a witness during the Committee's review of Bill Number 6.

Committee recessed at 12:10 and reconvenes at 1:40 p.m. with Mr. Miller in attendance again as a witness.

It was moved by Mrs. Whyard, seconded by Mr. Lang that further consideration of Bill Number 6 be deferred. The motion carried.

I can now report progress on Bill Number 6.

Committee resumed its discussion of Bill Number 2. Committee recessed and reconvened at 3:15 p.m. Mr. Miller, Mr. Williams and Mr. Gillespie were present as witnesses.

Committee recessed at 4:15 p.m. and reconvened at 4:30 p.m. Discussion of Bill Number 2 ensued. I can now report progress on Bill Number 2.

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

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

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker I move that we now call it five o'clock.

Mr. Hibberd: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre 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 the Motion as carried.

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: This House now stand adjourned until ten a.m. tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNED