

Property of
M. L. A. Lounge



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 16

5th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Monday, March 15, 1976

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Monday, March 15, 1976

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory.
Monday, March 15th, 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: We will proceed with the Order Paper. Are there any documents or correspondence for tabling this morning? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I have for tabling Legislative Returns number 9 and number 10.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further documents or correspondence for tabling this morning? Are there any reports of Committees? Introduction of Bills? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

BILL NUMBER 16 - INTRODUCTION

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, for leave to introduce Bill number 16, entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Community Assistance Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, for leave to introduce a Bill entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Community Assistance Ordinance. 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: Are there any Notices of Motion or Resolution? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give Notice of Motion this morning with respect to recommendations by the Yukon Legislative Assembly to the Public Utilities Board in connection with the recently held N.C.P.C. Hearing, that is moved by myself and seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give Notice of Motion re the Electrical Public Utilities Ordinance.

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

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, regarding the management and participation of the Yukon in the disposition of funds regarding the Western Canada Lottery.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion? Are there any Notices of Motion for the production of papers? We will then proceed under Orders of the Day to the Question Period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTION PERIOD

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

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I have a few items here this morning, with your permission I would like to proceed with if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Commissioner: On March the 11th, Mr. McIntyre inquired about the availability of the Northern Roads Committee report and, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to be able to supply a copy of this report at this time, which I will deposit with the Clerk.

On March the 10th, Mr. Lengerke had a question about rents for government housing being, he wished to

know if comparative market rental rates were set, housing would be about \$250 to \$275. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lengerke is correct in this stated assumption.

On March the 3rd, Mr. Fleming had a question concerning the pool housing that is administered by the Federal Department of Public Works and this has led these inquiries that I had in connection with this, had led to further developments which is, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to report that at the meeting of the Federal Department of Co-ordinating Committee in Whitehorse on January 23rd, we have been advised that Whitehorse was no longer considered by treasury as an area in which housing had to be provided to government employees. It was stated at this time that the Department of Public Works was proceeding to formulate plans for the disposal of Crown owned housing in Whitehorse over the next several years while observing appropriate rights of the individual and this information was included in my address to council at the opening of this session.

I have recently received indications that the decision taken does not imply that the Department of Public Works will immediately commence the disposal of all government housing in Whitehorse and I recognize the importance of this matter to the departments concerned, the individuals and the people of Whitehorse in general, and I have been advised that the Department of Public Works will issue a statement in order to clarify this situation. This is to be available early this week and when this is available I shall be pleased to provide the information to council, Mr. Speaker, to the federal departments involved and also to the public in general.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Question re: Prosecution of Teachers at Faro

Mr. Lengerke: I have a question for the Commissioner this morning, or possibly the Minister of Education. What is the status or the present direction that the government is taking with respect to the proposed prosecution of the teachers of Faro?

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We have asked the Yukon Teachers Staff Relations Board for an interpretation of the incident which occurred on December 3rd, 1975 at Faro and we will have to wait to see what their decision is and then evaluate our position from there.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The Honourable Member from Klondike.

Question re: Brief to Public Utilities Board.

Mr. Berger: Yes, I have just a simple question, with the Commissioner: why was such a poor brief prepared to the Public Utilities Board Hearing by the Territorial Government?

Mr. Speaker: Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board is a creation of this government and we would hope to hear from them as to what their recommendations are and, certainly, it is public information concerning all the resolutions and motions etcetera that had been given by this House and I am sure that the members of the Public Utilities Board, both collectively and individually, are fully aware of these concerns, Mr. Speaker, for this we expect to hear from this creature of this House as to what their recommendations are with regard to these proposed rate increases; not for us to tell them what they should be doing.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The Honourable Member from Klouane.

Mrs. Watson: As a point of privilege, I would, I was unable to hear the Honourable Member's question; I wonder if I could have that question repeated?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike.

Mr. Berger: What I asked was why was there such a poor brief prepared for the recent Public Utilities Board Hearing for the Federal Government?

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? We will then proceed to Public Bills.

PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre.

BILL NUMBER 7 - THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 7 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 7 be now read a third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the motion as carried; are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

MOTION CARRIED

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 7 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable

Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that the Bill number 7 do now pass and that the title will be as on the order paper. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the motion carried and that Bill number 7 has passed this House.

MOTION CARRIED

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

BILL NUMBER 10 - THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 10 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 10 be now read a third time. 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. Are you prepared to adopt the titles of the Bill?

MOTION CARRIED

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 10 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 10 do now pass and title be as on the order paper. 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 and that Bill number 10 has passed this house.

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill number 12 be now read a third time.

BILL NUMBER 12 - THIRD READING

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, that Bill number 12 be now read a third time. 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. Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill number 12 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, that Bill number 12 do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the motion carried and that Bill number 12 has passed this House.

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure at this time. The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve in the 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 discussing Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the motion 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: I will now call this Committee to order. When Committee last met, we had deferred consideration on page 107 of your Main Estimates regarding Business and Professional Licences. At that time there was a motion on the floor. I'll read that motion: it was moved by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that business licence fee increases for the 1976-77 fiscal year be limited to ten percent.

It was with the concurrence of Committee that further discussion of that motion was deferred until today. Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to move to that motion. I would delete the words "increases for the 1976-77 fiscal year be limited to ten percent" and substitute the following words "be considered as per the attached sheet".

I tried to word the amendment so that, because it is a money, it does involve money matters. During the weekend...

Mr. Chairman: Do we have a seconder? Do we have a seconder for the amendment?

Mr. McIntyre: I second that.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, over the weekend the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua and myself spent a considerable time reviewing the Commissioner's Order 76-8 Schedule of Fees effective for this year, and that's the Business Licences for the areas outside of municipalities. We used, as a comparison, the City of Whitehorse Bylaw which defines their business licences which come into effect in 1976. We found some very glaring, and I really mean glaring, comparisons between the two schedules of fees.

In almost every instance, the business licence fee that is being charged by the Territorial Government in the outlying areas is greater than that being charged within the City of Whitehorse. Some instances there is as much as 100 percent and some instances 800 percent difference. For example, coin operated machines, the territorial business licence fee suggests \$30.00 per machine; Whitehorse listed the automatic vending machines and for cigarette machines charges \$5.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, with regard to your amendment as per attached sheet, it might help from the point of view of discussion of your amendment if we

could have per attached sheet distributed.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I've taken the liberty of getting copies of the City of Whitehorse Bylaw, of our schedule of fees, and our amended sheet, so you can pass those out.

Mr. Chairman: I'm sorry to interrupt Mrs. Watson; perhaps you would like to continue now, would you?

Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think a lot of us, since the increase in the business fees was announced, have done a great deal of time reviewing it. It's been obvious to so many of us that the Territorial Government schedule of fees has been too broad. There was too much left to the discretion of the person who was assessing the property, or the discretion of the person who applied for a business licence.

It wasn't an equitable distribution. So what we have attempted to do, we have attempted to re-classify and to break down some of the broad categories. I think it is our opinion that if the Territorial Government were to truly enforce the schedule of fees as outlined in this schedule that we are submitting, I don't think there would be a loss of revenue because I think they would be collecting business licence fees from people who operate out of the municipality in the outlying areas and who do not have to have a business licence because there hasn't been a classification for it, definitely defined.

This is a suggested schedule of fees and I would hope that the Honourable Members may come forward with some further amendments and even the Administration may want to take the schedule of fees and review it. But I don't see how we, as a body, can recommend a schedule of fees that is so much greater, taxes the small businesses in the outlying areas more than the businesses in the largest municipality in Whitehorse is being taxed. I think, if you review the two schedules, the one that's in existence now in the Territory, the one that's in existence in the City of Whitehorse, you'll see the appalling differences. I really mean appalling differences and I can certainly understand why there was such a reaction from the business community in the outlying areas.

I would hope that we can adopt certain features, if not all, of the revised schedule.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to add to the Honourable Member from Kluane's remarks because the material is all contained in the schedules submitted. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would agree with everything that has been said so far. I would like to bring it to the attention of the ministers or the government, whoever is responsible for making these scheduled fees. I'll read one, for instance the banks. If you will check on the bank in the City of Whitehorse, it is \$300.00 for a bank and a branch for each bank under the old schedule fees that the government wants to put in is

\$500.00 for a little outlying community. I think there is not much sense to this, this is probably one reason we will never have very many banks in the outlying communities.

On the other hand, the other one is very high too is \$150.00 possibly not high but for 10 hours or less per week they still pay \$150.00. And in town they can have a separate branch and keep it open all hours for \$100.00.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I would just comment that I am quite happy with the proposed revisions, and really confident that the administration will incorporate most of those changes. I would also like to ask the administration, if they would be considering the business tax concept, because, I really feel, I strongly feel, that business licensing is just a form of enforcement and policy, and policing I should say, and that the business tax idea or concept should be looked at very seriously. If we are gonna be making major changes in this whole area of licensing and tax, that we should be looking at that, because if we take the lead, as a territory, then you will have your municipalities and the other supporting agencies probably doing the same thing.

The Chairman: Are you ready for the question? The amendment before Committee is moved by Mrs. Watson, seconded by Mr. McIntyre, that the words "increases for the 1976-77 fiscal year be limited to ten percent" be deleted and the following substituted therefore, "be considered as per the attached sheet".

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: What was the motion of it? The amended motion.

Mr. Chairman: The amended motion as would read that business license fees be considered as per the attached sheet.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I think that that has to be an opinion motion, rather than a fact motion.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Another thing I would like to bring to their attention is that the City of Whitehorse has, I think, 78 licenses under the old schedule of fees, I believe it's 38 licenses all together. Therefore, the

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I believe the word is considered, and that makes it an opinion.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, would my motion not be 'attached schedule' rather than the 'attached sheet'?

Mr. Chairman: Okay. Are you ready for the question? All those in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary? The amendment is carried.

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Chairman: It was moved by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that business licences be considered as per the attached schedule. Ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Chairman: Page 106, Main Estimates; we are in consideration of recoveries Local Government \$212,000.00.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the bulk of this under Local Government would appear to be the increase in municipal taxes assessment from \$30,000.00 in last year's estimates, to \$100,000.00. Could we just have a very brief explanation of this?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, under Commissioner's Order, the cost of assessment to municipalities is recoverable from the Assessor's time. It's a major reassessment of Whitehorse being undertaken this year which, every five years, has to be done under the Taxation Ordinance. So, because of a major reassessment of the most populace municipality in the territory naturally there is going to be more assessment time and efforts spent with extra assessors and this is recoverable under the Commissioner's Ordinance for charges made to the municipality.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this gives rise to another, a further, question I had neglected to ask them when we were talking about the Bill which would increase minimum taxation throughout the territory from somewhere from \$25.00 to \$100.00, and perhaps Mr. Miller could give us a ball park figure of how much additional revenue is expected to be raised by this increase?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that was attached to a schedule handed out a week or so ago and our estimate is \$195,000.00, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, my only other question at this moment is, I notice that dust control has disappeared. I assume that this is now covered under en-

gineering estimates and there is an increase of \$4,000.00 to \$17,000.00 in water delivery and sewage charges. Could we just have an explanation of how substantially these charges have increased or how this comes about?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The increase in the programs from Local Government when they are serving more people and providing more services, the recoveries, naturally, we intend to go into the water deliveries business and Carcross next year, probably, into the sewage education in several communities, so these charges will be on the people who are using them. So, as there are more services by local governments, that there is going to be more coverage.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It gives rise to a further question. Do we have the assurance that the sewer eductor system, the territorial sewer eductor system, will still be available to unorganized communities throughout the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It's a program laid down in legislation under the Capital Assistance Program and, unless we change the Ordinance, the service is going to be available.

Mr. Chairman: We are, indeed, appreciative of the increase in insect control by \$17,000.00, Mr. Minister. Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering, are we abolishing the building appeal board?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, it just has not been used in the last several years, but we thought that we would realistically reflect the cost that it has cost the Government, and it is the Commissioner's Order and legislation the Building Appeals Board that is established and it will still continue if there's an appeal, there will be money available.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Insect control recoveries, the question, where do you get your \$57,000.00, where do you recover that money from?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The municipalities, Mr. Chairman, if the charge against them for the number of acres that they agreed to be sprayed by the YTG Program.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a further question. Does that include the L.I.D.s?

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

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that includes the recovery from the L.I.D.s and the L.I.D.s place that into their budget when they request funding. Mr. Chairman, this brings up another further question that has bothered me for some time. Under the L.I.D. legisla-

tion, do they have the authority to carry on this type of a program?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, it's never been questioned, just an accepted fact that they do have the authority, under the L.I.D. ordinance. I don't know why it would be questioned.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should be reviewing our L.I.D. legislation for some of the authorities that they have defined by law and some of the functions they are performing at the present time, where they have no legal authority to do it. I'm concerned about ambulance service. Now, does the L.I.D. have the authority by legislation or are these services sort of being given to the L.I.D.s to perform, are they an agent for the Territorial Government? I think this is what is happening and I think we are going to have to define this form of Local Government much more, so that they are, the functions and things that they should perform, should be defined in the legislation rather than have them act as an agency.

I'm bringing this point up because all of these things are included in their budget. And when the people sit around this House and they look at the grants or the budget that the L.I.D.s received, these are, the cost of certain programs, are being built into the budget and yet L.I.D.s aren't, were not constructed to do this really. It's a misleading type of budget that people are seeing and they're saying, oh, the L.I.D.s are getting so much money. But the service that the Territorial Government is providing, that has not been given the, the L.I.D.s haven't got the authority to do, is being built into that budget. It inflates the amount of money, but they are getting for municipal services. It's a concern, it's something that concerns me very much, and I think it's beginning to concern a lot of L.I.D.s and a lot of people in the L.I.D.s and it concerns me very much when the Honourable Member voted for the ten mills from Dawson because he thought L.I.D.s were getting too much. I'd like to take some of these budgets and go over them with him and see how much of that was really for a municipal service.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: I have a question for Mr. Miller for, possibly, with respect to the assessment. What is the estimated cost to the City of Whitehorse for the 1976 assessment going to be, that's including all outside help?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I don't have a figure right handy; my guess, if you wanted a guess, will be that approximately \$70,000 of the \$100,000 would apply to the City of Whitehorse. Now, that's purely and simply a guess on my part.

Mr. Chairman: Clear? Tourism, Conservation and Information, \$9,000.00. Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'm curious about the Tourism Grant from Secretary of State; what was it previously and why don't we have it any more?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that particular grant was with respect to some studies that were carried out during the course of this last year. We will attempt in the current year to have some of the study work also cost shared but we have no assurance at this point that there will be any cost sharing, so we put nothing into the budget.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, both the Honourable Member from Riverdale and myself were a little concerned with the types of studies and reviews that the Tourism Branch were going to be embarking upon, for this coming year. Would it be possible for some of these studies and some of the work that they are planning to do, would they qualify for cost sharing under the Secretary of State arrangement?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that's what I was trying to indicate; we were hoping that some of them, but we have no assurance at this point in time, that they will, in fact, be cost sharing; that's why we have put nothing into them.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a further question. Will we be applying for cost sharing?

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thought I indicated that, we will be applying.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: How will we be informed if we do get a cost sharing?

Mr. Miller: The House, Mr. Chairman?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, how will we be informed. Will it be shown in, if we don't need a supplementary for that.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I guess we could undertake to bring an information paper to a session, a further session, of Council which would indicate whether or not we did get a cost sharing.

Mr. Lengerke: I would think that would be a pretty meaningful exercise to find out just exactly what grants we were successful in obtaining.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Legal Affairs \$47,500.00.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, why are we showing a recovery from the Federal Court this year. Are we identifying costs that we never did before?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we, as you know, pay costs in response to the Federal Court. Now, what we've included under the expenditure side for the first time, are the costs of the Judge when he is travelling on circuit, for example to the Northwest Territories. Those costs are then recovered from the Northwest Territories or from the Federal Department of Justice. In prior years, we have had to handle this in manners which have not been acceptable to the Auditor General, so we are regularizing the procedures that we have been handling these costs under.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, do you think the \$5,000.00 will cover the costs of the Judge in his travels and the extra?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this is our experience, that \$5,000.00 will cover it; it's been running between four and five thousand dollars for a couple of years.

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Highways and Public Works \$12,860,097.00. Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could learn from Mr. Miller today how much, in actuality, how much money was spent on airports and airstrips in this last, or to this point, in this current fiscal year?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the amount that we have spent to the end of January, on airport maintenance, this is MOT hundred percent recoverable airport maintenance, is a hundred, I am sorry is \$82,000.00. That's a hundred percent recoverable.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was indicated that we are doing minimal work on these airstrips and yet I was trying to find out why we have received \$217,000.00, I should say \$126,000.00, in this current fiscal year for the maintenance of airports and airstrips and why we are only spending \$82,000.00. I mean, what I am trying to say, is ought not this money to be spent to upgrade and fully maintain these airstrips?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I believe I reported to this House some time ago that the Ministry of Transport have asked us to cut back on our airport maintenance because they didn't have the money in their budget to pay the bills. We undertook to cut back and, as I have indicated, we have spent \$82,000.00 to date, which we expect to recover. We have two further months in this current fiscal year and, depending upon snow conditions, I suppose we'll probably end up with about \$100,000.00 actual costs. We are hoping next year to get from the Ministry of Transport \$200,000.00, in excess of \$200,000.00, for the same function and, if they approve it, we spend it; if they don't, I guess we don't.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are you not proposing MOT maintenance on behalf of MOT in other airstrips, rather than what you have done this year? Additional airstrips?

Mr. Miller: That's correct, Mr. Chairman, that's part on the reason for the increase in cost. But, again, that is subject to approval of MOT.

Mrs. Watson: Even adding the additional airstrips? Are still subject to their approval? It hasn't been received.

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they pay the bills, they call the tune.

Another thing I would like to bring to their attention is that the City of Whitehorse has, I think, 78 licenses under the old schedule of fees, I believe it's 38 licenses all together. Therefore, they don't cover many of the items out in the country. Now, I think if they checked into it very carefully there is probably many licenses, such as, I might mention one such as maybe the landscaping, there could be a lot more, I mean, now you would have to go through it all check it, but I am afraid that there is a lot of work being done outside the City of Whitehorse actually on City of Whitehorse licenses.

I know, myself, as a small private contractor at many times wished to bid on a contract or two in Whitehorse, for a basement or something, and I find that I have to pay the \$200.00 to the City for that, if I come from the outlying district and I have a Territorial License.

Now, I don't know about general contracting, I think that they have to have both if they go out into the country and, naturally, if they are doing a government contract, but I am speaking of the small businesses such as electrical shops, possibly, going out on highway and doing work anywhere in the territory and I am wondering if the government wouldn't mind checking just to see if they also have a territorial license, and are not just working under City License, which would be very, very much less than the outlying license, if the government had one which they don't have. I think the whole situation, as I said here in this house before, two or three times now, needs a real good looking into.

Some people may say the taxes are greater in Whitehorse, in some areas for these places and so there is no comparison. I say, that's not right, I think that anything that they do pay for in big centres, they do get services for it. On the Alaska Highway and in the small areas we don't get those services so, therefore, I don't think we should have to pay for them yet, until such time as we do get them. I am quite agreeable with this schedule of fees that have gone through as the Honourable Member from Kluane has spoken. We have done a lot of work to just get this far, and I don't think this is going to be exactly right and wouldn't expect it to be, but it could be a very good guideline to the government to start working on it a little bit, because the comparisons she read in the coin operated machines, for instance, is absolutely right. A small business person on the highway has a cigarette machine, a coke machine and a jukebox, which is part of the small business, is paying

\$90.00 under that old schedule, or the new schedule the government has put in. \$90.00 for just that little bit to get a few coins to run his business, and you check into what you make on cigarettes, you will find that it takes a lot of cigarette packages to make \$30.00.

So, as I say, I am all for the change and I would hope that government themselves would take a good look at it and say let's have a real good look at it, and check into it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I think that on behalf of my colleagues and myself we would certainly like to thank the Honourable Members for the work that they have done, and as this is a money motion, all members, of course, know that it is an opinion that can go to the government. I can promise the Honourable Members that this schedule will be looked in thoroughly, and as many of these suggestions that have been made by the Honourable Members will be taken into active consideration. I just want to say that, I don't think we should get too carried away on making comparisons on different types of licensing, as all members know that practices regarding business license fees vary greatly and that making comparisons is very difficult. Some jurisdictions impose only token fees, but charge a business tax and others charge a relatively high license fee and no business tax. While, still others use business property taxes, an important means of obtaining revenue from businesses. I can use the arguments that the Honourable Members are using the other way, and back them up with the statistics from the different sheets. If you take Whitehorse and Yukon comparison in the following area. A ten unit hotel or motel with gas pump service stations and a restaurant, and for the Yukon with the proposed increases as they were, would mean a two hundred dollar license fee for ten unit hotel, with restaurant, that would be a hundred dollars, the service station would be a hundred dollars, in Whitehorse that same businesses and ten unit motel would be \$40.00, the service station would be \$150.00, and the restaurant would be \$150.00, so it would be \$340.00 versus \$200.00. That's according to the schedules of fees that we take.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. If you look at your service fees for a station, it is not \$150.00, a \$150.00 fee in the City of Whitehorse allows you to be an automobile dealer and have an auto wrecker, have gas pumps, do major service and repair. It is a full fledged garage with all the outlets. The service station is much less than that, in the City of Whitehorse.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: If it was Whitehorse in business with the garage, that would be the comparison. It would be 340 versus 200, with a garage facility. This is just the point that I make, we go into this argument, we go on it forever in making the comparisons. The thing is what do we feel in this House is a legitimate increase in the license fee and the schedules, and as I say without getting into these arguments of comparison, that I would thank the Honourable Members for their work that they have done with the passage of the motion. As I have said previously the Government is certainly willing to look into the area of business license fee.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, may I say how pleased I am that the Administration have agreed to review the schedule as set down and suggested in the amendment to the original motion. I would certainly also add to those who have spoken my appreciation to the Honourable Members for taking the time on the weekend to do this detailed and difficult chore.

I think everything that has been said has pretty well covered anything I wanted to say. Other than I think it more realistically provides for the person in the hinterland. You know he's just not having these licenses to pay, but he's got this 10 mill increase in taxes, he's a lot of other things to pay too. He's having a pretty tough time of it especially when perhaps in the winter time, I'm sure people will appreciate that outside of the City of Whitehorse, businesses just don't do the volume that perhaps they would do here. These people have a difficult time, perhaps this is a way we can offer to them a small measure of social justice. I would indeed support the amendment to the main motion.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that these suggestions are most welcome and to remind the Honourable Members that the offer was made at least three times in this House, that this Executive Committee would be most receptive to suggestions for revision of these license fees.

We did not hear anything on the subject Mr. Chairman, until about 10 to 5 on Thursday. It is great to see them finally coming through and it's going to take considerable amount of time to sit down and study them, in context, of what is already on the books.

I would just like to add Mr. Chairman that as a former agent operating a business in the Yukon, I have paid City and Territorial business licenses both here and in the Northern Territories. And you've got to admit, Mr. Chairman, there is a tremendous discrepancy. There is no standard, it is a matter which each area sets according to the cloth. I don't suppose if we worked around this table for six months, we would ever come up with a schedule which would suit everybody around this table because we all have different approaches to the value of what a business is. I have some familiarity with it, Mr. Chairman, with highway lodge operators and the tourist business.

I think that we can approach these proposed revisions with a very fair attitude, because we have that background and we have an understanding of the difficulties that these concerns have along the highway.

I would just like to assure the Honourable Members who have proposed this motion that they will get a fair hearing from this committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Just in conclusion Mr. Chairman, I know the Honourable Members on the Executive Committee have said they've offered to review this and no one has come forward. However, I think we overlook the fact that the Honourable Member from Watson Lake did

bring up the issue very early during the session and the decision was made at that time. We deal with it when we dealt with the revenue section of the budget and this is why it hasn't been brought up before.

The reason why we embarked upon the comparison with the City of Whitehorse and I know there are various philosophies and standards for business licensing but because the City of Whitehorse, the municipality of Whitehorse, does not have a business tax. If they had had a business tax, the situation would have been altered quite considerably. So we felt fairly safe in using a jurisdictional area that does not have an extra tax on a business establishment.

And a other reason why we endeavoured to break it down, because both the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua and myself, and I'm sure other Honourable Members around this House, realize that the broad category in the Territorial Government schedule of fees, make it very difficult to apply equitably. And we have found where some business establishments were paying a great deal more than other business establishments and yet, in essence, they were running the same, providing the same type of service. So we felt it necessary to be fair to the people who were applying for the business licenses and also from the administration's point of view.

It leaves the discretionary power, takes the discretionary power away and it defines it. I'm very happy that the Honourable Members have said that the Administration and themselves, and they themselves will consider this schedule of fees. I hope that they don't consider it until next taxation year. I hope that they consider it and I hope that they report back, their considerations to this House. I would be very anxious to hear their comments and the Administration's comments to the proposal which we have put forward.

I would hate to leave this Session and leave it up in the air, and feel that maybe nothing is going to be done this year, that we'll wait for another year. So I would hope that they really come back with some indication of what their actions are going to be and what their interpretations of this suggested schedule is.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I would just like to point out to Committee that in our sister territory on the other side of the mountain, this particular federal department is referred to as Misery of Transport.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could just inform Committee while we're dealing with Engineering Recoveries, that on Friday we received approval under the Engineering Services Agreement for the paving of the first seven miles of the Campbell Highway at Watson Lake, or some culvert replacement on, I'm sorry bridge replacement with culverts on Nahanni Range Road. And for the pre-engineering that they normally allow us.

So we will be coming back with supplementaries in the fall, subject to being able to get contracts let, within the dollars we have for those particular items. That includes Conglomerate Creek.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, just quietly I was, I was immediately rising to ask if that included Conglomerate Creek and I believe I got a positive response from the witness. Thank you.

Mr. Miller: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, Third Party Office rental. I just can't seem to identify that recovery.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this relates to the rental of office space, for example, the post office at Watson Lake. The oh, we share certain other buildings where we pay the bill and then charge a federal department, I can't think of the ones off the top of my head, that's the type of thing we're referring to here.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that's the type of thing that I was thinking of and the one at Watson Lake was the only that I could identify. I mean, if at any future time you can identify some of them generally. We're looking at 61,000 so that's about ten, eight or ten larger ones.

Mr. Miller: I can bring that information forward, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Mr. Miller. The VHF radio system the 75,000 you're recovering there, that's from the Federal Government, what for, RCMP use and federal department of highways -

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this is the federal agencies contribution towards the lease costs of CN circuits and of maintenance of the main repeater.

Mr. Chairman: Yukon Housing Corporation \$916,850.00.. Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Could the witness explain the decrease in the recoveries in the operating deficit from CMHC?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this primarily due to a supposition made in preparing the '75-'76 estimate and in fact we won't get the 380,000 recovery we had anticipated.

What we are trying to do with CMHC is to enter into a Section 44 Agreement on all of the housing projects that the Yukon Housing Corporation has. Section 44 being a 50-50 cost sharing of the operating deficit. We have not as yet managed to get all of the projects under a Section 44, we are gradually adding them on as CMHC approves them. That's the object of the exercise. What we've reflected in 1976-'77 are those that we now have a Section 44 Agreement on.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, a question for Mr. Miller. Under Section 44 of the National Housing Act, I think you're applying for some recoveries there for the YWCA, am I correct in that and are you getting them?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we are not applying as yet. The question was put to this House and to the City of Whitehorse and we have had no decision from the City of Whitehorse or anyone else on this matter.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the rental purchase housing subsidy, is this the cost sharing that we do get some funding from the government of Canada?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, this relates to the contribution by Indian Affairs towards the operating deficit of those houses that are occupied by registered Indians.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, they must have, this is just a comment, it's not a question. Indian Affairs must have one terrible time keeping track of the housing programs that they're involved in, the subsidies that they're paying with these various programs. I wonder if they'll ever smarten up to the fact that there is a overlapping and a duplication. And that it would be much better off to have it all under one authority and a great saving to Canada and to the Yukon Territory.

I am not asking the witness to answer that question.

The Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the Honourable Member that this has been pointed out.

Mr. Chairman: Revenue and Recoveries \$36,051,119.00. I would like to refer Committee back to page 79, under Establishment number 901. There is some more information forthcoming, Mr. Miller, I wonder if you have that available?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I believe all the information that I was asked for was presented to Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue questioning on Revenue very briefly.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: And I would like to question the witness regarding the tax revenue that we hope to, the government hopes to receive from the ten mill increase for municipal services. Now, I believe the Yukon Territory was named in the Anti-Inflation Legislation, and I believe that municipal services is also considered in the Anti-Inflation Legislation. Now, the ten mill increase is almost a hundred percent increase in property taxation, and how can you justify an increase of ten mills almost a

hundred percent, when you can't identify the municipal services that are provided under the L.I.D. Legislation, and the L.I.D.'s, and in the unorganized community. Because I think if this application for this increase were referred to the Anti-Inflation Board, this government would have to justify why they are having to increase the mill structure to this degree, and they would have to identify the extra services that they will be providing for the ten mills. I wonder if the government has ever considered this.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert on the Anti-Inflation Board, but I can tell Committee this, that our total revenue increase in 1976-77 represents 7.8 percent of the revenues we collected in 1975-76, which is well within the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this may be in total, but under the Anti-Inflation guidelines, municipal services are named as services that have to be restricted to a certain percentage increase, and you have to justify that increase. I would like to have some commitment by this government, at least to let us know the anti-inflation legislation as it applies to municipal services, because I am very serious about this. Ten mills, when it hasn't been identified with the service, is very difficult to accept.

Mr. Chairman, we are the taxing authority for property taxes in the outlying areas, for municipal services. We have delegated that authority to the municipalities. They are the taxing authority for property taxes, other than school taxes, to provide municipal services in the municipality. We've done that in our Municipal Legislation. Now, the Yukon Government is the taxing authority and the deliverer of municipal services to the unorganized areas, and I am saying, if you are increasing it by a hundred percent, then you should identify the increase in municipal services that you are going to provide.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I think one could, and I don't want to enter into a debate here, but all one needs to look at is page A-23, and you will find that the L.I.D.'s alone this government contributes something in excess of \$300,000.00, and we don't collect any \$300,000.00 worth of taxes in those taxing areas.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that brings it up again, your municipal services are identified under the L.I.D. Legislation, and I am saying you are putting other services inside that grant, which is, which enriches the grant but does not identify the service.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any increase services within the L.I.D. Grants that a normal municipality would not carry out.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about normal Municipality, we are talking about the L.I.D. under L.I.D. legislation and that's why I've been asking these questions around this House.

Mr. Miller: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the Municipal services provided in L.I.D.'s are equivalent to those or less than those provided in Municipalities and was have to be paid for out of a Municipal general purposes mill rate, if the L.I.D.'s had the ability to levy them.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. We have identified your Municipal services under your L.I.D. legislation, and until that is expanded, I mean this is the point I've been trying to make all morning and the witness knows, I'm correct. That there's a deficiency in this, and we're not indentifying Municipal services, and therefore, it leaves it a very grey cloudy area and you've lumped everything in and say, they're getting too much for the Municipal services we can justify the ten mills. And this is the thing that I'm objecting to.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I think if the Honourable Member is referring to the question of what does the specific L.I.D.'s Ordinance allow these people in the L.I.D.'s to do, and what they are in fact doing, that is, she is probably correct that they are doing things that are not specifically provided for under the L.I.D. Ordinance. I do submit, however that the things that the L.I.D.'s are doing are in fact, Municipal services, whether they have the legal right to carry them out or not. They are still Municipal servies, and they have an option in the L.I.D.'s, we can A) either amend the L.I.D. Ordinance or the L.I.D.'s can come under the Municipal ordinance by offering to become Municipalities under the Yukon Territory.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, our ambulance service is a Municipal service in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Miller: Everywhere else in Canada.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, why are we paying for ambulance service in our YTG budget, and it's not a municipal service in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, you're a perfect liberty to debate the issue on the floor of the House but not with the witness.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, my apology.

Mr. Miller: And mine Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I would refer back to vote Number 9.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it's been unfortunate that some of the rest of the members have failed to give their comment on the Anti-Inflation Boards ruling on an increase of ten mills. I think there are many people wondering about this very thing. When a Municipality increases their mill rate, they can justify it. Their services are costing this much more, they have the dollar, but the can justify it with. Can we, can this government, jutify that ten mills?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: I have bitten on the bait, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member just spent approximately 20 minutes of our time, running around in a circle, study the C 73 Bill and then investigating the guidelines that are brought down, in essence, do not regulate. The Honourable Member is assuming the mill rate of municipalities.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would argue that with the Honourable Member from Pelly River, but I don't have the legislation in front of me, but I would very gladly get it.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I wasn't going to rise to the bait either but I think after hearing the debate that has gone on for the last while, that perhaps a Department of Local Government and the Government of the Yukon should be depend it's position on the ten mill increase, and it's grants to Municipalities. Mind you the '71 census by the Haines Junction population, Mr. Chairman, was 179. Last year's funding to the L.I.D. of Haines Junction by the government of the Yukon, was in it's budget, which it lays down the Municipal services that it wants to operate and budget for and has the appropriation of duly elected members of the L.I.D., that operating grant for that budget for Municipal services which is totally broken down in the budget of the Haines Junction L.I.D. was \$41,500.00. There was an outside, an out and out grant for road improvement in the Haines Junction area last year of some \$40,000.00 \$39,000.00 to upgrade the roads. The capital cost year in the water and sewer system, in the Haines Junction area was some \$450,000.00 to the Government of the Yukon Territory. The administration building, the cost of the Government of the Yukon in capital was \$724,321.00 in the Haines Junction L.I.D. therefore. In local government alone, not counting health and welfare, not counting education, not counting any of the other Government services, a total of 1,254,821.00 was spent by the Department of Local Government only. The Municipal type revenue, accruing back to the Government of the Yukon Territory on the taxable assessment, from the L.I.D. of Haines Junction, was \$6,313.00.

Mr. Chairman let's not get snowed by fine political tactics that the Honourable Member is using on behalf of her constituents, which I'd be fighting just as hard for if those were my constituents. But the fact of the matter remains that in the unorganized areas and the L.I.D.'s, the Government of the Yukon Territory is not even coming within a whisper of receiving the taxes back from the services they are providing in these areas. This is a philosophy which I agree with and will continue to be as long as I serve the people in the Yukon in the Ministry of Local Government.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'm very happy the Minister of Local Government has spoken on this because there are some very specific facts that I would like to bring forward to this House's attention. And I'm very happy that he stated a few statistics so that I have an opportunity to correct them.

And it took a lot of fishing but I finally got it. Water

and sewer systems \$400,000.00. The people, the users of that water and sewer system at Haines Junction are no different. They are paying the capital cost on a per foot basis for their property. They are paying one mill for the property tax for the capital cost on their property. They are paying the O & M on the same schedule that is being used across the Territory, I think the fee schedule is determined by the Department of Local Government to be adopted by by-law. So that they are paying their way, if they have a sewer system they are paying the frontage on the sewer system. They are paying an O & M cost on their sewer system and they are paying one mill on their sewer system.

As far as the Administration Building, I don't think that the City of Whitehorse has paid anything towards the Territorial Building. I don't think they should and that is fifteen million dollars or whatever it is, I think it's going to be. It started out with ten million, I think it's up considerably. The Territorial Building here in the City of Whitehorse is not costing the taxpayers of Whitehorse, one red cent. Neither should the Admin. Building in Haines Junction cost the taxpayers of Haines Junction, one red cent, neither should it cost the taxpayers of Watson Lake one cent.

If you're going to charge it to one area, if you're going to throw it up and say we spent a million dollars for an Admin Building, or \$700,000.00 for an Admin Building at Haines Junction aren't we great. Why don't you stand up and say we spent ten million dollars for a Territorial Building in Whitehorse, aren't we great.

I mean don't ever continue to throw this up. Road improvement, you've got road improvement in your budget for other areas, forty thousand dollars to road improvements that were done because the water and sewer system had to be dug up twice. I mean, whose mistake. Should the people who have their road dug up twice pay for that? \$40,000.00 look in your budget, there are other areas that are having road improvements done to their communities, as a result of sewer and water system. So, then municipal type of revenue \$6,000.00, but that does not include the grant in lieu of taxes that is being received by this Government on behalf of the Federal Departments and the Territorial Government in the L.I.D. of Haines Junction. And your \$6,000.00 would be quite different amount of money when you look at Whitehorse's revenue, you put your tax revenue and your grants in lieu of taxes. When you do it with Dawson, you do the same thing.

So the point I am making around this House here is that we're constantly being told that we are receiving such an enrichment of funding above anyone else, that you better not ask for anything more. It's defined in the Community Assistance Legislation. Now there's no more funding available for the L.I.D. of Haines Junction than there is for any other L.I.D. in the Yukon Territory.

I am very, very disturbed about the 10 mills that was put on unilaterally. Actually when you think of the municipal services that are being received, they're not enriched at all. If our community halls and the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua knows this, the 10 mill increase in taxes on the property that is held for community halls, skating rinks and curling rinks, if it goes up by 10 mills, a lot of these communities are not going to be able to pay the taxes.

They are going to have to turn the administration of the Community Halls, and their recreational facilities over to the L.I.D.. Then you will be paying two mills extra for the curling rink, two mills extra for the community hall, two mills extra for the swimming pool, whatever you have. So, don't say that these people are getting something for nothing, because, they are not.

So, Mr. Chairman, I express my concerns about the L.I.D.'s and I expressed it again this morning, and I am very hopeful that the government of the Yukon looks at local government, because we complain about Federal Government, with the treatment they give us as a junior government, I think we should be very careful with our junior government, with our L.I.D.'s to define very specifically where the taxpayers in that area are expected to pay. This is what concerns me. When the Minister of Local Government says apply for a municipality, if you don't like it the other way.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I never said that.

Mrs. Watson: I don't think this is the answer.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: With respect to a point of order, I did not say that it was the Assistant Commissioner and I don't like to

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, we are building up. We are building up bureaucracies, local government bureaucracies, be they small or big, they are assuming functions and duties, and acting almost as agents for the territorial government. I am not criticizing the territorial government, they are performing municipal services, but there is no relationship between the service and the tax structure within that L.I.D.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: You are right.

Mrs. Watson: And there has to be a factor, there has to be a factor that has to be explained before the services are brought in. Because I am so afraid that one of these days the L.I.D.'s will wake up and they will say, okay you are now that type of structure, you are getting so many municipal services, it will now cost you fifty mills. At that, because it is costing you have got three men working for you, you have got this, you have got that and so on. I don't want people to be let, slip into a pattern without knowing, and this is the thing that really concerns me. I would have hoped that Local Government would have come forward with a package of local government in the Yukon, before a ten mill increase, before the ten mill increase, that was the key. Now, we have got the ten mill increase, they will come forward with a package and slap another ten mills on. You know, and I think that every member who has an L.I.D. or an unorganized in the constituency better start questioning this. I am not criticizing the people within local government who have worked very, very well, have cooperated with the L.I.D.'s, but I am criticizing the whole concept within the territorial government, and the relationship of the people receiving the service and the relationship of where are they going, and how much are they

going to be expected to be, to pay, and I know that the Honourable Member from Mayo feels the same doubts and the Honourable Member from Watson Lake were concerned, but I still don't think, and I think a lot of the statistics that the Minister of Local Government brought forward, are very, very misleading. We are not on a gravy train.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there is enough material in that the political defense of L.I.D.'s by the Honourable Member from Kluane, for me to rebut for half an hour many of the things that she said, I am not interested in this type of political one-upmanship at this time. I just would suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the City Manager's and City Administrations in the municipalities around the Yukon look at the Municipal Ordinance, and the L.I.D. Ordinance that the association of Yukon municipalities say to the Minister of Local Government, we have got to be up our tree, we should be just forgetting about our charter and applying for L.I.D. status, because look at how much better off we would be that way.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I can't let that go unchallenged, and this is the point I am making. You are not defining, in the L.I.D.'s what is a municipal service and which is a normal service that the territorial government should provide, and that they provide in the City of Whitehorse. This is the trouble and it is misleading, and it is enriched figures and I don't think it is fair to the people who live in the L.I.D.'s and I don't think the Honourable Member from Dawson would have voted for the ten mills, if he'd have understood it.

Mr. Chairman: It works both ways, Mrs. Watson. Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: I guess I'll bite too. I did not want to get involved in this because I have to agree with the Honourable Minister of Local Government, I was in City Government in Dawson when the Capital Assistance Program came forward and all the other things. We seriously considered how to become an L.I.D. because the Honourable Member from Kluane does not know what she's talking about. And I don't think she even realizes what she is trying to get into. What is she complaining about? Does she want less services to L.I.D.s or more services? If she wants more services, somebody has to pay for them. It's just as simple as that. Does she want the taxpayer of the Yukon to pay for the L.I.D.s or the people in the L.I.D.s to pay for them? It's just as simple as that. Somebody wants something, somebody has to pay for it.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for services for the L.I.D.s. The point I am making and this is what is so sad is that, actually, the people in the L.I.D.s are paying for the municipal services which they receive, which are very limited.

The budget figure is enriched with other things. And I do know that municipalities, the function of municipalities, and I also know that in the operation of

the Municipality of Dawson, that this Government should maybe be looking at different structures of Local Government to suit the needs of the population of the area. And I have always been concerned that Dawson City and Faro have to operate under the same structure of municipal government as the City of Whitehorse because there is such considerable difference. And that's why we have to pay Dawson \$70,000.00 to pay for their water system outside the municipal arrangement.

This is the part, and this is not a political speech, this is honest-to-goodness fact. This is fact and people will not be serious about it. Municipalities say that L.I.D.s are getting too much and the point that I'm making is that our government has to take the bull by the horns and look at this question of municipal services in the outlying areas and the structure of local government that we have, rather than just come in and say ten mills fellows.

Mr. Chairman: I'm very glad that the Honourable Member did not give a political speech because I was afraid that she might have wasted it for the afternoon, when she really might need it.

(LAUGHTER)

Mr. Chairman: This afternoon for consideration will be the Home Owner's Grant and there is a request before Committee that the Chamber of Commerce wishes to appear. I think members are aware of this and I think they did agree to it at one stage, am I correct?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: The Consumers Association had originally wanted to appear. They are not in a position to appear now, they are merely requesting that they read the brief that is before us this morning. Before we get to that, I would like to clear Vote Number 9, Department of Highways and Public Works \$14,490,589.00. Are we clear?

Mrs. Watson: What's that?

Mr. Chairman: I declare a recess until 13:30 hours. I'm sorry - Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: There was questions asked on a previous say concerning lottery operations and the beer bottle return system. I have information here which I will pass out to all members.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. We are now in recess until 13:30 hours.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. We have with us this afternoon, with Committee's consent, a representative of the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Iain MacKay.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on, Mr. MacKay.

Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comments this afternoon, spoken as a member and vice-president of the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce, are particularly concerned with the proposed Home Owner's Grant.

At the time at which we began to get involved with this situation we did not realize that it would become rather a crucial issue as it has become. There seems to be, to us, a very important point of principle which we want to get across. We have no intention of getting involved or taking sides in a political debate involving the present Executive Committee.

The point of principle in reference to the proposed Home Owner's Grant is that this Assembly should view the Yukon as one economic unit and not in a regionalized manner. There is a distressing split appearing in this Assembly of rural versus urban, which we feel can only lead to deadlock in an action in the future.

The Home Owner's Grant appears to us to ride a vehicle whereby the heavy burden of property taxes, which every home owner in the Yukon carries, may be elevated. This group of taxpayers are those who actually provide the backbone of Yukon's economy and society. They all have considerable faith in the Yukon by virtue of the fact they have invested their savings in their own home here. They are year-round taxpayers; they pay every tax going.

Recently, urban home owners, particularly, by virtue of living within a municipality, have been paying an increasing large amount in property taxes. We note it in passing this Assembly recently increased property taxes in non-urban areas. This is a separate issue on which we do not want to comment.

The mechanics of the Home Owner's Grant are set up to benefit those home owners who pay most, who have the largest investment in this country and who live and work here on a year-round basis. We feel that this formula is fair and we most welcome a needed assistance to home owners.

Undoubtedly, the urban home owners as a group, just by virtue of their size, will benefit most in dollars; and as individuals they will also benefit most because they have larger homes as a rule.

This is a fact of the formula and we feel it's fair that those people who are paying \$6, 7, 800.00 in property taxes should be given more relief. The argument is valid; the urban home owners receive more benefits too, though, and I think that should be noted but that's not valid throughout because, I think, the taxpayers of Dawson City, who have mill rate of 55, might give some argument about the benefits they received for that. The members should be aware that the urban home owners are paying their own way in the form of high mill rates now and also, specifically, in frontage taxes for paving and sidewalks. This is a cost which I would estimate, probably, as 25 percent to the average home owners property tax bill, in an area which is paved. So it's not like people in the urban areas or in the rural areas saying we have all the benefits here, we pay for them also. We know that the effect of the grant will be that most taxpayers will receive a rebate even after allowing for the recent tax increase in non urban areas. It's

fairly obvious to everyone that this conjuring trick has been pulled off by increasing taxes in the mines and commercial establishments in the territory. Which is a very painless way from the point of view of all the home owners in the territory. One concern we do have is the cost of administrating this program; we've contacted the YTG and we are informed that it probably only takes one person about six months in a year to administer this program. We hope this is in fact what is going to be. We started in our presentation saying that a point of principle is involved and we have stated why we think the proposed legislation is fair to home owners and we have not avoided the fact that urban home owners will benefit more in this measure. Yukon is one economic unit with one government, as legislators, we feel that each member here must keep a Yukon perspective and not just a rule or urban perspective. Revenues raised by the Yukon Territorial Government are not returned directly to those who pay; rather, they're paid to those who need it. Measures have been passed in previous Assemblies with the consent and support of urban members generally, knowing that money will be transferred from urban areas to rural areas. This has been a fairly well established principal, in the past. We're more fortunate in the urban areas such as electrical rates and fuel oil tax than those in the outside areas, in these areas where there are transfers going on. This is a principle I think that has been established and I'd like to think that it would be continued.

In this proposed legislation, the home owner, both rural and urban, is going to be helped. This can only be of benefit to the Yukon in helping people to stay here who are prepared to invest their money here. And we feel if the Assembly splits on rural versus urban lines that the goodwill principle that has previously been established will not exist in the future, to the detriment of all. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions for the witness?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. You stated that Yukon was one economic unit. Do you not, though, believe that there are differences in the economies enjoyed in various regions of the Yukon?

Mr. MacKay: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. MacKay. Is there any further debate on Bill number 6?

Ms. Millard: One question of the, any members I guess, who are supporting the, from the Executive Committee. We were told that there would be no increase in the number of people who would be involved in administering the home owners grant. Now, I understand that there will be a half a person man year. Which is true - that there will be no increase in man power or that there will be a half a person increase?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: There is \$5,000.00 included in the Department of Local Government budget for the administration of the home owner grant.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I have a question or two of, I guess it would be the Minister of Local Government, as to the, how the Home Owner Grant will affect. You, for instance, said the business place of restaurant, cafe, otherwise, that also have living quarters but they are not attached and they are not, you might say, permanent foundations. In other words, trailer units that would be, say, on the same property. How would you assess the taxes there? And then I have one other question as to the, a trailer situation again, where in some of the outlying communities they cannot get room enough on one single lot to put these trailers, under the legislation that's through today, under the regulations they can't place them on the lots, which is a fact, because they can't fit lengthways and get the yardage they are supposed to have and they can't go the other way because they are too long for the lot; therefore, they have to have two properties, two lots, in this instance, what do you tax or what do you consider the taxes for the Home Owner's Grant? The two lots and the trailer, or one of those lots; which one?

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, if the person is on two, if the trailer is on two lots, it would be the total taxation that would be considered in the re-distribution through the Home Owner's Grant. If the trailer is a part of the business premise and is used for residential purposes, that will be assessed as the person's residence and the Home Owner's Grant will apply to the trailer on the business property.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, I'd like to speak on the Bill and before I start I think everybody knows where I stand on the Bill, regardless of the comments we just heard from the Chamber of Commerce.

I'm against the Bill and am going to remain so as it stands today. I don't doubt that a Home Owner's Grant would be a wonderful thing for the Yukon and probably has been a wonderful thing for the Provinces. But, this Home Owner's Grant is not, in my opinion, equitable and for all of the people and the home owners. I heard the Chamber of Commerce mention that something to do with the fuel situation and this and that but we must remember that if there is any fuel tax returned to people in the outlying districts or anything, that it is because they are paying more for that fuel in the outlying districts.

It is the same thing as we have said so many times, if you want it, you have to pay for it. So I don't think these things come into effect at all in the Home Owner's Grant. The only thing that should be looked at is the people themselves, what category they're in, and how much they are going to gain for it and who is going to gain. I'd like to start down at the bottom some where of a small home owner, and I don't care if he's in Whitehorse. There's one thing that I don't want have anybody think that I am fighting Whitehorse or the municipalities in anything I say, because I'm not. I'm thinking of everybody.

If you have a small home owner that has say a

twenty-six hundred dollar or three thousand dollar assessment, he's not going to gain anything from this grant. If you go up a little higher, he is going to gain a little bit on the grant. And the higher you go, the higher you get and naturally somebody that is a millionaire and has a fifty thousand dollar establishment is going to get the total.

The Chamber of Commerce may say that these are the taxpayers that really are the backbone or something in this country, but I don't think that's quite right. I think that a person who is working somewhere for \$3.00 or \$4.00 an hour in this Territory, and can't afford that home and another thing possibly don't want to afford that home, because they want to live where they wish to live and be left alone. I don't think they should be jeopardized and just get nothing from a grant that is given to people.

I've always said we don't give grants to bums and people who are abusing programs but there is no way that I'm going to vote for something that also gives the rich more money than the poor or the middle class either. Everyone of us is here for a purpose and it isn't because we're rich. There's many, many people that don't have large homes and don't pay large taxes, I agree, but they want to live in that area and that's their home. I don't see why they should be asked, which they already are asked, their taxes have gone up 10 mills, I know that I'm going to have an awful lot of guts to stand here and vote against the Home Owner's Grant on people who have already taxes just the other day for 10 mills. But I didn't do that myself and I'm going to vote against this. No matter what happens. If this government can afford the Home Owner's Grant that is equitable for everybody and starts at the top where it should start, such as they have in the Provinces, and the figure if 50,300 or whatever and we can afford it, I would vote for it. But I will not vote for this one the way it stands today.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson? Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I might say that since the inception of Bill Number 6 which, we, of course, were only made aware of when we came to this Session, has been a cause of concern to myself and those I represent and indeed those across the Yukon Territory. It's a new program. It's one that the people of the Yukon have not cried out about. The people of the Yukon have, or a segment of the people of the Yukon, have cried out for things like Remedial Tutoring Programs and this type of thing. They have told us quite clearly that we did not, at this time, feel that it was justifiable that taxes should be increased upon the people of the Yukon.

However, these things have occurred. We have at this table and at this Session, been asked to consider several propositions both in Resolutions and Ordinances, which by my reconnecting in the answers that we have obtained from the witnesses, from the Administration, we have already to this point today increased the revenues of the Yukon Territory over last year, by calculation, of one million and thirty-three thousand dollars based on the information that we have been able to ascertain.

This is a million and thirty three thousand dollars

over the revenues which would have been approved last year. It is to myself, as I am sure it is all members of Committee, and to all people in the Yukon of great concern that these, that this great accumulation of revenue has occurred all at one time. It might be well to say to put 25 cents or 30 cents, or whatever it might be in a bottle of whisky, to add another mill or two here or there to municipal taxation, to general taxation. To cause the smoker to pay a little more on his cigarettes, for his cigarettes, to say that the insurance companies, perhaps, will not raise the premiums because we are raising taxation on them. It is all well to say in each individual case, but this is not really going to have any effect upon the people of the Yukon, but, indeed, Mr. Chairman, with deepest respect, when you have put all this together, and you put the high costs of living in the Yukon together, you've really got something to think about.

Well, I have taken the opportunity, and not being a rural member, and I agree, I should say at the outset I agree there should be no difference between establishing lines between an urban and a rural, or an intown member as you prefer. I've taken the thing fairly objectively. I have had a little opportunity not representing a constituency in Whitehorse. I have had little opportunity to get home and really talk to my people, or get a good cross section of their opinion on it, other than by telephone. I have taken what opportunities were available to me to select opinion. The first case, people are bewildered by this thing. They didn't know it was coming, and they, like me, found it very, very difficult to give an answer as to whether or not I should stand in this House on this crucial question, on their behalf and vote, because perhaps my vote could make the difference as to whether or not this program is instituted or not instituted. I have had to take into account the question of the ten mill increase, which has been levied by a majority of the House upon the people of the Yukon outside of municipalities. I have to say, well, now if this raises \$440,000.00, whatever it is designed to raise, it is in that ball park somewhere, that how does this money get back to the people, and perhaps, I've given a lot of consideration to say, well, does the \$400,000.00 go into the support of the government of the Yukon Territory as a civil servant, or, does in fact this money go back to the people of the Yukon directly. We are talking here of a redistribution of revenue. I was mindful, in attempting to make a decision of the fact that we put on a fuel equalization program.

Now, this didn't mean that when you got your fuel bill, if you were John Q Yukon citizen, as we do with our light bill, that this amount, this subsidy was reflected in the bill you got. You had to make application at the end of the year if you understood the program first, and you got the applications, then you made application to get this pittance back on your bills, and, as a result, a lot of people didn't do it, for either lack of understanding of the program, or for one reason or another, and the fact that maybe, perhaps, they forget to save their fuel bills.

Now, this is a realistic experience. It is well to say what a wonderful program it is, but the average person in the Yukon, I don't think, is taking advantage of that program for one or two reasons. One he doesn't understand it, forgets about it, or the other is that he just

doesn't feel it is worthwhile. Here is another program, this is not coming off the, you know, if you accept the Homeowner's Grant, you are simply not going to get your tax notice minus so much. You have got to make application for this, and I can see that a lot of people in the Yukon are confused on it, as I am, as the Consumers Association in their representations to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, have said. They don't fully understand it. I don't fully understand it. Obviously, many members of this Committee do not understand it. So, what's the poor guy in the street, John Q Public supposed to understand about it.

So, I can only rationalize it this way, Mr. Chairman, in making my vote, and that is that we have an opportunity, however, inequitable it may be, and I do think, based on what information I have now, that is not really in my opinion an equitable thing for those I represent; but, it is an opportunity, and it does present an opportunity to take a portion of these revenues, these additional revenues, that have been raised by this ten mill increase, and get a portion back to somebody in the public, and it is for that reason that, and I have to answer to those I represent, it is for that reason, and for that reason only, that I am going to support Bill number 6. I feel that I have been compromised and in compromising me you have compromised the citizens and the representatives of my constituency. But, I am compromised and I can only come to this decision, and I do it honestly and I hope to God that I have made the wise decision, but I state before Committee today, I am disappointed that this has come to us in this manner, this quickly and that will be my vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I've also been somewhat confused by this Bill for the simple reason that it was a complete surprise again. There hasn't been a lobby, to my knowledge for a Home Owner Grant. I am not aware of any portion of the public making representations to me or to other members of this legislature, or to the Government asking for a Home Owner Grant. In the past I am not aware of any of this type of a request at all, for this type of assistance, but I am aware that the municipality have asked for a review of the per capita grant that they received from the Territorial Government.

The per capita grant structure was brought into force, I think in 1972, or 1973, it hasn't been revised since then, and the administrative cost, in the Municipalities and the costs in the Municipalities, have increased, and Municipalities have asked the Territorial Government to review the per capita grant situation. I cannot understand why our government, didn't do this thing to review the per capita grant, if there was the need for the taxpayers in the Municipalities to require assistance that they did not in fact review this grant structure, and come up with a structure that would satisfy, or take into account the increase costs of providing services that the Municipalities are faced with, and are apparently having to pass on to the Home Owners.

I sometimes have to compare the situation here with this House, we are forever criticizing the Federal Government, by apparently not having confidence in

us, and here our Government, do we not have the confidence in a Municipal administrative body the Municipal elected body, to properly administer the Municipalities and provide the services. Why was the money not then, allocated to the Municipalities so that the people in the Municipalities make the decision.

The Home Owners could make their representation to their council. And you might say, that we don't like to see the split against the rural and the urban, and I don't either, but we have to face the fact, that the Territorial Government is the taxing authority, in the rural areas. And you have to face the fact that the ten mills were put on the rural areas, and you have to face the fact that a great, and part of the reason that the ten mills were put on to increase the Home Owners taxes, then many of the rural areas, so that they would be able to benefit to a very, very, minimal amount from the Home Owner Grant.

I would have preferred for you to have forgotten the ten mills and put on the Home owner grant for the people that qualify, if that's what you were going to do. I couldn't help but notice the representation from the Chamber of Commerce, when the statement was made that the people who have the greatest investment, get the greatest benefit. But we must not forget, that the people who have the greatest investment also have the ability to have the greatest investment. And there are a great many people who do not have that ability, to have that large an investment in a Home so that they can benefit from the maximum of the Home Owners grant. And I think this is one of the very marked deficiencies of this piece of legislature, if we must go in to a Home Owners grant, rather than an increase on per capita payment to the Municipality, if we must go into Home Owner Grant, the maximum goes to the people who can afford the greatest investment in a home. And if that's how we want to, and this is my question to the Member from Watson Lake, is that how we want to redistribute some of this revenue that we will be getting and there is \$196,000.00, from an increase in the minimum tax, raising it to \$100,000.

And there is revenue from the 10 mills that has been levied on the areas outside of the municipality. And this is my greatest concern is the way that the Home Owner's Grant is structured who it will benefit the most. We also talk about Joe Lunchbucket, the guy who's paying the taxes. This is very true, but I also have to think about Joe Lunchbucket who can't afford a house. And there are a lot of Joe Lunchbuckets who have to rent in apartments and they're not going to benefit from this redistribution of revenue at all.

I realize that this is a very difficult thing to do. But we can't completely, if we're starting to consider assisting people, for the cost of their shelter and that's what we're doing, then we try to make it. The people who need that assistance most should receive it and we should try to cover all people who require shelter and that pretty well takes in everyone.

So there are quite a few misgivings I have with this piece of legislation. And had we opted had the government opted it for increasing the Per Capital Grants to municipalities, Joe Lunchbucket who has to live in an apartment would have benefited also.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know I will be supporting Bill number 6. I think I first got up and spoke about it and covered my reasons in quite a bit of detail. I probably would have preferred some relief via Per Capital and unconditional grant system but I know this is very, very difficult to try and aim the relief to the persons that you really want to do it for and that's why I opted, certainly, for the Home Owner Grant system.

I think it reflects a responsibility in really determining what areas are to be burdened or for that matter to be alleviated. I support the concept and I did of taking a look at a whole economic unit and I consider Yukon to be that. I think that this Bill does give some relief to the middle class income group where relief is really required. It brings taxes more in line for services being asked for and being provided in the outlying areas, I'm convinced of that. Again Mr. Chairman, I say that I like the idea of gaining further revenues from our resource industries, which to me sets the stage, the future stage Mr. Chairman, for responsible government where they can exercise these kind of responsibilities further down the line.

I've examined the Hamlet Allowance, for instance. I know that there is relief being brought to the outlying areas, for instance Haines Junction 28 per cent, Watson Lake 17 percent, Faro 28 percent, Dawson 35 percent. Somebody should take a real good look at that kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, the basic problem will probably remain unchanged. Property assessment does not expand rapidly enough to meet growing municipal expenditures. Property taxes are essential form or an element of local autonomy and therefore they will be continued, there's no doubt about it. Granted improvements will be sought in assessment practices but in the final analysis, it will always remain a political game to entice higher levels of government to come through with the additional revenue based on some new wrinkles, be it the cost sharing programs, the unconditional grants or the tax abatement schemes. And it is a political game. I would say that it is where the responsibility should remain that we simply play it out as a game winning game and losing some, in the full knowledge that Mr. Chairman, there probably is no real solution to it but I think that we're on the road to the better solution.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was asked a question earlier here and I was going to give an answer to the Honourable Member from Kluane, but she apparently had asked a question about why I could accept, you know, this particular program in light of her remarks. I was about to rise to say that we really have little alternative. As I say I have been compromised, perhaps the Honourable Member had not understood my remarks quite clearly.

Oh, I've been through this route right from, I spent a weekend, I got right out of Whitehorse, I got down thinking on these things, trying to rationalize, based on what little information I had, as to the meanings behind it. I

thought about the 360 houses that D.P.W. you know, is that the carrot that the government are going to use to sell the houses with. Perhaps indeed it is, I don't know, and I'll probably never know until long after this Session is over.

I thought about the fact that this government are budgeting for a \$350,000,000.00 surplus and we're sitting here, pitifully, arguing over the operation of a library for \$6,000.00.

I have talked about the, and thought about the problems that the Honourable Minister of Education, the difficulties he is having with the Remedial Tutoring Program, and I have thought about all these things, and I still am left with the idea, either these funds, these \$400,000.00 goes into general revenues, or God knows where, or else it is re-distributed to the people. I thought I made it clear that I don't feel that it's being equitably distributed, but however, I have no alternative, if it means that I can give some measure of refund and return to my people. I don't want to do this, I really don't want to vote for this Bill, but, in all honesty, I have got to vote for it. I am compromised, so that's the answer.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, my advice to the Member from Watson Lake if he feels that compromised that, possibly, we could have some amendments. We are voting now on the Bill as it is and possibly the administration would be prepared to come forward with some amendments to the Bill to provide for different structuring of the eligibility for the grant. I think that the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua would have different thoughts on it then, if the greatest benefit didn't go to the greatest investment. We are trying to help the guy who barely can pay his taxes. Let's see, let's look at alternative methods of providing this Home Owner Grant, and I think then the Member from Watson Lake wouldn't have to compromise himself so badly, and people would have different alternatives of looking at it. We have got one alternative that's all. There are various methods of providing a Home Owner Grant, that are used all across Canada. I am sure that our administration isn't that inflexible that they're not prepared to come forward with proposals, various proposals before they provide the exact legislation, and we can at that time, then make a decision on the proposal, the legislation amendments would be quite minor at that time. But, this would be my suggestion before we take an outright vote whether we are going to let it die in Committee or go on to third reading, or this type of thing. I am not satisfied with the type of grant you are proposing.

Mr. Flemming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have another question I would like to ask the Minister of Local Government, and that is something to do with the native peoples, and I am going to speak of houses in the villages and so forth, and the log houses that are built on naturally there is possibly no tax there to the individual, but in this grant is there any consideration anywhere where these people may get any return for being a homeowner in the Yukon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, it is only on assessible property, and that property is not assessed, in that fact they don't pay tax.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, however, I am just wondering, I think you were asking the administration the other day, is there not some grant from the Federal Government for any lands set aside and are on, possibly on the taxation roll in the Territory?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman it was asked of the administrative commissioner, and he was going to try and break it down. I think his two remarks were that it was minimal, that it would be difficult to break it down, but he would try to bring those figures back.

Mr. Fleming: In other words, Mr. Chairman, I would say if he comes back with the answer that we are, in fact, getting monies from the Federal Government or anywhere else in taxation of any type in there, that these people should also be eligible for this grant. Although they wouldn't be eligible because their taxes would never get them a grant in their homes they are living in today. However, it is the same thing as I said before, we are all living here, including the native people, including the poor people, that can't afford large homes, and for my money they are eligible for a grant the same as anybody else, and that's what I, why I stand here today, and I see where people have changed their minds since the other day, because of the ten mills that went through. I am really amazed that anybody can stand up and change his principles. I know that we have stuck these people and I am saying "we" although it wasn't me, with the ten percent, but I am still not going to stick them further, because I can see in the next few years, the turnover of the federal housing up on the hill. I can also see, and I am not going to tie this down to Whitehorse because I can see it in the outlying districts of the D.P.W. homes being turned over, and they are all going to be in the, more or less, the upper bracket, and they are all going to be eligible for homeowner grants, while it is still going to do absolutely nothing for the people that I am fighting for. The people in the middle class group, but, it is going to cost instead of \$400,000.00 it is going to cost probably a million dollars to supply that Home Owners Grant.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I think there was one question that remained unanswered from the Honourable Member, and that is even though the Territorial Government doesn't assess the improvements on land in the Indian community, that all of the normal types Municipal Institution services are provided to those people, because I agree entirely with the Honourable Member that they're full participating members of the community and of the Department of Local Government, even though they cannot get money back from the assessment of the property, as the Honourable Member well knows, that they provide the ordinary Municipal services to those communities.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want to reit-

erate what my position was, before, and that is, that I will be voting for this Bill. I think it's about time, that we considered the private Home Owner in the Yukon. Some have criticized the Bill itself, I've yet to hear one Honourable Member that's criticized the Bill, come up with any amendments. We've had it for approximately four weeks, it can't be all that bad. I also suggest to the Honourable Members that are criticizing this particular Bill, that they should give it enough time, in it's present form, to work. If it shows after a period of a year, that there is some necessary amendments needed, then it would be an appropriate time then, to consider it, but not now. One Honourable Member suggested I've made reference to Joe Lunchbucket, I always make reference to Joe Lunchbucket, because I am one of those Joe Lunchbucket's.

I think most of the problems that the Joe Lunchbucket has, is that there are no housing available that he can afford to buy. So all you are doing is playing into the hands of builders that believe in that sort of concept. If you want that sort of thing, fine, let's just tax the private Home owner right out of the Yukon, because this is what we're going to be doing anyway. So if we were to encourage our little friend, Joe Lunchbucket, to consider going into a private home ownership, we should give some encouragement in the right direction. And that is consideration on his taxes, et cetera, et cetera. We should also when considering this Bill, consider motion number two from last week, because I will not sit in this House as a hypocrite.

Yes, that is for sure, when I make a decision I stand by it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang;

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just have one point to make, I think everybody knows where I stand, but in reference to the comments made in regard to the people with low assessment, will be getting less than people with that are charged the high assessments. I think that the Honourable Member should look in at this area and the positive light, that if the person is charged a low assessment, he decides to do something, repairs on his home, he gets into a higher assessment bracket, therefore, he gets a higher rebate from the government.

So therefore, in turn he is helping to enrich his life, and at the same time, supply his family with a home that is acceptable in the 20th century. I think that this is one area that a person should look at in the positive sense rather than in the negative.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? Mr. McKinnon, Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm against it, for one particular reason. to me it's an open licence to Municipalities to increase taxation in Municipalities. I'm especially concerned right now in Dawson, there is all sorts of things needed for Home Owners Grant, and Municipalities can go ahead and raise taxes and say you're going to get it back anyway, again, what are you crying about. People are concerned that Joe Lunchbucket, needs to get something, I say Joe Lunchbucket is going to get a kick usually where he sits on, that's all

he's going to get. If people are so concerned, I would refer people to Sessional Paper number three, Yukon Income tax, and see if there's a possible reduction in the income tax in the Territory possible, this would encompass everybody in the territory, the low income people, and the high income people. And everybody could be satisfied so that possible changes in that, not in specific things like housing or anything else, indirectly Joe Lunchbucket and everybody else is going to end up paying more, for what it is going to receive back.

That is all I've got to say on this thing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman there's been a lot of good points that have been raised by many of the Honourable Members who have spoken during this debate, both before, and this afternoon.

I think that those who are looking at some ulterior motive of the Executive Committee or the Government in bringing this type of measure before the House, should ease their minds on that score completely.

During the last election Mr. Chairman, I didn't do any extensive advertising, go to many political rallies or call them to be called. But I went on foot to every home in my constituency. It is a middle class constituency I think you are all aware of that. The feeling that I got from knocking on every door and talking to every family in that constituency, was that they were just so completely and absolutely and totally frustrated and annoyed and pessimistic about they and their families future because of the erosion of the disposable income through the inflationary spiral.

I've spoken in this House prior to that election about what I considered was going to be the revolt of the middle class and I was afraid of what was going to happen to the Yukon, if somebody somewhere didn't start paying attention to the backbone of Yukon society and Canadian society. These are the people, Mr. Chairman, who do not cry out, they do not form lobbies, they do not come and pressure government like the affluent groups or the articulate groups or the groups of vested interest which do have the ability of making noise and do have the ability of lobbying this Legislative Assembly. But any of you who know your constituents and know the type of people where of I speak, know how absolutely and totally frustrated and bitter they are at present federal economic policies and also, as what they see, as their wages going up and up and never enough to meet the spiraling cost of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, we did our homework on this. We looked at all kinds of different avenues. We hired Joe Oliver, one of the most respected municipal experts in the country, to come up with plans and programs for the Yukon to be able to help the target group that we were heading and trying to help. We did look at the per Capital Grant. We weighed it out at this time because that would not be a universal scheme but was just to the municipalities only. There were other reasons, because at this present time the studies that we did, showed that the unconditional grants were given to municipalities by the Yukon Government were the most generous any where in the country. Also those usual municipal type responsibilities, like education, hospital, libraries,

health, welfare, tourism were all taken care of by the Territorial Government not the municipal authority.

The other reason why the Per Capital Grant was looked at and wasn't taken up, was that in most municipal structures, the financing is considered to be proper when 60 percent of it is approximately paid by business and commercial interests and 40 percent by the domestic or the home owners. Unfortunately for many and varied reasons, the reverse is the absolute truth in the City of Whitehorse and the Yukon, where the onus of 60 percent of the taxes are paid by the home owner resident taxpayers and 40 percent approximately by the business and commercial efforts.

So Per Capital Grant, all if would have done is serve to keep this type of relationship in that perspective. So we have to come up with some type of a program where we were going to get the money into the target group that we thought would most benefit by some sort of program, and it was the Home Owner Grant which is before you now, that we did come up with.

The reason that there's a maximum on it of \$250.00 is so that the person with the real mansion and the palace that is worth sixty, seventy thousand dollars, he still only receives a maximum of \$250.00, but that maximum is also going to be received by the guy who is paying six, seven hundred dollars in municipal taxes which many of the taxpayers in the City of Whitehorse are now paying.

We heard of, it's difficult to understand the program. The only reason, one of the main reasons why the program was gone for, is because of its absolute and total simplicity. All that has to be done by the home owner taxpayer is to pick up a form which will be simple from any of the Territorial Agents, form the Territorial Treasurer, they will be available, send it in with proof that he's paid his taxes for the current fiscal year. The formula is so simple to figure out, half the taxes minus \$50.00 and a cheque comes back from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Government of the Yukon Territory. That's why we're not going to get involved in heavy administrative costs because the onus will be on that home owner taxpayer, there will be enough of a benefit for him to make sure that he does fulfill his obligation of making out a simple statement and proving that he's paid his taxes to the taxing authority.

So, Mr. Chairman, we feel the elected members on the Executive Committee and the Government of the Yukon, that after looking at all the aspects of the different programs that could have been available that our homework was done, that we have the program that we wanted to deliver to the target group that we feel is deserving and worthwhile of some help from government at this time. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will have the support of the majority of the members for this program which we feel is very necessary, a good program and one that will be welcome by the majority of the homeowner taxpayers in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Is there any further debate?

(READS PREAMBLE)

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour please indicate.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe a motion would have to be forthcoming in relation to this Bill.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would move Bill number 6 out of this Committee without amendment.

Mr. McCall: I'll second that.

Mr. Chairman: Question? Are you in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Disagree?

Some Members: Disagree.

Mr. Chairman: Please indicate by rasure of your hands. Those agreed? Disagreed? Motion is carried six to five.

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Chairman: I declare a brief recess.

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. Before further consideration of Bill number 2, there are two motions before the Committee that are pertinent to Bill number 2 and will be considered at this time. First of all, motion number 14.

MOTION NUMBER 14

Mr. Chairman: Moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, 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 a higher income level, the information be provided to the House respecting the cost of assistance for child care, covering both working and nonworking parents, within the scale improved. Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am going to have to hope someone within the House proposes in an amendment to this legislation, it should be stated-- in the opinion of this House I can't propose the amendment as a mover of the motion-- but it is a money motion and it should be stated in the-- it is the opinion of this House that the existing government assistance and the basic principle behind it is that I would like to see our child care assistance, assistance for child care, to be continued at the same level in this next financial year as the level we funded it in 1975-76, and that is where we provide assistance for people who require it and the guidelines are set within the cost sharing arrangements under the Canada Assistance Program. I am very, very

reluctant, and I would hope, and this is the basis for my motion, that the government not assist child care in child care establishments, at any greater degree than what we are doing now, before we know exactly how much it is going to cost us. Also, before we also examine what child care would cost us if we gave it, not only to people who had their children in a child care centre, but if we gave it to the mother who stays at home and is taking care of here children.

I stood up in this House time after time and said that I am opposed to grants, and I am basically very opposed to grants. But if we are going to assist people of a certain income level with the cost of child care, if they take their child to a child care centre then I feel we should be looking at funding the cost of child care in the home, whereas the mother has opted out not to work so you are not getting two incomes in the family. I think this is a very valid approach. I think all across the country we are seeing evidences of intensive increase, and I do mean intensive increases, in the cost of child care centres, and governments all across the country who have embarked partially into these programs find that they are sort of-- they have their backs against the wall because they are being asked to provide ever more and more funding for this service. I am saying, because I am fiscally responsible, before we go any further at any greater level than what we did in 1975-76, let us know the full ramifications before we embark upon it. I think it should come before this House with a definite proposal and a definite estimate of funding rather than ask for additional funding, and I think the funding we are asking for here is about \$25,000.00 over what we did last year, and really not be able to say exactly what it is going to be used for, how it is going to be used to assist in child care. This is why I put this motion forward. Let's stay at the level we are at this year; if we want to expand upon it, please bring it into the estimates next year, outline the details of it and then let us consider it.

Mr. Fleming: I don't think I can expand very much more on the motion itself, on seconding it I have to agree that we should take another look before we raise the levels. Now, make sure we are not giving something away again. Possibly it is going to cost the average person more money to again, and I think I've said the same thing a little while ago, support the rich as I call it because I think that is what we are doing when we start raising some of these things and especially these grants that are being given, or at one time are started and given, to help people that were more or less on the poor side, or have a problem and needed to go to work and couldn't because they had children to take care of, okay, we give them something to help them along.

But on the other hand, as soon as we start giving it to people who are really in no need of it, I think we're just going to ruin the whole program. So I would say just let's leave it where it is this year and bring it in next year if you wish and take a look at it. Possibly come up with something better.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare could let us

know if there is any conflict between this Resolution and the new financing arrangements that have been offered by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare. Sometimes we automatically get into a higher range of costs in order to get the grant and if this resolution passes and is accepted and we fund only at last year's level we may not be eligible for 50 percent funding.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable Member from Mayo, the most recent plan approved by the Federal Health and Welfare Minister which I referred to briefly in Committee recently would provide direct assistance to the Day Care Centre rather than a subsidy to parents, up to one-third of the unit cost annually per child. And as I mentioned, that is a little rich for our blood here at the moment.

We could probably go under that plan up to 25 percent of the cost and that is a whole new proposal as I said, Mr. Chairman, which the Social Welfare Branch is now working on, trying to come up with figures based on the unit cost per child in each Day Care Centre and there is no income level application which applies to the subsidy plan. There are technicalities which make it not as simple as I outlined it here; there are all kinds of wheels within wheels from the accounting point of view for that new plan.

But it is not tied to the family income level which was our barrier before. My problem, Mr. Chairman, with this motion is that it is not saying what the Honourable Members are saying. The Honourable Members are saying to me, leave your Day Care Assistance as it is now, until you come in with specifics for the cost of the plan, but this motion doesn't say that, Mr. Chairman. This motion says that level should be left there until we come in with information respecting the cost of assistance for child care covering both working and non-working parents within the scale proposed. And that is a whole new ball game, Mr. Chairman. The staff in the Social Welfare Branch have earnestly researched this motion.

My advice from them, Mr. Chairman, is that it is impossible to come in with that information. In the first place, you are saying within the scale proposed and we are assuming that you mean within the all family income level cut-off point. How you determine how many people in the Yukon are within that level, we don't know because income statistics, Mr. Chairman, are not broken down into family income. One parent, two parents, whatever, there is no way that we can decide how many families of both working parents would qualify under this plan. We have really worked on it, Mr. Chairman, and my staff informed me that unless we did a house-to-house survey and actually asked all working parents, whether they come within the scale, first, for their combined income. Second, whether they use Day Care, which they may not be. Third, whether they would stay home rather than get a \$20.00 a month subsidy, which is a rhetorical question if they're both working in order to pay for a house, you know. And fourth, whether or not that answer would still be viable one week later when, perhaps, a new job offer had come up. That is our difficulty with this motion, Mr. Chairman, there is no

way we can come back to this House with that information. Unless, perhaps, the mini-census to which my colleague referred some time ago might include those questions to be asked of every household throughout the Territory.

I really don't see how we can come back with a cost figure for what the Honourable Member wanted, which was, I believe, to find out how much it would cost to extend the same kind of subsidy to people who stayed at home who were within that income level.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but we cannot bring you that information, not at this Session.

That is my problem, if this motion simply said that the existing government assistance for child care be continued in this coming financial year, you know, I would have some terms of reference there, but before we can expand that assistance we have to bring in information which I don't believe we can bring, presents the problem.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I can understand. I certainly didn't expect it this Session but I can understand the difficulty in trying to determine the cost. I think this also points out the difficulty in not being able to predict the cost of Day Care Centres Assistance, how much money would be required if we embarked upon a grant structure of a third of the cost of a unit of a Day Care Centre.

These things could grow and we would never be able to tell how many working mothers there are, how many would be taking their children to the Day Care Centre. So this is a very dangerous route to go.

I am quite prepared but I can't make the amendment, but I am quite prepared to have the motion amended, it is the opinion of this body or Legislative Assembly, that the existing government for child care be continued at the same level in 1976-77 as in the current financial year, period. So that we don't go on to anything before we know what we're into, and bring it forward next year if you have further proposals.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I would so move that amendment, that it is in the opinion of this assembly that the existing Government assistance for Child Care be continued at the same level in 1976-77 as in the current financial year.

Mr. McCall: I'll second that Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I must protect the interest of those already receiving assistance. The existing Government assistance, and that is for people who are already receiving assistance from the Social Welfare Branch. Yes, now, I have no guarantee that I'm not going to have to spend a few more dollars than I did last year, on those families. I hate being tied down to not a cent more than last year sort of policy, and I will not accept that, because our families under the level of \$600.00 a month must be cared for. If I have that assurance from the Honourable Member.

Mrs. Watson: We weren't trying to tie you into an amount of money, we were trying to, we were defining the criteria used for that assistance, and to maintain that same criteria. Whether you have more people and you require more funds than you did in the last year, that's fine, but don't change the rules of the game, before we pursue it hear in the House.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, well I thank you Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, for that assurance because the actual words in the motion by which I must be bound to not say that. The do say existing Government Assistance, the do not say the policy, the principal, they say existing Government Assistance, which means dollars.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member has our commitment, you'll have it in the Votes and Proceedings the interpretation of the motion.

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

Mr. Chairman: The motion as amended now reads, it was moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mr. McCall, it is the opinion of this House that the existing Government Assistance for child care be continued at the same level in 1976-77, as in the current financial year. Question? Are you in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary? The motion is carried.

MOTION CARRIED

Hon. Mr. Taylor: At a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe it will now be necessary if that was an amendment, to call the question on the main motion.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order, what we'd have to do is vote against the original motion, and revoke the second motion, because it is entirely changed.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Contrary, Mr. Chairman, here we go again procedurally, what has in effect happened is that a member has risen to amend motion number 14, that amendment was just voted upon, and carried, it is now necessary to carry, or defeat, as the case might be, motion number 14.

Mr. Chairman: Why don't we start again, I'm sorry. It was moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mr. McCall that the following words be added, the beginning of paragraph one; it is the opinion of this House and delete the final paragraph. Now that is the amendment. All those, Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I was just going to say that's what I assume that we voted upon.

Mr. Chairman: I didn't read it that way, so now I am doing so, interpreting it. Question?

Some members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary?

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the member of Kluane, seconded by the honourable member from Hootalingua, it is the opinion of this House, that the existing Government Assistance for child care, be continued at the same level in 1976-77 as in the current financial year. Question?

Mr. Chairman: Favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary?

Mr. Chairman: Carried.

(Motion Carried)
Motion Number 16

Mr. Chairman: We will now continue with motion number, we will now continue with number 16. It was moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable member from Hootalingua, that Family Allowances paid to the Director of Welfare on behalf of children in care, not be paid to group homes, or foster parents as at present, but that instead, an allowance be paid to such parents, varying with the age and requirements of the children in accordance with regulations to be made for that purpose. Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think in this motion, I'm going to have to ask for an amendment again, it should be worded, it is the opinion of this House that, and I think the motion is quite self explanatory. I talked of length on it before, that rather than continuing the practice of, I believe \$20.00 was the Family Allowance cheque being paid to group home parents or to foster parents, that the Department of Welfare, determine regulations and provide assistance to parents for extra requirements that the children in care may have, and that the family allowance cheque would be deposited to the Director of, to the general revenue fund of the territory, because actually Family Allowance cheques under the Family Allowance Act of Canada, really specifically at one time were meant for the general maintenance of the child. We should define by regulation for the benefit of foster parents and group home parents, the type of assistance that they can expect, based on the need of the child and the age of the child, makes quite a difference if it is, let's say a six month old child or a 15 year old boy.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I haven't got much to add to that, Mr. Chairman, except that I never like to see money just given directly to anybody no matter how responsible they are, and think that all our foster parents in the Yukon are responsible, there is no question about that at all, but the fact remains that the possibility is there. You

hand anybody a dollar or a twenty dollar bill and say here you spend it on so and so, that may not happen that way. That's is my reason. I think that they should have more control over where that money is actually going.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question of, possibly, the Minister of Health and Welfare on this, then what will be involved, what sort of costs are going to be involved in determining these new regulations that are called for in this motion. There is going to have to be some new criteria set up, and I would like to really know how long this would take, what costs are going to be involved?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, that's a very good question and I can't answer it. I don't know how we would determine. What allowance should be paid in lieu of the allowance that is now being paid. If I could, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the members a little of background on this accounting. Up until 1973, there was a very elaborate bookkeeping system operating in the Social Welfare Branch, just as is now being proposed again, and it was so cumbersome and so difficult that in 1973 the family allowance cheques were turned over to foster parents to look after their children in care. All but the extra two dollars or whatever, the foster parents gets \$20.00 and the extra goes to the YTG. Now the social workers, who are intimately involved with each of these foster parents and the children in their care, have spent a great deal of time educating those foster parents to utilize this amount instead of coming back to the branch asking for money for extras. The system has been working very, very well, and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that this motion has caused a great deal of concern in the Social Welfare Branch, where the workers are most upset at the possibility of reverting again to a cumbersome bookkeeping system, where the foster parent would have to go to the social worker, to the Social Welfare Branch for the amount of money every time they needed an extra amount.

Now, to have an Honourable member say here that nobody's keeping track of where this money is spent, I am going to overlook. In the first place it is an insult to the social workers who are working with those children and those families, and it is an insult to foster parents, who take on a great burden when they take a child into their home. Mr. Chairman, I remarked earlier that foster parents don't get rich doing this, and many of them dig into their own pockets frequently, so that the child in care in their home will have exactly the same treatment as their own children, who are receiving family allowance, which is paid directly to the parents.

Now, if the foster child in a family with natural children at every turn has to be told no you can't go and play hockey with your two foster brothers, because we would have to pay a fee, and I haven't got it unless I go and ask the Social Welfare Branch for it, or camp, or any other special use. You can see that this is going to destroy the whole basis on which that child is in care, as an accepted regular person, an accepted member of

that family.

Now, I would also like to point out Mr. Chairman, that last Christmas for the first time this branch did not have to provide one single cent for extras at Christmas for any child in care, because the foster parents had saved up the family allowance in order to cover all the extras at Christmas for those children. Now, do you want this Department to revert to the former system, and go back and forth for every signal special advantage that that kid is entitled to have. We are not asking for luxuries. Foster parents are paid a daily rate for care. For the basic cost of feeding and housing and clothing a child. Everything extra that they get comes out of that family allowance. I would like to say, from my own personal experience, Mr. Chairman, that I don't think that would apply to every family. There are many, many families receiving family allowance who don't need it. They can put it away in a savings account for their children, or for their college careers or for whatever, but in these cases, these children have no other source of funds, and \$20.00 a month to provide membership in school groups, if you are in highschool, for example, going to the show, taking music lessons, church and sunday school outings. There are children who still go to sunday school, Mr. Chairman, buy hockey gear, sports equipment, any team they join. Going on family holidays, would you suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the child should be left at home while the others go. Camp, almost anything aside from your basic cost of living have to come out of that family allowance cheque and really Mr. Chairman, I think what we're talking about here is a form of accounting.

Now, we've already tried the other system in '73, we brought in this system. It is working well, my staff are happy with the way the situation is now. My question is why should we change it back again? If you've got a good thing going, don't disturb it. This system is working very well.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well the Honourable Minister has said it so well and repeated everything that I would have said, having worked under the system where the family allowance had to be doled out in little bits and pieces and had, in fact, in areas we had to write to Whitehorse to get anything. And it would end up that the foster parents would pay out of their own pocket and eventually be repaid.

Procedurally it was silly, it was ridiculous, I can't see any point in changing back to that system for the sake of anyone along the line. I can't see any reason why I still have to be given some reason why we should support this motion at all. Worse than that is the discrimination that it creates against the foster child. It's totally against Social Welfare principles to treat foster children as anything different from any other member of the family. It is completely discriminatory and I just can't tolerate any motion that would point out to everybody in the community and everybody else in that

household that this person is different because they happen to be a foster child.

If we support this motion, I feel that we're doing the same thing as a whole, the Committee as a whole is discriminating against every foster child in the Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was going to rise in to the Honourable Minister but now I will rise in response to both Honourable Minister from Whitehorse West and the Member from Ogilvie. Because I think if they just clear their ears very carefully when somebody says something, they will see that maybe they don't have to talk in this manner, as about somebody insulting somebody or referring to somebody that they might be a thief or might be anything, because I said that when I stood up and spoke that the possibility was there. But I also said very, very clearly that I did not suspect anybody in the Yukon Territory doing anything like that.

I find it very hard, they twist the words around a little always to make it look like you were really saying somebody was dishonest. I didn't say that. I said the possibility was there and then supported the people that were doing the job by saying that I didn't think they would be doing any such thing like this.

However, I still say, and I think I said this once in this House when it came to my own expenses in this town, when we come in here and sit in Council, the same principle that I wouldn't want anybody looking at me saying that I could spend money that might not even be mine. And this is all that I'm saying in support of the motion is that I think it is a problem, I've got to go along with you now that I've heard what you have got to say, in administering it. But I can also see somebody else some day looking across the road and saying so and so is not doing with that money what they should be doing.

Hopefully if you can find a way so that couldn't happen, I think the people themselves would be very, very glad, that it would be that way. No reference to them, whatsoever, their character or anything.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I wanted to reply to the Honourable Member --

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I thank the Honourable Member for his confidence in our foster parents and I want to assure him that careful accounting is kept of what happens to that family allowance.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre...?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that if we have enough confidence in these foster parents to entrust children to them surely we have enough confidence in them to give them \$20.00 a month for each child.

(Applause)

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Really, really. However,---

Mr. Chairman: Is this your political speech, Mrs. Watson?

(Laughter)

Mrs. Watson: If you read the motion carefully, you will know that the motion does not say we revert to the old order. It does not say that at all. I find it rather disturbing for people to stand up and say, that if, it's very difficult to define the needs of children. It's very difficult to define what the \$20.00 is being used for.

Then you must have as much difficulty justifying using the \$20.00 too. If you have this much trouble defining the need for it, then how do you justify the \$20.00? And the point I am making is that we have accepted the responsibility and so we should as a government to assist in the care of children, to care--they have a food allowance, they have a clothing allowance, they have a school supplies allowance.

Now they're receiving the family allowance and this government has chosen to let people use the family allowance for their extra curricular needs. The point I made in this House the other day, that there are a lot of parents in the Yukon Territory who need that family allowance for a clothing allowance, or they need that family allowance to put food on the table for their children.

I think this is one thing we cannot forget. It isn't just for extra curricula supplies and needs, that family allowance is being used across the board in the Yukon Territory. A lot of people need that family allowance in order to buy that pair of boots, or to buy food for the children. I am saying in this motion, you don't need any more bookkeeping in your regulations to broadly define the needs, the extra needs the children in care have, other than food, clothing and school supplies. Broadly define them and set your maximum amount per month because a child of three will not have the same needs as a young boy of 15, and what you are doing you are not, by just handing them the family allowance cheque not recognizing the difference in need, and it would be a very simple administrative thing. There would be no accounting going back and forth, that would be defined in regulations of foster parents that have received the amount of money that they would require for these extra things, based on the age of a child, and that's the end of it. In fact, it would simplify your accounting and it would simplify every welfare worker going to every foster parent and saying, now how are you spending your \$20.00. You define it to start with in your regulations.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you Mr. Chairman, First of all, I would like to say this, that we don't need the motion. To me there is no logic behind it. I don't want to interfere with foster parents or anybody else that wishes to care for children. I don't see why they should be accountable as the Honourable Member has been pointing out for the

last few minutes, but not part of a computer system, we are dealing with children, and if any agency, private or otherwise, is willing to put up their time, love, care and attention that children need, I don't see why we should start gearing them to a rubber stamp type of system which the Honourable Member is implying with this motion.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one point in reply to the member from Pelly River. Every parent is accountable. He is accountable because of his income, for the care of his children, and this is one thing we have to remember.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, I just had a couple of comments to make out of the statements by the Honourable Member from Kuane. She says this doesn't mean regulations at one point, and yet in her motions she says in accordance with regulations to be made for the purpose. That's just one other point, you know, we seem to be asking for regulations when we should be tearing up that regulation book, and retting down to simple laws that everybody can understand and administrate. I would just like to simply say that, in this particular instance, the children, I think our foster parents are doing as good a job as they perhaps could do under the circumstances that are involved here, and they are multifold. I have every confidence in the system that is currently employed until we can find a better one. I don't find a better one, certainly in this motion I would be voting in opposition to it.

Mr. Chairman: Before I can proceed with this motion, I require an amendment.

Mr. Fleming: What for Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The motion is out of order.

Mr. McCall: I would like to move it die in Committee.

Ms. Millard: I'll second that.

Mr. Chairman: Question?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, a point of procedure. Is that correct procedure since the Honourable Member from Pelly River is so knowledgeable.

Mr. Chairman: We have two alternatives, we can consider this a typographical error and go ahead with the motion as it should be, or someone must amend it before it can be considered in correct form. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I consider the motion, this motion No. 16, before it was presented to the House, and had a great deal of difficulty, in fact to be clear, it should say that it is the opinion of the house, it did not but I consider the question as to whether or not it

involved the further expenditure of money over those monies which are now being expended, and I, the way it is worded it is very touch and go, but I did suggest that I would allow the motion to pass the house, in as much as it did not indicate to me at that time the expenditure of additional funds. If the result of the motion would expend, in fact, the expenditure of additriional funds, then the motion would have been out of order, but I have not made any ruling on this subject in my position in the House.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, because you are not in the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I believe Mr. Chairman you are not discussing this matter with the Speaker you are discussing it with the Member from Watson Lake Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the opinion of the House that this is in order that we continue with the motion in its present form?

Some Members: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour?

Mrs. Watson: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary? The motion is defeated.

Motion Defeated

Mr. Chairman: We will return to further consideration of Bill No. 2 Schedule A. This is the second reading of Schedule A, to the services \$1,794,901.00. Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to rise and be assured by the administration that there are funds on my new appointment to the Executive Committee, that there are sufficient funds to pay me an additional salary, I have just received a letter from the Government, addressed to the Honourable D. Taylor, Member of the Executive Committee, from Watson Lake. And I hope,

Mr. Chairman: We've got a majority.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Are we going to agree to it?

Mr. Chairman: Are we clar?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Department of treasury, \$1,853,053.00. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have just a question on the use of the new computer system. Through my usual little espionage organization, I keep

going to find out what Governments are doing, I find that this computer shuts down at coffee breaks and noon hour, I wonder if the administration would consider the loss in time and productivity, in this system, I think it's important, would consider the loss being incurred having this machine being shut down during these periods, when it indeed should be able to function.

Mr. Chairman: I would submit Mr. Taylor, that that's the best grape vine system we have, isn't it?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I'm asking a question, and I would appreciate a reply from Mr. Miller to this regard.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that procedure varies from time to time, the present utilization on the computer is running somewhere about 75 percent of the available hours. So this allows them to turn down during coffee break and noon hours. As the utilization increases, that practice will be discontinued as it was discontinued under our old card system.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I thought that personnel was under treasury, but I see it's back over under the vote we, under vote one, but I have a question, in any event that involves treasury and it's the revised payroll distribution system and people and employees of the Government of the Yukon territory have received letters, a copy of which I have around here somewhere, as a matter of fact I just received one myself today. I didn't know I was an employee of, under Personnel Director of the Government of the Yukon Territory, however, a new system has been employed by this government, which means that nobody can at the end of the week, have their cheque mailed to them or pick it up at the office, apparently now, it's insisted that your cheque goes to a bank account and if you don't have a bank account they create one for you, and this places a hardship, upon these people, employees of the Government for certain, that are in the outlying district where no banking facilities are available. It's my contention, based on talking to some of these people and to some people in Whitehorse that are unhappy with this system that the employee should properly have the opportunity of receiving his paycheque in the mail, or directed to him in the mail, or from wherever his place of work is. I don't think and as some of those members think that they should be forced to have their cheque sent to a bank and a bank account opened in their name. I feel very strongly about this, as do the people that have made the representation to me, and it is at this time that I make these representations. I'd like to know if this could be avoided, and if perhaps those employees of the Government of the Yukon Territory wishing to have their paycheques in the usual manner can continue to do so.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we have had an optional banking system available for approximately four years. There is presently in excess of 50 percent of the staff automatically banking their cheques. Before this directive went out, the Department of Personnel con-

ferred with the Yukon Staff, I'm sorry, Public Relations, YT. Public Service Association, and they have agreed that this procedure could be put into effect in those communities where there is banking service available. An arrangement has been with the banks in those communities that if an individual wants to remove the full amount of his cheque, after it is placed in the bank, there will be no service charges. So, it seems to me that this is an advantage for everybody. It saves the government considerable sum of money, saves us a lot of time, and does not really present the employee with any major insurmountable problems.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, could the witness let us know if it's the eventual intention of the Government to pay employees by a pay list, rather than sending individual cheques to the bank.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, what we do now is pay into the bank on a list basis. Each employee still gets his own stub which gives him a full indication of what monies were deposited on his behalf.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

The Hon. Mr. Taylor: If this be all so well and good, Mr. Chairman, then why am I receiving the complaints from people. I have some definite complaints about this situation, as I say I even got one myself today. I still feel that, notwithstanding if an employee of this government is working and putting in a day's work for a day's pay, and let's hope he is, that when the day comes around to pay him, that he can; it's obvious he can't take his money in cash, that would be a little rough, but at least he could have his cheque from his employer or the department he works in, or he should have the option of having it mailed directly to his home. Perhaps he does not wish his cheque to go to the bank, for whatever reason that may be; perhaps he doesn't want the bank to have control over his account or his funds or his revenues, and for various other reasons which I can't conjure up at the moment. Members of the public service have brought his complaint to me and asked me if I would bring it to the table, which I simply do. I really feel that consideration should be given this, notwithstanding that maybe the executive of the Public Service Association thought it a delver of a good idea.

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, I personally heard of one complaint, that's all, and that individual, when it was explained to him, was quite happy. So I would suggest that if there are members of the public service with problems in this regard, they have an executive that they can complain to and I am sure that they can work out something with personnel to satisfy those complaints.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, then do I take it that, if an individual employee is agreed and sends a letter to the government of the Yukon Territory asking that his cheque be sent directly to him or that his cheque be left with him on his pay day with his director of his

department, that this will no longer be acceptable to the government of the Yukon Territory?

Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Chairman, the individual has a right to that if he so requests it and I don't think this government has any right to refuse it. That is my own personal view and I would stand by that view. If an individual wants his cheque delivered in timbuctoo, we will deliver it there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this computerized payroll system - I am totally opposed to it; it's three years ago Cyprus Anvil got involved in this sort of thing and we were considering reverting back to the pay cheque system because the banking system we have is so deplorable that you get double or triple charge on using the bank system. Simply because your cheque is deposited into the bank; and also the question of freedom of choice for an individual that works for any company or even the government, he has that right of choice and you cannot take that away from him. So, that should be kept in mind also.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, the last two who spoke voiced my opinion exactly. As far as I am concerned, I am very happy to sign my cheque and have it go to the bank because it is very small, I don't want to see it, I feel better if I don't see actually. But any person has a right to his own cheque and a right to have it sent where he wants it. I couldn't go along with anything like this, if it was coming to the House or be passed or anything. However, I have no problem with this thing; it would have to be through this House, I think, before they could carry on and do this. I would hope so anyway, that the government isn't just going to sit down and say we are going to put your cheque right where we want it or we are going to do whatever we want with it, without any law being passed that that was it. I can't go along with that.

Mr. Chairman: I note with reassurance that Faro is not included with the list of places where this procedure is going to take place, Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: It is on the list, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I should assure the House that in the past your government has always been free choice of employee to go one route or go another route. I think that in its letter also who wish to have their payroll cheques deposited, and I think this is up to the employee to have his choice made free. The other thing is that I would like to point out to the members in the outlying areas, especially, in the last mail strike it was a great big headache to people to receive their pay cheques when they would have been really to have a bank deposit made in their name when they could draw a cheque from the thing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: I don't want to differ with the Honourable Member Mr. Chairman, but I think if the Honourable Member from Watson Lake would show the Honourable Member Klondike, don't be deceived by this letter because the employees receive an entirely different one. Very different.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Miller did the bank reassure us that there will be no charge forthcoming if the payroll, if they wish to withdraw the total amount of the cheque. The only circumstance that I heard at the bank being so liberal in their services.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, under the Bank Act of Canada, there are provisions for this.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: It is not a matter of the charges as far as the payroll deposit. It is a matter when you withdraw is where you get the charges.

Mr. Chairman: That's what I meant.

Mr. McCall: It's all right when you put it in, when you take it out.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we have been assured by all banks and I know that there is provision within the banking service for this, that on a payroll system, if the money comes in the fashion which we propose to put it in, it is withdrawn from that individual's account in one lump sum.

There will be no bank charges. If there are 500 cheques that's a different thing. That's normal banking service.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, this is the first I heard of the system was the letter that I got today. I have to agree with the Honourable Members, I just don't like it. Just the thought of it. Not holding that cheque in your hot little hand for at least five minutes before you give it to your creditors anyway. And the other thing I'm embarrassed to go to the bank with my overdraft anyway so how would I get the \$20.00 out of the cheque that I usually get from it --

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Family allowance.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: This is just appalling to think that at no time do you actually possess that cheque in your hand for any period of time at all. I certainly will not opt and not going to sign for the privilege of never seeing that cheque and having it being deposited in the bank. No way. Some of us are still left who think you should see the rewards for your efforts, whatever they might be.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this question because I did sign mine and turn it in. I was thinking at the time it was just, as I have been doing, but now that I have signed that--

(LAUGHTER)

Mr. Fleming: Have I been bit? I'll have it back.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: You had it Bob.

Mr. Fleming: When you take my money and do what they want with it, that will be the day too.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you. I just want to make the comment that I certainly have been involved with the computerized payroll system and I can certainly think of one place in a mining community in Northern Canada where, it was United Steel Workers as a matter of fact, that asked it be put in place and then later on they came back and asked that certainly it be changed because of the problems.

It's not bad in a community where you have quite a number of banks, where in fact if I didn't want my particular main bank to have my cheque, I could at least elect to have it sent down the street and it wouldn't be touched because of my banking difficulties at my main branch. Certainly you can see the problems there, but in the case where there's only one bank, you know, it's a captive kind of situation.

I want to know just again the assurance from Mr. Miller that it is to the individual's prerogative that he can have this done or he can elect not to get on with the system to have his cheque sent to his house. Is that correct, Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we cannot make it mandatory without the permission of the staff association. We have their permission to try this way and that's what we're doing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, in the letter that went to the employees, not the one that comes here, it says for instance, effective April 7th, this employer will be changing its payroll system to total bank deposit system in Whitehorse, Dawson City, Watson Lake, Faro and Elsa. The effect of this change on employees is merely, just merely, that rather than pay cheques being issued, all pay will be deposited directly to a bank account in the employees name in a financial institution of their choice.

Pay stubs will be sent to work locations, your pay stub doesn't go to your address necessarily. And it goes on to indicate blab, blab, and it ends up by saying, after several paragraphs, Mr. Chariman, it ends up by saying order to ensure smooth implementation I ask for your co-operation in returning the attached form immediately. If however, no reply is received by March 24th, a bank account will be automatically opened in your name at this employer's bank, the Canadian Im-

perial Bank of Commerce in the community in which you reside. If there is no branch of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce in your community an account will be opened at the remaining bank. Thank you for your anticipated co-operation, Personnel Director.

Now, you know this is not telling the employee that he has any options at all, it's telling him buster if you want your pay cheque, this is where it's going whether you like it or not. I don't like it, some of the employees don't like it. I think that it should be made clear to the employees, through the staff association through a circular to all employees, that they do have the option of getting their pay cheque in the manner which they get it today.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, did the witness say that more than 50 per cent of the employees were now having their cheques banked directly from the government. This is on a completely, they've asked for it, they've volunteered, no one has asked them to, they have come to the government and asked for the government to provide this service, am I correct?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we instituted an option, instituted an optional service three years ago, or a little better, which we then made available to all employees who opted in. Now, we are suggesting that we would like to have 99 per cent opt in, and if you read the letter, it says if you don't complete the form and you don't write backund protest then we are gonna do it. That's what the letter says.

Mr. Chairman: There is one further advantage of the bank that I can recall in earlier years. When I wanted to lend someone money and they went to the bank manager, the bank manager said no he can't lend you that money, he doesn't make enough money. They know just what you are making.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I will give the house the assurance that anybody who wants to write into the Personnel Director and say under no circumstances do I want my cheque banked, that that's exactly what will happen, we will send it to him wherever he wants it. Normally to his work location.

Mr. McCall: Does that include everybody?

Mr. Miller: That's what I said. Now, if this House, the letter that the members of this House got were a different letter. So, if you don't sign up you get it where you have been normally getting it.

(LAUGHTER)

Mr. McCall: I don't think that we like these sort of threats.

Mr. Miller: No threat intended it was merely a slip of the tongue.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Mr. Taylor: We then have the assurances in perhaps closing this question that the administration will let the members of the government, or the employees of the government of the Yukon Territory, know this by circular or some means.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, they are all represented by a staff association. I think it is up to them, to the executive of the staff association who agreed with this to notify their members.

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I will declare a brief recess.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I now call this committee to order. Department of Education, \$12,502,368.00 Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, there still one question on my mind, and that's in the special education. This year, '75-'76 we were told that there was a considerable amount of money left over because special education teachers were not hired, but normal teachers were considered to be special education teachers, although they were not specified that. My question which has never been answered was, is that going to happen next year, or are we going to hire 22 special education teachers?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: To my knowledge we will be attempting to hire as many, up to 22, as many special teachers as we can get. As you know the supply and demand is such that they're very difficult to come by. But at this point, and we have a new special education supervisor who is looking into the whole area of special education and revising the whole area as well.

Mr. Chairman: Clear? Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: The Minister of Education, regarding recreation and amateur sports and the deal that used to apply to communities that got a swimming pool. One of the portable swimming pools from the territorial Government. Or a rental of one, the Territorial Government would fund the salary of the swimming instructor, does that still apply, even though the community assistance legislation has come in.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it still does apply.

Mrs. Watson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Clear? The Department of Territorial Secretary and Register General, \$1,358,778.00. Department of Health and Welfare and Rehabilitation, \$11,900,890.00. Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: There was one question answered,

during our study of the estimates asked Mr. Chairman, and I have an answer for it now, the question was regarding costs of Nursing Home Care, I believe it was the Honourable Member from Klondike. And I didn't have the figure available. The figures are for cost of Nursing Home Care at Macauley Lodge, Whitehorse, the daily rate, \$51.50. Alexander Macdonald Lodge, Dawson City, per diem, \$69.51.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, is that the cost of the Territorial Government or is that the cost of the individual user?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman that is the cost to the Territorial Government.

Mr. Chairman: What is the cost to the individual?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: The cost for Nursing Home care for the individual are assessed on the individuals, means an income.

Mr. Chairman: But they might be up to that full amount?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: No, Mr. Chairman, if it's extended Nursing Care, as you know this council some years ago, passed a limit to \$10.00 a day for extended care.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one question to ask the Minister, whether she has any information when we were discussing this vote before, you indicated that they were meeting Northern Health or National Health, meeting regarding the future of the Charles Camsell TB Wing, and I'm wondering whether you had any more information whether they will be closing it down and what the effect, what we would do to take care of the Yukon people who are now utilizing that facility?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here somewhere, if the Honourable Member wants to give me a moment, specifying the type of tuberculosis which would be effected by the closing of that one wing. I did inquire after my first report to the House, and I was informed that discussions were going to take place with the practicing physicians in the Yukon, and the Hospital authorities here. And I have not had any further report on that.

Mr. Chairman: I believe those discussions did take place, my knowledge is not accurate but certain number of T.B. patients will now be taken care of at the Whitehorse General Hospital.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, would they qualify under our Yukon Hospitalization Insurance Scheme. I believe T.B. patients come under a different piece of legislation do they not.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, they would still continue to be funded out of Disease Control.

Mr. Chairman: Out of Chronic Disease Control.

Mr. Miller: Under Chronic Disease Control.

Mr. Chairman: Right. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if provision, or if the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare could tell me if provision has been made in the construction of the Watson Lake Nursing Station or Cottage Hospital as you will, for a back up emergency standby power system to keep life support systems going?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that one, I will have to bring in the information.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the reply is that the Ministry will have to bring in back up information, will in fact the government take a look at this situation and will they in fact bring in this information and if there is no back up power, take it up with the Department of Northern Health or whoever is involved and see that back up emergency power could be provided to that hospital.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to do that. The information I receive from the Chief Medical Officer of Health regarding tuberculosis treatment is that, after April 1st 1976, patients from the Yukon with the diagnosis of tuberculosis will be cared for at the Whitehorse General Hospital. Plans are presently being completed to close the tuberculosis ward at Charles Camsell Hospital. Aberhart Hospital in Edmonton will be available as a resource to deal with complicated cases of tuberculosis such as far advanced pulmonary tuberculosis, adrenal tuberculosis and muscular skeletal tuberculosis, that was the further information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, when we received information paper on March 9th, it described the Yukon Medicare, describes the resident who is lawfully entitled to be or to remain in Canada and it goes on. The person becomes a resident after three months of continuous residence in the territory. Now, it came to my attention there is placer miners in the territory who are United States citizens. They are in the territory for four months, under some permit, in most cases do not pay any taxes in Canada because of the free market system of gold, the gold usually ends up going somewhere else, and my question is, are those people entitled to Medicare? I know as a fact that some of them have carried Medicare cards.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, is the question the Honourable Member asking, are people registered under our plan who should not be registered? Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, if they have a right to be in Canada under the Immigration Act, they have a right to be registered under the laws of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, this is fine if, as far as I am— maybe I am completely wrong but my understanding is you also should contribute something to the fund through taxes or something like this; those people as far as I know don't contribute anything.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the point I made is that if they have a right to be in Canada, they have a right to be registered under the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan and pay their premiums and be entitled to the benefits while they are in Canada.

Mr. Berger: This is fine, Mr. Chairman, the premium under normal circumstances do not cover the actual cost of the care that they receive and so \$14.50 per family or whatever it is right now is cheapest ways of means of getting medical attention for those people.

Mr. Miller: There is no argument about that, but that's the penalty you have, if it's a penalty, that one of the provisions of a universal plan.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, after hearing the Honourable Member's remarks, I am a little disturbed as to what may happen. Not in the case where the landed immigrant had been given authority to be in the country, is working for a— for somebody else, because his would automatically come off the payroll; but I would be concerned, as he is I think, in the fact that he may be running a placer situation, something where he is his own employer, and therefore there would be no way that unless you are right there to pinpoint him, as to how he would pay, whether he would pay it or not even. Unless he got sick and came in to use it, and then you would naturally catch him, but otherwise he could carry that card for many years and probably be never more than just registered and not paying his money.
I think that would be my concern.

Mr. Miller: Well, I think that's a valid concern, Mr. Chairman, and one that there is no protection against. No different than any citizen who decides not to pay his premium and I think the Honourable Chairman would attest to what happens in those cases he raised the issue here at the table.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just thinking of the amendment that could be possibly forthcoming; and there's two that come right out the top of my head, as one could be amended to valid landed immigrant who carries a valid work permit.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, those are the only circumstances in which you can legally be in Canada under the Immigration Act. He either has to have work or have landed immigrant status or be on a visitors visa where there are visitors visas required. So it seems to me that a U.S. citizen from Alaska working in the Yukon for the summer would have to have a work permit under the Immigration Act.

Mr. Berger: I really don't know.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: If I could assure the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, that in all cases of delinquency in payment, we do have inspectors who do try to collect and, as we did say earlier, most of these people pay up and that's why you don't see them in court. There is a great deal going on and we would appreciate any assistance.

Mr. Chairman: Department of Local Government \$3,360,504.00. I'm wondering if the Honourable Member from Watson Lake is reassured regarding the status of the fire engine in his community?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in that regard, if I'm not interrupting with what the Honourable Member wishes to say. This entire Assembly wishes to join in an accolade to the Honourable Member from Watson Lake for his years of faithful service to the people of his area. I myself, personally, in the days when I sat in the Press Gallery heard his heart-warming pleas for consideration for the people of Watson Lake and their fire equipment needs. And at this time, Mr. Chairman, with the concurrence of this Committee, we would like to send a small tribute in line with these efforts beyond and above the call of duty for Watson Lake.

And long overdue, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, we are now working on a little red bicycle.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In response to the Honourable Member, I do express thanks on behalf of the people involved, the Watson Lake department and I have received and have for a card which says "thank you" and it's worded accordingly "Words are so inadequate they never could convey the sincere appreciation that this brings to you today" and it's signed Keith, Bill Wimp and all the members of the Watson Lake Volunteer Fire Department.

(APPLAUSE)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in respect of the vehicle for the fire department in Watson Lake that we were discussing, I hope it's somewhat bigger and has a motor in it than this one.

I have undertaken to communicate with the chairman of the L.I.D. who assures me that he has still copies on his file of the letters making a request for this vehicle but he did not make a request this year, figuring that perhaps this year we would get the vehicle. I have then asked him if he would make another request, which he assures me he will be doing tomorrow. I'm wondering if this request comes in if there are sufficient funds in this budget to provide this vehicle to the department.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we'll certainly have to see whether we can, pending the recommendations of the Fire Marshal, whether we can adjust funds

accordingly.

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

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Honourable Member earned himself a car this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Explain, explain.

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information \$2,522,190.00. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, under Establishment 700, I had asked quite a number of questions and I have been provided the information, or this House had been provided the information, from Mr. Gillespie. Since that time, I have also conferred with members of that department and I am satisfied now, after a more comprehensive look at it and talking to members, I'm satisfied with this Establishment 700.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the members leave the entire establishment until tomorrow. I would like to present notice of motion with respect to library services, and I don't you would want to go ahead with this until we have heard that particular motion.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: My question was, do we as yet in the interval since we last discussed this vote 7, have we made any further progress as far as the administration is concerned in providing funds for the operation, the continuous operation of the Takhini Library?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, I am not clear.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I intend to present a notice of motion tomorrow with respect to the library, the Takhini Library, and if it has any bearing on this particular vote at this time, we should wait or unless you want the motion now, I am quite happy to present it now, but I have had quite a reaction from this Chamber on that occasion before.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question and possible the Minister of Local Government would sooner discuss it when we discuss the Bill that was introduced this morning, that is for television, because this comes under local government, and whether we should be, because the legislation that was introduced this morning repeals section 75 of the Community Assistance, which applies to television services in the outlying, in the smaller communities. I am wondering if you would prefer to leave it and discuss it when we discuss

the Bill or will it affect the budget.

Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, they can be independent.

The only thing the Bill does is repeal the section of the policy now in effect which is redundant with the exception of the policy that is given to all members, there is no way, going the route that we are, Comply with Section 75 of the Community Assistance Ordinance.

Mrs. Watson: Okay, Mr. Chairman, then are we going to incorporate into our budget provisions of take care of the policy that we discussed regarding providing television services to these eight communities. We will be revising this budget to take care of that, or how are we going to handle this?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we have \$100,000.00 in the current budget to provide the television, but we will have to come back with a re-vote to allow for the operation and maintenance, which would be the funds that lapsed last year, and we will have to do that, but we can proceed under the policy that was proposed to the House that the installation of this under the existing authority contained in this budget.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Chairman, would that mean to proceed with the eight communities at this time this year.

Mr. Miller: We have sufficient money to handle up to eight communities, and it will depend on the communities getting their applications in here as quick as they can, so that we can proceed.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke I am not clear on your notice of motion. Does it have a direct effect on the budget?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would say so, I think it has an effect.

Mr. Chairman: In doing this you are holding up the progress of Bill No. 2. Now would it not be appropriate to introduce that so that it could be dealt with at third reading?

Mr. Lengerke: No, I don't think so. Would you like to introduce it now.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Member is looking for the consensus of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the wish of the House that we defer the consideration of this at the present time?

Mr. Lengerke: Do you want to hear the motion?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lengerke: I am sorry I didn't hear you, that's why I asked.

Okay, I have got a motion, that's made by myself, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly, that it is in the opinion of this Assembly that the Takhini Library Association supporting appropriate organization be provided with an operating grant of \$3,400.00 subject to the association providing to the Yukon Territorial Government a comprehensive and operating budget, coupled with the association's commitment to provide the balance of funds required to operate the library to its present standards and level of service.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, I don't think that is in order, that is a money bill which we are not entitled to consider.

Mr. Lengerke: I said it was in the opinion of this Assembly.

Mr. Chairman: May we have a copy for the motion, please.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mr. McCall, it is in the opinion of this Assembly that the Takhini Library Association supporting appropriate organizations be provided with an operating grant of \$3400.00 subject to its Association, providing to this Yukon Territorial Government, a comprehensive and operating budget, coupled with the Association commitments to provide the balance of funds required to operate the Library to its present standards and level of service. Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and putting forward that motion, I think this House went through rather an interesting debate with respect to the Library, and at some point in time, I would think that we would have to consider the Library's request. We know that the library has gone through an exercise and have made representations and application to the city, and to the Territorial Government. On the outcome of that, I think we were waiting to see, just really what the outcome of that was, and with the kind of results that have been obtained I would say now that the House has to consider some help for this Association. I think the benefits from that Library, are something that you just can't measure over night, I know that the local benefits that have been provided there are of such a degree, the use of that Library is very comprehensive, and if that Library was not there, we would probably find that we would have other problems, social problems, attributed to the particular area to Whitehorse, that we would have to have further considerations for cost expenditures in the area of policing welfare help, law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Thank you Mr. Chairman, in view of what the Honourable Member who is moving the motion, I won't elaborate too much, I guess we all went through an exercise, not very long ago on the, Takhini Branch Library, I think the minimum of the funding, should be put forward with the position that they find the

rest. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: It's very nice to see the efforts of other members assisting for a project in my constituency and I appreciate it. But Mr. Chairman, with respect, my understanding of this situation at it's present stage is, that the Takhini Recreation Centre which operates as a Board or a Library in Takhini had arranged with the Executive Committee responsible for that department, Mr. Gillespie, that they would approach him after they had made attempts to gain financial assistance in other areas. And that they would then discuss the future of the Takhini Library, and that is my understanding Mr. Chairman. I think that at the meeting which my fellow members attended very kindly, at this Takhini Rec Centre, Mr. Gillespie committed himself to sympathetic hearing of the Board at that stage. And I would think it is at this point, between the Takhini Library Board and the Executive Committee responsible for that Department. I have not taken any further action on this particular project because I was waiting for that to develop. I think we all got the very firm impression from the Committee member responsible that there would be sympathetic hearing and there would be attempts made to find some kind of assistance, if the Takhini board themselves came up with offers of volunteers and so on to keep the project alive. And I would not like to see us crossing Departmental Lines here, Mr. Chairman, if what I understand, is correct.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In review of what the Honourable Minister has just stated, I presume she's in agreement with the motion, all it is is just in part applying a commitment that Mr. Gillespie has made it is not any more on that.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, my point is that it is a commitment for Mr. Gillespie to decide. It is his department.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the confidence of the Honourable Minister. I would hope then that the sympathetic hearing is, can be interpreted as in fact if some help is going to be given to the Takhini Library, but to have that decision made strictly in the hands of Mr. Gillespie is somewhat distracting to me. I would say that if it's in the opinion of this House, that they want to help that particular organization that in fact we can do so.

Mr. Chairman: I might add that one of their approaches had been to the sports and recreation advisory committee and it is outside of their terms of reference. Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite concerned about this motion. I'm quite concerned about the whole Takhini Library situation. Now because of the fact that,

after analyzing the function that the Takhini Library branch is serving in that area, because of the fact that they-- it is a recreation centre, or they recognize that it is sort of a recreation centre, that if they did go to the City of Whitehorse and that they did go to the Government of the Territory for a recreation grant, then we must also assume that it is not just completely a library service.

I am quite concerned with the motion that was put forward asking for a grant of \$3,400.00 provided that they put forward a comprehensive operating budget. Now this is a new library grant program that we would be embarking upon and I can think of quite a number of other communities and areas that would qualify for this type of a grant. It's fine to sit there and laugh about it. I know that Teslin might; I can name you Porter Creek may decide that they want a grant to have a library there. And if you are going to start a new program or make an exception for one branch, then I think the terms of that grant must be made available to every community in the Territory. Because you cannot just because one group comes to you and wants funds give them funds without setting up the terms of reference where those funds are available. I just could not support this type of thing unless it's open and available to every other community in the Territory that wants it.

We must also remember, and I think with this branch at Takhini, if it were an area, now if it was from the Indian Village in Whitehorse where they had a library going and the children were going there and were spending time in the library and where they were playing games and this type of thing in a library, because of the type of homes they have there, I would say we must make every effort possible to keep this centre going.

I don't think that the type of suburban area that Takhini is has to have the support service from the recreational area the same as, say, the Indian Village would. On the basis of that, they all have very adequate housing and homes in the area where there are recreational games and so on where they can do their reading. And there is a very good library downtown. So going upon a new-- if you're going to make the grant available to one group, it must be available across the board.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the Honourable Member's comments with respect to a grant. I'm familiar enough with grants having been on the end of doleing them out at many times and I know that this can put you into a long-time program. Maybe possibly an amendment should be made to read a one-time grant. But better than that, I'd like to ask a question of Mr. Miller or maybe ask for an explanation. Mr. Miller, can you tell me exactly how the Takhini Library has been assisted and funded in the past?

Mr. Chairman: I think, in view of the hour, perhaps you could write that question down and ask him first thing in the morning.

Mr. Lengerke: I will certainly do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCall: There's a motion on the floor.

Mr. Chairman: It's under consideration.

Mr. McCall: I take it the motion on the floor will be deferred until tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman: The motion is tabled until tomorrow morning, with permission of the mover of the motion.

Mr. Lengerke: Agreed.

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

Mr. Lengerke: I'll second that.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour?

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 10:40 a.m. to discuss Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions. Mr. Miller and Mr. Williams were present as witnesses during Committee's review of Bill number 2. A motion as amended was moved by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that Business Licence Fees be considered as per attached schedule. This amended motion was duly carried.

Committee recessed at 11:50 a.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Iain MacKay, vice president of the Chamber of Commerce, was in attendance as a witness and presented a position on the Home Owner's Grant Committee.

Committee then considered Bill number 6. It was moved by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. McCall, that Bill number 6 be reported out of Committee without amendment. This motion was duly carried.

Committee then considered Motion number 14. Motion number 14 as amended was duly carried.

Committee considered Motion number 16; this motion was defeated.

Committee considered Bill number 2. I can report progress on Bill number 2. It was moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Lengerke, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair and this motion was duly carried.

Mr. Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committee; 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.

Ms. Millard: I second that, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

MOTION CARRIED

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

ADJOURNED

LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 9 (1976 FIRST SESSION)

March 11th, 1976

Mr. Speaker,
Members of Council

On Monday, March 8th, Councillor Fleming asked the following question concerning Workmen's Compensation:

"On the compensation being paid to individuals who must go outside sometime, I would like to know if you could give me a written answer as to what the Subsistence Allowance is for rooms and meals for these people that do have to go outside on compensation?"

The answer is as follows:

In addition to the actual medical costs, the injured worker is entitled to the following:

- (a) Temporary total disability compensation (maximum payable \$24.66 per day)
- (b) Subsistence allowance - \$16.00 per day (payable when worker is not hospitalized)
- (c) Transportation to and from usual place of residence to place of medical treatment, which includes taxi fares.

The above is also payable to a worker requiring medical treatment within the Yukon Territory away from his usual place of residence.

P.J. Gillespie,
Member
Executive Committee

LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 10 (1976 First Session)

March 11th, 1976

Mr. Speaker,
Members of Council

On Wednesday, March 10th, Mr. Lengerke asked the following question:

"What is Yukon's per capita spending in relation to the other provinces and territory?"

We regret that we cannot provide this information since per capita spending statistics are not available.

M.R. Miller,
Member
Executive Committee

