

Property of  
M. L. A. Lounge



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 18

5th Session

23rd Legislature

---

Debates & Proceedings

**Wednesday, March 17, 1976**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory.  
Wednesday, March 17th, 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:** I think, just prior to dealing with the Order Paper this morning, I'm sure the House would wish me to offer our Legal Advisor congratulations on the celebration of his native country today and wish him a happy St. Patrick's Day.

(APPLAUSE)

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any 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 17 - INTRODUCED

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, for leave to introduce Bill number 17 entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Credit Unions 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 Credit Unions Ordinance. 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:** Are there any further introduction of Bills? Notices of Motion or Resolution? Are there any Notices of Motion for the production of papers? We will then proceed under Orders of the Day to the question period.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### QUESTION PERIOD

*Question re: Utility Lines on Tagish Bridge*

**Mr. Speaker:** Have you any questions? The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua?

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Commissioner, supplementary I would presume, because on March the 12th I asked a question about the Tagish Bridge; I did get the answer but not entirely what I wanted, not quite satisfied with the fact that we will be getting the plans when the appropriation is made. I'm a little concerned as to the wild fowl in that area and, consequently, I would ask the Commissioner does the Commissioner know if the utility lines, which will very likely be on this bridge, will be placed in the bridge structure or will they be overhead lines?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to have some time to answer this question. I certainly will do that.

*Question re: Marsh Lake Properties*

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Speaker, question for the Commissioner. Yesterday we discussed briefly the situation that had arisen with respect to the leasing of lake front properties in the Marsh Lake and in the Tagish Lake areas that probably have special circumstances or terms associated with the original lease arrangements and many people are affected - probably from 80 to 120, just as a quick estimate, many long-time Yukon residents. Mr. Commissioner, after you have a chance to review all the facts pertaining to that situation, would you consider action on behalf of those Yukon citizens involved, action perhaps directed towards the Regional Director of Resources office or to the Minister responsible?

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Commissioner?



**Mr. Commissioner:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as Honourable Members are aware, there were certain questions supplementary to the answer that I gave yesterday. I do not have that information as yet as it no doubt is going to take a few days to compile this, but certainly in answer to the query made by the Honourable Member at this time, Mr. Speaker, it would be my intent to examine the information that we get and hopefully have some discussion on the basic question with my colleagues in the Executive Committee. If it was the consensus that we should be making representation to the Minister or the Regional Director of Resources with proposed solutions to the potential difficulties that appear to be rising, then the answer to the Honourable Member would be in the affirmative.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further questions? We will then proceed to Motions.

#### MOTIONS

##### Motion Number 24

**Mr. Speaker:** The first Motion on the Order Paper is Motion number 24. It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that the Government of the Yukon review the Electrical Public Utilities Ordinance to determine if amendments are needed in order that the Electrical Public Utilities Board can function with the required authority on behalf of Yukon consumers. The Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Motion is basically simply to ask the Government to review the Electrical Public Utilities Ordinance to see whether there is a need for amending certain sections of it and for them to bring those amendments forward to this House. This piece of legislation was passed in 1972 and an Electrical Public Utilities Board was established by appointment by the Commissioner. I dare say that Board has sat more in the three years of its establishment - or two-and-a-half years of its establishment - than most boards in the provinces would sit in ten years.

Legislation is never perfect and, after it is used and after you work under a piece of legislation, you realize that there are deficiencies. I am sure that the Board, after using and working under this piece of legislation, will in all likelihood have amendments that they would suggest that the government bring forward. So I am suggesting that we do - the government does a review of this legislation and if amendments are required that they be brought forward to this House.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Speaker, in supporting and seconding the Motion number 27, I really can add not much further than what the Honourable Member has already stated.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** May I ask the Honourable Member from Kluane if she feels that it is within the jurisdiction of the government of the Yukon to incorporate the amendments they feel would be necessary?

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, no, I am sure that one amendment that we would all like to see in there I realize that it can't be in there but I think there are other areas where we can put more teeth into it. Also, I think that in doing the review of the Electrical Public Utilities Ordinance, I think we should be very careful to see whether there isn't a conflict with this piece of legislation and the Municipal Ordinance. This is the type of thing that I would hope they would be doing.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate? 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)

##### Motion Number 25

**Mr. Speaker:** The next Motion is Motion number 25, moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, that this House recommend that the Yukon Recreation and Amateur Sports Committee, or the Yukon Sports Federation, be given the opportunity to administer the Yukon participation in the Western Canada Lottery. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Mr. Speaker, this Motion is brought forward for the purpose that there has been some difficulty with the administration of the Western Canada Lottery in the Yukon and it had been the responsibility invested in this House to appoint Members to a board which is officially called the Yukon Recreation and Amateur Sports Committee; their objectives were to set out policy guidelines for sports, recreation and cultural activities in the Yukon and to administer the funds that were available to these various organizations. It seems only fitting, therefore, that they should have the opportunity to gather these funds to the best of their ability.

I mention the Yukon Sports Federation because they are also a body that is formed out of other sports agencies to try and correlate sports activities within the Yukon.



It may be the feeling of the appointed Yukon Recreation and Amateur Sports Committee that they would rather not be involved in this directly but would delegate it to the Yukon Sports Federation, but with the responsibility still resting with the Yukon Recreation and Amateur Sports Committee.

I feel that it is important that people such as these are directly involved in the administration of the plan. It is their primary interest, that is why they are there. At the present time, the Lottery is under the jurisdiction of the Territorial Secretary's Department. They have many other functions to fulfill and this obviously cannot be a primary interest to them.

As a result of that, I am very concerned, or suspicious, that there has been a considerable over-run in the administrative costs so that the actual money accruing for sports and recreational activities in the Yukon has been severely limited, despite the sale of a fairly large number of tickets.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, there will have to be some legal and technical questions answered to see whether or not it's possible for one of these organizations to administer the Western Canada Lottery. We will look into it and see if it is possible and if these organizations are willing to take on the responsibility, if it's possible, I'm sure this government will give it very serious consideration.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate? The Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I'm just trying to assess my position as whether-- in voting on this motion, because as the Honourable Member from Porter Creek did indicate, I know that there are some very serious legal agreements that this government has made in order to even become involved within the Western Canada Lottery system or program. And to even consider this type of transfer, all of this information should be made available and the government would certainly have to research it.

So, I'm sorry, I think I would have to vote against the Motion at this time because if we vote for this Motion we are in fact saying they shall administer it. Do we have the authority to do that, because I think within the agreement there are certainly some very definite legal requirements of the government of the Territory; whether this government even has the authority to delegate the administration of it is another question.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Porter Creek and the Honourable Member from Kluane make valid points, because there are agreements involved with the Western Canada Lottery people. Whether or not we have the legal ability to follow this Motion to the conclusion that, I think, all Members would like to see it being removed from gov-

ernment hands and probably being administered in as efficient manner as possible with the ultimate result of more monies going back to the recreational organizations, is something that we all find desirable.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we put in the words that this House recommends "that if possible" the Yukon Recreation and Amateur Sports Committee or the Yukon Sports Federation be given the opportunity to administer the Yukon participation in the Western Canada Lottery, then we could enter into the legal and technical research that we have to do and would certainly be willing to bring back an information paper as to the results of that research into the legal ramifications of the Motion.

So, with that in mind Mr. Speaker, I would move that Motion number 25 be amended so that, following the word "that", the two words "if possible" be inserted.

**Mr. Lengerke:** I second that.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that Motion number 25 be amended by including, following the word "that", the words "if possible". Is this the Motion as stated?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** That is correct, Mr. Speaker; the Motion would now read that this House recommend that if possible the Yukon Recreation and Amateur Sports Committee or the Yukon Sports Federation be given the opportunity to administer the Yukon participation in the Western Canada Lottery.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared for question on the amendment?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the Motion? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre?

**Mr. Hibberd:** I only rise now, Mr. Speaker, because I didn't have the opportunity to rise before. It is perhaps not clear in the original Motion, but that was the intent of the Motion. I think all we are doing is clarifying the point. It was, as I say, that this recommend-- that was the purpose of it. So I can certainly go along with such an amendment and it is actually what I had intended in the first place.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared for question on the Motion?

**Some Members:** Question.

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



Water Motion #26  
Carried

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall declare that Motion 25 is carried.

(MOTION CARRIED)

Motion Number 26

**Mr. Speaker:** The next motion is Motion number 26. It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane: whereas the Yukon Water Board is presently responsible to the Honourable Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by the authority of the Northern Inland Waters Act, and whereas at the present time the Board consists of nine members appointed by the Federal Minister, three of which are named by the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, and whereas it is desired that a majority of non-government Yukoners serve on the Water Board, therefore be it resolved that the Yukon Legislative Assembly recommend to the Minister and request that, in making appointments pursuant to Section 7(2) of the Northern Inland Waters Act, the Minister restrict the number of nominees of departments of Government of Canada to two, and that all of the remaining members be persons named by the Commissioner-in-Counsel pursuant to Section 7(2)(b), and further that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development consider and make future arrangements for the repeal of the Northern Inland Waters Act and its replacement by an Ordinance of the Territory which would constitute a board with similar power, jurisdiction, authority and responsibilities for the conservation, development and utilization of water resources of the Yukon in a manner similar to parallel Provincial Legislation and authorities that will provide the optimum benefit therefrom for all Yukoners, in particular and in turn for all residents of Canada. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By formulating and presenting this Motion, Mr. Speaker, I mean no disrespect to Government Yukoners, to Government employees, and I wish to make that perfectly clear, first and foremost.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Motion is one that is really most significant towards the goal of self-determination for Yukon. We are once again asking the Federal Government to give us the right to demonstrate our capability and the right to exercise our responsibility. A request, Mr. Speaker, that can fit very nicely into the goal of Government for Yukon in a meaningful way.

The Yukon Water Board, in its present form as set up under the authority of the Northern Inland Waters Act, is nothing more, in my opinion, than a facade, a front for Ottawa.

Again, Mr. Speaker, no disrespect to its members; but I believe it to be a fact of life, due primarily in the way that appointments are made and by the fact that the majority representation on that Board is of Federal Government members, all whom are probably well educated and dedicated to their various disciplines.

Mr. Speaker, it's a situation that bothers me - the

Yukon Water Board today has as its members, as probably most of you are aware, a marine transportation expert or specialist who resides, I believe, in Prince Rupert, Federal Government employee, a most dedicated environmentalist, Federal Government employee, a natural resources land use hydrology specialist, a Federal Government employee, an energy advisor, who is located in Ottawa, Federal Government employee, a medical health officer or doctor, Federal Government employee, a Department of Public Works Engineer, Federal Government employee, and three lay persons with varied experience in business, private enterprise and Government in Yukon.

Saying it like that sounds good, you would most likely be inclined to say great, sounds like we're going to be well looked after and be assured that those good things, like Environmental impact studies, Fisheries, Wildlife, and other considerations along with the other things, Mr. Speaker, an application to use water will be fairly dealt with.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm of the opinion that indeed, that would be the case of all members could act freely with no interference, without having to act, or having to report to their higher authorities to their bosses in Ottawa, from where counter direction, most often emanates, in other words, the goals of Ottawa can be protected, but not necessarily the immediate practical requirements for Yukon are dealt with. Government members tend to move, Government members tend to be transferred, just about the time they know something of Yukon, just about the time they know and feel what Yukon wants, they leave, they move.

I think that most Government members would tend to compete with each other, and sometimes that's good, but usually ends up in a, oh in a opposition, in a general opposition to the Boards direction. I think Government members have no real feel, or no real respect for funds. Many times studies are commissioned on the strength of a report to Ottawa about the north, about what we're doing to it, about how we're going to ruin it. The situation is magnified in the minds of those people in Ottawa, and low and behold, funds are usually granted in pretty good quantities, to commence the very studies, that in fact many instances can be done at a lesser cost, at probably a lower key, by asking locally orientated people, by consulting with Yukoners and by utilizing less people and less of those so called consultants.

Other considerations in my mind, are it's very hard for a Government appointed member to act independent. Premature decisions are often made as a result of information to Ottawa, and Ottawa wishing to react and back to the applicant and so on, and Government and members are under instruction.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of my thoughts, and before proceeding, I must again emphasize that the Federal Government employees responsible to a Federal Minister, who in turn is responsible to the Board, for the Board, it's not a good formula, by which to operate. So therefore, I would suggest that if it's a clear desire for those people to be involved, they should be in an ex officio capacity, with no vote.

In other words act as advisors to the board, be observers and do all the reporting they wish. I'm convinced Mr. Speaker, that government board members



are most valuable and are very fair and practical if they are allowed to function by their own dictates.

You'll note in my motion that I'm really not that hard on government board members. My motion calls for two members or two nominees, one from the Departments of Government of Canada, and hopefully from departments that are significantly involved with the water resources of Yukon, of Northern Canada.

I believe this kind of specific representation to be essential and at this time and must continue from the Federal Government until Yukon has its own resource management function.

The other members of the board Mr. Speaker, must be drawn from a cross section of communities and people of Yukon and must include non-white and white. Persons that have been identified by their interests in Yukon's future be it economical, cultural or social, be it development orientated, or status quo, but with a practical knowledge of Yukon.

In conclusion I understand that we have a vacancy or vacancies occurring on this board, and I'm convinced that this motion, if approved, is timely, can be effective, and will be effective in encouraging the Minister to take the kind of action that will be beneficial in the planning and utilization of Yukon's water resources. Thank you.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I have no problem seconding this motion whatsoever. I think some of us wonder, around this House, whether these motions that we put forward practically every Session that we have, ever get to the ear or to the people we want them to go to and whether they ever even consider them.

I think sometimes we look at it and it's hopeless, what's the point, but we keep on trying. I don't think we can give up trying, because I think that we do erode it just slightly. The fact that the Chairman of the Water Board is now a Yukon resident is a result of this type of wearing down the resistance, the motions constantly going in, the constant reminder that we do want more authority over our own affairs.

Reviewing the Northern Inland Waters Act last night, it's rather shocking that, the wording where they're preserving the water for Canada and Yukon. It's really quite shocking when you read this. It makes you realize that you are, we are going to be almost sacrificed for Canada. Preserve it for Canada and the Yukon. I think this is an extremely good motion. I think the suggestions that two appointees could be representative of federal departments is very good.

The comment that the Honourable Member said that they want to protect the goals of Ottawa, which is one thing which we really don't agree with, but if they at least co-ordinated the goals of Ottawa it would help.

I think that we have to look at Section 8 of the Northern Inland Waters Act which does give the Minister the power to appoint officers and employees from the Public Service of Canada, as advisors, professional and technical advisors to the board. So there is really not the requirement to have the specialists from the various disciplines as actual voting members on the board. I'm sure that Yukon residents who would be serving on that

board and who are serving on the board now, have to rely and have to get information from the technical people.

I'm sure that Ottawa's interest could be protected just by having the advisors available to the board. If Yukon people were on the board, our interests would certainly be protected. I'm very happy to second this motion, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will rise in support of the Motion, definitely. It is a strong Motion and a strong change that they are asking for, or we are asking for. As I go down and read the Motion, get near, down near the bottom, I find that it is losing some of that strength, and I would amend at this time, providing I can get a seconder, that the words "similar to parallel Provincial Legislation and authorities" be removed, and that it just reads "in a manner that will provide optimum benefit there from for all Yukoners in particular and in turn for all residents of Canada", because I feel that, that actually does give back the Minister a chance to just say we will make the Government the authority to just give some legislation up here, which is something similar to the problems in the other provinces and which don't always work in the Yukon, and come back when we complain some day and say, well you asked for it, you got it. I would like to be a little stronger and just continue as we do at the top and say we want this done for the Yukon. Not the way the provinces are doing it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there a seconder? There being no seconder, there can be no Motion. The Honourable Member from Mayo?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Speaker, I have some doubts about this Motion, because it goes beyond just the appointment and the funding of a board. If this Motion were taken seriously by the Minister and the Northern Inland Waters Act were repealed, and we were required to replace it with our own Ordinance, we would be establishing another bureaucratic group within our department which would be very expensive to maintain. I think you need only to have the Commissioner request the cost of the operation of the Civil Service in the Yukon and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, that devote to the time of the administration of Northern Inland Waters Act, and I don't we'd be prepared to fund it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further debate? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I have no comments to make on the Motion as it stands. I would like to address a comment to the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, however, in part of his support for the Motion. In his comment regarding future appointment of non-white members to the board, I would remind the Honourable Member that this House has already named non-white members to that board, and are happy to



Watson

have them.

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

**Mr. Hibberd:** Mr. Speaker, I rise as I am in favour of this Motion but I am not really speaking to the general thrust of the Motion. I merely rise to caution the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale in his remarks regarding Civil Servants and their abilities wherever they may come from, because it has been recently brought to my attention that the Senator from the Yukon, in the local, press accused me of stating that Civil Servants in this town is a dirty word.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** I thank the Honourable Members for their comments, and certainly the comments by the Member from South Centre. I wanted to reemphasize that fact, that I have no qualms with Civil Servants, in the sense, outside of what this Motion, outside of the Board's functions. What I would like to say, also, in response to the Member from Mayo, and I can recognize some of his concerns here, but the last portion, the last paragraph of this Motion is, again, is a future situation. It does ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to consider and future arrangements, whenever that is down the road, whenever that is suitable, and I am sure this Assembly will be making further demands with regard to that. I just want to say one thing to the Member from Hootalinqua that, when I said similar, in a manner similar to parallel Provincial authorities, similar doesn't necessarily mean exactly the same. I think the functions, the basic functions are there because I can tell you that provinces are very, very cautious. Very, what do we say, grasping of their own water resources. They want to make sure they control them, and this is the point I am trying to make. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now declare that the Motion is carried.

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MOTION NUMBER 27**

**Mr. Speaker:** The next Motion is Motion Number 27, moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klwane. That whereas the Yukon Public Utilities Board is considering evidence as gained from a recently held Public Hearing in connection with the NCPG proposed electrical rate increases and whereas a brief was pre-

sented on behalf of the Yukon Territorial Government, be it resolved that the Yukon Legislative assembly, submits to the Yukon Public Utilities Board, copies of all resolutions passed during the fifth Session of the 23rd Legislature pertaining to the proposed electrical rate increases, and the Yukon Power Authority and that this Assembly emphasizes to the Board that it is this Assembly's position that the Government of Canada should bear the cost of all expenditures incurred by the Northern Canada Commission and the development of projects which are attributed to National Objectives.

And further, this Legislative Assembly is firmly of the opinion that NCPG should be accountable to a Yukon Public body, which is representative of the consumer or user service. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. My comments will be brief with respect to Motion 27. I think it's fairly self explanatory what we'd like to do, I could make this comment, that I was personally not satisfied in the brief that was presented at the Public Utilities Board, and I was probably not satisfied because I didn't understand exactly from where it came, and what trust it was made. So, I make no excuse as I said I was made cognizant of how it was done. I would just like to reemphasize, I've said this before, that I think I was remiss, I think that this Assembly, this House was remiss, in not asking that a brief be presented to the Public Utilities Board on behalf of this House. Because Mr. Speaker, we did make some pretty strong points with respect to the kinds of things that I think the Minister responsible for NCPG, the kinds of things that the Public Hearing, or the Public Utilities Board could react to. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking of the overruns that were due to the environmental costs, the studies, the special studies that were made in connection with that, and again, Mr. Speaker, the Motions that we would send along with this, certainly emphasize that point.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Klwane.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker I would certainly agree with the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale that we were remiss, in not preparing or even sending the resolutions, which were very comprehensive and were very good resolutions to the Electrical Public Utilities Board, defining our position as representatives of the people of the Territory, in regard to the increase in electrical rates, which we're being asked for by the Northern Canada Power commission. I'm very happy that we're proceeding with the motion at this time, but it would have been much better if the Public Utility Board, would have had our position at the time when the rest of the people of the Territory were making their position known. Thank you.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I think there is some misunderstanding in the role of the YTG, and in particularly the Department of Local Government, in



representation before the YEPUB.

There is no way that the Department of Local Government can take a policy or a political position, other than the Minister himself, as representative of the people of the Yukon. With the motions that had come from this House, and knowing the involvement of the Federal Members, I thought for certain that there would be a strong political representation from both the Federal Member, which I understand there was, and from the individual members of the Assembly. I think it's safe to say that when any Boards or committees were making themselves publically available, that when I wasn't tied down quite to the extent that I am now, that every opportunity was taken to present the case on behalf of by constituents to those Boards and Committees. If Honourable Members were a little disappointed in the YTG presentation, I think there's some Honourable Members that were a little disappointed in not hearing a strong political position, which had been passed unanimously by this House, being presented on behalf of the people of the Yukon, before the YEPUB.

The Department of Local Government did not present a brief, they presented a letter to the Chairman of the Yukon Electrical Public Utilities Commission. After I had asked whether there was any information only that should be presented that they say as information to the YEPUB. They came up with one point that I agreed with, that it appeared by NCPC statistics, which I have here, that NCPC were paying more for gallon for fuel oil, than the YTG. I thought that was information that the YEPUB should be made aware of. Evidently the figures were questioned, I do have here the Northern Canada Power Commission proposed rate adjustments, and the charge that they say that they were paying for fuel which were included in our information. Which I thought was a valid point of information, before the YEPUB.

So that was the involvement of the Department of Local Government, and the YTG as administrative authority, Mr. Chairman, and I think probably there is some misunderstanding on behalf of Members who were present at the YEPUB Meeting.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate? The Honourable Member from Klondike?

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Speaker, I have problems with this Motion, because to me this Motion only concerns the Whitehorse Faro Grid system, it does not concern the people in Dawson City, in Mayo, up and down the highway which are not connected to the grid system. It says here that the Government of Canada should bear the costs of all expenditures incurred by the Northern Canada Power Commission in the development of projects that are attributed to national objectives. The thing is that we are not connected to Aishihik, and we are not connected to the Whitehorse Power Plant. We are on our own power system in Dawson. There is plans under way to come up with a North Fork Power Hydro project again, which again will not be hooked under the grid system in Whitehorse and Dawson, as far as I know, up to now are going to pay the whole cost of this development.

I don't see anything in there that really concerns

people in the outlying areas, or that this Motion really says, we are really concerned with everybody in the Yukon. I am convinced right now that if the people in Whitehorse would not have had that increase, there would have been no uproar in the Yukon about power rates in the outlying areas, because, we in the outlying areas, we paid high power rates for years and years. We put it to the attention of a lot of people and nobody says anything. All of a sudden Whitehorse is getting an increase, which is really nice compared with the power rates we have to pay in Dawson right now, and everybody is in an uproar. So, I don't know, I really can't really go with this Motion, because, like I say, it does not really fulfill the need of all the people in the Yukon.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I am having some difficulty with this Motion because of it's proposal that copies of all resolutions passed during this session pertaining to, et cetera, be passed to the Board. I have been checking the Motions and their status during this session, Mr. Speaker, and with the assistance of Madam Clerk, perhaps we could clarify for the Members the status of each of those Motions on the subject of NCPC at this time.

Motion No. 1, which asked the Prime Minister and the Minister of Indian Affairs to approve the transfer of, et cetera, et cetera, to the Yukon Hydro Corporation, was passed and transmitted to the Minister.

Motion No. 3, has also been transmitted, but Motion 6 and 8 which deal with the same subjects are still in Committee, Mr. Speaker, and have not yet been passed or approved by Members. Is it the proposal in this resolution that you should include any future motions passed during this session, because we seem to have made the message clear on at least two instances already, Mr. Speaker, to the proper authorities.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Speaker, due to the problems we seem to be having with this Motion, I would move that Motion No. 27 be moved into Committee for discussion.

**Mr. Berger:** I second that.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Bill, that Motion No. 27 be moved to Committee, well just be moved into Committee. 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:** We will now proceed to Public Bills.

*PUBLIC BILLS*

**Mr. Speaker:** Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

*BILL NUMBER 2 - THIRD READING*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill Number 2 be now read a third time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill No. 2 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.

*MOTION CARRIED*

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I had my hand out to ask you for a division on this vote. I wanted to register my disagreement on the Bill because of the taxation and the homeowner. I think I have an opportunity on third reading to speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** All Members will have an opportunity at third reading, that is the reason why I delayed and waited for a Member to indicate whether or not they wish to speak. Having received no indication from the floor that a Member wished to speak, it was only necessary to put the question, and I am sorry if the Member had wished to speak. She should have indicated in the time allotted for that.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, with respect...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, with respect, I had my hand up - I don't think you see too well.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would once again caution the Member to cease imputing motives of the Chair or it will be necessary for the Chair to take action accordingly, according to the Rules of the House. Now, if the Honour-

able Member wishes division recorded on the vote, she is perfectly entitled to ask for division and need only ask that division be held.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, may I so request that division be called?

**Mr. Speaker:** Madam Clerk, would you poll the House?

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Mayo?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Klondike?

**Mr. Berger:** **Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua?

**Mr. Fleming:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Mrs. Watson:** Disagree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

**Ms. Millard:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

**Mr. McCall:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Agree.

**Madam Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, the vote is ten yea, one



may.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Motion is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared to adopt the title to Bill number 2?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill number 2 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 Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill number 2 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 Bill number 2 has passed this House.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

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

BILL NUMBER 3 - THIRD READING

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill number 3 be now read a third time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill number 3 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 is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Now, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill number 3 do now pass and the title be as on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill number 3 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 that the Motion is carried and that Bill number 3 has passed this House.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

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

BILL NUMBER 16 - THIRD READING

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 16 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 16 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 is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 16 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 16 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 is carried

and Bill number 16 has passed this House.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

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

BILL NUMBER 13 - THIRD READING

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill number 13 be now read a third time.

**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 13 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 carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, that Bill number 13 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 13 do now pass and 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 is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House that Standing Order number 41 be suspended in order that we may further process Public Bills, namely an Ordinance to Amend the Credit Unions Ordinance at this time.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I'll second that.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, that Standing Order number 41 be suspended in order to further process Public Bills. Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any contrary? I will declare the Motion is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

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

BILL NUMBER 17 - FIRST READING

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 17 be now read a first 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 17 be now read a first time. Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** When shall the Bill be read for the second time?

BILL NUMBER 17 - SECOND READING

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Now, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill number 17, entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Credit Unions Ordinance, be now read a second 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 17 be now read a second time. Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.



**Mr. Speaker:** I shall declare that the Motion is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure at this time? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House. I had intended to rise earlier prior to the Orders of the Day on a matter of procedural protocol.

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** However, the Chairman of the Committee being absent at that time, I deferred my action until now, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House and your assistance in applying your wisdom of Parliamentary procedure to our lack of proper phraseology, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the best way to describe it, when moving Motions, particularly in Committee of the Whole. I refer specifically to an incident of yesterday and it is not the first time we have slipped into this loose usage and phraseology. When an Honourable Member moved that a Bill should die in Committee. Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that there is no such order; there is no such motion. I would crave permission to quote from Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Beauchesne's, Page 165, on the subject of motions: substantive privileged superseding and dilatory. And the Honourable Member was using, at the time, a dilatory motion which is designed to dispose of the original question, either for the time being or permanently, and, Mr. Speaker, there are proper forms and methods for doing this, which include the following:

That the consideration of the question be postponed to a certain date or no date. That the House proceed to other business, and so on; and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the process of maturing in this Legislative Assembly we would attempt, if we are going to move motions, to do so properly and I would ask the co-operation of the House and all Members in not continuing to use improper phraseology. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Motion that was presented, which the Honourable Minister is questioning at this time, was a non-debatable motion, and I believe also it was in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** In dealing with the question, I made a ruling on this question yesterday, but perhaps, for the guidance of the Honourable Member and Honourable Members who may not be aware of the manner in which motions are made in Committee and the differences

between procedural motions and substantive motions and so forth, when a Bill or a matter, a motion for that matter, is referred from this House to a Committee of the Whole or any Committee of this House, certain actions must be taken upon it, and these actions must be reported back to this House.

Now, in the case of Bills in Committee, as all Members I am sure are aware, Bills go automatically into Committee of the Whole at second reading. Now, at this time, the Bill—several things could happen to a Bill. The Bill could be moved out of Committee without amendment or the Bill could be amended in Committee and then moved out of Committee, reported out of Committee I should say, as amended. The Bill could be given what is known as the six-month hoist, but this is generally done in the House rather than in Committee.

So in fact, the only other alternative in Committee is the proper motion that the Bill be left to die in Committee of the Whole. This is a procedural motion and this is a non-debatable motion. Many procedural motions are non-debatable. For instance, the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair or that, indeed, Mr. Speaker do now assume the Chair, are non-debatable.

One of the very few motions, procedural motions, which is in fact debatable is a motion to adjourn. That is a procedural motion which is debatable, and one of the very few. It has been the practice of the House in Committee to use the phraseologies contained in the question raised by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, which is the motion that Bill number so-and-so be left to die in Committee, and this has been the custom and usage of this House, certainly, for the last fifteen years and it is not an unlawful or an illegal motion.

The motion, when given in Committee, gives the opportunity of the Committee to, indeed, kill the Bill or if it is voted in the affirmative, if it is voted in the negative, it permits further consideration of the Bill. It is that simple. It is a matter of procedure. Members should not use it unless they wish to effect closure. This is usually done at the end of a discussion or debate on a matter in Committee; however, it is a Member's prerogative to move such a motion.

As I say, yesterday as a consequence of this question I made a ruling and I ruled that the motion to leave a Bill die in Committee is quite in order and the decision of the Committee at that time was final. Accordingly I would so substantiate the ruling I made yesterday and I would assume that this would put an end to the matter.

May I have your further pleasure?

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, I would now move that Mr. Speaker do 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 that the House resolve in the 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 that the Motion is carried.

(MOTION CARRIED)

**Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair.**

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Mr. Chairman:** I now call this Committee to Order and call a brief recess.

(RECESS)

BILL NUMBER 17

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call this Committee to order. We will now go into reading clause by clause of Bill number 17. One.

(READS CLAUSE 1)

**Mr. Chairman:** Two.

(READS CLAUSE 2)

**Mr. Chairman:** Three.

(READS CLAUSE 3)

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, to be perfectly honest it's a lot of goobolygoop to me, because I haven't had an opportunity to read the Credit Union's legislation at the present time. I think maybe, as we go along, we should have explanations on these sections. Now, the amendment to sub-section 22 is a restructuring of the Board of Directors, is that right? Well, what is the purpose for the amendment then, in 3, where we are repealing sub-section 22, one of the said ordinance. Why are we restructuring it, it appears to be.

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

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** It shows a restructuring in sub-section 1, but in sub-section which is a new section, we are adding an officer, a Credit Officer, and our Credit Union has got so big now that it's no longer really a question of amateurs, they need an official and if they don't have a supervisor committee then he will exercise the function in a professional matter, that is the real purpose of this change.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Four.

(READS CLAUSE 4)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, this is devolving it one step down. The Director determines the procedure and then it's dealt with by people appointed by them on applications for memberships.

**Mr. Chairman:** Five.

(READS CLAUSE 5)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** That is just adding the proviso at the beginning to allow for the fact that there will be exceptions to the general rule that only members can borrow. In other words, organizations and such places will now be able to do it or jointly.

**Mr. Chairman:** Six.

(READS CLAUSE 6)

**Mr. Chairman:** Seven.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Miller had better explain that one; it's a financial thing about closing off the limitation on rates of borrowing.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, presently those sections deal with the maximum interest rate; there are provisions now under Federal Law which deal with maximum interest rates and disclosure of interest rates in contracts. And what we're proposing here is to put the Credit Unions in the Territory, on the same basis of any other financial institute. In other words, the ability to raise or lower their interest rates as the market changes. It's that simple. This would all apply under the Federal Law, which would prevail.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, what about the Federal Law if there was, if they were tied into an interest rate under the Credit Union Ordinance, would not the Federal Law, supersede this ordinance?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, they would, but it is unrealistic, when the Credit Union in order to secure it's finances, and to say, lend to a certain individual a sum of money, the Credit Union may in turn, may have to borrow money, they must pay a going rate, therefore they must charge a going rate. It's unreal to have it limited, like having to come back to this House, under those circumstances.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Seven.

(Reads Clause 7)

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, rather surprised that it has been permissive in section 38 up to this time has

been completely, absolutely permissive and there has been no obligation.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, would you insert to sub section 7 of the top of page 4.

**Mr. Chairman:** On the top of page 4 that is sub –

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** It should have been sub section seven.

**Mr. Chairman:** Okay.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, originally it was a short section, permissive to the point of auditor, but not spelling out in detail the auditor's part and duties. This is a very much longer section, and makes a code of conduct for the auditor and the Credit Union.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Eight

(Reads Clause 8)

**Mr. Legal Advisor,** that is pretty stretchy type of language, isn't it?

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** It's not intended be understood other than by an accountant, Mr. Chairman. If you would finish over the far page, then we could discuss the section the whole section. Mr. Chairman, the old section 39 was a fairly restricted section, this section is intended to be restrictive, but to deal with lifting the restrictions where required. The mechanism is this, no, money may be borrowed except on the resolution of the Directors who have the basic authority in the Ordinance to go up as far as one quarter. If they wish to proceed up to the one half, they must get the affirmative or confirming resolution of the shareholders, but in an emergency case, where money would be borrowed say from the Central in B.C. or somewhere, then the registrar might for a temporary period be asked to permit them to go past a point to cover a temporary emergency. But he would only do that on the advice of the person who was lending the money who required the security.

**Hon Mr.s Whyard:** Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, Mrs. Whyard.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I have a problem with Section 2 where we say, approved by an affirmative vote is three quarters of the Members who are present at and vote on. My own inclination would be to have that read, three quarters of the Members. I may not be legally informed on the matter, but I can see an emergency meeting being called on a stormy night and four people showing up, and on the basis of three of them, you authorize this

important business.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, membership of a Credit Union fairly automatically comes to anyone who goes down and deposits a five dollar bill. So your membership can be that and have no specific interest in the operation of a union. The rules would require for a vote like this that you would have to send everyone notice but they don't turn up. So, you are dealing with the people who are taken an interest in the organization, and this is common form, and if all organization were put into that kind of straight jacket, we wouldn't even have a curling club in Whitehorse.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, if it was my five bucks I'd be there.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think also Mr. Legal Advisor that this disallows proxy type votes. I am a member of the Credit Union myself. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Nine

(Reads Clause 9)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** This Section enables when somebody lends money, they can get the correct security issued to cover the debt. It was missing from the previous Ordinance.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Ten. (Reads Clause 10)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** This will secure a typist error which arose in the course of the examination in the new draft. The one, in brackets was missing.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clar.

**Mr. Chairman:** Eleven.

(Reads Clause 11)

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Twelve?

(Reads Clause 12)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, this is a slightly complicated section. Which expresses in legal terms, two concepts. One is, that where two people own money or shares in common, then the trust company, sorry the credit union, can pay out to either of the full owners without being responsible to the other party, and where



a trustee deposits money, they can pay out to him, but the converse is not true where a trustee attempts to pledge as security, shares or money, which is owned in trust. He cannot do that for a personal debt, and that the double concept is these sections. There are normal banking rules for dealing with this kind of thing, and they are also the same kind as you deal when you are dealing with land titles.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thirteen.

(Reads Clause 13)

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** These are just normal technical rules, but you will see that there is a provision for seven days notice for meetings.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** That is the last section, Mr. Chairman, and I was maybe I am out of order a little bit, but I would like to go back to where the Honourable Member, Minister from Whitehorse West, because I am concerned with eight. Who I would like to have a clearer explanation as to that three quarters of the Members who are present at and vote, and, also, if there is such a thing as a proxy vote, there is nothing in the --

**Mr. Chairman..:** Are you talking about Section 8, Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Eight, yes. Page two. Oh Section 39, I am sorry.

**Mr. Chairman:** Sub-section two?

**Mr. Fleming:** Two, yes.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** The concept, Mr. Chairman that all borrowing can only occur if Directors pass a resolution, and they have permitted only with the consent of the members as set out in this sub-section to go up to one half. Beyond one half they cannot go, but there is a saving clause at the end for the registrar to permit them to borrow the money quickly, notwithstanding these two restrictions. So, up to one quarter under the Ordinance, up from between one quarter and one half, they need the affirmative vote of Members, and there is a saving clause by the Registrar. Just the machinery.

**Hon. Mr. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes Mrs. Whyard.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I think the Honourable Member shares my concern about the three quarters of the

members who are present at, and we all recognize that ratepayers, who are being asked to approve a referendum for municipal money, must have more than fifty percent who vote. I think it is sixty something. You know, they have to be there and they have to vote either the money thing is killed. Now, it seems to me that even if there was some assurance that they could be polled by mail and the written approval returned in the mail, but to say that three quarters of the Members present at a meeting. Now that really bothers me and I imagine the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua has the same problem, and we may be very naive, Mr. Chairman, but it's pretty simple to rig a meeting with six people and say oh didn't you get your notice. You know, all these other sections provide protection. I am naturally suspicious of that kind of a ruling, Mr. Chairman. Why can't it be three quarters of the members?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we would want to restrict it to three-quarters of the members because how do you assure that you even get three-quarters of the members prepared to vote on anything?

Mr. Chairman we have automatic seven days notice must be given of a meeting. Having given seven days notice, those members who are concerned with the affairs of the Credit Union are going to turn up because they are going to know what the meeting is about in the notice. On the agenda for the meeting is a requirement to raise it, they're going to know about it.

Now you might, and there is coverage for this, you have an inadvertent omission of one member but it would not be deliberate. I think three-quarters of the members who are present at the meeting if they can't organize the affairs of the Credit Union, who's going to? That would be my question.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** If there's seven days notice is that in the old --

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, we just dealt with it in Section 54 (2).

**Mr. Fleming:** That possibly is a very great help in some instances but in the case of the Yukon and possibly members that do live not where the Credit Union, seven days, he wouldn't have the notice yet. I'm quite sure of this because I have received mail from this town many, many times, it's been two weeks old so it doesn't really give them very much of assurance that something can't happen. I don't see it.

**Mr. Chairman:** I would like to add a little more --

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** There is no requirement for this notice in the old Ordinance. It just said arrangements would be made in the by-law. This is put in to safeguard the other position.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, I'd like to add a little more to what Mr. Miller has just stated to Mrs. Whyard's curios-



ity. I am a member of a Credit Union and have been for the last ten years and I get my notifications through the mail and this is B.C. Credit Union. I am also a shareholder and if I don't attend the meetings, I don't know what's going on, and that is the way it should be. It is my prerogative to show up as a shareholder of the Credit Union, to make sure the business is conducted properly. The onus is on the individual shareholder.

**Mrs. Watson:** It's your money.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, it is. Clear?

**Mr. Chairman:** Fourteen.

(READS CLAUSE 14)

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Fifteen.

(READS CLAUSE 15)

(READS PREAMBLE)

**Mr. Chairman:** I'll entertain a motion.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman the Government of the Yukon would sincerely like to thank all members for their co-operation in this matter. I would like to report Bill Number 17 out of Committee without amendment.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. Lang, that Bill 17 be moved out of Committee, I presume without amendments, Mr. McKinnon?

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

**Mr. Chairman:** Without amendments. Reported out of Committee, I'm sorry. Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I'm going to support the motion to report it out of Committee without amendment but I do have some personal, within myself I really don't understand what I'm reporting out of Committee without amendment. I'll be honest about it. I'm going to have to trust our Legal Advisor and our witness.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, the elected members on the Executive Committee are doing exactly the same thing.

**Mr. Chairman:** As a shareholder of a Credit Union, I find it very beneficial -

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I must acknowledge the fact that the Honourable Member from Pelly River seems to be very familiar with Credit Unions and has been actively investing in a Credit Union, Should I say.

Well then maybe we can trust him too.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** In God we trust.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Only on Credit Unions.

**Mr. Chairman:** All those in favour of the motion?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Disagreed? The motion is carried.

(MOTION CARRIED)

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now recess until 1:30 p.m.

(RECESS)

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call this Committee to order. At this point I would like to hand the Chair back to Mr. Hibberd. Mr. Hibberd?

MR. HIBBERD BECOMES CHAIRMAN

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McCall. We will continue our debate on Motion Number 19, which I will re-read for Committee.

Motion number 19 - Continued.

**Mr. Chairman:** Moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that it is the opinion of this House that education in the Yukon Territory should directly reflect the needs and desires of the Community it serves and further that the document "Barriers to Education" be referred to the Department of Education for a review with interested organizations with the understanding that a written commentary will be forth coming to the Yukon Legislative Assembly, by the next Session of the Yukon Legislative Assembly. Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the motion and in doing so I would like to say that the first part of it, the opinion of this House that education in the Yukon Territory should directly reflect the needs and desires of the community it serves. I have to wholly agree.

On the second paragraph, I think I agree too because the two Honourable Members are merely asking that something, a document which has been presented to this House and which some of us have read. Any maybe some agree with and some don't agree with, and some agree with the writer and some don't agree with, but nevertheless, it is merely asking that the Department of Education in this case, take a little bit of time and check it over and say what they think about it. I think they're really asking not very much when they say the forth coming Yukon Legislature -- by the next Session, that's quite some time to write up a page or two that might answer the question.

I sat here yesterday in this House and listened to the answers that were given then and if they can be done that easily in the House here, I would think they could



just drop back through and look at Hansard and ask in the same way again if they wish to. But anyhow give an answer.

**Ms. Millard:** I'd like to thank the member from Hootalinqua for his remarks and support. I feel that we might be emphasizing too much the actual document "Barriers to Education". To me this book is only a means to further the communication between interested people and the government, and the facet happens to be need of education. You talk about, Mr. Parnell's payments or his qualifications or whether or not he's come to discuss things with the department, is not really relevant. What's relevant to the people of the Yukon, and what has been made known to me through resolutions from Yukon Teachers Association, from the school committees, from the Brotherhood Seminar on Education which was held last Fall. From Band Council resolutions, I have fifteen Band Council resolutions right here dealing with Indian education, and I don't feel that there has been a proper response to this movement in the communities, to further the development of native education.

There has been no response, except to say, we don't have any money, we don't have a racist policy. A lot of general kind of conclusions, with no specific answers to the things that have been brought up. For instance, in Band Council resolutions, this one from the Mayo Indian Band, hereby resolve that the Yukon Educational Department be requested to accept the present classes in Mayo as a legitimate course of studies. This is dealing with Indian languages, and to take over the financial responsibility if necessary to ensure its continuance. It would be very easy to take that band council resolution and say, we just can't do it, we don't have the money. Well, let's have that answer, let's have the answer to a lot of these other band council resolutions and motions from the seminars. Selkirk Indian Band supports the teaching of the native languages in the school and requests that the native language project continue during the 75-76 school year. This was in October last year. The Dawson Band and the Kluane Tribal Brotherhood. From all over the Yukon, we are getting these requests. Not just from the band councils, the Yukon Teachers Association is supporting the ideas that are coming forth from the communities. The school committees themselves are bringing forth ideas. I think these things must be met with a reply.

The "Barriers to Education" book is only a tool to discuss the furtherance of solving the problem of, that is inherent in native education in the Yukon. This is why I feel that it is very important that the part with interested organizations in this motion be taken very seriously, that we don't have to sit down with interested, with the YNB and the CYI and the rest of them and discuss "Barriers to Education." Let's discuss education with them. Let's get some ideas what can be done, what can't be done. Let's set up some communication for a change. This motion just emphasizes that, that there are a lot of people that are very concerned about this and there should be some reply. There should be, as well as being replies to what is actually being said in "Barriers to Education", there must be replies to the implications and the ideas that are in these resolutions

that are available to the department, have been sent to the department and have received no reply.

To tell you the truth, if I were an Indian on the Land Claims negotiating right now, I would say to myself, well we have had no response from the Territorial Government in that very important aspect native education, so why don't we just set up our own education system, because obviously they're not all that concerned. And that is something that we really have to think about, is that what we want, do we want to just ignore these pressures and let the Indian people set up their own education system. It's certainly being thought about.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, if she is in presenting an amendment to this Motion?

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, no, I only bring up the implications that are, to me, in this motion. The motion only, of course, deals with the "Barriers to Education", but I feel that it should be taken seriously enough, the implications in that document, to further communication with the Indian people.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, yesterday I had planned on bringing in an amendment, but I have changed my mind, and I have a little problem trying to relate this motion to what the Honourable Member from Ogilvie wants to attain. I don't think there's that much in, there isn't anything in this motion, that says what you want to do. Now, I really, as I said when we heard the witness's answer on the "Barriers to Education" brief. That the "Barriers to Education" was a brief that was prepared on behalf of and with the non-status organization in the Yukon Territory. It was their assessment of some of the problems of education as it effects native children and I sort of questioned that, because it was the non-status group. And also some recommendations that they had made to alleviate it.

Now, I would be quite prepared to support this motion if we took out "with interested organizations" because we are assuming, or the Member from Ogilvie is assuming, that the only people who are interested in education, are the native organizations. Every other school committee may want to consult with the department on the "Barriers to Education" report. So, when you say "interested organizations", you must give every organization that's interested in education and the education of Indian children in our school system and on the whole thing an opportunity.

Now, I don't think our Department of Education can legitimately do a task like that without taking a year. When we did, the review of education, we had a committee travel throughout the territory, and it took them a whole year, to prepare the recommendations. I would be very happy to support the motion, as I said before. The organizations have presented their brief, I would like a reply from the educators who are on the staff for the Government to that brief, and that's what I would like to see this motion do. Not to start consulting. If they want clarification on some of the points they've made,



well certainly they would have to contact the organization.

But we are getting one brief, let's get a reply to it. Let's get an assessment of the brief, that's our responsibility there. I don't think that this is all encompassing to go into the resolutions the Native Organizations have put in and this type of thing. That in itself might be a separate motion.

I would like to see that deleted "with interested organizations". I want our educators to comment on it for us. Let's get both sides.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, this was my major point yesterday in regards to the answers to the "Barriers of Education", is to give our educators an opportunity to answer. I would be prepared to come back in this House next session with a short comprehensive analysis of the "Barriers to Education" and a more comprehensive analysis at a later date, in order to give my department that time.

I think that first if I brought in a reply into this coming Session it would be more or less in a general sense rather than in straight specifics, which would in all eventually would probably come in November, I would expect November would be the date when it would come in.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Well Mr. Chairman I'm certainly not putting any restrictions on what this motion says. In fact, I like it because it's broad enough so that the Department can interpret whatever they like, "with interested organizations" could be the P.T.A. from Carcross or whatever. If there was a P.T.A. anymore. It could be anybody, I am hoping that the Department of Education has enough interest to use this motion, to really look at this motion and to take it in detail if they want to, if not if they want a general response, let's have a general response. All I'm saying is I would like to have a response since the "Barriers to Education" was printed in January, it's already three months gone. A copy was given to the Department before it was available to me anyway, oh two days. I feel there's been time, by May there will be five months gone since the time it was published. By November there will be ten months gone from the time it was published.

I think we're making too much emphasis on the document itself, because as I said before, this motion is general enough so that it can include whatever the Department really wants to include along these general lines.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Could I ask the Honourable Member from Kluane if she proposing amendment to the Motion Number 19?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I'd be just happy to get an assessment through on the "Barriers to Education". I'd just be happy to get a concensus from the

Honourable Member that let the educators do a job and bring down a commentary, an assessment on "Barriers to Education" without going through this interested organizations and having hearings and if they miss one organization that they don't confer with them, they're in hot water again.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, I rose in support of Motion 19 before and I rise in support of Motion 19 again. I would also be in favour of the amendment. I would vote positive to that. If an amendment is proposed, I think the Honourable Member from Kluane said something that for a reply with the understanding that a written report or something will be forth coming. To me that would be quite in order either way.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** For the Department I would like to move the amendment that the words "with interested organizations" be deleted as the Honourable Member says, if we miss one organization we're in trouble. As far as conferring with the Yukon Association of Non-Status Indians in regards to the "Barriers to Education", I would presume that I would probalby be having a meeting sometimes between now and before the following Session.

**Mr. Chairman:** A seconder?

**Mr. Lengerke:** I'll second that.

**Mr. Chairman:** The amendment is that the words "with interested organizations be deleted, moved by Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Lengerke. Ms. Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly have considered this previously to this time. And we've been considering this motion for such a long time. I've been crossing that off in my mind and I've been thinking, how often do we have to make decisions in isolation without communication to other organizations that are interested in things. It was typical yesterday of the Administration that the people who represent the employees of the Yukon Government didn't have input into the legislation that was going to control their whole life. And today we're saying the same thing, we won't talk to the people who are interested in education, we will make our decisions in isolation. We know best. We are, in other words, it is a dictatorship to me, that these that we can't have input from interested organizations in such a delicate matter, in such an important matter.

People are trying to put input in and it's not being recognized. Now we're going to cross off any conversation with anybody who's interested in the subject. I find that really hard to accept.

**Hon. Mr. Lng:** Mr. Chairman --



**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, as I said I can vote positive to either motion and I'd like to just say to the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that the Department of Education, I would hope reflect the interests of a lot of other people. I think the point is to get this thing on the way, and get something done because we are going around in circles. I would ask that we vote on it.

**Mrs. Watson:** Are we voting on the amendment?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, we are voting on the amendment.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is moved by Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Lengerke, that the words "with interested organizations" be deleted. All those in favour?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Contrary? The Motion is carried.

*MOTION CARRIED.*

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion Number 19 as amended moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that it is the opinion of this House that education in the Yukon Territory should directly reflect the needs and the desires of the community it serves, and further that the document "Barriers to Education" be referred to the Department of Education for review with the understanding that a written commentary will be forthcoming to the Yukon Legislative Assembly by the next session of the Yukon Legislative Assembly. Are you ready for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Contrary? The Motion is carried.

*MOTION CARRIED*

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now turn to consideration of Sessional Papers.

Sessional Paper Number 1

**Mr. Chairman:** Sessional Paper No. 1, Amendment To Land Use Regulation. I would like Committees direction on this, do you wish this to be read or do you wish to discuss it, or is there anything forthcoming? Mr. Taylor?

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to read Sessional Papers. Sessional Papers are only moved into Committee when Members are concerned about them, and perhaps the concerned Member would

wish to speak on it, whoever moved it into Committee.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, the concerned Member has a mouthful of candy.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Now, Mr. Chairman, I, the only comment I have to make on the land use regulations is that it appears that the Minister, or his advisors, have refused to respect the wishes of this Assembly and the recommendations that we have made. I understand that the land use regulations as originally proposed by Ottawa have been gazetted. It is my hope that at some future session, we may once again undertake to show Ottawa the error of their ways in applying land use regulations to our territory.

I would like, however, to say that since the passing of our Highways Bill, that the administration continue to make a close study on how and how much control we do exercise in terms of roads, lanes and trails within the Yukon Territory, because I think that they would have a great effect on the implementation of these Federal Land Use Regulations. Just with those few comments I would say I have nothing more to say on the Bill, or on the Sessional Paper.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further comment? Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can say that I am happy that it happened this way. I was against the amendments and I think that it is the best thing that ever happened. I am really happy about it.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is good to see someone is going to leave this House in a happy frame of mind.

I will enter into Sessional Paper No. 2, Goals and Objectives of the Governments of Yukon.

SESSIONAL PAPER NUMBER 2

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we would also like to add that we are in favourhood of motherhood and maple syrup also. Motherhood and apple pie and maple syrup.

**Mr. Chairman:** You did it Mr. McKinnon. Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, going over this Goals and Objectives again last evening. There was one glaring deficiency in there, a goal or an objective that we hope to attain within the territory, and that was the absolute neglect to recognize that we should try to attain a standard of physical fitness, particularly amongst our children and amongst our adult population.

I am sure that the Chairman will have some comments to make, because I think we share the same view, and if you look at the Department of Education's goals and objectives. If you look at the Department of Recreation and really our goals and objectives for the Depart-



ment of Recreation, I don't know, we are going to be sort of sitting by and watching the world go by instead of becoming actively engaged. I really can't agree with the recreation objectives that were outlined.

I must never lose the opportunity to speak on some of the Legislation that we passed at this Session. I feel that some of the legislation that we passed at this session are directly in conflict with the Goals and Objectives that are Government are committed to, and I would draw your attention to page 5. A basic objective for social development is greater equality for all Yukoners, through a more equitable distribution of the benefits of development. And we look at the fourth paragraph on that page, the principle of greater equality requires on so on, to this sentence the last one in the paragraph, that territorial taxation system, must be transformed so that the burden of taxation is transferred to higher income groups. Amen.

I don't think we obtained that objective and goal this Session, and I will continue after the second objective. In some areas of the territory, particularly in a small settlements where decline and hardship has continued for decades, this objective rule requires strong Government commitments. That really, our legislation this time didn't really substantiate those goals and objectives.

Here is one question I have on the Economic Development, now I don't know whether the government people will be able to answer this. Economic development should be encouraged since political maturity and provincial status will be achieved only when most of the financing necessary can be raised from local sources. And I think that this is one area, a dangerous area, and we're striving for the responsibility that we want so badly. That will we as a Territory be able to carry the fiscal responsibility strictly from the sources of revenue that we have now available to us without being able to tax the revenue from the natural resources. I think many of us are questioning that in our own minds today. It is fine, we can say we will be fiscally responsible. How far, are we going to be able to go with the limited revenue sources that we have, without being able to directly receive benefits from our natural resources, or have an idea of what benefits we will be receiving from our natural resources?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, we presented the exercise that the departments of the Government of the Yukon Territory had gone through, in presenting Goals and Objectives with our eyes wide open, because we know the dangers, as well as any member does here, of presenting Goals and Objectives. However, the exercise had been asked for, it was a part of the motion that was passed, the motion Number 17 at the last session, and there was an exercise under way with the Departments involved. In keeping with the openness of this Government, we thought these should be presented to the people who were paying for the exercise, namely the people of the Yukon through their Legislative Assembly. And of course goals and objectives can be used in any manner it seems that anybody sees fit, and as the Honourable Member has stated, she sees the stated

goals and objectives in opposition to some of the legislation that was passed at this session.

And of course other members, like myself would look at it at a completely different light, and say yes we were fulfilling, the transformation of the Territorial taxation system, when the burden of taxation is transferred to high income groups by placing higher property taxes on the mining companies in the Yukon. So we are fulfilling that goal and objective. We would say that the greater equality for all you Yukoners through the equitable distributions and of the benefits of the development, we would say is the program of transferring nearly \$200,000.00 in Territorial funds this year, to the provision of television to the smaller community, in a stay option exercise, so those people will feel that they are getting some benefits from Government and the redistribution of tax dollars and programs that other Yukoners enjoy.

So, we realize all these difficulties that you come into when you develop goals and objectives. I think that, I'm not so certain, that they're useful an exercise, I'm going to tell you that the exercise had been done, that it had been called for and that it was available, and so I don't think that there's any way that it shouldn't have been provided to all Members of the Assembly and the people of the Yukon.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you Mr. Chairman, as the mover of motion 17, that call for goals and objectives or a strategy for development, I must say first, that I'm pleased that we had some response certainly, but I would say the response falls way short of what the motion was calling for. I, to me, this represents goals of the Government of the Yukon, goals of the Departments of the Government of the Yukon, I think there is, where is the input by the people of Yukon into this. I think this is where it falls short. I recognize and I appreciate that this, as it states here, this is the first set of goals and objectives developed by this Government and therefore we fully recognize that they can be improved upon or be expanded and are subject to change.

Certainly, I take that into full account and, as I said, I am pleased that we do have a response, but I could take a lot of time of this Assembly today and probably start spouting off and going back to Motion 17 and saying what I wanted; I'll take that opportunity at a further date, Mr. Chairman. That's my position with respect to this at this point.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Perhaps this would be a good time to suggest, once again, that the Members might like to set a special committee to consider this subject and come back with another version.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in what the Honourable Member from Klauane has said,



that so many times we can write so many things and come up with all sorts of objectives, but when we seem to go through the performance of our duties we end up with exactly the opposite.

I would, looking at the social development objectives, and of course liquor must be in there somewhere, it reads "to seek to alleviate the necessity of organizations earning money by the sale of liquor" and "to development of equal standards of service" and so on. It goes on to say these things, and I am wondering in this House-- we passed legislation that's possibly, I don't consider organizations being private organizations that might be handling these things. We pass legislation costing these organizations more money to handle something for the government, without any compensation more than what there has been in the last many, many years. I am wondering if possibly they are wishing to help the well-being of the people that do sell these things. They couldn't possibly look into a system of financing, more or less, that sale to the business places, maybe of, in the way of putting the liquor there on consignment possibly. It might be just something to think in the future.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Further to this, I have something underlined here also on the liquor, Economic Objectives "To increase profits from the sale of liquor". Now, in the social development objectives, point four says "To reduce the adverse impact of liquor sale programs and advertising". I am wondering how is this increasing the profit and point four going to work together? I think it is sort of contradictory in the whole set-up.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I want to point out, once again, this is just a beginning. We are not saying they are perfect, and I think it is up to all the Members on this table to go through it, and I would furthermore say, why don't we hold this Sessional Paper over to next session? So people have had time to go through it and put the appropriate amendments where they see fit.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** They don't want it; I invited them but they don't want it.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think there is considerable feeling, from what Mr. Lang's had to say, and I would like other Members' comments. Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** I would very much wish to do that.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I am not necessarily stating a committee, I am just saying-- stating that Members have an opportunity to take it home for a month or two months or whatever time I give in-between now and the next session and go through it and see where the amendments should be. I wouldn't like to think that any Members around this table would use the goals and objectives of the territory to their own end.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** The government would, though.

**Mr. Fleming:** Does this require a motion or anything to do this?

**Some Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairman:** No, it wouldn't, I don't think. Any further discussion?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, I look forward to seeing the observations of the Members on these vague and amorphous goals and objectives. If you could pin them down to reality, good luck.

I would also recommend to the Honourable Member from Kluane and her concern for physical well-being on the part of all Yukoners, that I could use a little support from that direction in the subject of the new capital building where I have made futile attempts to use large, open areas for physical education and physical activities and physical jerks during noon hours and I have received absolutely no support from other members of Ex Com. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** That's privileged information.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to bring forward suggestions. I have quite a few of them underlined. I am sure you don't want to be bored at the present time, but I can bring forward some if this House wants to discuss Goals and Objectives in all seriousness and can see how we will utilize the Goals and Objectives as defined and adopted by this House. I would be very, very pleased to bring them forward; I don't mind the work.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McIntyre?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Chairman, in looking through these Goals and Objectives, most of the material that's in it is what we're doing right now; it's a plateau, and there is very little indication in these Goals and Objectives of what we hope to do in the future, when you look at it department by department. I think that it's going to be quite a job for members of council to eliminate the policy, the Government Policy, at the present time and find out really what's in there as to the future. We're going to have to do that ourselves, think up what's for the future, because it's not in here.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I have to go further; most of the Goals and Objectives are defined in legislation, aren't they? They are here for each department.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you. Again, I just want to express-- I don't know-- concern; I'm probably concerned with my Motion 17. I'm concerned that I didn't get the point across, obviously. One that writes long



motions, I guess this is my answer, that it wasn't understood.

I think that the exercise that I wanted Mr. Chairman, was something that was going to start to determine, to lay out, the strategy and it was going to be an overnight situation. As I said earlier, this forms a very small part of what the total package is going to be. Somehow, I think around this House and again I'm concerned with myself for not being able to explain it well enough, that I don't think you understood at all what I wanted or what was meant by Motion 17. I'm absolutely convinced of that. So the challenge to me, as an individual, today is that I'm going to come back to this House and I'm going to give you something that you can possibly understand. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I would like to tell the Honourable Member from Riverdale that, not only did we understand his motion, we have to admit that he was so far ahead of what we are accomplishing in that document that it's funny. What the Honourable Member was suggesting is exactly a proposed Department of Economic Development in this Government would try to achieve.

What the Honourable Member was groping for was what the institute, the Yukon Institute of Research and Development, has been working on for some years in an unorganized way and it's an objective which is dear to the hearts of many people in this room. And nobody had ever attempted to encompass it in a motion before. I think that was the problem, Mr. Chairman, but I hasten to assure the Honourable Member that he has a great deal of support.

### SESSIONAL PAPER NUMBER 3

**Mr. Chairman:** Regarding Sessional Paper number 3, Yukon Income Tax: Mr. Miller has advised me that he would be delighted to appear before Committee to offer explanations regarding this Sessional Paper, if this meets concurrence of Committee.

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** I declare a brief recess.

(RECESS)

**Mr. Chairman:** I now call this Committee to order. We're about to embark on discussion of Sessional Paper number 3. I would bring to the attention of Committee that, although this is printed on white paper, it is asking for direction from council - if you look at the summary, they're asking for direction of council - this is usually printed on green paper and in view of this being March the 17th there has been a gross error made on our part. Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I was noticing the same thing. The Sessional Paper was no doubt compiled by, perhaps, Mr. Miller for introduction to the House and I was wondering if we could have a fairly concise comment from Mr. Miller, Mr. Chairman, in capsule

form of the implications of the imposition of the Yukon Income Tax?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, what I've tried to explain, or what we've tried to explain here, is the make-up of the present income tax structure, which is that on the federal basic tax, there's an additional levy placed now by the Federal Government under the Income Tax Act of Canada, an additional 30% for individuals and an additional 10% for corporations. This is the same rate of taxation that is applied to the citizens of the Northwest Territories and to non-residents of Canada, who have had Canadian earnings during the tax year. Our provincial governments in Canada levy their own provincial income tax, and they range anywhere from 30.5% in B.C. to 42.5% in Manitoba; corporations paying from 10% to 13% - depending upon the province.

We know, I think you're all aware of this, we now get a grant in lieu of income tax which is equivalent to the percentage of the Yukon taxes collected. It was very difficult to try and explain this in the paper, but basically the grant in lieu of taxes is calculated by Canada in the case of individual income tax in respect of the 1976-77 fiscal year. They took the 1973 income taxes collected in the Yukon as a proportion of the total income taxes collected in Canada, which came to approximately .001%; they then took an estimate of the 1976 taxes to be collected in Canada and applied the percentage. And that's how we get the grant in lieu of taxes.

It works mathematically, and as long as the Yukon continues in relation to Canada there are no problems.

Now, with the grant in lieu of income tax situation, there is never any adjustment made; in other words, the money is given to us and that's the end of it. If we went to our own income tax structure, basically what would have to happen is we would have to enact legislation here allowing us to impose the income tax in the Yukon; we would have to enter into an agreement with Canada to collect the taxes. Nine out of the ten provinces do that; Quebec is the only province that collects their own income tax in Canada. And Canada would then pay us, on an estimated basis, they would pay us one-twelfth each month on an estimated basis and their calculation of the estimate would not be substantially different than what it is now. But there would be an accounting of the actual versus estimate, some two years after the fact; in other words, in respect of 1976, the accounting would be done in 1978 - if they owed us money, they would give it to us; if we owed them money, we would make arrangements to repay it either by a reduction in the one-twelfth payments in respect of that year or in cash or whatever the situation is.

The risk of imposing our own income tax is, if you have a particular down-turn in the economy at some point in time, there is a risk that at some point two years down the line we would have to repay Canada some 'x' number of dollars.

However, I think that there are other implications that are probably as important or more important than that risk situation.

I think the imposition of the Territorial Income Tax could constitute a major step forward in responsible government. It would put us in the position of fiscal



responsibility, in respect of raising our own taxation, to a point of where we would be raising approximately 84 percent of our total operation and maintenance needs, versus the inferred percentage now of 67 percent, because we do not impose the income tax.

Now I don't know too many Provinces that have that sort of a record of raising 84 percent of their own fiscal needs, but I know there are some. Many of them, as you probably know, are subject to Federal Government equalization payments as being "have not" Provinces. The Yukon would not be eligible for that plan because we would be a have province. The way that particular formula works.

Now from a timing point of view, I have a schedule included in here. It take approximately nine months of preparation to put this process into effect. So if it's the wish of Council, of the Assembly that we do not proceed at this time. There's no turning back once that decision is made, you've automatically deferred it for at least one year, which is not a major problem in itself, it's just a wish. Really what we're asking here is for the wish of Council.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the collection of Territorial Income Tax, we always seem to drift back to the old problem of how we can, for instance, recover those taxes which properly belong to us, from people like White Pass or people like Cyprus Anvil who may file in Vancouver or in other jurisdictions. Is there a system in taxing in Canada now which segregates or is capable of putting together those taxes, irrespective of where they are filed, those taxes attributable to the Yukon?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, corporate income taxes must be reported in the Province in which they are earned, so there is no problem with corporate income tax. Basically what happens is a company will take the percentage of revenue earned in the Yukon as a portion of the total revenue earned and determine their tax on that basis. There are ways and means of, not distorting, but manipulating, not illegal manipulation, but there are ways and means of charging expenses to one jurisdiction which are quite legal. In fact at the present time with our income tax rates, we may be the beneficiary of that because we happen to have the lowest income tax rates in Canada.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** That Mr. Chairman, brings me to my second question and that is in proceeding with the program as outlined in Sessional Paper Number 3, Who will have the authority of decreasing or increasing, for instance, presently we're paying 30 percent of Federal Tax and of individuals and 10 percent of corporation. Does Canada still have the right to increase or decrease or would that give us the right to control those taxes?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, that would give us the right. However, it is likely that Canada will insist on a caveat in the agreement, that we would not lower our

rate below the Federal rate applied under Section 120, which is currently 30 percent and 10 percent.

I think that you can understand that. Canada is saying look we're still be providing a deficit grant, we're not going to allow you to reduce your income tax rate and increase the deficit grant because of it.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** I was going to say thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Ms. Millard:** I'm just curious if we're able to raise 84 percent of our running costs, where are the other 16 percent going to come from, by raising the income tax?

**Mr. Miller:** No, Mr. Chairman, that would come out of the deficit grant, as long as this Assembly and Government wants to continue having a deficit grant come from Ottawa, and Ottawa's prepared to pay it.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** That gives rise to another question. When we talk about the deficit grant, and I think I've mentioned that before many times in the House, it isn't just a deficit grant. It's a misnomer I think, that there are certain services that this government provides to other agencies or to Canada shall we say, which are indeed charges for services which are not specifically identified. For instance in education and this area and that area. Perhaps if we were a Province we would be receiving specific grants and specific allotments for these services. It seems that it's been the practice in the past just to lump all these things together without necessarily identifying them and saying, okay here's the deficit grant and it amounts to so many millions of dollars and there it is.

Is it anticipated that this will change and that these grants for services rendered by this Government to Canada will be identifiable rather than just lumped into the so called Deficit Grant.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, for the most part we now have arranged agreements with Canada to cover most of the programs. I admit that there are certain exceptions. One that comes to mind is education to registered Indian children, which in the provinces depending upon the situation, if they were living on reserves in a province, the Federal Government would pay for it through IND.

The reason we have not an agreement in that particular case is because this government does not want an agreement. We treat these children as being Yukon citizens and we do not want to discriminate or distinguish them from any other citizen. Now, if it is the wish of the Government and the Assembly at some point that, that again be delineated as it used to be. I guess that's what we will try to do, but for the most part our agreements with Canada are normal federal - provincial type agreements.



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

**Mr. Fleming:** I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, this is 1976 - 77 territorial government direct responsibility for raising about 67 percent operating expenditures, and the introduction of this tax, of course, if we are going to this structure the Yukon will be responsible for raising almost 84 percent. It is fine to say you are going to raise almost 84 percent, but what proof have you that you can raise 84 percent without raising the taxes to the individual higher than it is now, to get the 84 percent. How do you come to that conclusion, in other words.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, what that is saying is, the tax bills that the territorial government now has on the books, we raise 67 percent of or operation and maintenance expenditures. If we had the grant in lieu of income tax that we presently get, which is not changing the tax rate at all, and assuming that that will be the actual tax collected, then we will reach 84 percent.

**Mr. Fleming:** You are assuming though, Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Miller:** There is an assumption, a basic assumption, Mr. Chairman, that the grant in lieu of tax that we are getting in 1976 - 77 will equate to the actual tax collected in 1977. That is an assumption, correct.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I like what I hear, and I like what I see. I think that we always talk of some pieces of legislation and various Bills, here is another key to that responsible government. I think this is really, the key is in the lock and I concur with the recommendation and I would hope that we can support this Paper.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, a couple of very minor questions. Does the Federal Government take any percentage for the administration of the collection of the tax on behalf of the provinces, and, in this case, the Yukon?

**Mr. Miller:** No, Mr. Chairman, there is no assessment by the Federal Government for the collection of income tax.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Further, is there any way that, if we embark upon this program, that we would be in fact jeopardizing our position to continue to receive a deficit grant? Since you have said that we do not qualify for equalization payment. Under the formula for equalization payments we would be considered a "have" province and we don't want to sort of be left in limbo. Is there any indication that this won't happen?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, on the discussions we've had with

Ottawa on this, Mr. Chairman, we have had the assurances of the people that we have been dealing with, that they would continue to treat us, regardless of whether we enact this or not, they would continue to treat our deficit means as they have in the past. Now, that is at the official level. I would suggest that before we entered into this, that we would probably want a commitment for our own Minister, and-or the parties to the financial agreement that we now sign, that, that, in fact, will be the case in the future.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Very minor, I probably know this. On page two, "advising the Department of National Revenue if the Territorial Government will enact legislation and so on. But "relieved of Federal Income Tax by the 8 percent Federal Tax Reduction." What is that?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, when you file your Income Tax, you will notice on the back page somewhere about the middle of the page, if you are so tired and blurry and get it mixed up, that you deduct an 8 percent Federal Tax. It is a tax that the government brought into effect about three years ago. It was, the Federal Government was giving it to every taxpayer in Canada, but the provinces had to concur as to whether they would allow that to happen. Some provinces did, some didn't. The majority of them did. We would, in fact, have to, well, we would have to indicate to them. It would be my intention that there would be no change at least in the first one or two years of this, from what we are now doing.

**Mrs. Watson:** Just a continuation?

**Mr. Miller:** Just a straight continuation. Now, I am trying to foresee the future here a little. I probably won't be here and I don't know whether our Ex Com members will be here, but this House can control that to some degree.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, another thing that does worry me, amendments to Federal legislation prepared, and again I think that is something are we going to be sure that the Federal legislation will, in fact, be amended. Do we have to wait until it is, in fact, amended by the Parliament of Canada?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there would have to be an amendment to the Federal Income Tax Act, particularly sections 120 and 124, which now provide the taxing authority to Canada, in respect of Yukon citizens. That would have to be repealed, we are assured by the officials that with this sort of timing available, there would be no problem in getting that, those sections repealed.

**Mrs. Watson:** But that's the key isn't it?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's the key and quite frankly I don't see any problems, but it's a very



simple process, it's not a controversial matter at all.

**Mrs. Watson:** Well, I can't agree they may not think it's, we may not think it's a controversial matter, but some, you know some of the Members of the Parliament of Canada, may see this is a threat that we are becoming more independent all the time. But I would certainly concur with the recommendation of the Sessional Paper.

**Mr. Miller:** It's a good test.

**Mr. Berger:** Just one other question. Mr. Miller said that probably the Federal Government will insist and having 30 and 10 as a basic formula, what formula is the Province operating under right now?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, other than Alberta, who is just done some, made some changes as a result of having their windfall profits from oil, all of the other provinces are in excess of 30 percent and in excess of 10 percent. And in fact they range right up to Manitoba's 42 percent personal.

**Mr. Berger:** An additional question, this is actually what, I wasn't asking this, but can they actually go below 30 and below 10?

**Mr. Miller:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, they can in fact change their rate at the wish of their House.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Can Alberta give a rebate?

**Mr. Miller:** Alberta did give a rebate and they're done to the effect of 26 or 28 right now. So they can go below 30, but I'm suggesting here that I think Canada would insist that we not go below 30 and 10, because they are coming up with the deficit means. Now, if we ever wanted to put up the total money to run the Territory then we'd be able to do what we liked.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, while we're on the subject of future Territorial income tax, could Mr. Miller assist me in my search for the Holy Grail in this department, which has been for some time the wish to obtain from people employed in the Yukon our share of their income tax, despite the fact that they have left this jurisdiction and returned to another province when they are filing their income tax form. Is there any practical way to obtain this portion of the tax, which is ours because they earned the income in the Yukon. There are a great many seasonal workers and a great many people who float in and out during the high employment season, make a great deal of money and go back to Toronto, Edmonton or Vancouver to file the form. We never see a penny of it. I've been shot down, Mr. Chairman, a number of times in my fumbling attempt to cope with this little accounting development, but perhaps an accountant would have a more practical approach.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to find any practical nor legal way of attempting to cap-

ture that tax. The provinces have agreed, and this has always been the agreement amongst the Provinces, that for personal income tax they will use the place of residence as at December 31st of the year of which the income was earned as the taxing jurisdiction. Now we did, a couple of years ago, a little study in the Yukon, which indicated some 25% of the income earned in the Yukon is not reported in the Yukon. We were not able to converse the study to find out how much was earned in other provinces and was reported in the Yukon. But there is no way under the present - at least, no way that I have been able to find under the present - laws of Canada that would permit us to collect tax on all earnings, individual earnings, in the Yukon.

This is distinct from the U.S., where they have ways and means of doing it. There is nothing in Canada, and in fact in the agreements that would be required to be signed there is provision there to exclude, if you like, any attempts to collect tax on people who are not resident as at December 31st.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, but you are required to reveal the source of income, aren't you? In the case of investments, for example, which may be bringing you dividends from out of Canada, why is it not practical to extend that one step further and say where was this income earned?

**Mr. Miller:** Well, on income earned in- you know, you're required to reveal the source, the company, the location on the income tax form. I can only surmise that the provinces have agreed to this because there is not that much transiency in total between the provinces. I think we're probably in a very unique situation here, in that a good chunk of the earnings in the Yukon are in fact reported elsewhere. As we get more stability, we get more people coming to live in the Yukon on a year round basis, even if they are only seasonal workers; we'll benefit from that particular....

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, if we have our own percentage calculation here on which the Federal Government bases its computation of our share of income tax, why can we not use the information that you've just given us and it leaves 25 percent of the income here, is not included in the income tax paid and adjust that formula?

**Mr. Miller:** It's a nice theory. However, we would have to find out which province would be happy to give that back.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Alberta.

**Mr. Miller:** That's really- it's being reported in a province and as I've indicated I don't know how much is reported in the Yukon, that is in fact earned elsewhere in Canada. So there is some plus and minus here. The big problem as I would see it would be in attempting to identify the earnings in a particular province and filing on varying tax rates, because that's what you're faced with in respect of every individual in Canada. I don't know whether they've got computers big enough to do all that work or not.



**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Oh well, Mr. Chairman, just one final comment, and that is: you know I don't mind suggesting taxes, I don't mind people turning them down. I'm the person who suggested that there should be, whatever you want to call it, a work tax on everybody in the Yukon earning any kind of money throughout the year and at the end of the year if you are a Yukon resident you've got it back, and if you weren't here, you didn't.

I still think that's got some value, you know. We are missing 25% of this pot right here and there's got to be some way to put your hands on it. Right, we're getting absolutely nothing out of a majority of those people; they pay nothing for the Yukon all the time they're here, and they sail in and they sail out and there are times when I'd like to sink their little boat. There was just one other comment I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman, and that is, we might effect a considerable saving in the federal field if all other members have, as I have, received two complete sets of income tax forms in the mail. I've spoken to at least twenty people who did in Whitehorse, which must represent a considerable amount of money across the nation.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just going to rise in support again of the member in her ideas of that. I was going to ask the same question but the witness more or less answered it when he said they couldn't collect from the corporations and I knew you could not get anything from the transient workers in the Territory. I think it's something we really, really should look into because I don't feel, as the witness pointed out a while ago, that as the country develops it's going to get better in that sense. I think it's going to be worse because, as this country develops, it is not going to develop as fast as the transients are going to come in here to do the work to develop it. I think we're going to get farther behind as we go along. If there's any possible way that we can come up, somehow, to collect that tax from people who come in here and work for six months of the year or so, I think it's our duty to try and find the way. I don't know the way either but I think we certainly should look into it.

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated under the laws of Canada, there is no way at the present time. I can only suggest, Mr. Chairman, the better we make the place to live the more people are going to come and live here. Let's get on with the job.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Just a basic question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Miller, with the introduction of the Yukon Income Tax, will the Territorial Treasurer's Office or his Department have to be strengthened to any degree? You might have answered this before to facilitate this?

**Mr. Miller:** No, Mr. Chairman, I don't see any additional need for staff. I think the only strengthening that the Territorial Treasurer will have to have is some good sound knowledge of the agreements and the Tax Bill

that would eventually be placed before this House.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McIntyre?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Fleming would like to go back to the Poll Tax we had a number of years ago, and on your first payroll cheque after being employed in the Yukon you had your Poll Tax deducted.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I am old enough to remember the Poll Tax, and in that particular province if you didn't pay it you went out and did the equivalent of that amount of work on the road.

**Mr. Chairman:** How did you make out on the road? Mr. McKinnon?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I think that there are certain fears of all Members towards the acceptance of the recommendations of this Paper, but I think the advantages far outweigh any disadvantages that are presented in the Paper. Of course, I look at the area when we will be collecting with the advent of the collection of our own income tax at an 85% operation and maintenance involvement in our budget. I think that we will have some difficulty with the Federal Government going for a deficit grant. They will turn around, they will say look, you are better off than most of the have provinces, why don't you just raise your income tax. Well, of course, the perfect answer is then that is exactly what we will do, if we have the provincial responsibilities that we've shown that we can maintain through out proper management of our financial affairs, and I think it is a very strong argument at that point in time. The one question that I would like to ask is, will there have to be changes in the financial agreements that we have now with Ottawa, because if I remember them correctly they say that we cannot collect corporate income tax over a certain percentage of personal income tax. I wonder if I can have that question answered?

**Mr. Miller:** The present financial agreement contains a clause which does not permit us to impose an individual or corporation income tax for the year ending December 31st, 1976.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** That would be excluded to many further financial agreements is what I am getting at.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Is there any maximum? Once the province that has this taxing authority has this ability, it is up to the provincial or taxing territorial authority up to what maximum, because that would be a political decision. Whether the government were maintained in office for the amount of corporate and income tax that



were allocated to the individual and corporation.

**Mr. Miller:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman. Anything above the thirty and ten would be strictly at the whim of this government.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** This is a point that one of the Honourable Members made the other day because it is extremely valid. They say not find the money not through the ten mill increase, but an increase on the territorial income tax or corporation tax which hits everybody. Well, of course, the answer is that we don't have the legal ability to do that at this time. With the acceptance of this Assembly and the Federal Government of this proposition, that could be done. I just wondered, for information's sake, what would one percentage point of personal income tax, and what would one percentage point on corporate tax, mean to the government of the Yukon Territory in the next fiscal year?

**Mr. Miller:** Mr. Chairman, you are testing my memory a little but it would be something in the neighbourhood of \$400,000.00 personal and \$500,000.00 for corporate.

**Mr. Fleming:** I have one question. It is not a long question, it is just something that I have always wondered about. I have always been of the opinion that we shouldn't tax anybody until he has at least got enough in his house to eat. I am just wondering when we get the powers to tax people, when provinces now have to put on a provincial tax, I am presuming that this tax must start somewhere where the Federal Government says it must start. A percentage of their first deduction from the individual. In other words, is there any way that the province or, say, this Assembly could adjust that so it's started at a higher level, the deduction?

**Mr. Miller:** No, Mr. Chairman, all that we are talking about here is the provincial income tax portion which is applied to the base, the federal basic tax. Now, we would not be able to interfere with that federal basic tax schedule. The only change you could make would be to change your 30% on individuals to something, and I would suggest greater because I don't think Canada would allow us to make it anything less, but it certainly would give you the flexibility, as one of the Honourable Members has pointed out, if you needed additional revenues; that is one way of getting it, but you do not have at the present.

**Some Members:** Clear. We need a motion.

**Mr. Chairman:** If that is clear, I will entertain a motion on Sessional Paper number 3.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I mean this seriously when I say it's with a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure and I think that it is a major step forward in the evolution of government in the Yukon that I would ask the Committee to concur with the contents of Sessional Paper number 3.

**Mr. McIntyre:** I will second that.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. McIntyre, that Committee concur with the contents of Sessional Paper number 3. Are you ready for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion is carried.

(MOTION CARRIED)

SESSIONAL PAPER NUMBER 4

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Miller. Sessional Paper number 4 - Land Subdivision Policy. Any discussion on Sessional Paper number 4? If there isn't, I will declare a brief recess.

(RECESS)

**Mr. Chairman:** I now call this Committee to order. I now call this Committee to order. Thank you. The main business before Committee involves several motions that are still in Committee. Motion number 6.

MOTION NUMBER 6

**Mr. Chairman:** It was moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that this Assembly communicate with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development that he instruct the NCPC to be strictly subject to the jurisdiction of the Yukon Territorial Electrical Public Utilities Board, with reference to forthcoming hearing of March 11th, with regards to the projected increase in power rates within Yukon. And further that all motions with respect to the problems of electric rates and power development in the Yukon emanating in this Assembly at this Session be conveyed to the Minister by telex as well as by letter. I would suggest that this matter has been thoroughly dealt with in other motions and that it be left to die.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Can the Chairman do that?

**Mr. Chairman:** Perhaps the mover and seconder might wish to withdraw the Motion in Committee? The mover is so suggesting, the seconder has agreed, but he is not here at the moment.

**Mrs. Watson:** It's out of date anyway.

**Mr. Chairman:** Very much out of date.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** I would move that motion be that Number 6 be left to die in Committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** It does not require a motion. Sorry.



(LAUGHTER)

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** How come I can't move that motion? Everybody else can. This is rank discrimination.

**Mr. Chairman:** Do I have Committee's concurrence?

**Some Members:** Concurred.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion number 8.

#### MOTION NUMBER 8

**Mr. Chairman:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Klondike, it is seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that it is the opinion of this House that the Yukon should be under one rate structure so real equalization on electrical rates in the Yukon could be possible. Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I call this a motion to separate the men from the boys, or the girls from the women, or something. I see some Honourable Members shaking their heads about it. There's quite a concern being raised in this House - what are we going to do with the rate subsidies once the money runs out and NCPCC takes over Yukon Electric? What is the solution for this problem? Come up with real equalization, declare the whole Yukon Territory one power plant and divide the costs up to everybody. As I said this morning, on Motion number 27, I can't agree with this motion because it is strictly concerning the grid system involving Whitehorse, Faro and some other couple of small places. But it leaves out the rest of the Yukon Territory, like Dawson, Mayo, Watson Lake, Teslin, and there, especially in Dawson, I am quite concerned about the system - NCPCC are proposing to come up with a new hydro plant there at approximate costs of 3.3 million dollars, without studies done on it yet, so that costs could probably rise to maybe 20 million dollars, nobody knows.

Under the present rate structure, Dawson City would be required to pay for this power plant alone, without any help from the rest of the territory. And this is why I moved this motion, because, as I also said this morning, the whole uproar was only created in the Yukon Territory mainly because of Aishihik and the cost overrun and the costs have been passed on to the consumers in Whitehorse. We, in the outlying area, had paid for many, many years exorbitant rates of power and nobody was really concerned about it because why should I be concerned - I'm sitting in an area where I pay power rates, why should I be concerned about my next-door neighbour up in the North who has to really fork out for high power rates? But when the hitting gets closer to home, why then the people start to realize that it could also affect them. Then all of a sudden they say, help us, help us. The whole Yukon is supposed to come in. Well, here I'm proposing something and I would like to see the reaction of the Members in this House.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, long and often I've sat around with my colleagues and debated the question of power equalization in this House, former Houses I should say, and that was based on the premise that if we had one power authority across the Yukon perhaps we could equalize the cost of power from Old Crow to Watson Lake. It was based on the premise that either NCPCC would buy out the assets of Yukon Electric or Yukon Electric would buy out the assets of NCPCC or something would happen and a Yukon Power Authority would result - a power corporation such as the House has already indicated it's desirous to have and to achieve.

It seems to me then, if a grid was established for the distribution of hydro generated power throughout the Territory, wherever possible, that it would be possible to equalize the cost of power, as I say, from Old Crow to Watson Lake. I certainly can't support the motion because I think the people in Watson Lake, who are paying a fairly substantial price for their power, certainly should not be required to pay the extra costs of the power of the people of Dawson City, that's for sure. I think that the only way that perhaps this objective of rate equalization, which I agree with, the only way that it can be achieved is through one solid power corporation across the Territory and a grid system linking all the hydro generated power together. For those reasons, I could certainly not support number 8 at this time in the manner it's written, in the manner it's inferred.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McIntyre?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that this motion is exactly what the Northern Canada Power Commission would like to put into effect and for that reason I'm quite suspicious of it. As a result of adopting this motion would be to increase the power rates in my district by probably four times, I'm afraid I can't support the motion.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I'm puzzled by what the Honourable Member from Watson Lake just said because, in my brief knowledge of what's happening with electricity in the Yukon, I would say that their rates would probably go down in Watson Lake if it was shared throughout the Yukon. The same as with Dawson.

It seems like, in the outlying areas, we're always being punished for being silly enough to live outside of Whitehorse. We're being punished by paying higher power, higher food, higher clothing, higher gasoline costs. The municipal taxes in Dawson City are higher than most places. Housing is out of this world and we even get punished for living outside of Whitehorse when we travel medically. We don't get more than ten cents a mile.

It used to be that the rate equalization is just a logical thing to go to. I'm sure that we can control it the way - if we certainly have our own Yukon's utility that we can control so N.C.P.C. isn't going to rake the bottoms of all our pockets as usual.

I just think it's a very logical conclusion and we should all support it.



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

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I am listening with interest because so many years ago, so many, many years ago, when it wasn't, I realize, probably not even possible, I said that there should be rate equalization in the Yukon Territory and I've been admonished very harshly by some of my friends in Whitehorse when I said this.

I'm not thinking of it as Whitehorse, or outside areas, or anything else, but possibly I don't understand completely what the motion does read. But I certainly do think rate equalization should be equalized across any territory in this day and age. I think it's an essential service to this country, just as medicare, just as our school system, and so many mills or any other thing that is essential. And as far as I'm concerned, I will be voting for the motion and that's how I feel.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I hope I wasn't one of those people who the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua admonished because there is no way that I haven't been a champion of equalization amongst the outlying areas all through my tenure as a member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly. Indeed, I was part of the Assembly that went for the equalization of the base amount throughout all of the communities of the Yukon.

I think that is the only way that we can go at this time. At some other point in time I will also be standing here and saying that I will be supporting the one rate structure so real equalization of electrical rates in the Yukon can be possible and that will be the day when the Yukon is on an entire grid system.

The reason why I don't feel it's possible at this time, Mr. Chairman, unless we have a complete grid system, is that we have to have real meaningful equalization, that any demand at any point on the system can be delivered at any time.

I will tell you what I mean by an example, Mr. Chairman. That Dawson and Old Crow and the other rates in the total of the Yukon were all the same, obviously the use of wood and fuel oil in the areas such as Dawson, Old Crow, would decline and electricity, the use of it, naturally, quite naturally, would sky-rocket. This would necessitate, Mr. Chairman, at this time nothing more than the further costly installation of diesel generating equipment. That's exactly what it would do, placing another unrealistic heavy burden on all the other users, including the users in Dawson City, and they would just be higher rates to subsidize the diesel generated areas all through the system again. So, Mr. Chairman, the only reasonable and economic alternative to the total population of the Yukon can stand at this time is the base equalization on the two or three hundred kilowatts, which I think it is now. The demand of this Assembly that the total Yukon get on to a grid system as soon as possible so that the demand can be delivered in any place and at any time at an equalized system throughout the Yukon.

So, Mr. Chairman, though I agree in principle with the concept of rate equalization throughout the entire Yukon, I do not see how this could be economically

possible at this time until all areas of the Yukon are on that grid system. With respect, Mr. Chairman, once again putting the cart before the horse, because the real thrust of this Assembly should be, I don't care who is generating or distributing the power, but the one who is to get in to a grid system throughout the Yukon so that we can have a realistic equalization not only on the base amount but on the entire amount of electricity produced and generated and distributed in the Yukon Territory.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of sympathy with the Honourable Member from Klondike and the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, because I do have concern. The Minister of Local Government is very correct; until we are on a grid system, it is very difficult to bring in a true equalization scheme. But I also am concerned about the areas in the Yukon such as Dawson, Teslin, Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay, who are strictly on small diesel generated power.

Now, these people are far, far above the rate that is being asked in Whitehorse, even with the application for the increase of 30 or 40 percent. They are far, far above the rate that's being paid in Watson Lake. They're far above the rate that's being paid in Haines Junction, because we are using the expensive Aishihik hydro. So that indicates how much higher these people are going to go with their electrical rates. I can understand the concern of the Honourable Members from Dawson regarding this; are we just going to sit back and say well, are we going to wait for a grid system or is it going to be up to this government to try to provide some relief, even at the rate base, because if we lose our equalization payments - which now are approximately \$30.00 a month, \$29.00 and something in my community; other communities are greater than that - that's just the equalization of the first 300 kilowatts and that's amounting to \$29.00. Now, if you lose that equalization, these people are in very, very serious trouble.

Now, I don't know whether it is, this is, the opportune time to deal with this when we are making our recommendations to the Board regarding NCPIC increases, request for increase. It is, as far as Dawson is concerned, and I am in a great quandary about how to attack this problem - it is your problem and it is my problem. I don't think this government can sit by and see people have to pay for the basic 300 kilowatts, which you know is very, very basic. It gives you a light bulb, that's about what it gives you. You pay something like \$80.00, \$90.00 a month. So I am in quite a quandary. I can't vote against it. I can understand that it is impossible to bring about at this time. So I would certainly be open for other suggestions about how we can handle it, because, Honourable Member from Dawson, we have a problem and we have it now. Long before the grid system comes.

(Mr. McCall becomes Chairman)

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further questions or motions? Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Taylor? No? Okay, Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am in full



agreement with the grid system and I am in full agreement with everything else that's been said here. I realize what I am doing here. I am also very realistic about the grid system, that it won't be implemented for another ten, fifteen or maybe twenty years in the Yukon Territory. In the meantime, we are making it impossible for the people in the outlying areas, and especially Dawson, and I wish I wouldn't be right but I am quite sure that also Watson Lake, it is impossible to live there. That is what I am talking about. I'll quote some figures. I think the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre has seen them already, I saw the paper laying on his desk over there.

In Dawson City, under the proposed rate and existing rates right now, a thousand kilowatts cost you \$79.90.

Under the proposed rate increases it is a \$120.00. It's an increase of 50.3 percent. If you have a electrically heated house under the existing rate system, you pay for 7000 kilowatt \$493.90 per month. Under the proposed rate increase supposed to come into effect the first of May, the increase would be \$1020.00, an increase of 106.5 percent.

In Whitehorse the existing rate for 1000 kilowatts is \$25.30 and under the proposed rate increases it is supposed to rise to \$32.90. This is what I'm saying. I don't think the people in Whitehorse or some of the people in Whitehorse don't realize what really goes on in the hinterland, because you're making it impossible for the people to live up there.

Grid system or no grid system. And might I say N.C.P.C. is looking at the North for a power plant because I know they are because there were surveyors out there last year, to re-survey the whole thing. The cost without a grid system has to be borne by the consumer in Dawson City. And if it's another project like Aishihik, I'm afraid those costs are going to go up like I say possibly to twenty million dollars, if you take into consideration all the environmental things that need to be done.

How can anybody afford to live in that community? What will happen in Watson Lake when N.C.P.C. buys out Yukon Electric? I know what will happen the price is going to go up because you no longer have any competition. Right now you sit there smug because you're paying less than anybody else in Dawson does.

In Watson Lake for 1000 kilowatts, you pay \$54.16 at the present. Under the proposed increase it is \$55.86. Naturally you wouldn't agree with me. But wait until N.C.P.C. buys you out, you're talking differently then. And this is my concern and as the Honourable Member from Kluane pointed out, we should be all concerned right now, not wait until a grid system comes in. You can never install a grid system in Old Crow. I don't care what company you're going to have. Yukon Power Corporation, Chinese Power Corporation or the Canadian Power Corporation. It just won't pay. I think the responsibility lies on us to look after those people up there also and now not ten years from now.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In reply to the Honourable Member from Klondike. I agree, yes, the responsibility does lie with us. We are concerned but

I don't think this Motion Number 8 does anything to further that concern. All it is is an opinion and I think we're all probably in affirmative with it.

Equalization on electrical rates should be in effect but again we've had it pointed out to us, it's just not possible at this moment. We have to seek those ways to put that in effect. So I would say to you that we should amend this motion or do something, some further action that does put into effect action to achieve what you're looking for.

This motion as I said I can vote yes for it. Absolutely, it's a motherhood motion. It should be in effect.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, I read this motion and I sympathize with the Honourable Member from Klondike with what everybody has said. I read this motion and I recall approximately two weeks ago we said, the whole rate structure of N.C.P.C. would have to be looked at. The way I understand it the little knowledge that I have of the way they charge the bills for electricity in the Yukon is that the more you use, the less you pay, in regards to the industry.

Now we all sat around and agreed around this table that in the industry, the industry would have to be looked at in regards to the quantity used. This was my understanding. Now right here we're saying that it is the opinion of this House that the Yukon should be under one rate structure so real equalization on electrical rates in the Yukon could be possible.

There's so many variables entering into this thing that to pass a motion like that I think we would be irresponsible until we get right into the background of it.

MR. HIBBERD BECOMES CHAIRMAN

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

**Mr. Berger:** Just for the information of the Honourable Members. The more you use in Dawson, the more you pay. The basic rate for 300 kilowatts is five cents. Anything over 300 kilowatts is fifteen cents a kilowatt, not a reduction.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the first 300 they charge them five. The first 300 are equalized to two cents and you get a refund to the two cents. The only route that we could even embark upon at the present time, would be to look at the expansion of the base rate out of our equalization funds and look at 500 kilowatts rather than three. We all know what would happen, our fund is declining, this is a decision that we are being faced with, the fund is declining.

Are we going to look at it on a temporary basis to do this type of thing, to relieve the situation at the present time and hope some act of God happens between now and two years? I think this is the only route we that is open to us at the present time. I can't help but agree with the Honourable Member from Dawson, it's tough and he doesn't want sympathy, he wants action. Some of the people in my constituency, I don't dare say I feel badly



for you because well forget that, do something.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I know that this problem goes back for many years, in Dawson, and its predates the NCPC operations by many years, and we all know that for a generation or two in the Yukon you could tell that someone came from Dawson City, by the fact that they turned out the light, as they went from one room to another. That's a fact of life. I would be much happier if the Honourable Member would give us a specific route here to go, if he would like to follow through on the suggestion, that we expand that limit for the equalization, or break it down to isolated community rates, I would be happy to support that kind of motion. Everybody is now going to say, and where are you going to get the money from, and I am going to say from resource revenue sharing, I don't care, it's got to be found somewhere. They could've had it from the room tax on motor hotels and things, you know, or, but there's got to be a way to find that money, and I quite agree that it is a priority but I think it has to be a specific suggestion, here, and if the Honourable Member would bring one in, I presume we're going to meet again tomorrow, it looks a little late for finishing, here today. I would really recommend that he give us a specific table or rate schedule to approve. As a positive recommendation from this House, rather than just a generalized overall, I would like to support that kind of motion.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I agree with the Honourable Member, but I would as soon have the facts and figures as well, before we start voting on a motion, I find it very difficult to vote on a motion, until we know what it's actually going to do to the Yukon. I won't vote, you know I'll vote against the motion until I know exactly what's going to happen.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McIntyre?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Chairman, I probably misunderstood the member from Klondike's intention, I assume that when he said that we should be under one rate structure, that our recommendations would go to the Northern Canada Power Commission, that they would establish one rate structure for the Yukon. I didn't assume that what he was saying that this assembly should find some money to equalize the rates in the various communities, because I think that's way beyond our capabilities.

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

**Mr. McCall:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. After listening to all of the gabble for the last three quarters of an hour.

**Mrs. Whyard:** Were you awake?

**Mr. McCall:** I was awake. The particular motion in question, is very simple, it clearly defines the intent. It

needs no elaboration or ideas to expand upon it, like the Honourable Minister on my left here suggested. I don't think we need to go into any further detail on it, it is simple, a matter of fact, and I think we should vote on it.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman before the question is called, could I ask the Honourable Member what he would suggest that the rate structure be if it's going to be one only to the whole?

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, we're voting on the motion again as it is defined.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, I disagree, I think we'd be awfully irresponsible voting on a motion and not know what the ramifications are of it.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, when I seconded this motion, I certainly had nothing in mind to get any money out of the Territorial Government and try to equalize the rates that way, to me the concept is, okay let's find out what everybody is paying in the Yukon, divide it by the number of people that are using it, and equalize it, it's so simple it hurts. We don't need anything else.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** You'll get it in the end.

**Mr. Chairman:** Are you ready for the question, Mr. Lang?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, two weeks ago I suggested we set up a committee, and everybody ignored that suggestion as it was not -

**Mr. McCall:** Well, of course.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It was not a viable idea, and this is exactly what I'm saying, here we have a motion before us, we don't have the fact if people are interested in Government, worried about their constituency, this is something you should be organizing a committee over. So you've got the facts and you've come to the assembly here, present them, and say this is what we've found. Four or five options or whatever, but I think this is, you know to vote on this motion, I think it's clearly irresponsible.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with the member from Pelly River. This is the motion we're voting on, right here, and not all these other things that we might be bringing into the house later on or anything else, and the only thing that the members that do wish this motion to pass is asking and is telling the other members is, the facts of how high it is now, and I'll just stand up myself and I'm not guessing, anything, when I take it right from a Yukon Electrical Company Limited, where a small business in the Yukon Territory, in the month of December, and a very small business, in fact it's my home, paid \$549.97 after the reduction of



\$97.05 credit, for six little small motel units. I won't say little, they're large motel units, let's say six units, Mrs. Chairman, six. And you don't use that much power in there. I know that is electric power, but just to give you an idea of what might happen in the Yukon if somebody built a large motel someplace.

That is for the heat, for the lights and that same motel, those six units, was \$83.55 with \$14.75 credit, which you add of course to that. There was a cafe next door with twenty five seating capacity and it paid \$236.04, and on top of that we didn't have the credit equalization another \$41.66. We paid \$869.56 plus \$97.00, we would have paid if we hadn't had the credit equalization. \$97.05, \$14.75 and \$41.66, would bring that total just a little over the thousand dollar mark, and I think it needs looking into. That's just a fact of life. But, we are voting here just on a motion to maybe get started and look into the possibility.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am in full agreement with the Member from Hootalinqua. I had nothing fancy in mind. I just, what the motion says. I am also in the full realization that we are running fast out of monies for the equalization rate in the Yukon. I also realize it's going to be tough for the Territorial Government to raise these monies required for equalization. If we raise the equalization rates to 500 kilowatts instead of being three million dollars, or whatever the figure is going to be, it's possibly going to be four or five million dollars. This is why I am saying, the only way of equalization in the Yukon can be had is charge everybody for the cost of producing the power in the Yukon. Not in Whitehorse, not in Haines Junction or Teslin, or Watson Lake, or Dawson or Old Crow. In the Yukon. The people in here, most of them are very proud to say oh we are Yukoners. We are not Yukoners, in most cases what I am understanding now, we are Mayo, we are from Watson Lake, we are from Whitehorse, but not Yukoners.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, this is exactly why I said, when I said earlier about where the money would come from to make such a plan work. We have heard around this table for the last month, Mr. Chairman, repeatedly the recommendations and resolutions and motions all leading to what we are saying would be an eventual take over of Northern Canada Power Commission by this government through some utilities body.

Now, you know, it is exactly what I am saying. Whoever is producing the power is going to have to come up with the money to make the system work. Whether it is NCPC or YTG, it is going to cost somebody something to equalize these rates. I don't want to delay this discussion any further, I just wanted to clarify the point. I am not volunteering, out of a clear blue sky, that this government is going to come up with the money to make this happen tomorrow. I am just trying to make a point, that whenever this happens you have to face the fact that there is going to be a lot of money involved in

making this possible.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman. I may be alone in this conclusion about this motion, but I think it is strictly an opinion motion only. I suspect it to be really a strategy. I look to the Member, the Honourable Member from Klondike to bring a further motion at some later date that will outline and will give us some specifics. I think the only action required by this motion, is that it is just an expression of opinion period. It is as simple as that.

**Some Mebers:** Question?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the mover of the motion whether that is all that he considered his motion to be, just an opinion to be passed by this House very easily. Send it on to the Electrical Public Utilities Board and forget about it. Is this why the motion was brought before this House?

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

**Mr. Berger:** No, Mr. Chairman, but I can't see no other way out at this time. We express an opinion of this House recommending to the Public Utilities Board, what we think it should be done because we have no Yukon Power Corporation. We have no rights over NCPC at the present time. The thing is, all with this body can do at the present time, is express the opinion that this House feels this is what should be done. We can't, I can't come up with figures like some Honourable Members suggested to me. Bring me figures. I can't. All that I know, what I am asking in this motion for real equalization, somebody's, it is going to cost somebody more money in this territory, but it is going to make it for somebody else much easier to live in this territory. That is all what I am asking for.

I am also realizing what I am saying, that we have no Yukon Power Corporation that we are creating a Yukon Power Corporation, we are not going to solve the problems over night. We can change names of any corporation in this territory, but you are not going to solve the problems. Somebody is going to have to come up with the funding of those things, under the present structure of the system, the only way out is you have to consider the whole Yukon as a power plant. Grid system or grid system.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, again an opinion motion only, I would certainly offer my assistance to the Member from Klondike in drawing up a further motion at a later date with some real specifics. I would call the question.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I won't be able to support the motion because it just quite simply is not the answer to probably one of the most



difficult questions that is facing the government of the Yukon at this time, and it is no use to try and just, you know, pull the wool over our eyes by saying it is just going to be a simplistic motion like this is going to cure all of the problems that we are facing, in trying to make it possible for people to live in the outlying community, to pay power bill they can't afford. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been here, I know what happened when the YCGC got out of the power in Dawson, it went to NCPC. What was it, it was 25 cents wasn't it per kilowatt hour. It went down from that to 5 cents for the first 300 and 15 cents for after that, under NCPC which are the rates now. Mr. Chairman, when those rates went into effect, people in Dawson no longer went around turning out the lights from one room to the other. They said it is so much better than it used to be, we can use three or four or five times as much electricity as we used to. So here we go again, we say the answer to the question is put all the costs into one pot and then divide them equally.

Mr. Chairman, we know what is going to happen and I wouldn't blame the people in Dawson in any way shape or form, they are going to use five times as much electricity as they do now, because it is going to be that much cheaper to them.

So, what have we got in Dawson. We have got a grand and glorious deficient Crown corporation that we all so admire, NCPC is going to have to provide five times more electricity in Dawson City. What's going to happen to the electrical rates of everybody in this Yukon Territory, including the people in Dawson City, that there is not going to be within five or ten years, but in five years, I'll bet you, any type of equatability or lower of rates, all you are going to have is a higher rate to everybody in the Yukon, including the people in Dawson City, and then you tell me you are solving a problem by this motion. It just isn't the answer. It's not going to be the answer, and we have to look at hell of a lot deeper at it to come up with some really far reaching recommendations.

You know, the point that I tried to make, several times throughout this House, that we are looking at the complete diminution of that equalization fund within the next couple of years. That we are looking at the Crown corporation and you know how I feel about it. Taking over the total generation distribution of power in the Yukon without the equalization fund, and I am telling you that this government just the equalization fund alone is going to be looking for millions and millions of tax payers dollars to allow the people in the community to live at the level of electricity costs that they now have, let alone any other increase.

So these are the things that we have to be looking at. Mr. Chairman, to think that through the passage of this motion, these problems that I am talking about are just going to go away and they are going to be solved. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, it's naive and it's over simplistic and it's not the answer. We have got to go a hell of a lot further than this, and I commit this government as far as I am a part of it, to start immediately to looking at equalization program to see where we are going on it, to see what we can do following the purchase of it does happen of NCPC, or Yukon Electrical to NCPC, and you know it is up to this government I agree to provide the facts, figures and statistics and come into this Assem-

bly in the not too distant future and, say, look, the people of the Yukon aren't going to like it, but these are the cold, hard facts of reality of what it is going to cost for a further equalization formula. What it is going to cost for electricity in the future and how the hell are we going to cope with it? If we think that we are have gotten, that if it's, it's rational attempting to do anything else, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, we are just fooling ourselves and we are fooling the people of the Yukon. That would be the biggest tragedy of all to try and pull the wool over their eyes at this time.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mr.s Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, could I accept that as a commitment that information paper will be brought to the next session with this background material which is required?

**Mr. Chairman:** Are you ready for the question? It is moved by the Honourable Member from Klondike, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that it is the opinion of this House that the Yukon should be under rate structure, so real equalization on an electrical rate in the Yukon could be possible. All those in favour please indicate by hand. Four. Contrary? Six. The motion is defeated.

#### *Motion Defeated*

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I made the commitment and it wasn't dependent upon the passing or failure of that motion. That commitment is going to be kept by the Government of the Yukon Territory.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the commitment isn't made just on behalf of Dawson, I hope, because there are communities that are paying as much and more than Dawson. I don't mean Old Crow.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman that was a commitment on behalf of all of the people of the Yukon even including those within the municipalities.

#### MOTION NUMBER 11

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion Number 11. Moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that the Yukon Territorial Government through the offices of the Minister of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation make representation to the Federal Northern Health Services for the purpose of initiating a program designed to upgrade the psychiatric facilities now available in the Territory. The purpose of such a program would be to extend the home care treatment program and to create a separate psychiatric unit with adequate staffing in conjunction with the Whitehorse General Hospital. The present nursing staff is competent to carry out this intensive treatment plan but they are unable to do so because of insufficient staffing and inappropriate facilities for treatment of emotional dis-



abled patients.

The establishment of a separate psychiatric unit and of an extended out patient treatment program is consistent with the aims of modern medical practice which is to treat these people in their own home environment.

The number of patients requiring referral to a major medical centre would thereby be reduced and the cost of this particular program would be alleviated.

As mover of the motion I have little to add other than what is in the motion. I would like to know why it was moved into Committee by Mr. Fleming.

**Mr. Fleming:** Not that one. Excuse me this motion, I don't think so Mr. Chairman. I don't it's been moved by me.

**Mr. Chairman:** Our records have it that you did, Mr. Fleming.

**Mr. Fleming:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, your records are very likely right. But to my recollection I don't think I did move that into Committee.

**Some Members:** Question.

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I do have it blocked out here and I'm just wondering if I haven't through all these motions, forgotten something that was in it. But I don't see any questions or anything I would ask, why I would move it, I don't know. I'll vote for the motion, Mr. Chairman as it stands now.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, this is a very supportive motion and I would certainly welcome it. I would make one suggestion that is that the actual motion as such ends at the word "in the Territory" the rest of it is support for the motion.

I have discussed the contents of this motion with our psychiatric officer in the Health Services. His only objection to the presentation here is that he does not approve of separate, physically separate facilities for such patients, and prefers to have them treated with other patients in the over-all medical centre context. Certainly anything that would initiate a program designed to upgrade psychiatric facilities now available here is more than welcome.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mrs. Whyard. Do you wish me to re-read the motion? All those in favour?

**Some members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Contrary? The motion is carried.

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MOTION NUMBER 12**

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion Number 12. Moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that the Minister of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation undertake to initiate changes in the Mental

Health Ordinance in order that patients who require psychiatric care beyond that which is available in the Yukon, may be referred to specialists or hospitals in the Edmonton or Vancouver areas in a similar manner as are patients requiring specialized care in other fields of medicine.

The purpose of these changes would be to permit free election of referral of these patients to facilities more adequate than those that are now being made available to them. This is in keeping with the present and proven values of treating emotional ill patients in the setting of a general hospital.

**Mrs. Whyard?**

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, does this motion impose as a course of action upon me and I would be committed to undertaking to initiate these changes. I feel that there has to be an in-depth survey and study done of the institutions we are now using and what would be involved by the phrase in this motion "free election of referral to facilities" as the Chairman understands medical referral is limited under our hospitalization plan to certain facilities which are listed as acceptable under the plan.

This is the kind of determination that I would have to provide before I could give carte blanche to such a motion. I would need the advice of my medical people and psychiatric officers to assist me in determining what facilities would be accepted under our plan.

I realize that the earlier remarks of the mover of this motion were inspired, I think, by his dissatisfaction with conditions in some institutions outside, to which patients of the Yukon have been referred. And I thought, for the benefit of the House of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this Government did use to refer patients from the Yukon to an institution near Vancouver, but because of the unsatisfactory record of that institution in many ways, such as discharging patients to their homes in the Yukon without prior notice or consultation, the lack of any reports during their treatment there, and so on, we have discontinued this practice. Patients are not sent to the institution any longer, but we do have an agreement with the Alberta hospital near Edmonton, which is considered a much better situation. We would find it very difficult if the doors of that institution were closed to us as a result of this motion.

There are very few general hospitals which will accept a number of cases on the overall heading of mental help, and we must, we feel that we must, keep the door open in the meantime to the Alberta Hospital. I would like to say that very few patients requiring mental care are committed from the Yukon and we're happy to know that this condition will continue, that we extend every possible effort to treat the patients here, in their own home environment and their own area, whenever possible. With the passing of the previous motion, we would hope that that would considerably improve the possibilities of keeping them here.

My only comment, Mr. Chairman, is that we would not wish to see our agreement with that institution in Alberta terminated as a result of this motion and I must say that I would need the advice of my officials regarding the meaning of the latter part of the motion.



**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. McCall, would you take the Chair.

MR. McCALL BECOMES CHAIRMAN.

**Mr. Chairman:** Have you got a question, Mr. Hibberd?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has given rise to several points, I think, of interest that Committee should be aware of that she is indeed right, when we did run into a considerable difficulty with referrass to the hospital outside of Vancouver. She is wrong when she says conditions outside of Edmonton are any improvement. Patients who are sent there, we are not referred to know when they're coming back, they're often not seen by a psychiatrist for months on end, they receive medications only, they are-- there is no accompanying letter explaining their illness or explaining any on-going treatment - exactly the reasons that we could not abide the situation in Vancouver that is now existing in that facility which we are now forced to use.

Now, I agree with you, there are many instances when we do have to have a facility such as that one available too.

You obviously know, for instance, the prisoner requires psychiatric evaluation, it must be done at some sort of a centre like this and we do not have the alternative. But in contrast, the general hospital facilities that have been building up over the last 10, 15 years everywhere have included psychiatric facilities to include just the type of patient that this is being aimed at. Now, we are a small centre, we are indeed sending out many less patients than we used to do. We are doing that primarily because we've got a psychiatrist who is not only competent but realizes that, if we refer the patient out, maybe he is going to get incompetent service to that patient. Your statistics are not valid when they are considered in that light. There are still patients who would require referral and would benefit from it if the facilities there were better than they are here.

What I am suggesting to the Minister is that we not only improve the facilities here but there are also patients that require further care than we could have availability as in any other field of medicine. That brings me to the other point - what I meant when you refer to the phrase 'free election referral'; that phrase is quite simple in medical terms. The Minister, I'm sure, realizes that if the patient has a problem with eye disease, their doctor, in consultation with the patient, selects a specialist in that field, arrangements are made through your offices for that patient to be sent to a specialist in the Edmonton or Vancouver area as included in the wording of this Bill, and they are simply sent to that doctor or that facility and cared for in that manner. I am merely suggesting in this motion that mental patients who are beyond the capacity of what we can offer them here, at the present time or in the future, they'd be offered the same type of referral as available in any other field of medicine.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** It is difficult to discuss this matter in Committee. It would have been appreciated if some consultation had taken place with this information prior to it becoming a public matter. I would have appreciated that information, Mr. Chairman, and failing any such background this motion comes to me unsupported as is.

**Mr. Chairman:** Point of order, Mr. Chairman. This Bill has-- was in Committee since March 1st and there has been plenty of opportunity for the Minister to discuss this paper.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, there's been plenty of opportunity for the Honourable Member to bring me supporting information.

**Mr. Chairman:** She has found the opportunity to go to her medical advisers, why couldn't she have come to me as the mover of the motion?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes difficult to find the Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It is pretty difficult to argue with that.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to get into personalities or debate on this. I am just saying that, until I know what is involved financially and to our Medicare Plan by the intent of this motion, I cannot advise the House on its portent or results.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard, I don't want to interject too much but, as Minister of Health and Welfare and the Honourable Member is a prominent person in the field of medicine, I think you are doing quite well. Mr. Taylor, any questions? Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I find myself in quite a quandary. As the Minister of Health, I would hope then that we are not expected to vote on the motion. I just wouldn't know how to vote; I think there's going to have to be a lot of sorting out between the Members who has brought the motion and the Minister of Health. I think there is an awful lot of implications in this, and possibly if they have an opportunity to meet and discuss it that some type of proposal, the ramifications, will be made clear. I am sure there are some extensive financial ramifications. I have questions on the other motion also. You know, do you qualify for hospital insurance? Would they qualify for hospital insurance, would they qualify for Medicare and this type of thing?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson, you are referring to another motion which is not on the floor.

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, I know, but I would hope that a proposal might be brought forward in reply to this at the next session, to give and then deal with the motion at that time, but I wouldn't know how to vote at this time. I would have to abstain.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Hibberd?



**Mr. Hibberd:** Mr. Chairman, there are not that many ramifications in this motion. It is phrased-- the way it is phrased is in the context of our present medical bills now. That's why it was put in this manner. It is to fit in with the present plans that are in existence for referral of patients. It is very simple, there are not any special ramifications, it is not that difficult. The Minister knows of how many patients might be involved. She has already given that information to the House.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order please.

**Mr. Hibberd:** I sincerely believe that we, at this time, are in a position to carry on with consideration of this motion. I think there is enough information available to us, as I have tried to outline to you, that we can make a decision on it. I would be most pleased if we would vote on that motion.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, as seconder of that motion, I wholeheartedly agree. I, personally, again cannot see any difficulty with this. There is a-- we are calling for an undertaking to initiate changes. There is no time limit on all of the changes. Some changes can be brought forward. I would think that, just as my only comment was that free election of referral, for instance can be accomplished within the present budget constraints right now, and we were looking for some action here that I am sure can be taken at this point.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, you are not talking about election of referral, you are expanding election of referral, but you are also then expanding the transportation costs which must be born. I think this is part of it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Hibberd?

**Mr. Hibberd:** The transportation costs would be considerably less than at the present time; they require a nurse, an RCMP, and if we take that patient for a specific hospital and they are not open on special hours, so the patient has to be kept overnight in a hospital, as does the two people who accompany him. Don't tell me the costs are going to be increased.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have any difficulty supporting the motion. If it had of said Minister Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation amend, all it says is undertake to initiate changes, if it had of said that she shall or the patients requiring psychiatric care beyond that which is available to them shall be referred to, I think it would have been giving her instructions before she had the ability to get the facts, figures that she has to. If it is found, through the undertaking, that changes can't be initiated for the-- for different reasons that we are not aware of now, then I imagine it would be the responsibility of the Minister involved to bring that information back to the Assembly. There is nothing mandatory as I see it, in the motion in any way, shape or form. If there were, I would have a very different opinion of the motion but as it is written.

**Mr. Chairman:** Are you prepared for the question? Question on Motion Number 12?

**Some Members:** Question.

**Mr. Chairman:** All those in favour of Motion Number 12?

Motion is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Hibberd will you now take the chair back.

Mr. Hibberd becomes chairman

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. McCall. Motion Number twenty.

*Motion number 20*

**Mr. Chairman:** Moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that whereas the completion of the Skagway Road would be more economically beneficial to the Yukon than the extension of the Dempster Highway, and whereas evidence submitted to the Berger Commission suggests that the Dempster Highway would have a greater adverse effect on the Porcupine - Caribou herd than the construction of the Mackenzie Pipe Line. This House recommends that further extension of the Dempster Highway be deferred and the Skagway Road be completed within the time frame originally scheduled.

Mr. McIntyre?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the purpose behind this motion is really to get the Commissioner a little bit steam of when he makes his representations to Ottawa in connection with the construction of the Skagway Road. I should point out in the report we had dealing with the Northern Roads Fact Finding Committee they state on page 13. There is general acceptance that the completion of the Dempster Highway is the first priority for highway construction in the Yukon Territory.

I don't think really that anybody in the Yukon Territory has ever, at any time, asked for this road to be built. This is completely a scheme that was cooked up in Ottawa for their own purposes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, I too was one of the people that was trying to spur the Commissioner on to get some action on this road. I really can't agree with this motion because I don't like the kind of action that's being taken to gain another purpose. I want to also point out to the Assembly that tenders were very recently opened in connection with the Carcross Skagway road, and a low bidder has been identified. I believe it even to be a local bidder.

They have indicated, I believe, that they might even be able to complete the work within a two year program,



within the two year time limit, I should say. Really I don't think there is any need to be deferring funds from one place to the other.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Well I would just like to rise in complete support of this motion again. Mr. McIntyre pointed out exactly what I was going to point out that this roads tour that they had ran around the Territory, I think I was probably the only one who mentioned the Dempster to them when they were in Dawson. And when I said that I said why don't we stop it and they said we can't. It's for development and that was it.

For them to conclude that the vast majority of the people in the Yukon think that the Dempster's a great thing, is really erroneous. I feel that, hopefully, once this motion is passed, that we'll send a copy to this Roads Committee, so that they know how the people of the Yukon feel about the Dempster Highway, which I think most people have a great fear of it, is the only way that I can describe it.

Certainly we're looking at things once the horse has run out of the corral or whatever you want to call it, that we should try our darrest right now to do something about the environmental damage that's being done right in our back yards.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Skagway Road of course has been a matter of concern to this Legislature for a long time. I agree with the Honourable Member from Mayo when he said that the Dempster Highway is a dream, in actuality, I suppose, created many miles in the East and certainly didn't originate in this Territory to my knowledge.

The American Government have, I don't know what the costs are now, have the toughest part of this road to construct and it was costing, a few years ago, an estimate of a million dollars a mile in rock work. They've been blasting away at it for several years now. I believe it's their intention to my knowledge, it's their intention to complete their section this year, or that funds are available for that purpose.

I think it is exceedingly important and I said before the same Roads Committee when it was in Watson Lake, in my brief, that it was felt, it was important that we had access to the sea. And access to Pacific Rim markets for our products from the Yukon. And perhaps, I don't know what the White Pass position would be here, whether they might feel this might affect their railroad. However, they are also in the trucking business, as are other people in the Yukon, and certainly I'm sure their trucks could augment their railroad.

Otherwise I haven't heard anybody anywhere in the Territory oppose the construction of the Skagway Road. I think roads to the sea are important and I certainly give wholehearted support to the motion. I feel that's where the priority should lie is in the development of this road to the sea, linking Whitehorse and this network with Skagway.

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

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, I always find it odd always following the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, I mean really - I thought the motion was making reference to the Dempster Highway. Yes, well the Honourable Members been talking about the Skagway Highway, I believe. It's very interesting. What I'm concerned about as far as this particular project, actually what the motion is about. It will probably finish up something like the old pipe line that went to Norman Wells once a upon a time. And all the millions of dollars that went into that for specific purpose.

I have a feeling that this Dempster Highway is going to be another lemon, that the Territorial Government are going to have to pick up the cost as far as maintaining etcetera, etcetera.

As far as I'm concerned I see no logic behind it. Where is it going, what is it going to prove, it could open an area for development, what development?

**Some Mebers:** Question?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Would you take the Chair, Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall becomes chairman;

**Mr. McCall:** Yes, you had a question?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. I must rise in the agreement, of the pretent of what this motion brings to us. First of all, the implication is the Dempster Highway, is not going to be of economic importance to the Yukon. I do not think that that is a valid inference to make. I think that we would, speaking of roads to the sea, I wondered what, to which ocean he was really referring to actually. But I do believe it is a very valid thing to have the first road to the Arctic, would indeed be important to the Yukon and could be very important to the economic development of the Yukon.

A lot of these statements that have been made with regard to the effects on the ecology, there is certainly been a considerable disagreement, what these effects to ecology might be. It was mentioned by the member from Mayo that there had been a very severe disturbance in the Caribou herds since this highway has been instituted, but it is not worthy that the place where these caribou cross the highway, was built 12 years ago, some 80 miles out of Dawson. It could hardly have this have the effect on the caribou on the present time that we're concerned with. I think that the whole context of it is wrong, I am very much in favour of a Skagway Road. I probably think that it should take precedence over the Dempster Highway. But I do not think we should go about it by stating that we should shelve the Dempster Highway until we get the Skagway Road built.

We probably already have a contract for the Skagway road already there. Why don't we just let them carry on with the Dempster as they are now projecting to do. The motion that to my mind that, Mr. Chairman, is unnecessary.

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Hibberd, do you want to take the Chair back again.



Mr. Hibberd becomes Chairman

**Mr. McIntyre:** Regarding the statement that I made in connection with the Dempster Highway, interfering with the Caribou herd, I didn't make that statement. I said I thought it would in the future, and in connection with the interference of highways with caribou, I wonder when the last time a caribou was seen at Caribou Crossing or Carcross?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thanks, I'm just opposed to this, as I say an deferral is not required, because I think that probably if you look at the history, that it took a lot of fighting and in fighting and lobbying to get money for the Dempster Highway somewhere along the line.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** In Ottawa.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Maybe it did, maybe it took it in Ottawa, I don't know. I can think of a lot of railroads that were said to be going nowhere. And I can think of a lot of roads that were said the same thing. I think it is very, very essential that more north-south links be provided in this country. And as I said, if I felt that to defer this, would be of some use at this moment, fine. I'm not convinced that the Skagway Road would be more economical than the Dempster, that's for sure. In fact I feel the reverse, is true. And when somebody gets up and says it's going to prove a lemon, I can't say that. I would have no way saying that.

I would ask the members to very, very seriously to consider further what this motion does, as I said, if a deferral was required I would be quite happy, but a deferral is not required because, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, I believe the tenders' were open, I believe there's been a commitment, that will be made, and I believe the action will be taken, the construction will be carried on with the Skagway Carcross Road, and that was the whole purpose of the motion, in the first place.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I can't help but rise in fury over some of the remarks from the Honourable Minister from South Centre, from Whitehorse South Centre. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre. I thought I had it memorized.

**Mr. Chairman:** I rise on a point of order, it's quarter to five.

**Ms. Millard:** Just a few comments. I can't understand how anyone living in this day and age in the Yukon Territory can say that the environmental damage that the Dempster Highway has already done and is going to do much more of, is incidental and not worth being concerned about. It's not just a few caribou that are 50 or 60 or 70 miles up the Dempster at this point, the Dempster now goes almost 300 miles, and there are many caribou past 80 miles, that are still trying to cope with the environmental damage that's happening, let

alone the caribou there are many other factors involved. Many, many other factors, the water systems are being effected, the whole ecological system of, in that area, the wildlife, the water fowl, all kinds of things are being damaged, irreverably damaged by this Dempster Highway.

Not only that is there is many sociallogical implications that haven't even been considered. The people in Fort MacPherson are now having great difficulties coping with the impact, on them, of the economic changes that are happening in Fort MacPherson, and these things have to be considered. It is not just Caribou running around somewhere eight miles up the Dempster that are being affected. It is a number of people who are being affected in Fort MacPherson will be affected, Arctic Red River and all the other places that the highway will go through.

I just wonder how we can put economics above people all the time without any consideration at all. I have many books on the subject if the Member from Whitehorse South Centre is interested in expanding his knowledge on this subject.

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

**Mr. Berger:** I would just like to rise and straighten up this Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, that the Dempster Highway does not link the Yukon with the ocean, it links the Mackenzie River. I think the whole motion actually came years too late, because the damage is already done up there. I will vote for the motion, for the simple reason there is further research has to be done on that highway. Territorial wise, Federal Government wise, and I only hope it will be done. I doubt it very much that the Federal Government will listen to us and defer the highway because there is another lobbying group much stronger than ours involved in that whole system.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I won't take up too much time with this, but I am going to vote for the motion. I will say at this time, is that I don't know how many years we have sat around and waited for a little piece of this Skagway Road to be built, a little chunk at a time, hoping every other year that some day they would continue that road and finish it, and all of a sudden I see whereas we may get a voice towards them. Whether they will listen to it or not, but I don't think they will, but the opportunity is here to voice that and as far as the road being of value to this country, the Skagway Road, should be, and I think will be, a lot of value to this country. With the tourist trade and an easy way to the coast, the west coast.

Now, as far as the Dempster Highway is concerned. If I had ever found anybody in this country that is really, really except here in this House today, that really thought that it was going somewhere and was really needed, I may have had been a little bit leary of this last part. No, I don't think so, I am going to vote for the motion.



**Some Members:** Here here.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Am I next. Oh, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wish to remind all members that if this motion passes you know what it means. It means war, Mr. Chairman, because you are going to have to fight the Canadian Army, Mr. Chairman, who are poised on the brink ready to go in and build yet another bridge, as I heard all about on CBC this morning, Mr. Chairman. We have army in Winnipeg, and army in Chilliwack and army warehouses full of steel and it is not going to fracture or give them any trouble at fifty below zero. All over the West, Mr. Chairman. So, this should be a very serious factor in our deliberations.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman I recall the comments that the mover of the motion made. He said that his motion was brought in to give strength in the Commissioners bid to get funding for the completion of the Skagway Road. I really don't think that we should be arguing the pros and cons of the Dempster Highway at this time, when there is so much environmental information and debate that could go on, we could debate here for a week on this, and also we don't have the information on the economy behind the planning of the Dempster Road. It is something that I would rather not go into at this time. I don't that our motion could really affect it that much. I would like to see an amendment brought to this motion, and I would like to have it say and I would be prepared to bring it in tomorrow morning that whereas the completion of the Skagway Road would be an economically beneficial to the Yukon. That this House recommends that the Skagway Road be completed with the time frame originally scheduled." That's all we need to say. In order to substantiate that the Honourable Member from Mayo wants to do. To assist the Commissioner in his bid to have the Skagway Road completed within the time frame.

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, we have been saying that for the last ten or twelve years, and longer, I would say. We have got no results yet.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I would just want to get on record, I don't think there every was any planning behind the Dempster Highway, at anytime.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I just rise the state that it is obvious that in the content of Motion No. 20, that there is a priority either on one road or another road. We make it quite clear in this, and the message is very sound and clear, don't spend the money on the Dempster Highway, spend the money in the Skagway Road first, and then if there is money left, they will do what they want.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, I just rise once again because there is really no point in the motion, if money is available, if construction is going to go ahead on the Skagway Carcross Road, then why the deferral on the other. What's the point in it at this time, and I wish the Honourable Members would research the facts out about this. Because very recently tenders were opened, and that's all. If you want to bring in another motion, and other concerns about the Dempster, well and good. That's another subject.

**Some Members:** Questions.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the completion of the Canadian side of the Skagway Road is going to be delayed one year. There has been a contract let but for a smaller portion of that road, is that not correct?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** It is not going to be delayed, it is not. The tenders have been opened. They are, they will probably be awarding a job, and the contractor will be entering into some kind of agreement. This is the kind of thing that can happen, there is an area here of flexibility and the contractor will probably finish the road in time to meet the U.S. side. That is the point I am trying to make. I was one that got up in this House many times and asked the Commissioner to exercise whatever responsibility, whatever influence he could to get this thing on the way.

**Mr. Chairman:** They will probably complete it long before we are finished discussing it.

**Some Members:** Question.

**Mr. Chairman:** Moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that whereas the completion of the Skagway Road will be more economically beneficial to the Yukon than the extension of the Dempster Highway and whereas evidence submitted to the Berger Commission suggests that the Dempster Highway would have a great adverse on the porcupine caribou herd and the construction of the Mackenzie Pipeline. This House recommends that the further extension of the Dempster Highway be deferred and the Skagway Road be completed within the time frame originally scheduled. All those in favour?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Contrary?

**Some Members:** Disagreed.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to have mine recorded please.



**Mr. Lengerke:** So would I.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order the votes are not recorded in Committee of the Whole.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, if the recorders have noticed what we said they know what we said.

**Mr. Chairman:** Take it from an experienced politician.

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

#### MOTION NUMBER 27

**Mr. Chairman:** There is one thing left in Committee. We have one motion left in Committee and if we can complete that, let's complete it. Motion No. 27 moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kluane, that whereas the Yukon Public Utilities Board is considering evidence as gained from a recently held public hearing in connection with NCPC proposed electrical rate increases, and whereas the brief was presented on behalf of the Yukon Territorial Government, be it resolved that the Yukon Legislative Assembly submits to the Yukon Public Utilities Board copies of all resolutions passed during the fifth session of the 23rd Legislature pertaining to the proposed electrical rate increases and the Yukon Authority and this Assembly emphasizes this to the Board that it is this Assembly's position that the Government of Canada should bear the costs of all expenditures incurred by the Northern Canada Power Commission in the development of projects which are attributed to national objectives, and further this Legislative Assembly is firmly of the opinion that NCPC should be accountable to a Yukon Public body which is representative of the consumer or user service. Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** I got up to express an opinion about this motion many times, Mr. Chairman, and I know that when we were last discussing it, the Member for Klondike was raising some point, he said that this motion was only good for Whitehorse, or something to that effect, and I stand to be corrected if that wasn't his statement but it was somewhere in that.

I say that this is very important to all of Yukon. But, I say that the costs of Aishihik are a direct reflection to a non-NCPC operation and that is why it is very important that the opinions, the action that this Legislative Assembly has taken with regard to the proposed electrical rates increases be emphasized, be strengthened and this is one way of doing it. We can get them into the Public Utilities Board again strengthening and hopefully helping them put forward their recommendations.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment of this motion. After "incurred" I would like to insert "and will be incurring by the Northern Canada Power Commission in the development of project which attributed to national objectives and"

**Mr. Fleming:** I second that motion, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. Berger, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that Motion Number 27 be altered so that the phrase "and will be incurring" be included after the expenditures incurred. Which is in the second paragraph, the penultimate line of the second paragraph.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have much to say in seconding the motion, merely that we wish to be sure that the motion as it stands and which I'm prepared to adopt now. It does make sure a little bit of the future, so it is just not one Aishihik project that they may think we're speaking of.

**Mr. Chairman:** Further discussion? Moved by Mr. Berger, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that the phrase "and will be incurring" be added after the word incurred in the second paragraph of Motion Number 27. All those in favour? Of the amendment? Contrary? The amendment is carried.

The amendment is carried.

#### MOTION CARRIED

I will now read Motion Number 17 as amended. It was moved by the honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that whereas the Yukon Public Utilities Board is considering evidence as gained from a recently held Public Hearing in connection with the NCPC proposed electrical rate increases and whereas a brief was presented on behalf of the Yukon Territorial Government, be it resolved that the Yukon Legislative Assembly submits to the Yukon Public Utilities Board copies of all resolutions passed during the 5th Session of the 23rd Legislature pertaining to the proposed electrical rate increases and a Yukon Power Authority and that this Assembly emphasizes to the Board that it is this Assembly's position that the Government of Canada should bear the cost of all expenditures incurred and will be incurring by the Northern Canada Power Commission in the development of projects which are attributed to national objectives, and further this Legislative Assembly is firmly of the opinion that NCPC should be accountable to a Yukon public body which is representative of the consumer or user service.

Are you ready for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

**Mr. Chairman:** All those in favour? Contrary? The motion as amended is carried.

#### (MOTION CARRIED)

**Mr. Chairman:** All those in favour

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



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

**Mr. Berger:** I second that.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Berger, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the chair. Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion is carried.

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

MR. SPEAKER RESUMES THE CHAIR

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

**Mr. Hibberd:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the committee convened at 11:30 a.m. to discuss Bills, Motions and Sessional Papers.

Mr. Miller was present as a witness during Committee's review of Bill number 17. It was moved by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. Lang, that Bill number 17 be reported out of Committee without amendment. This motion carried.

Committee recessed at 12 noon and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Committee discussed the contents of Motion number 19. Motion number 19, as amended, was duly carried.

Committee then considered Sessional Papers 1, 2 and 4. Mr. Miller was present as a witness during Committee's discussion of Sessional Paper number 3, the Yukon Income Tax. It was moved by Mr. McKinnon, seconded by Mr. McIntyre, that Committee concur with the content of Sessional Paper number 3 and this motion carried.

Committee read Motions 6, 8, 11, 12, 20 and 27. Committee passed Motions 11, 12 and 20; Motion number 27 as amended was carried. Motion number 8 was defeated.

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

I can now report, Mr. Speaker, that this completes all the business which has been placed before Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees. Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there a seconder? Adjourned would be the appropriate motion.

**Mr. Lengerke:** I move that we now adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, that we do now adjourn. Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

*(MOTION CARRIED)*

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

ADJOURNED







