



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 17

7th Session,

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Wednesday, December 1, 1976

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory.
December 1st, 1976.

Speaker: Madam Clerk, is there a quorum present?

Madam Clerk: There is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order. We will now proceed with morning prayers.

(Prayers)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of interest to all Members of this House and the public of the Yukon. The Health Department of your Government has received from a firm in Stirling, New Jersey, information and material addressed to the Province of Yukon Territory, Mr. Speaker, and someone in New Jersey knows more than Mr. Trudeau does.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The news media reported that the Federal-Territorial Advisory Lands Committee Motion had passed this House, and there has to be a correction. The Motion did not pass this House. It's referred to the Minister of Local Government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out to the House that Question Number 32 on the Order Paper is in the name of Mrs. Whyard; it should be Mr. Berger.

Mr. Speaker: May we now proceed to the Order Paper?

Are there any documents for tabling this morning?
The Honourable Minister of Education?

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a Green Paper on Highway Information Signs.

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

Are there any reports of Committees? Petitions? Introduction of Bills? Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers? Notices of Motion or Resolution?

The Honourable Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the proper time to rise on the Order Paper, but I am

wondering if it would be possible to move the Green Paper on Highway Information Signs into Committee of the Whole and waive the rules, because it is my understanding that we could possibly wrap up tomorrow and I think it should be moved into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: Well, perhaps the Honourable Member could give Notice this morning and the matter could be dealt with tomorrow. Perhaps, would this be —?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would request that the — I would like to move that the Green Paper on Highways and Maintenance Signs be moved into Committee of the Whole for discussion and ask the House to waive the standing rules.

Mr. Speaker: Would the House agree?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.
Are there any statements by Ministers?
This brings us to the question period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Are there any replies to questions?
The Honourable Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, on the 29th of November, Mr. Fleming asked if it was true that the bus went from Whitehorse to Carcross both morning and late afternoon to pick up and return children for school, and the answer is yes. Diversified Transport are of the opinion that the bus is best cared for in this way. He also asked if there was a two-way radio in the bus and the answer is no. It is a trial run and Department of Education radios are very expensive and hard to come by. Possibly, Diversified will be putting in C.B.s.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question from the Honourable Member from Pelly regarding the hours for x-ray service at the Faro Nursing Station, we have been provided with information from Medical Services, Yukon Region. The regular hours for x-rays at Faro are Wednesdays and Fridays, 2 p.m. until 5 p.m. And, additionally Mr. Speaker, we are informed that the Faro Nursing Station has caught up with a backlog of x-rays.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I have answers to three questions. On November 17th, Mr. Lengerke asked a question regarding whether we were aware of changes in the B.C. Motor Vehicles Act and whether we had approached the B.C. Government to allow the same type of thing to happen in Yukon — special corridor, he was referring to. The B.C. Government has proposed a change to their Motor Vehicle Regulations to permit 14 foot 6 inch wide loads on certain B.C. highways. However, the changes have not been brought into effect, but

they are still under active consideration. And we have not made approaches to the B.C. Government for a special corridor to be created.

On the 24th of November, Mr. Berger asked a question regarding holders of traplines who do not meet requirements as outlined in the answer to the question. This was an earlier question that I responded to. Secondly, he asked why the Game Department would issue assistant trappers' licences in certain areas in the Territory when there were no trappers available on the traplines.

Firstly, all trapline holders whose registration was cancelled were notified by mail. In order to prevent traplines from being tied up by the people who have no intention of utilizing them, it is Game Branch policy not to register an open line in a new applicant's name until this applicant has demonstrated his intentions to work the line for a one-year period as assistant trapper.

Thus, the usual requirement for an assistant trapper's licence with regard to approval of the trapline holder is irrelevant since an open trapline has no trapline holder and the Director of Game thus acts as a co-signee.

Finally, on November 25th, Mr. Berger asked a supplementary question regarding fishing rights and who was eligible to receive a commercial fishing licence and what steps the Department of Fisheries were taking to preserve the fishing rights of the native people in the Yukon Territory.

In the Yukon, no person is eligible for a commercial fishing licence unless he is: a Canadian citizen or has served in the Canadian Armed Forces or a landed immigrant who has resided in Canada for not more than five years.

In order to ascertain a reply to the second part, the Game Department had contacted the Federal Fisheries and they advised that the Indian food fishery is second only to escapement as a priority in the mandate to manage the fisheries resource of the Yukon.

As part of this mandate, the basic guidelines for the preservation of native fishing rights is set out in both the Fisheries Act and the Yukon Territory Fishery Regulations made thereunder.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any oral questions? The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, with permission I would like to read a reply to the written question from the Honourable Member from Ogilvie concerning the programmes for children in care at Wolf Creek.

The first question was: Are children being sent to Ogilvie without being sentenced by the court? How many children there are from court sentencing and how many are not? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is: the practice of admitting children who have not appeared before the courts has ceased, and the last submission of such a child was on the 7th of September this year. At present, there are nine children committed to the training home by court process. There are, however, still seven children who are wards of the Director of Social Welfare who are still residing at the Home but who will, in the course of the next few weeks, be discharged as suitable facilities are found for them.

It is expected, Mr. Speaker, that the last welfare ward will leave Wolf Creek by early February.

The second was: Would the programme at Wolf Creek be defined more accurately as that of a treatment centre for disturbed children rather than that of a juvenile home? The reply is that the programme at the training home is designed to treat disturbed children. It is our belief that children who present behaviour problems require a treatment training programme as opposed to punishment by incarceration with no attempt to modify their immediate behaviour.

Therefore, the present programme can be described as treatment-oriented.

The third question: Is there a review board monitoring the progress of the behavioural modification treatment being used at Wolf Creek and who is on the board? The reply is: a review board monitors progress of individual juveniles who are in our care. The board includes the superintendent of the training home, staff of the home, both male and female supervisors, representatives of the Department of Social Welfare and Probation, the regional psychologists and the group home parents.

The fourth question: Was there any report in the last three or four months on the Behavioural Modification Programme at Wolf Creek? Did the report support the use of this type of treatment at Wolf Creek or not? Are there findings of the report being presently implemented? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that a number of reports have been submitted by individual members of the review board and in all cases the reports supported the use of this type of treatment programme. The findings of the various reports are under active consideration and some of the recommendations are being considered for implementation when they become financially feasible.

The fifth question: Is the Behavioural Modification Programme being continually re-assessed by this Department with a view to extend the changes in the future, and who is carrying on this assessment? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the Behavioural Modification Programme is under constant reassessment by the training home staff and the Directors of Social Welfare and Corrections, who have been reporting to me personally on these assessments.

A number of changes have been made from the original programme necessary because the treatment modules on which they base this programme was designed for a group home, not a larger juvenile training home.

The sixth question: Are there any special nutritional outdoor sports or leadership training programmes at Wolf Creek? The answer, Mr. Speaker: The nutritional standards of institutional care as set by the Federal Government's Department of Health and Welfare are more than adequately met at the Home. In addition, any special guides prescribed by medical practitioners are strictly adhered to. An active outdoor recreational programme is in effect throughout the year, weather permitting. This includes skiing, skating, snowshoeing, fishing, summer and winter camps and hockey.

The juveniles also either as individuals or as a team participate in sports at community-organized events, such as volleyball, swimming, skating and in the Territorial Experimental Ski Training programme, cross-country skiing. Leadership training is stressed in all the foregoing recreational pursuits and this is, from time to time, further exercised by special leadership training camps. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that recently

we have extended an invitation to a cross-cultural worker to attend meetings to assist the staff in understanding more fully the behavioural problems as they relate to native children.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further replies to questions?

We'll then proceed with the oral question period. Have you any questions?

The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question re: Education and Life Skills Programme

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, a verbal question for the Minister of Education. We recently have received information on the community's basic education and life skills programme.

My understanding was that there was to be an assessment of this programme and, whether or not it was actually carried out, what we would like it to carry out. I don't see in that Paper any assessment. Is there one forthcoming?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member raises a very good question on getting an assessment of the programme because at the present time we just do not have the staff or the monies to hire somebody from another jurisdiction to come in and do a proper assessment of the programme. I think it is unfair to ask an individual who is directing the programme to do an assessment. I was attempting to get more information for all Members by this forthcoming Budget Session.

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

Question re: Consumer Protection Ordinance

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable concern over the last few years regarding the Consumer Protection Ordinance and this has again been brought to our attention by the Tourism Advisory Board, who passed the resolution on November 19th. They resolved the Consumer Protection Ordinance should be amended to provide for a clearer interpretation and for clauses governing trade practices in the Territory and that this Ordinance then be adequately enforced. My question probably is directed to the Minister of Health and Welfare. Is the Government intending to act on the advisory amending the Consumers Protection Ordinance and enforcing it?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, no submission has yet been received by the Standing Committee from the Executive Committee Members on that area.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Honourable Member could take it as notice?

Are there any further questions? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Question re: Statement of Policy on Tourism in Yukon

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Speaker — excuse the voice again. I have a question for the Minister of Health and Welfare. In reply to the Speech from the Throne this Session, I had asked the statement of policy be provided in connection with tourist industry of the Yukon and I now am aware that the Yukon Tourism Advisory Board is asking for clarification in that regard also. Could you provide this House with a statement of the policy for the tourist industry of the Yukon at some date — or you could do that today or tomorrow — some statement of policy.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member knows full well that's not my baby at the moment; however, there are some moves I think on the record of this House regarding the transfer of responsibilities from that particular department. As a Member of the Executive Committee, whether or not this takes place I cannot say. The question is a little vague, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so. The policy regarding the tourist industry from whose point of view? The people in the industry or the government? I'd be happy to discuss this with the Honourable Member.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question re: Day Care Financing System

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation. Is the department considering a different financing system for day care in the Yukon that in the past five years?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member knows, this department went to considerable trouble a year and a half ago to come up with a subsidization plan which would assist working parents in the question of day care for their children. We went to bat for them; we did battle with the Federal Department in charge of the Canada Assistance Plan in order to raise the minimum cut-off of joint combined wages which would qualify parents for that subsidy and, after we had worked out federal subsidy for the parents and actually got the money voted into the budget, the Yukon Child Care Association turned the plan down, which was a great disappointment to all the people who had worked on it. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, we have been continuing discussions with the Yukon Child Care Association; the new Director of Social Welfare has been personally involved with them in an attempt to come up with some alternative form of subsidization. But I cannot say at this moment, Mr. Speaker, that we have got a plan.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

We will then proceed to Motions.

MOTIONS

Motion Number 36

Mr. Speaker: Motion Number 36. Would the Honourable Member be prepared to discuss Motion Number 36 this morning?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that the Yukon Legislative Assembly, in recognizing the concerns of all Yukoners as to the continued and future operation of the Northern Canada Power Commission, ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development when considering the recommendations of the task force on rates to take immediate action with respect to amending the NCP Act so that financial relief by way of debt retirement and lower interest rates can be given. This should be done in such a way as to guarantee a positive financial position for present and future operations and in turn provide stability to the rate structures affecting energy users in Yukon and Northwest Territories.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In discussing the Motion the other day, I explained my reasons why I felt this would have some significance in this House and I know one of the Honourable Members suggested that we defer any debate or any discussion on it until we actually heard if the Minister had reviewed the Committee's recommendations on rate structures and I understand the Minister has not done this.

Mr. Commissioner could confirm this today. I think he could anyway. Mr. Commissioner, is this correct? Could you confirm that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: To whom did you direct the question?

Mr. Lengerke: I directed it to Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, I see. Sorry, it appears that we may have trouble with the sound system and I wonder if I can inquire if you wish a recess.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the Minister is not prepared to release the report as of this date. That's all I know.

Mr. Lengerke: That is confirmation, Mr. Speaker, and what I'd like to do at this time then is have the House consider the Motion. What we should be doing is giving the Minister support politically to go to his colleagues and ask that the N.C.P.C. Act be changed. As you know, we have discussed this many, many times in this House and if something realistically is going to be done with N.C.P.C. by way of relief or to operating relief to the rate payers of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, but certainly something is going to have to be done with respect to the Act to allow for a debt retirement of existing debt against the corporation now and lower

interest rates.

In other words, money made available to them at a lesser rate so that in fact development can take place that is much required. This is the kind of support I'm looking for. It's of political nature only. It's something that the Minister can take in discussing the possibility of any changes to the N.C.P.C. Act.

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)

I believe at this time we'll just declare a brief recess while we see if we can get our recording system working again.

(RECESS)

Mr. Speaker: I'll now call the House to order. We'll now proceed with Motions.

Motion Number 37

Madam Clerk: Motion 37 standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Berger.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss this Motion?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Klondike, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo that the White Paper on the community hearings on the Alcan Pipeline Route be referred to Committee of the Whole. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

(Motion carried)

Motion Number 38

Madam Clerk: Motion 38 standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mrs. Watson.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss her Motion?

Mr. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that ..

Mr. Speaker: Order. I'll have to read the Motion first.

Mrs. Watson: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre that Messrs. Berger, Hibberd, Lang, McCall, McKinnon and Mesdames Watson and Whyard be appointed to a Standing Committee to study Yukon Land Claims and to develop and make recommendations relating to Yukon Land Claims; that the said Committee have power to call for persons, papers and records, to sit during the inter-sessional periods and to report from time to time; and that the Clerk of the Assembly be responsible for providing the necessary support staff to the said Committee. The Honourable Member from Kluane?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, at the present time, I would call question on the — if there's no debate.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that Motion Number 38 be referred to Committee of the Whole for further discussion or for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie that the Motion Number 38 be referred to Committee of the Whole. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Some Members: Disagree.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called. As I see one Member is absent due to illness, we will at this point call division. Madam Clerk, would you kindly poll the House.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Agree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Agree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yea.

Madam Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the result of the division is three yea, seven nay.

Mr. Speaker: The Motion has not carried. Would you proceed with debate at this time on Motion Number 38? The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to this Motion, after giving it considerable attention. It's news to me and I don't really feel that this Committee is going to represent all the diverse views of the Committee of the Whole.

There is no assurance that this Committee will not consider itself as the official policy maker on land claims for our Assembly. I disagree with that. I also disagree that this Committee may set itself up as being the only contact with any other bodies which are considering land claims, such as the C.Y.I. or any other official kind of body.

I feel that we have to have a more specific outline of the responsibilities and rights of this Committee before I can ever agree with it.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the concept whatsoever, I think it's about time we set up a Standing Committee and special committee, or whatever you want to look into this matter, but I'd sure like to hear a little more about it.

I'd like to hear who you're going to develop and make recommendations relating to the Yukon Land Claims, to whom are they going to make these recommenda-

tions? Through whom and by whom and what's the rest of it. I'd like to really hear some discussion on it, Mr. Speaker. I think an important subject like this certainly deserves to be discussed. I think that, in all honesty and all sincerity, I would hope that the Members who have moved it would be willing to discuss it further at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre? Is there any further debate? The Honourable Member from Mayo?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker. I would like to know what Land Claims we are talking about. Is the Yukon claiming land from the Federal Government, is that what we're talking about or are we talking about the Yukon Indian Land Claims? I have no idea what this Resolution deals with. Is it a claim for a block transfer of lands to the Territorial Government or is it a claim for — what land are they claiming?

Mr. Speaker: To whom would you direct your question?

Mr. McIntyre: The person that moved the Resolution. I think Members of this House deserve some explanation. What the hell is going on?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.
The Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would be most reluctant to make any further statements. The Motion is before the House and I would like a question on it. I think that in due course, considerable information will be made available.

Mr. Speaker: I do think that the Member has a legitimate question and he wonders what the land claims are referred to here. Could that not be answered?

No, the Honourable Member from Riverdale I believe you have spoken before.

Mr. Lengerke: Okay.

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

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a little problem with the Motion now because I know we do need a Standing Committee to study certain things and although I am more or less now in favour of the Honourable Member from Mayo in wondering just what the Committee is going to do. I think that we should have some explanation as to who this Committee is going to support. Is this going to be all of this Assembly or is it going to be their views in certain matters? I would like a little explanation before, otherwise I would have to vote against the Motion if I don't get some information.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?
Question has been called. Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Some Members: Disagreed.

Some Members: Division.

Mr. Speaker: Is there more than one calling division?

Division has been called. Madam Clerk, would you kindly poll the House.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mr. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Agree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Agree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Agree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Agree.

Madam Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results for the division are six yea, four nay.

Mr. Speaker: I will therefore declare that Motion Number 38 has carried.

(Motion carried)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Private Members' Public Bills.

Private Member's Bill Number 1 — Third Reading

Madam Clerk: Third reading Private Member's Public Bill 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Homeowners' Grant Ordinance.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I move that Private Member's Public Bill Number 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Homeowners' Grant Ordinance, be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Private Member's Public Bill Number 1 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)

Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that Private Member's Public Bill Number 1, An Ordinance to Amend the Homeowners' Grant Ordinance do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike that Private Member's Public Bill Number 1 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 the Private Member's Public Bill Number 1 is passed in this House.

(Motion carried)

May I have your further pleasure? The Honourable Member from Pelly River?

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

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

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

(Motion carried)

(Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. First of all, I would like to announce that arrangements have been made for a meeting of a caucus with Dr. Naismith tomorrow after prorogation.

I'd like to deal with the Liquor Ordinance first. This Bill has been referred back to the Committee for redirection from the Assembly and at this time, because of the redirection from Assembly, we can accept any instructions from Committee Members. What amendments are you requesting? Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just before proceeding with the amendment, I was just wondering could we have the Legal Advisor here?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, we have a proposed amendment to the Bill. It's moved by myself, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane. I've got a copy of it here. I believe some copies have been already circulated. Do you want to read it from the Chair?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I will. It has been moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mrs. Watson that Bill Number 5 entitled, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance be amended as follows, by adding the following new section thereto:

"(1) Unless especially provided by this Ordinance or the Regulations, no person shall consume liquor in any public place except:

(a) in a residence;

(b) in a public place that is:

(i) a public beach, public park, public campground,

(ii) a location that is off the highway, that is reasonably remote from any settlement that is used for picnicking, sport fishing, hunting, or other outside recreational activity, unless otherwise notified to the public by the owner in the manner prescribed,

(iii) a facility such as a garden, terrace, or pool-side patio of a licensed premises.

(c) in such other places as may be prescribed.

(2) Proof of possession in a public place for bottle or can containing liquor which can be open is *prima facie* evidence of consumption by the person found in possession of liquor in such a public place.

(3) Where one of two or more persons with the knowledge and consent of the rest has liquor in his custody or possession, the liquor shall be deemed to be in possession of each and all of them.

Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in posing this amendment I'm confident that it does provide the kind of control that people are looking for. It does provide the latitude that people want in our drinking laws. I'm totally convinced that this is the right direction, Mr. Chairman. We've had a lot of discussion about it and, as I said, I feel that it does put the restrictions where the public of the Yukon have asked it to be put and we still have a very liberal liquor law and I would think probably the most progressive legislation in the country by inserting this clause.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think every Member of this Assembly realizes that it's difficult to express in words what we are attempting to do and that is to try to get drinking off our streets and our highways, and still not inhibit the normal habits that Yukoners enjoy and are used to.

I believe this amendment is quite a creditable attempt to do that. While this Liquor Ordinance has been discussed, the amendments for the Liquor Ordinance, Bill Number 5, has been discussed, it's been, become, quite evident that the people of the Territory are looking for some restrictions. They're not looking at a complete prohibition like they had in other provinces, and it was really quite interesting when we were trying to come up with an amendment

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Legal Advisor could indicate 1(a) if 'in a residence' included the yard area or whether it could be interpreted as to mean just the dwellinghouse itself in that the consumption of a bottle of beer in your own yard would be contrary to this particular provision.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be tidied up in the, either in the definition or here to make it clear that the garden and yard area of a residence were. I'd need to look at the definitions section itself to check and I don't have up-to-date Liquor Ordinance here.

Mr. Chairman, before I finish that point, may I say that the Honourable Member from Mayo raised the question of residence in an earlier portion when this subject was being discussed before and suggested that a residence cannot be a public place and it should be taken out, and there was very little debate on it; but I've had occasion to consider this matter since and, with respect, I would suggest that if this section is being passed the word 'residence' in some form remain in— first of all to make it clear and secondly because we're including things like tents and huts and what-have-you, so we want to make sure that although it's a camp somewhere or other, or a tent, that that would be included as a residence. To remove the doubt that the residence happens to be in a public place.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, can we take then from those remarks that the definition section of where it indicates residence will be amended to give a little broader term to the word 'residence' and to include the yard or enclosure? Could we have that?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Could I say this? I'm not sure exactly as to what the state of the debate is, as to whether this section is being discussed or is not being discussed in regard to what has gone on before. But if the House was to indicate and the Chairman was to indicate it was acceptable that this could go forward in amendment, perhaps an opportunity could be given to look through the amendment so that we can check it through, because I can see certain minor faults in the draft as it stands at present, which might need attending to. They're minor faults, but they — I prefer to see that the language might be changed.

Mr. Chairman: The clause is in order, Mr. Legal Advisor. If we deferred further discussion, could we have this back this afternoon?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it would only be a matter of a short time to sit down at the table for a few minutes and to change the language and change the positioning of the word so that, for instance, when we're talking about otherwise notified the public by the owner, we're also talking about that that must qualify public beach, park and campground. That there may be campgrounds where people do not want liquor drinking to occur and, as it's printed out here, it's not clear that that does refer to both sub-paragraph (i) and sub-paragraph (ii).

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, there's an area in this present amendment here that concerns me and I find it very nebulous and here we go once again attempting to define a public place, which is almost an impossibility. I think all Members are aware of that. It states here "that is reasonably remote from any settlement". I'm concerned. It's not defined and I don't know whether or not the discretionary powers there in relation to enforcement are very, very broad and there's no definition of any kind and I'm just wondering if possibly at the same time the Legal Advisor could look at this area. Would you not agree with what I've said a little earlier, Mr. Legal Advisor?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes, I agree with the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, but it's hard to polish it up. There are some stones that don't polish up like diamonds. I'm not sure what we could do with this section. It's evidently a matter for a court to decide; a charge would be laid that such and such a person did consume alcohol contrary to section so and so of the Liquor Ordinance in a place which was not reasonably remote from a settlement. That's how the charge has to go. Then you have to call the witness to say the place where this occurred was not reasonably remote from a settlement.

Now, when the court starts to construe that, the way

the
wa
dep
or r
a M
S
is t
M
our
has
M
glas
M
Ho
that
out t
opin
wond
ritor
amen
nick
tiona
near
does
and t
Mr.
puttin
one li
A l
A -
B -
C -
Th
you
M
H
clea
hav
to c
ma
per
tha
ma
an
pe
ge
ha
m
C
v
r
g

Why do it is they say what would a reasonable man think was remote and it all goes on the reasonable man. A lot depends on whether the judge has had a good breakfast or not as to what he thinks is reasonable and whether it's a Monday or a Thursday.

So, I'm not sure how you would polish it up. The clause is there. It's just very hard to describe.

Mr. Chairman: It's rather precarious to think that our Legislation depends on whether the Legal Advisor has had a good breakfast or not.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes. It depends whether he has glasses on or not. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it appears that someone is going to undertake to try and straighten out this one, which ought not to be in front of us, in my opinion, at this time. Then I, too, am having difficulty in wondering what is reasonably remote in the Yukon Territory, what the limitations are on that. It says in this amendment, from any settlement that is used for picnicking, sport fishing, hunting or other outdoor recreational activity. Just what, in God's name, does this mean? What is a settlement that's used for this? What does that include? Tent, stove, where and what and how and tell us all about that please, if you could.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, we do that by putting in another sub-paragraph and indenting it down the line in, so that it would read something like this:

A location that is:

A — off a highway;

B — is reasonably remote from any settlements;

C — is used for picnicking, sports fishing, and so forth.

Then, by the paragraphing, you make it clear what you mean.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it still isn't clear to me that that would solve the problem. You'd have to write pages and pages and pages, I would think, to define this. Well, I'll save my remarks, Mr. Chairman, for when this comes back for consideration, perhaps this afternoon, but I just want to say without — that to deny this freedom, the people of the Yukon, a majority of the people of the Yukon have not abused it and I might say that a lot of the abuse is not done by people necessarily resident in the Yukon as far as that goes.

To try and bring in legislation, to bring down the hatchet upon the people of the Yukon at this time, in this manner, is completely abhorrent. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the one main effect you're going to have with sub-two of this amendment and the whole amendment for that matter is to make one huge beautiful garbage dump in the Yukon Territory for all time. I'm sure that the Members who proposed this amendment must have taken that into consideration. Our highways are going to be littered with bottles and because — you know, if someone is having a bottle of beer on the way to beach and — they're going to drink it anyway. So you're just going to make a criminal out of him. So, you

get rid of the bottle, throw it in the ditch. You get lots of broken glass around. That's one of the many effects you're going to have with this section.

But I'll wait until this afternoon before I have anything further to say.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have another question that the Honourable Member from Mayo touched on, and my question would be: when is a residence not a residence? And I'm thinking in particular of mobile homes and there's a lot of people travelling in those these days. I notice there is one driver sitting in the front of a mobile home and people sit in the back end, in their home actually, and if they happen to be drinking then Section 3 would be quite dangerous because the driver, who may not be drinking, is also included in the offence.

Mr. Chairman: We would like to mention at this time, it has been referred to me whether this is valid to be considered at this time, so I will — the ruling is on this basis. The various stages through which a Bill progresses are intended by the practices of parliament to provide so many opportunities, not only for consideration but also for reconsideration. No objection can be taken to an amendment on any particular stage on the ground that it raises again a question decided on in an earlier stage.

Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate the difficulty that the Honourable Member from Dawson has had with respect to the residence. I'm sure we're on the way to clearing that up. The other comment that was made by the Member from Watson Lake is, I think, valid and the fact that he's saying we don't want to restrict drinking to the people that now do not abuse the rules, and I think our amendment is not doing that, Mr. Chairman. Our amendment is a very, very board amendment and it still does, in fact, allow the kind of laws and the kind of practice with respect to drinking that's available to Yukoners at this point in time. The only change will be drinking on the streets. I think that's the only thing that we've heard from the people of the Yukon, where they would like this control. That's why it's so very, very difficult, as all of us well realize. — and the Legal Advisor has expressed this also — to try and put this in certain terms.

We tried an amendment on a couple of occasions, defining the distances and being very specific, and then I would have had the Honourable Member from Porter Creek get up and say, my God, that means I've got to get out there with a tape measure and how do I know where I'm at! Can I drink here, can I drink there! I think the whole intent is to be rather vague in this section because we are, we have no objection to people drinking out in these types of areas. As far as the Member from Watson Lake is concerned, that is from any settlement that is used for picnicking; it isn't the settlement that we are referring to here; it's a location that is off the highway near a settlement.

Again, Mr. Legal Advisor, I hope, will straighten that out in a way that he is going to put this down in point form, so I'm quite anxious to see the amended amend-

ment.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, well, what you're saying then, Mr. Chairman, is up in — first of all, that, except in a public place that is a public beach, public park, public campground, now you're trying to say that any settlement that is used for picnicking and this type of thing...

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I don't get, I find the ...

Mrs. Watson: Point of order. The Honourable Member from Watson Lake is calling point of order to people and usurping the powers and duties of the Chairman. Mr. Chairman, he seems to feel that the Speaker can carry the Speaker's prerogative to a Private Member's position in the House and I don't think that he should feel this way and I take objection to his doing this.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the Chair and the poor confused Honourable Member who has just spoken before, I might point out that it is any Member's prerogative to call 'order' any time he wants.

Some Members: Order, order please!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, as I say, it is confusing, it doesn't make any reasonable sense. It seems contradictory, at least to myself, and such kind of ridiculous wording should not, ought not, to be on any law in this Territory. And well, as I say, I cannot agree with the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale who said that the people in the majority are not going to suffer by this, because, indeed, he knows and I know that they are. But I do point out one thing: if, as the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale has stated in his last address, they simply want to get it off the streets, well then you simply come in and you say something to the effect that it shall not be lawful to drink in any street in any organized community in the Yukon, and you've said it. And that you can spell out and define and throw that before the House for consideration, but to come out with this, you're bringing in restrictions and restrictions and allowing discretionary powers to law enforcement people or you're leaving it to a judge, as Mr. Legal Advisor just said, being a Monday or a Thursday to decide what is reasonable and what isn't reasonable. This is no kind of legislation to bring into this Territory. Use your head!

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It's fine, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I take exception with the Member from Watson Lake's words when he speaks of the criminals that are going to be criminals

due to the fact that they can't drink liquor when they're driving down the road and so forth, which is what he inferred in so many words.

I think that in this amendment that's exactly what we're trying to do. I think anybody, including myself, and I have drank sometimes and drove my car and if I'd have had an accident, I'm certainly sure that it would have been my own fault. I think we are giving also some power to our police force whereas they can prevent a man from becoming a criminal instead of waiting until after the accident and then trying to lay charges.

Anybody that really has to drink and drive somehow or other I don't feel he really cares too much about the other fellow.

There is in 2, "that proof of possession in a public place of a bottle or can containing alcohol", and this, Mr. Chairman, is that I've been thinking ever since this Ordinance came into effect, that somehow or other we should stop the intent of somebody that is going to become a criminal, possibly not because he wants to but because he is involved in alcohol and when he is standing on the corner and he is getting into his car with a bottle in his hand, the policeman has no way to go up and say, put that away son, you can't drive and drink in this Territory, unless he goes over the .8.

I say, Mr. Chairman, it may be very well for them to say you have to be .8 to be drunk or .08 but I also would like to say that anybody that has had a drink or two or three, but still not to that stage, is not really capable of driving his car amongst many other cars.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I realize it might be a little froggy for the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, but really this is — the Member brought in the amendment and myself and the Legal Advisor realize that, you know, you can sit and pick holes in this forever. You're going to be able to ridicule it, but we've tried in a reasonable way and we realize that most people of the Territory are reasonable people and are looking for some type of restraints to drinking in public places.

We fully realize that there are great deficiencies in this section and really you only have two other alternatives that would fit if we're going to be very picky on this and that is to leave it completely wide open or to shut her right down. If you want to specify very realistically in law, and this sometimes is very difficult to do.

This is a compromised, reasonable position and I don't think most of the Territory, the people of the Territory, when they realize the reasonable interpretation of this amendment, they won't have any problem with it. I tend to agree with the Member from Hootalingua that we might be a little — have to be a little more restrictive on the ability to drink while you're in a vehicle and while you're driving. I think this is one thing that people are very concerned about.

We have provided for that in this amendment. If the Honourable Member of Watson Lake feels that he is really picking it apart, I did the same thing to it when I reviewed it. I did exactly the same thing, but let's look at it from a reasonable overall point of view and maybe we shouldn't have too much difficulty in just giving it a try at least.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of all the remarks that have been going on around this table, why don't we do the proper thing and that is — that's if the Honourable Member, of course, doesn't have this Bill thrown out as she did the Insurance Bill. Maybe perhaps if this Bill should remain and this one Board can get going, the Liquor Board, these people who are in the business could study and advise this House or the Government of this Territory as to whether, (a) there is a problem; (b) where the problem arises from; (c) who creates the problem, could determine from among the residents of the Territory by some means or another, and this is what the people of the Territory want is a referendum if we're going to start losing these new-found privileges and then advise the Government, and if it appears that legislation is necessary, bring it in at some future session.

But for one Member or two or three Members to sit down and try and draft out an amendment and to deny all the people of the Yukon certain privileges which they have found and by my findings, have not largely abused, then you ought not to come in with this type of amendment at this time, in this House, not ought to consider an amendment at this time.

This is what the Liquor Board is all about. Let's get somebody to go out and do the research. This is simply it. I say that when you bring in this type of legislation, each Member, Mr. Chairman, that proposes this type of legislation at this time without this information is not doing a service to the people of the Territory. The feedback I'm getting is totally different than the feedback that's being expressed by some Members in this House.

We've got a board or we're going to establish a board. I say, if the Honourable Member from Kluane doesn't get this whole Bill thrown out, then we'll have a board, we'll have an opportunity to get this information.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, there are just two points I'd like to make to Members of the Committee. First I am a little concerned about the apparent sudden commitment here, that there is going to be a review and legal definitions brought back today, because as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, this has not been agreed to by Members in the Committee and if you are suggesting that this section is going to be redrafted and returned today by the Legislative Programming Committee, that's a completely different can of worms.

If you are simply asking for redefinition from the Legal Advisor of certain sections of this amendment, that is a different question.

The other thing I'd like to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that as Members all know, we have already seen the results of the attempts of some months of consideration by the Government to provide legislation which would cover the main requests from the people of the Yukon, and that was to try to eliminate drinking on public streets and more recently, support for removal of liquor from any cars on highways.

The attempt that we made to meet those requirements was brought into this House and was rejected. We have now before us a second attempt to revise the same area regarding public drinking. I would like very much to be able to support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I cannot see how it could be enforced. We all have

personal experience with the problems of the definition of a residence. We know of cases locally where neighbourhood feuds can result in a charge of drinking when a man is sitting on his front porch step or out in the yard.

This is a very difficult area legally to define. I also have problems, not because the location — the settlement is used for picnicking, but I have problems with the location off a highway used for recreational activity. I immediately think of the situation such as the ski club where there are children and family groups and it's not a licensed premise. You know, this is going to be a very ticklish thing to assess.

I have problems, Mr. Chairman, with this amendment. I simply rise to say that if the Honourable Member who proposed this amendment is asking for legal definitions, I would like him to make that clear.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just responding to the Legal Advisor's comments that he suggested that (b) (i) and (ii) could be reset to be a little more clear. I have to agree, but you know, I'm not the Legal Advisor and I can understand this amendment quite adequately. And it doesn't bother me much and I like the guy from Watson Lake who says, you know, if you just put a street ban on the sidewalk, I can understand and you probably could too, but, as Mr. Legal Advisor says, the law and the court won't hold that up. So we're in that dilemma and you fall out on it, because you've been through this thing many, many times. I just asked you Honourable Minister how easy is it to clarify and to interpret the section that was brought in by — in the Bill in the first instance anymore than it is this one. And that's the dilemma we all face.

I'm asking here is if Mr. Lgal Advisor can clear this up immediately for us, which I'd be appreciative, fine, I don't want to have this thing delayed to run over. We've spoken long enough on it.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake and I are having a little conversation today, it appears. I think he flatters me when he says that I can have the Bill thrown out on third reading. Thank you. However, I went on record in this House

that I had no intentions of voting or opposing the whole Bill on third reading. I made that perfectly clear. And I also made it clear that I wanted to see the Members of this House to have an opportunity to vote on restrictions to public drinking uniformly across the Territory. And that's why this Motion is before the Members today.

It is rather enlightening that the Honourable Member does not really like to make a decision, now he wants the Liquor Board to make the decision, or to have a referendum. And, you know, I just think we're elected to do a job, we better do it. I can understand why people have, are reluctant to accept this type of a section. I can understand it. But I can't understand the Minister of Health saying that she can't support it because I think this is much clearer, much more clear cut than the section that was brought in on 103. And I think she realizes the difficulty we were faced with. And she men-

tioned the fact that people ski, well right now they are allowed to. And they will be allowed to under this new section. It is up to the discretion of adults who are with the children. We're not trying to do anything in that area, we can't. So, we're not, the only two areas is the vehicles and the streets.

Mr. Chairman: We'll defer further debate on this until this afternoon.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Refer to the Order Paper, Motion Number 32.

Motion was debated yesterday, but we deferred it in the hope that the Minister would be back in the House. Unfortunately, he isn't, so we will have to continue with it at this time.

Mr. Fleming:

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman just allow me a moment until I find the papers. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there was a little misunderstanding yesterday that the Motion was misinterpreted because the Members probably felt that, in the one instance where the Motion states that nominations from the Yukon Legislative Assembly, it was not the intent of the Motion that the nominations be from this Assembly. Any people that were nominated. But that this Assembly would nominate people to the Minister and he would consider then possibly if it was in order Mr. Chairman, and confirm with the seconder, that the nominations consented by the Yukon Legislative — I will just try to get another word in there other than from the Legislative Assembly — presented by the Yukon Legislative Assembly instead of from the Legislative Assembly. Would this be an amendment or could it be just a — because I think that's where some of the misunderstanding came in yesterday.

I have some information here as to the Lands Advisory Committee and their terms of reference. I'm very sorry to see that the Minister of Local Government is not here, because I did think that he could explain some of the terms of reference better than I could possibly answer if there be more questions, because they are very broad. And yesterday, I think the Minister of Health asked, if it was, also could be used in this Committee on the Land Use and I did not feel at that time that this Committee was used there. However, by the terms of reference, if you read it all, it's possibly that it could be. And that information may be hard to obtain right now, however, I'm prepared to go with the Motion. I would like these passed around first.

If the Members will look at the terms of reference, I think that on 3, it was mentioned by the seconder of the Motion yesterday that this would give the Minister a very opportune time to possibly get some input from the local people and possibly the native people in respect to administration of Federal Crown lands. On 4, it says to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas related to improving the quality of the land administration services provided to the general public for the adoption of complementary land administration methods, procedures, legislation and regulations by both governments to make a recommendation accordingly. I think this also is an area in which I myself, and possibly other

Members would like to see a person other than a government official on that Committee. We're only asking the Minister to consider, as from this House, somebody maybe going to an individual from the country or from anywhere and any other person other than government employees. We're not asking him to change the whole concept of his Committee, merely to put some people possibly on there that are not government employees.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman. I have some doubts as to the legality of this Committee. It doesn't appear to be authorized by any statute of Canada or regulations made thereunder. It isn't listed in the book that we've — that we all have, which contains the membership and names of all Territorial Government committees and members thereon, so I'm really disappointed that the Member for Local Government isn't here, the Minister of Local Government isn't here because, perhaps he could explain to us how this thing got started and really what it's all about. I just don't think it's — it has any legal status at all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman. In answer to the Honourable Member, I too would like to see it explained a little, however, in the beginning, I did ask the question. I think the Honourable Member heard me ask the question of the Territorial Government, as to who was on this Committee because I felt there was a committee of this type, and the answer I got, I think I read here yesterday, that there was such a committee and this is the paper which came from the Honourable Member of Local Government. These two papers. The one with the Territorial Lands Advisory Committee on it and the two observers and also the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee objects to the committee and terms of reference. That is what I received from him. And that is the only information I have too, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman. I think the terms of reference are quite different from what this Committee actually does and this is why it is so important that before any action is taken that the Minister of Local Government is here. I know that when applications for land are sent in to the Government office, the reply you get is, it has to be referred to the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee. Now they sit and determine whether applications for land, for leasing of land, for purchasing of land, in many areas, are approved. Now, this is, the Honourable Member from Mayo mentioned this yesterday. Under these terms of reference there's no business that applications should go to then.

If there is a further terms of reference and if we follow our policies established, established policies for land disposal and if we follow our regulations under the Lands Ordinance, there is no need for this Committee to sit in judgment of land applications.

Before we go ahead and put somebody else on it — I think it would be horrible to appoint somebody to sit on a Committee and to find out that they would have to be sitting in our judgment on land applications. You know,

I wouldn't be that person for anything in the world in the Yukon Territory. It is okay if you are a member of a government service, you can sort of hide behind the service, but if you are sitting out there in front of the public and you are on that Committee and that person's application was turned down, you are the guy that the rejected applicant is going to go after.

I think that the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua has brought up a very, very sensitive area and before we come to any conclusions on it, and I think a lot of people have some very great misgivings about it, he certainly should be given the opportunity to get the explanation of the department.

I don't know how the Honourable Member wants to handle the Motion but before I would agree to appoint someone to a board that has no authority, and that he would be used under terms of reference for something else, I wouldn't be prepared to do that. I would hope that the Honourable Member would withhold this Motion until we sit again and I certainly would like to get into it again at that time and have a full discussion on it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just further to that, if that is the wish of the House, that is fine, but there could be another approach used. We could probably call one of the Members of that particular Advisory Committee here to just give us a brief outline on what they actually do and I know Mr. Bilawich could probably be available.

That is all, answering no questions. You know, just tell us what the Committee does.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: I don't think we should be doing that unless we get permission from the Minister of Local Government. He sits as a Member of this House and he is politically responsible for that Committee and he's the one that is going to answer to us, not a Member of that Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, due to all the problems we have and as the Member is not here and that there will be another session and so forth and so on, and with the consent of the seconder, I would withdraw the Motion. I can always bring it back next Spring or as we find it necessary. We thought it was now. We didn't have much information but we'll have a lot more by then, I assure you, and I'd be quite willing to do that because I wouldn't want to belabour this House now and hold it up when we are almost finished and hopefully we can save the people and the Yukon Territory a little money this week by getting done and getting home instead of staying here. On something like this that we're not really sure of, I'm not quite sure myself, I just wanted something done because it doesn't sound good to me and it still doesn't and I will try once more.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I would thank the Honourable Member for his offer on behalf of the absent Minister who, as you know, is ill. I know that he

will be interested in providing you with all the answers to the questions you are asking on behalf of this Government.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, this Motion will then therefore be deferred to the next session.

Motion Number 35, I believe is probably in the same category. Matters relating to Y.T.G. policy of annual rental for leased land.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we discussed part of that yesterday and I indicated at that time that I was prepared to let the matter drop for this Session because the Minister didn't have a lot of information that he wanted to have.

I will certainly be pursuing it further at the next Session.

Mr. Chairman: You withdraw it then?

Mrs. Watson: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not withdrawing it. I will let it die in Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.
Motion Number 24.

It is moved by Mr. Lengerke that an independent committee be appointed under the provisions of the Yukon Act and Public Inquiries Ordinance in accordance with the wishes of this Assembly as expressed by their approval of Motion Number 17 on December 10, 1975 and that the Committee be known as the "Committee for Yukon's Economic and Social Future" in its responsibility of defining a pattern of strategy for Yukon's resource, economic and social development, and by virtue of its terms of reference bring up-to-date the Carr Report, examine the question of provincial status in terms of economic and social factors and provide direction with respect to the required and essential participation of Yukon's native people.

Mr. Lengerke:

Mr. Lengerke: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I can express in a very few minutes — do you want to adjourn for lunch?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lengerke: Because if you think that I can tell you about this in five minutes then I would, at this point in time, call question.

Mr. Chairman: Committee will recess until 1:30.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. We have begun to consider Motion Number 24. The Motion has already been read from the Chair. Mr. Lengerke, would you like to ..

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, did you say it was read from the Chair already?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes. I will speak to it, Mr. Chairman.

I'm almost of the opinion that I should call a question on it. I've distributed some background material on it. As you recall, we've discussed this particular subject on a few occasions in this House and I was asked to try and provide Members with the mechanics of how I would like to see this thing come forth and be developed. I've provided you with a copy of what I call a Commissioner's Order. It may not be in exactly the right format, so you may have some objections to that, but I think what I'm trying to do is to give you an idea of the objectives of the Committee, the purposes, duties and who they would have to confer with and the mechanics involved in that.

I have distributed this morning another copy that did have a correction in it. I believe in the first copy that was distributed to you it was calling for a co-chairmanship and a sub-committee of a sub-committee or something. It was rather confusing. So, that's been cleaned up.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to speak on that for a minute now. I'm convinced that the action in this Motion is one of the most important items that we'll have to consider this Session. I think I said that about Motion 17 of December the 10th. I said that it held the key to our future and I'm firm in that opinion and I really appeal to you once again to try and understand what I'm requesting.

During the days of questioning proposed pipelines and further mining developments, and the increased tourist industry and transportation expansion, asking about the logic of completing the Dempster Highway, questioning energy requirements and looking at the advantages or disadvantages of provincial status and so on, but above all in trying to figure out what the Land Claims Settlement will bring, and what we're going to do about it, what we're going to do during the interim period, and also how are we going to communicate and work realistically and effectively with the native people of Yukon?

Mr. Chairman, these are questions that we all want answers to. Questions that require action to obtain these answers. And answers not from the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, answers not from the Territorial Government, answers not from Indian Affairs, not from consultants, but from the people of Yukon. All the people of Yukon.

What I propose is not new, it's not a, it's a form of action that I think was very successful in a part of Western Canada. I know a few of the States have adopted it. And I know a lot of the progressive European countries have adopted this kind of method.

The Committee, Mr. Chairman, as I envision, would be through a disciplined cooperation and involvement of citizens, as members of the Committee, as members of the advisory group, or personally as advisors, as consultants, business firms, citizens' associations, labour organizations, native groups, womens groups, government agencies, all the rest of it, they'll create more than a mere development plan, Mr. Chairman. They will provide a substantial direction and a concensus among all citizens and leaders of the Yukon on the direction on which Yukon must move and which it wants to move to achieve the level of social and economic well-being that all Yukoners admire.

Mr. Chairman, I'm really deeply concerned about certain things that I see happening. I see the Y.T.G. economic research and planning unit being created. I

know that C.Y.I. have put together an economic planning unit, funded by the Federal Government. I see a continuing build-up of Federal Government Indian Affairs planners and researchers not only in Yukon, but in Ottawa as well, and all these people are concerned with planning Yukon's future.

I say to you, Honourable Members and Mr. Chairman, that's planning in isolation. They are all planning in different directions. And I'd really like to say that it's about time that we got smart and utilized the expertise by giving them some direction and telling them what we as people want for Yukon. I think we should be obligated in attempting to let our people in on the process. So in fact, we do have some commitment now and for the future so we can handle those questions that I mentioned earlier in a meaningful way. I also suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have an opportunity, at this point, better than any motion, speech or anything else, that allows us to communicate, to communicate with the native people.

The best way that I know how to communicate and understand them is to work together for a common goal. I think we've got that opportunity now. As I said before, and I think as I circulated, I said the Committee that I propose could well be co-chaired and that's something that this House would have to decide. The choice could be made of the President of the Yukon Research and Development Institute or their choice from their membership. That could be a possibility for a chairman.

I say that because they were the groups that were involved in first initiating and being responsible for the Carr Report to be completed. So, they have an interest in here. I can see that if we go to a co-chairmanship idea, a guy like Elijah Smith's calibre as a co-chairman. Or maybe we should go for a third party person and this might be the best way and just coming to mind would be a fellow like the former magistrate, Dennis O'Connor, somebody of that calibre.

I'm trying to give you an idea of what this might suggest. I suggest that we, Yukon Territorial Government, together with C.Y.I., and I'm saying C.Y.I. here because I think it's very important when I see them planning their own economic future in isolation. I say that we should ask the Federal Government to totally fund such a project.

Now, I know that initial talks have already taken place in that respect and I know that there's been some positive reaction. I suggest that the request though should be done in person, not by a letter. I think we should, if we like the idea, we should suggest that we send a Member or two or whatever, a delegation, to actually get this thing underway.

I think we've got a lot of people in Yukon who want to see a lot of smokestacks and more industrialization. We've got a lot of others who don't want to see anything happen. They want it to remain as it is and we've got the middle of the road people that know full well that development's going to take place if we're going to maintain the kind of quality of life that we've got now.

But I say that we can realistically control the development. We can identify the opportunities that we wish to proceed with. I can say that we set in motion the action to fulfill these opportunities.

I don't know, I really want to emphasize that what I suggest is not complicated. And I've said this before, it's not another consultant's report. The updating of the

Carr Report is relatively simple. Answers to some of those questions are also easily obtained, or the other questions that we've asked are easily obtained.

Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

But I think, again, we must determine of those answers really provide Yukoners with what they want. And that's the only way you can find out is by asking and by consulting.

I further suggest to you that if we sincerely address ourselves to this project, that we can climb out of a hole of all this small time bickering that seems to be going on, arguing with the Feds, with ourselves, and tackle a positive job and before you know it, we'll have accomplished some of the things that we speak of today. And I wouldn't be up here saying this, if I thought it was Cinderella talk. In the simplest terms, I say to you that we get off our butts and get something done. If you choose the method that I suggest to you today, I think the problems confronting us can be solved.

I mentioned before the updating of the Carr Report could be done in the same step as when we get the answers to the question of provincial status and we can further identify, I think, one of the problems that is before us, the pipeline situation. The energy, you can tackle the Yukon energy question very effectively, as we would have a consensus from the people of Yukon to which direction we must address ourselves.

You know, we are going to find out the types of development we want. We can identify the types of industry, identify the growth centres of the Yukon. So, we really know what the regional needs are and where we do need these types of development.

I think we can use this citizen exercise of planning by, if you like, confrontation to get the answers we require to the — I think somebody was mentioning the Alcan — the White Paper today, to the Alaska Highway proposed pipeline.

You know, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has an obligation to the Indian people of the Yukon to get the answers. I think we've got an obligation to all citizens of the Yukon to get the answers and set out the conditions by which a pipeline might proceed. We also must be prepared to make a submission to the National Energy Board. I believe they're holding hearings in March '77 and I say we can use the same forum, the same level of questioning, the same methods, to extract those views and ideas of our citizens about a number of questions at the same time.

I've really put it to you that if we don't ask some basic questions first and get some basic answers or get some basic commitment towards Yukon's development, that questions pertaining to just the pipeline and just to the energy question would be in vain.

I don't want to duplicate the effort and I don't want to spend a lot of money, but really I think we can put some answers together to just say and to put forth how we really see Yukon in the 1980's and what the opportunities and the challenges are going to be.

I think the committee that I envision will primarily be concerned with visualizing the kind of Yukon that is possible by the 1980's, and they'll just really suggest and identify policies that must be formulated or committed today if those goals are to be achieved.

I say above all, we can do this thing together and for the first time involve one heck of a lot of Yukoners in a common project that I believe will really bring about

the much-needed communication at all levels, the restored pride in Yukon, and a true sense of direction for where Yukon is going.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Lengerke. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly commend the Honourable Member for his interest in this question. However, I don't think that I can agree with the Motion for, basically, two reasons. One is the broad mandate that is suggested in the Motion at this time; the second is the cost. What I see here is a very, very, very large cost to somebody in the Territory and perhaps to the Government of the Territory; more particularly at a time when we don't have these kind of funds. We're supposed to be talking, at least to some extent, restraint.

Now, it occurs to me that — the figure incidentally that Mr. Carr wanted to update in his report is reported to me as being \$400,000.00. I think that report, which I have a copy of here, cost us initially \$250,000.00. In considering this question of getting the basic information required so that people could indeed, the people of the Territory could indeed, view the whole subject of provincehood, its economic consequences, its social consequences and so forth.

I felt very strongly and I still feel strongly that this should be done either at the local level by a very competent group of people to undertake the study and it also occurred to me that if we wanted someone from the outside, rather than Mr. Carr, to update some, at least, of the topics outlined in the Carr report, as I suggested in my Throne Speech reply, perhaps the Canada West Foundation would be the people to approach. And I do this because of the aims and objectives of that Foundation and, first of all, I think I pointed out that the Canada West Foundation is an independent, non-political and non-profit organization and it was incorporated under the laws of Canada. Its purposes in Western Canada — it has two main objects. One is to initiate and to conduct research programmes regarding the economic and social characteristics on potentialities of Western Canada. And it is here, I think, that perhaps they would regionalize to some extent to do a study in Yukon. Its second, of course, main object is to initiate and conduct informational and educational programmes to encourage an appreciation of the Western Canada heritage and to stimulate an awareness of its future throughout Western Canada.

So here's the two things we're looking for. We're looking for research and we're also looking for a way to let the people know what this research amounts to. The suggestion is made in this proposal that, you know, that we undertake a very unwieldy committee of 12 to 16 members is, you know, it's a good suggestion but I can't see it working. And the terms and conditions that have been laid down in this paper are just too broad. There's no control in anything; there's no — I haven't heard a mention about even funding this thing. Where's the money going to come from?

As I say, if you deal with people like Canada West, this money is funded by industry, for instance, Canada West has just now completed and is about to release a very important study and the results of that study on non-renewable resources. That is mines, oils, natural gas,

and it's a thorough study and it's an updated study and we should have the benefit of that. This is made public; we'll have the benefit of that study and it won't cost us a red cent. It is this type of thing we should be looking at. Something which is updated, something that our purse can handle.

And when we talk about the Carr Report, certainly we're not going to update every individual section of the report; I think only those sections which are pertinent to the questions we might be asking about the provincehood should be updated. But let's for a moment, Mr. Chairman, look at some of the sections we're talking about. The Yukon in a national and regional perspective. Who better than the Canada West Foundation could provide us with this information because, on an ongoing basis, they're doing this on a day-to-day, almost, basis.

Chapter 2, the Northwestern Economic Region in the Yukon. That's what these people are all about on an updated and upgraded basis.

Number 3, the New Philosophy of Northern Development. Then we get into the areas of the physical resource environment. The minerals industry. Now we have a Chamber of Mines, we have the studies, again, by Canada West and that expertise to draw back on. I would think that even in our Yukon Chamber of Mines, in updating information as to potentials, reserves, this type of information would be available to us. The forest industries. We have statistics, we have people and planning people in forestry in Yukon. The electrical power industry. I'm sure we have a great number of studies on this. The agricultural potential of the Yukon, I think as recent as last year, was updated. And certainly perhaps additional information is available now.

Hunting, trapping and fishing in the Yukon. I'm quite sure that our Game Department have just, are still in the ongoing process game inventories. This type of information is available. The tourist industry. Certainly, the Yukon Visitors Association and our own Tourism Advisory Board have done much in this field and, indeed, I believe one of their resolutions was raised in the Question Period this morning.

These are ongoing, updating programmes.

The service industries and processing and manufacturing; this perhaps — you know, we'd have to find some expertise in this field and I just don't know exactly where we go for that; whether we go to the Chamber of Commerce or just where we go. But I'm sure that somewhere in the Yukon we could get assistance on this programme.

Summary of Yukon growth potential, output, capital, manpower, populations, basic developmental services and power and transportation, supply of capital and manpower, the economic environment for growth and the potential viability of the economy — that's the Carr Report that you're asking to be updated. Mr. Chairman, I'm convinced that much of that information is available at the Yukon level and I would suggest that with the new department being formed within this Government on research and planning we may find the opportunity to compile this information in such a form as to be presented to this Legislature and the people of the Yukon so that nothing is held back.

With the help of all these agencies, in particular the Canada West Foundation, hopefully at little or no cost to the taxpayer of the Yukon Territory the information is

there. All we've got to do is put it together. I don't think, in my own mind, though as I say I commend the Honourable Member for his concern and suggestions on this matter, I don't think that this is the approach.

I think the approach or an approach similar to the one I suggest which costs a minimal amount of money to compile the maximum amount of information at this time. Probably using the format of the Carr Report would be great, but I'm saying to you that we ought not to embark on something — I would suggest to you that to undertake this would cost somewhere in the area of a half a million dollars and I just really don't know where the Honourable Member would think we'd get half a million dollars; let alone fifty thousand dollars, unless there is funds budgeted in the up and forthcoming budget in the research and planning group for this coming year. I don't know.

So, it is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I couldn't support the Motion, because of the funding, because of the mandate and because of those things I've just said.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to congratulate the Member from Riverdale on the work that he has done on it and I'd also like to say that the Honourable Member from Watson Lake has real worries there. But my comment on this proposed paper is in a different nature and the financing, I don't think we have any problems whatsoever because we can sell memberships, because all that this Paper proposes, in my point of view, is a new political movement, an unidentified political movement, because I think if we are going to politically develop as this Paper proposes we already have the routes set out in our democracy in Canada.

We have the political system. We have political parties. Most of the questions asked in this Paper are answered by political movements, by political parties. The notes are made on the face of the Papers and approved and ordered by the Commissioner of the Yukon and leader of "What's his name" party, because this is exactly what it's going to amount to.

This is my biggest concern: because of the broadness of this proposal, we are creating a non-political monster responsible to anybody.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I really think the Honourable Member could have saved himself all this great effort, which I know must have been put into the production of this thought-provoking proposition, because the Committee for Yukon's Future, which he outlines here which has twelve to sixteen members, a cross-section of the Territorial people, and all its aims and objects is exactly the forum we are in now, Mr. Chairman.

What he is doing here is outlining what the Government of the Yukon is attempting to do with the twelve people here to do it. I cannot see how there could be any requirement for another group to be standing in a parallel situation doing the same things, out of the same taxpayer's pocket, side by side with this Government. I noticed, Mr. Chairman, on page six, even the officers of the various departments and agencies of the Govern-

ment will provide technical, advisory, research, administrative and liaison services to this committee.

So, how are they going to be doing the work they're supposed to be doing also? Mr. Chairman, we don't have to go as far as Canada West to find somebody to update the Carr Report. We have an offer from the Yukon Research and Development Institute to be the central body to organize such an update if there is co-operation and finding in collaboration with the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce. I would be very interested to know, Mr. Chairman, why the Honourable Member thinks it's necessary to set up another government body, sponsored by the government, with government people working on it, to do what this government is doing.

The Honourable Member's Motion Number 17, which called for strategy in guidelines to clearly provide for Yukon's independent economic and social status was approved because that's a motherhood issue with every Member in this House. We're all here to do those things. And in an effort to carry this forward, this government has already established a research and planning division which will eventually be part of an economic development department in this government. We're working toward all these things now.

I would also be very interested, Mr. Chairman, in knowing whether one of the basic commitments of this Committee for Yukon's future, outlined here, is that we must not argue with the Feds, as the Honourable Member has pointed out. I would also be interested in knowing, Mr. Chairman, who has been discussing the possibility of financing such a committee, with whom?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you. First off, it's been the Yukon Development Institute that's been talking to the Minister. I personally have talked to the Minister about it and, as you mentioned, that's the route I would like to go if it's at all possible to have the Institute be the chairmanship of this particular group. I'm not trying to set up another government, believe me. I think you've lost the whole point. I don't want government to plan for the people. You presented me with some goals and objectives on that before. That's the government that has put those forward, not this Assembly. It's been the professional planners that have put that forward.

I can respond to the Minister, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake. I happen to know the Canada West Foundation too. I paid a \$10.00 membership in it once. I happen to know Senator Buchwold and Dr. Spinks and Herb Pinder, as well, and they're all good people and they do have a very fine reputation and the Canada West Foundation has done a lot of good work. And I wholeheartedly agree that if you wanted to get them to do this, to be the sponsoring body for an exercise like this, I concur wholeheartedly. Wholeheartedly, Mr. Chairman. I think it is an excellent idea. It's going to cost money to go through that way, too.

You asked about funding. You mentioned, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake himself mentioned, funding — \$400,000.00 to update the Carr Report. I didn't make any mention that I wanted Dr. Carr to do that. I didn't say that whatsoever. I say there's — just like you, that there is much information available to us today. I'm saying, once utilized, the planning groups that we have already got in place, that our government pays

and government sponsors and let's just put some of their energies in one direction.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to waste the time of any — this is my third attempt and obviously I'm way out in left field and obviously it's not a great subject to be talking about. And I think we've got more important things to do and I would just concur with that. I really enjoyed doing the exercise and I don't think I was so far out.

Thanks.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate the Honourable Member feels the way he does, that he doesn't want to take any more time. I think we're having an excellent discussion and I think it is a very important topic that we all have. I don't agree with many of the things that he is saying, but the things that he is talking about are our future and we should take time to discuss them.

I do not agree with the Honourable Member when he states that government must not plan for people. And I agree with the Minister of Health that it is government's responsibility to plan for the future of the people that they represent. And I also agree when she indicates that the structure that is almost, that is being proposed in here, and there is a great deal of thought put on to it by the Honourable Member, I'm sure, it's almost paralleling what this Assembly and the Government of the Yukon is supposed to be doing. I often wonder why we bother having elections and electing people to represent them in an Assembly. I really wonder when we have so many boards and committees who are supposed to be making the decisions for us. But I can understand why the Honourable Member has looked for an alternate route, because I don't think in the Yukon Territory the normal process that occurs in other jurisdictions is occurring here. Now we are told that they have an economic planning department with Indian Affairs; they likely have; all you have to do is look in that handbook we've got and they've got committees galore to plan for us. One of them takes two full pages of names.

I read them last night and I was absolutely appalled and they were just the ones that are related to the Yukon directly. Now, we have an economic planning for research and development, whatever it is that's being established here in our Government. I wonder how much of the information and the proposals and the planning that is supposed to be done by people that are hired on our tax dollars will get through the Executive Committee to this House.

I think this is where your frustration comes and this is where the frustration of many of us come today. The planning is done in Ottawa. It's relayed to the Government. Now, we're setting up our structure. We're calling it Research and Planning Y.T.G., and the people who should be making the final decisions on some of the proposals that are being presented there are not being given the opportunity to make the final decisions.

If we went the route that the Honourable Member is proposing, and I can see why he proposed it as an alternate route, it would mix it up just a little bit further and we'd never get this thing cleaned up. I don't think that it's going to be a matter of study, or of research, or of economics when the Territory eventually assumes re-

sponsible government.

It's going to be a downright political decision. I think we can save ourselves the dollars on that. But I'm getting more reluctant all the time to place the functions that I'm here for into the hands of boards and committees; and the Honourable Member from Klondike was correct, it's a beautiful thing for a political party. You could use that, and it was well done.

It could be used as a framework to fill in the blanks if people really cared from the grass roots to establish Yukon parties and maybe it's time we did, but I don't think we should hire consultants from on high, or have special interest groups and look at it establishing our party. It should be the people at Dawson, the people in Whitehorse, the people at Haines Junction, the people in Beaver Creek who should be writing the terms of reference and who should be filling in. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just to clear up a point that has arisen out of this debate, I noted two interesting comments made in a letter to Privy Councilor Allmand from the Yukon Research and Development Institute. The first is they suggest that the consultants should arrive at conclusions, but not recommendations. This is on the update of the Carr Report. But here's the important part:

"To further avoid bias, it is recommended that the expenses be cost-shared by the Government of Canada and the Government of the Yukon Territory. If required, the Yukon Research and Development Institute would be willing to accept the necessary funds made available by the appropriate governments and establish a coordinating system for the project in terms of both content and monetary aspects".

You know, this is where the two kind of differ in a way because in the suggestion made by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, he's asking that recommendations come out of this Committee, and here the Yukon Research and Development Institute recognize that we don't want recommendations, we want conclusions. I think that the final decisions, I would agree with the Honourable Member from Kluane, would probably arrive in conjunction of this House and the Government, but I don't think at any time that we should involve the Government of Canada in this thing.

I don't think we should ever again go down if we can avoid it with hat in hand asking the Government of Canada to help fund any studies because when we do that, it seems that all these studies get buried somewhere and we — or they get edited by the Federal Government. You know, and the Federal Government has two sets of figures. One they use when it's to their advantage and the other they use when it's — when things are going to little rough, sort of thing.

So, I just wanted to bring that point up. The Yukon Research and Development Institute bring up one good point that they don't want recommendations from the Committee, they just want the facts as they've been able to ascertain them, gather the material for us to consider.

Secondly is that if we accept the Yukon Research and Development Institute proposal, it's going to cost us back in the area of \$400,000.00 and this figure I got

quoted to me by the President of the Yukon Research and Development Institute.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate on Motion 24?
Question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: It was moved by Mr. Lengerke that an independent committee be appointed under the provisions of the Yukon Act and Public Inquiries Ordinance, in accordance with the wishes of this Assembly as expressed by their approval of Motion Number 17 on December 10, 1975, and that the committee be known as the "Committee for Yukon's Economic and Social Future in its responsibility of defining a pattern of strategy for Yukon's resource, economic and social development, and by virtue of its terms of reference bring up to date the Carr Report, examine the question of provincial status in terms of economic and social factors and provide direction with respect to the required and essential participation of Yukon's native people.

All those in favour.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary.
The Motion is defeated.

(Motion defeated)

Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question from any of the Members from the Government? Is it the plan of the Government, or is this secretive also, that the Carr Report be updated?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge that really has never been discussed in the Executive Committee. I think, as all Members know, we're going to be going through a restructuring of government with the leaving of the Assistant Commissioner Administrative and once we get or start getting organized within the government itself that any proposal such as that magnitude will definitely come before this House.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Perhaps I should explain that my reference to the offer from the Yukon Research and Development Institute was contained in a proposal from that group to coordinate an updating of the Carr Report. To my knowledge there has never been any action taken on that proposal.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if a Member of the government could let me know if anybody in government has ever used the Carr Report. I've seen lots of copies around the building and they're all in mint condition.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I attempted to use the Carr Report some years ago, but lost faith in it as a source of information when I was reading the chapter on Tourism and Transportation and they neglected to include passengers on railroad trains.

Mr. Chairman: We'll return now to consideration of the amendments to the Liquor Ordinance.

It was moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mrs. Watson, that Bill Number 5, entitled An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance be amended as follows:

"(1) Except as otherwise expressly provided by this Ordinance or the Regulations, no person shall consume liquor in any public place.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), a person may, unless prohibited by the owner of the place in the manner prescribed or by the Regulations, consume liquor in

(i) a residence,

(ii) a public beach, public park, public campground, public picnic ground,

(iii) an off-highway area which is reasonably remote from any inhabited settlement and which is used for picnicking, sports fishing, hunting or other outdoor recreational activities,

(iv) any other place which may be prescribed.

(3) Proof of possession of a bottle or a can containing liquor which has been opened is *prima facie* evidence of consumption by the person found in possession of liquor in such public place.

(5) Where one of two or more persons with the knowledge and consent of the rest has liquor in his custody or possession, the liquor shall be deemed to be in possession of each and all of them."

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Which version is this Mr. Chairman? Is this the original amendment proposed?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, this is the latest. As you will recall, just before lunch hour, the suggestion was made that, in discussion with the Legal Advisor, that a little bit of the legalese be cleaned up and I think that has been done in 1, 2 and 3. Just to make it a little bit more clear. That's the only thing.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: ... introduce these changes? We're just being presented with a completely rewritten proposal.

Mr. Lengerke: I suggested to Mr. Chairman if he wanted it as another amendment to the amendment we could certainly do that. You know, I'd like to do it the way it's to be done, Mr. Chairman, or whatever you wish.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I find this rather confusing. I don't know about the other Members in the House. I can understand the problems that the Members are having attempting to define a public place,

attempting to leave as much latitude and freedom that can possibly be left for the majority, as the Member from Watson Lake so ardently states, the majority of Yukoners can partake of the freedoms that they presently have. It's my opinion, in view of the confusion that's going on, I would like to hear what the Members that are proposing this amendment would have to say if the government were prepared to look at this particular section of the Liquor Ordinance, over the next two months, because in the next months this problem is not within the Yukon, and possibly come in with an amendment with — because we do have the ability to do all the necessary research if you want to go in this line. I heard the suggestion earlier put forth this morning, that possibly we should be looking at the concept of deterring people from drinking on public streets and putting that in legislation rather than going this way. I think that these areas should be examined and I don't think that they've been properly examined. I would suggest that if the House were to give direction to this government, we would be prepared to look through the next two months at this particular section to bring in a section to be considered by this House.

I don't think you've had the opportunity to research it like you would like or otherwise. Looking at it another way, I'm sure the government would be prepared to give you the Legal Advisor and the administrative staff to help you out on your amendment, because as far as I'm concerned, I cannot vote for this amendment the way it stands now because I believe that it's too vague and too nebulous.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education has said that this section is attempting to define what a public place is but I must point out to him that the definition of a public place is in the original Ordinance itself and there's no attempt being made to change the definition of a public place. As for residence, it's also in the definition section of the present Ordinance and we're not trying to change that.

The contents of what we're trying to do are in the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes Mr. Chairman, I find this very strange on the part of the government when the last Ordinance — the Ordinance that was brought in here for us to read and hopefully we would pass almost says the same thing, and now all of a sudden the Member of Education doesn't seem to like the wording of this one and it is so close that I don't think he could figure out any difference if he looked at them, other than it is just slightly turned around.

So I see no problem — the Honourable Member from Mayo has answered my other question. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education really walked into that one and said why don't you leave it for the government to take it back and to research and review it properly and we've been asking for you to do that all along, and we never seem to get

your agreement and then all of a sudden now you feel that you can research it better and you've had all the opportunity before the Bill was brought in. I think we've really come to the point where we're going to have to make a decision.

It wouldn't be fair to use more tax dollars to take it back again, bring it back and open the whole thing up and argue again, around and around, next time around. I think a decision should be made. If it's defeated, well then it's defeated. If it isn't, fine. There are people of very strong views here and if the majority don't want it, well that's just fine. I think we're going to have to make up our mind sooner or later.

The thing that disturbs me though is are we in a procedural wrangle again? Are we clean procedurally?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Confused perhaps, but clean. Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, now that the Legal Advisor is here, is there a typographical error in what we have? Shouldn't that say — where is my new copy? I've got so many copies of this amendment here. That the last two paragraphs should be numbered three and four?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes, they should be numbered three and four. They were left out on the retyping.

Mr. Chairman: A typographical error. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I'm not going to say too much more, Mr. Chairman. The confusion — certainly I'm not confused about it and I think all we were trying to do — before lunch we heard a comment by the Legal Advisor and this whole House was part of that and I thought, well my gosh, if we can accommodate that kind of consideration, why not?

We haven't brought about another brand new amendment or anything else. It's just been cleaned up a little, and I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Education can see that. I will just leave it at that. I think it's time that we voted, Mr. Chairman, whatever it may be. We've had a very, very good discussion on it and if it's defeated, fine.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think I've more or less outlined my feelings on behalf of my constituents and many more in some areas elsewhere around the Territory on this subject. They simply ask that they have an opportunity to have some input into this question. A lot of them point out that indeed it's a pity that this Legislature would even consider such a — taking away these privileges from a majority of people of the Yukon because we're simply not enforcing the laws which now exist *vis-a-vis* litter, and I think I've pointed out to you earlier in debate, Mr. Chairman, and to the Members of Committee that nowhere has anybody ever enforced this particular by-law, this broken bottle bit, to our knowledge.

I think we owe it, as competent legislators, to give the people of the Yukon an opportunity to consider this question and more particularly to give the Government

of the Yukon Territory, as stated by the Honourable Minister of Education, an opportunity to seek that opinion and to give, most of all, each Member an opportunity to seek opinion from their constituents.

Now I am very shocked indeed to hear that in one or two electoral districts, that is the electoral district of Kluane, that a majority of those people are for the legislation that's being suggested here. I'm shocked to hear that because I haven't heard that from any that I've met. I'm shocked to hear that the residents of the Riverdale constituency feel so strongly on this that a majority of them want this legislation. I'm very shocked to hear that.

I'm very, very interested in knowing how these people were polled to determine this because I certainly haven't had an opportunity to get down and talk to all my people because I've been sitting in this Legislature with the fellow Members of the House.

I really say and I plead with Members of Committee to listen to the suggestion that the Honourable Minister of Education has made. On behalf of the people of the Yukon, give the government and give ourselves an opportunity to find out how they feel about this without ramming it down the throats of the people of the Yukon, which you would do by buying this amendment and we owe it to the people who elected us and sent us here not to do that to them.

They send us here to make good laws and to look after their affairs, not in this manner. Could I know how the Members determined that a majority of their constituents, Mr. Chairman, were in favour of this amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd be only too glad to answer that. I think I brought up the question of liquor back almost two years ago and if the Honourable Member didn't realize it was a problem then, and have lots of time to see his constituents, and the only thing that did give me a problem was the new Ordinance coming from the Government, because I received the Ordinance, of course, a month or so ahead of time which they agreed to do for us and which I really appreciate.

However, when I do receive it, it is marked confidential, but still I read it and I knew what was in it and I went to my constituents and I held meetings and I've seen every group that was in that constituency and found out all I could about what they wanted. When the Ordinance was brought before me here and was tabled in this House and was no longer confidential, I made it a point that night to go to my constituents.

I know that some people in the Assembly or some of the Members could not possibly get out like I did because I only have a hundred miles. Some of them have three or four hundred. However, in the time that's gone by, I would say that we have had some time to do possibly more work than the Honourable Member has himself. I'm just going to say again that there is no question as to whether I see my constituents or not.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of this Motion and all I say is finally, finally after all this

hassle we're coming out with something that is actually taking some action on the drinking problems in the Yukon. All the phone calls I've received have been in full support of doing something about public drinking. They've been discouraged with the fact that that section was thrown out and that we had to go through some procedural hassle to bring it back in.

They're disgusted that we aren't approaching the real problems in the Yukon and doing something about it. The native people have approached me from the native groups and have said what's going on? Why aren't there things in that Ordinance that really pinpoint what's going on in the Territory and do something about it.

People who work with alcoholics have asked me to try and push through something that would at least take some real cognizance of the problems in the Yukon with drinking and this motion finally does it. I really regret that we've spent so much time hassling this thing and not really addressing ourselves to one of the biggest problems in the Yukon. I'm just sorry there aren't more amendments so that we could really do some things with it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Legal Advisor is with us. I still have a doubt on the residency that I mentioned before lunch. When is a residence not a residence? I am specifically referring to mobile homes. I looked it up in the old Liquor Ordinance and it says a camper unit, trailer or tent that is actually and *bona fide* occupied.

Now, a mobile home is occupied when it's on the highway. Is it still considered a residency then?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, is that question directed at me?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Legal Advisor.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Klondike — Dawson is raising something which ruined my lunch, because Mr. Chairman we researched the matter and we found that so far as we know, there are five mobile homes in the Territory and we were torn as to whether to put in a subsection for those five people which would read something like this: "that no driver of a mobile home may consume liquor while driving", because when it's in a campground or somewhere else, he's a person like everybody else and he's entitled to drink with these privileges, we feel that with these expensive homes, it's unnecessary to have a special section for these five people. We think that it can be treated as a vehicle when it's actually driving on the highway and when it's parked off the highway, then it's no longer being driven and can be a home.

Now, admittedly, there'd be arguments if any of these five people are actually charged while they're driving along off the highway, but we did consider it and it ruined my lunch and we think that the section is safe as it is, rather than put in a special section for mobile homes.

I plead with the Member to leave it alone.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to apologise to Mr. Legal Advisor for spoiling his lunch, but I think he's wrong if he says there are five mobile home units in the Territory. Yes, maybe, on a year-round basis, but in the summertime, and I'm specifically thinking of tourists coming into the Territory, and I've seen it myself and I'm sure other Members have seen them too, where there is one driver in the front and some other people sitting in the back having maybe a beer or maybe a glass of wine or so. They are breaking the law. Are we going to do something about them or what? Are we going to have special legislation for them?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman ...

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Legal Advisor?

Mr. Legal Advisor: As we see, the passengers in a mobile home will be treated the same as passengers in a vehicle. When the thing is moving they may not drink as long as the vehicle or the mobile home is driving along a place which is a prohibited area because a vehicle is part of a public place and you are not allowed to drink in a vehicle which is in a public place unless you meet the conditions which are here. We think it's adequately covered. Although we do admit that there is room for argument. But we're not sure how to cover it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, Mr. Chairman, we also have the situation where you have a camper designed where you can gain access to the camper via the cab of the vehicle. I've seen many of them; there are a lot of them around and that's — they call them campers, not mobile homes, but it is the same thing. I also think there's a situation where it's possible for a ball team to go from here to Fort Nelson or from here to Cassiar or Cassiar to come into the Yukon and this type of thing and down to Dawson and so forth for sport events. But I take it, under this, that it's not going to be any longer possible for these boys to have a beer as they're going to and from their sports events. Is that correct, and if they do they are consuming in a public highway and of course we'll throw our athletes in jail with the rest of the people you want put in jail, is this correct?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Legal Advisor?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, we're hopefully not going to repeat this situation we had on Monday morning in 1970, with an athlete, which the Member refers to. As this Section states, except in accordance with the Ordinance, no person shall consume liquor in a public place, and a street or highway is a public place unless it happens to be part of a public beach or an off-highway area, but then it wouldn't be a highway. A person is not allowed to drink in a vehicle in a public place.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: So that's it.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate?
Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, before question is called on this, I just want to reiterate once again I don't think that this Section is well enough written. I think it's just too broad and too nebulous and as far as I'm concerned I believe that the problem of public drinking should be addressed but I don't think it's being addressed properly in here and I cannot support the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: I hope the movers of the Motion will permit me to correct a typographical error. Moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Mrs. Watson, that Bill Number 5, entitled "An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance", be amended as follows by adding the following new section thereto:

"(1) Except as otherwise expressly provided by this Ordinance or the Regulations, no person shall consume liquor in any public place.

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection 1, a person may, unless prohibited by the owners of the place, in the manner prescribed or by the Regulations, consume liquor in:

- i) a residence;
- ii) a public beach, public park, public campground, public picnic ground;
- iii) an off-highway area which is reasonably remote from any inhabited settlement and which is used for picnicking, sport fishing, hunting, or other outdoor recreational activity;
- iv) any other place which may be prescribed.

"(3) Proof of possession in a public place of a bottle or can containing liquor which has been opened is *prima facie* evidence of consumption by the person found in possession of liquor in such public place.

"(4) Where one of two or more persons, with the knowledge and consent of the rest, has liquor in his custody or possession, the liquor shall be deemed to be in possession of each and all of them."

All those in favour of the amendment? Contrary? The Motion is carried.

(Motion carried)

Mr. Chairman: I'll declare a brief recess.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I call this Committee to order. Is there further amendment to Bill Number 5? Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: May I just ask a general question, Mr. Chairman, to all the Members of this House and especially to the Members that came up with the amendments to Bill Number 5? Now that we have the drinking in streets and public places prohibited, what will happen to the offenders?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I was a little worried as to when this Ordinance would come into effect. In the case of coming into effect just overnight, we would have a problem in

the Yukon because people wouldn't know what the law is. I think it says that this Ordinance or any portion thereof shall come into force upon a day or days as pertaining by the Commissioner and so this would give the people time to get acquainted with it. It's okay.

Mr. Chairman: Do we have anyone to answer Mr. Berger's question?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that if you break the law you will be charged with breaking the law and I would see that, after a period of public education regarding the new regulations affecting drinking in public, that the law will be enforced. I would think that it would take the form of simple charge of drinking in public. It would not necessarily mean that you would be put in jail and I think the main problem the Honourable Member raised earlier in our discussions was what to do with people who were drunk in public. And that's an entirely different subject, Mr. Chairman. In this case, we're charging people who are breaking the law regarding drinking in public.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to start another debate on this, because I disagree with the Honourable Minister completely because in most cases the drunk that drinks in a public place — and this is a question I raised all through this debate. I voted for this particular section for one particular reason. I would like to get on record to say that too, that all we're trying to attempt with this particular section of the amendment is just to cover things up. That's all. We're not admitting the truth.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question that the Honourable Member asked a short moment or so ago, I would hope that the Commissioner does not bring into force this section until following the Spring Session of the Legislature in the best interests of the people of the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: The Motion has already been voted on, so we will desist in any further debate on it.

Are there any further amendments to Bill Number 5? Shall the title carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Shall I report the Bill as further amended?

Some Members: Agreed.

Motion Number 37

Mr. Chairman: Motion Number 37 regarding the White Paper on the Alcan Pipeline Route: is it the wish of Committee that I should read this White Paper?

Son
Mr.
Limit
throug
dered
and t
being
North
for th
The
be ho
White
const
way is
ple of
ment
disadv
makir
reflec
The
velop
ing th
and of
additi
Lands
condit
to be
held b
to ens
tal int
It ha
White
the vi
the Al
struct
Acc
focusi
condu
carrie
condu
Mr.
Mr.
conce
parag
facing
the re
tional
Yukon
My
happe
the C.
south
north
my fe
with t
Tha
Lake,
the pi
comm
could
electr
tion.
The
and I

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: The Foothills' Pipe Line Yukon Limited's proposal to construct a national gas pipeline through the southern Yukon is currently being considered by the United States Federal Power Commission and the Canadian National Energy Board. It is also being considered by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with respect to the right-of-way for the line.

The National Energy Board has indicated that it will be holding hearings regarding the Yukon route in Whitehorse during March, 1977. Since the proposal to construct a natural gas pipeline along the Alaska Highway is one of the most important issues facing the people of the Yukon today, the Yukon Territorial Government will have to examine all possible benefits and disadvantages and must accept the responsibility for making a statement to the National Energy Board that reflects the wishes of all Yukoners.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, meanwhile, has responsibilities for protecting the interest of Yukon Indians under the Indian Act and of the Territory as a whole under the Yukon Act. In addition, he has a responsibility under the Territorial Lands Act to determine whether, and if so under what conditions, a right-of-way should be issued for a pipeline to be built through the Yukon. Discussions are being held between the Federal and Territorial Governments to ensure the varied social, economic and environmental interests are identified in a co-ordinated manner.

It has been recognized that hearings taking place in Whitehorse only will not obtain sufficient expression of the views of the communities, particularly those along the Alaska Highway, that may be affected by the construction of the pipeline.

Accordingly, consideration by the two governments is focusing on the means by which this review should be conducted. It is intended that the review process will be carried out in a public forum. Details on how it will be conducted will be announced at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm quite concerned with this White Paper. It states in the second paragraph, "One of the most important issues that is facing the people of the Yukon today and must accept the responsibility for making a statement to the National Energy Board that reflects the wishes of all Yukoners".

My fear is that we're creating another C.P.R. like it happened in the late 1900's in southern Canada where the C.P.R. came up with a strip of developed area in the southern part of Canada and there was nothing in the northern part of Canada, and we're still suffering and my fears are that exactly the same thing will happen with the Alcan Pipeline Route.

That is what came out in some hearings in Watson Lake, I believe, and Teslin. Those communities where the pipeline touches onto, or it goes right through the communities, there's cheaper fuel available which could be utilized for all sorts of things. It would create electricity, heating homes, anything you want to mention.

The communities in the northern part of the Yukon, and I haven't heard any proposal coming forward from

Foothills' Pipe Lines whatsoever on that yet — we're going to be left out in the cold or way out in the left field because the cost of providing natural gas to those communities will be so prohibitive. My understanding is that, when it came out in Watson Lake I believe it was, a twelve mile trunkline would cost in the neighbourhood of a million dollars. Now, if twelve miles costs a million dollars, what does three hundred miles cost to go from the Alaska Highway to Dawson City, for example, or Mayo or other communities in the north?

This is what my idea is, unless we discuss it in this House openly and express our wishes to this extent I don't think we have any right to say that we agree to this pipeline. I'm not only talking about the economic effect, the social aspect effects from the pipeline or anything like this. I don't think anything was said in this House until now; we're just leaving it until the very last minute, discussing a very important aspect of the economy in the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is quite obvious that a pipeline down the Alcan Route certainly can't service Dawson and some of the upper areas without going to some enlargement of our pipeline building projects to dispense gas to those communities, but, you know, I think in the broad context of the thing you've got to take into account when you talk about pipeline...

Perhaps you have a problem with the sound system again, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Is that so? Brief recess.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I call this Committee to order.
Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, you're not talking about one pipeline in this case, you're really looking to the future. If you're looking at pipes coming down through Canada, you're looking at perhaps eight pipelines.

(Equipment problems)

I think it is well-known that the American people who want to get this product to market certainly don't want to commit their total eggs into one basket. I think this is to be recognized. So consequently, there is an alternative route and perhaps the Honourable Member who has asked the question might give consideration and talk to his people in Dawson about supporting a proposal to bring the second gas line down the core of Engineer Survey from Fairbanks to Watson Lake. That is the surveyed route; it's a railway survey.

It's a beautiful way to get the natural gas into the Dawson City area and also into Carmacks, also into Faro, Ross River, and so forth on the way down. I would suggest that as an alternative suggestion, which I think if they build the Alcan Route I'm sure they're looking for an alternate route as well and that would be a suggestion I would offer the Honourable Member.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised with the Honourable Member from Dawson and Pelly River and anybody in that area in respect that they will probably not gain as much by the pipeline as some of the other districts do because of the fact that it is going right straight through the Territory and naturally will come close to some villages and miles from other villages.

I have a little something on the gas being distributed itself to the towns and villages and as the Member has said, in Watson Lake it would be a very expensive operation and I really don't agree that we could look at that as a feasible thing in the Yukon at all, myself, for many years anyhow when you look at the price that it would cost us.

I am neither in favour right at the moment of a pipeline or in disfavour of a pipeline. If it's going to benefit a good part of the country then naturally I'd be for it; if it's not going to hurt the environment or in any way disrupt the communities in the country.

They had a meeting in Teslin. There was 80-some, 85 people plus the representatives of Alcan there, and I think I got many answers from them and of course they are only what they have told me at that meeting.

However, I was quite reassured in my own mind that actually the pipeline will benefit some communities, not only in monies from the rental and from the lease and so forth, but from actual employment on the job after the line is completed.

For instance, in the Teslin area itself, in the Town of Teslin, there will be 22 employees on the pipeline. These were figures that were given distinctly to me at that meeting in front of all those people. They said there would be 22 employees. There would be 190 permanent employees in the Yukon.

They could come from the community if they were qualified. If not, they would naturally be people that they would probably hire outside. But their permanent homes would be built in the town and this was one question I very definitely wanted to know, whether they were going to create their little empire outside of our town or whether they were going to come in and be part of that town, and I was reassured that definitely there would be no such thing. They would definitely be coming into that town.

Now, I can't answer for all the other towns, but I have to agree with the Member from Watson Lake that in an overall picture I think that the Yukon would benefit in many ways and especially in the monetary gain. The figures they gave me, and I'm not going to quote these exact figures, but there was a figure of \$2,000,000.00. Mr. Commissioner could probably correct me if I'm wrong on one or two of these. When I asked the question, they said it was 2.2 million dollars in the rental for the initial right-of-way. Then there would be 3 million dollars a year in tax rental to the Yukon Territory.

Now, these figures were given to me at that meeting. If the pipeline was operated at full capacity, it would be approximately 34 million dollars to the Federal Government in royalties, of which of course he said at that time we would receive ten per cent. I don't know where he got that information. I said well, if we're lucky, maybe so.

But I was quite interested in hearing that and very interested in the fact that they were going to be building right in the town. A lot of people were very concerned as to what was going to happen when the contract was let

and people moved into the Territory and then hunting and tearing around and these problems, and I think they reassured us that there wouldn't be that much of a problem, although I know the boom camps myself and there's always some good and some bad comes out of them.

However, they say that the contract will be let to large contractors, and he quoted one or two that might possibly be in the bidding on these contracts, which would be some of the bigger outfits outside, and that they would be maintaining their own camps. They would not be going into the towns to try and board their men and so forth and so on. They would maintain their own camps complete to the fact they would even have shows and so forth and so on. That reassured us in some manner that it wouldn't hurt us so much.

Of course, the pictures we were shown, I think, were good pictures. They showed the pipeline being in progress. They showed the pipeline after it had been built and being there a couple of years and it was growing back to the same state pretty well, on the Prairie, anywhere that it would at any time or anywhere, but the only place it naturally would take a long time would be in the Yukon Territory.

I made sure that I asked him that question, too, to see if they had checked on the soil up here, because it is so much different than outside where it is porous and will — there can be an awful lot of erosion after you tear it up, put in the line; and they assured me they had been doing a lot of extensive research on this. Of course, that's the only answer I got for that.

They are going to go by the town by one mile and to come to the town with gas they considered at one time it was around 80 thousand dollars or 70-some thousand to come to the outskirts of the town and they felt that the distribution in a small town the size of Teslin — this was over a year ago they said though, and I didn't think they'd have the answer but they did; they said they had done a survey — it would take about 56 thousand but they felt now it would be more like 75 and the other figure to come to the outskirts of the town limits would possibly be a hundred thousand now.

Of course, I had to immediately stand up and tell them but I thought it didn't make any difference because it was too much for us anyway. We wouldn't be looking at these kind of things, and I don't think a little town really would be looking at this. I think that we would be looking at the overall picture and there was many other questions I asked, but I'm not bringing them forward now. I think that, from what I've seen and I hope to see more, it probably will be a good thing for the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that this White Paper is headed "Community Hearings Regarding a Pipeline Route" and it spells out the reasons why these hearings are being organized.

The government is focusing on the means by which these hearings should be held, who should conduct them, who's going to be in charge of the set-up and it will be conducted so that all residents of the Yukon will have an opportunity to present their views and to receive information regarding the proposal. We are gyping the government, Mr. Chairman, in our discussions here be-

cause none of us know whether this pipeline is going to come and when it's going to come or who's to approve it or when.

I would suggest that since I see that the Commissioner is with us, Members might be interested in asking him if there's any further progress in planning these community hearings.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, there hasn't been any further definite information. We are of the firm belief that we can best determine the views of the people who will be most effected by the pipeline by taking community hearings to those areas and receiving information directly from the people.

What we are doing now is discussing actively with the Federal Government, who also have a mandate for the country under the Territorial Lands Act and must grant a right-of-way, if a pipeline were so to be, I'm not certain of the word, but if the National Energy Board were to say go ahead, this is the route and this is the pipeline we choose, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs still must grant a Land Use Permit and can put regulations and stipulations thereunder so they want also to get the views of the people.

We are simply asking, or informing Members that we are actively pursuing this discussion and dialogue with the Federal Government, with the view of carrying out these community hearings in the new year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's most interesting and I hope that comes up. I just rose, I was distracted a little bit earlier, just to answer a little further to the question raised by the Honourable Member from Klondike and that was that he mentioned a CPR type development and it would be my impression that if the pipeline did come down through the Yukon we would be talking about an energy corridor resulting from it so that any future pipes coming that route would, you know, more or less parallel the thing, transmission of power that could well be within that corridor and perhaps railroad, where applicable.

I had some figures which I think the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua mentioned. The figures I have are that, another way that this could benefit Dawson indirectly and all other places in the Territory is — the figures I have is that by 1981, if everything goes with this pipeline, that direct revenues to the Government of the Yukon Territory are estimated at 3.6 million dollars annually and the general, shall we say the revenues going into the general economy throughout the Territory, totally as a result would be something like 25 million dollars a year, for one pipe.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear from the Member opposite bringing forward the thing I was going to say, and that is that the title of the Paper is "Community Hearings". We really are discussing a proposed pipeline, which is something we always forget as well. I think we have to keep reminding ourselves that it's a proposed pipeline.

Over the past couple of years we've heard a lot about a proposed N.C.P.C. dam, which has now become not only — the first question was, is there going to be a dam, now the question seems to be where is it going to go? So the conclusion is that we are going to have one without even — and I'm afraid this is what is going to happen with the pipeline, is that we're forgetting that it's proposed.

But since I'm standing, I'll take the opportunity to discuss my fears of the pipeline. My fear with the Alcan Highway route is that it doesn't do anything about MacKenzie Valley oil and gas, so that we will also be facing a second crossing of the Yukon because, somehow, that MacKenzie Valley oil and gas is going to have to get south and it looks like it may not go through the MacKenzie Valley. The next proposition is down the Dempster Highway and that frightens me. It frightens me very much. Two crossings of the Yukon with all the attendant social problems, economic problems. We really have to take these community hearings very seriously.

My questions on the hearings themselves are, I hope it's not going to be like when the Berger Hearings came and Mr. Smith presented solutions which I certainly didn't agree with, to the Berger Hearing on behalf of the Yukon Territorial Government, presumably on behalf of ourselves. I objected very strongly to that at that time and I would like to see these hearings take a lengthy time, go everywhere in the Yukon. I think this is what the White, well it should be a Green Paper, asking us for direction on the community hearings. I'd like to state where I want them to go, when I want them to go, how they're going to get there and come back, how long are they going to take, and who is going to be on those hearings.

I think those are the kind of things that we should be answering to now and I would really like to see this come back as a Green Paper so that we can have some real input into the community hearings themselves.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Two simple questions, or one simple question to the Commissioner. In your considerations and your discussions with the two governments, Mr. Commissioner, how do you see the hearings being conducted? Who do you envision doing this? Is it going to be under the directorship of a judge or a board of people or what? Could you give me some hints to what you've got in mind?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, we are not fixed in our views as to who should — or how the community hearings should be held other than the fact that they should not be a judicial type hearing which would frighten away and the formal Berger Inquiries, we felt frightened away the average person, and it's the average person to whom we would like to direct these hearings.

So, they would be more like the Berger community hearings where the Honourable Mr. Berger went by himself, without a whole parcel of lawyers, to the communities that would be affected and sat and listened and he listened as long as people wanted to talk and he made notes and he remembered, and that is really what we would like to see done.

Now, whether it's done by one or two or three people

who will sit and will listen is not relevant to us at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Commissioner. That was a concern of mine that it would maybe become another judicial hearing.

Would you envision, and as I say, I realize that I'm asking a question that you're just now considering but if then you're looking at the Berger-type community hearings and if it was not going to be just one person, would you envision that a native person be on that hearing committee as well?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I would be fully in favour of that if there was somebody that wanted to take that responsibility.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I have a question for Mr. Commissioner on the community hearings and I would like to voice my concern too as to whether the communities where the pipeline is not going adjacent to now, are you going to consider community hearings in those communities also because as the Member on my left has said, you know, there is the very good possibility some day of another line being put through the Yukon according to Alcan anyhow and I would be interested to know if all of the people in the Yukon were going to be consulted, rather than just the few that it went through because I think it concerns them all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult question to answer and we could ramble on and agree that everybody should have an equal chance to speak for or against a pipeline, or pipelines in the Yukon. But we're faced with what we see, that we envision very restrictive time limitations. We are now all of a sudden facing the prospect of an imminent pipeline in the Yukon.

The United States Congress, in fact, are deeply involved in the decision as to whether or not there will be a pipeline constructed. Our concern is that if there is a pipeline that is going to be built in the near future down the Alaska Highway, that the Yukon people have a chance to tell the concerns that they have about such a pipeline to the proper agencies so that stipulations and protection can be built in to any permits that are issued.

Now, the broader question of ancillary pipelines is something that may arise in the future. I don't think that permission to build the Alaska Highway route would automatically prejudice the fact that there'd be a line coming down the Dempster Highway. I mean, it's something that would be considered in the future, I'm sure, and we could attend to that at that time. I would suggest that communities outside of the actual route to be affected by the Alaska Highway proposal would have ample opportunity to express their feelings at a hearing

to be held in Whitehorse, at which time we would envision interested groups from throughout the Territory presenting their views.

If I might carry that one step further, Mr. Chairman, I would not like to see lobby groups such as the Yukon Native Brotherhood and the Conservation Society and the Association of Yukon Municipalities and groups that are Territory-wide in their scope travelling up and down the proposed route with the community hearings and giving their same brief at each community hearing, but I would envision them perhaps centering their attention at a more central and more all-encompassing hearing, community hearing, that would be held here in Whitehorse, which is central to all of the communities of the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think there's one fact this House is overlooking and it's stated right here in the second chapter again, that it is the Yukon Territorial Government that will have to make a statement to the National Energy Board. We will also have to present the majority of the people to those hearings eventually or directly to the pipeline company. I realize we're talking far ahead in the future possibly, but if we're not prepared for this time, we're going to be sold out.

I don't care if the Honourable Member from Watson Lake says it's going to bring us 15 million dollars. I don't care if it brings us 50 million dollars, because it's not the monetary value. It's the human value, and I'm also thinking ahead of the future. I've asked many questions in this House, this Session, what will happen to the oil and gas reserves in the Yukon and the answers which came back were so vague. There was no plan in it. There were no answers for it. We are at the mercy of an oil company. We're at the mercy of southern money. This is what I'm concerned about.

The Honourable Member from Ogilvie is right when she says there's a possible chance that the major pipeline route will be the Dempster Highway, because I think we are already sold down the drain, because all the flack is shut up about the MacKenzie Valley pipeline. It is already over because we're making a decision to go down the Alcan Highway. It's the most natural route to travel. The road is already there to go up to Tuktoyuktuk, up where the oil and gas reserves are, we use the Dempster Highway.

None of these Members are really prepared to stand up and be counted on it. All we are looking at is the possible returns on a short-term basis, but on the long-term basis. I completely disagree with the Commissioner when he says "maybe". We have to come up with a definite plan right now, not maybe.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed. I am really amazed. Now, here a short while ago we were discussing another subject and the House didn't feel — a majority of the House didn't feel that we should ever solicit the views of the public on very important matters. Now, we're getting around to the point where we're going to solicit the views of the public on what the Honourable Minister from Klondike has just termed 'a

sell-out", and we're talking about approaching the public again and he suggested that isn't a very good idea. I'm just wondering what attempt — or what's going on here.

In any event, the question that I did rise to ask that I think has been answered by Mr. Commissioner and it was my concern that these pressure groups would be going, roaring up and down the highways into these little communities and I'm very pleased to hear that it is not intended that this be permitted in this study because I don't think that if this happened, that you would accomplish much at the community level and I agree with Mr. Commissioner on this.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Commissioner. I don't know whether they have the details of their proposed hearings worked out to that point. I'm very, very skeptical of hearing the Tory-type of government unless there's some very, very, very distinct guidelines.

You say in here, we will have to examine, the Territorial Government will have to examine all possible benefits and disadvantages but with the people on your staff, with your discussions with the Federal Government, you're going to have a much better idea of what the benefits could be and what the disadvantages could be. You're going to be holding all the cards and you're going to go out to people and say, do you want a pipeline? Well, unless people — unless you're prepared to tell them what the benefits could be and what the disadvantages could be, how can they really make a decision in the way we have hearings, unless people are completely and fully briefed and informed?

We're asking them to make an emotional decision or to sort of be swayed here and there, and I know every time I talk to anyone in my constituency about the pipeline, and it's really going to affect my constituency, this one, because it will go right down the Alaska Highway, all along in there, they say to me well I can't tell you how I feel about it unless I have more information. I have to be able to make a judgment myself.

Now, is this going to be part of the hearing process, to make sure the people have adequate information upon which they can make a good sensible judgment?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think every Member is aware of the Berger hearings, and as Mr. Commissioner is referring to. Now we're talking about another community hearing. I think that the results of the Berger Inquiry and community hearings he conducted, are really questionable. I don't want to say that Mr. Justice Berger didn't do his job properly, but what I question is the sincerity of the Federal Government to listen to those recommendations, because I think that the deal is already made.

I was in Old Crow many years ago when Arctic Gas first started to lobby these people and this is what the Honourable Member from Kluane is concerned about. They are presented with nice slide pictures, nice sceneries, all sorts of promises. Those people haven't got the slightest idea what they are listening to. There's nobody from any Territorial Government present or

there prior to explain the pros and cons to them. This is what I'm concerned about that with this type of hearing proposed again, it's going to be another sellout to the people because all that they're going to hear is the proposal from the pipeline companies as they're going through the communities already. But they don't hear the other side of the story.

I'm in complete disagreement with Mr. Commissioner and with the Honourable Member from Watson Lake if he says that those pressure groups should not travel with the hearings. I think they should travel with the hearings to make it possible for every little hamlet in the Territory to listen to those people, because they have a message also.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should give Mr. Commissioner an opportunity to answer Mrs. Watson's query.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was indeed one of our main concerns that a community hearing would be held in splendid isolation, I guess is a good word for it, that — without adequate information.

The pipeline applicant themselves have started going up and down the highway, talking to the various communities and it is hard for me to believe that in each of those communities there are not interested parties the same as we find here in this House, who can look at the information that is being presented to them, which is now factual information and forms part of the application and say, that looks like a good thing, but, what about this?

I think that the two Members here who have already had members or people from their constituency attend these community hearings can verify that the members of those constituencies are not all stupid, for goodness sakes, they go to these things and they hear. Certainly they hear what the pipeline says.

Mrs. Watson: Point of privilege, my question didn't imply, and I want it for the record, that the people of the Territory who would be attending the hearings were stupid. This wasn't my implication, Mr. Commissioner. I regret that you took this interpretation.

Mr. Commissioner: I'm sorry if it was not, but it seems to me that, and I don't really take that as your statement, I am sorry if I inferred that. I am speaking in general terms, that the people can hear only the one side of the story, but there will be people there who will say, wait a minute, there's something wrong here, what are the ultimate consequences of this? And so we were hoping that the information would get to the people affected by pipeline applicants themselves, holding these informational sessions that they are holding now.

We would hope that there would be a person from the applicant who would travel to the community hearings, not to give a presentation, but to listen to the concerns of the people as they were presented to the Commission or the inquiry and that they may actually be able to answer some of those questions at the hearing itself, at the end of the day's sitting they may be able to stand up and allay some of the fears. If they could not, then they would make note of these of course and hopefully they would go back to the drawing board and try and determine what could be done.

On the contrary, Mrs. Watson, I was not taking your

comments as a slam at the people of the Yukon, but I was trying to explain that we are hoping that the applicant themselves would disseminate the information at the local level before the hearings ever got there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would rise also to be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings that I did not state that the people are stupid in the Yukon. All that I'm implying is that the people are misinformed, because all it amounts to is a company that is interested in selling a product, they will always only come forward with the best view point. It's the same thing as a grocery store that has a bunch of apples for sale. They always put the nicest looking one in front to the view of the public. And this is what I'm concerned about.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I don't think it is fair for any Member to hypothetically accuse a corporation of misinformation unless those allegations can be shown to be true. I don't think that is a fair thing to do at all.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate on the White Paper?

Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: As I said, I have misgivings about hearings. Very much so. But on the other hand, I have had some reassurances and I am going to be attending quite a few of these likely. I hope the communities will be given an honest opportunity to make some assessment so that they can get feed-back.

I wonder whether the statement or the report on the assessment of the hearings is going to be made available? I am sure that you are going to have to set up a committee that is going to go out to have the hearings and they are going to have to report back to the Executive Committee I assume. I am wondering whether, you know, the recommendations of that committee who are conducting the hearings will be made available to the Members of this House, or whether this would be considered as confidential information?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, these hearings are going to be held in complete public venue. We have really not coped with this matter of recommendations or not. We had more thought that the Commission or Inquiry would report back to the Executive Committee the views of the people. The economic research and planning unit and the pipeline co-ordinator that we are hiring to work for the Territorial Government would then try to put these views in proper perspective and present them to the Executive Committee for consideration. That was the general thoughts we had at the present time. Whether they should appear before the House, all the views, or not — I am easy on that.

Mrs. Watson: I don't want to belabour this really. I am seeing a danger here. Maybe I am sort of a Doubting Thomas, but when you are talking about will they be bringing their views to the research and planning portion of the government, the people who conduct the

hearings, now if these people who are conducting the hearings know very well that their views will be in a confidential report which will never be open to public scrutiny, then their views can be almost anything.

I often think, I listen to the news and read the newspaper of the views of the news media who follow what goes on in this House and often it is very different, I believe, it is their interpretation so there are many interpretations.

I am not going to belabour it any further, but I would like somehow or other that the results of these hearings be made known so that the Territorial Government's proposal to the Energy Board will be based on known recommendations of the Board of Inquiry or the group that did the official inquiry. We want to know whether your proposals are going to be based on the general acceptance of a pipeline or a rejection of a pipeline. I think we should be able to know.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I didn't think I needed to comment on that. We certainly are not going to try and keep anything secret. We are really out to get the views of the people and we feel that we don't want to keep them secret and misinterpret them, so we will make them as public as we possibly can.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate on the White Paper?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: We then go on to the Green Paper on Highway Information Signs.

In Sessions dating back to 1972, this Assembly has debated the question of controlling billboard advertising on Yukon highways. At the 1975 Fourth Session, Members gave this government a mandate to embark on a more comprehensive signing method of indicating where the highway services are. As a result of that mandate, a study was undertaken during the past summer and the results are detailed in the report entitled "The Design of a Highway Information Sign System", Volumes I and II of which are tabled for the information of Members.

This report has been presented to and discussed with the Yukon Visitors' Association and the Yukon Tourism Advisory Board. Both groups endorsed the content of the proposed highway information sign system.

To implement and install the signs described in the report would cost \$57,760 for the Alaska Highway and the Haines Road and \$60,027 for all other Yukon roads. In the case of the Alaska Highway and Haines Road, costs are normally one hundred per cent recoverable from the Federal Government sources, and eighty-five per cent recoverable for Yukon roads. Direct cost to YTG would be \$10,593. The Department of Highways and Public Works currently expends \$10,000 on sign construction, erection and maintenance. The Federal Department of Public Works has said, however, that no funds are available to cost-share this project in 1977/78.

As a result of this study, the following recommenda-

tions are made:

1) That the highway information sign system, including policy and legislative recommendations as contained in the above-mentioned report, be approved in principle.

2) That Tourism and Information Branch co-ordinate implementation of the sign system with the Departments of Highways and Public Works, Local Government and Territorial Secretary.

3) That implementation of the sign system proceed as and when funds are available.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I — it is unfortunate that the Executive Committee Member in charge of this department is not here, but it has been brought to my attention that this particular department has a movie on the sign system that they are proposing. It is my understanding from the Green Paper that the availability of cost-sharing monies for this programme are not available for 1977-78. I don't know what the wish of the House is, whether to defer it to the Budget Session and possibly examine it at that time or possibly in the Spring Session. I think it is essential that we examine the possibility of that cost-shared money if we are going to go into a lengthy system such as is being proposed.

At the same time, all Members have had the opportunity to see the proposed film as well as the booklet that has been put out. It is a fairly lengthy booklet. I would like to think that all Members would take the opportunity to read the booklet prior to the making of a decision on this particular Green Paper. I don't know what the wish of Committee is, whether or not they would want to defer this to Budget Session or whatever.

It is going to be a fair amount of money if we were to pursue it in our forthcoming year. I don't know what monies would be available; that decision would have to be made at Budget Session. I would just like to hear what the wish of Committee is.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I again have to rise. Please, no more candy-striped papers! I would propose to the Chairman to ask if it is agreed on by the House to follow this proposal.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't always agree with the Honourable Member; signs are something like the liquor thing — we have been working on it for years and years and years and nothing seems to ever happen and that has happened again, of course, due to lack of money I guess. But a study was undertaken in the past summer and the results are detailed in the report entitled "The Design of Highway Information Sign Systems", Volumes I and II, which is tabled for Members. I haven't had time to see all of this yet other than just this Green Paper so I am not really too well acquainted with what they really intend to do when the money is available.

However, through our persistence, or some of us persisting, that the Sign Ordinance be changed and that it be done something to along the highway. I have noticed

in my area especially that signing has been a lot less and has been a lot better and possibly without any money we are really doing something ourselves. I think the people actually are realizing that mixed-up signs all over the place and on corners and where they are dangerous, wasn't needed. So as to this Paper, I don't think it says very much. It doesn't give much information; it isn't intending to do anything. It is merely a green piece of paper. I don't see really much to it.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this Paper is asking approval in principle for a programme which will be carried out when funds are available. It is based on a study which, I think, could have been done likely by competent people in this government but was done by another agency.

This is my old refrain, Mr. Chairman; I don't know how many times I have been on my feet in this House and in other areas saying, "why don't we use the people here and do it for less?" But, it has been done and I was happy to see that at a recent board meeting of the Yukon Tourist Advisory Council they approved this programme for signing and it seemed to meet with their approval. They commended it in their recommendations to this government. I am certainly not going to oppose it.

I have a few questions myself about some of those signs but I don't think you are ever going to get everybody — you are never going to get general approval of any one artist's concept and this is an attempt to install a universal system of highway signing which is now going across Canada. Anything we can do to update and meet the levels of tourist conditions in other parts of this country gets my approval.

We all know the importance of the tourism industry to this country. We rely on a department which is supposed to be working towards its improvement. We have a proposal here which has been thoroughly researched at great expense and all we are asking for in this Paper is approval in principle.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger? Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to express my views on this matter. It usually takes three years from the time you start something in government to, hopefully, get any, even a glimmer, of hope for whatever it was you started. We are only four years down the trail on this one, so I think as the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek has suggested perhaps we should just go along with the suggestions contained in the Green Paper and perhaps we could have additional information at the Spring Session on the whole question.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, we must be getting towards the end of a Session because I see us standing here and discussing something we don't even know what it is. This was tabled this morning.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the reports are available.

Ms. Millard: If anybody has had the opportunity of reading those two volumes since it was tabled this morning, I'd sure like to know. I'd like to know what's in them. It also must be getting towards the end of a Session when I can stand in full agreement with the Minister of Education.

I would like to have more time to read this, if it's that important, and it's been discussed with the Y.V.A. and Tourism Advisory Board, why couldn't we have had a little bit more time for it too?

Mr. Chairman: I require direction from Committee. Is it the wish of Committee that we either leave this, defer this to the Spring Session, or do you wish to vote on it now?

Ms. Millard: Defer.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest rather than a formal motion on this question maybe a simple agreement of Committee with the contents of the Green Paper would be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman: I think that would require a Motion, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to hear one or two more words from the Minister of Education because I think I'd go along with whatever he wanted really.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I rise with a great amount of glee. I can't believe the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, but I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'm not that much aware of this Paper. I, myself, have not had the opportunity of seeing the film and unless the Members want to see the film right now, that's their prerogative, but I would just as soon see it deferred until the Budget Session and it can be discussed and you can have the opportunity of seeing the film.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that this Paper be deferred until our Spring Session for discussion.

Mr. Fleming: Seconded.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Ms. Millard, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that this Paper on highway information signs be deferred to the Spring Session of the Legislature. All those in favour?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Contrary?

Some Members: Disagreed.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we thought that the liquor was controversial and we all read those signs and see which sign we like. So, really, I would have loved to have approved it sight unseen.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: You first.

Mr. Berger: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: I was right, Mr. Chairman, it was candy-striped again.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: The Executive Committee Member responsible for this Department is not here. He's not been available to underline the importance to his Department whether or not it has to go now, with agreement in principle. I'm not here to argue for him, but I would point out, Mr. Chairman, there is an offer before the Committee from members of that department to provide a show and tell performance on this policy which they presented to the Tourist Advisory Council and you have all named members to that, and I think it's only fair to either indicate that we are or we are not interested in seeing that display prior to leaving at the end of this week.

I'm sure that it would be a simple matter to arrange it very quickly.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, shouldn't we just pass a motion on this? Couldn't we go on to other business?

Mr. Chairman: Well, this might — perhaps it's not quite the same.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think most of the Members would if we could arrange a time. I think so, before we leave.

Mr. Chairman: Is Committee in agreement?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I refer you to Motion Number 9. The general theme is that the constitutional development in the Yukon is involved with Motions Numbers 18, 19 and 28, 29 and 30, and I would suggest they be considered together for the purposes of debate.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: As I have been involved in these Motions, I have requested Mr. McCall to resume the Chair during this debate.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, as these are the last items in the long Session and everyone certainly is tired

tonight, it's a matter that has been belaboured considerably so I don't want to take very long in going over this. The purpose of this Motion in itself was that, when the Minister was here he specifically asked us for direction on what we wanted as far as constitutional development in the Yukon is concerned. This Motion is simply expressing it, that an elected Member be — another elected Member be added to the Executive Committee.

I realize that this issue has been talked a lot on and there are other more important issues but it is only when we develop a fully responsible government here can we really come to grips with other issues that are so considered or important. I think it does assume importance in that light.

I see an instance of this occurring when we received a brief from the tourism industry prepared by the Yukon Visitors' Association and it's called "A Tourism Industry Crisis in the Yukon, 1976". And they considered that they have run into considerable difficulties because tourism is certainly suffering this year in the Yukon. They have valid statistics to back this up and they want action. They want something to be done. They feel stifled by the Territorial Government. They don't feel that the Government's spending enough money. They don't know where to go to make those demands so they make a general plea.

In their general plea they do state, as one of their principles, that they would request an elected member of Tourism, as I quote, "in recognition of the importance of tourism to the Yukon economy, we would request that serious consideration be given to the appointment of an elected member of the Yukon Territorial Council to this position."

This would just seriously exemplify what responsible government really means, Mr. Chairman. Here is an industry that is facing considerable difficulties, it is not meant to impugn anyone in charge of that department now, or is responsible to that department, it's the position he is in does not permit the access, nor the responsibility, that an elected member would have.

I think also, Mr. Chairman, that if there was this free exchange with an elected Member, it would result in a more informed public as they would realize they had a responsibility and an opportunity to have input into the legislation or to laws that were affecting them.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Assembly would be able to put forth a policy of some position with regard to not only this motion, but of all these motions and that is what I am looking for today. I do not wish to debate it too much longer, we've been into this so many times before.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I have a proposed amendment here and I was wondering if it could be passed around and read from the Chair. And if I have the opportunity of speaking to it.

Mr. Chairman: You're making an amendment on this motion, Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: You want me to read this out as a

Motion?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, as an amendment to the Motion Number 9.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just going to suggest maybe perhaps to keep everything legal we should have the Motion read in Committee first, and then the amendment following.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. Hibberd, whereas the elected Members who are the elected Members of the Executive Committee have demonstrated their ability to administer the affairs of the Yukon Territorial Government, and, whereas there now exists an opening on the Executive Committee, be it resolved that a fourth Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly be appointed to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government.

And the suggestion made that Motion Number 9 be amended by removing all the words in the second paragraph and replacing them with the following: Be it resolved that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development forthwith appoint a fourth Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government. And be it further resolved that within the life of this Assembly the position of the Assistant Commissioner, Executive, be abolished and a fifth Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly be appointed to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government. And be it further resolved that the Commissioner forthwith:

(1) bring the departments of Tourism and Information, Game Library Services, Territorial Secretary, Highway and Public Works, Yukon Housing Corporation and Treasury under the jurisdiction of the elected Members of the Executive Committee; and

(2) that the Department of Natural Resources be created within the Yukon Government to be under control of an elected Member.

Yes, Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I'd first like to have it for the record that I'm very disappointed that my colleague, the Honourable Mr. McKinnon is not present because he's probably one of the more knowledgeable Members of this House on the specific problem of a constitutional development. And it is a problem.

I think that, in speaking to this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I think one should note the national objectives of the Federal Government. And the fifth national objective of the Federal Government is to further the evolution of government in the northern territories. And here you have presented for you a course of action that we would like to think would be taken on behalf of the House to get more elected people involved in the decision-making process of Yukon. I think it's a definite area of concern to all Members of Executive Committee.

I can recall when I was first elected and I was only an M.L.A. in the House for a short period of time, I think in the area of six months and then I became part of government and I think it's a very, very worthwhile exercise for people to go through to be in the position that they have to make the decisions as executive arm of

government.

I think that, also at the same time, I think that the Yukon deserves a move towards more responsible government. We saw the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Honourable Warren Allmand, approximately six weeks after he was in office, appoint another in the N.W.T. to the Executive Committee to equate to the numbers that we presently have in Yukon.

I would also like to say at this time, to quote from or paraphrase the Honourable Member from Kluane the other day when she rose on a point of privilege, pointing out that the Auditor General's Report for Yukon has not been mentioned on the news. In other words, what I am saying is we're running probably one of the most responsible governments of Canada, and I think that if we get more elected Members involved in the process, I think that it would be very advantageous to all Yukoners, just as the report that the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre read out, it gives them the opportunity to go and see another elected Member in a portfolio.

I think that, also in view of the fact, that the Assistant Commissioner, who, I would like to say at this time has done a very creditable job on behalf of Yukon, and myself and I know on behalf of all Members of Executive Committee are very sorry to see him go. It's going to leave the Members of the Executive Committee with more administrative responsibilities. I would like to think that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development would send us back a reply, hopefully in the forthcoming New Year, to see what kind of an approach he's going to take so that we can plan accordingly.

I think it's very, very important to note, in this amendment to the Motion, Mr. Chairman, that we have asked that Treasury be put under the jurisdiction of an elected Member of the Executive Committee. And I want to qualify that position, Mr. Chairman, because it is essential that the Member, if it were ever to come about, would be able to deal at the political level of the Federal Government.

I think it's essential that all Members be made aware of the process of the financial negotiations to the Federal Government at the present time. The procedure for negotiations for financial agreements includes annual submissions to IAND and intergovernmental committee on Federal-Territorial financial arrangements. On this committee, Mr. Chairman, is the Assistant Deputy Minister of IAND and representatives from Treasury Board, Department of Finance and IAND members. The Y.T.G. representative is represented by the Commissioner or either one of his appointed members in the Executive Committee. I think it's very important, Mr. Chairman, that if we're going to take on this responsibility, I think it's essential that we also have the political responsibility to be able to deal at the political level.

Now, I don't know whether the Federal Government, at this time, is going to give us lip service once again to their fifth national objective to further the evolution of government in the northern territories or if they're prepared to act. All we can do is wait and see.

I think that also, Mr. Chairman, that the other important point in the amendment and that is the formation of a Department of Natural Resources. I think it's essential that our only natural resource that the Legislative

Assembly has control over, be transferred to an elected person. And I think that this should be put into action.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to hear what other Members have to say. I think we've gone a long way in constitutional development and it would be interesting to see if the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is going to accept our course of action as we're outlining here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think that the motion is well put, although and I hope I'm not misunderstood when I feel that in some way that the motion is maybe not always for the best interests of all the people of the Yukon Territory. I've always had a little problem with the concept of our government and the Executive Member concept, not in anyway thinking that they ever felt there was anything wrong or anything like this, but sometimes it looks as if I feel that way maybe.

But I'm thinking at this time that if there were two more Members on the Executive Committee, and I'm speaking of cutting down the amount of people that are actually out, they are elected by the people here. They are not really the government where the Executive Committee actually is part of the Government. I'm thinking at the time that this may happen that there's two more there. I would certainly like to see also two more — at least two more Members in this Legislative Assembly, because we are not a political party.

If we were political parties, the Government would be the political party that was put in by the majority of the people in the Yukon and run by them. The opposition, if they are too small, it is too bad. As I say, I have no real problems with our Government to date at all, but I can see a possibility whereas the Government on that side would have more controls in bringing in ordinances, for instance, where there are five Members and there must be or should be, I think, if they are in there and making legislation together and meeting together to do this, they should be pretty fairly well impartial to whatever is brought in.

I consider myself more or less as an opposition to that system for the people and this is my only concern. As I say, I will probably vote them in. I would like to hear other Members' views on the same thing and as I say, I probably will be voting for the Motion because I really realize that we should get things under control ourselves. I'm very agreeable to that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just rise to say that I certainly support the amendment. You know, I was just reflecting back that I charged in my reply to the Speech from the Throne and I charged that the Federal Government, ever since we were starting to look like we were operating a little responsibly in this Territory, have directly and deliberately interfered with the downgrading, shall we say, of the administration or the attempt to downgrade it. The very obvious attempt to downgrade and hold in contempt this Legislature, and I've suggested that in fact they have played politics with the Anti-Inflation Board to the extent of downing our economy of this Territory as well. I do not withdraw

those charges.

But I say that here is the golden opportunity for the Federal Government to prove that these charges are false. Now, we are accepting — once again we're asking for more responsibility. We're saying we're prepared to accept that responsibility. Now, perhaps the Minister or Privy Councillor or whatever you want to call him in Ottawa, can show his good faith to the people of the Yukon.

Again, when they ask for and are prepared to accept responsibility by giving not only the responsibility, but backing it up in the Yukon Act with some authority as well. Perhaps we would then find something more akin to what the people of the Yukon expect in their Government and from their elected representatives. I think this is a great amendment, but I just say this, Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity for the Minister to show whether indeed the charges that I have alleged in this House, now on two occasions, are in fact true, or whether they not be true. So, let's put the amendment to a vote. I hope that it goes with unanimity when this debate is concluded and let's throw that ball into the court and just see how sincere the Feds are in relation to their dealings with the people of the Yukon for a desire for responsible government.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, as seconder of this amendment, I think Honourable Members will agree that we have pulled together all the aspects of the other Motions involved in this same overall question and we are expressing what all those separate motions were intending to achieve. I think it might be valuable, Mr. Chairman, just to take a moment to look back seven years to the date exactly seven years ago when Jean Chretien who was then the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, at the opening of the session here in November expressed his intention to constitute an Executive Committee with the Commissioner of the Yukon as Chairman, the two Assistant Commissioners and one elected Member comprising that Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman, you will probably remember that there was a certain amount of public uproar and as a result of the wishes of the public, this was amended to two elected Members. I think because there are a lot of new people in this country, it would be of interest to note that the motion, which was in the name of Mr. George Shaw, which passed the House on July 3rd, 1970, six months after the Minister announced that this would become a reality, outlined the conditions under which there would be an Executive Council, it was called in the original motion, and the terms and conditions and that these people, while serving would be the effective executive organ of the Government of the Territory together with the Commissioner.

That was the beginning of a whole new era and the Commissioner who was here at the time extended his congratulations to the Honourable Jean Chretien for his far-seeing and cooperation in assisting the advancement of constitutional development in the Yukon. It is certainly to Mr. Chretien's credit that he was the man who made the breakthrough for us. I think this is a contrast to the attitude of the Federal Government some years before. I have been reading, Mr. Chairman, a

speech by the Member of Parliament who is the parliamentary secretary to our new Minister of Indian Affairs, M.P. Keth Penner, who addressed a Northern Change Conference at Anchorage a week or so ago. And I have, I owe it to him for a beautiful quote which I would like to share with all Members. He said that, prior to the 1950's contact between the North and the South was casual and intermittent. Canada administered its North in a state of absence of mind as Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent aptly described it in 1953.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we've gone a long way since then, and Mr. Penner went on to remark that in somewhat the same vein as my Honourable friend from Watson Lake that the Federal Government has now recognized that there is two quite different perspectives from which one can examine northern development. The first sees development in terms of national interest, sensitive to economic and political concerns and pressures that do not originate in the North. The second, and perhaps more important perspective sees more than development through the eyes of Northerners. Here development stems from the needs of the residents of the North, is subject to their perceptions, concerns of resources and takes place according to Northern interests.

There's one little catch, Mr. Chairman. The Federal Government's view, as expressed by Mr. Penner in his speech, goes on to say that it regards resource-related developments as a means of strengthening the economy in the two territories. On the one hand to promote this self-reliance, while on the other to enhance their contributions to the national economy. End quote. And, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us in this Committee know exactly what that means. The Federal position is that the resources of the north belong to all the people of Canada, but at the same time, you people in the north are supposed to develop, somehow, your self-reliance without the revenue from those resources.

Mr. Chairman, I was thrust into a position on this Executive Committee, with very little training for that particular portfolio. I am not ashamed to say that I have worked very hard in a very demanding situation, in fact it's referred to by some government staff as the department which is a complete can of worms. We have all the people problems. We have Health and Welfare and Corrections and Parole and Rehabilitation and all the personal people problems and I find it a very demanding position. It has to take a great personal toll. It would be most unlikely, Mr. Chairman, that you would ever find in any Federal or Provincial Cabinet the imposition of two or three more portfolios upon any single member in that Cabinet who is already responsible for three different departments.

Mr. Chairman, I am not superman, nor am I the bionic woman. I do not know where I would find additional hours in the day if I were forced to assume additional serious departmental responsibilities. And that is why I feel we must support the motion which would give us at least a fourth member to work with us and disseminate those heavy duties, proportionately, which are going to be dumped upon whoever is there, by the middle of January. And for the benefit of every department in the Government and the efficiency of this Government, I would certainly hope that there would be no doubt that that assistance would be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, the part of the amendment that I find myself unable to support is the addition of the fifth member. The rest of it is fair ball. But when an Executive Committee is composed of five members, with a Speaker in the Chair, this only leaves six of the rest of us to oppose and I find that in the situation that we were in this week, the people that were in disagreement with what the Executive Committee wanted would never be able to set aside a section of an Ordinance and substitute an amendment. It would be simply impossible for this House to operate the way it has been with the addition of a fifth member to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. McIntyre. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there can be doubt that there's a lot of merit to what the Honourable Member from Mayo has said and with the acceptance of the Federal Government to the proposals laid down in this amendment, I think it becomes clear that the House would have to give grave consideration to enlarging this House to a substantial amount of Members in light of the added responsibilities that we are going to undertake and I think that is agreed upon.

I think that also, in the interim, if we have the fifth member before the end of the life of this Legislature and this Assembly, then perhaps there would have to be some arrangements made to cover the question raised by the Honourable Member from Mayo.

So I really can't find any problems with that at this point, but I think that should be fairly well understood because it's obvious that the House would have to consider enlarging itself to meet these — if two more go on the Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that is one concern. I must express my concern with Mr. McIntyre on that and I don't like the way the Honourable ...

Mr. Chairman: Would you speak up, Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: I don't like the way the Honourable Member from Watson Lake sort of shoved it under the rug or we could accommodate that by enlarging the Members in the House. That's easier said than done; it requires a hearing and this type of thing.

I doubt whether we would get the five, and I'm just wondering, you just leave it in and hope for the best. We never seem to come up with a hundred per cent batting average. But I do agree that it would be even four, but five would be a very serious situation if that came about before there was an enlargement made to the number of people in the Assembly.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to state that I'm delighted to welcome the amendments to my Motion coming from the presently elected Members of the Executive Committee because these are the persons

who know what is going on in the executive floor — at least I hope they do — and they should be in a position to know more than anyone else the advantages of this realignment.

It has been noted that one of the features that was required before we could achieve a more responsible government was the confidence at this level. I think this has been adequately demonstrated. I think the Minister himself recognized that. I think this Motion and the amendment represents a further step forward in the evolutionary process of acquiring a cabinet form of government.

With the assumption of elected representatives, I would see, Mr. Chairman, that decisions of policy-making be made in the democratic context. Government then becomes all the people of the Yukon, by the people of the Yukon and for the people of the Yukon. We have up until now had this democratic — I have been raised in a country, I've been taught all my life that this is democracy. We live in a democratic form of government. I still believe that, Mr. Chairman. But we in the Yukon do not have that. Northerners are deprived that simple democratic principle.

Mr. Chairman: Is that derived or deprived, Mr. Hibberd?

Is there any further debate on this amendment? Yes Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, just hearing some of the Members speaking, I am more inclined to think that I was right in my feeling in the first place and especially as the Honourable Member says, on the fifth member — especially that. It even worried me a little bit on the fourth member, but the fifth one does really worry me.

If there was something in here that would say they were going to in the life of this Assembly, which they say here, see to it or try to force the government or bring the government around to our way of thinking and enlarge this Council, then I would be absolutely — would wholeheartedly go for the amendment here. But the way it is, no, I am afraid I just can't go that way.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate on the amendment? I will read the amendment:

It was moved by Mr. Lang, seconded by Mrs. Whyard, that Motion 9 be amended by removing all the words in the second paragraph and replacing them with the following:

Be it resolved that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development forthwith appoint a fourth member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government. And be it further resolved that, within the life of this Assembly, the position of Assistant Commissioner, Executive, be abolished and a fifth member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly be appointed to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government. And be it further resolved that the Commissioner forthwith —

1) Bring the Department of Tourism and Information, Game, Library Services, Territorial Secretary, Highways and Public Works, Yukon Housing Corporation and Treasury under the jurisdiction of the elected members of the Executive Committee, and

2) That the Department of Natural Resources be

created within the Yukon government to be under the control of an elected member.

Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: May we have a show of hands please? Those agreed? Those that disagree?

The amendment is carried.

I will read the Motion, along with the amendment:

It was moved by Mr. Hibberd, whereas the elected members of the Executive Committee have demonstrated their ability to administer the affairs of the Yukon Territorial Government, and whereas there now exists an opening on the Executive Committee, be it resolved that the Minister of Northern Affairs and Northern Development forthwith appoint a fourth member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government, and be it further resolved that within the life of this Assembly the position of Assistant Commissioner Executive be abolished and a fifth member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly be appointed to serve on the Executive Committee of the Yukon Territorial Government, and be it further resolved that the Commissioner forthwith:

1) Bring the Departments of Tourism and Information, Game, Library Services, Territorial Secretary, Highways and Public Works, Yukon Housing Corporation and Treasury under the jurisdiction of the elected members of the Executive Committee, and

2) That the Department of Natural Resources be created within the Yukon Government to be under the control of an elected member.

Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: May we have a show of hands please? All those that agree? All those that disagree? Motion is carried.

(Motion carried)

Mr. Chairman: I take it, Mr. Hibberd, that that would make Motions 18, 19, 28, 29 and 30 redundant?

Mr. Hibberd: Yes. I would withdraw them.

Mr. Chairman, without expressing the opinion of where I think the Chairman should go, I would move that Mr. Speaker now resume the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a seconder?

Ms. Millard: I second that.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Hibberd, seconded by Ms. Millard, that Mr. Speaker now resume the Chair.

Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I shall declare the Motion carried.

(Motion carried)

(Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair)

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

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 5, "An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance", and directed me to report the same with further amendments.

The Committee has also considered Motions 32, 35, 24, 37, 39 and 9 and directed me to report progress on same.

This now concludes the business of 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 Pelly River?

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that we do now call it five o'clock.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

(Motion carried)

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

(ADJOURNED)

THE FOLLOWING SESSIONAL PAPER WAS TA-
BLED

76-3-41

Green Paper on Highway Information Signs
(The Design of a Highway Information Sign System
Report - Vols. I & II)