



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 6

8th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

**Wednesday, March 9, 1977**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor



THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

PROCEEDINGS

DEBATES & PROCEEDINGS

1971-1972

Whitehorse, Y.T.  
March 9th, 1977

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

*(Prayers)*

**Mr. Speaker:** We will proceed with the Order Paper at this time.

#### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any documents or correspondence for tabling? The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

#### TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief to be tabled this morning to Members of the Yukon Legislative Assembly from the Yukon Native Brotherhood, concerning the subject, Green Paper on Policy for Recreation Development.

**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 Member from Kluane?

#### NOTICE OF MOTION

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, that this House recommends that a Board be constituted forthwith for the purpose of advising the Commissioner and the Executive Committee on the selection of a person for appointment as Director of Game. The Board to consist of a Member of the Executive Committee, a nominee from the Public Service Commission, a representative of the Indian community, a representative of the Outfitters' Association, and a scientist learned in game and wild-life management, from outside the Territory.

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

Are there any Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua concerning school bus services.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any oral questions?  
The Honourable Member from Mayo.

**Question re: Breakthrough in Land Claims Negotia-**

**tions**

**Mr. McIntyre:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Commissioner this morning. There was an announcement on CBC this morning regarding an initial breakthrough in Indian Land Claims negotiations. I wonder if the Commissioner would care to comment on the failure of the CBC to mention the participation of the Yukon Territorial Government in this first agreement reached?

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

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any omission on the CBC of the participation of the Yukon Territorial Government. During the press conference held following the end of the deliberations of the planning council yesterday, all three participants at the table, during the planning council, were in evidence, sitting side by side during the interview and we all made statements and comments and the documents do include reference to all three parties contributing to the deliberations. The documents, which are being forwarded under covering letter from me to each of the Members this morning, will indicate that the Yukon Territorial Government is indeed a part and parcel of the Land Claims planning process.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further questions?

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre.

**Question re: YTG addressing U.S. Federal Power Commission**

**Mr. Hibberd:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I refer to Motion No. 10, passed by this House on May 27 of last year, that the Yukon Legislative Assembly convey to the National Energy Board of Canada and the United States Federal Power Commission, the desire of this House that full consideration be given to an Alaska Highway route for the transmission of natural gas from Alaska to British Columbia, and that because of the social, economic and political advantages inherent in the Alaska Highway route that it be considered as a viable alternative to the coastal or Mackenzie Valley proposals.

My question for— any of the Ministers may answer this — if this was to be conveyed to the United States Federal Commission, is the Yukon Territorial Government planning to address itself to the power commission on this matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Local Government?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I have no indication whether or not that has gone forward, and I would ask if Mr. Commissioner has any further information, as he is directly in charge of the pipeline administrator, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether we addressed the Federal Power Commission asking them to consider it. They, I think, preceded this

request by saying that they would indeed hear the application, and so the motion as passed by this House, the intent was fully recognized.

We do not at this time, unless directed differently by the House to attend in person the Federal Power Commission hearings in Washington.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further questions?

We will then proceed to — the Honourable Minister of Local Government?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I have answers to several questions.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre wanted to know why the contract for the renovations of the sound system was let, when the sound system was under warranty with the original installers.

The sound system contractor failed to provide an acceptable system, and the government hired Baron and Strachan to report on the condition of the system. This was done, and the contractor returned to make good the poor and deficient work.

The cost of Baron and Strachan's review will be recovered from the sound system contractor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question by Mr. Fleming concerning land in the Carcross area. The question on March 2nd was: "Has the land in the Town of Carcross been transferred to the Territorial Government by Ottawa? If so, when, and why were the residents of Carcross not notified at the time?"

The answer to the above question is as follows: Land around the townsite of Carcross was transferred to the Yukon Territorial Government on July 3rd, 1975 by block land transferred to the extent of 9.6 square miles.

The matter of the transfer from 1976 federal government has been referred to and informally discussed on a number of occasions at community association meetings by Department of Local Government staff. There has been no attempt to withhold such information and the Department has discussed the subject with everyone who inquired.

All residents whose uncompleted land files were transferred were advised of this change by letter from the Lands Branch. Future land use in the Carcross area will be the subject of discussion with all interested community residents and organizations during the formulation of the proposed regional land use plan for this area.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to Motions under Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTIONS

#### Item No. 1:

**Madam Clerk:** Item Number 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member Ms. Millard.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that the White Paper on decentralization be referred to Committee of the Whole.

**Ms. Millard:** I will call for question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any 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)*

#### Item Number 2

**Madam Clerk:** Item 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Mrs. Watson.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 2?

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a point of order, it's actually Item No. 3.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, I am somewhat confused.  
We've missed one of my --

Yes, perhaps I have erred in that I did not call Motions through the production of papers, which I will do so shortly. I thank the Honourable Member for drawing that to my attention.

It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that Sessional Paper No. 77/1/6 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 that the motion is carried.

*(Motion carried)*

#### Item Number 3

**Madam Clerk:** Under Motions, Item No. 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member Ms. Millard.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item Number 3, this morning?

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable

Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that a Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments be established to review all regulations as they are published;

That Messrs. Fleming, McCall and Berger be appointed to the said Committee;

That the Committee have the power to report from time to time, to call for persons, papers and records, to print such papers and documents as may be ordered by the Committee, to arrange for verbatim transcripts and to sit during the inter-sessional periods.

That the Clerk of Assembly be responsible for providing the necessary support staff to the said Committee.

The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's because of the confusing words to the public, I think a few words in explanation might be in order about Statutory Instruments.

This Committee will be formed to simply monitor regulations and assess the implications of those regulations, make recommendations to the Assembly about the clarity and authority of regulations. I think we must remember that regulations are produced by our delegation of authority in the Ordinance and this is not recognized by the public.

Most legislatures have this Committee, and it is a very valuable one. I see it as a further step towards the development of a responsible legislature. We have made many steps in the last few months towards developing a more responsible legislature, particularly in Standing Committees which are new to us.

Standing Committees are the true working area of the legislature, and we are already having effective results from our Standing Committees.

I think this Assembly will be remembered for expanding its responsibility through the working structures of the Assembly.

**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)*

#### Item Number 4

**Madam Clerk:** Item Number 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Ms. Millard.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 4?

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre,

THAT WHEREAS this Government has as its responsibility the care and well-being of our senior citizens,

AND WHEREAS there has been much controversy of late concerning the Yukon Territorial Government's response to that responsibility, particularly in the area of accommodation of our aged citizens,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Assembly requests the administration to look into the following areas of concern and report back to this House by the end of this Session concerning possible action in these areas:

(1) Encouragement by the Y.T.G. of involvement by non-profit organizations in the field of seniors' housing;

(2) Discussions with the Yukon Housing Corporation concerning take-over by them of present Welfare Branch seniors' housing;

(3) Expansion of seniors' housing programs to the smaller communities through the co-operation of the Welfare Branch, Yukon Housing Corporation, non-profit organizations, Indian Affairs, native organizations and all other interested parties;

(4) Programs within and without government housing which will promote and ensure the independence of our seniors.

The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a fairly straightforward resolution. I think everyone's been aware in the past few months of the discussion involving our senior citizens, particularly concerning the MacDonald Lodge in Dawson City, where there were layoffs and where there was some controversy about raising of rents.

I've had many discussions in the past few months with the officials involved with administration of senior citizens in the Yukon, and it has resulted in the recommendations listed here.

I feel this Motion really is only affirming the directions that are already slowly being taken. Unfortunately, they're not being taken quickly enough. I feel that our senior citizens are in almost emergency situations at this point, and that we need to make some very clear decisions on what's going to happen with them.

Under point one, the involvement of non-profit organizations is very important. The Pioneers, Lions Club, people like this, should be encouraged by the Territorial Government to get involved in senior citizens' housing.

C.M.H.C. has agreements where they can help to pay for housing so that we don't have to worry about our budget concerns, which is what's been the problem before. I feel that we should have a policy of encouraging non-profit organizations involving themselves with senior citizens.

The Yukon Housing Corporation is already housing some of our senior citizens, because they find it easier on their budget than living in welfare-supplied housing.

There are just as many people in Dawson City in Yukon Housing Corporation housing as in welfare housing in senior citizens, and they are quite happy under those circumstances. Of course, already the Alexander Street home has been taken over by the Housing Corporation. I think this should be encouraged; I think there should be more discussion between Welfare Branch and the Housing Corporation, and — concerning the take-over of other residences in the Territory.

My third point is very important, that the smaller communities — in the smaller communities, the financial responsibilities are very complex, and because it involves various responsibilities and small numbers of people. I think that it's time for the Territorial Government to make a definite policy of talking with these other departments which are involved in senior citizens' housing and other social issues.

My fourth point of independence of the senior citizens is extremely important. It is unfortunate that most senior citizens in senior housing in the Yukon have found that their independence is being eroded, and we must have a policy towards allowing senior citizens to retain the independence that they have the right to expect.

In moving this Motion, my hope is for a Territorial Government policy plan, involving all agencies, private and public, in discussing our senior citizens' problems, coming to a conclusion and hopefully setting down a plan for the future.

We have a great need in the Yukon Territory for social planning. We talked a lot yesterday about economic planning. I think that social planning is equally important, and this is one area where we could start. This is one step towards the end of a real social plan for the Yukon.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Speaker, I feel there's many areas to be discussed in this Motion Number 4, and I would ask that it be moved into Committee of the Whole.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, it's just a straightforward motion asking the administration to bring forward some information and I would sooner debate it in the House, and I would like to go ahead and speak to it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Mrs. Watson:** I would like the information — I'm going to support the Motion — I would like the information that the Honourable Member has requested, but not for the same reasons that she's requesting it.

I found her remarks rather ambiguous. She was asking for planning, for a social plan for senior citizens in the Yukon Territory, which is fine, and then on the other hand she also said that we must preserve the independence of the senior citizens.

Now, you're not going to be able to plan for them and still let them be independent. I think this is a very, very important thing, and I think this is why I am going to support the Motion to get the report in the House.

Do we want to plan people's lives? Do we want to give them the opportunity to live their own lives, provide some of the assistance which may be required, and I'm sure that many senior citizens require assistance in one area or another. But if I thought that we were going to embark upon a plan to tell senior citizens what to do, I know they would tell us what to do. Let's not forget, they've lived in this country, most of them, for quite a long time and they're pretty set in their ways and I think

they know just where they are going.

I was also — the Honourable Member remarks that these questions were posed because she's been talking to people who are involved in the administrative programs for senior citizens. I would have hoped her questions would have been evoked by talking to senior citizens.

I'm not interested in the views of the administrative people. I'm interested in the views of the senior citizens that we are supposed to be serving but, nonetheless, I think the questions that she has asked are very valid and I think that the Honourable Minister of Health will be able to bring back a fairly positive report in this regard, because the Honourable Member also indicated the various programs and things that the Y.T.G. was presently doing.

So, I would like to see it sort of concentrated in the one report, so I will be prepared to support the Motion but for different reasons.

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

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

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be very happy to support this Motion because it will be giving this Department an opportunity to lay on paper all the things that we are trying to bring about for our senior citizens.

The Honourable Member did not come and discuss this subject with me. If she has discussed it with my officials, that's entirely her business. If she had come to me I could have told her a great deal more about what is in the mill for our senior citizens.

We have had a great deal of pressure recently, Mr. Speaker, from the Golden Age Society, which is a very strong spokesman for the senior citizens in the Whitehorse area, and we are doing our best to cooperate and work with them to achieve their goals. But there are other senior citizens throughout the Yukon who are not being spoken for by this group in Whitehorse and our problem up until now, Mr. Speaker, has been in identifying how many senior citizens in other parts of the Yukon also require assistance for things such as subsidies for their utilities so that they can stay in their homes, and how much it would cost to implement pharmacare universally for people over 65.

All these programs are in the mill now, and I am very hopeful that in the next two weeks or three weeks I will be able to make an announcement in this House, pending financial arrangements.

There is one point I must make clear before we bring in the Paper answering these questions, and that is that there is no way that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker, that any government department can force a service club to sponsor any kind of housing for senior citizens and, if proof is needed of the efforts of this department to interest the Lions Club and the Yukon Order of Pioneers and other groups in sponsoring such housing, we will be happy to bring that forward.

We would be delighted if such housing would be supported by service groups. And there have been abortive efforts to obtain this in Watson Lake, Mr. Speaker, as well as in Whitehorse, but strangely enough they seem

to fail to come to fruition. That is the business of another department, unfortunately, that is the Yukon Housing and CMHC, not ours. But this department has given every support in that direction and we're very disappointed that none of this has come through.

I'd be very happy to support this Motion, Mr. Speaker.

**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)*

#### Item Number 5

**Madam Clerk:** Item Number 5, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. McCall.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 5 this morning?

**Mr. McCall:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale,

THAT WHEREAS a study, entitled 'A Preliminary Assessment into the Viability of Home Manufacturing in Yukon' has been prepared;

AND WHEREAS, in order to fully respond and realize the potential of the viable home manufacturing industry, some further information and promotion is required;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT it is the opinion of this House that an in-depth study involving a detailed analysis of the market, an examination of various financial aspects, an assessment of potential participants in such a venture, and a study of social and economic impact of such a facility upon the Yukon economy be carried out;

AND FURTHER THAT such a study form an integral part of this social economic planning unit's report on Yukon's economic and social future.

The Honourable Member from Pelly River.

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I may, from my seconder ask for the consent of the House to move it into Committee, if I may.

**Mr. Speaker:** It would not be competent for the mover of the Motion to propose procedure of motion...

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre?

**Mr. Hibberd:** I move that Motion Number 5 be moved into Committee of the Whole.

**Ms. Millard:** I second that.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that Item Number 5, or I should say Resolution Number 5, perhaps, be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Are you prepared for the question?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Motion Number 5, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Well, I believe that this is Resolution Number 4. This is Item Number 5, Resolution Number 4.

**Mr. Hibberd:** It's Motion Number 5 in my Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Resolution Number 4; 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)*

#### Item Number 6

**Madam Clerk:** Item Number 6, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Lengerke.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item Number 6?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

THAT WHEREAS it is apparent that questions with respect to the immediate future of the Cyprus Anvil operation at Faro are being asked and the need for clarification is essential;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT a telegram on behalf of this Assembly be sent forthwith to the President of the Cyprus Anvil Corporation requesting confirmation of the continued operation of the Cyprus Anvil Mine at Faro and to advise the people of Yukon of the specific duration that the mine operation will continue in Yukon on the basis of a reasonable mineral or metals market.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

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

Again, I presented a Motion that I feel is very straightforward and requires only a yes answer, because all we're requesting is that a telegram be sent to the President of Cyprus Anvil confirming information, I'm sure, that we all know what the answer will be — at least I hope that's what the answer would be, a positive answer.

I suspect that any rumours and any questions that have been raised in the — over the last few months,

could be of a local nature, at the site itself. However, these things I don't know, there could be some other problems, but again I don't anticipate that there's anything too serious to this, but the best way to get at it is to get an answer in writing, Mr. Speaker, and we should move with the action that I've suggested in this Resolution.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Education?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Some information has just come to my attention from the Commissioner that Mr. John Brock has spoken to the Commissioner this morning, and is prepared to come before this House as a witness to explain the position of Cyprus Anvil and the future of the Anvil mining operation in Yukon.

I would suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the following Motion be amended to read:

That the following amendment be put in Motion number 6, that all words after "THAT BE IT RESOLVED", that the words be — I just wrote this amendment up, Mr. Speaker. I don't know, maybe I should get a copy of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder if it may be of assistance to the Member to suggest that the Motion be referred to Committee of the Whole, where witnesses could be called in any event, to deal with it.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** That's fine, Mr. Speaker, I move it into Committee then.

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

**Ms. Millard:** I second that.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that Resolution Number 5 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 that the Motion is carried.

*(Motion carried)*

#### Item Number 7:

**Madam Clerk:** Item Number 7, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Fleming.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item Number 7?

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, however, there is many questions to be asked because the Minister of Local Government wasn't here at the last session when

this motion was also present, and I would ask that some Member possibly move it into Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will first have to read the Motion from the Chair.

It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, that:

WHEREAS the Federal Territorial Lands Advisory Committee now comprises a total membership of government representatives;

AND WHEREAS it is the desire to have non-government representation;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, when appointing Members to the Committee consider nominations recommended by the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

The Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I would move that this Motion be moved into Committee for consideration.

**Mr. Hibberd:** I second that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre — it has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, that Resolution Number 6 be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Are you prepared for the question?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, can we speak?

**Mr. Speaker:** I'm sorry, it's not permitted to debate this Motion.

Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Speaker:** May we return at this point, on the Order Paper, under Orders of the Day, to Motions for the Production of Papers.

#### MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

##### Item Number 1

**Madam Clerk:** Item 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mrs. Watson.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.



**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua;

THAT the draft of the Area Development Regulations to control land subdivision, as outlined in Sessional Paper Number 4, Spring Session, 1976, be tabled in this House, this Session, before the presentation to the Regulations Review Committee.

Are you prepared for the question?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, can I speak to the Motion or is it a procedural motion?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, I'm afraid that Motions for the Production of Papers are non-debatable.

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Speaker:** We will now proceed to Public Bills.

## PUBLIC BILLS

**Madam Clerk:** Second reading of Bill 12, "Recreation Development Ordinance."

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

### BILL NUMBER 12: SECOND READING

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill Number 12 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, that Bill Number 12 be now read a second time.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak briefly to the principle of the Bill now before Members.

The Recreation Branch of the Department of Education presently requires the authority to administer programs through the Financial Administration Ordinance by regulation.

The proposed legislation will formalize this government's commitment in the field of public recreation, and will complete the legislative base for all the responsibilities for the Department of Education.

All Members will recall last Session I undertook to travel throughout the Territory to discuss the policy paper on recreation, and I'm pleased to report to this House that the policy was favourably received.

At the same time, I discovered that each community had different needs and aspirations, which in turn made it very difficult to draft the legislation now before the Members.

In order to accommodate the different communities' requirements, the Ordinance has been designed to allow for flexibility in order that each community can take the best advantage of the programs offered.

Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes the importance of local government institutions, and therefore the responsibility of recreation services has been directed towards the local government.

At the same time, we recognize that many communities are at different stages of development, and we have allowed the local governments the option of administering recreation through a Board, or through a community organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all Members note that under existing legislation, it is questionable whether Local Improvement Districts have authority to expend funds upon recreation services.

To clarify this ambiguity, and to expedite implementation of this program, the authority is clearly defined in this Ordinance. As this government also has responsibility to promote territorial-wide sports and cultural activities, we have provisions for retaining the Advisory Committee to carry on their present duties of allocating monies to Yukon sports and cultural governing bodies, and at the same time, we will retain this body to advise the government on the programs and policies of the Recreation Branch.

Draft regulations will be presented to all Members when considering the Bill, so that all Members have a clear understanding of the guidelines that will be set down for the programs offered by this government.

Also Members will be provided with an information paper which outlines the additional cost that will result in the passage of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that once Members have had the opportunity to study the proposed Ordinance, along with the regulations, they will agree that we have attempted to accommodate the needs of all communities, and at the same time promote the orderly development of recreation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate on the principle?

The Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be speaking against this Bill. I am disagreeing very much with the philosophy of this Bill, because what it is doing is taking away the autonomy of the local volunteer community organization, which has provided recreation facilities and programs for many, many years in the communities, by forcing them, under the supervision and control of the Local Improvement District Boards.

This legislation is insisting that any assistance or funding be channelled through virtually another arm of the Territorial Government. It's a historic Bill, because I don't know whether all Members sitting around this House realize the important role that the community clubs have played in the unorganized area, the areas outside of the Municipalities in the Yukon Territory, long before anyone ever thought of Local Improvement Districts, long before the Territorial Government had

any recreation or sports program at all. Long before any funding was available for facilities, and operation and maintenance grants, or any assistance for recreation at all.

These community clubs stepped in and provided this on a volunteer basis, and it has continued in this way over the years, on a volunteer basis.

Now, if this Bill is brought in without amendment, you are virtually sounding the death knell for community clubs, and volunteer organizations, and for a very historic institution in the smaller Yukon communities.

Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the Bill as it is written now.

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

**Mr. Hibberd:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of this Bill, precisely for the opposite reasons of the Member from Kluane.

I think that these volunteer organizations in the past have done a very credible job, but they are running into difficulties with increasing costs, and I think this Bill is precisely designed to sponsor these organizations, to retain their autonomy, but to give them the money to carry on in the roles that they have been performing in the past under much hardship, so it will, indeed, give them more credibility and more ability to function in that area.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the Minister, a problem that has been before this House, ever since we sat in this Session, in that the government has simply been not prepared with this legislation. We've had a good deal of trouble in dealing with the matters before us, because as soon as they arrive on our desk, they require amendments, there's white papers coming down, and I would suggest to the Minister — not that it's the situation with this Bill in particular — but I would suggest to the Minister, that if he is bringing forth possible regulations and white papers, that he doesn't give it to us at the minute that we are supposed to be making a vote on this.

Please let us have that information long before it is to be considered.

We can look at it in an intelligent way. I would like to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that this has been a failure of the government during this Session and I would not like to see it carry on in this fashion.

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

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mrs. Watson:** Division, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Division has been called. I'll sound the bell.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, a point of order: if anybody has a conflict, they could have been down the hall a long time ago.

**Mr. Speaker:** For the information of the Members, I'm bound by the rules of the Committee in this regard...

**Mr. Hibberd:** You are bound by the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, because they are adopted by the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** For the information of the Members of House, the bell must be rung for at least two minutes on division and this came from the Rules Committee and was adopted by this House.

Madam Clerk, will you poll the House?

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Mr. McKinnon.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Mrs. Whyard.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Mr. Lang.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mr. McIntyre.

**Mr. McIntyre:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mr. Berger.

**Mr. Berger:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mr. Hibberd.

**Mr. Hibberd:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mr. Fleming.

**Mr. Fleming:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Ms. Millard.

**Ms. Millard:** Nay.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mrs. Watson.

**Mrs. Watson:** Nay.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member Mr. Lengerke.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, the results of division

are nine yea, two nay.

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

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

##### Bill Number 101

**Madam Clerk:** Private Member's Public Bill Number 101, An Ordinance to Amend the Medical Profession Ordinance.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the Honourable Deputy Speaker kindly take the Chair?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the Member prepared to continue with this Bill?

##### Bill Number 101 — Second Reading

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to move that, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Private Member's Public Bill 101 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Private Member's Public Bill Number 101 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mr. Taylor.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, just briefly speaking on the principle of this Bill, as I stated yesterday, the amendments contained in the Bill have the effect of ensuring that the Board of Inquiry, in receiving evidence and accepting evidence and information in its inquiry concerning whatever matter it concerns itself with, must do so in a judicial manner, similar to proceedings in civil jurisdiction.

I might say that, contained in the Bill, is a question which I could, in Committee of the Whole with the broadest debate, explain it's in conflict with the basic fundamental rights contained in the Canadian Bill of Rights in this regard.

So I would simply, Mr. Speaker, ask the Members of the House at this time to give second reading to the Bill, allow second reading to the Bill, so that it may receive in Committee of the Whole the broadest debate and discussion.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak on the philosophy of the Bill because I don't think it's got a philosophy and I don't think the Honourable Member outlined the philosophy whatsoever. However, I'm very, very curious if he would outline the difference in the two philosophies with the existing section that's in the Legislation now and the philosophy which would be embodied in the amendment that he's proposing and what would he hope to accomplish by changing the Legislation. I think we have a right to have him outline the different philosophies and what he hopes to accomplish.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member from Watson Lake.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, perhaps, in answering a direct question to the Honourable Member, it would not preclude, I would trust, any other Member to speak, is this the situation, Mr. Speaker?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** I find it difficult, without discussing the context of the Bill in detail, which I would have to do to explain my position in respect of civil rights. Civil rights are denied, as you will find in your explanatory note where it indicates the current session, or the current section, 17.1(e), which of course we will find within the Bill. But that section does allow in hearings evidence which does not necessarily have to be evidence which would normally be heard in a court of law or in a tribunal anywhere else in our judiciary or in our legislation. It leaves discretion to a board to do what it wants and the evidence that it receives can be hearsay; it can be anything.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, this is contrary to the Canadian Bill of Rights, which certainly provides that a person has the right to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations.

The amendment, as I've stated before, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to...

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, I find this whole discussion most improper in this House. This is dealing with a matter which is still to be decided before the courts of this land, and I would not venture to make any comment at this time on this entire subject.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, with deference to the Honourable Member, she is entirely incorrect. This matter is not before any courts of the land, or any laws of the land, at this point in time...

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** ... Mr. Speaker, and it is not sub judice...

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, the inference has just been made that the Civil Bill of Rights has been infringed by a Board of Inquiry established by this government, and I cannot countenance such statements, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** This matter is not before a court in the sense that it cannot be discussed, Mrs. Whyard. I think it is permissible for the Member to discuss it.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member who is now proposing this Private Member's Bill should consider very carefully the subject of conflict of interest.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mr. Taylor?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Perhaps the Member is confused. I have made no such allegations that any Board has ever done anything in this regard. I am stating that the Ordinance is inconsistent with the Canadian Bill of Rights, and I would ask for the concurrence of the House to get it into Committee where we may be able to properly debate and consider the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Are you ready for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** This brings us to the end of the Order Paper.

May I have your further pleasure at this time?  
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.

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

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

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Mr. Speaker do now leave

the Chair and that the House resolve into 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 that the Motion is carried.

*(Motion carried)*

*(Mr. Speaker leaves Chair)*

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

*(Recess)*

**Mr. Chairman:** I now call this Committee to order. Before proceeding with the consideration of the supps, I have received a request that Mr. John Brock, President of Cyprus Anvil Corporation, be requested to appear as witness before Committee. Is Committee in agreement?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mrs. Watson:** Now?

**Mr. Chairman:** No, not now — so that the Clerk can make arrangements for his appearance.

**Mrs. Watson:** Agreed.

**Mr. Lengerke:** That would be as soon as possible, Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** Very well.

Vote 600, Establishment 600, we now have this information. Is there any further debate on Establishment 600?

**Mrs. Watson:**

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. When we last went through this establishment, we were discussing primarily, I believe, the \$10,000.00 that was being suggested to be used for a study to study electrical franchises in the Yukon.

At that time, when we went through it last time, I said the necessity of spending the \$10,000.00 for a study to be done by the Territorial Government was not necessary because we would have to be funding the Board, and I still maintain that we will have to be funding the Electrical Public Utilities Board in order to analyze the various franchises that will be put before them.

However, I believe the Chairman of the Board stated that I was incorrect in my arguments, which is fine; I will accept his decision. However, I don't necessarily agree with him and I'm not going to belabour it.

It brings forward some of the very grave deficiencies

in the legislation that the Board has to operate under, and I'm sure that they have taken to interpret it one way, which is absolutely fine. I am interpreting certain sections in another way, and I think that it brings forward, if you spend any time going through the Electrical Public Utilities Ordinance, or I imagine if the Board, who is trying to work under the Ordinance, will see some very glaring deficiencies in the legislation, and I would hope that the Territorial Government — not now, because we have hearings in progress and this type of thing — would undertake to probably get some special advice and to undertake a review of the legislation.

Just for example, a franchise means an agreement whereby the right to supply electricity within a defined area is granted. Now, to supply electricity, is this distribution or generation? These are some of the questions that are being brought up that came to my mind, and that is one suggestion I have.

I have some questions, more specifically, on the information paper that was handed out by the Minister of Local Government. It was a reply to a letter that I had written to the government asking for a list of the existing franchises and their expiry date, and in the letter we were advised that application had been made for franchises by the Yukon Electric, for the communities of Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay/Burwash, Keno City, Old Crow, Pelly Crossing, Stewart Crossing, Swift River, Tagish and Ross River, as well as franchise the boundary extensions in several areas, including Haines Junction.

Now, my first question is, the communities that the Yukon Electric has applied for, for the right to have a franchise, have they at the present time got a franchise or is there an, was there an interim permission given by the Electrical Board for the Yukon Electric to supply electricity in the communities? That's my first question for the Minister.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** There are no franchise agreements in those communities where Yukon Electrical has applied at this point in time and I think there are interim operating agreements in these areas.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I would suggest and I would certainly hope that the government gives this consideration that since these communities do not have a franchise that the government advertise and ask for, give other people or companies the opportunities to bid on supplying electricity to these communities. Right now, Yukon Electric has applied. Should we not, as a government, say that we have had applications from one company, shouldn't we give the opportunity to any company, or even an individual, who feels that they should be able to bid on that franchise? Is the government planning on advertising in this regard? My next question.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** This is exactly the reason why we retain consultants, Mr. Chairman. They are presently looking at the proposed franchise that Yukon

Electrical has proposed for those areas where they do not now have franchises and are going to recommend to the government whether there should be changes, whether we should be advertising independently for other — These are the types of decisions which the experts which we have hired are supposed to deliver to the Department of Local Government so that we can then make a decision as to where we go from here. We haven't got that expertise in our department.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect, I don't think that requires expertise. I think that's just good judgment that could be exercised by the Territorial Government to advertise and state that they are accepting bids for franchise operations in these various communities and I would feel quite upset if a franchise was entered into with Yukon Electric and the opportunity was not given to other companies and to individuals to apply.

Another question that I would like to ask, or possibly it's not necessary to ask the question because the Honourable Member has given some indication that they have not made any decisions, they're going to take the advice of the experts.

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** No, I didn't say that.

**Mrs. Watson:** Well, then, I can get my two bits' worth in. Maybe I'm not an expert but I think that we, here, in this Legislature, have to make some recommendations on this.

The last franchises, the existing franchises, most of them were for twenty years. Now, twenty years is a long time in our modern society and there are many, many changes being proposed, not being proposed, but five years can make quite a difference in the Yukon. 1970 — 1975 are two different things. 1970 and 1990 — you couldn't foresee what the needs of the Yukon would be twenty years hence. So I am going to be bringing in a resolution recommending that we not embark upon long-term franchises at this time, for that very specific reason. Five years would be adequate, particularly when the company who is applying for a franchise is established so they are not in the position where they're going to have to make a lot capital investment to carry on the operation that they have. I think it's a very, very serious thing that we here have to consider and give some direction to the Government of the Territory.

The other area that does concern me a great deal is the fact, and I would again like to thank the Administration who gave us a copy, of the franchise agreement which is in existence at the present time in the community of Haines Junction. And we were informed that similar other franchises almost the same type of agreement, and the franchise for Yukon Electric in the community of Haines Junction, most of you know how large it is, extends 25 miles on either side. Now they are not supplying electricity in that area at all, with a couple of exceptions possibly, a few miles out of town.

Now, they already have the franchise for 25 miles, and we are being informed that there is an application for an extension of boundaries and I think we would be very, very wrong if we even considered that. We are not leaving any of our options open, as far as pipeline or many

things that could happen.

We are setting, would be setting a condition for any future development right there, so that, again, should be very, very carefully looked at.

Also, the franchise gives that company the sole authority to supply, the sole and exclusive right, privilege, licence and privilege, to sell and supply, distribute to residents within an area, having a radius of 25 miles, the sole and exclusive right.

Now, there should be something in these franchises that does not give them the complete and sole and exclusive right. If there was a large development, if there was a large mine, if there is a pipeline, any large development, the conditions again would be set; that mine, smelter, pipeline, what have you, would not have the ability to determine the type of electrical — or where they would be getting their power for their operation.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those remarks, I am not going to continue to oppose the \$10,000.00. I'm not going to hold up the supplementary budget, and I am going to be bringing in some recommendations, some resolutions, outlining some of the things that I have stated, because I think that this is one of the most important things that we're getting into in the Yukon this year, and for a few years following. Quite a few of the franchises are coming due, and I think the government needs a little bit of political input.

Before I completely let Establishment 600 go through, I would like to ask why do we not utilize our staff of economists, and advisors that we have as part of the new units or department of the Government of the Territory? Why do we have to go outside for advisors when we were just told this is exactly the type of thing, they're economists, couldn't they do the analyses of the franchises? My question to the Minister.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, there's a lot of ground to cover, I think I could just make a few remarks.

On the longevity of the franchises, and I don't admit to be any kind of an expert on electrical franchises, but my advisors tell me that it's just the opposite of what the Honourable Member says is true, that the longer the franchise, generally the better the rates it is for the consumers. Because if it is every five years, that the rates and conditions will be renewed, every five years, and major companies such as Yukon Electrical Company, don't like to enter into a rate structure that would be good down the line, if they know that they're going to have to renegotiate on a five year basis. That's one of the areas in which our consultants are looking at at the present time.

The other point that I do want to make is that I've instructed my officers in the Department of Local Government, that all of the L.I.D.'s and the individual members are to be kept consulted and informed as to the stage, any stage of the present franchise negotiation.

I'm led to believe that we have received a preliminary report on draft franchises from Price, Waterhouse up to this point, and any of the Members are certainly welcome to go to the Department of Local Government. They will be available, whatever comes in from our

consultants at the very time that it comes in, and we hope that this is exactly what we're attempting to do, that the unorganized areas, that the Local Improvement Districts and that the Members who don't have this expertise will be kept informed of what is happening at any given moment, as far as their particular franchise goes.

So I hope Members will avail themselves of this information, that will be made available as we go along.

The Economic Research and Planning Unit, of course, was not in place when we started this study. I believe that we were told that it really has only come into being several months ago, and I'm not sure whether there is anybody in that Economic and Research Planning Unit which didn't have the expertise at this time with their latest addition, whether they now have people in who are qualified to deal, and pretty technical and pretty — it's a pretty narrow field of discipline, dealing with electrical rate structures. One of the Economic Research planners has this expertise, then of course we will use it in the future.

But at the present, and when we wanted to examine the franchise agreements, when we received draft agreements from Yukon Electric that they wanted to enter into franchises in these areas, it was really the only route we had to go at that particular moment.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a question that the Minister of Local Government — maybe he can confirm this. Is it not true, Mr. Minister, that in the case of the franchises or the — in the case of the operations at Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay, Burwash, Keno cities, the ones referred to in the third or fourth paragraph, that Yukon Electrical did, and not just recently but quite some time ago, quite a number of years ago, did ask to enter into a franchise agreement?

I think they were told by this government, or by the government of the day then, that this in fact would not, it wasn't really necessary. I think that business of the day at that point in time was done on a rather informal basis and I think it was just an understanding.

Now, what bothers me is that in fact then, if that is true, that now it would be the case for a franchise renewal and I think it would have a little difference when you're considering proposals from Yukon Electrical on this case.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting to dig out from the records, some of the debates that went on with some of the various franchises and I think the Honourable Member from Watson Lake will probably remember some of them. All of the franchise agreements used to come to this House for debate and we threw one out, I believe it was the Teslin, that Bill 13, the Teslin subdivision for some particular point which memory escapes me at this time, but at that point in time, the Commissioner just signed the interim agreement, the franchise agreements with the person providing the power, so that was the way that we were handling these, in more informal days. If we didn't agree to a bill and threw it out, then the Commissioner would just go on his way, sign a franchise agreement or

an interim operating authority. So there's quite a long and involved — which would fill volumes of the problems of dealing with franchise agreements in the Yukon up to this point in time.

We hope that we'll be able to rationalize it through franchise agreement, through having expertise, making sure Yukon consumers get the best deal, particularly in the smaller communities and hopefully, keeping the Members and the local L.I.D.'s and the unorganized areas available and aware of what's happening at every particular stage and attempt to rationalize this franchise arrangement throughout the Yukon.

As the Honourable Member from Kluane says, it's no small task, it's a large order problem and one that we're attempting at least to bring some sense to and I hope we're successful.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm very concerned about a twenty year franchise at any time, because as the Minister said, of course, it does give the companies a chance to possibly give us cheaper rates.

However, I'm not even concerned at this time with franchises. I would like to ask the Minister if the Board or whatever is going to study all the franchises, has there been any thought to them studying the possibility of operating our own power in Yukon Territory instead of studying the franchises?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, if I went and tried to dictate to the Board what they do, the Honourable Member would jump down my back with a vengeance like I couldn't believe. I have no authority and will not, and cannot instruct the Yukon Electrical Public Utilities Board. I think so much of the membership on that, that if I did they'd complain to — probably the Speaker of this Legislature that I was trying to exert undue political influence on them.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister misunderstood me, I said "the Board". However, we are spending a bunch of money now to have some planning, something, I don't know what you're getting, to study the franchises in the Yukon Territory and if we should have a franchise.

What I'm asking is the government which consists of the Executive Members, the Commissioner and that group, and possibly myself, but I'm attempting now to do so, study the fact as to whether we can run our own power or not cheaper than what it's being run now. Other than spending money on studying franchises.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, could I suggest to the Member that a better answer to that question could be obtained from the Chairman of the Northern Canada Power Commission when he comes before the House in Committee of the Whole. I think that he's going to give you a heck of a — I happen to think you can. But I can't back that up with facts, figures and statistics,

which I'm sure the Chairman of the NCPC will be able to do.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, as I've said before, to me this is one of the most serious things that we have to consider. This year or in the next few years, and we are actually, we are talking about planning for our future. Well, this is it. This is the nuts and bolts of it, of our future.

I'd like to go on record that I want to be kept informed on whether it's my own community or whether it's communities in my constituency, or whether it's Mr. Fleming's community in Teslin, I would like to see the reports of the experts. While I respect expert's ability, I don't think a little bit of political sugar helps some of the experts' reports.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** If we could depend on the House to supply that political sugar, Mr. Chairman, it would be much appreciated.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Honourable Member from Kluane, she made some interesting comments which I think escaped the Minister of Local Government, I expected him to reply on it.

I have to agree to let other companies bid on a franchise, but she on the one hand says, a 20 year franchise is too long, 5 years is long enough, fine. On one hand she says new companies should be able to bid on it, but on the other hand, she also says that the established company does not have a large investment already, because they invested money in the Yukon.

So how does she explain on one hand she wants new companies bidding on the franchise; on the other hand she keeps them out because she doesn't want to give them a 20 year franchise?

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I realize this, I realize this full well, that if a new company was bidding on a franchise, the fact that it was a short term franchise would certainly be to his disadvantage, this is very true.

But we are not in there to give a disadvantage or an advantage to a company. We're trying to get the best deal, but we still, I think, as a government, when you're going to give someone the sole and exclusive right, we still as a government have to advertise and let anybody who wants to, bid on it.

Whether the new guy's at a disadvantage because he doesn't have it there, and it's a short term one, but some of them, but some people in some of these areas may have the ability, without too much capital investment, to provide the electricity, other than the company that's operating now, and we can't exclude that either.

So I know that it sounds like, it contradicts itself, but it's still a requirement to go to bid.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I think this is what the whole exercise of this particular study is supposed to be, to look at franchises, and I think we talk about for so long over the same thing with the Department is trying to do in the first place.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I agree the Department is trying to get an expert's advice, and I say we have experts here we should have used that are on our payroll at the present time, but if we didn't watch this, and didn't monitor it, and didn't get our political input in, we would be abrogating some of our responsibility too. I don't want to sit here and go along with the experts. We've done it before, right down the path and sometimes they haven't led to where we want to go.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is there any further debate on Establishment 600?  
Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 605. Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about the one time grants of \$104,000.00, to the municipalities, and the paper that we got states during budget deliberation one year ago, the former Commissioner assured this Assembly that every attempt would be made to provide for a one time only per capita windfall grant to municipalities, based on the adjusted preliminary population statistics obtained in 1976.

Well, I sort of researched that and I couldn't find any reference to that, but that really doesn't matter. But we all know that under a program of assistance to municipalities, the Yukon Government provides grants based on population, population set by Statistics Canada. We all know that the community of Faro, and of Whitehorse have said that it isn't completely fair, because their populations change between the statistics and they are not getting the benefit of it.

Now, the statistics were taken in 1976, and there were preliminary figures out in 1976. However, under the Municipal Aid Legislation, you are not able to use the new statistics until June of the following year. The new statistics shouldn't really be used until June of 1977, on which to base your per capita grant.

My first question for the Minister is, how did you arrive at your \$104,000.00?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, that would be the difference, that the grants would have been given to municipalities using the 1971 figures, and the 1976 figures.

I would also like to state, Mr. Chairman, that the former Commissioner, in his opening address, Speech from the Throne last year, stated that no provisions have been made in this budget for increased per capita grants to municipalities. However, following the receipt of the 1976 census, the population figures in early 1977, there will be a reassessment of the financial positions of the Municipalities in the light of the high rate of infla-

tion.

At that time, consideration will be given to the provision of one time special grants to help ease the burden of shrinking dollars on municipal governments, and I might say that the municipal governments kept reminding me and reminding me of that statement of the former Commissioner in his opening address, Speech from the Throne at the last budget session, and I felt obligated to make sure if the money was available, that that promise of the former Commissioner be initiated.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, so you have actually used the new statistics for your 1976 calculations then?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason why there is a line item in a supplementary budget, rather than under the Municipal Aid Ordinance, because we realize the problem with using them under the Municipal Aid Ordinance, in June of last year.

It's going to be a problem next year, because I imagine what we'll be doing is to be giving a grant on the old ones, and bringing it up to the other ones when we're able to use it according to the legislation, but in one way or another, the municipalities are going to get their 1970 — and we have budgeted their 1977 per capita grants on the 1976 D.B.S. statistics.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, this is what I thought. Are you going to follow the same procedure in 1977, because it says in June of '77, so you will have to again come back, and you said this would be a one time grant, so if you are going to do what you're doing, you're going to have to make a second one time grant in 1977, am I correct?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think so. This is a one time windfall grant, which really does not have a relationship to the terms of the Municipal Aid Ordinance. It's a line item vote in the budget, which is perfectly competent under the Financial Administration Ordinance, which I'm led to believe.

The reason why we wanted to do it in supplementary is because it was a commitment of the former Commissioner for those years when the populations in municipalities were rising, and no considerations were being given to that rise, because we had to go by the 1971 statistics.

Now, I think the actual — that's the reason it was explained to me, why we were doing it in supplementaries, and I believe that any questions on the financial procedures other than that, I would appreciate if they were addressed to the Treasury Department, because I don't have any further answers.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, that's specifically the point that I'm getting to. We have a Municipal Aid Ordinance, which specifically defines the terms under which Municipal grants are given to municipalities, very, very specifically.

Now, we are saying we want to deviate from our own



legislation, which is the law as far as grants to municipalities is concerned, for this government, we want to deviate and give additional money, and just vote it as a line item, and I maintain, and I'm not arguing with the money being given. What I am saying is, there is no way that we should authorize the government to go ahead and spend, give a grant which is contrary to our law, because our law very specifically says you use the new statistics figures in June of 1977, whether you like it or not, it's in there.

Now, if you want to use the statistics figures of 1976, amend your legislation. If you want to do it for one year only, please amend your legislation, give yourself the power to do it, but don't ask us to vote money against our own laws, and I think if you would check the Financial Administration Ordinance, the Commissioner cannot grant it either. It has to be for a specific service.

So it would be one of the, it would be just a horrible thing for us to vote money, contrary to our own laws, and I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member has two choices. I think that he can amend the Municipal Ordinance, or he can bring in enabling legislation for a one time grant, but get the authority, notwithstanding the Municipal Aid Legislation, we can do this, bring that forward, but don't ask me to spend money that I am not entitled to spend, by law.

I don't think anyone in this House should be prepared to spend that money against the law that is on our books. I think that everyone should consider it, if the enabling legislation was brought in, be it an amendment or a one time Bill.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I can say as I asked the former Commissioner, the former Treasurer, the present Treasurer and the present Legal Advisor whether what we were doing was completely legal and above board and was assured by all of them, yes, that's good enough for me. As far as I'm concerned, I don't think the municipalities will be bringing us to court over this.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Well, Mr. Chairman, don't ever ask me to pass a bill here, don't ask me to pass any bill outlining a policy or a formula because the government feels that they can break law. What's the point. What's the point about sitting here? What was the point about sitting here and doing the Liquor Ordinance? I ask you. It was passed by a majority in this House and has it been brought into effect? No. All we do is sit and make recommendations. And what happens? Nothing.

Now, we're being asked to break our own laws and I'm saying don't ask me to do that. And I don't think any of us should do it. Bring in your legislation, do it properly.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I would be most happy if the Members request to delay the implementation of the one time grants until the experts that I have heard from have satisfied me and satisfied, or otherwise, the Members of this House. That's a legitimate request for information that is available and

if Members ask for that information, witnesses can be brought forward before this House to bring that information to Honourable Members.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the wish of Committee to go on with that consideration or shall we vote on it now?  
**Mrs. Watson?**

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, you can get all the experts' advice that you like, whether it's legal to do it by a vote wording. I don't care whether the expert says you can do it by vote wording, but you still have a law. And this, the general public so often says that, the government has laws, but they don't have to live by them. And we would be doing exactly the same thing. The government has laws but they don't have to live by them.

How many times do the Honourable Members sitting around here hear that? Quite often, quite often. They don't follow the building code, they don't follow the fire protection, they don't do this. You often hear the government accused of this whether there's any legitimacy to it or not. But the public so often says that.

We just had a fine example the other day in Northern Health, isn't under the Labour Code. Right? Okay. Do we have a law in our books for municipal aid? Do you want to deviate for it one time? Let us pass the enabling legislation. Don't ask us to do it by vote wording.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson, it is the wish of Committee that we do bring a witness forward and at that time I'm sure you will be able to question him.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I don't care how many witnesses you bring forward.

**Mr. Chairman:** That is the wish of Committee, Mrs. Watson.

Can we have these witnesses at 1:30, Mr. McKinnon?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** I will try to see whether I can arrange their busy schedule so that they can be available for Committee, Mr. Chairman.

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

*(Recess)*

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

At recess, Committee was asking for a legal interpretation regarding Establishment 605, one time grant to municipalities. Mr. Sherlock?

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, allow me to compliment Mrs. Watson on her adherence to principle, most commendable, however, I wish to assure the Member that she will not have to compromise her principles in any way by voting for this particular appropriation.

What we have here are two separate pieces of legislation, and one does not contradict the other, if taken separately. On one hand, certain grants can be made to the Municipalities, under the Municipal Aid Ordinance, and in this case, a one time grant, a special grant, under the Ordinance that is now being debated, that is the Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1976-77.

So in my view, there is no conflict between the two, and from a financially legal point of view, the two are quite legal and correct.

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

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, I agree with that opinion, but the principle is that no money may be spent by the council, or by the government, unless it's approved by the Commissioner-in-Council, which means by an ordinance. The Appropriation Ordinance is an ordinance, the other one is also an ordinance, so an amendment could be made to the Municipal Aid Ordinance, or a separate ordinance could be introduced or it could be done by way of appropriation.

For years and years, a number of expenditures have been made by this government, and the only legal sanction has been, so far as an ordinance is concerned, is by an appropriation, and sometimes this is continued indefinitely for years.

For instance, we expended money under the Legal Aid Appropriation in the Appropriations Ordinance for many years, but eventually then when the detailed scheme was put together, it became the subject of a separate ordinance. This is something which has been hallowed by custom and it's perfectly legal, and has been since this council first commenced its operations.

**Mr. Chairman:** We would also like to ask the witnesses if this type of procedure is carried out in other jurisdictions.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's been done for a hundred years by the Government of Canada in the same way.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, is that all the witnesses?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I respect the opinion of the legal advice that we've had and this is correct, I knew this would be the legal advice and the financial advice. I'm quite aware of that, that you can vote something by a line of appropriation. But that isn't the point that I was making.

The point that I was making is, under the Municipal Aid Legislation, we define how we calculate aid to municipalities and we calculate them on the basis of statistics and a per capita grant by the population based on the Statistics Canada and a per capita grant.

Now this grant that is being proposed now is also based on statistics and is also based on per capita and that is precisely the point I am making. You are lifting this out of that and it's still a per capita grant, whether you call it unconditional. The Honourable Member said today, I asked him how he calculated it and they calculate under the terms of the Municipal Aid legislation.

I am saying, if you are giving that kind of a grant, based on number of people, increase in population, based on so much per person, then for goodness sakes, amend your Municipal Aid legislation or, as the Legal Advisor said, and as I said this morning, bring in a

separate bill.

I am quite aware that you could make, you could sit down and say I'm going to make a grant to so and so, which we are proposing in the — in assisting the Dawson sewer and water system. But that is a specific grant for the sewer and water system. It isn't a per capita grant. I think, that if Honourable Members consider, and I'm sure that the Legal Advisor will agree with me, that because the grant is based on the formula in that legislation, we'd better amend legislation.

Everyone is sitting and saying she's trying to slow down the supplementaries. I am not trying to slow down the supplementals, at all. I want it to be done properly. And we have a law and we should obey our own law.

I am quite prepared to stand this supplemental aside until, in Committee, until the legislation is drafted, and I don't think it would be an extensive piece of drafting, and bring it forward, and we can pass the legislation which will give the government the authority to give extra money to the municipalities, on the basis of a per capita grant.

Thank you.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** Mr. Chairman, that's a political question, really, it's not really a legal question.

**Mrs. Watson:** You bet it is.

**Mr. Legal Advisor:** As I said, the government has a choice of using one of three legally sound methods. The government has chosen to use a particular method for its own reasons, so it's not really a legal question, it's a political question, and it's not quite correct to say one method is more proper than the other. Each is appropriate for its purpose.

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

**Mr. McIntyre:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, may we clear this item?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.  
Establishment 605, clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

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

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Members are making a very, very, very bad decision.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson, this has been debated, and --

**Mrs. Watson:** And I think -- no, Mr. Chairman --

**Mr. Chairman:** -- it's now been voted on --

**Mrs. Watson:** -- I think I have the right to debate it.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has now been voted on, so we'll now consider Vote 6.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, do you realize we have

given the authority to people just --

**Mr. Chairman:** You're out of order, Mrs. Watson, you're out of order, Mrs. Watson.

**Mrs. Watson:** Well, I think I'm completely out of order, because I happen to think a little differently.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Local Government, Department of Local Government, decrease \$35,736.00.

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

**Some Members:** Clear.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** I have other questions on that 605, which I should have the right to ask.

**Mr. Chairman:** 605 has now been cleared, Mrs. Watson.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I was denied the right for information by this House.

**Mr. Chairman:** We are now considering Vote 6, Department of Local Government.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Schedule A, Second Review, Administrative Services, \$212,524.00.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?  
Department of Treasury. \$584,212.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Education. \$162,939.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Territorial Secretary and the Registrar General. Decrease \$67,278.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation. \$797,551.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Local Government. Decrease \$35,736.00.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information. \$65,868.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Legal Affairs. \$3,423.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Department of Highways and Public Works. Decrease \$299,900.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yukon Housing Corporation. \$162,269.00. Clear.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Project Capital. \$2,176,100.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Loan, Amortization. \$45,000.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Schedule A. \$3,806,972.00. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall Schedule A carry?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mrs. Watson:** Disagreed. I want my vote recorded.

**Mr. Chairman:** There are no recorded votes in Committee, Mrs. Watson, but you already succeeded in doing so.

WHEREAS it appears by message from Aurthur Pearson, Esquire, Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, and in the estimates accompanying the same that the sums hereinafter mentioned in Schedule A of this Ordinance are required to defray certain expenses of the public service of the Yukon Territory and for the purpose relating thereto, for the twelve months ending the 31st day of March, 1977.

THEREFORE, the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, by and with the advice and consent of the Council of the said Territory, enacts as follows:

Second Appropriation Ordinance 1976-77.

**Mr. Chairman:** We'll have to first carry the clauses that were not carried before because of Committee's desire to cover them at this stage.

One (1):

(Reads Clause 1 (1))

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Two (1):

(Reads Clause 2 (1))

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I don't

know why I'm thanking you, it's a right I have.

I think you are all aware I'm going to oppose it, and I wouldn't have opposed it if I hadn't been denied, if you people hadn't agreed to go along and make a political decision to spend \$104,000.00, which isn't completely the worst of it.

There's another \$80,000.00 in the budget for the sewer and water system in Dawson City. There was \$15,000.00 voted. Not one person has stood up and asked why, not one person has stood up and asked if there was a formula; not one person has stood up and asked whether we are going to continue to fund the deficit of the operation of the Dawson sewer and water system, or whether we are going to put it on a formula basis. Not one person has, we just automatically agree to spend an additional \$80,000.00.

I'm just absolutely appalled. I will be asking further questions on that type of expenditure when we get into the Main Estimates. I realize now that I won't be getting any answers, and I'll be cut off if I try to get information on it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clause 2, are we clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mrs. Watson:** Disagree. Mr. Chairman, I would like to record my disagreement on Clause 2.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clause 3 (1):

*(Reads Clause 3 (1))*

**Mr. Chairman:** Four (1):

*(Reads Clause 4 (1))*

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the Bill carry?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, disagreed, I'd like it recorded.

**Mr. Chairman:** Do I have leave to report the Bill without amendment?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** The Committee will carry on to Bill Number 2. First Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78. Clause One.

*(Reads Clause 1)*

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether this is the point or not, and I'll be guided by the Chairman. As all Honourable Members will know that there has been a distinct change in the format of the estimates for this year, this took quite some debate at sub-committee on finance meetings and Treasury convinced the members on the sub-committee of finance that this was a much more palatable way of presenting the estimates, and also gave much more information

than did the last estimates.

I'm not sure that I'm all convinced by the arguments that the people from Treasury made at that time, and I was wondering whether the members would like an explanation from Treasury as to the format, and what they feel is additional information in the estimates in the form in which it has been presented to Committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think that would be very appropriate if we could have such an explanation. We've all had difficulties with the transition.

Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, the main change which has been made has been the breaking out of the establishments into their component activities.

I recall last year towards the end of the budget session, one or perhaps two or three of the Members spoke to the budget, and in doing so, mentioned that after having voted substantial amounts of money, in some cases they were still at a loss as to exactly what was going to happen with the money being spent. They might know how much was being spent on office supplies, how much was being spent on pool cars, et cetera, et cetera, but there was an indication they didn't know what was going to be accomplished.

So what we endeavoured to do is to break the establishments into their components, wherever that was possible, to provide a bit more information as to what activities are being carried on within the establishments. So that was the main theme behind the changes which were, in fact, made.

**Mr. Chairman:** Thank you, Mr. Williams.  
Mrs. Watson.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, for the records, I'm not arguing about the formats, the information, but I do take great exception with the print. I understand they didn't have a great deal of time, they were trying to fit a great deal of information into one page, but the print is, I think it's extremely small. Maybe a person shouldn't be my age and be in this Assembly to try to read it, but I have problems trying to read it without using a ruler and carrying the figures across. And I would certainly suggest that for next year, put it on larger paper and use larger print.

**Mr. Chairman:** Vote one. Administrative Services. \$2,374,100.00.

Mr. Taylor.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of interest for the members of Committee, under Establishment 100, to date, we've spent, in relation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, from the \$8,000.00 allotted us, only \$2,671.91. And in respect of the Legislative Committees, I can report that the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee, \$319.30, and the Committee expenses on Yukon Land Claims Committee, \$1,985.32.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 100. Yukon Legislative Assembly. \$331,700.00 I refer you to pages 12 and 13.

Mrs. Watson.

**Mrs. Watson:** Salaries and Wages. For members of the Assembly and the elected members of the Executive Committee. How many members of the Executive Committee are we budgeting for in this Vote?

**Mr. Chairman:** Will one of the Ministers attempt to reply?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Twelve members, three elected members of the Executive Committee, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** There's a considerable increase, is that quite normal over '76-'77. Is this normal increases?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, these are the payments which have been approved by the Anti-Inflation Board.

**Mrs. Watson:** It's just normal increases.

**Mr. Williams:** It's normal, right.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is there any further debate on Establishment 100?

Mrs. Whyard.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, no debate, but I think it might be an appropriate time for Mr. Speaker to inform the House of the activities of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, as all members know, being members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, our activities during the season were somewhat limited. The Speakers' meeting, it was unfortunate, due to the conflict of the sitting of the House, it was not possible for me to attend that this year on behalf of the House, but we did have an opportunity to attend the Area Conference in company with Mr. Deputy Speaker, in Charlottetown, this last fall. The conference was very rewarding, as the report to the members indicated and we, unfortunately, were unable to host any visiting delegations during the year.

I can report that the House of Commons, through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, are still working very diligently on the presentation of a Clerks Table to this House, and it is hoped that by fall that the Honourable James Jerome, the Speaker of the House of Commons will be here to present us with that table.

Also, in future activities, I believe the big, the major Commonwealth Conference will be hosted by Canada this year. Meetings are now underway in Ottawa to prepare for this. The Yukon will not be playing too predominant a role.

There is a week of tours lined up across Canada, and it is just virtually impossible to, in view of the enormity of this conference, to get people into the Yukon, Mr. Chairman, and so we will be playing a rather low key role this year in general Canadian area Commonwealth Parliamentary activities, and this is about all I have to report at this time, unless there are any questions. I

would be glad to help answer them.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that we are not going to have any of the post-congress tours of the Parliamentary Association in the Yukon?

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is correct. Each tour, they're booked pretty well across the country, across the provincial regions of Canada, and they're broken into four, actually four tours, they're kind of counter-rotating. Each tour doesn't see all of Canada.

Some will go to the Maritimes, some will come to western Canada, some to Ontario, Quebec, and some into the Prairie regions. As I say, just because of the enormity of the project, it is not possible to -- for the Yukon to accommodate this situation.

Also, there are some very, very heavy financial responsibilities for those host provinces for the week that they host these tours within their province, and it would be obviously not wise for us at this time to even attempt to find the many thousands of dollars it would require to work into this schedule, were it possible that we could work into it.

The whole situation was such that it was not possible to do this.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment again on what the Honourable Member from Klucane remarking before, and I think it sort of leaves a bad taste in my mouth, and I think it should be for the record, I would like to get it on record, what is the salary on an appointed Ex-Com member, and what is the salary of an elected Ex-Com member?

I also would like to get on record how much the Members of the Legislative Assembly make right now.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I do have a schedule which supports that item of \$251,000.00. I could have it duplicated and distributed if the Members wish.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I think what the Honourable Member wants is what is the salary range of the Public Service Commission schedule, for a person in, an appointed person in an Executive Committee job, in the Territorial salary range, what would be the position if there were another appointed Member on the Executive Committee with the former Member's qualifications, what salary range would that be?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, it's a question, what does an elected Member of the Ex-Com get as opposed to what an appointed Member gets?

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I would like to see the comparison on record, what does an elected Member get right now, and what an appointed Member gets right now, on Ex-Com.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman at the present time, the only two appointed Members of the -- there are two appointed Members of the Executive Committee, and neither one of them -- and in neither case, does their salary appear in our budget.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, what was the salary range that the former appointed Member of the Executive Committee, that was paid out of the Territorial budget, what was the salaries?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know the full range, but the maximum of that range was \$45,000.00.

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

**Mr. Berger:** If the witness could please tell us what is an elected Member making?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, the elected Member of the Executive Committee cannot come in, according to the Executive Committee documents, at a salary higher than the lowest range, than the Executive Committee appointed, so it would be somewhere at the lowest range in that area, of about 36, I would imagine, would be pretty close.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Now, if we could also have for the record, what is the Members making in this House right now?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, as I said, I can distribute the list. There's a basic indemnity of \$8,800.00, but there are, I believe, \$12,800.00, but there are a number of adjustments.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, I think the question also that the Honourable Member from Klondike has been trying to get is what -- we know now that an appointed Member would make somewhere in the \$36,000.00 range annually -- what does an elected Member of the Ex-Com make, in comparison to that?

**Mr. Chairman:** We just had that answer, I think.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** No, I don't think so.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** They did have an answer of what was the range that an appointed member could be started at. I also wish to say the same questions as the Honourable Member from Pelly. I'd like to know what we are getting, what I am getting, today. What are they getting today? And what will be the -- an appointed member?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** I think, in view of the confusion, it would be best for us to table the answer, bring it in tomorrow.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, could it be that the Administration are becoming embarrassed over their failure to be, to give us that one figure? We now know what the bottom salary of an appointed member is in the Public Service salary range; could we know what an elected member of the Executive Committee makes today? By comparison. That's all I want.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, I believe we do have the answer available. We can read it in if that's satisfactory.

**Mr. Chairman:** Please do.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, the projected expenditure for the salary of an elected member of the Executive Committee for the fiscal year 1977-78 is \$36,534.00. The comparable figure, the comparable maximum for a territorial appointed member of that Committee was approximately \$44,900.00.

**Mr. Chairman:** For the coming fiscal year.

**Mr. Williams:** For the fiscal year, 1977-78.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, for clarification of my question, apparently there must have been some misunderstanding. Establishment 100 provides for salaries for councillors and elected members of the Executive Committee and I looked at the amount of \$256,000.00 and asked whether, within that amount, was the salary for a fourth elected member on the Executive Committee. And the reply I got was 'no'. That was my question.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 100.

**Mrs. Watson:** Under Establishment 100.

**Mr. Chairman:** I don't think that comes under that Establishment.

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

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, if I may point

out, the Honourable Member will find that item under 120, 122, Executive Committee.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Vote 100, Establishment 100, it says to provide for the salaries of elected members of the Executive Committee, expenditures for Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Am I not correct?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, the salary figure in Establishment 100 is based on paying the twelve members of this Assembly, including three appointed members to the Executive Committee. The salaries for the fourth member of the Executive Committee, the Territorial appointee, appears in Establishment 120.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, that's all I want.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** That's in the salary range of \$45,403.00.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mrs. Watson, I think you are inferring that you would like to see it under this Establishment.

**Mrs. Watson:** Right. Mr. Chairman, we've been hearing we need a fourth member on the Executive Committee. There is money in the budget. Right? So I am asking whether the money was put into 100. That's all. Whether the elected, whether it was put in for an elected position and taken out of the Administration.

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

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** The answer to that question is no. It was not put in this vote. You will find it in Vote 120 which says, salary for an Assistant Commissioner (Administrative) retained for Ex-Com Member.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 100. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 120. Administrative Services. \$784,800.00.

**Mr. Taylor?**

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is at this point I would like to rise and say that, under Clerk of the Assembly, you will note on Page 14, Establishment 120, Administrative Services; and as you will note also, on Page 9, the whole department, Vote 1, Administrative Services, and I think the time has come, and I think that this Legislature is now mature enough, that we should have, in isolation, our own budget for this Legislative Assembly.

The Clerk of the Assembly's duties on Page 14 are shown as Clerk of the Assembly. The Executive Committee and Commissioner's Support, and I don't really

know how our Clerk, with the many, many chores that she does have to do, both on the administration side of government and on the legislative side of government, can really calculate what portion of her salary or what portion of her time, indeed, is spent working these two positions.

It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, that at some point in time the Clerk of the Assembly would be just that. The Clerk of the Assembly. And function strictly for and in the service of the Assembly, and that another person would be with the Administration and work with the Executive Committee and the Commissioner's support staff.

It was brought to mind a few days ago, in reading a report from our colleagues in the Legislative Assembly in Saskatchewan. They stood a special committee to study the rules and procedures and it was interesting, and I cite from that document, they say in part of their report: "the principle of a continuous and impartial service to Parliament provided by a staff responsible only to Parliament and distinct from a civil service has roots firmly imbedded in Parliamentary history. A Parliament must have its own independent and competent support staff and adequate services if the vital role of Parliament, in its review of the activities of government and its servants, is to be well served."

I found those words, Mr. Chairman, most appropriate to the question I addressed today, and it seems to me that as a first step in the evolution to an independent support staff for this Legislature that we could well, and ought well, ask of the administration of the Government of the Yukon that at least our budget — that in budgeting, that our budget provisions be kept separately and shown separately from those of the administration.

I would like, at this time, Mr. Chairman, to propose a motion and it would be moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Hibberd, that a separate vote be established for the Yukon Legislative Assembly, and that the said Vote encompass the following:

- (1) Statutory emoluments payable to Members of the Legislature;
- (2) Canadian Parliamentary Association activities;
- (3) Operation of Committees of the Assembly;
- (4) Members' services, similar to those provided to Members of Legislature throughout the Commonwealth, and
- (5) Administrative support services to the Assembly.

I would sincerely ask, Mr. Chairman, for the full support of all Members of the Legislature in this regard, and I do have copies of this Resolution for distribution, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. Taylor that a separate vote be established for the Yukon Legislative Assembly and that the said Vote encompass the following:

- (1) Statutory emoluments payable to Members of the Legislature;
- (2) Canadian Parliamentary Association activities;
- (3) Operation of Committees of the Assembly;
- (4) Members' services, similar to those provided to Members of Legislatures throughout the Commonwealth, and
- (5) Administrative support services to the Assembly.

**Mr. McKinnon?**

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, just for some clarification for information. I have no trouble with the resolution at all, but I understood that the Committee on Rules, Privileges and Elections was working on a Yukon Legislative Assembly Act which would encompass, as in all provincial legislatures, the vote of their Legislative Assembly in a separate vote.

I'm just wondering whether the Members felt that it shouldn't come together as an all-encompassing type of legislation with a separate vote, or they felt that we should go ahead with this Resolution at this time.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear in response to the Honourable Member's query, that there is no intention to interfere in any way, shape or form with the functions of the Committee in developing a Legislative Assembly Ordinance.

This resolution would be designed to, you know, inasmuch as we have no report on this it's hard for any Member to know whether it is indeed in conflict. I would not think it would be and it is certainly not intended to.

I think that the Resolution would give support to the Committee, if indeed this happens to be one of their considerations.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, as Chairman of that Committee, I can report that there is no conflict between this motion and the work that is being done by the Committee.

Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, I'm a little concerned about this particular motion. It may have been touched upon briefly by the Committee but, before this Motion was introduced, I don't think that the whole Committee had an opportunity to look at this particular Motion.

I would like to propose an amendment to the resolution, and I would move that this particular motion be referred to Committee of Rules and Privileges before it is duly processed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Your amendment is out of order. The Committee of the Whole does not have the power to do that, Mr. McCall.

Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, I just wondered whether the mover of this Motion intended to sign it?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, indeed; I'm sorry, it was an oversight.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Chairman:** Is there any further debate on Establishment 120?

Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Are we on page 14?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.

**Mrs. Watson:** Man years, Executive Committee. I was confused at a couple of the things that were said during the last debate. Now, who were those five man years, what are the positions?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, those five positions are comprised of four secretarial positions and an Assistant Commissioner position.

**Mrs. Watson:** Thank you.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, then who are the two support staff for the Commissioner?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, those positions are a Secretary, and an internal auditor.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the internal auditor is not a new position, is it?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, no it's not.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** A further question. Establishment 120, Primary 20, Professional and Special Services are for consultant fees and for studies, am I correct!?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** In the Clerk of the Assembly, we have \$78,200.00 for professional and special services.

Under the Executive Committee, we have \$55,000.00. Under the Commissioner support staff, we have 9,000. We are just going to come to the next session of the budget, we'll deal with the Socio-economic Planning Committee, who are supposed to be preparing and assessing and bringing forth reports and studying certain things and making recommendations, and here we have well over \$125,000.00 for further studies.



Now, I would like to know the Clerk of the Assembly, the 78,000, is any of that money allotted to the Legislature, or is that all of the money for the government for studies?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I can give you a breakdown of the Professional and Special Services for all of Establishment 120.

First of all, under the Clerk of the Assembly, there is \$78,200.00. That's comprised of \$68,200.00 for the Hansard contract, and another \$10,000.00 for a Clerk's conference, which is to be hosted in the Yukon this year.

Under the Executive Committee, there is \$55,000.00. That's comprised of \$45,000.00, which is an uncommitted figure, which has been in the base for at least two years and perhaps longer, and 10,000.00 for a study in relation to the Elections Ordinance.

Then under Commissioner's support, there is \$9,200.00, which is budgeted for a study for a Land Planner. That's to cover a contract, the remaining portion of a contract. I believe the contract is at least one year old, and perhaps two years old.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, a land planner?

**Mr. Williams:** I hope I've got that correct, Mr. Chairman. It's the Land Use Planner, Mr. Chambers' contract.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, why isn't it under Local Government?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, it was transferred from Local Government to Commissioner Support Services, because the majority of Mr. Chambers' time will be used at a committee which is being set up presently on land selection criteria, where Mr. Chambers' expertise will come more under the Commissioner's and Land Claim Duties, than the Department of Local Government.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I note a change downward in primary 10 to 12 salaries and wages. I wonder if that means a change in man years.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, yes there is a change of man years in that Establishment. Two positions, the economist position and the statistician position have been moved to the Economic Planning Unit, and then another position has been added, a law clerk position so there are two positions which have been transferred out, plus one new position which has been added.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, I just had one question that occurred to me at this moment, Mr. Chairman, and I perhaps could direct it to the Honourable Minister of

Local Government.

I wonder if he could tell me how far advanced we are on the study, respecting the Elections Ordinance?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the details on how far we are advanced on the Elections Ordinance.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, that will be all right, I will inquire within the administration. It's just something that I happened to think of.

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

**Mr. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the rental for the Clerk of the Assembly of \$117,000.00, is the rental of the Legislative Chambers charged to that vote?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, one more question, I don't know who can answer it. Are we going to be looking for more office space up on the third floor as we transfer more people up into the support staff? Who can answer it?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** That's probably my department, because I found out that I'm in charge of this building just the other day, but I haven't got that information. I hope we will not have to be renting space back from the Lynn Building, Mr. Chairman, in the next year.

**Mr. Chairman:** Not until January the 1st of next year, when the lease runs out.

**Ms. Millard?**

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, could we have a breakdown on primary 99, Miscellaneous?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, you can see it's broken into two activities, \$6,000.00 has been allowed for entertainment expenses incurred by Members of the Executive Committee, and \$13,800.00 relates to entertainment expenditures incurred by the Commissioner.

**Mr. Chairman:** I'm ignorant, Mr. Williams. What's nugatory payment?

**Mr. Williams:** I'm sorry, I don't know.

**Mr. Chairman:** Does no one know? Even worse, we're voting on things we don't understand at all. Committee will declare a brief recess.

(RECESS)

**Mr. Chairman:** I call Committee to order.

Now when we recessed, we were considering what 'nugatory' meant. I have a definition. Trifling, worthless, not operative, ineffectual, invalid. So what are nugatory payments?

Is there further debate on Establishment 120?

**Ms. Millard.**

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions on the reductions in Primary 32 and 41. Does this have any relevance to the two positions being put over to the Economic Unit?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to Primary 32, I'm not sure precisely why there's been a reduction. The reduction has been quite slight but I think it probably is related to the fact that two of the positions have been transferred out and perhaps because the original Estimate was a little bit high. But with respect to Primary 41, the budget for 1976-77 was high because of the necessity of replacing or updating our Ordinances and buying new manuals or binders and I believe there were changed to Primary 41. There was a one time only expenditure, hence the decrease.

**Mr. Chairman:** One twenty. Clear?

One Twenty-four. Intergovernmental Affairs.  
\$118,400.00.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

**Ms. Millard!?**

**Ms. Millard:** I'll just make the comment that I'm glad to see that the man years haven't been increased this time, so that we create another unit out of it next year.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear? Establishment 125, Economic Research and Planning, \$242,800.00.

**Mr. Berger?**

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, nothing in 125, I just wanted -- I was waiting for the Honourable Member from Watson Lake to come back but he hasn't arrived yet.

**Mr. Chairman:** You might have to wait quite a while, Mr. Berger.

**Mr. Berger:** It's referring to Vote 120, the motion he made at that particular time, when he says a separate vote could be established, does he mean a separate vote at this session or the next session of the legislature?

**Mr. Chairman:** I believe he meant the next budget session, Mr. Berger.

**Mr. Sherlock?**

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, that was our understanding, and we would certainly take it that way, unless the House chooses otherwise.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, Economic Research

and Planning, again, in Primary 20, we have \$23,000.00 and \$15,000.00 for special services and consultants' fees.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, that amount is largely uncommitted. That figure appeared in the estimates for at least two years, and I believe perhaps even three years.

The only commitment that I know of, I believe there is a person on a retainer to assist in the negotiations for the land claims, but the remainder of the money is uncommitted at this point in time.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I don't care whether it's uncommitted or not. We are setting up planning groups, research groups and still we have to give them money to have more research, to hire private researchers and consultants.

I think it's absolutely ridiculous, what we're getting into. I can see this thing growing, it has grown now within the last 12 months, and it's going to be like Topsy, and it's a very, very difficult thing to assess, to evaluate, and I'm not very happy with it at all.

We have the -- been informed that the land planner is now going to be part of the group, under contract. We've had five people, I believe, on the Land Claims Secretariat, or four. Now we see that somebody else, there is salary for a negotiator out of this. You know, we just seem to be involved with -- right at the top, we seem to be extremely top heavy in our government at the present time, and getting bigger.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, I think in all fairness that the Commissioner would appreciate an opportunity to speak to his vote. Has he been invited to attend Committee?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, he has, Mrs. Whyard. After speaking to you at recess, I spoke to him and he said that he would hold himself available and would come if he were required. So if there are questions that you would like to put to the Commissioner he would be pleased to appear.

**Mrs. Watson.**

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, mine wasn't a question for the Commissioner. It was an observation, it's a comment on what a dangerous situation that I think that we're getting into. We're getting into a pretty top-heavy type of government.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, with respect to Primary 20, again whoever wants to answer, maybe, I don't feel that it's, that the witnesses should answer this, but maybe they will. Specialized services, or special services. Give me an indication, could somebody tell me what the special services are.

**Mr. Chairman:** What Establishment are you refer-

ring to?

**Mr. Lengerke:** I'm referring to 125, Primary 30. Pardon me, not 30, 20. And it refers to Professional and Special Services and again, we have the answer that this is an item that's been in the budget a number of times, uncommitted. Still, it's in here and I would like to know, you know, are there plans for the use of Professional and Special Services and how are they so identified? What's in the mill?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.  
Mrs. Whyard.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** I think that's a question for the Commissioner.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it your request then that the Commissioner be asked to attend?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** I would hope that, as we go down these primaries, that there certainly are other questions for the Commissioner. I'm sure there are.

**Mr. Chairman:** Very well, Committee will recess until the Commissioner is present.

#### RECESS

**Mr. Chairman:** I now call this Committee to order. Mr. Commissioner has now joined us to assist us in our deliberations. We are considering Establishment 125.

**Mr. Lengerke?**

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

My question of the witness, namely Mr. Commissioner, and I'm dealing with Establishment 125, Primary 20, and I the for a total of 38,000, is that the correct figure there? And I'm just wondering, Mr. Commissioner, if you can — as I understand it, that Primary deals specifically with Special and Professional Services, and could you identify to me how that is broken down? Because under Professional and Special Services there are about 20-odd categories, I believe; and can you tell me how you've forecast that?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, these are basically uncommitted. They are and could be used for many things. In the past and in the present, they are still being used for specifically a retainer for a lawyer to assist the Land Claims Secretariat.

Other than that, I know of nothing that they are currently being used for, but we do envision as land claims particularly increase in momentum and we get involved in working groups, in discussing specific elements of a settlement, that we will require additional personnel on a short term basis to provide advice and

this type of activity, but there is no specific person or project involved or on the horizon for the use of those funds at this time.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you very much.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** That explains it. I am glad to hear that.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I'm curious why there was an estimate for '76-77 when this is what I understood was a new unit this year. What was under Establishment 125 last year?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, the old figure, '76-77 is the budget for the Land Claims Secretariat alone.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Under the man years, how many of the 8 people are secretarial help?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Two — sorry, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Two are specifically land claims and a third is in the unit and is providing the secretarial assistance to the Land Claims Secretariat, so basically when required, three, and when the secretary's not required for land claims work she's fulfilling duties for the rest of the Economic and Planning Unit.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, that's very interesting, that we have that \$38,000.00 uncommitted for extra research, when the idea of establishing this unit was to establish a unit where you could have your research and planning done, so we are still putting another \$38,000.00 for additional consultants plus, on Establishment 120, Primary 20, under the Executive Committee, we have an additional \$55,000.00 for professional and special services, and I don't believe any of that is committed.

So it looks as though we are being really well researched and well planned and well studied. In fact, we are going to have so many planners and no workers.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** I hope the question I ask is with regard to the economic development unit, but it's of this nature, Mr. Chairman — and I'll address it to the Commissioner:

I understand — well, first off, let me establish this. Is the Pipeline Co-ordinator answerable to this unit?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, for administrative purposes, he reports through that unit and coordinates his work with them. In essence, up until this time, he has been reporting directly to the Executive Committee in terms of expediting the work that he's doing. But, indeed, he is part of the unit on contract.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** And I understand his salary, then, Mr. Chairman, is recoverable from the Federal Government; is this correct?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** That is correct.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Okay, the other ....

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** What I was trying to get at, with respect to the Economic Planning Unit then and the tie-in between the Pipeline Co-ordinator, I understand Y.T.G. — and I commend you for this and I think it's an excellent idea — have a request before the Minister of Northern Affairs via the Treasury Board for around \$365,000.00 to do some work with respect to the pipeline, and I'm wondering if then the people of this Economic Planning Unit will be involved in that work that is to be carried out under those funds?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not exactly sure, but in the few discussions that I've had I would guess no, that these are extra funds requested from Treasury Board to do with a very specific project over which the Yukon Territorial Government had no say to start with.

In other words, it's being imposed upon us. We feel we must be prepared for it and so we have gone to Ottawa and said, we believe that you should fund these extra studies that will be required.

Now, they may be done, some of them indeed will be done, in House, some of the wildlife studies will be done by people in our Game Department, but the O and M costs will be borne by the submission to Treasury Board, the funds obtained through that submission.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask, before we pass this Estimate, that we be given a position description of each member of the eight man years and salary range, if that's possible.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** I believe in the submission that I gave to the House earlier there is a description of each position. The salary levels for each position were not included, but I'm sure we can obtain those. As a matter of fact, I think I have them here and could read them if you so desire?

**Mr. Chairman:** Please, Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** We'll start with the Chief Economic Research and Planning Officer. Range 50. Do you want his exact salary.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think the range would be appropriate, just the range.

**Mr. Commissioner:** The range is 50, and do Members have a copy of what those ranges, what the actual salary of those ranges, might be?

**Mr. Chairman:** No, Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** I would prefer just for the people involved not to read their exact salary within the range out before the House. I think it's in deference to the Members, but the range of their salary is really what you're looking for, is it not?

**Ms. Millard:** Mmm-hmmm.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, I agree; I think it should be just the range, really, I don't think that the actual salaries should be ...

**Mr. Chairman:** I think that's really what the questioner was after, was the range.  
Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, with respect, I'm not, I don't care either way, but let us not forget that these are public funds that are being expended and salaries are not a secret. And if people want to have the salaries read out in this House, there is nothing improper about doing that at all.

**Mr. Chairman:** Ms. Millard — the range or the precise?

**Ms. Millard:** Well, actually what I was after was what they were being paid, exactly, and if there is no compunction about discussing a civil servant's salary on the floor of the House, I would like that.

In the position description, I really wanted the Civil Service, Public Service, description of their job.

**Mr. Chairman:** Do you have that information or would you like to bring it in?

**Mr. Commissioner:** I think that in view of the fact that the Honourable Member wants the exact description of their jobs I'd best bring the whole issue in and give it to each Member.

**Ms. Millard:** Thank you.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the \$365,000.00 that Mr. Commissioner was referring to, that is not reflected in the Main Estimates.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't mention \$365,000.00. One of the Members did.

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, you agreed though that you had gone to Treasury Board for funding.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, is the salary of the Pipeline Co-ordinator then shown in the Estimates?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** No, it is not, Mr. Chairman.

**Mrs. Watson:** Well, Mr. Chairman, does not Y.T.G. pay...

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

**Mrs. Watson:** ... the Pipeline Co-ordinator?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, yes, indeed, he is paid by us on a recoverable basis.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, if Y.T.G. pays his salary, then isn't there a requirement, and again I suppose I'll have to go to legal authority, to put it in our Estimates and show it as a recovery?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, we had authority to spend up to \$35,000.00 in this fiscal year for a Pipeline Co-ordinator, his salary and expenses, and we still do not know how much of that money will be spent in this fiscal year.

So it's impossible to put an exact figure in any budget, supps or budget, for next year, for next year we have no idea whatsoever how much money we may get for studies, for Pipeline Co-ordinator, or anything to do with pipeline-related activities, from the Federal Government, and thus there is nothing in the budget to reflect that.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, isn't there a requirement at least to put a dollar in there, if you have no idea, and where was the 35,000 shown? Was it in this fiscal year in 1976, was it in the supplementary budget? How — you can't pay someone unless you have authority through this.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, there was \$20,000.00 in Establishment 120 in the supps. There is nothing in the Main Estimates to cover the cost of this pipeline program for 1977-78.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, with respect, I'm sure that there is a requirement that there be some figure. I realize that you have no idea how much is going to be required, but if you recognize the fact in '76 that \$20,000.00 was put in and the program is going to be accelerated, shouldn't there be some amount of money in the budget now?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not totally familiar with this process, but I suggest that perhaps, in Vote 20 which is Professional and Special Services, there are funds there, and Mr. -- the Pipeline Co-ordinator could be hired for a certain period of time out of those funds with the cost recovery basis, and an excess would come in as a supplementary in the next fiscal year.

It might be one dollar more, it might be \$325,000.00 more, I ...

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Maybe I could get at it this way then. Mr. Chairman, in a question to the Commissioner, has the Territorial Government in fact signed any sort of an agreement with the Federal Government then for this type of funding, and do you set that to one side, and have we got an agreement by which the terms we operate, to expend this kind of monies?

I think that's the normal procedure that happens, Mr. Chairman. I know from my own experience in other provinces, having dealt with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, for instance, and special development agreements and special research agreements, this is the way it's done, these dollars are identified.

There's nothing wrong with it; I think it's a great exercise, but I think it has to be shown in the books of this government accordingly. Are we, in fact, signing an agreement, Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Not to my knowledge, no official agreement.

We have Treasury Board authority at the present time, special Treasury Board authority to spend \$35,000.00 on pipeline-related activities, those pipeline-related activities associated with the Pipeline Co-ordinator.

We have nothing further, nor even a promise of actual funds, but we are hopeful that Treasury Board will approve a submission made by Department of Indian and Northern Affairs which includes studies that will be carried out by this government, by the Yukon Territorial Government.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** You know, Mr. Chairman, I think that there should be an item in our budget to signify Pipeline Co-ordinator, and as the Commissioner says, that we're hopeful that it will be a hundred per cent recoverable.

However, there is no indication, you know, you haven't had complete agreement on this, so that if it isn't a hundred per cent recoverable and you want to expend — expand the studies on the pipeline and continue the Co-ordinator, then wouldn't it or shouldn't it be necessary to call back the Legislature and to advise them and to determine how much further funding, because then it's going to be Y.T.G. tax dollars.

It's a different thing, so I think it's very necessary to get that Pipeline Co-ordinator in there somewhere.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner?

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, the Pipeline Co-ordinator is not a man year in this government. He's a contract employee, and thus far the policy of the Yukon Territorial Government has been that if the Federal Government are unwilling to carry on to provide funds for this type of activity, then the Y.T.G. is not going to get involved in it.

That has been the policy. The Pipeline Co-ordinator, under which the Pipeline Co-ordinator who was hired, and it is still our contention that since the pipeline is a manifestation of some other agency, that is, the Federal Government, studies and work that are carried out should be paid for by them, and we do not really want to commit the Yukon taxpayer to funding extravagant studies of a project over which we have had no say in initiating and which we have very little control of.

Thus, to put funds in would indicate that we are willing to go ahead and fund out of our own budget, and I ask you for advice on that.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member from Kluane has a pretty good point. I can remember, in the many years I have served in this House, various times when the federal government, embarking upon programs of their insistence in the Yukon, have insisted, and in fact called special sessions of this Legislature, to ensure that a bill was passed to introduce this new program and to pass the funds from an embarrassed federal government, milk them through the territorial government, I give you one example when we got out foxed many years ago in Dawson, over the embarrassment of the federal government at that time.

There is, it's always been a principle that, when government want to spend money, create new policies and this type of thing, that they come first to the Legislature and you might consider these Estimates and any acceptance of these Estimates as being in fact an acceptance by the Legislature of the policies that are reflected from within it.

I think the Honourable Member from Kluane has an interesting point in that the Pipeline Co-ordinator is not reflected within these Estimates, even, as she pointed out, to the extent of one dollar being placed in the Estimates, you know, and the manner handled in supps, which ought not to be either. But, if the Legislature is to have effectual control over the finances and the activities of government, it is extremely important, as the Honourable Member has pointed out, that these be reflected in the Estimates.

I would like to say that I'm extremely pleased, per-

sonally, to see a Pipeline Co-ordinator in the Territory. I think it's an important position, notwithstanding who pays for it, the operation of that particular function, or be it by contract or salary.

The question is, and the legitimate question has been raised by the Honourable Member, that this ought to be reflected in this budget and it seems to me that the government should insert into this budget, somewhere, provision for the Pipeline Co-ordinator, be it a dollar, be it \$30,000.00 or whatever, for the consideration of the House. In that way, we would adopt the policy of having a Pipeline Co-ordinator in the first place and maintaining him.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, under the vote wording, to provide funding for an economic research and planning group, and under the uncommitted funds of \$38,000.00 in Primary 20, we feel that there is indeed authority there to hire a Pipeline Co-ordinator under contract. Since we have no idea of how much money is going to be required, it may be a dollar, and we'll have to come back with supps.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, we're coming back again to the same thing I was arguing about earlier on Municipal Aid and grants, the extension of it. To use vote wording, finangle figures around within the budget. Here we are doing it again with the Pipeline Co-ordinator. We are not, I am certainly not questioning the function or the necessity of having a Pipeline Co-ordinator, but we would like the records straightened in our financial statement of the Yukon Government and the Honourable Member from Watson Lake put it very well. I just regret that he wasn't a little bit more understanding when it came up in a previous instance in the House this afternoon.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, as I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, again I welcome federal funds for any type of project that we can have and certainly the initiative in putting forth a proposal and all the rest of it is to be commended, but I also understand that the pipeline, in order to properly assess the pipeline, that a socio-economic baseline has to be compiled. This is what I'm told.

I'm wondering, that, you know, that there's going to be dollars in this \$365,000.00 to do this, I'm wondering if this will offset some of the salaries that are indicated in the Economic Research and Planning Unit who are also going to be doing some of the very same type of work.

What I'm trying to do here, Mr. Chairman, is avoid duplication. I don't care what taxpayer is that pays for it, but we're all taxpayers and we all pay into the pot, and we don't have to do these jobs three and four times. And this is just what I want to be assured of, is that if we do get the funding from the federal government for the Pipeline side of the research, that there's some very basic research that has to be done first that can be used for a number of the other categories that have been explained in the paper of the Unit, the Economic Planning.

So in fact, are we going to have someplace along the line, some more recoveries for those salaries, as well?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Commissioner.

**Mr. Commissioner:** Mr. Chairman, if baseline data is gathered through the funds provided for pipeline research, I can guarantee you, we're not going to pay somebody else out of the funds in this government to collect data again and that way avoid duplication.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 125. Are we clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mrs. Watson:** No, Mr. Chairman. You can proceed with it as far as I'm concerned, I don't like handling our spending of money in this way. You can clear it, but I'm certainly going to oppose it. It's not the amount of money, it's the way it's being put in.

**Mr. Chairman:** Well then, Mrs. Watson, do you have any specific proposals?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I've been making these points all afternoon. I think people are getting a little bored.

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

**Ms. Millard:** I wouldn't like to clear it until the information I've requested comes back.

**Mr. Chairman:** Very well.  
Establishment 140, Public Inquiries, \$100.00.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** 150. Plebiscites, \$100.00.  
Clear? Establishment 160, Public Service Commission, \$896,200.00, and I refer you to your Appendix, Page 11.

**Mrs. Watson?**

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, just another very unpopular comment, but we were told yesterday that we got a great deal of back-up material for the budget and the Appendix. There are 27 pages, and the first 11 are details of the coding of the primaries.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Establishment 160, Primary 34, under Recruitment, it's \$377,000.00, and it's for removal of furniture and personal effects. I'm just wondering how many moves that suggests. In other words, what was their forecast, it would just be very interesting how they ended up at \$377,000. I mean, it could have been 400,000, it could have been 300, just I would like to know how they figured that one out?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, that's calculated on the assumption of 105 moves comprised of 45 civil service moves, and 60 moves of teachers. The total in-

involved is 105 moves.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** I assume that is drawn from the previous year's experience?

Are you up in your moves or down, or what's goin on? It would be interesting to know just how stable a work force we've got.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, in 1974-75, there were 101 moves. In 1975-76, there were 92 and in 1976-77, there were 123.

The prediction for next year is 105.

**Mr. Chairman:** Do you have the comparable costs as well, Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. In 1974-75, the comparable cost was \$266,000.00; 1975-76, it was \$331,000.00; 1976-77, we're estimating \$421,000.00 and for 1977-78, we are saying \$501,000.00.

Now, when I say \$501,000.00, that disagrees with the \$617,000.00 shown in the Main Estimates, because in that, I'm only reflecting advertising costs, costs for relocating furniture and interviewing costs, so the difference between that \$501,000.00 and the 617 in the Main Estimates relates to the salaries of the people involved in recruiting, and YTG staff training fees, plus various small miscellaneous amounts.

**Mr. Chairman:** I wonder if we could have some clarification of E.M.O. training, \$13,700.00?  
Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I don't know the details of their planned training program for next year, but under the E.M.O. function they do carry out exercises from time to time, and in addition, I believe the E.M.O. Coordinator does have sessions with various community coordinators, but specifically what their plans are for next year, I'm sorry, I don't know.

**Mr. Chairman:** I wonder if we could have a little more accurate breakdown of that, Mr. Williams. It seems to be a very high figure in terms of what I know their training program is.  
Ms. Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Yes, I was going to ask that myself, because from the people who attended it in Dawson, from some of the people who attended it in Dawson, they were very discouraged, it wasn't very relevant to the town.

So it would be wise to get more information on it, I think.

The other question I had was under Recruitment Staff Training, \$30,000.00, is this a new item, since I noticed there's quite an increase under Primary 20 from 28,000 to 64,000 and it looks like the increase is under the 30,000, under recruitment.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, it's not a new item. In previous years, we had a budget of, I believe either 15,000 or \$20,000.00 for staff training.

For 1976-77, the government had wanted to increase it to \$30,000.00 but because of the restraint program they didn't. In 1977-78, they are in fact, making that increase in staff training from 15,000 to \$30,000.00.

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

**Ms. Millard:** I'm wondering if our witness can give us a little detail on how this is spent?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, the expenditures of these funds is administered by the Public Service Commission, and what their normal procedure is is to canvass all departments to find out what training needs the departments have identified for their staff.

They then tally up all the individual departmental requests, and between themselves and the departments they set priorities to see who will in fact be allocated the \$30,000.00, so it's a consultation process between the Public Service Commission and various department heads.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the staff training for the teachers is part of their collective agreement, is it not?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, this particular item that we're discussing relates to staff training, other than for teachers. When we get into Vote 3, we'll see that there are additional funds budgeted for teacher in-service training, etc. This is strictly for non-teachers' staff training.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I was aware of that, but isn't there a requirement for teachers under the collective agreement, to provide in-service training and some training funding for sabbatical leave and this sort of thing? Just for teachers, as part of the agreement.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, I'm referring to Vote 3 in relation to the collective agreement. There's a — if my memory serves me correctly, I believe it's 15 thousand point 4 available for professional development of teachers, in relation to upgrading them in their various areas of teaching.

In relation — could you ask the other question in relation to the sabbatical, I didn't catch the second question?

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, sabbatical leave, the point I was making that under the — for in-service train-

ing, for training for employees, but with teachers it's part of the agreement, and I'm wondering with, if this Vote, whether it is also part of the collective agreement of the Public Service?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, this is not covered by the collective agreement.

**Mrs. Watson:** Thank you.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, in relation to the sabbatical leave, due to the collective agreement, that's covered in Vote 3 as well, and it's under the collective agreement, I believe, for four teachers.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, I'm just curious how an employee's salary while in training relates to this. This doesn't include their salary, I would expect, it's above and beyond that, and if I could have some description — just a brief sort of idea of what they do.

Is it like sending someone out of the Territory for a separate course, or what?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, there's — the Public Service Commission uses a multitude of ways of carrying through on this program.

Under this program, in some cases, people are actually sent outside to attend courses. In some cases, the Public Service Commission brings instructors up here and holds courses.

In other cases, for instance, people might take night courses or correspondence courses. The charges which are made against the Public Service Commission do not include the person's salary while on training. That \$30,000.00 covers things like tuition fees, registration fees, that type of item.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, Primary 61, Rental of Machinery and Office Equipment, and I know it's a very small item, I think two and a half thousand dollars, but I was just curious to know what does — what type of machinery or office equipment is that, or is it for aircraft, rental of aircraft?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, that's for the rental of an I.B.M. memory typewriter. In the Public Service Commission, they've got a requirement for many form letters or letters which are very similar, one to another. Therefore, by utilizing this particular machine, it decreases typing time substantially, and you'll notice that in the Public Service Commission, there has been a slight decrease in man years, and one of the reasons why there has been a decrease in man years is that the Commission has found that while using this machine, it



has been unnecessary for them, to in fact, utilize their full staff complement.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Do I understand it's rental of the machine?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's rental of the machine. They are quite expensive.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Okay, this is what I was going to ask. Why don't we buy one? I'm sure if it's useful in that department, it's going to be useful in many, many departments and I know, when I think of the machine that he speaks of, and, you know, I realize that they're pretty costly, but why don't we somehow work it out on a rental-purchase agreement or something like this so that, in fact, we do own it, or, you know, I'm sure you looked at the economics of it, but let's hear that.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I can't give you the details of the economics of the situation, but I know it has been looked at from time to time. For instance, in addition to the Public Service Commission, I believe the Department of Legal Affairs also has the same or a similar machine. In Treasury we've got, not the same machine but a similar type of machine.

Periodically, people have looked at the possibility of either buying a machine and establishing a small pool. At the last time it was reviewed it was decided that, for the time being at least, the way it was operating right now was, in fact, the superior way. However, yes, it is reviewed periodically and if it becomes more beneficial to establish a small pool of these machines, I'm sure that will be done,

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I notice that in your man years you're not giving us any indication, you are not giving us any indication of whether they are permanent positions or casuals.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Public Service Commission, of the 13.75 man years, thirteen man years are permanent and point seven five are casuals. Now that compares with last years figure of fourteen man years, of which all were permanent. Within the complement of fourteen man years, the Public Service Commission found that they, in fact, never did have to hire the fourteenth person. What they do have to do from time to time is hire casual clerical assistance. Therefore, that particular change has been made in their Establishment for this year.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 160, are we clear?  
Mrs. Whyard.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to

delay this item, but since the person responsible for this department is not here with us today, I think it might be of interest to all members to know that recently, one of the training courses given through the Public Service Commission of the Yukon Territory, was in conjunction with the Federal Public Service and it's one that I'm very interested in and it's a course in pre-retirement for public servants prior to their retirement from the public service.

For some years I have envied the facility offered to federal Public Servants in that area. And, on inquiry, I find that courtesies were extended to include a number of our public servants in this course. The numbers involved became so large that they were no longer taken to Edmonton to get the training, but the trainer now comes up here and combines the class with federal and territorial and I think this is great.

What they're getting in that course is instruction on what to do, how to face it, how to plan, something which is a real social service to the people in this job. I just wish that everybody had it, including myself. But, this is the kind of training that's ongoing, as well. As I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, it's not just the training that takes place here for E.M.O. I imagine that figure also includes the sending of people down to the E.M.O. training centre near Ottawa. As we all know, there are representatives from each community go there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Clear?

Vote one. \$2,374,100.00. Yes, we will defer that, we haven't cleared two of the Establishments yet.

Vote 2.

Mr. Taylor.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** Yes, I wonder if the Commissioner could be excused from the Witness Table, at this time?

**Mr. Chairman:** Certainly. Is it Committee's wish that the Executive Committee member for Treasury be present during the consideration of this Budget?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Two. \$2,524,700.00. Establishment 200 - Treasury. \$1,015,900.00.

**Ms. Millard:** I saw advertised a position for, I don't know what, a data processor, I guess it would be called. I'm wondering if there has been an actual change? Although there is not a change in numbers, has there been a change in the man years themselves and how they're allocated?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock?

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, yes, there has been a change in the reclassification of a couple of positions, to give us expertise in an area which we did not have before.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, why has Primary 30 doubled?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I can give you, on a simple basis, why has it doubled. There's probably two general answers; first of all, prices have gone up during the last year, therefore everything costs a little bit more; and secondly, I think it's safe to say that provision is being made for more travel this year than what has gone on in the past, and I can give you examples of what is presently contemplated under the Treasury budget for travel.

For instance, under the administrative sub-activity, money has been allowed for travel to the annual Department Heads meeting; travel to Ottawa for inter-departmental committee meetings; travel for the board of survey, and provision for one trip to the N.W.T. for discussion of related - or not problems, I suppose, discussions to see how other people do things.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** With respect, I think that's the wrong place to go.

**Mr. Williams:** If I can continue, Mr. Chairman. Under the Accounting Section, the travel presently contemplated includes a trip to the Canadian Fuel, Tobacco and Retail Tax Conference. There's money in that budget for the hosting of the Western Canadian Fuel Tax Conference here in Whitehorse, and there's money provided for audits of - tax audits and liquor store audits.

Establishment - under Budgets and Systems, there's an amount allowed of \$200.00, and it's a nominal amount in the last two years. It's been necessary, or at least we've been requested from time to time to go to Dawson City, for instance, to assist KVA with various things, and it's a nominal amount.

Under 6.4, Data Processing, I don't have a detailed breakdown, but a great deal of that is related to the one time only cost associated with converting our Medicare records from C.U. & C. in Vancouver to an in-house operation, and naturally there's a fair bit of travel time associated with that program, going down there, converting program language and bringing things back up here.

Under Small Business Loans - I'm sorry, there is nothing under Small Business Loans, so that's a breakdown of the contemplated travel, making up the \$15,000.00 total.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, just clarification to me again, 61, Primary 61, under Data Processing, the \$89,400, maybe Mr. Williams could tell me there, that's a rental of a computer I imagine, again, is it?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, almost that entire amount is related to the computer.

As the Members are probably aware, the computer which we have is being upgraded from a Model 12 computer, or rather from a Model 10 to a Model 12, and the incremental rental costs associated with that is approximately \$38,000.00.

The other - that comprises most of the change, the

other amounts are just normal price increases.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** The question I was going to ask was asked by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

I was just a little interested in knowing, now that we've graduated in government from the colloquial pen and inkwell, through the ballpoint and into computers, I assume that we rent these computers, that we cannot buy a computer for government, and is this work actually done outside? Is it, like do we send the material outside for processing a large amount of this computer work, or is this in fact done within this building?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock?

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, the work is in-house work. We rent the computer, we have our own programmers who design and develop our own programs.

We do have some canned programs, that's the programs that we buy off the market and then have to adapt it to our own needs.

The new computer, if I may, gives us considerably more flexibility than we had before. The capacity, the storage capacity is about 10 times what it was before. The printer is about 4 or 5 times faster, so we will be able to do a lot more processing in the normal 8 hours, without having to go to two shifts, which would mean extra people.

These are the kinds of things that were considered when we went to the upgrading of a better computer.

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

**Ms. Millard:** Mr. Chairman, back to the old rental problem here. I noticed that this is one of the few places where it's gone down, rather than up. Most other establishments have gone up, Primary 60.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, Members probably recall when we were dealing with the supplementals, there were a number of adjustments in rentals.

The original forecasted estimate for Treasury for 1976-77 turned out to be too high. They had originally thought that we would have a lot more space than what we did have. When we got to the building, the space actually assigned to us was less than the space originally anticipated.

**Mr. Chairman:** All departments missed on their estimates.

**Mr. Sherlock:** As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, they moved the wall on us, they moved it in.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, when, I believe you said when we were going through the supplementaries, that you were going to be doing the processing of - I was going to say land claims, but it's not, it's medical claims, instead of taking - you were taking over from

C.U.& C.

Now, the operation, the cost of the contract with C.U.& C. has always been charged to Y.H. Medicare scheme. How are you going to pull out the costs of doing that work for Medicare scheme out of Treasury, when you take over the function of C.U.& C.?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, at the present time, we don't pro rate our data processing costs to individual departments, although that's something that might someday happen, but perhaps I can provide a little bit of information on that particular conversion.

If, for instance, the proposed conversion was in place on April 1 of this year, the annual incremental costs to Treasury would be approximately \$44,000.00, and in addition, the annual incremental costs to the Department of Health for four more staff would be about \$54,000.00, so on an annual basis, it would cost us \$94,000.00 to process those Medicare records.

The amount of money we will actually be saving is in the neighbourhood of \$135,000.00, so that there is a significant saving associated with our taking that function over.

But to get back to the Member's point, it now means that the total costs will no longer appear strictly in the health vote, Vote 5, a portion of the costs are going to be in Treasury, i.e. that portion associated with the rental of the larger computer.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, if I could speak to that point as well. We're not bringing home the Constitution, we're bringing home the computer, ha, ha, ha.

One of the main reasons, in addition to the efficiency and the savings, for making this decision was, that we will have within our own control the operations of the postings and of the actual program here, rather than relying on staff of a company in Vancouver, and we've learned the hard way, that there are times when this can be very awkward.

One is, if there is a mail strike; and two, we have found to our horror, there was a strike, not of the employees in that company, but of the administration, and we were held up for sometime then as well, and we were powerless to obtain any action on the data recording and returns that we required, in order to pay bills.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think it's rather remarkable that C.U.& C. is simply a carrier, and yet their costs to this government were in the range of \$220,000.00?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1976-77, I believe the processing charge is approximately \$10,000.00 a month. That contract will have to be renewed as of April 1, 1977, and therefore, we don't know exactly - when I say it's going to cost us 135,000 for C.U.& C., that's just a guesstimate as to what the new contract will be on an annual basis, but for the current fiscal year, it's approximately \$10,000.00 a month which we pay to C.U.& C.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Easy question, Mr. Chairman. Changing the subject completely to Small Business Loans, I see the man years there is .5 man years. Is that a decrease?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, no, what we - in our Revenue Section of the Accounting Department, there is one person who splits their time between doing work on Small Business Loans and doing work on our own accounts receivables, so what we do is, there is one person involved, and half her time is charged to Small Business Loans, and the other half of her time is absorbed under the Accounting Section, so under Accounting, you'll see 24 and a half man years, if you take that half man year and that half man year under Small Business Loans, they add up - that accounts for that one particular person.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, just on that same subject, I realize this is for the accounting of that, but maybe with Mr. Gillespie here, he can tell me how many dollars - of somebody from Treasury, how many dollars were utilized out of the Small Business Loans last year, and I understand that the amount of loan available now has been increased, has it not, and I would hope while I was looking at the man years, I was hoping that with the increase, maybe we're getting a little more utilization of that particular fund.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, the amount, the upper limit for loans has remained at \$50,000.00. As to the remainder of your question, I'll have to defer or refer to the Members of Treasury.

Do you have figures for the amount of loans issued? Because we could bring that information in, if that is satisfactory.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman. I'd like that information. I'm not going to hold this up for that, but I think it's interesting to know and I'd like to know also how we stand? Have we got any outstanding debts that are, have not been looked after properly? Just really, what is the performance of that particular fund?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, we will get that information. I would hope that we do, in a sense, have some bad debts, because if we are a lender of last resort, if we are functioning properly there should be some.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Is that a warning, Mr. Gillespie.

**Mr. Gillespie:** I don't know, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, if I could make a comment. There is no need for the Honourable Member to worry on that particular point. There are always bad debts in that area. We have citizens here who have claimed those loans and take off in the strangest direc-

tions. Instead of trailer camps, they buy an airplane, for example.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Branch, I would understand, provides the inspections or the auditory service within the department, within the government. How much of a staff do you have to provide that?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps there's a slight misunderstanding. The Internal Auditor of the government is not a member of the Treasury staff. He's a member of the Commissioner's staff.

We do carry out audits in the areas of fuel tax, tobacco tax, mobile tax, this kind of thing. We do this two ways. We do some of it in-house, right at the desk where we get information in and we simply audit it through and accept or reject the information that we get.

This year, we're going to try and do some of it in the field, as you noticed for the travel. We haven't really done very much of that except in Whitehorse. We have gone to the companies in Whitehorse and done in-house audits or audits on sight with them. We hope to get out a little bit more this year. We're obliged to by the legislation, but we just haven't been able to do it to this point.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** How many auditors have you got for that service, just the one?

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, we only have one position at the moment.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, possibly Mr. Sherlock could briefly give us an idea of the functions of the Internal Auditor.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, the functions of the Internal Auditor are much more general than the ones that we just described, the ones within Treasury. Internal Auditors, primarily look at areas that he's been asked to look at, perhaps by the Executive Committee, by the Commissioner, or by the individual departments. He looks at regulations and systems to see that they are in place and in fact followed. He looks at accounting areas and sees that practices are correct and followed from year to year in the same manner. He does the similar kind of audit as the Auditor General, only he reports directly in-house, he reports directly to the Commissioner and Executive Committee.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** In a provincial jurisdiction, where are the internal auditors? Are they part of the personal staff of the Premier or would they be attached to the Department of Finance?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, I think in the provincial jurisdictions there are perhaps two sets of auditors. The departments have auditors, internal auditors within the departments, who carry out certain functions for them. And they also have Provincial Auditors, who report directly to parliament.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, the Premier doesn't have a private staff of auditors then, reporting directly to him?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, no, I do not believe that he does.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I find it very interesting that our Internal Auditor reports directly to the Commissioner, the Chief Administrative Officer.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, while we're on the subject, perhaps I could ask Mr. Gillespie if he could explain how the costing goes when auditors are brought in from the federal government to audit various branches of this government, which has occurred in the last year or two. I understand that we are charged for this service and it is not an inconsiderable charge. Where would that be shown?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, that particular audit was done on a consulting basis, on the request of the then Commissioner, and was charged to the Commissioner's vote. I believe that's true.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, this is certainly not a question for the witnesses, but anyone in the House may answer it if they wish.

I wonder if the Members of the Executive Committee received copies of the internal audits that are performed within the Government of the Yukon Territory?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. MGillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, every audit report that is done of Departments, for example, a copy of it is given to the Executive Committee Member, and also to the Department involved. That is the practice that is currently followed. And the Treasurer, I should say, too.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't say the Executive Committee Member. I said the Executive Committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** These reports, as a matter of fact, have not been going through the Executive Committee as a body. They have been going to the Executive Committee members. They do not go to the Executive Committee as such.

**Mr. Chairman:** So they are not subject to scrutiny outside of the Department at that level?

**Mr. Gillespie:** They are subject to the scrutiny, beyond the Department of the Commissioner or the Executive Committee Member responsible, and of Treasury.

**Mr. Chairman:** The point still remains.  
Mr. Sherlock?

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, I might just add that one of the reasons that the internal auditor does not report, say, to the Treasurer, is because Treasury is one of the areas that he audits most of the time.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that, because that's one of his prime functions, isn't it, but I think it's quite significant that the internal auditors in a province report back to the body that votes the money.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment in that regard?

**Mr. Gillespie:** There is an audit that is performed and reported back to this body, and that is done by the Auditor General.

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

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** How much does that cost?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?  
Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** It's a free service, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, nothing is free from the Federal Government.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, it is free, it's a statutory requirement of the Auditor General under the Yukon Act.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 200, are we clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Two oh one, Insurance, \$234,800.00.  
Mrs. Watson?  
Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, I know that we cleared 200. I asked a question with respect to the Small Business Loans. They'll bring that information?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, you did mention that you wouldn't hold it up on that basis.

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, no problem. Thank you.

**Mrs. Watson:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't see -- usually you receive a report of the Liquor control operation in the budget, and of the Workmen's Compensation, but we did receive the annual report of the Workmen's Compensation function, it isn't a department, Workmen's Compensation, so the only place within the estimates where it can be questioned is this section here, am I correct?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, the Liquor Department appears here to the extent that included amongst Treasury revenues is the net profit earned by the Liquor Department. It appears in no other budget. The expenditures do not appear in any other budget. The only thing that appears in our Main Estimates is the net profit.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** But we don't have a statement of the operation of the Liquor Board, do we?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, no, there is no expenditure estimate for them, other than the net product of their estimated expenditures, subtracted from their estimated revenues and it appears as a revenue item on Page 39, but there is no schedule of their expenditures.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, in our other budgets, they used to include a page or two on the Liquor Control operations. And also of the Workmen's Compensation Board and that is why I would wonder if, because Workmen's Compensation is not dealt with, again, in the Estimates, would it be possible if I could have this section stood over, because there are some questions that I would like to bring forward on the Workmen's Compensation?

**Mr. Chairman:** Do you request further information to be brought forward, Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Not necessarily, I just want to review my questions before I bring them in. There are some questions on the Workmen's Board fund.

I have one, I have one question to ask. I would like to have the opportunity to ask questions and I don't want to by this if I don't have another chance. But there is one question. At the Territorial Accounts on Page 33, the Auditor General's report to us, Page 33. On the Workmen's, the assets and liabilities of the Compensation fund. I refer to the last paragraph. 'I further report that

in my opinion, proper books of account have been kept by the Compensation fund. The financial statements are in agreement with their risks and the transactions that have come under my notice have been within its statutory powers, except that the manner of calculation of the maximum wage rates reported in Note two, did not comply with the provisions of Section 80, of the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance."

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie.

**Mr. Gillespie:** We are aware of this difficulty. It's a difficulty that actually rests in the wording in the Ordinance itself. And we have indicated to the Auditor General that we are going to have to bring in an amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance itself in order to rectify this. And his staff has agreed that this is the proper course of action to follow and this is something that we're working on at the present time.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, just specifically, what is the problem?

**Mr. Gillespie:** It's a technical problem that I'm not competent to explain here now. It has to do with the timing of statistics produced by Statistics Canada that we use and we have to modify the working in the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance to accord with the way Statistics Canada brings out its figures and the timing with which it brings out its figures.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** I was just going to elaborate on that slightly, Mr. Chairman. Under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance, their maximum insurance payouts are based, are adjusted annually by the Industrial Composite of average weekly earnings for the Territory for the immediate preceding year. The Ordinance says that adjustment has to take place in January or as soon thereafter as possible. But, as Mr. Gillespie indicated, the, as soon thereafter as possible turns out to be much later in the year, four to five months later and that's the problem referred to by the Auditor General.

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

**Mr. McCall:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the item the Honourable Member to my left has just brought up. I was just looking for Note Two in this particular report and it's not even in it. And I'm just wondering where, maybe you could point it out to me where Note Two is on Page 35. And where is the reference note two.

**Mr. Williams:** It's Page 36. Or 37.

**Mr. McCall:** Oh, I'm sorry.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the opportunity to pursue this a little further tomorrow, or to go back to it again on the Compensation fund.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that perhaps a place to raise those questions would be in Vote 4 and we could probably ask T-1 to be represented or their member, because that's where the expenses for Workmens Compensation

**Mrs. Watson:** That's Territorial Secretary.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Right.

**Mrs. Watson:** Fine. Just one more question, Mr. Chairman, on the thing that I just brought up regarding the wage, maximum wage rate. Is it going to be necessary to do some adjustments in some of the benefits that have been paid out or is --

**Mr. Gillespie:** I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, I was just going to note that if there is to be a change in the Ordinance to adjust to what the Auditor General has requested, would those responsible at the same time kindly look to the retitling of that Ordinance, in order to adjust and be in line with the more progressive jurisdictions throughout Canada, which now refer to it as the Worker's Compensation Ordinance?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, that is currently under consideration. Work Persons was another alternative.

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** No, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, when can we expect this amendment?

**Mr. Gillespie:** The earliest would be the fall session, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, isn't it rather a bit of urgency?

**Mr. Gillespie:** The Auditor General is aware, Mr. Chairman, that we are not intending to bring it in before that time, and his officials have indicated that this would be okay with them.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** All that is required is a letter?

**Mr. Gillespie:** No.

**Mr. Sherlock:** Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Sherlock?

**Mr. Sherlock:** May I just add to that, since the Auditor General, the individual who prepared this particular report is no longer our auditor, as we have a new Auditor General who now is located in Edmonton, and as a result of the changeover, I think they need the time — they need a time and we need a time to look at this again, and although we've had some preliminary discussions, we're not prepared yet or not ready to be able to really act on it.

They are coming down to see us later this month, as a matter of fact.

**Mr. Chairman:** With Committee's concurrence, we'll stand Establishment 201.

**Mrs. Watson:**

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, I'm quite willing to discuss Workmen's Compensation in Vote 4.

**Some Members:** Clear.

**Mr. Chairman:** Very well, is there any further debate on Establishment 201?

**Mrs. Watson:** Pardon?

**Mr. Chairman:** Is there any further debate on Establishment 201?

**Mrs. Whyard:**

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, there was just one question I wished to inquire. It had been suggested to me by a non-government authority on this subject that we might be well advised to look at paying off the item under Supplementary Pensions and being done with it, rather than annually dealing with it, and I don't know whether the Department has done any investigating in that area or not, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, this is one of the matters we are looking into in connection with amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** A question with respect to the general insurance, Mr. Chairman.

I understand this isn't insurance to insure buildings, am I correct?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are three components to the Insurance Establishment. There's general insurance, where we insure ourselves for third party claims, and then there's the other two categories which we've been talking about, Workmen's Compensation, that's the amount that we pay to the compensation fund on behalf of our employees who are injured, and finally, there's a supplementary pensions which we discussed in some detail during the supplementals. Those are payments made to individuals who were injured

prior to the new Ordinance.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, you say we insure ourselves. What I'm trying to get at is do we place any insurance with any private companies?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that amount of \$51,000.00 represents insurance premiums we pay to private companies.

We insure ourselves against third party risks for loss of our own property. We are basically self-insured.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** How do we determine where we place that insurance, that's what I'm trying to get at? Do we tender that, are there tenders called to place that insurance? Is it a competitive situation?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, I stand to be corrected, but we use one particular agent, and we've used that agent for a number of years, and I believe it was an arrangement worked out with the insurance agents themselves, rather than constantly changing agents.

I believe an agreement was reached between the government and the agents some years ago, but that's — I'm relying on memory for that.

**Mr. Chairman:** That sounds rather convenient, Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Lengerke:** It's something that concerns me, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that, unless it's a very costly situation, but I think that when you can allow some competition, I think maybe we might be getting better rates, I could be wrong there.

I would like to see us adopt some kind of a policy whereby that is called on some kind of a tender basis, every three or five, or whatever years is applicable.

**Mr. Chairman:** Perhaps the witness could bring back more information on this, and we can go through --

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, I would like to know when the policy was put into effect.

**Mr. Williams:** We will bring that in.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Thank you. I'm quite concerned with this self insurance business, I brought it up in the last session when we talked about insurance.

I was wondering if the government increased the self-insurance sufficiently, for people living out in camps, and I'm thinking particularly in the outlying areas, can insure their belongings in those camps, and I was wondering if there has been steps taken to eliminate this.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, at the present time, we do not insure the belongings of our employees living in camps.

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

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

**Mr. Berger:** I'm not talking about this. I'm talking about the government right now at the present time hasn't got enough insurance on those camps, that private insurance companies would touch people working for the government in those camps.

People living, and I'm thinking in particularly on the Dempster Highway now, on a year round basis, the government plans in other camps out at Eagle River right now, to those people this is their homes. They have all their belongings in there, yet they can't get no insurance on that, because the government has not sufficient insurance on their buildings.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, by self insurance, I mean that we do not have insurance policies. If one of those camps burns down, we have to find the money within our own resources to replace those camps.

The only kind of insurance that we place with private companies are — is insurance to protect ourselves from third party claims.

Mr. Chairman, further with respect to the situation Mr. Berger mentioned, we have had some preliminary talks with insurance companies, because the problem has been brought to our attention as well, and our preliminary information is that we too will not be able to buy insurance to protect those particular individuals.

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

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

**Mr. Berger:** Well then I think it's high time that the government insured those people's belongings, because if the government expects people to go out in those camps to work up there, I think they should supply insurance for those people also.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable Member to explain again why it's impossible to get insurance, why it's impossible for the people concerned to have a policy?

I misunderstood what he was saying.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, it's just like any other insurance, what we discussed yesterday and in the last session. The people just apply for insurance, and they get the explanation, no, we cannot supply insurance in this particular area, and this is all the explanation that people can get.

Except in one particular case was because the gov-

ernment has self-insurance on those places, and there's no sufficient coverage on that, and this is the only explanation I have on it.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Just a question of Mr. Berger, so I can get clarified on that. Are you referring to personal insurance, like for personal belongings, while they are staying in the camp, that individual cannot get insurance?

Can I have further clarification? Are you saying that it should be up to the government to be able to provide that kind of insurance to them?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Berger, your nods are not recorded.

**Mr. Berger:** I haven't said anything, Mr. Chairman. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do believe the government should be able to insure those people. because it's not through the fault of the people in those camps that those people can't get insurance, or their personal belongings insured, so I think it should be the responsibility of this government to make sure that those people do get insurance on their belongings.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, I'm informed, I wasn't aware of this beforehand, but I'm informed that this matter has been brought to our attention, and that the Territorial Secretary is engaged in an exchange of correspondence with insurance companies, to determine the nature of the problem, and what can be done about it, but that we have no conclusions as yet.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Just for the information of this House, and there seems to be quite a bit of ignorance about it.

There's people driving the highway right now with their so-called service trucks and their tool boxes are worth 5,000, \$6,000.00 worth of goods, tools in there, which they can't get no insurance on it either, and the thing is it's required through the government, that those people should buy their own tools in order to get a job there.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, then the same case would apply to people in private enterprise as well, in relation to having, if you're a mechanic and had to have tools to do your trade, then that individual should, mustn't be able to get insurance also. It was my understanding that they could get insurance if they wanted it.

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

**Mr. McCall:** They have it in private enterprise, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Lang

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the individual involved is working in private enterprise and he has his own tools. He gets the



insurance policy himself, or are you inferring that the company gets that insurance policy for them?

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

**Mr. McCall:** Mr. Chairman, the company provides that sort of thing.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just going to verify that that in fact, that does happen. In the case of a mechanic working in a garage, at least most of them that I know of, the garage owner provides, has a blanket coverage, that if in fact something happens, if that building burns down, that the contents in that building, which could well be a mechanic's tools, or other belongings in there, are covered. And provide for this. This is the kind of insurance that most private enterprises have. Where there's a need for the individual who is working there to use specialized equipment, that he himself might have.

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

**Mr. McCall:** I think you'll find, Mr. Chairman, that most of private enterprise has sufficient insurance coverage for all possibilities. And I think it's on the statutes that they have to have this when they're operating. One of them, Mr. Chairman, is Workmen's Compensation.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, we have a list of the answers in answer to the Member's concern, but all I can say is that we're looking into it and he's raised some interesting points and we will have to come up with a position at a later date once we've had the chance to look at it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Any further debate on 201?  
I won't clear that yet.

202. Electric Rate Equalization. \$600,000.00. And I refer you to Appendix Page 11.

**Mr. Lengerke?**

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Chairman, I believe we had a pretty in-depth discussion about this when we were dealing with the supps and, again, it's — all I want to say at this time is, and I'm sure that most Members agree, that some place along the line we are going to have to make some sort of a commitment as to how we're going to carry on with this kind of equalization rate, because, as we know, it's depleting very rapidly and are we going to continue to subsidize it in what way, I don't know, but I think some place along the line we should make some commitment for the future.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not quite clear to me. The Minister of Local Government said the other morning in the House that this fund would be deleted, however, I hear from the witnesses, too, at the same time that they don't seem to have any knowledge back about two or three years as to how much money we are going to get from the government through the

equalization program, from back income tax from Yukon Electric. I might ask just how much income tax is to be returned to us for '75 and '76?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, the way the cash inflow works is as follows: In February of every year, for instance in February 1977 a couple of weeks ago, we received from the Federal Government an estimate of how much they think Yukon Electric is going to have to pay them for income taxes for the year 1976. And they advance that money to us two months later, in February of 1977.

However, it won't be until 1978 or '79 that the Federal Government tells us precisely how much money Yukon Electric owes them for 1976, so therefore we do get our money on an advanced basis and then, two years later, we make an adjustment, and it's been our most recent experience that the amount of money which they have been advancing us is in excess of what they should have actually given us, so we are in fact having to repay them amounts which they have over-advanced us.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Very well, but I have heard from different sources possibly that there is a difference there. I think possibly there may be, but I would think that maybe the Government might check with Yukon Electric and Yukon Electric may be able to tell them how much money they are going to or have given the Federal Government in the past two years.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, that's a good suggestion, and of course there's no compulsion on Yukon Electric's part to reveal what's included on their corporate tax returns. As a general course, we're not entitled to that information, but if they would voluntarily make it available to us then we wouldn't have to guess what the overpayment is, we could calculate it more precisely.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Chairman, a question for Members, any one of the Executive Committee. Have they had any indication from the Minister, or have they inquired of the Minister, whether he would be prepared to consider an equalization fund for the Yukon Territory, Electrical Equalization Fund for the Yukon Territory, that we could fall back upon after this fund is depleted?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie?

**Mr. Gillespie:** We have indicated to the Department and to the Minister that we are undertaking a study at the moment into the equalization plan, and would be forwarding to the Minister our recommendations, so to that extent, yes, we have indicated and asked him to take into account our recommendations, which are not yet ready.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** A little later, Mr. Chairman, excuse me.

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

**Mr. Berger:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. On this same particular line, in your recommendations, will you also recommend to increase the level of subsidization to a more realistic level of 500 kilowatts?

**Mr. Gillespie:** This is an aspect of our study that we're looking into, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Fleming:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witness could inform me if that estimate they are giving us is under what they're going to get in income tax from Yukon Electric, is that going to be given to us as a loan and we will owe back two or three years monies that is necessary?

Will we have to, in other words, pay that back, or is it going to be just given to us? What's the plan?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams?

**Mr. Williams:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Fleming is relating to the advance we received from the income tax people.

Yes, we do have to repay any overpayment and if, for instance, there happened to be an underpayment then the Federal Government would give us that.

I do have some place, in fact I believe I distributed it, copies of the adjustments which have been made in recent years, for instance for 1973, I believe, it turned out that the Federal Government had underadvanced us by some \$14,000.00, so in 1975 or '76 they gave us back that \$14,000.00. In 1974 they had overadvanced us by some \$70,000.00, so therefore, when we received our money two weeks ago for 1976, from that they subtracted the \$70,000.00 that they had overadvanced us in 1974.

So our inflow is eventually adjusted to equal the actual amount that we should receive, but there is a timing problem on it.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Another question for the Executive Committee Member. Has the Minister given any indication of whether he is prepared to consider the proposal of Y.T.G.'s when it comes forward, and has he given any favourable answer?

He did make a public statement that he was prepared to look at assisting Y.T.G. in an equalization scheme.

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Gillespie.

**Mr. Gillespie:** We've not had any precise, we've had nothing directly from the Minister on this, although we have assurance from his officials that our recommendations will be brought to his attention. But we have not received instructions from the Minister.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Who is doing this study?

**Mr. Gillespie:** A consultant by the name of Mr. Kidd, in Vancouver, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** Is this the same person who is doing — is it part of the study that is being done on franchises?

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Just before I said to the House that Mr. Kidd was definitely doing the study on the equalization, and I wasn't positive who was doing it, I thought it was perhaps Mr. Kidd on franchises; also, Price, Waterhouse is doing the study on franchises, Mr. Kidd on equalization.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** How much is the study costing and where is it in our budget?

**Mr. Chairman:** Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Chairman, it's presumed, I believe, that that study will be funded under the 1976-77 funds and it's coming out of the \$45,000.00 base in that Establishment. You might recall a little while earlier we said that it was a \$45,000.00 uncommitted base, and that's an example of one of the sort of things that's being charged against that base.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** The cost of the study, Mr. Chairman, again?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Chairman, we haven't a precise figure. It depends upon the amount of time that he will take to complete the study, but our estimate at this point in time is roughly \$2,000.00.

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

**Mr. Lengerke:** Thank you. The other point that I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I believe in the Task Force Report, and the Honourable Member from Kluane was asking how the Minister is going to react and what's going to happen with this, with respect to this subsidy or equalization fund.

I think in the report, if I am correct, there is a recommendation that recommends against no further subsidy. And what I'd like to say, you know, we have a resolution that we will be debating in Committee of the Whole, and I'm sure, the Honourable Member from Kluane, I think, was one of the movers to put it in Committee of the Whole, and I would hope that at that time that we can have quite a discussion on this and maybe get some direction to the Minister and get some answers because it's a very, very important question. We just have to have answers to them and certainly his action has to be, I hope, beneficial to us.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, I honestly expect that the Chairman of the NCPC and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development both expected the Task Force Report to come out saying that they thought there should be probably a further equalization subsidy because of the high cost of electrical energy in Yukon and I think that they were both kind of cut off at the pass because the Task Force specifically said that there should be no further subsidizes for northern and Yukon users.

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

**Mrs. Watson:** No, it didn't cut it off completely. It's suggested that there may be certain groups of people who may require an equalization scheme and some assistance. Read your recommendations.

**Mr. Chairman:** Establishment 202. Clear?

**Some Members:** Clear.

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

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

**Mr. Fleming:** I second that. It has been moved by Mr. McCall, seconded by Mr. Fleming, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Are you ready for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chairman:** I declare the Motion as carried.

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Chairman:** The witnesses are excused. Thank you.

*(Mr. Speaker resumes 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 considered Bill Number 1, Second Appropriation Ordinance, 1976-77, and directed me to report the same without amendment.

The Committee have also considered Bill Number 2, A First Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78, and directed me to report progress on same.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee have also adopted a resolution and directed me to report the same as follows:

RESOLVED that a separate vote be established for the Yukon Legislative Assembly, and that the said vote encompass the following:

Statutory emoluments, payable to Members of the Legislature;

Canadian Parliamentary Association activities;

Operation of Committees of the Assembly; Members' services similar to those provided to Members of Legislatures throughout the Commonwealth and administrative support services to the Assembly.

The Committee have directed me to ask leave to sit again.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave is granted.

And when shall Bill Number 1 be read a third time? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

#### Bill Number 1 — Third Reading

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill Number 1 be now read a third time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill Number 1 be now read a third time.

Are you prepared for the question?

Oh, the Honourable Member from Kluane?

**Mrs. Watson:** Mr. Speaker, I again have to rise on this Bill. I think a great mistake is being made. A political decision is being made to expend money — \$104,000.00. You're going underneath the umbrella of vote wording, you're going completely contrary to the legislation that is now on the books, and I think that it's a black day in this Legislative Assembly, and our politically elected people will not be prepared to expend grant money, which is based on a formula which is outlined in legislation, and I'm not prepared to take the time to have the necessary legislative authority prepared so that it can be done the proper way.

It's well and good to say, to get legal advice and say you can do it in vote wording. As I said before, I was aware of it, but I've always thought, particularly with this type of thing, that vote wording is almost an underhanded way of doing it, and I think that political people, when they're not following the rules of the game, should be very, very, very careful and take the time to enact the proper legislation to give you the authority to do certain things.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason I will be voting against the Bill and probably asking for division.

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

**Mr. Hibberd:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Member from Kluane that this is precisely what politicians of the Territory have been doing, ever since they have been an elected body, it has been pointed out to us.

It has also been pointed out that this method is the method that is carried on through every other jurisdiction in Canada, and therefore, I do consider it a politi-

cally proper move that we make at this time.

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

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Chairman, if there's anybody who's getting in a problem with his colleagues and Members in this House for using ministerial discretion, it's this Honourable Member, because I come from the school where you get a problem, and you get it on your plate and you get it solved as quickly as possible.

So, I'm doubly, I'm triply, I'm quintuply careful, when it comes to legislation of this sort, Mr. Speaker, that I've made sure, because of the jams I've got myself in before, and probably will in the future, of being careful of the authority from which the Bill emanates.

I went to the former Treasurer, the former Commissioner, the Legal Advisor and the present Treasurer, to find out the method by which this Bill could be introduced to the House, and the best method of getting it passed.

There was three methods: There was bringing an amendment to a Bill; there was bringing in a new Ordinance, or a Vote wording in supplementaries, for many reasons, one of the main ones being that we wanted to get the supplementaries in as quickly as possible, and the one time windfall grant to live up to a commitment that a former Commissioner made, was the method that we chose at the time.

It's perfectly valid, it's perfectly legal, perfectly within the competence and authority of this House, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the Auditor General once again writes his financial report on financial matters of the Yukon, that he will not be singling out this one time windfall grant for any type of statement that is not within the authority of this House, and within the Government of the Yukon, because it is, and Mr. Speaker, I'm positive that we are acting legally, authoritatively and Parliamentarily in this matter, and I think that we should, at this time, call third reading to Bill Number 1.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any further debate?  
Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

**Mrs. Watson:** Division.

**Mr. Speaker:** Division has been called.  
Madam Clerk, would you poll the House?

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Mr. McKinnon?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Mrs. Whyard?

**Hon. Mrs. Whyard:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Mr. Lang?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mr. McIntyre?

**Mr. McIntyre:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mr. Berger?

**Mr. Berger:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mr. Hibberd?

**Mr. Hibberd:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mr. Fleming?

**Mr. Fleming:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Ms. Millard?

**Ms. Millard:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mr. McCall?

**Mr. McCall:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mrs. Watson?

**Mrs. Watson:** Nay.

**Madam Clerk:** The Honourable Member, Mr. Lengerke?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Yea.

**Madam Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, the results of the division are 10 yea, one nay.

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

*(Motion carried)*

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

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

**Hon. Mr. McKinnon:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill Number 1 be now -- do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West, that Bill Number 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 that Bill Number 1 has passed this House.

*(Motion carried)*

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure at this time?

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

**Mr. Lengerke:** Mr. Speaker, I move that we do now call it 5:00 o'clock.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, that we do now call it 5:00 o'clock.

Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Members:** Question.

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

**Some Members:** Agreed.

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

*(Motion carried)*

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

*(ADJOURNED)*





•  
•  
•



•  
•  
•



