

Property of
M. L. A. Lounge



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 13

8th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Tuesday, March 22, 1977

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

M. L. A. Langley



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Volume 11

Debates & Proceedings

Tuesday, March 22, 1977

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
March 22, 1977

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

(Prayers)

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

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: Are there any documents for tabling this morning?
Are there any reports of committees?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I sought your attention for tabling of documents.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: I have for tabling a Green Paper on the Native Special Constable Program.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any reports of committees?

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the first Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other reports of Committees?

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

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a resolution, moved by Mr. Fleming, seconded by Mr. Berger, that the First Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments presented March 22nd, 1977 be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Any further Notices of Motion or Resolution?

Any Statements by Ministers?
This brings us then to the Question Period. Have you any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Question re: International Gold Rush Park

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, a verbal question for Mr. Assistant Commissioner concerning the National Gold Rush Park. How far along is the planning in this and has any consideration been given concerning the people living along the river, the Yukon River?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the planning is further advanced in the United States than it is in Canada at this point in time. We have just established a Historic Resources Program, or we're hoping to establish a Historic Resources Program within YTG and, as a result of that, to do in a more detailed fashion the Territorial Government's planning in respect of the Gold Rush International Park.

The Park is proceeding and work is getting underway in Skagway, this coming summer, but there are no plans for this year for territorial direct involvement in that program.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Question re: Sessional Paper on Fuel Equalization Program

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Local Government.

On that Sessional Paper of 1974 on the "Fuel Equalization Program", I think I had found some discrepancies and I think they are still there. I think the Minister understands them. I am wondering if he is prepared to look at that and make any changes in it?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Local Government.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I am not the resident expert on the "Fuel Equalization Program." It does not fall under my portfolio responsibilities, it falls under the portfolio responsibilities of the Assistant Commissioner, Executive, which is Mr. Gillespie and I would ask the Honourable Member to address that question to him.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: Would you ask the Speaker over again.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Administrator.

Mr. Gillespie: I am sorry would the Member please repeat the question.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a Sessional Paper in 1974, the "Equalization Program" -- "Fuel Equalization Program", there is some dis-

crepancies in it which I have found and I am wondering if the Government is prepared to look at it and possibly make any changes in it, if they are necessary.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, we will have a look at that paper, I haven't looked at it recently myself. Maybe I can take the opportunity to discuss it with the discrepancies that the Member has found with him and come back with an answer to that.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question re: "There Must Be A Better Way"

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, question for the Minister of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation.

At the inter-agency workshop "There Must Be A Better Way", there was a recommendation which reads that "there should be a mechanism set up to ensure input by native people to the development of child care and other social services." Has this been acted upon?

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I know of no special mechanical process for opening lines of communication to any particular part of the population. All parents concerned with matters involving day care have access to the people operating day care centres and in some cases operate them themselves.

In addition, there is a Yukon Child Care Association in which membership can be taken by any day care centre of play school. And that is another direct channel of communication to this government.

There is also the telephone and the mail is still working, and we read it daily. If there is anybody that wishes to communicate on any subjects within my Department, it is not difficult to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Question re: Community Pastures

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Local Government.

Under the Yukon Act, the territorial government has the responsibility for agricultural, including programs to support the agricultural industry, and I am just wondering, is it the intention of YTG to incorporate provisions for the establishment of community pastures within the framework of the Federal/Territorial agricultural policy which I understand is ready for completion by the spring of '78.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Local Government?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure for an agricultural policy in Yukon will be decided in this House. We will bring the facts of the matter to the attention of the Members and it will have to be their decision whether the people of the Yukon can afford part or all of the infrastructure needed to support an

agriculture policy in the Yukon.

That will be a decision of this House, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to that. When can this House expect that policy; to the Minister of Local Government.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Local Government?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I think it has been indicated to all Members, I am not sure just in which paper it was presented at this Session, that the soils study will be completed by this summer, the study will be here. That is the key to what we can do agriculturally, knowing what soil conditions we have here in Yukon.

The earliest I would think that a policy could be presented to the House on the facts of the study would be at the Fall Session. We still, Mr. Speaker, have the problem of attempting to get any lands in a block land transfer for agricultural purposes, even if we set a policy. I think that all Members are aware that is very difficult at this point in time, in Yukon's development, to get a block land transfer for any purpose.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? We will then proceed to Orders of the Day, under Motions for the Production of Papers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

ITEM NUMBER 1

Madam Clerk: Item 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 1 this morning?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that a copy of the report entitled, "The Yukon Land and Resource Inventory", as completed for the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, be tabled in this House during this Session.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, some motions for the production of papers may be impossible to be able to fulfill, because certainly it depends on the printing and availability as to whether the government is able to table such a document.

My point of order is that the demands that we do something that may be impossible for us to do and I just hope the Chair keeps that in consideration. If it had said, "if the document is printed and tabled", I'd have no problem at all in supporting such a motion.

Mr. Speaker: The Member raises an interesting point or order, however, I believe that is a problem that the administration would have to cope with. I think that all Members have a right to ask for documents.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

(Motion carried)

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Motions.

MOTIONS

Item Number 1

Madam Clerk: Item 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to discuss Item 1?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that whereas a unique opportunity exists for the strengthening and stabilizing of Yukon's economic future, be it resolved that the Yukon Government establish an independent board or commission to examine in detail the feasibility and to appraise the economic benefits of legalized gambling in Yukon, and in particular the question of full-time commercially operated enterprises in the City of Dawson, and seasonally operated enterprises within all other appropriate areas of Yukon.

Be it further resolved that the Board or Commission work in liaison with representatives of the tourist industry, both private and government, and with municipal representatives, elected and non-elected, and have the full cooperation of and access to the Yukon Territorial Government's Socio-Economic Planning Unit and other appropriate departments.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I think the motion is fairly self-explanatory. I just feel that we are at a point in time in Yukon's development that we do take a look at the possibility of legalized gambling in this Territory. I'm sure it's been

talked about by many individuals and thought about. I don't know if it's ever been discussed in this House before, certainly not, well, it hasn't been discussed since I've been a Member, Mr. Speaker.

And again, as I say, I think it gives us an opportunity to examine a situation that would provide, I'm sure, great economic benefits to this Territory. It would help stabilize the economy. I think that, certainly in a place like Dawson, City of Dawson, would be interested. I know, certainly, the tourist industry and the tourist support industry would certainly welcome a move such as this. And what I'm asking for is that it be looked into, that the feasibility be studied. Certainly there are many examples, certainly to our neighbours in the south, that we could, I'm sure, get information as to how they've set up their jurisdictions, and I'm talking in particular with the State of Nevada.

As I say, I know there are probably many problems inherent in doing something like this. But again, we should be looking at it.

I am not suggesting that it has to be another Board or Commission because what I have thought about here is that we are going to be embarking on some kind of plan as we have heard for Yukon's socio-economic future. I don't know what the formula is yet or how that is going to come about with respect to asking for participation by Yukon's citizens but whatever that form may take, possibly that committee could look at this particular question because it is part of economic planning and part of economic benefit for the Territory. If this motion in itself triggers that question and makes a guarantee that they will in fact look at that, then I would be satisfied.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that's about all I have to say at this time. I could certainly go into all the other ideas that I would have with respect to it. Like, I would say that it would certainly be a unique situation where people from all over the country could not only come to Yukon to be part of a sixty-below weather or climate because a lot of people have never experienced that, but they could also be gambling at the same time, which is something unique for Canada.

These are the kinds of things, and your imagination can run away with you if you think about what could happen. I am sure as I hear the Honourable Member from the other side, yes, your imagination can run away from you. There are a lot of things that might be a detriment.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: What is sixty below?

Mr. Lengerke: What's sixty below! However, I think that it is a valid question, Mr. Speaker. I hope I have some support.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting motion, Resolution Number 10. I asked the Honourable Member if he has considered what happens if you lose your shirt at sixty below.

My concern with this motion is that I think that we are trying to establish a redundant body here again, since we have already heard in this House queries as to what fulfilment of duties the Socio-Economic Planning Unit

will have, and I would think that this kind of an assignment is definitely within their terms of reference so long as the words socio-economic are included. Mr. Speaker, it would be my suggestion that this motion be moved into Committee so that we can have fuller discussion and perhaps do some amending.

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

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I second that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I believe a motion would be in order at this time, if this is the will of the House.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if you would excuse me, but I thought there was a motion and I seconded it.

Mr. Speaker: No, apparently there was a suggestion but not a motion.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, before that motion is made, I wonder if any other Members want to speak to the motion?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I seconded the motion. I am mainly interested in the gambling facilities and the economic future of Dawson City. As it stands right now, I think it is safe to say the Federal Government hasn't got much interest, at the present time, to help Dawson City in any way, shape or form. Economically, Dawson City has been written off about twenty-four years ago or more, federally and territorially speaking.

I think the proof of it is that Dawson City is the only community in the Territory that has no land set aside for expansion or anything. Every other community or municipality in the Territory has miles and miles of land set aside except Dawson City.

There were motions put forward and questions were raised in the House of decentralization of government structures in the Territory. This was declined and denied by the Territorial Government so I think it is high time that we look at the economic future of Dawson City and I think we do have the unique opportunity in Dawson right now. We have the establishment of the only legalized gambling casino in Canada and I think it would be just the time now to look at expanding those facilities. For one simple reason, we have to look at people coming up in the Territory.

It seems to be no longer feasible for the family man to take a drive up the Alaska Highway and stay in the Territory for any length of time so I think the time has come now, that we have to cater to different people, and this is one of the reasons that I supported this particular motion.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no problem in supporting the motion. However, I do have some

doubts as to what it will do to our way of life up here because I am sure that it will change by people coming up here and, as the Honourable Member said, that they will probably lose their shirt and then will have to find a way to help those people back out again.

However, I think it is about time that the Yukon Government did take a look at the situation and see where we are going because we must have something to boost the economy and it doesn't seem like we are getting there very fast with tourism alone.

This motion, if it is brought into effect, would legalize gambling in possibly Dawson City, even in a small area such as Dawson it would bring many, many people into the Territory that have money. It would be a different clientele, actually, than we have driving up the highway now. I am sure there would be lots of them here.

I think that we are about twenty years behind the rest of the Provinces in everything that we do. They found a way to get around legalized gambling by running Lottos and Western Canada this and that and the other thing. I find that in the Yukon the only thing we are doing is paying out money to gamble which is just gambling, exactly the same as this would be here, even if it is in a different form.

We are sending our money out of the Yukon Territory, doing our gambling, instead of trying to bring some money in to the Yukon Territory and doing it ourselves here. I think it is about time we looked into even that situation along with this motion here, this gambling.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to rise in support of this motion.

As it stands, I don't see it needs any further discussion. We've been talking over this whole Session about planning and this simply says, 'let's take a look at this and plan and start seeing what we're doing'. I'm surprised we're not doing it now. It's a viable, economic source in the Yukon and it could get way out of hand if we don't know what we're doing with it and we must take a look at it now.

I agree with the Member from Klondike; we have been ignoring the things that are happening in Dawson. The motion that was passed last Session concerning decentralization was not investigated properly. The whole aspect of tourism as a secondary industry in the Yukon has to be looked into and planned and properly implemented. This is just one way of doing it and I see no reason why it needs any further discussion. We really should be organizing ourself to be doing this.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I think there's a little bit of misinterpretation of the motion. The motion certainly doesn't say whether we feel that we should embark upon legalized gambling in the Yukon or whether we should not.

The motion specifically suggests that a board or commission be established to investigate the feasibility of legalized gambling in the Territory.

I share the views of the Minister of Health, that we do have the Socio-Economic Planning Unit within the Gov-

ernment of the Territory. I know that a lot of work has been done already by the Territorial Government in this regard, in legalized gambling. I think that before we embark upon a commission or a board that we should have the Socio-Economic Planning Unit draw together all the material that the Territorial Government now has available, with some recommendations to lay before this House.

At that time, we may want to establish a commission or a board that would also look at not only the social but the political questions of legalized gambling in the Territory. I'm rather surprised at people who claim that the social impact of a pipeline would be so tremendous on the Territory, and yet they skip over the social impact of legalized gambling on the Territory. And I think that we'd better tread very, very carefully.

I have not made up my mind whether legalized gambling in the Territory would be good or would not be good. But let us, before we establish the board or the commission, give that Planning Unit that we're paying for now, give them the opportunity to do some work and bring it, present it to this House. At that time, then, we can make the decision of whether we want an independent board or whether we want to make a decision.

So I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the Motion be moved to the Committee for further discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I'll second that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, that Resolution Number 10 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)

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

Amendments to Bill 102, First and Second Reading

Madam Clerk: Third reading, Bill 102, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Pelly River.

Mr. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that the Amendment to Private Member's Public Bill 102 be now read a first and second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable

Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that the amendments to Bill Number 102 be now read a first and second time.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

(Motion carried)

Mr. Speaker: When shall the Bill be read a third time?

Bill 102, Third Reading

Mr. McCall: Now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Private Member's Public Bill 102 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Bill Number 102 be now read a third time.

The Honourable Member from Kluane.

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to lose the opportunity to speak again on the Bill. And in going through some of my papers last night I came across a news release by Mr. Gillespie, who is in charge of the Department of -- who is in charge of liquor in the Territory. The news release outlined the fact that the amendments to the Liquor Ordinance would be brought into force on April 1st, but no mention of Section 103.

This news release was released January 24th of 1977. So they were pretty sure on January 24th, 1977 that they would not have to bring in the amended Section 103, as it was amended in the Fall Session. And this is one of the things that I'm objecting to so much in Bill number 102.

It was very obvious in this House, the last time we discussed the Bill, it was obvious that when we listened to comments of people across the Territory, it was obvious from the poll on the referendums that were prepared by the Honourable Member from Pelly and the Honourable Member from Klondike and the Honourable Member from Riverdale, that there was a strong consensus in the Territory that we should have uniform liquor laws. And the local option to opt out of the public drinking clause was not desired, nor was it required. And these people in the Territory, particularly in municipalities and LID's, have every right to expect us, as Members of the Legislature, to make that decision, rather than dumping it in their laps.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to concur with the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua who yesterday said, we just haven't got the fortitude to do something about the person behind the wheel who is drinking. And it's very true. We do not have the political fortitude to do that. I think it's very sad that we have let ourselves go down to this extent.

I was accused in the House, implied that I didn't have a referendum from my constituency and this is true, I didn't have a referendum but I had public meetings in every one of the communities in my constituency right after the Session — Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay, Burwash, Haines Junction and at Porter Creek with the Boundary Association. Never once can I recall, now I must be very careful, it may have been the once where the topic of public drinking with the amendment that we brought into force was ever questioned — it was never questioned, it was not a problem to people once they understood Section 103, there was no problem.

And if I had embarked upon a referendum I wouldn't have done it in one community in my constituency; I would have done it all or it should have been an opinion poll across the Territory, because the liquor laws should apply uniformly across the Territory.

The third reading is going to go through, I accept that. It isn't a major victory as the newspeople reported. Not major; one vote isn't a major victory. I think that there are not going to be too many years down the road when that major victory may be upset again when people are prepared to face the issues of drinking, particularly when you are at the wheel of a vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour it any more. I know the way the whole thing has been handled. I am embarrassed for the Government particularly. And I am embarrassed for the people of the Territory.

I think we under-estimate the conscience that the people of the Territory have. And the amendment that was brought in last time, Section 103, didn't take away the rights of the people who didn't abuse those rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the Bill on third reading. I would hope, when the Liquor Ordinance is introduced to this House again, be it by a Private Member's Bill or by the Government of the Territory, we are prepared to face honestly and squarely the problems that do exist in the Territory and also have some idea of what the people of the Territory are prepared to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the Honourable Member; however, I am not embarrassed for the Government's side of the picture because I think that that is their own problem. They have embarrassed themselves.

Any time that this Government and the people in this House can't sit down and realize that drinking and driving do not fit together after all the money we have spent to solve the problem, if some of the Members in this House had been in the same place that I have been many times and seen what drunken driving has done on the Alaska Highway and picked up a couple of children out of the ditch that have been caused through drunken driving, they might have a different outlook on this Bill today.

I think the government was absolutely gutless when they wouldn't accept what was here before. However, all they had to do, if they insist on having their own way in things, was to bring in the different wording for section 103, if they didn't like the way it was worded. I think that they'd have got a lot of support in this House from the Members that are opposing them now, just to

change that wording. If it was wrong and couldn't be comprehended by the policemen and couldn't be acted upon by the judges and couldn't be this and couldn't be that, it could have very easily been changed, I think because they did change it. However, they didn't have to bring in on the same motion what we had thrown out in the last Session here. That was not a necessity, I'm sure, and I don't think they had any support from the people to bring it in.

I'm not going to belabour the subject either, because I think you all know how I feel. But I will be opposing the motion, definitely and I would hope that someday they see fit to possibly at least take drinking off the Alaska Highway, the main highway.

I think possibly even in this motion, when you give the Commissioner the power to change, I think it's here somewhere, to make regulations and to do different things, that it might even be possible to do it yet. Hopefully they would look into that to see if it could not be probably done.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as at the end of last Session, when we talked about the Liquor Ordinance, the Member from Hootalinqua got up and spoke some pretty straightforward words and he's done that again. And I only hope and I would wish that we would have been able to react to those kinds of things that he has asked for, because certainly, as I've said before, I think that we have very liberal drinking laws in Yukon. We recognize that, we have a unique way of life, but there's only one thing that really most people ask for and that was some control of drinking on the highways and on the streets. We attempted to do that. We attempted to do that and yet leave it as wide open as possible.

I think that what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, most of all, is that the way we did amend Section 103, the last go-round we had, and I'm speaking of the last Session, that it really wasn't made clear as to what rights were still available to people.

I heard a number of Honourable Members being interviewed that had opposed it and I don't mind them opposing it, but they certainly used a scare tactic to the people of Yukon, when they tried to explain just exactly what 103 meant. I had people call me that said, oh, I'm not going to be able to drink at my cabin or on the beach or, you know, and that was a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Utter nonsense. Because we left it as broad as possible.

I have no problem with somebody telling me that they couldn't enforce it or could enforce it or what have you, because I've been through the gamut many, many times and I'm sure the Honourable Members across the way who sit on Ex-Com, who try to look at legislation, know very well the interpretations. They can talk to their legal advisor one day and think they've got it right and the next day there's another interpretation of it. And you can go down the line to many lawyers and many legal draftsmen and do the same thing.

That is not a problem, Mr. Speaker and that's a bunch of hooey when I hear it that, you know, things were amended in great haste.

I brought an amendment in this House yesterday that I worked on for quite some time, trying to incorporate

the ideas of as many people as I could. I knew what the feelings were of Members in this particular House and of the constituents. And I went to the Legal Advisor and I went to a lawyer and I got interpretations. And it was not drawn up in haste.

So, I'm not, I don't want to belabour it any longer. I think we've got a very good go-round at this and Mr. Speaker, that's my feelings and I stand that way and I thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to rise and debate on third reading and I wouldn't except that some charges were made against people on this side of the House and the government that have to be defended, because they just are not correct.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is the charge that it was for political purposes and because we didn't get our own way or different things that the amendments to the Liquor Ordinance were not proclaimed prior to April 1st.

I have no problem at all, Mr. Speaker, in admitting that it was a political decision by the elected Members on Ex-Com, that confusion would have reigned supreme in Yukon if portions of the amended Liquor Ordinance had been brought up at certain times and other portions had been proclaimed at different times. We had decided prior to the amendments of the Liquor Ordinance that all of the amendments would come into force on the date of April 1st, for obvious administrative and other reasons.

I also will not accept the charge, and I was surprised that Mr. Speaker didn't stop the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua implying motives to Members of the Government, because, even though we are Members of the Government, we still are Members of this Legislative Assembly and I think he knows and Mr. Speaker knows, that such terms as "gutless" cannot be applied to Members. I would not do the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua the discourtesy of applying such adjectives to him and I think that he should not have done so to Members sitting on this side of the House.

I would only remind Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments that are being voted on at the present time are not a government bill. The government would not have introduced amendments to the Liquor Bill at this Session. We were prepared to put in the amendments that had been passed at the last Session as of April 1st. Because a Private Member put in a Bill, which was roughly the same as the government was supporting at the last Session, we supported that Bill. It was not a government Bill, and I will not accept that it was a gutless government that introduced the Bill at this time, because those are just not the facts of the matter and I think that this should be understood by all Members of the House. I will not accept a gutless adjective against the Members of government, and I will not accept it personally from the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

It seems that Honourable Members, now in third reading, are taking a great case about the problem of drinking on highways. I also am aware and agree with the problem of drinking on the highways. The amendments, as proposed in Section 103, which would have

gone into effect on April 1st, if there had not been further amendments, would not have helped that in one iota.

The only effective method of controlling drinking on the highways is through the Criminal Code of Canada and through the breathalyzer laws. Mr. Speaker, they are having an effect in the Yukon and a very valid and a good effect, to the extent, Mr. Speaker, where some 2,000 charges have been laid in the last five years under the breathalyzer. There are only 15,000 operating permits in the Yukon, so I would say, Mr. Speaker, so that I would say that one out of every 7.5 operators has been charged under the breathalyzer which is double or triple the nearest average of anywhere else in the country and it is having an effect.

The Honourable Member must know, as all Honourable Members know, that people are not driving any longer on the highways when they are intoxicated because the fine is up to 1,500 or \$2,000.00 or six months in jail and people can't afford it. And if that is what it takes to stop people from drinking on the highways then I support it one hundred per cent.

But that is where the effectiveness is coming in on drinking on the highways. We wouldn't have done one iota of putting it back to the old days where it was *prima facie* proof of having an open bottle in the car, that you have been drinking in public and it would have just been right back to the old garbage pen philosophy of the Yukon where you are forced, if you did drink a beer in your car, of throwing the bottle back on the highway because if you didn't do it, Mr. Speaker, then you and everybody in that car could be charged with the dregs from that beer bottle as *prima facie* proof that you are guilty of drinking in public. Now that type of law, Mr. Speaker, to the majority of the Yukon population is just not sensible and you are cutting off your nose to spite your face when you pass that kind of ridiculous legislation in this House.

There are other points Mr. Speaker, that weren't raised in debate. I don't think that Honourable Members realize that highways in the Yukon includes everything, including tote trails. It doesn't matter what purpose you are there for, picnicking, fishing or anything, that if you were not off that highway, which includes the right-of-way, you were capable under the amendments that were going to come in on April 1st, of being convicted of drinking in a public place. Now even a tote road has a right-of-way of 200 feet. That means that you have to measure off at least 35 paces from the centre of the road before you were capable of having a bottle of beer if you were out on that kind of a highway. Now really, Mr. Speaker, that kind of law is something that Yukoners don't want which is capable of being enforced.

I went to independent legal advice, and I know now what a hodge podge is, if that is what the amendments were, that were brought to this House by the Legal Advisor, because I have never seen a hodge podge of unenforceable legislation in all my life as was presented, and was to go into effect on April 1st.

Mr. Speaker, nothing would have been gained by those amendments. We would have plugged the courts solid again, plugged the Whitehorse Correctional Institute solid again on liquor related matters which doesn't get to the root of the problem in any way shape or form and would go back to the ridiculous day when people took it as on their credit that they had three or four hundred

charges under the Liquor Ordinance for drinking in public. Mr. Speaker, certainly those were not the results that most Yukoners wanted from amendments to the Liquor Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments that would have gone into effect said "reasonably remote". I say that is a cop out. I say that would have been the super cop out of this House of all time. Instead of us making the decision where people could drink and could not drink, we would leave it in the subjective analysis of a Member of the constabulary what "reasonably remote" is.

I could take a poll of the twelve Members of this House and everybody would have a different opinion of what "reasonably remote" was.

What is reasonably remote to a member of the constabulary's mind, you would be brought to the court. A quarter of a mile from the highway might be reasonably remote to one person's idea, maybe half a mile would be the other. Then it would be the subjective decision of a magistrate to decide whether the member of the constabulary was right in deciding what was reasonably remote. Those are not, Mr. Speaker, the kind of laws that the people of the Yukon want.

Mr. Speaker, as it is now, the law remains the same on the sections on public drinking. Mr. Speaker, over and over and over again, and I must say that I heard from every one of the settlements in the Honourable Member from Klwane's area, that they did not want the changes as proposed that the Honourable Member was supporting in the Bill that would have gone into effect on April 1st. People just have not abused the privileges under the present ordinance. They have been mature, they have been responsible and they have abided by the spirit and the intent of the law.

Over and over again, the public was saying it's a first time that government has treated us like reasonable, rational mature people in all the time we've been in the Yukon, and because a few abuse it, all of the privileges that we have gained are going to be taken away.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that that's the type of legislation that this House wants to pass.

I admit there are problems in the streets. There were problems in the streets prior to the passage of this Ordinance and there will be problems in perpetuity as long as there is an alcohol problem in the Yukon. If it becomes to such a degree that the people of Whitehorse, the people of Dawson, the people of Faro, the people in the L.I.D.'s think that their streets are just being vandalized and think that there are drunks lying all over the place, then it's up to them to support their municipal councils to prevent that from happening within their jurisdictions.

I have no problem at all with the City of Whitehorse, in which I am a taxpayer, bans drinking on the streets in the City of Whitehorse. I don't do it, mature, responsible people, which are the vast majority of people in the Yukon don't do it. They just say that the rights and privileges should not be taken away from all the other areas in the Yukon, which the proposed amendments would have done.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendments as are now in place with the enabling ability of populated areas to ban drinking from the streets if their citizens so desire are the way to go, they are the sensible route. They still apply universality of the law throughout the Yukon, unless people want differently and it is up to them to

trigger that mechanism within their local communities.

That's the way I like to see the Yukon operating. It's the way I think the people of the Yukon want to see the Yukon operated and, Mr. Speaker, naturally I will be voting and I hope the majority of the House will be for the amended Ordinance as it now stands.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?
The Honourable Member from Whitehorse West.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, I would expect, from the remarks made in this House in the last two days, that following the passage of this Bill, the Commissioner will be receiving applications from at least five communities in the Yukon who wish to have no public drinking within their boundaries, because those are the opinions which have been expressed here by their Members and their Members are standing and repeating over and over again that that is what the people of their area wish.

Mr. Speaker, we have made it very simple for the people of those areas to have what they wish. If they indeed wish no public drinking within their boundaries, there is now a way to achieve that objective.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And in final comment upon this Bill, Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone feeling that they are gutless in this Legislature, they now have an opportunity to go back and show the world that they are not gutless by having their communities bar public drinking and, Mr. Speaker, they can go a little further and follow the example of areas in our sister Territory, where they are having complete prohibition at the request of local areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not being gutless. That is standing up to be counted on the issue of public drinking. If you don't want it in your own community, there is now a way to stop it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Watson: Point of --

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Watson: -- privilege, that's being a dreamer.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

Some Members: Question.

Mrs. Watson: Division.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called.

It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Bill Number 102 be now read a third time. Madam Clerk, would you poll the House?

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. McIntyre: Nay.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Nay.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Disagree.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: Agreed.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Nay.

Madam Clerk: The Honourable Member, Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Nay.

Madam Clerk: Mr Speaker, the results of division are five yea, five nay.

Mr. Speaker: I think it has been made clear, my position in this matter in Committee of the Whole, and I shall declare that the motion has carried.

(Motion carried)

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order...

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

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Private Member's Public Bill Number 102 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Klondike, that Bill Number 102 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.

(Motion carried)

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order — isn't it traditional, when there's a tie in the House, that the Speaker vote so that the question can go back to the House to be debated again?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I find that the Honourable Member has no point of order and perhaps the Honourable Member will give the House a few courtesies.

May I have your further pleasure at this time?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale.

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

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, 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 call Committee to order and declare a brief recess.

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: I call this Committee to order.

We left off yesterday on Vote 7; we are down to Expenditure Recoveries, page 152 of your main estimates. Expenditure recovery is \$9,000.00.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are we on expenditure recoveries for Library Services?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we are.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the witness?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Why do we not have any estimated expenditure for Library Services for overdue book fees, archive's photo service and film rental? Are you not going to be charging for these services in '77-78?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I believe we are and I find myself quite vulnerable as I look at this, and I don't know the answer to that.

When the Treasury Department representatives come, I will put the question to them and answer that, because I am afraid I don't know the answer.

Mr. Chairman: The Treasury has been advised for Committee's information. They are on the way. Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, just prior to leaving this section, I am wondering if our witness could give us some information on the recommendations which the Tourism Advisory Board gave on November 19th last year. I find that there are several good recommendations in there. I would like to know if some action is being taken by the Department on this.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: I would be happy to bring in an answer, an indication of what is being done with regard to each of those recommendations.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: The answer to the question put regarding expenditure recoveries for overdue book fees, archive photo service and film rental, is that that is now shown under revenues, fines and sundry other information.

Mr. Chairman: Where are you making reference to, Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: On page 153, the revenues for the Department of Tourism, Conservation and Information. Information, fines and sundry show items of \$5,000.00 respectively, for a total of \$10,000.00 in revenue. That is the figure referred to. In other words, it is being removed from recoveries, where it was identified last year, to revenues where it is being identified this year.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are there no revenues in the tourism side? Did they not have a cost sharing arrangement, I believe, with the Federal Government on one of the studies that was embarked upon by the Territorial Government through Tourism?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: Those expenditures are paid for directly by Parks Canada to the recipients, not -- in other words, the expenditures are not all incurred by the Territorial Government and then Parks Canada amounts recovered from them, so that the Parks Canada pays directly.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: I believe we have some agreement, don't we, under a piece of legislation or an agreement with the Federal Tourism Branch, whatever they call it, where we would get a cost-sharing arrangement with them to do some preliminary planning or study within the Territory?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: When we come in with our report on the planning projects that have been undertaken and who paid what toward those projects, the contributions by such agencies as the Canadian Government Office of Tourism, CGOT, will be identified.

I don't recall their having contributed to any studies in this current year, Mr. Chairman, but they did contribute in the previous year. But I will confirm that and it will appear in the report that I'm bringing back.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: You're just showing, as an expenditure, the Territorial's portion of it, of any study that's been cost-shared. You're not showing as a revenue the other, the other jurisdictions that are helping pay for it.

Mr. Gillespie: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.
Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Under Revenue, the Tourism Branch and the Game Branch, Mr. Gillespie, I see you've estimated \$56,000.00 was in the '76-77, and \$35,000.00 under campground fees for '77-78. Is this strictly a reflection on what has happened this year, being a doldrum year in the tourist industry, and you're anticipating that it's going to be a fairly quiet year again for this coming season? That's with respect to the campground fees.

And my question -- oh, I'll let you answer that first, but then I've got another question with the Game Branch.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: The \$56,000.00 was simply an overestimate of what we would get. It was a new system we were employing this last summer, and we were hopeful it would bring in that amount. In actual fact, it brought in only \$31,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: With respect to the Game Branch, the licences, again, that's probably just an overestimate, the \$250,000.00 and you brought in \$230,000.00, but my question on the licences is, it's related of course,

the Game Branch embarked on a program this year whereby there was a reporting system on the amount of game that was taken and I was just wondering how that program went. Did you get good responses to that?

I know you were offering prizes and bonuses and things like that. I've often wondered why you would go that route and why you don't take, say, an example from some of the other provinces whereby if you don't report you don't get a licence the following year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, the responses this year have not been too good. I would have to check to see what the final outcome has been, but the last time I heard, there was some discouragement in the Game Department about the level of response. We have not, since that time, yet looked at the possibility of not providing a licence, if returns were not made.

I think we would want to look at that very carefully, Mr. Chairman, because I'm not sure that's the kind of thing that we would like to do in the Yukon. I think that would be considered a rather heavy imposition on Yukoners.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: I would contend that it's certainly a responsibility of -- if this is what the regulation is, it's the responsibility of any hunter to report and certainly we shouldn't have to be giving away bonus prizes to get this kind of information back. I would certainly recommend to you, Mr. Gillespie, that you take a look, very seriously, at suggesting that people will not get a licence issued again if they do not report.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, our approach has been, up to now, to attempt to use a goodwill, supportive approach to try and encourage people to help us out in this regard. If we have to move to an enforcement punitive approach, it will be unfortunate, but we'll have to look at it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Mr. Gillespie.

I'm looking at the \$56,000.00 in campground fees, the estimate last year as being over-estimated, you said. However, I'm looking at \$35,000.00, you said \$31,000.00, I think that was the figure that was taken in, wasn't it?

In other words, possibly, we are looking for a little better year, this year. That's my first question. Are you looking forward to a better year?

The other one is, last year in the House there was a campground fee schedule of some kind passed here. If I remember right, I think it was \$10.00, something pretty something to this effect, and after we left the House it was changed by the Government or by somebody. I know that I had nothing to do with it. And there was a different fee charged.

I'm wondering if that same fee is going to be charged this year or will we be seeing possibly a piece of paper on Information Services, for instance, for our information,

as they put out, that all of a sudden somebody has decided that it will be a different fee again, because I notice that sometimes these things do happen, even though we pass them in the House as one figure, and when they start to work it turns out to be a different one.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Member that we have no intention of changing the campgrounds schedule for this year. That is not under consideration at this point in time.

The \$4,000.00 increase in anticipated revenues increase over those received during this last year or this current year, is simply our best estimate of what will happen. Although we expect Tourism rates to remain level in this coming year, this is our latest estimate we have; we are simply just estimating \$35,000.00, which is perhaps a little optimistic.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to get your eye while we were still on the other subject of these hunting licences. I am somewhat disturbed by the remarks of the Honourable Member of Whitehorse Riverdale who gave a direction to the -- virtually gave a direction to the witnesses here this morning. This is not a decision of the House and I think the witnesses should disregard that direction. I think Members should, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, be a little more careful in, you know, one Member cannot get up and leave the direction of this Government or this Administration without having the concurrence of at least the majority of other Members.

In the case of the refusal of a licence, it is all well and good to say, 'well, we will make it easier for the Administration'; I think you should also consider that we are burying the poor public of the Yukon in more laws and regulations and things that it is almost becoming impossible for them to move.

The question of refusal of a licence simply because a person didn't report, that still ought to remain a voluntary sort of thing and if some prizes are offered to encourage people who don't normally report to report, all well and good. You just cannot go and take away their licence because they did not. Perhaps they lost their licence, perhaps they never got anything in hunting and thought 'well, it's just not worthy of reporting'. But to suggest to me or any other sensible or living Yukoner that you are going to take away his licence because he never filled out a piece of paper - you could destroy a man's livelihood and say, well, this year you don't eat because you didn't report last year. And this is what it is coming to; our servants are becoming more and more so our masters, as I have said before.

We are overruled and if there is any such policy involving livelihood of people in the Yukon it ought to be determined by the Members of this House, not by one Member. In fact, the Government ought to take very, very grave consideration of this matter.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member from Watson Lake has an excellent point

and I do apologize to the House and I apologize to the witnesses for giving that kind of direction without the consent of the House.

I certainly still stand in on my remarks of -- I am looking at the possibility of -- rather than bonus prizes, I am saying that there should be some restriction on the issuance of licences. That is something that maybe this House could consider.

I am saying that not to, again, impose a lot of undue restrictions on people and everything else. But I think we, in the Yukon, do have a very excellent system whereby licences are issued. We do have the privilege of hunting at very little expense in the purchase of licences. I think the fees are very, very reasonable and I wouldn't like to see them increased. That is the reason why I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that possibly the other side of the coin be looked at.

I know many other jurisdictions and I know of many countries where hunting has become a very privileged thing. In order for the Game Department to keep proper control of game management for the benefit of all Yukoners, certain statistics and certain information is needed. I think that is the only thing, and I think that the general public has a responsibility in responding to that.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on the revenue from the Game Branch, under Licences, I wonder if that has been broken down so that we would have an indication of how much of that estimated \$230,000.00, was generated by the big game outfitters' business, rather from the local people in the Territory?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed a moment to look at our books to see if we have that information.

Mr. Chairman: Certainly.

Mr. Gillespie: Budgeted for 1977-78, we are anticipating revenues from Resident Hunting Licences, \$22,000.00; Non-Resident Hunting Licences, Canadian, \$3,000.00; Non-Resident Hunting Licences, Alien, \$35,000.00; Seal Fees for Residents \$25,000.00; Seal fees for Non-Residents, \$7,000.00; Fishing Licences, \$48,000.00; Trophy fees, \$82,000.00 and Miscellaneous, \$7,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just was wondering if Mr. Gillespie could possibly tell us when people in the Yukon can expect the first Yukon Park? And I'm thinking in particular of the MacArthur Range between Pelly and Stewart Crossing.

Another question in my mind - if the territorial government, the administration, took into consideration to declare a park area along the Dempster Highway? And I was wondering if Mr. Gillespie could enlighten us on this subject?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Gillespie: The government has no plans, no short-term plans to establish a Territorial park. We have no funds allocated for that purpose. We are continuing, planning to continue on a limited basis, to continue with our inventory work and our parks planning work, but, because we don't foresee the kinds of resources, funding resources that would be required to establish a park, and they are very great, I would doubt very much that they will be coming in the next two or three years.

As to the Dempster Highway, the effects of the approach we used this last fall for controlling hunting along that route are being examined and when those results are known, possibly new approaches, may be applied next year or we may go again with the approach of allowing hunting of caribou only during certain times of the day.

However, there are no plans to establish a park per se along the Dempster Highway.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, a question, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Gillespie on the licences.

The revenue from all the licences, do we receive the revenue from all licensing? For instance, I'll give you an example, of this fishing licences that you said, I think, we collected \$48,000.00 or something. Fishing licences, that would be angling licences. How about the commercial netting licences, things like this? Does the federal government receive some of the monies and we receive or -- what portion do we get?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, we receive all the monies for angling licences, for fishing licences and none of the revenues from commercial licences.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger:

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to go back on the Dempster Highway once more and the park. I was wondering, Mr. Gillespie, if the Game Branch at the present time, was thinking of studying, going to embark on another study on the caribou. I was wondering if Mr. Gillespie could tell us how the picture controlling people going up the Dempster Highway, once that Highway is a thoroughfare?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: We haven't any conclusions yet, Mr. Chairman. This is why we're doing research.

There have been examples or methods tried out in other areas, such as controlling the speed of vehicles and controlling the number of vehicles, controlling the times of day when vehicles pass; controlling whether people are allowed to actually stop their vehicles and get out, because apparently this has a much greater effect on the caribou than the mere passage of vehicles, which they have, in time, become used to.

These are things that we're looking at in relation to the experience gained elsewhere and also in terms of the observations that we make on the Dempster Highway during those times that the caribou are passing

over the Dempster Highway.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, just while we're on licensing and having listened with some interest to the debates around licensing and revenues this morning, is it anticipated on the Dempster Highway that there seems to be only one thing left that you're not intending on controlling the licensing at this moment and that is the right to breath air. Will there be a permit issued for this very thing as well? Is this under consideration?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: That may be a part of our study, Mr. Chairman.
No, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: This is how ridiculous the thing is getting.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I don't very often share the views of the Honourable Member from Watson Lake, but every once in a while, he comes out with a wise saying. I was wondering, after listening to this, why did we spend all those tax dollars, Canadian tax dollars in building a highway if we can't use it? You know, are we building a highway for the caribou? Or are we building a highway for people? It just seems absolutely ridiculous more and more, you know, you drive certain speeds and you stop, it's only reasonable that when a caribou is on the road, you stop, or if they're on either side, if they're migrating across the highway -- my gosh, I can't understand it. I'd like some answers.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, all I indicated was that we too were looking for answers, I didn't say that we were, that we had the answers, that we were contemplating doing those things. I used those as examples of things that were being done in other jurisdictions.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Are you considering that the people are going to be allowed to drive the highway?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No drinking on the Dempster Highway.

Mrs. Watson: Good.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the Honourable Member from Kluane, this shows the lack of planning that happened in the construction of the Dempster Highway. Because when the Dempster Highway was started, nobody had any idea of what problems we were going to get into. And we are suffering because of that today.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, the Member from Watson Lake said that we should not give direction to the government so I guess I might have a little problem here, however, after the fiasco that went on in Teslin Lake last summer by the federal Fisheries, and that was to check to see if the commercial fishing was viable or not, I am wondering if the government ever thought of trying somehow to deal with the federal government and maybe receive the commercial fishing licence monies as revenue for the Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: We would not be in a very strong bargaining position so long as they have the responsibility for issuing those licences and enforcing them, and establishing the regulations for them.

That is our first objective, is to take over those responsibilities and when they come then we can get the revenues that go along with them.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Just a comment in that regard so that the federal government know where I stand, I don't think that they are staying up, looking after their responsibilities very well and I again quote the episode at Teslin Lake which started 10 years ago last fall. I have letters from the Commissioner at that time and papers from the meetings that were held in Teslin with the federal Fisheries, asking them at that time to take a survey to do something to prove whether we should ruin our lake or shouldn't ruin it. We were promised, faithfully, at that time that this would happen as soon as possible and it did happen 10 years later.

There was a man there practically all summer and of course it is the tax dollars of all of us whether it is federal or not that has been paying the bill. I really don't have the answer after asking twice in the House. I still don't have the answers to what really happened, other than he disappeared. And there is no report, there is no nothing. I would hope possibly that if I ask that question again to see if we can't find out what just did happen or what happened to the report, if there was such a thing. It's very strange.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I have never introduced a motion before because I don't consider myself expert enough in the area. But I keep asking questions of the residents -- of the people of Teslin. I keep asking questions of the residents around Kluane Lake and I get the answer over and over and over from people who are living traditionally, who are living subsistence living, who used to fish commercially in the lakes, who used to angle in the lakes, that the fish stocks in the accessible lakes along the major highway networks in the Yukon are being depleted through the proliferation of commercial fishing licences.

Now, as I say, this just the answers I get from the people who have been there for hundreds of years, who have traditionally fished the areas, supposedly know what is going on. I have never been able to understand

why Honourable Members whose constituents are in that area, haven't put a motion to this House, or a resolution, that we ask as a House for the federal government to ban proliferation of commercial fishing licences unless they are used for subsistence or traditional or grandfather commercial fishing rights.

I would like to hear Honourable Members debate this issue and I would support such a resolution from the information that I presently have from people in those areas. I know that the Honourable Members know a heck of a lot more about it than I do.

We just ask question after question of the federal government and we get no answers. Why don't we do something positive as Members of this House from the Members of those areas whose constituencies are effected, to at least go on record that we want to save whatever fishing is left in the Yukon for Sport fishing and for angling purposes. As I say, I am not an expert on the subject, I don't know enough about it. I know the Honourable Member from Teslin knows a heck of a lot more about it than I do and I would support, upon his advice and recommendations, such resolutions if they were presented to this House. I only wish somebody would do it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just one point raised by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre and that is, he does not know the information, the statistics, perhaps none of us know in this House. Are we then competent to make such weighty decisions until we do know? I think that perhaps, though the Honourable Member has a great idea, that before we reach a decision on closing fishing and restricting fishing rights, commercial rights, that we get the information upon which to make a reasonable, rational judgment. I think this is important again, on licensing.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: There is information available as to the number of commercial fishing licences that have been given by federal Fisheries in the last five years. And they have increased, I think, something about 500 per cent. Now, you know, something just isn't right, because everybody's telling me that the fish aren't there any longer. I trust without getting onto all the facts and figures of Fisheries, the people who know those areas and know those lakes and have been around therefor that length of time, and I just can't see, they keep constantly telling me that the fish are depleting, but all I see is a proliferation, more and more and more and more commercial fishing licences and Fisheries say they can do nothing about it.

If they come and squat in an area and build a cabin and put a couple of junk cars in front of the place, then they're entitled to a fishing licence, which seems to be the way that they're given at this point in time in Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I fully agree with the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North

Centre. I even like to go one step further. I would like to suggest to the House, demand from the federal government, take over the Department of Fisheries in this territory so that we do have control in the territory. Because I asked a lot of questions the last session and the answers that were forthcoming from the federal Department of Fisheries are completely unsatisfactory to me. And I would also like to enlighten the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, you don't have to squat on a lake or along the river to get a fishing licence. You can come in from New Brunswick in this territory, and you have the right to get a commercial fishing licence because you're Canadian. So it has nothing to do with the Yukon. But I still would like to suggest to this House here, to take over -- demand to take over the Department of Fisheries by this territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Still, I say to the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre, Mr. Chairman, that it may appear that there has been an increase in the number of commercial fishing licences that have been issued in the territory over any given period of time, and perhaps, there has been during that period of time, a decrease in fishing, sport fishing yields in these lakes. But who says they're relative? I have knowledge of many lakes where there hasn't been so much as a net or commercial fishery ever implanted in the lake where fishing, as far as sport fishing is concerned, has gone downhill for the last six, eight years, and is now just starting back.

So, you know, maybe this is a general situation that has gone across the Yukon. Who knows? And, you know, we've got to find out just really what effect commercial fishing is having. Perhaps commercial fishing in some lakes is good for the lake.

You know, I think it's very, very unreal and unrealistic to try and draw a conclusion upon assumptions such as this.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly agree that we require more information on the commercial fishing licences. And I would hope that the government could get as much of the information as they can, on the commercial fishing licences that now are being given out by the federal government and also, give us some indication of how long some of these licences have been held by people, the requirements to get them, because I know that a great many of them in my area are traditional or subsistence and before I would step in, unilaterally saying, no more commercial fishing licences, I would like to have more information, because I certainly wouldn't want to be depriving some of the people who have been fishing in the lakes, as a way of life and using it to supplement the type of life they're leading.

So I would require a great deal more information and, as the Honourable Member from Watson Lake says there may be some other information to show that the stock in the lakes is attributable to the commercial fishing. I am certainly not afraid of making some decision on this in this House this time at all.

May we please try to get some information so that we can make a valid decision?

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

RECESS

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee to order. We are considering Vote 7, Expenditure Recoveries.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, prior to Committee rising over the noon hour, we were speaking of recoveries, particularly licences, and I'd like to ask of the witness, Mr. Chairman, in respect of trapline licences, whether or not there has as yet been a policy formulated in respect of traplines, the licencing of which seems to be under some question right now. I understand that you're taking away licences from people for certain reasons and I'm wondering if there's a policy and if this could be enumerated at this time?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I believe that it was at the last Session, or maybe it was the one prior to that, where a legislative return was brought in explaining what our policy was in relation to the issuance of trapline licences. The policy has not changed since that time. I will obtain a copy of that legislative return and bring it back in.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, perhaps I could narrow this thing in a little bit. I'm curious as to whether or not it is the intention of the Government of the Yukon Territory, through its Game Department, to take away all traplines in the same manner as you were doing for non-Native people, to take away native traplines for non, you know, from people who are not trapping it or who, indeed, don't need them for the same reasons you take away non-native traplines.

Mr. Gillespie: As indicated in that previous legislative return, there is no intention to be treating the one group differently from the other at this point in time. That is the policy at this time. The natives and non-natives are to be treated alike.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, could I ask then if any native traplines then have been taken away since the introduction of the paper?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that, but I can find out.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Please, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further consideration of the Expenditure Recoveries and Revenue? Project Capital, on Page 208, of your Budget. Vote 20, Establishment 2701, campground and rest stop development, \$100,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: I don't know whether this is the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, in reference to campground and rest stop developments, I am just wondering if Mr. Gillespie could advise this committee whether the items that are being forwarded to the Municipal Council of Faro, are on a loan basis or whether the Government is going to allow the council to keep these items and I am making reference to the tables and whatever else is necessary for campground utilities. I believe that the Council has been advised, they are only on a loan basis from the Government but we have to provide the cans of paint to cover the various utility items that are needed for a campground purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I haven't a clue. I wasn't aware that we had loaned or given or otherwise, some of these items to Faro but I will find out and bring back the answer to the Honourable Member.

Mr. Chairman: For further details regarding Establishment 2701 order, I refer you to Page 32 of your appendix. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just cancel that for the moment, I will look at this.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Gillespie, just advised us that he is not aware of all the details yet. In the appendix, they make reference to Faro here as to rest stop development and I am curious as to why he does not have that information at present. Keep it in mind that the Municipal Council is putting in a campground.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: I have no answer. I just simply -- not knowing the answer, I have no answer to give.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with respect to rest stop and campground development, it is noted that Carcross is going to have some development there. I would like to know some of the details with respect to that. What size of facility and just a little more about it?

Mr. Gillespie: As a result of the Carcross-Skagway road, there will be a need for development of some type of facilities in the Carcross area. We have not yet decided precisely where those facilities will be located, nor have we decided exactly what their nature will be. This is going to be the product, or those decisions will be the product of ongoing discussions that have already started with the community of Carcross.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, how then do you determine \$100,000.00 budget? Oh, pardon me, that's not \$100,000.00, that's '77-'78.

For all of those items, what is going to be left for Carcross development? Or what is earmarked? You can't even tell me the size of the facilities, or

Mr. Gillespie: For budgeting purposes, Mr. Chairman, \$7,000.00 have been allocated for development in the Carcross area within that \$100,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, what will the \$7,000.00 enable the branch to do then?

Mr. Gillespie: As I indicated, we don't know yet what we are going to do for budgeting purposes though, we have to allocate some money for that area. A rest stop, I believe costs more than \$7,000.00 to construct and this would be a partial payment, or funds to get a rest stop started. The same thing would apply if we were working toward a campground, but in this first year we're not going to, I don't think, complete whatever the decision is, with regard to a new facility.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I think my friend across the way is seeking answers to some questions which were posed last Saturday when we were both in attendance at a meeting of representatives from Juneau, Haines and Skagway in a day long session which was most fruitful to both sides at various levels of government and community interest. One of the questions they specifically asked was, "Are you going to have a trailer and tourist campground for us when we come up on the new road from Skagway late this summer? And will there be one at Carcross and how many are there around Whitehorse?"

I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that we should all stress the need for assessing the location of that campground and giving it the greatest priority possible, because I am not an authority on the completion date for that road, but each time I hear it mentioned, it seems to be coming closer.

The expression of the opinion on Saturday, Mr. Chairman, was that it might be last August, or early September, and immediately thereafter, of course, it will close down because there's no maintenance funds to keep it open for the winter.

However, Mr. Chairman, all facetiousness aside, I think this is a first priority if the Department is looking at questions as to where these campgrounds should be located. That's the number one.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I welcome those remarks by the Honourable Minister because that's exactly what I was getting at. I just want to be assured that we start this thing and we complete it. And, if you're going to budget for something, you should have a plan as to what you're going to provide. Surely to God, there must be some projections as to the type of traffic that's going to be going over the Carcross-Skagway road and the type of people that are going to be utilizing it. And we have to provide for some kind of a campground rest stop and I just, again, I feel, Mr. Chairman, very strongly that, if a branch is going to budget, that they must have specifically something in mind and I'd like to see and hear about it.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, those discussions, we agree and do appreciate the urgency in this particular situation. We have been approached during the course of this winter by people from Carcross and have been meeting with them. I believe there was a meeting held, if my memory serves me correct, a couple of weeks ago. And there are on-going discussions as to the alternative locations for a campground. But we don't want to charge in and put a campground right where it would compete with a private campground and there's some discussion about that being established, in the immediate vicinity of Carcross itself.

So, our plans have to take into account the plans of other people and it's for this reason that our planning is a little late in getting finalized, with regard to where we're going to establish this campground.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting to hear that. I think that most of my questions now have been answered, not in entirety though. I was going to ask that very question as to whether they were going to possibly develop the campground in opposition to possibly private enterprise, if private enterprise were actually going to do it.

However, I would say again, as I think I have told private enterprise in the Carcross area, that they must, if they are planning a campground, must produce something worthwhile and the meeting you were speaking of, I was there. And then I would hopefully see the government, possibly spend that money on some other area farther out. One campground is not going to do that whole territory, I wouldn't think anyhow.

I would question this Teslin, two. Could you explain the two in Teslin, is there two rest stops to go in near Teslin, or just what is the "two" there for?

Mr. Gillespie: On invitation of, I believe it was the LID at Teslin -- there, again, we're in the same situation. There will be a meeting taking place fairly shortly, in the month of April, I'm told, to discuss where and whether rest stop should be put into that area. But that has not been decided until that public discussion has been held.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: But I was still wondering about the "two". Is this for two rest stops or -- ?

Mr. Gillespie: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: It is for two. Just a comment, Mr. Chairman, there will be a meeting the first week in April and the Government will be getting some type of direction from the Teslin area. I think it is possible that it might, I am always saying this, it might be a little different than they have from many other areas. Sometimes we are a little different people out there anyway. They possibly maybe right in the area of the townsite area or in, I would say, the boundaries of the townsite area. I would ask now if that would be considered if it was in that proposal?

Mr. Gillespie: I am not sure what the legalities of that

would be Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the Minister of Local Government could indicate whether the zoning and other provisions would permit the establishment of a rest stop within the LID boundaries of Teslin if that were requested by the community, by the LID?

If not Mr. Chairman, we could look into that or certainly this will come out -- if that is requested at that meeting, then it would be up to our people to indicate on the basis of homework done in the meantime. Now that you have indicated to us that this might be requested, we will do our homework in the meantime and come with the answer when that meeting is held.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the zoning of every LID and Municipality off the top of my head. There are so many different zoning areas in each community. However, I would think that if the LID requested it, I know that every area has open space areas within the LID boundaries, so if that is a legitimate use of open space area requested by the membership of the LID, I can't see any great problems in that type of an establishment being constituted within the boundary.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson. Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if Mr. Gillespie could possibly tell us what plans the Department of Tourism would have with the campgrounds west of Dawson, in light of the pending closure of Clinton Creek and the possible curtailment of hours of the ferry service in Dawson, that campground becomes sort of a useless place there because with a possible twelve hour ferry service, people would no longer use that. Is the Department planning another campground on the east side of the river or what plans do the Department have.

Mr. Gillespie: We are conscious, Mr. Chairman, of the effects that the closure Clinton Creek Mine will have on the usage of that particular campground. That is a decision, though, that we don't have to make this year. We have recognized it explicitly in our examination of our campground program and we will be addressing it during the course of this coming winter. For the moment, we have not made a decision on what we are going to do about that campground.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a short note. I would think it should require some urgency into looking into the feasibility of another campsite in the particular area of Dawson. I think it wouldn't hurt to take a preliminary look at different sites in the particular area, instead of waiting until the last minute.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under the category of Rest Stop Development, quite often I think I've stood in this House and protested the fact in Watson Lake that the government, in their wisdom, or this department in their wisdom, saw fit to link the weigh scales in Watson Lake with putting in the same building a tourist information booth.

Now, I understand, and it has been my understanding for the last year, that it is the intention of the govern-

ment to also put at this location a tourist rest stop. And I think those Members who may recall will be reminded of the fact I talked about the mixing of multi-ton trucks and cats and dogs and more particularly young children. It's my understanding that the rest stop development is on the other side of the check-point and immediately appertaining thereto.

I would like to know if it's still the intention of the government to embark upon this rest stop at this location and, if that be the case, if it's their intention to provide full fencing to keep apart the multi-ton trucks and the children?

Mr. Gillespie: I would have to find the answer to that; I'm not sure where the planning stands, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

When I see the Campground Rest Stop Development, \$100,000.00, and I look down at the bottom and I see Improvement of Camp Sites, Yukon River and Teslin, I'm wondering — \$100,000.00 is not really very much money when you start spreading it around the country, through all these areas here. We have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, at the top, which are rest stops and rehabilitation for all different camp sites. And then the new water wells, ten locations, ten wells. Dump stations, eight locations, that's sixteen. This is \$100,000.00, am I right? Yes?

I'm just wondering if that money is going to be spread, I think, so thin that those wells are going to be very shallow, or something. How much money is going to be spent on the primitive camp sites on the Yukon River and the Teslin River?

Mr. Gillespie: The budgeted figure, Mr. Chairman, is \$3,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I also am wondering how you're going to stretch \$300,000.00, and I'd like to ask the question on the road relocation at Horseshoe Bay. Do you mean the access road to the campsite or are you actually meaning a relocation of the Alaska Highway at Horseshoe Bay?

Mr. Gillespie: I would have to find the answer to that, Mr. Chairman, I just don't know that detail.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: It is quite a significant question that I'm asking, because if you're talking about the actual highway relocation at Horseshoe Bay, you're going to face great problems of a private business and also the national park on the other side. So, I would be very interested to see what your plans actually are. I think this could be a very sensitive thing if you actually meant the highway. I would like to have the answer.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, I can be reasonably

sure that it's not the highway. We have \$1,000.00 budgeted for this project, but I will, nevertheless, find out what our precise plans are for that area.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, my question is probably just supplementary to what the other Members are asking, and I would ask the witness if he could provide us with a dollar figure for every one of the items that are listed here, and a timetable as to when they expect to implement the expenditure that they have so allocated for each one.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and a timetable as to when they think they are going to complete the work. If they are going to spend \$7,000.00, I'd like to know when they are going to complete that work, because this is always the problem - we are either turning money back or we are wondering whether a program has been completed or not. I think it's essential that we know that this program is going to be done, and if they haven't got enough money to do it, then we can get some more.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: I will bring that information; we have it in dollar terms. The timetable I don't have, so I will bring that in.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject of asking Mr. Gillespie to provide a little more detailed information on this \$100,000.00 which is going to be spent, I wonder if he could give a brief explanation as to this road relocation that he's made reference to in Horseshoe Bay. I always thought that it was in British Columbia, and Mr. Gaglardi spent a lot of money on that. We're not playing around with the same thing, are we?

Mrs. Watson: That is my riding, Mr. Chairman, I'm not Mr. Gaglardi.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering, we had discussed the primitive campsites in the last Budget Session already, and I was wondering if the Department installed any primitive campsites alongside the Yukon River or any other place, and if so what was the cost involved of cleaning those places up?

Mr. Gillespie: The precise figure for the cost involved, I don't know, but there was some work done along the Yukon River, Selkirk, I believe, in which a number of the residents from Carmacks participated, and the particular cost of that exercise I don't have but I can obtain it and bring it in if you wish. Some work was done there in cleaning the place up and establishing privy areas and so on. Dump sites.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, some time ago, there was a suggestion that perhaps, where government campgrounds existed, immediately or fairly closely to a highway lodge or a type of facility such as this, that perhaps the government might look at turning that campground over to that particular highway lodge or something for private enterprise operation. Has this indeed happened, or have any requests been received perhaps in the last year for this type of transfer?

Mr. Gillespie: There have been no requests in the last little while, Mr. Chairman, and none of the campgrounds have been turned over. Some examination has, however, been made of that issue and some of the requirements that would have to be fulfilled by a private owner by way of providing facilities have indicated that for many of them it would be prohibitive in terms of capital and ongoing operating costs.

Beyond that, nothing has happened in this area, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under the primitive campsites on the Yukon River and the Teslin River, I know myself that there has been considerable money spent; however, it's possibly federal monies. I've flown over the campsites myself — the cleared areas. There are numerous cleared areas on the Teslin River alone. And this is why I asked the question on how much money would be spent, because I find that, instead of developing something where the money is going to come to the Territory, such as along the Alaska Highway, and developing good campgrounds, and maybe not so many of them but good ones and large ones, and getting monies from our revenues from our licences, to use these grounds and so forth, that we are more or less running around putting in a rest stop here and a rest stop there, where the highway is going to be changed in a few years, the money is being spent, I think, in some cases, very foolishly, because there is no planning ahead.

The river campsites are a wonderful thing to keep the people from throwing a can under a tree or something; however, the travel is really not that large on many rivers and it's been going on for thousands of years. I find again that the money we spend will possibly never be brought back to us in many instances.

I question just spending too much until such time as we do know that there is a viable return there.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, there are two ways of looking at this issue. One is in terms of revenue returns to the government that might ultimately accrue from these expenditures.

The other way, and the way we're looking at it in the more immediate term, is the effects on the environment of not doing some work on primitive campsites. The accumulation over the years of garbage and sewage and so on along the river banks, is getting to be rather alarming in some areas and the amount of traffic that is going down these rivers is increasing annually, so the problem is accelerating.

It's an investment in our environment more so than an investment in future revenues, that we are addressing

with this program.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Again, I don't want to leave the campground rest stop development.

Priorities. Are there any priorities for those particular projects. Have you set priorities for those items listed there?

Mr. Gillespie: Well, according to this list, Mr. Chairman, we intend to do work in five different, on five different rest stops and so they'll all receive equal priority in that sense.

Mr. Chairman: Any further consideration to 2701? Twenty-seven oh two, Tourism Displays, \$12,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: How many displays will that construct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Gillespie: Two, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, where?

Mr. Gillespie: Well, they will be here in a sense. These displays are used by Tourism and Information for Travel Trade Seminars, Consumer Travel Shows and various other exhibitions, used where we promote Yukon Travel. They are light-weight and they are portable and they are used as a backdrop where we have exhibit booths at these various exhibitions. They are quite expensive, as is indicated here, to build but they should last a good many years.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Is it the intention of the Department to have those built locally or would they be done outside the Territory by professional types or again can you give me some details to that?

The reason I am asking that, Mr. Chairman, is that I have certainly seen many displays built or put together and done very well by local people, by people through the Vocational School, or the Handicapped can be used to do some of these - Rehabilitation Centres do a very, very good job. I am just asking if any thought has been given to that?

Mr. Gillespie: As far as I know, no conclusion has been reached as to just who will be building them and how and what they will contain. I haven't the answers to that. If we have a plan already in place, I will so indicate. It may, though, be something that is not yet ready.

Mr. Chairman: Twenty-seven oh three, Historic Sites Development, \$30,000.00. Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, every time the Budget rolls around, I would like to ask this question. In programming Historic Site Development, is it still understood that this development takes place upon

the advice and direction generally of the National -- pardon me, of the Territorial Historical Sites and Monuments Board?

Mr. Gillespie: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Just on passing on that subject, how will the Historic Sites Officer work in relation to the Historic Sites Board?

Mr. Gillespie: He will be working in relation to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in various capacities. One is to provide secretariat services to the Board; one is to do research for consideration by the Board with regard to the establishment of historic themes and various other things. He will also work to follow up on their recommendations as they occur, to see what can be done within the funds that we have or however else their requests might be accomplished. So he will be working extremely close, he or she will be working extremely closely with the Historic Sites and Monuments Board.

Mr. Chairman: Twenty-seven oh nine, Museum Construction Contributions, \$30,000.00. Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witness could tell us where the funds are actually going? "To provide funds for recognized groups to aid in the construction of new museums", where would that be, and "the expansion of existing museum building", where they are, and "for the acquisition of historical artifacts". Those three questions.

Mr. Gillespie: The answers to those three questions will come as a result of consultation with the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, that consultation which has not yet been held.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if the witness could tell us possibly where the \$30,000.00 were allocated from last year's budget?

Mr. Gillespie: The funds last year, again \$30,000.00, I believe, were totally expended to purchase artifacts. There was a collection of artifacts purchased through those funds in the last year.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think my question was pretty well answered; however, I would say, then, this \$30,000.00 actually, even here, we see here, could actually be spent all in one place, or possibly two places, not all, to do all these things, providing the board recommendations from the board, eh?

Mr. Gillespie: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. This last year was an unusual year. I'm sorry, I was slightly wrong in saying that the total \$30,000.00 was spent on the

purchase of artifacts. \$25,000.00 was a territorial contribution toward the purchase of those artifacts.

There is no, we have no preconceived notions about the distribution of those funds between the purchase of museum artifacts and the construction of new museum facilities. It will depend upon the applications that we have and the advice of the Board.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, could the witness tell us when the Board last met and what happened to the other \$5,000.00; I know there's an application pending from Old Crow which should have been considered in the last budget.

Mr. Gillespie: The application from Old Crow is still pending and will be considered at a meeting which is scheduled for this spring, the precise is something I don't know, but it is scheduled for this spring. There was a fall meeting, I would guess in November or thereabouts.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the witness could possibly give us the recommendation the Board made at this fall meeting?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, those were distributed during the last Session of Council, along with whatever follow-up action was taken with regard to all the recommendations. But I can obtain that again and distribute it to Honourable Members, if they so wish.

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: Twenty-seven twenty, Game Equipment, \$27,200.00.

Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I notice a sharp increase from \$4,000.00 to \$27,200.00. Could we just have a rough outline of what type of game equipment we're talking about and the reason for the sharp increase in this equipment?

Mr. Gillespie: A good deal of this, Mr. Chairman, is the result of our hiring some biological staff during the last year. Of course, because they are only hired after the summer, they did not require equipment during this current fiscal year. However, they will require equipment for this coming year and a good part of this is to provide them with that equipment for habitat research, big game research, Dempster Highway research, furbearer research, some material for the hunter safety training program, a small amount for enforcement work and various other items - oh, the Old Crow Flats Project - those are the main items. It's spread fairly evenly among all of those research areas.

Mr. Chairman: I would hope, Mr. Gillespie, that most of your staff is biological.

Mr. Gillespie: I'm going to have to find a better word for that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Clear? Twenty-seven forty, Record Storage, Archives, \$25,000.00. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I'm sorry, I said "no" when you said "clear" and you didn't hear me. I have one other question on the 2720.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on, Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: I would just like to know what would be the most significant piece of equipment that you would be buying, the most expensive, what item?

Mr. Gillespie: It's indicated here as one eighteen-foot travel trailer for \$5,400.00, having to do with big game research on the Dempster Highway.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I was wondering, I would like to ask with respect to the Dempster and the study, and I know it's got to be the Caribou research program, is it the intention or have we got a schedule to complete that study to coincide with the opening of that particular highway? Or are we going to be facing the situation where we are going to have pressure groups saying to us that the study on the caribou herd has not been completed and they're not in favour of opening the highway until that is done? Can we accelerate the study? Can we provide the required manpower to get it done to coincide with the completion of the highway?

Mr. Gillespie: That would certainly be our intention, Mr. Chairman. It will depend upon the availability of funds next year particularly. We have allocated a significant amount for this year, depending upon the availability of resources for next year, we would hope to make that a very high priority item and in that way meet the deadline to coincide with the planned opening date of the highway.

Mr. Lengerke: It occurs to me that probably some place through this Session, we might have to give some direction, as an Assembly, to that particular matter.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, just to be clear here, if it's advice or otherwise an expression of support for this project, we would appreciate it. But giving direction on a money matter of this sort, I just want to draw that distinction.

Mr. Chairman: Twenty-seven forty.
Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand that in Archives, we must be putting away a lot of material but its -- you know, what type of additional storage space are we talking about and what are we looking at in the future from a long range point of view? Are we keeping just about every document that comes through government, what are we keeping and what type of

space may be required in the future? How far do we go with the retention of Archives and just what are we talking about here?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gillespie?

Mr. Gillespie: Ten thousand of the 25,000, Mr. Chairman, is designed to answer precisely the questions that the Honourable Member has asked. There is, increasingly, a space problem within the Archives vault in particular. But in records storage generally and \$10,000.00 has been allocated here to undertake a study to answer, as I say, precisely those questions before we make any other plans for a very sophisticated humidity and temperature controlled storage or whether cheap storage can be used and so on. The \$10,000.00 will be used to give us the answers to those questions.

\$15,000.00 is allocated to providing moveable track shelving in the vault that we currently have. This will, I believe, more than double the available space within that vault. It's something that I'm looking forward to seeing in operation. Apparently there need then only be one alley way in the whole vault and it's a matter of pressing an electric button and picking the alley way and then everything moves and opens up a new alley way so everything can be jammed together with only one opening throughout the whole vault whereas now, there has to be an alley way between each row of shelving. So that will more than double the available space or the useful space in the vault.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand now, are we renting space for this or is this something the territorial government has of their own?

Mr. Gillespie: No, we're not renting space, Mr. Chairman. This vault is in the Archives building itself.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'm just curious, why is this study under project capital? So far, all the studies that we've been spending money on are in O & M.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Chairman, studies that relate to a planned or possible capital project are part of what might be called the pre-engineering costs of that project and are included under capital normally.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Further on that study, are we going to hire someone by contract or is our staff not capable of doing this?

Mr. Gillespie: I imagine, Mr. Chairman, that we will be hiring somebody under contract to do that who has expertise in this particular area. I don't think we have anybody now that has sufficiently, a sufficiently broad range of expertise to be able to advise us on capital, the options that are available to us, the costs, the benefits, the efficiency and so on.

Mr. Chairman: Clear?

2741. Library Equipment. \$8,000.00.

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: We will proceed with Vote Number 6, after a brief recess.

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: I now call this Committee to order. Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I have some answers to questions that the Honourable Member from Kluane asked on March 15th. The reason they weren't before us before this time was that the taxroll, the current taxroll was just printed yesterday and I wanted to make sure that they were this year's figures and up-to-date. There are minor variances with some of the figures that were in my budget address, because those were estimated figures, whereas these are actual for the current tax year.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 600, Administration, \$136,500.00.

Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Just a couple of small questions from the budget address.

First of all, concerning the container sewage collection system in Old Crow to accommodate all residents' needs. The number of people in Old Crow who have already containers for a sewage system are very few and I'm wondering if we are planning on putting sewer collection systems throughout the village or, is it simply all residents who have this system already?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, container sewage treatment is the euphemism these days for a honey bucket.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: That won't work. Since last year we spent considerable money on a truck with a pumping system and I can't imagine it working for a honey bucket. I think you'd have to have the whole system to work properly. I think it's kind of misleading to think that -- to lead the people in Old Crow to believe that there's going to be any improvement in the situation that's there now.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. --

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, it worked for generations in Canada and in places throughout the Yukon, prior to the installation of the more sophisticated types of sewage disposal systems. There is no, what's the word I'm looking for, there's no connection between the education service, as it is now, which is an education service for those people having septic tanks to be pumped out and then that effluent put into the lagoon with a honey bucket system, which means the collection of containers on a contract basis, by the container basis from home to home.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, the system is not going to be improved as the original sentence says.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I am led to believe, at this time, that there isn't a reliable honey bucket system of sewage disposal in Old Crow and that is the type of system that we would like to set up. Where there is a contract given on a regular basis to empty the containers of sewage and dispose of them in the lagoon.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Thank you. Now I am clear on what is going to happen. The second question I have is in the next paragraph of the Budget address, about statistics and again I think it is misleading. The statistics I have from 1971 have the population count of unorganized communities at 4,429, not what - 1,810. The paragraph runs on to state that in that case, then the taxes received are 34 per person and the expenditures are \$100 per capita, which is quite misleading when you look at the statistics that I have. I am just wondering where the count of 1,810 is from?

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard, is referring to Page 4, Paragraph 3.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, in all instances where there was a breakdown of population estimates from the 1976 census statistics, we used that figure. In the unorganized areas, I don't know whether the 1976 statistics are broken down to the point where we could use them as a total for unorganized areas and it is a question that I will have to have answered, but in all instances in -- you will see the information that I gave out today in the Local Improvement Districts, those are the estimates of the 1976 census, rather than going on the '71 census figures.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Well then again, I am confused in that reply because, it says, in using the 1971 population count of 1,810 which is the most current, and the one that I copied from the 1974 Yukon statistical analysis states unorganized communities at 4,429. It is maybe a moot point, but I think it is misleading to make people in unorganized and native communities feel that they are receiving three times the benefit than they pay out, which is what this paragraph states.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the figures are done on a conservative basis on the unorganized and native communities, that there are a lot of other services that could be added in which are partly funded and paid by YTG. So if we want to get on this statistical battle which I don't want to in perpetuity, you know, we could go on and on. All we are trying to do is point out that there are services provided in unorganized communities and native communities that are paid by the total taxpayers of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, are we asking questions on the paper now or do you want to stick to the various votes and establishments?

Mr. Chairman: I prefer to stick to the establishments, although it might be difficult if referring back and forth to the paper. We will try. Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: You are now on Administration then?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Watson: What positions are in the Administration end of it? You have divided your Department into programs and maybe if you could just tell us what positions would be considered Administration?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: In Administration Mr. Chairman, the three man years are the director, his clerk typist and the administrative officer.

Mr. Chairman: Establishment 601, Community Planning and Land Disposal, \$230,200.00 and I refer you to Appendix on page 17. Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could have the positions again for the seven man years there identified.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the seven positions contemplated in the Community Planning and Land Disposal branch for this year are one planner; one lands administrator, one clerk-4, two clerk-typists-2, one drafting technician and one lands inspector for the seven positions.

Up to this point in time we have not been successful in filling the land planner position. The lands inspector was only filled after well over a year of advertising during the last fall position. We've transferred one clerk typist position which was indicated in last year's estimates to the assessment services, so that we hope to have the capability of hiring an additional assessor in this year's budget.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under Community Planning and Land Disposal, I understand we're only talking about the development of communities as such, but while I appreciate the problems that my colleague the Minister of Local Government has had in terms of community planning and making available land in Watson Lake, it is extremely important that certain lands, in particular industrial lands be made available at the earliest possible moment. I've discussed this to some length with the Minister and we've unfortunately, because of a series of circumstances and events, been unable to come up with an acceptable solution.

But I'm wondering, why it would not be possible, Mr. Chairman, for the Department of Local Government to make available, industrial land upon survey, and that is not to say the final legal survey but by survey from the Department which I'm sure would be reasonably accurate and an agreement for sale based on some terms be issued so that these lands can be occupied under some

arrangement pending and, I say pending, the final legal survey which may or may not come within the next five or six years.

The problem is we've been trying to get some of this industrial land, the size of which is suitable for the industry involved, for some two or three years and we're really no further ahead than what we were when we started.

I'm wondering if this may not be the answer and if the Minister might comment on this question, and that again is that we survey through the government of the Yukon Territory, survey the land, lay out the subdivision or lay out whatever it might be in industrial subdivisions and grant an agreement for sale pending the final survey.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is the policy of the government in Land Development, to go to a total development plan, whether it be a residential, an industrial or a small holdings subdivision.

We find ourselves in just more headaches and more problems than we ever thought that we could get into, if we don't take an overall view of planning of any area that we move onto for development.

We found that we've had extremely good co-operation with the planners that we have been using and trying to get as efficient and as fast a survey and a plan done. We've been working with local firms like Stanley and Associates who have offices here, Underhill and Underhill, Epec, who all have offices here, and we try to divide the work of the smaller contracts on an even basis because they have all given satisfactory service to the Department of Local Government on major development projects which would be the development of a new subdivision the size of Riverdale, in the Hillcrest area. We put that out to tender and proposal so that everybody has a chance at bidding on a major proposal like that.

And it's so easy to say, you know, that all you have to do is go out and lay a few lines on a piece of paper and then sell and give agreements for sale and everything is satisfied.

Mr. Chairman, it's just been the experience of the Department of Local Government, when we attempt to do that type of development, that we just run into more problems than we ever thought possible to get into. And it takes us and the taxpayers of the Yukon years and money to get out of the mess that we've got ourselves into.

Because of that type of philosophy, Mr. Chairman, it's almost impossible to say that an integrated developed plan of development can come about to the actual sale of lots in less than a two year period. The first year, you do the planning, you let out the contracts and get to work on it, that hopefully you'll be able to sell somewhere in the next building season.

In the area of Watson Lake, we've run into great difficulties, the majority of them not being of our making. Where industrial land was originally asked for, we ran into the problem of people who had put in mineral claims within the LID boundaries, which is not prohibited under the Yukon Quartz Mining Act.

The LID and the planners, then, in a town plan, said that that wasn't the place for an industrial subdivision, it should be in another place and that should be a small

residential holding. So we're starting from scratch this year for an industrial subdivision for Watson Lake.

We hope that everything goes right and I'm not going to make promises because I've got burnt on them before, badly, that if everything goes according to plan, that hopefully, we will have lots in that industrial subdivision for sale sometime this year, during the late summer or fall. But to indicate that we can do anything quicker than that and faster than that, because of the circumstances, which were completely out of our hands and out of our control, would just be making false promises and I don't intend to do that, as the Minister of Local Government, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, just Mr. Chairman, talking on subdivisions and dry industrial subdivisions or industrial subdivisions, maybe the Minister could tell me what would be the projected price or is it going to be a lease arrangement with respect to the dry industrial subdivision at Porter Creek?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could wait until we get into the Land Development part of the Budget, because I do have the breakdown of what we expect to do in Land Development throughout the Yukon, at that time. I can shear through all my papers now and come up with it for the Honourable Member.

Mr. Lengerke: Where do we..?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: In Capital, that's our capital development project.

Mr. Lengerke: That's my question that I was going to ask him, Mr. Chairman. With respect to Primary 20, the \$74,000.00, and I see you've got \$70,000.00 earmarked for regional studies and community plans and I'm wondering if the Minister could inform me what community plans you're going to be embarking upon? Are these these community type plans that we've seen bound up and sitting on the shelves or have you got a new system in mind?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, most of those that you see bound up aren't on shelves. All of them are active, zoning portions of them are active, area development regulations which were considered by the planners in the different areas have been enacted and are either being studied or are in actual force in the communities and the plans that were studied. These aren't documents that are allowed to sit on the shelves and nothing ever comes about by them. I think all the LID's and the different unorganized areas, even, have copies of the plans and follow them and Local Government certainly does to a great degree.

I don't think that we're going to get away without doing the Carcross Regional Study this year, with the completion of the Carcross-Skagway Road, we're going to look at what the development should be taking place along the Carcross-Skagway Road. We've put this off for several years because we didn't want to expend the money unless it was absolutely necessary and we knew

that the road was going to be completed. I don't think we have any choice this year.

We did have some money in, at estimate time, for the Minto area and the Carmacks-Faro area, an integrated plan of that area, taking into consideration what would happen with the establishment of a mine in Minto with the knowledge now that that mine will not be going ahead this year. That one, of course, will not be proceeded with unless there is every indication that it is going ahead.

We have had the request of a plan for the area of Tagish, by the Tagish Community Association. We feel that that is a valid study for us to undertake at this time because there's some very obvious different concepts of land use in the Tagish area, which is coming to an absolute fore at this point in time. We would like to be able to do a land use study and get public input, because there is conflicting land use opinions in the Mayo Road-Takhini Road area and we'd like to have professionals go in, talk with the Boundary Citizens Association, talk with the various people and come up with a plan that can be debated publicly and can have all the public input that is necessary to it to come to some resolution of the very real problems that are facing the development of the Mayo Road and the Takhini area.

And then we have some \$4,000.00 for miscellaneous surveys, which always seem to crop up as we go along the year. With a volatile economy like the Yukon, we never know what's going to happen in the course of any year so that's just some money in there to protect ourselves for something we don't know about at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: I am very, very pleased to hear the Carcross Regional Study will be undertaken. Just a supplementary to that, have you split up the \$70,000.00 in any way or is the Carcross Regional Study going to take the major portion of that? Can you give me an idea? I don't want you to give me the exact figures but in the neighborhood area.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It is estimated, Mr. Chairman, at this time the Carcross Regional Study will be in the area of \$30,000.00. The Mayo Road-Takhini Study will be in the area of \$20,000.00, the Tagish in the area of \$5,000.00 and the miscellaneous surveys in the \$4,000.00 area and the Carmacks-Faro-Minto Study was estimated at \$15,000.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the Government is moving on the Mayo-Takhini Hot Springs Region and I would assume that would be taking in the North Alaska Highway area—the area surrounding Whitehorse. I am very happy that they are going to be moving and doing some planning in trying to determine what the future of this area should be.

I do have one concern though on these studies, and it is one area of my constituency, that I feel quite strongly has been neglected and really, it's a very important small community and that's the one at the north border of Beaver Creek. I am very concerned because with the Alaska Highway paving, which apparently is going to be

proceeding, and I understand that will likely be one of the areas where they begin, that there hasn't been that much planning done or especially for any future expansion of the community. I think that we would be—if we don't do something fairly soon that we could find ourselves in a very difficult position, in that community.

I know that the Government—the Territorial Government and I, myself, have worked very hard to try to get the customs out of the middle of the community and it has been a drag out battle. I certainly haven't given up and I've had full support of the Territorial Government on this. I am wondering if the Minister has any comments on what they see for Beaver Creek?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, if the establishment is passed as it is, we will actually have nineteen thousand dollar in the budget that is unallocated because we won't be going ahead with the Minto Study unless we know that the principals have changed their minds and the mine is going ahead.

I like that kind of flexibility because I think that, as the Honourable Member has mentioned, with the paving of the Alaska Highway, that Beaver Creek could become, overnight, a growth area. I would like to see us have the ability to move into areas such as that where we don't have specified amounts of money presently in the Budget for plans of that sort. I will bring the concerns of the Member from Kluane on the Beaver Creek area, which I share, to the attention of Local Government. Perhaps we should be looking at that as an item of this years Budget.

Mrs. Watson: I don't know whether this is the time to ask the question, it is on Land Disposal and it's the -- it's regarding the new regulations that the Government brought into force very recently regarding the Agricultural Leases where a person could get a certain portion of Agricultural Lease for a residence.

Is it my understanding, are these just Territorial Agricultural Leases?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we kept in correspondence through all the time we were going through the exercise of coming to the decision of whether or not we were prepared to move in this area, which the Honourable Member of Kluane and some of her constituents have brought to the attention of the Government, we had hoped that we would be able to move in concert with the Federal Government; that they would allow the same type of flexibility on their leases. They are not prepared to move at this time and we thought that it was important enough that maybe we could show some leadership and lead the way in this area.

The only thing is that it doesn't apply to nearly as many people who have this problem as we had hoped it would, if the Federal Government had seen fit to move in the same direction as the YTG.

That is the only land over which we have control and that is the area in which we moved, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, has the Federal Government closed the door completely on it?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, they haven't completely closed the door on it.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I would hope, in your negotiations, when you are suggesting any portion of a lease that would be reverting back to the Crown, the Crown would be the Territorial Government.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are not much inclined, after the fight we put up for the few square miles we have, to give any back to the Federal Government except for some pretty heavy reasons.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I must rise at this time. The community planning, I am not in disagreement with the Honourable Member of Local Government. In fact, I realize that he has really got some problems and that he does get more problems as things go along; however, I would like to ask a few direct questions, on the community planning but first I will comment on the problems that we have ourselves, too, and that my constituents have.

I just heard him say it'll take three years to actually plan, after you start planning to come up with maybe not, residential—two years, OK. Now, I've been in this House for two years, over two years and I was out of this House, hollering for many years before that, that we couldn't seem to get property to build a home on.

Now, today, it's two years since I've been here and I think I've spoken many times on the subject and is becoming now urgent that we do something in the Teslin area and I'm speaking of the Teslin townsite.

There are people there now, I had one of them come to me the other night, a person who was born and raised in the Yukon, married in the Yukon, have children now ready to go to high school, and the fact of the matter is, they've been working for the Government up to this time but are not working for them now, I would consider them very much a Canadian resident and Canadians and those people today cannot buy a lot to put a home on. It's over their head, and I think it's absolutely disgraceful. There is absolutely no need for that.

If we have to say, "Go and build your home in the bush, we'll catch you later." It may be a problem, Mr. Chairman, and a big problem to the Government someday, but the fact is that we must do it now. If we had worked on it before, this situation wouldn't be there now. It's time we did something. That's only one family. There was two or three moved away last fall which we may never see again, which would have been residents in that little town.

There's another one at this very moment who is looking for a place to put a trailer, and the trailer is now parked in the Indian Village because, as I said I think once already in this House, the native people see the need but it don't seem like the Government sees it here.

So, once again, I must say that Community Planning

is fine, but if we don't have the community planner yet, which is more or less out at Tagish too, then if we're going to be another two years, Mr. Chairman, before we do get lots or anything in that area, then I think we're just going to go backwards two years, not forward.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, both the Teslin and Dawson City, and probably the Carcross area are the most dramatic examples in the Yukon of what happens when land is not developed on a planned basis and when land is not developed on an Agreement for Sale basis, but rather given over to private enterprise to be able to do with it whatever they want. If holding it for fifty years is what they want to do with it, then they can do it.

I've been called everything from "Ken the Red" to every name in the book for my stand on behalf of the people of the Yukon in this area. Why land is not available in Dawson is because it is all in the hands of private ownership within Dawson. Why land is not available in the Teslin area is because it is in the hands of private people throughout Teslin.

Now, we look at Government to develop the satellite community probably, I think one-half a mile is the closest area in the area of Teslin where one could be developed but we're putting in a sewer system at the cost of, I don't know how many hundred of thousands of dollars, which could be efficient if those private lands in the Teslin area could be sold for people to develop instead of being held on to for speculative purposes by private ownership in the Teslin area.

It seems to me that Government is a heck of a lot better using the Land Development Fund which was passed at this House last year in trying to shake loose some of that private land in the Teslin area to make an efficient and an economical town plan where people can afford the services.

The same holds true in Dawson. Of course the City of Dawson, tried the use of the minimum tax rate and raising it up to \$125.00 or \$135.00 to try and get some of this land back into the public domain where they could use it for residential and commercial purposes.

In areas where the YTG has land, where it has ownership, where it is adjacent to serviced property, this problem does not exist and serviced land is available at the best price in Canada to people to develop homes or businesses.

Now it's a very distinct problem in these areas and should we go out and develop completely new satellite townsites away from a community which has nowhere reached it's efficient potential because land is held in the hands of private entrepreneurs. Mr. Chairman, the people of Teslin couldn't afford the price they would have to pay for services in a satellite subdivision if the Government of the Yukon went about developing it at this point in time.

We have looked at the area in Teslin, we have said that there is a very great need because of the demands of Teslin for some small holdings area, the same as in some other areas where this demand has been made known to the Government by the people. We are doing a planning of a small holding area in the Teslin area for this year which hopefully will be sale either by late summer, or fall of this year or by early spring of next year.

I cannot give the okay for this Government to go out

and on the only land which I know is available in Teslin, to go out and develop a completely new subdivision when the Honourable Member, and I know the amount of land available in the Teslin LID proper, that is there for development if we could just get our hands on it.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, it's just a terrible expenditure at the expense of the taxpayers of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

It's been ten to fifteen years ago, I think, and this is why I'm worried about the next study and the next planning is going to go on and how long it will take. There was \$5,000.00, and I think I'm quite right saying there's \$5,000.00, spent on a study and some surveying that was done in the Teslin area where now is the L.I.D. grounds and that study was turned down by the people in the Teslin area for one very good reason, that the lots weren't big enough to put a tent on, to start with. And they were told before they ever surveyed that that would be the case if they did it that way.

There was another plan brought to us, not anymore than a year, a year and a half ago, which I think, if it had been completed, would have cost probably \$40,000.00 of a new subdivision. And the plan was all drawn out and it was the most beautiful picture you ever saw. And what we pay these fellows for I have no idea, because you had went along with the plan and if the members here would like to see it, I will bring a picture of it in to this House and let them look at it, because no way could anybody in his right mind accept that plan.

In the wintertime, you wouldn't have been able to get out of the middle of it if you were in there with a fire truck or anything. You wouldn't have been able to get in there with one.

And the people who are trying to jam people in on top of each other and make them live, with locked arms, I just can't understand. You have to have room to move around. That was turned down.

Another reason why I guess we haven't gotten anything because we won't accept something that is not liveable in.

Now, you speak of a land in the Teslin area, in the old subdivision you are—the old, there's a subdivision, there is the old area and there's a new area. In the old area and the new subdivision, which was new about fifteen years ago or something, there is not that much land available right now and I could tell you why there's not that much land available, because we have bought that land from the speculator, because there was no other way.

I bought two lots myself to try and build another home on. And friends of mine have bought two lots down in the other area. There is somebody trying to buy two lots now from the speculators and, rightly so, that's private enterprise, let them hop right to it.

However, there isn't anymore than possibly ten or eleven lots that are owned, because there is only about twenty-two people that own anything there. There is a very small area left there to build in now. It wouldn't complement anymore than maybe three or four homes in the middle of town and I'm sure that it will be taken up by business and everything some day.

Now if we have to wait and wait and wait and wait, I

just—I can't understand, as I said before, how people that are born and raised here in this country, can't build themselves a home. It's unbelievable. You have to have a place to live. And you have to have—if you're going to live, you have to have a place to put your shack or whatever it is, to live on it. And there is no way, I think, that anybody should be forced to go and rent from somebody else or buy from somebody else or anything else. When we live in Canada and this is our home, we should be able at least to get enough to put our house on and doesn't have to be fifty by fifty, either. And I don't think it has to take two or three years to get it.

However, I won't belabour this subject anymore, because I think that there's no use. You know what I feel about it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, you know, I can't accept all the criticism of the Honourable Member from Teslin, because we do have a budget for this year for the development of acreage subdivision in the Teslin area. This is from one to five acres of unserviced, small acreage holdings.

I think the Honourable Member knows full well, from his statements that he's made and from listening to his constituents and I've listened to them, that that's what they want. They don't want to be joined together in a fifty by a hundred foot lot. And it was the result of the representations of the member from Teslin and his constituents that put in another major land policy of this government, that a person was allowed to buy the lot contiguous to where he had put his residence, if that lot was vacant. And people in the Teslin area took advantage of that ability, which was a change in policy of this government since I've been in charge of the Department of Local Government.

So, you know, you can raise a lot of criticisms and certainly you can in every department of government, but there are movements being made in all of the areas that the Honourable Member now brings criticism to this department on, that have been made and continue to be made and are going to continue to be made on behalf of his constituents. And I think that, moving in the direction that we have, is an advantage and a benefit over what was before.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, I thank the Honourable Member for that answer, because that's just exactly what I've been waiting for. You have said you are now going to actually do something and hopeful, it's not going to take so terribly long. Thank you once again, that's the answer I wanted all the time.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Local Government made a very good point when he referred to the fact that there was a great deal of land in these small communities that was owned by private people and he implied that these people were not prepared to sell the land.

I agree with him, there is a great deal of land available within the communities owned by private people and

I think that in many instances, the land is available for sale. But I think we've got ourselves into another situation which is a very real situation and we're going to have to look at it, and that is our plans for the communities and some of the zoning we have.

What we have done with the type of zoning and with the looking at a long term plan for a community, we are leaving areas of land which is serviced, developed land, which is not being able to be utilized because it's zoned for a specific purpose. I know the plan that we have, and I know that the local government were not very happy with the plan that was done, leaves us in that specific position today where we've got perfectly good serviced land where people would be quite prepared to sell it at the price, or possibly even less, that the government would have to charge for developed land, a new subdivision now. They can't sell it, because they wouldn't be conforming with the zoning regulations. I think that we're going to find this is a bigger problem all the time and that we are going to have to maybe look at our development plans and our zoning in some of these communities so that unless there is a need in the immediate future, knowing that there's going to be an extreme expansion in the community.

When I think of the community that I live in, it hasn't expanded until just the last few years, it didn't expand, in fact it got smaller. None of them, other than Watson Lake maybe, are growing to any extent and this is the bind we're in now. There's perfectly good serviced land there but it can't be used for what the people want to use it for because it's in the wrong zone.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I can only add that the development plan should not be static plans that you accept and you don't change for a twenty year period. They should be active. They are just a general plan to go by and there should be input from community, the same as there is in the municipalities, to reflect the attitudes of the community and sound, efficient use of the land and the efficiency of services.

So, you know, where, the municipalities have plans which have been given to them, they're active plans and they are changed according as circumstances change in the community. That's the way I'd like to see the plan which are now in effect throughout any of the communities of the Yukon Territory. I don't consider them to be static and the be-all and the end-all type of thing, because circumstances just change too fast in the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to.... The Honourable Minister is stating that most of the land is privately owned and states that the Territorial Government should get involved in it. The reason the land is not available in Dawson, he stated partially correctly but, on the other hand, I think stands a correction. A lot of the land is unavailable and useless because the Territorial Government, since it took over the water and sewage services in 1966, failed to provide services to those lots and the people have no way of getting services there because the engineering firm, one fellow, engineering, conducted a study and decided, well, this is

the land we are going to service and this is going to be it.

There's lots of land all over the town which is beyond services. There's no services there. Not up 'til now, with the Stanley Associates study coming out, are they talking about again to provide services in some of those areas, but in some areas in Dawson the services were actually taken out by the Territorial Government, or NCPC, so people would no longer move there.

So, you cannot blame the private owners of the lots all the time. My biggest complaint is in the Dawson area when I said it before, and I say it again, Dawson is the only community in the Territory that has no land set aside for people to move out and recreation lots and so—

Somebody in the Department of Local Government sent a letter to a person up in Dawson saying why don't they move to Whitehorse, there's lots of land available here.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I would like to see that letter. I've heard that twice, Mr. Chairman, I have heard that twice now that a person in the Department of Local Government and you know, my officers know better than that, and they know they'll have to deal with me if they send letters of that type and I don't like accusations being made in the House when people don't deliver.

I've heard that twice now and I was nice about it the first time and I really want the Honourable Members, if they are going to say those kind of things, to bring these with the proof of it. They know very well that if they do that, not in the public forum but in the proper forum, that it will be dealt with, and I just don't accept these type of allegations and rumors in the House.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I will make an attempt to bring that letter to the Minister's attention.

Mr. Chairman: Are we clear? Six oh two, Protective Services, \$326,100.00, Appendix, Page 117. Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a question — I don't know who I can direct that question to — I don't know who to direct that question to. The Government of course, the Fire Inspectors. Has there been any thought no, I'd better explain first. This year, there has been some problem getting insurance of course due to the fact many establishments have fire protection that has been put in by companies — they were forceably put in or you could not buy insurance in restaurants and so forth, which consists of a bottle hooked over your stove and a few things like this.

These have to be checked; I think it is every six months, they are going to demand now, which has been the first demand was actually this spring. That inspection of services of course out in the outlying districts is very expensive. I thought it would be more expensive than it actually is. I think my last bill to have mine inspected was -- my insurance was turned down anyway around \$60.00 or something like that they charged us. However, that is only in Teslin and I think I got a very good deal from the people who did check it and pass it.

I am wondering if the government has thought of having their fire inspectors, on their tours, possibly stop in when they stop in to check things and, say, if the time is

up for them to have that equipment inspected, which is actually just to look at it and see if it is still there and see if the bottle is full and the gauge is up, look at the nozzles and say are they falling off or aren't they, that's all it amounts to. Have they ever thought of having this done by the fire inspectors of the Yukon Territorial Government?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, that is a tough one to answer and I can certainly look into it. Because as far as I understand, the people who manufacture and sell that equipment look to part of their livelihood as making the inspection tours under law also. If it is not a private entrepreneur basis of a livelihood and they would rather the fire inspectors, during their course of going throughout the Territory, look at them, it is just a problem to the people who sell to service that equipment, then I would have no problem at all in saying that the fire inspectors could do it or can look at the -- if they are capable of making such inspections when they are going around the Territory. But if it is part of the livelihood of the person who sells the equipment, then I would have to look at it from that respect also.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that answer. I think that the Minister will find that it is not actually the livelihood -- my equipment for myself was put in three years ago and they didn't bother to tell me even that it was supposed to be inspected until such time as the insurance company said, "Look, you must now produce a form that says that it has been inspected."

I think you will find it is really not a livelihood at all. It is just a matter for the insurance companies, forcing them, and so they came out when we asked them to. That is all.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I would like the suggestion. If we can possibly do it, we will do it.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I find it rather interesting that we have six building inspectors and five fire inspectors. I think it is rather an uneven balance; however, my question: you are planning on another man year for building inspectors, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, we had a junior fire inspector trainee for the last two years in the Department of Local Government. It has been funded by the Federal Works Program. He is a native of the Haines Junction area. I received, as one of the first lobbies when I became Minister of Local Government, from both the Pelly Band and the Burwash Band some method and some system of providing a fire fighting unit, volunteer fire fighting unit, and some system of inspection in the houses.

It had been pointed out to me I think in the last five deaths in the Yukon from fire, four of them have been in the Villages of the Yukon, and from that we got involved in a program of training a local native person so that he would be capable of doing the inspections, setting up fire fighting programs, setting up volunteer fire fighting programs in those areas. It is not my intention to make

work projects, to break people in, to make it look good on paper and then say, well, you have done your two years of training, you are finished.

Our trainee is actively involved at the present time in setting up volunteer fire fighting crews in both the Burwash and the Pelly Band. Fire halls have been built in both of those areas, a pumper is directly on the way to both of those areas, and the training program is in effect.

This year the two-year training program stops and he becomes part of the staff of the Department of Local Government. That is the additional man year in the Protective Inspections Branch for this fiscal year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I had thought, in reading your submission yesterday, that you were getting another building inspector but that's fine, I'll ask the question.

Now that you've gone into area development regulations in various LID's, and they have an inspector who goes under the title of Development Officer, would that be a building inspector?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I asked that question and was given an affirmative answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, another thing that really concerns me with the regulations, and that is the fact that you not only have to get a building permit but you have to get a development permit.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, what regulations are we talking about, please? There's a lot of regulations in the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: There sure is.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, under the Area Development Regulations, the general ones which were brought into force in all of the LID's, all refer to a development officer and a development permit, where you not only have to get a building permit but you have to get a development permit. And I would like to know why. You have to pay a fee for both and you have to fill in forms and go through the routine for both permits. And yet the development permit is giving you the authority to go ahead and build your house.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the building permit and the development permit will be given at the same time. The building permit is the actual building of the house to make sure it complies to the minimum NHA standards and that type of regulation.

The development permit is to make sure that it fits with the zoning of the area in which it is being built. If it is a single family residential zoned area, then it isn't for a duplex type of building, as I understand it, that if a person fulfills all the requirements under the Building

Ordinance, that a building inspector should not refuse that person the building permit; that that is his job, to make sure all the NHA regulations and the whole thing are lived up to. It's not his job to say, "That is zoned as single family residential, you should not be building a duplex in that area". That is the zoning priority that a Development Officer should give the permission to do.

I understand it, though, that the Development Officer and the Building Inspector can change hats like this, put one on and take the other off, so that there isn't the problem of having to deal through two sets of papers, two different people, and the whole bit, in the smaller areas. That's the explanation I have at this point in time, at any rate.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I rather suspected that they both wore the same hat, but it's becoming quite a cumbersome type of procedure.

The development -- you have to make an application to the Development Officer, who sends it to the LID for their recommendation and then he makes the recommendation, then it goes back to the client or the applicant. And at that time, you know, you're having several levels and it is disturbing and it's bothering people who, in the past, have just gone ahead and built.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very sudden, sophisticated type of procedure we have to go through. I think it would make it a lot easier if we didn't have to have a development permit and they were prepared to go -- went along with the building permit. It just seems -- it just gets a reaction from people and I just don't think that it's necessary.

Mr. Chairman: Wouldn't it be nice, Mrs. Watson, if we could just go ahead and build a parks building without any planning?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The problem is, the protection of the people who buy land in an area which is zoned as a single family residential and all of a sudden a guy's got a building permit and is proceeding to put up a duplex, or a triplex, or a quadruplex, or a small apartment, or whatever, and the people feel affected; they say, look it, I paid a good faith for a single family residential lot and I've got a fourplex going next to me. What are you doing about it? And then we say, well, we have to, as a building inspector, just issue a building permit of all the rules and regulations as far as buildings are concerned.

It doesn't take into consideration the zoning of the district, so those people feel cheated and come to the Department of Local Government and say, boy, you guys just don't live up to anything that's going on. You got a zone here which says single family residential, look what the guy is doing next to me and what are you going to do about it?

And what are we going to do about it without some system whereby a person says, "That is single family residential, I'm sorry, even though your building conforms to the building standards I cannot give you a permit to build because it is an unauthorized use of building a commercial or a duplex or a quadruplex in a single family residential area."

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing with the zoning. If you have your zoning and you don't like it, you apply to have it changed. You know, this is fine, I'm not arguing with the zoning. But the point I am trying to make, and I don't think the Honourable Member has read all of the regulations which apply, some of them are necessary because of fire protection, but on the other hand, when you're told how big your front yard can be, how big your back yard can be, where your garage can be, that gets a little touchy for people who have been used to going and just building. And this is where I think that maybe we went too far, too fast. If we're stuck with the zoning and make people adhere to the zoning, rather than go for a development where -- even control what you do on your own yard, and that's what we've done, in those regulations. And, you know, people are told that they can't put their garage facing on the street, it must be so many feet back from the street. Well, anybody knows that you like your garage near the street because you have to shovel the snow out in the Yukon. And it's this type of thing that is getting people's backs up.

However, I think that the Honourable Member knows full well that we're doing some very positive things about it and making recommendations about things that can apply, but I was concerned about the Development Officer, it is the Building Inspector.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if the Honourable Minister could possibly tell us if there are any changes in the making of the National Building Code or the building code in the Yukon on its own?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there's a few things that I agree totally with the Honourable Member from Kluane, that I have not done and I don't intend to do, and I hope I never reach the point where I've read all the regulations of the government of the Yukon Territory. Also I'm not talented with my pinkies and I'm not really up on the National Building Code. I admit that I haven't read all the fine print in the National Building Code and I do not know at this moment whether there are major changes in federal legislation, which applies to the Yukon, which are in the offing.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we're in this section on protection services and I did deviate a little bit, I guess.

Mr. Chairman, the question for the Minister, are the salaries, or the per diem, or whatever you pay to the volunteer firemen, are they included in Protective Services or are they included under the community and the L.I.D.'s and --?

Mr. Chairman: Maybe Mr. Williams could help us out.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, the salaries to the volunteer firefighters are in Establishment 605.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, actually 602, under the Fire Inspectors, is really the administrative arm of the Protective Services for the fire protection.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, other than the administration of the Protective Services, the only other unrelated cost in the Vote is monies in the Vote to provide for a specialist to visit the community fire halls during the course of the year so that he can repair specialized pumps and different sophisticated fire apparatus that is in the community, to make sure that it is up to capacity and also, monies for a fire chief's school, where the five community fire chiefs come in to attend a school yearly, directly under the Fire Marshall's office.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that's one department that I'm very happy to see that you are getting someone in on that technical advice to go to the various fire halls, because I think there's some maintenance that is required where no one is available to do it.

Mr. Chairman: 602, are we clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: 603, Assessment Services, \$196,600.00. Again, Appendix, page 17.
Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Perhaps the Minister could tell us how we put the status of the assessments now, what progress has been made, when will the reassessments be completed? What has been done?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Behind Mr. Chairman, we'll have the complete general finished in the spring of this year for Whitehorse and hope to do the total of Dawson, also this year. We have the position of an additional assessor also in the budget for this year. We also have provision in the assessment services for some extremely specialized appraisal and assessment work.

There is mine assessments that have to be done this year and they need a special assessor who does only mine assessments, which is a highly specialized field.

Also, we run into the problem of having to do appraisals because of stipulations in the Lands Ordinance and regulations and it's a real problem when the only recognized appraiser that we know of in the Yukon, is the Territorial Government's Chief Assessor. So we really are stuck with contract appraisers to be able to not be accused of having a conflict of interest in doing appraisals.

And it's as expensive, it costs us about \$600.00 on the average to have a contract appraisal done for the YTG. They just have to be done, it's a statutory requirement under certain sections of Regulations under the Lands Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, then of the seven man years, how many actual assessors does the YTG have on staff now or you will hope to have on staff for '77-78.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: We have three presently, Mr. Chairman. We hope to have a fourth assessor and what is classified as an assessment technician which takes the material which the assessors have done and put it

into the form that makes up a taxroll.

Don't think that we are in a unique position in the problem of assessing in Yukon. We aren't. We tried to beg, borrow and steal from every jurisdiction that we could possibly find to bring our assessment work right up to date and we just had the most difficult situation in trying to get contract assessors to come to the Yukon to be able to do some work for us. Finally, our sister Territory, the Northwest Territories, helped us out to a great extent last summer and we have very great difficulties in attracting assessors to the Yukon to be on the staff of the Department of Local Government.

It would seem to me that in the next little while that if you have kids, train them to be a plumber or an assessor or a surveyor, from what I can see in the future in the Yukon and across the country.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, do the assessors do a land assessment separate from the improvement assessment of property? Or, Mr. Chairman, do they do the books together, do they go out and assess the land one year, and then the next year assess the improvements on that land, reassess?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I can almost guarantee it, I will check further that they do the total assessment in a general -- both land and improvements at the same time.

I've seen some of the others comparing assessment forms as it were before assessment forms after the general was done, and the difference between what our assessors are doing now in information and what had been done before is just the difference between night and day. Even the areas of municipalities in which we have fallen behind, the one thing that they have all agreed with is, one of the reasons we've fallen behind is because of the quality of the work that the assessors are presently doing. They are going to have really something for the first time to be able to build on as far as assessment goes. From the ones I've seen, I'm almost certain that the land and the improvements were taken into consideration at the same time as the general was done.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger? Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, then, what about Porter Creek? Wasn't there just a land assessment done on some of the land and they are going to do an assessment on some of the improvements this next year? Wasn't this one of the reasons why some of the people were so concerned.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: As I understood it, Mr. Chairman, I'll check again, the reason why they were so upset was because it was the first general that had been done in the land in five years or more and it went from a completely raw, unserviced value of land to a fully serviced improved piece of property and although the improvement had been done just as a formula you follow on improvements, but if you have the basis for improvements then you add so much a year depending on value as it increases. But the land had not been done and it was just as it was prior to it being serviced at all, and it

was the first time that the land had been assessed as serviced land which made it infinitely more valuable as it had been in the past.

The complaints that I received, and I think they were in general to the Honourable Member of Porter Creek, that if they had been done on a gradual basis over the years, there wouldn't be the problem that was met because the land for seven or six years had not been assessed and was just assessed at raw value and all of a sudden it's assessed as a fully serviced lot which was generally 100 by 200 rather than 50 by 100. So even taking into account the hamlet allowance, naturally wound up a more valuable land assessment than a 50 by 100 lot in Riverdale.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, another question, I'm not very familiar with the procedure they go through on assessments. I have a sneaking suspicion that our taxrolls in some of the smaller communities in the areas outside of municipalities particularly are not up to date and there isn't that good a record of some of the land transactions.

Whether it's the government's fault or not I don't know. But when the assessors do the assessments, do they follow the taxroll or do they create a new taxroll. Now I didn't take the time to look it up in the legislation, but what is the procedure?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Our assessors, in effect, in what is being done now, I guess you would say now are creating a new taxroll because they are being thorough. They are looking for areas which were not on the taxroll previously and which will be on the taxroll following their assessment. I might say that in everything that they have done, that they are checked, because they follow the Alberta Assessment Manual, by the Chief Alberta Assessor and we have received letters, he comes up to inspect their work, that as far as he is concerned that they are doing a thorough job and the assessments are bang-on the Manual as prescribed in Alberta.

So they are doing a thorough job in the communities where they do do a general reassessment and out of it comes additions and changes to the taxroll. So in that context, I would say that, yes, there would be the new taxroll developed. They just don't accept the old one and say that these are the only properties that are in this community. They actively pursue looking for other revenues for the Government of Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the Minister also mentioned using the Alberta Manual. I don't know, I have heard a great deal about B.C. and their new Assessment Act and I was wondering whether the Minister was able to give us some indication of what that involved because there seemed to be a great hue and cry and I never seem to be able to get any information. How does it differ from our type of assessment?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know and if the Honourable Member suggests that perhaps at this point in time we should change from the Alberta

Assessment Manual to the B.C. Assessment Manual, I'd think that there would be quite a few problems involved. I am sure that our Chief Assessor would be able to provide that information in a succinct form in about a page and I would ask him to do that. He journeys once a year to an assessment conference of all the chief provincial assessors and they keep up on what each jurisdiction is doing, so I am sure that I could provide that information by asking our Chief Assessor, which I will.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, then if there are changes made to the Alberta Manual, we do follow and I'm led to believe that at the present time, we are assessing our land at market value?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: We would appraise at market value, Mr. Chairman, which is the appraisal method. The assessment method is just a fair value of the land, not a market value of the land. An appraisal takes into consideration, the pressures of the market, what other privately held land of a similar area, in a similar situation, is going for. That is an appraisal. Assessing does not take that market value into consideration.

It could be that sometimes an appraisal could be lower than an assessment and vice versa, depending on extenuating circumstances.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, do they have guidelines for assessing properties? I know that there are -- they have a percentage and I know that again that they have their hamlet allowance but do they have guidelines?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Yes, very, very highly sophisticated and detailed guidelines in the Manual. I think the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua borrowed the assessment manual last year so I am sure that he is the resident expert of the Legislative Assembly on assessment now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not a Philadelphia lawyer. I didn't figure that one out, I just brought the books back.

However, I think that the assessor is trying to do his best, that's why I was listening very intently to your discussion. I think the Minister did say that he would bring back the method in which they do appraise the land.

And I would appreciate if he would bring that to the House.

Mr. Chairman: I think that was the undertaking, Mr. Fleming.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The undertaking was for the comparison of the methods of assessment in B.C. and in Alberta, under the B.C. manual and the Alberta manual.

You know, all I can say is that the way they assess a piece of land is through the Alberta Assessment Manual and I wouldn't even try to say that I know how that is arrived at except to say that we have people from Al-

berta check our assessors, anybody who has had any of the work and who is expert in the field up to this time, say that they are doing a very good job with the assessments they are doing.

The appraisals is a completely different method. The appraisals are at market value and I can bring you examples of appraisal forms where people, qualified appraisors, have done an appraisal of a piece of property and the way they compare it with a similar piece of property which has just been sold to arrive at the conclusion of what the appraised value of that property is. But that's a fair market value. That's at what the traffic will bear and the market at the present time. And that's a very different figure than the assessed figure after following an assessment manual.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I know that it's very difficult when you have to have the appraised value of a piece of land, but using the methods we do it does lead to sort of an inflationary spiral, does it not? If \$5,000.00 is the price today and another guy gets \$6,000.00 tomorrow, then if the government has to appraise a piece of land, they're going to appraise it at \$6,000.00 and doesn't that normally or naturally drive up the price of land?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Depending on the law of supply and demand. If the government is on its toes and has a supply of land in all different areas of all different types, then I think that we cannot get sucked into this inflationary spiral of supply and demand. That's been the objective of the Department of Local Government in the last two years, and I would like to think that by this fall, particularly in the Whitehorse area where this is a speculators' market, that we'll have met that law of supply and demand. I hope so; maybe not, but that's what we're aiming for and at any rate, I hope that's the point we have reached, or as close to it as we possibly can, by this fall, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Six oh three, are we clear?
Six oh five, Municipal Services, \$2,425,600.00.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Six oh five, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Right, 605. Appendix pages 18 and 19.
Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I will begin my questioning with the \$90,000.00, the Whitehorse frontage charges for local improvement.

Last year we voted \$90,000.00, I believe, and then I believe we voted another \$100,000.00 in the supplementary for frontage charges and I'm wondering, why do we just pay local improvement frontage charges in the City of Whitehorse?

Two questions then, you know; what about this supplementary that we voted last year, why that tremendous amount and now again this year it's down, and why are we only having these charges in Whitehorse?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: In Whitehorse and in the

municipalities, it is the municipality that is the taxing authority for the frontage charges which abuts the property that the services go by.

In this year, we estimate that there will be services abutting YTG-owned property that we will pay off, instead of amortizing it over twenty years, in a lump sum payment of \$90,000.00. This will be, Mr. Chairman, YTG properties that front sewer and water utilities in Porter Creek where frontage charges have been imposed for the first time. A lump sum payment would be \$77,636.00, so amortized over twenty years the annual charges would amount to \$7,885.51.

The Second Avenue water and sewer extension will be a lump sum payment of \$9,690.00, and that's the new frontage charge of a new service put in by the City of Whitehorse. Galena and Industrial sewer, which is a new sewer system put down also in the service area, will be \$1,581.75 for a lump sum of \$90,000.00 on new frontage charges which the City of Whitehorse is charging the YTG.

It's not ironic but it's part of the Community Assistance Program where we not only pay 90 per cent of the cost of the installation, but then we also pay the frontage charges that the City imposes on the money that we've already given to them to put the service in. And it's just one of the ways that the senior governments contribute, as a good citizen, to the junior governments and the municipalities. But the reason it only happens in the municipalities is because the municipalities are the only ones who are the taxing authorities for improvements other than the YTG.

As far as the supplementaries go, I would ask Treasury to answer that; I'm not sure where those properties ...

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, that is a good enough explanation. I didn't realize you were buying it out on a one time basis; that you weren't amortizing it out; but my question still holds. I have frontage charges here, changes last year, you had \$90,000.00 and then another \$143,000.00 in the supplementary. These were all paid in the City of Whitehorse and this would be property that would be serviced by sewer and water by the City of Whitehorse.

Now, in these two budgets, we've not had any request for frontage charges for Dawson or Faro, why?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: We didn't get to Dawson, because there has been no new installations, but when we get to Dawson, one will see that there could be an expenditure of up to \$4,000,000.00 for a new sewer and water system in the City of Dawson. Then there will be frontage charges.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, the supplemental that was requested for 1976-77, the \$140,000.00 which Mrs. Watson was referring to was for our portion of frontage charges or the frontage charge equivalent in three of the LID's.

I have got a breakdown someplace. I believe it was Watson Lake, Carmacks and Haines Junction. It was our equivalent of the frontage charge payment which finds its way back to the capital assistance program. So we do pay the equivalent of the frontage charge in the

LID's and that is what the \$140,000.00 was.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, we get it back in the Capital Assistance Program, is that it, the 143?

Mr. Williams: That is correct, Mr. Chairman, we used it to reimburse the Capital Assistance Program.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Just a question. I was wondering, on the LID's, did the LID's pretty well get what they budgeted for this year or has there been some cutbacks in the Teslin area? The other question is, is the LID managers -- just who are the LID managers?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, the LID's did not get everything they asked for, but they did one damn sight better than the Government of the Yukon Territory did, as you know our guidelines were in the area of about 15 per cent in the overall budget by the Treasury Board. I think, because my two colleagues aren't here now, I can say that I think that I did relatively well in arguing in Sub-Committee on Finance for the LID's because of their very great added expenditures with the new services that they were putting in, that the total of the LID's, the four of them, average about a 40 per cent increase in budget over last year. Of course, that wasn't everything that was asked for because you never get everything that you ask for, but on the guidelines that we stuck with, I am of the opinion that the LID's did very well and will have no problem living within the monies that they have available for them this year. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Is there another part of the question?

Mr. Fleming: What are the LID managers and who are they, or whatever?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, part of the philosophy of the LID manager is contained in the Green Paper on LID's. It has been my concern over a number of years and the concern of various LID Board Chairmen and LID members, that in some of the larger LID's and let's take specifically the example of Watson Lake, that they are even larger than at least one of our municipalities at the present time. They have all of the sophisticated machinery of fire fighting apparatus, sewer and water systems in place at the present time, huge capital investments in administration buildings and recreational complexes, in the total gamut of municipal type capital responsibilities.

They have been attempting to maintain and manage and administer those LID's with total volunteer lay help up to the present time with no expertise, with no accounting expertise, with none of the expertise that goes into the management of the small cities anywhere across the country.

They claim to me that one of the real problems of moving towards a more responsible system of government and municipal status is because they are just so snowed under with daily administrative work on a volunteer and lay basis that they don't have time to really know what the advantages, the disadvantages, where

they would stand or to be able to negotiate just what terms would be if they did take on future responsibilities by becoming a municipality.

I have had great sympathy for these representations that have been made to me and I think that I would like to start a program in at least two of the LID's of providing this expertise to the LID's so that they will be able to, what I consider expertly, manage and administer what is, in effect, small municipal areas at the present time. Hopefully, this will provide some initiative and some incentive to take the plunge in some of the bigger LID's to a municipal status, eventually.

I find it pretty frightening on behalf of all of us in the Yukon to be expending the huge amount of capital monies that we are in the LID's without some advice, some expert advice and administration to the Boards and the Chairmen of the LID's who have a difficult job under some pretty trying circumstances. I think that they would appreciate the help of this House and the Department of Local Government in providing the monies for these expert administrators at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, one more question. Professional and special services, I wonder what sewer flushing has got to do with education?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Sewage education?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, L.I.D.'s, there are other questions I have on municipal government, but since the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua was asking questions on L.I.D.'s, maybe I could pursue that. We're looking at \$442,000.00, which is almost a half million dollars. It's a great deal of money.

There's no requirement under the L.I.D. legislation where the Board of Trustees has to go to the residents in the area to get an approval of their budget or, you know, where there isn't the direct relationship and accountability that there is in municipalities. So there's actually no sort of person that reviews or looks at some of their budgets and I made up my mind that I think, this time around, I am going to ask for copies of the budget. I don't think, not for the reason for interfering or anything, but I think that because we are asked to vote \$442,000.00, that we have an obligation to look at some of these budgets.

So, I'm wondering if the Minister would be prepared to table some of the budgets that they have for the '77-78, for the L.I.D.'s?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I'd be prepared to table any L.I.D. budget to any Member that wanted any particular L.I.D. budget. They're all present and accounted for and I don't think that all twelve Members would want all four budgets of every L.I.D. in Yukon. And if anybody asks me specifically for any individual budget, I'd just be more than happy to provide that to any Honourable Member.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is where I am somewhat confused. I have a copy of the budget for

'76-77, for Haines Junction. We voted \$55,000.00 last year, and yet the budget is for \$100,000.00, 350. Now there are other things put in there, I know, but where do we find them in the budget?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: My information is that there was a preliminary submission of the Haines Junction L.I.D. for \$107,464.00 for the year. Then, as we get together with our department heads and Sub-Committee on Finance and with Treasury and battle it out as to what we can actually live within and what we can do, the Local Government advisors get together with the L.I.D. people and battle it out of where there is some fat in the budget, where it can be trimmed and the actual budget allocation to the Haines Junction L.I.D. is \$87,000.00. And this year's -- now, I have a breakdown of the Haines Junction's request and the YTG budget allocation -- if that's what the Honourable Member wants.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: There was a -- you misunderstood me. I said '76-77, Haines Junction's submission for '77-78 is their business. I would like to see, I would like the budgets of all of the L.I.D.'s. I'd like to be able to see them. I only have a copy of a budget that is passed and finished and in that one, we voted \$55,000.00 last year and the budget is for \$100,350.00. Where do we show the rest of the money in here. This is you know, --

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I can't follow the argument. I see what the Member means, that we voted \$55,000.00 last year, but I don't understand the other reference that the Member has made.

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Is insect control and dust control, are those two programs not part of the L.I.D. budget? Are they other programs?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I've never seen an L.I.D. budget. I know what we've got voted here and I know as far as YTG goes, the insect control expenses are under Special Programs, but how they're financed, whether they're financed above and beyond that \$55,000.00, I'm sorry, I don't know.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: They're part of the L.I.D. budget, Mr. Chairman.

They are part of the L.I.D. budget. The L.I.D., out of the operating grant pays back to the YTG what we charge them for insect control.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's what I thought. But I just, I just wondered why there was such a great difference. What about office rent? You charge them rent, they get it as part of their budget. Was this

where there was such a tremendous increase because of the new building? This is what I'm sort of -- I was completely -- I just, by accident, saw this and I thought, well, my goodness, you know, we voted \$55,000.00 what is the difference?

Mr. Chairman: I can leave it if they want to look it up or look at it. I'm sure that there's an explanation, but I'm just wondering how it's broken up.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sherlock?

Mr. Sherlock: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, when she talks about how it's broken up, it's really broken up within Local Government, and has nothing to do with our figures here per se.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I'll provide the four budgets for the Honourable Member, so she can see how they are broken up. This is a typical L.I.D. budget, which is Teslin's. It's broken down much in the same way as ours is, in administration and much greater detail. Administration down to the travel and the phone calls, public works, street lighting, garbage dumps, cemetery maintenance, dust control covers, culverts, campgrounds, sewer education service and wages to utilities boards, fire protection, garbage service, water service, animal control and insect control.

So they're well documented and, in fact, in the area of Teslin, we in fact, complemented them on the expert way in which they have prepared their budget for the forthcoming fiscal year. All of the budgets are similar and the Honourable Member has requested the four budgets for the four L.I.D.'s and I'll make sure that she gets copies of them, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of the 1976-77, if you want to look at it, to explain to me where the difference is. We voted 55 and it's \$100,000.00. Let's have a look at it and maybe somebody can give me a few answers on it. I'm not pursuing it now, but I'd like some answers on it. I would like to see the 1977-78.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further consideration of 605?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, also, under the L.I.D.'s, do they follow a standard wage scale for their employees or is this left to the discretion of the...., is there a standard one for all L.I.D. employees? I note that in the Green Paper, you were suggesting that LID employees come under the municipal employees' benefit legislation. Do you have a scale that all L.I.D. employees follow for their employees, or do they set their own?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: They set their own in negotiations with the board, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that I've been extremely disappointed about was that the larger municipalities didn't go into the municipal employees benefits plans so that the L.I.D. people could have been protected with the best benefit plan of anywhere in the Yukon and the larger municipalities saw fit not to go into it.

So the whole thing after -- It cost us a lot of money and we'd done a lot of work at -- The request of the municipalities originally to do, was turned down by the employees, not by the municipalities. I don't know whether we just didn't do good enough of a job in selling

it, but we've got to figure out some method because tragedies have happened and the L.I.D.'s or the employees have had no benefits at all as a result of injuries or death and it's a real hardship on the families. I'd sure like to get something in place as fast as we could.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Unless the municipalities go into this though with the LID's, it won't be worthwhile to embark on this program, will it?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It almost appears that way, we're almost grasping for straws when we've asked our consultants to do all the work because we paid them so much money anyway it is only going to cost them a little bit more to see whether there is any type of plan which wouldn't be costed right out of the employees or the LID's pocketbook if just the LID's or the smaller municipalities went into it.

We're of the opinion that without the larger municipalities, particularly Yellowknife and Whitehorse, this was a total North of 60 type of plan in the two territories, where everyone would benefit by the more employees that came in and we don't think that it will be cost possible, but we're examining every possibility at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask a few questions about unorganized and native communities? The services that will be provided in the native communities, such as, for example, Burwash Landing and Pelly Crossing, will they be cost-shared with the Department of Indian Affairs for municipal services?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: No, Mr. Chairman, they are intended to be funded partially out of locally generated tax revenues and through the contributions of the other Yukon taxpayers, the same as all other communities in the Yukon are.

You know, I have a philosophical hangout about trying to differentiate between the people in the Yukon and the between the communities of the Yukon and to this point in time, we have not gone, hat in hand to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and asked them to share in the cost of municipal services in the native communities.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, but in some communities this specific municipal service is being provided by the Department of Indian Affairs, water delivery, and this type of thing. Is this going to cause problems? Are the department of Indian Affairs going to say, okay, YTG, you take over and provide this service? And in some instances, YTG and the L.I.D. is running one service and the band in the Indian community almost the parallels the L.I.D., are running the same type of service.

So, you know, by doing this, are YTG going to be expected to finance the municipal service that is now being carried out by the Band?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the only way I can answer that is saying that I hope that somewhere in the foreseeable future, that all the services provided in the communities will be under the aegis of the YTG and the Department of Local Government and that there'll be an economic base in the communities so that the cost of those services will be recovered by the normal taxation type assessment on assessable property.

That's the kind of solution that I want to see somewhere down the line and I'm going to do everything in my power, as long as I'm here, to foster that of eventual solution.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this is idealistic. It's well and good to say it, I don't think that there's anyone disagrees with the Honourable Member. But on the other hand, you also have to realize the situation that some of these Indian communities are in and the type of service that we're talking about, the water delivery service, they are doing on their own, is a means for some of them to have employment. They guard the right to provide this service quite jealously. They want to be able to do it on their own. And I'm just wondering whether we should be stepping in or even trying to step in if they don't want us to.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, other than water delivery, I believe that the YTG and the native communities are providing the majority of the municipal type services in those communities. In Burwash and Old Crow and Pelly, we provide the protective services in the field of fire protection and the fire department, the utility supply and service in paying for the street lighting in the communities and the road streets, and garbage dumps in both operation and maintenance and capital and in the community television in places like Pelly, the same as any of the other communities.

In the case of Old Crow, also, the sewage education, the operation and maintenance of the lagoon system is a cost to the YTG and the escarpment control program.

So, other than maybe water delivery in the Burwash area, I think it can be said that the Department of Local Government is supplying the normal type of municipal services to the native communities to the same level and the same programs that they are providing in most of the other unorganized areas of the Yukon at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: No, Mr. Chairman, this differs from community to community. It's certainly not uniform because in some areas the Band have money for road maintenance or street maintenance within their own community and they have other sources for the municipal service in their community so it does vary. The point I'm trying to make is that it becomes a little difficult to -- in one instance it's performed by the Federal Government and they are assuming the responsibility and paying the bill in their grants to the Bands. In the other instance the YTG is doing it, and what I am trying to say is, if you're going to go for a uniform, if it were possible, then YTG should be receiving the funding from Indian Affairs.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: I think, Mr. Chairman, the Member has brought up a very good point. Actually it's a fact, let's face it, I think some of the LID's, if they're working in conjunction with them, with the Village, don't have quite the problems that she's thinking of, as Pelly or something that's more or less isolated from the white settlement.

I think in the area, the Teslin area, they're getting along very graciously together, and the water system I know is being paid for by the Indian Affairs. It is not being given to them. There is so much and if they can't pay themselves, it is paid by the Department of Indian Affairs to the LID. In some cases, there is no problem at all; however, I can see, whereas, if we were going to supply completely to a native village, I think the Department of Indian Affairs should be approached and they should possibly pay the bill. At this time anyway.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, the paper was a little unclear and the budget, the paper states that the price, the operational price tag of the TV Broadcast System is \$100,000.00. Somewhere in here I saw \$15,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: The receiving site of everyone of the ground receiving stations carries an annual budget of \$13,900.00 to Telesat Canada. If you add the number of ground receiving stations then there's operation and maintenance, equipment rental, a service contract basis on every one of the sites.

We don't have a direct \$13,900.00 cost to those communities which are serviced by translators but we do have a direct O & M cost in service contract, in the provision of the energy, the propane to run the transformer services so the total cost to both Telesat and for all the other incidentals, that comes to \$100,000.00 a year. For an area served by a ground receiving station approximately \$15,000.00 per year.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, if we were able, if Telesat Canada changed their mind on some of this, the actual operation and maintenance of these television stations would not be extensive at all.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. Everything we can do to bring down the price to Telesat Canada is a direct saving to the program. Where the signal is in the air and it is public and we have used a translator to capture that signal and bring it down, we have to pay nothing to touch that for a ground receiving station on a yearly basis because all we are doing is taking the public signal which is there and using a method to have a community licensed and bring that signal to the constituents in that community.

So if we could have serviced all the communities in the Yukon by a translator service, rather than a ground

receiving station, the only cost that we would have to the Yukon taxpayer would be the maintenance and service contracts on those sites on a yearly basis.

Mr. Chairman: Me. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm in the right department, I was just wondering if the Minister of Local Government could possibly extend the mosquito control program to flies and maybe spend about ten dollars to kill the flies in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: I am a little confused on that T.V. situation. I didn't quite get the drift of just the difference between the ground receiving station and the actual station.

Like, for instance Teslin has a ground receiving station direct from Anik. Carcross has a ground receiving station. Now Translator service, okay what are we paying Telesat Canada for the same one at Carcross as we are paying for the one at Teslin?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, we paid \$1390 a year to Telesat for the one at Teslin. We pay nothing to Telesat for the one at Carcross.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Then Mr. Chairman, when a situation arises as such as Johnson's Crossing where we could take the signal from a station in Teslin, would we again have to pay Telesat \$13,900.00 or could we just put the station up and pay them nothing?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: There is a much higher capital cost originally in putting up a translator. Telesat puts up the, except for what the community gets involved in, the ground receiving station and they recover their costs by charging \$13,900.00 a year in perpetuity adinfinitum.

The Translator probably costs in the area of, well take an average of about \$20,000.00, but once that capital cost to YTG is finished, that is the total capital costs of that installation. And the only yearly costs are service and O&M to that Translator site.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I have one more question on this. The Government does have a contract with Telesat I presume? A license for so many years I would presume? Forever - This is what I wanted to know.

If we did put in, say the people decided to put in a station, Telesat Canada could not take that machine away and then leave us in the air? Okay.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: All you need is the licencing, the community organization from CRTC and you are fully operational. There is nothing that Telesat can do, that's a line of sight public signal which the CRTC has licenced that community to receive through whatever method they've licenced them to receive it.

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

