

Property of
M. L. A. Lounge



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 26

8th Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Monday, April 25, 1977

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
April 25, 1977

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

(Prayers)

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed at this time with Orders of the Day.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

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

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of personal privilege this morning. I was listening to a program on the First Report on the Standing Committee on Constitution, on CBC on Sunday afternoon and on that program, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Constitution was quoted as Dr. Jack Hibberd. I'd like to correct that statement, that of course, the Chairman of Standing Committee on the Constitution is Mr. Lengerke, the Honourable Member from Riverdale, and he's just worked too long and too hard on this Committee to be slighted in that manner, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling a reply to Motion Number 15, 1976 Third Session.

Mr. Speaker: Alright, we'll proceed to Tabling of Documents and it will be so tabled.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I'm sorry.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further documents or correspondence for tabling?
Reports of Committees?
The Honourable Member from Mayo.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges.

Standing Orders: The Terms of Reference for the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges were passed November 3, 1976. Part of your Committee's Terms of Reference states: "To consider the Standing Order and rules of the Assembly and to recommend drafts of proposed standing orders and rules to give effect, if concurred in by the Assembly, to any changes proposed by the Committee.

Your Committee continues to use the criteria of assuring that standing orders of this Assembly reflect the actual practice and procedures used by the Assembly. Standing Orders 50 and 51 do not comply with the present procedures.

Standing Orders 50 and 51: Your Committee therefore

recommends that Standing Orders 50 and 51 be amended to read as follows:

50(1) At the commencement of each regular Session, a special committee consisting of all Members shall prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of Members to compose the Standing and Special Committees of the Assembly.

51(2) No standing or special committee shall consist of more than five Members without the consent of the Assembly. Such consent shall not be moved for without notice, and that the above amended standing orders become effective upon the Assembly concurring with this report.

Recommendations to proceed money matters: Section 24 of the Yukon Act states: "It shall not be lawful for the Council to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bills of the Appropriation of any part of the public revenue of the Territory or of any tax or impost to any purpose that has not been first recommended to Council by message of the Commissioner in the Session which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed."

The wording of this section in the Yukon Act can be found to be similar in the BNA Act and in provincial legislation. The only difference is in the word "Commissioner". In the provincial acts, the applicable word is Lieutenant Governor. The present practice of this Assembly in receiving money matters is that such matters be preceded by a verbal address from the Commissioner to the Legislature.

This practice must certainly create a great inconvenience to the Commissioner to have to appear before the Legislature on such administrative matters.

The provincial legislatures offer a better system which your Committee has studied very carefully. Your Committee recognized that pursuant to the Yukon Act, money matters involving the expenditure of public monies, which are presented to the Assembly, must be recommended by message from the Commissioner. The budget address and a speech from the Throne do not recover this requirement of the Yukon Act, nor does the following wording in the preamble of Appropriation Bills - "whereas it appears by message from..."

For the Assembly to legally and constitutionally consider matters involving expenditures or taxation, all that is required is for the Commissioner to sign a message thus giving his recommendations to the Assembly.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the following procedure be used by the Yukon Legislative Assembly respecting recommendations to precede money matters.

(1) The attached form to be signed by the Commissioner and such document be attached to any vote, resolution, address or Bill proposed to the Assembly by the Government.

(2) The Minister sponsoring the vote, resolution, address or Bill, read into the record prior to the document being introduced, the recommendation of the Commissioner.

Budget Address: An elected Member of the Executive Committee responsible for the finance portfolio is desirable in Yukon. Such Minister would bring before the Assembly, the Estimates and deliver the Budget Address. The purpose of a Budget Address is to outline the fiscal policies of the government and lay the ground

work before the Assembly commences its detailed study of the Estimates.

As a first step towards the attainment of the Finance Portfolio under jurisdiction of an elected Member, your Committee recommends that an elected Member of the Executive be appointed by the Commissioner to be chairman of the Sub-Committee on Finance; That an elected person deliver the annual Budget address to this Assembly and that a copy of this report be forwarded to the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, Dr. A.M. Pearson.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Reports of Committees?
Petitions?
Introduction of Bills?
Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion or Resolution?
The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane that it is the opinion of this House that the Public Service Commission should be requested to look into the possibility of undertaking a review immediately of the positions of corrections officers I and II, corrections matrons and senior matrons with a view to:

- (a) equalizing pay for equal work, and
- (b) changing the titles of the positions so as not to reflect sexual qualifications.

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

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I give Notice of Motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Riverdale that it is the opinion of this House that the Yukon Pipeline Inquiry be urged to consider visiting all interior Yukon communities which would be affected by any Dempster Highway pipeline route.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Mayo?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I give Notice of Motion re concurrence in the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Notices of Motion or Resolution?
Are there any Statements by Ministers?

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to the House this morning, that the Yukon Government has signed an agreement with the Federal Government to share in the cost of certain services provided by the Yukon Territorial Government to juveniles in conflict with the law.

Under the Canada Assistance Plan, the Federal Gov-

ernment shares in the cost of these services only when provided by the provincial Welfare Departments. This agreement had to be reached separately to allow the Corrections Branch to obtain this cost sharing from Health and Welfare Canada.

The agreement now enables the Yukon Government to recover fifty per cent of the cost of services to juveniles at the Yukon Juvenile Training Home, for probation services to juveniles, and other special units dealing with juveniles. An audit will take place shortly to determine what retroactive recoveries can be obtained under the agreement. This new agreement is similar to those signed in 1975 with Ontario and New Brunswick where these juvenile services are also the responsibility of correctional authorities.

Mr. Speaker, if I may add an informal word, I would like to give credit this morning to two members of the public service of this government who should receive credit for this most satisfying step forward in cost sharing. Up until now, the territorial taxpayer has paid every cent of the costs of the Juvenile Training Home and juvenile probation work, now we will get half of that from Ottawa and it is retroactive for a year.

Honourable Members will probably recall that a year ago now, I brought to this House, an enabling Ordinance to give the Commissioner authority to sign such an agreement, because we had been told a year ago that we were getting it. It has now come.

I would like to pay tribute this morning, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Harry Murphy and to Mr. Bill Milner, who through their intervention two and three years ago, have finally assisted this government to bring the agreement to a signing state and had it not been for their interest and alertness while attending federal-provincial conferences on corrections and juveniles, we would still be out in left field, Mr. Speaker, paying the whole bill ourselves. I commend particularly these two public servants, as well as other members of our staff who have made this possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, Members will recall last Fall that the Assembly recommended to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the appointment of Mr. Keith Byram to the Water Board. We have received information that Mr. Keith Byram was officially appointed to the Water Board on March 28, by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Speaker: We will then proceed to the Question Period. Have you any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Question re: Corrections Staff

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

- (1) What are the duties, qualifications and skills re-

quired of (a) Corrections Officer I; (b) Corrections Matron I and (a) Corrections Officer II and (b) Senior Matron and how many employees are there in these positions?

(2) Is there any sexual qualification in these positions?

(3) What are the pay ranges of each of the above positions?

(4) If the pay ranges are unequal but the duties, qualifications and skills are similar, is the Minister willing to suggest to the Public Service Commission a review of these classifications?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

Question re: Nominee to Board of Inquiry

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Commissioner this morning. Mr. Commissioner, on April 19th, the Indian and Northern Affairs Minister Warren Allmand announced the establishment of a Board of Inquiry on the socio-economic aspects of the proposed Alaska Highway pipeline and I'm just wondering if you have received an official communique from the Minister requesting this House or the Government to name somebody to that Inquiry? An official nominee from the Territory.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Honourable Member could, in the future, address the question to the Chair, rather than to the individual.

Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to recall whether we have a letter on file requesting a nominee or not and I'm not sure that we do, but I think the whole question is extraneous. He has stated in his press release that there will be a member of the panel who will be a nominee and representative of the Territorial Council.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane?

Question re: Post Office at Beaver Creek

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a written question for the Commissioner. Is the Government of Yukon prepared to make space available in a Territorial building at Beaver Creek for a temporary post office facility, so that proper postal service can be restored for the people of that community?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Klondike?

Question re: Press Release re MLA's Visit to Ottawa

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've got a question for the Honourable Member from Riverdale. In Friday's newspaper were great big headlines reported, "MLA's Going To Ottawa" and the first sentence in this article was, "the Legislature will go within a month to Ottawa." I was wondering whether the Member from Riverdale could elaborate to this House on what the

statement actually was?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could have a brief reply. We wouldn't want this to range into the area of a debate, but I will permit the question.

The Honourable Member from Riverdale?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to reply to that. I was going to rise on a point of personal privilege this morning and explain that. I was asked if the Standing Committee was going to go to Ottawa and I suggested that we had scheduled a meeting for this morning to discuss that very question and also that we could not really come to a conclusion until we saw what the results of the debate were with respect to a number of resolutions in the House today.

My reaction was that - my personal opinion was that it would be a good idea for the Committee to go to Ottawa and further than that, I said that it might even be advantageous if the whole House went to Ottawa, but I did not make any commitment as the paper indicated, and I can certainly give my assurance to the Member from Klondike that the case has not come to any conclusion. We did hear earlier reports on the Thursday prior by a Member of this House that we were in fact going to Ottawa as well, and we didn't have a reaction to that.

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

Question re: Radio International

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Mr. Commissioner this morning.

Through the holidays coming up and the nice weather coming up, I think CBC television sponsors applied to advertise Radio International. My question is, what's the population requirement for Radio International to broadcast, say, to the Bahamas and other foreign places.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly have to take that question under advisement and obtain the information and bring it back for the Honourable Member.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Kluane?

Question re: Investigations Regarding Haines Junction School Committee

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Commissioner this morning.

Mr. Commissioner, by motion of this House, the government of the Yukon was requested to carry out an investigation into the allegations made by Indian organizations regarding the Haines Junction School Committee.

Mr. Commissioner, what has the government determined regarding (1) the type of investigation that will be carried out; (2) who will be appointed to conduct the investigation; and (3) under what terms of reference will the investigation be conducted.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, perhaps again, these questions could be addressed to the Chair, rather than to Mr. Commissioner, but, however, Mr. Commissioner. Is this a written question?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a written question.

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

Question re: Student Enrollment at F. H. Collins

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, a written question, for the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mrs. Watson: One, what was the enrollment at the F. H. Collins Secondary School for each of the months of the school year?

Two, how many students left, transferred or dropped out each month of this school year?

And three, how many students enrolled in each of the months, after the initial enrollment in September of 1977?

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

Question re: Consultation with YTA

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. On April 2nd, the Yukon Teachers' Association Central Council passed the motion deploring the Department of Education's lack of consultation with them on the Yukon Teacher Education Program. I'm wondering if any action has been taken on that -- on their letter, which was sent April 6th, concerning consultation with YTA on this Education Program?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the accusations made against the Department about not consulting with the Yukon Teachers' Association, that is completely unfounded as we never had any more meetings with the University of British Columbia about the Yukon Teacher Training Program until which time Mr. Thomas appeared before the Legislature. It's my understanding that Mr. Thomas has sent a letter to Yukon Teachers' Association concerning the Department's position in this particular area because we have not had any more meetings. There will probably be meetings later on this year, once we have confirmation whether or not the program is going to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, just supplementary to that. The request was that consultation take place between the Department of Education and YTA immediately, concerning the Teacher Training Program.

It had nothing to do with UBC. I wonder if the Minister would comment in that regard?

Mr. Speaker: What specifically is the question?

Ms. Millard: Has there been any consultation between YTA and the Department of Education since their letter to them, concerning the Yukon Teacher Training Program?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will have to bring that information back.

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

Question re: Level of Asbestos Fibres

Ms. Millard: A general question to the Minister of Health. The American Institute of Occupational Safety and Health has recommended reducing asbestos exposures per cubic centimeter to .01 fibres for an eight hour day. Since the Yukon Territory has a level of five fibres per eight hour day, is there any consideration being taken of lowering this level?

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

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Speaker, not that I know of.

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

Question re: Game Research Project

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Speaker, I have a written question that probably should appropriately be directed to the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Gillespie. On April 13th, a Motion was passed in this House regarding increased manpower facilities for a game research project along the Dempster Highway with respect to the caribou herd and other related problems. My question is, now that this Motion has been agreed upon, what is the Government going to do about it? Is the Game Department going to be provided with required manpower and facilities to do this study in a first class manner and, if so, when and in what manner will this manpower and facilities be provided?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps one of the Ministers could undertake to take that as notice and bring back an answer.

Are there any further questions?
This then takes us to Orders of the Day. There being nothing outstanding at this time, may I have your pleasure?

The Honourable Member from Pelly River.

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Fleming: I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Pelly River, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that 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 the Motion as carried.

(Motion carried)

(Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

(Recess)

Mr. Chairman: I call this Committee to order.

We will begin this morning with consideration of Resolution Number 20.

It has been moved by the Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Member from Watson Lake, that:

WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development has recommended to this House that the Assembly be expanded for the 1978 Election,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommends that the Government bring forward, during this Spring Sitting, amendments to the Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance to allow a Commission to make recommendations to this Assembly on the electoral boundaries to accommodate 16 constituencies.

Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion regarding the size of this Assembly and the reasons that it should be expanded or otherwise. One of the major reasons that has been put forward is that we recognize the responsibility that we do have to try and have native representation in this House, which we have not had to this point. It has been felt that if there were more districts available the minority groups would have a better opportunity to elect their members, to this House.

One of the other considerations, Mr. Chairman, has been the necessity to develop a more responsible form of government in that we would be in a position that a party would form a majority and other parties would form an opposition for a balanced form of government, but with twelve members, Mr. Chairman, it is barely possible for this to be accomplished in that it would take at least seven members of the House to form a party that could be in power. And with one Member being the Speaker, it leaves very little in the form of an opposition.

We're also concerned, Mr. Chairman, that, as this Government expands in terms of the elected representation on the Executive Committee, there are more members that will be required to serve on the Executive Committee and therefore, again, be less Members available to ensure an adequate opposition.

Mr. Chairman, there is more than one consideration here. One of them is the number that we should be considering. It has been considered - various numbers have been considered. It is within our power that the House can be represented by anywhere from twelve to twenty Members. It is my personal feeling, Mr. Chairman, that less than sixteen Members would not - we would be able to achieve an adequate balance of Government and Opposition benches.

Another problem that is posed by the change in the number of the Assembly is how we should go about that. In this Motion, it is stated that this House gives direction to an Electoral Boundaries Commission to set out the constituencies themselves. But there has been some concern that, if there was some input from this Assembly or perhaps from other sources, we could better ensure that there could be native representation in this House.

This Motion has been brought forward to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, so that all Members may have the opportunity to put forward their views and we can reach a consensus on this and what is best here for the Government of the Yukon today.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, pleased to have the honour to second the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre. I have felt for some time now that the time has quickly come when we must, in fact, in the interest of good government, by and for the people of Yukon, it is necessary to enlarge this Legislature.

The reasons that I have are many-fold for thinking this way. Of course, it is always difficult to determine or play the old numbers game. You know, do you increase it by two, do you increase it by four, or do you increase it fully by eight to the limit allowable to this Legislature under the Yukon Act?

I reviewed, in considering this resolution and prior to its introduction, I did review fully the last Boundary Commission Minutes to find out just at that time what the people of Yukon were saying and thinking when this House was enlarged to twelve Members. I found it most interesting to listen to some of the constituency demands. People, you know, they felt things such as communication were very important, that constituencies ought to be arranged in such a manner that the MLA representing at the very local level that constituency, would be dealing with similar problems.

Perhaps today, for instance, in the areas of - well, the constituency of my Honourable colleague from Klondike, and I am sure it must be difficult for him to find the interests of the people at Carmacks the same as perhaps in his home constituency of Dawson. This type of thing occurs. I think that, in developing four more constituencies, that we will perhaps cure this problem, that people will have access to their MLA at a local level on a more frequent basis.

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse South

Centre has spoken of the problems that are evidenced here now and will be evidenced in the future with numbers in the House and those responsible for the off-duties officers of the House, your Speaker, your Deputy Speaker, your Deputy Chairman of Committees, your three or four or five Ministers, as the case might be in the future.

Pretty soon, as the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua has pointed out several times in this House, there is going to be no opposition. Without a good opposition -- you need a good, strong government, but you need a good opposition as well.

Perhaps with the next election, the further increase of activity in the partisan political field will take care of this by natural evolution if the political parties of Canada do face the election on a partisan basis. It's obvious then, in order to form a government, you're just going to have to increase the numbers of the House. It would be my thought that this House should go to twenty Members to accommodate this. I'm not certainly fully convinced indeed that political parties may fill, occupy, a majority of seats in the House perhaps after the next election.

It just depends on what naturally evolves and I'm just not so sure in my mind that the people of Yukon would agree to going the full twenty member Legislature at this time. We also have the troublesome question of saying how can we further enhance the possibility or probability of native people -- representation in this House by native people. Certainly the Boundary Commission, if this Resolution is carried in its present form, the Boundaries Commission will no doubt take this into great account and perhaps establish boundaries which would ensure a greater probability of native representation in this House, which I think would be heralded throughout the Territory if this could be achieved.

So, as I say, many of the other reasons I've stated here have been described by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, but I feel it certainly is, Mr. Chairman, in the deepest and most responsible interests of the people of the Yukon to, at this time, take this step by adding four more Members to this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the Motion the Honourable Member has brought forward, as it reads here, I would like to say that I'm very happy to see it. I think myself that what we need is representation from the people, more representation. Hopefully, this will be on the government side, so that there will be a majority at that time in the House who is representing the people. The minority will be, of course, the opposition and there's no disagreement in my mind there as long as they are elected and put here by the people and are not underneath a Federal Government thumb or anything like that.

I'm sure that there will be some concern, and there is myself, of the monies that is going to be put out for this type of thing, to enlarge the Council. However, that money, I think, will be well spent and as the Honourable Member said there will be more representation for each person in the Yukon. I know that, also, we will be possibly be belittled by many large centres in Canada and all over for the fact that we have that many Members and

so few people, but I will say this, that the Government, where they do cover large constituencies outside, where there's thousands of people with just one elected Member -- However, I'd like to say at this time that, whether that's good or bad I don't know, but I can see where possibly it's not so good as it should be because I've seen many cases where the Government doesn't do exactly what the people want.

I think possibly this is one of their reasons. They have to many Members, so many people to take care of and the only voice they get is from the rich or from the big groups and they don't get right down to the local level and the little people and I'm sure that, if there's only two or three hundred people that a person is responsible for, more or less, you will get a better voice from the bottom anyway.

So I have no problem with it. I wouldn't be prepared at this time to see any change in the concept of the three Members for Government as it is today until such time as they did this, and I'll stand by that as long as I'm here, but I do see this Motion as a step forward.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Motion. I think it is necessary that we get an expansion in the Legislature. My major point in saying this is the fact that it's very apparent that the Government of the Yukon Territory is going to have to take on more responsibility in relation to the governing of everyday lives of Yukoners.

I think, in the last couple of years, that the confidence of the public in the Federal Government to be able to direct the Yukon in a manner in which Yukoners want is being very badly shaken. I think that we have some very fine examples of this, Mr. Chairman. We have the Northern Canada Power Commission situation, in relation to the Aishihik Project, which the Yukoners are going to have to pay for, but at the same time Yukoners did not have the necessary input into that particular project to tell the Government of Canada exactly what they wanted and how they wanted it. And the people of the Yukon are going to pay for a decision made by people that don't live here and don't have to live with the consequences thereof.

I think, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, that in the last -- in the beginning of the Session, we passed a Motion in relation to the Yukon Power Corporation, and I personally believe that this is going to be the salvation for the economy of Yukon in relation to the future. We have to have the ability to take over the power situation in the Yukon and subsequently distribute the monies thereof to the people of the Yukon in a wise manner.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think it's quite obvious in relation to the situation that the Government of the Yukon Territory is in with the present land claim negotiations going on. Here the Members in this House have been elected by all the people of the Yukon and we are quite obviously a very subservient partner to the negotiations, which is going to affect all people of the Yukon, native and non-native alike.

So, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we need more elected Members so that we can take on the responsibility so that the decision-making process is done in Yukon rather than 3,000 miles away in some remote office and by people that nobody knows.

I think at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think it's imperative that we give the opportunity for native people to be elected to the Assembly so that they can participate in the decision-making process of government in the public forum where one has to account for their actions and, at the same time, has to be responsible to the public at large.

Also, at the same time, in relation to the Executive Committee, with more responsibilities coming towards the Government of the Yukon Territory, we have to have the ability of having more Members in this Chamber to take on the everyday responsibilities of government. In order to do that, we have to expand the Legislature so that we have people that are prepared to serve and prepared to put in four years, or even maybe longer, to devote their time to the everyday decisions that have to be made on behalf of Yukoners.

I am like the Member from Watson Lake; I sometimes think that possibly it should be twenty Members but, at the same time, I realize that we're going through an evolution. I think that party politics will evolve for this coming election. I think a government will be formed and in that time the Members of that day can see whether or not they want to expand to the full complement of twenty that we are allowed under the Yukon Act.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will be supporting this particular Motion because I think it's imperative that we take the step towards responsible government rather than asking the Federal Government to do it for us.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I have several thoughts on the Motions that are before us for debate at the present time.

I'm one of those Members on the Constitutional Committee who saw a political problem on the horizon and sought a political solution to that political problem by the fun of gerrymandering districts and bringing in a resolution for support on the districts that had been gerrymandered by the Committee.

The reason for that is, it will have to be pretty explicit, the terms of reference to an Electoral Boundaries Commission of just what we are attempting to do when we ask them to look into the question of enlarging the electoral districts. I was also one of those who thought that I would like to see the immediate increase go to fourteen rather than to sixteen for some very practical and for some reasons of principle also, I think. The practical one being the money question and the principle one being that I'm not so sure that we have to play the numbers game for the introduction of partisan politics into the Chamber. I'm not all that convinced really that we need partisan politics at the Territorial level at this present time and of course I know there are many Honourable Members who disagree with that statement of mine at the present time.

But if we did go to sixteen and there wasn't a system of party politics introduced, then we're all worse off than we were before because, instead of 12 or 14, we have 16 voices all crying in the wilderness on a completely and absolute single party system with no discipline. If we think that we're impossible now with two months of sitting, just double it — we'll be sitting here permanently in this Legislative Assembly unless that type of

discipline and a party system comes into effect with the advent of 16 Members.

So, there are some practical difficulties as I see them in that area. I was in favour of coming up with a political solution to 14 seats for the next Territorial election, divided in the following manner: that we create Old Crow as a single and distinct entity as an electoral district because it does have particular and distinct problems of any other area in Yukon and I think that those problems should be represented at this table; then I looked at a single constituency for Dawson. I don't like the division as it presently is between Ogilvie and Klondike, because there is a very distinct possibility that at some point in time the City of Dawson could be caught short of not having a representative interest exclusively on this Legislative Assembly. I would find that tragic for Dawson City and would cure that by an electoral gerrymandering of districts, if that is the word that I imagine politicians don't like to use but is what we would be doing through a political solution.

Mayo would remain the same. I would see a new district created of Carmacks, Stewart and Pelly. This would also at least have -- or probably be about a fifty-fifty split and probably a majority of natives in that type of an area where I think there is a real community of interest in those three communities along the Klondike Highway.

I would see the Kluane electoral district changed so that it does not include the area on the Alaska Highway, say, possibly to the Stony Creek area or around that area, and not on the Mayo Road up to Fox Lake. The problems in those areas, and my Honourable colleague from Porter Creek disagrees completely with me, are the problems of living adjacent to the major urban centre in Yukon and have no relationship with the problems as I see them of the North Alaska Highway people.

I would have seen Pelly remain the same. There is a problem with Ross River being part of that constituency, but I don't see any solution in a fourteen-member expansion of that particular problem at this time, and you can't have everything with the expansion of boundaries.

Watson Lake remaining the same, and one new district coming out of the Whitehorse area. There were six areas in Whitehorse, six electoral districts that were divided on the first report of the last Electoral Boundaries Commission. I think they were done sensibly and I think the argument still holds true for a division of Whitehorse Riverdale, Whitehorse South Centre, Whitehorse North Centre, Whitehorse Hillcrest, Whitehorse Takhini, which could be a new area which includes the Kopper King Trailer Court, the Takhini Trailer Court and the new mobile home subdivision which is going to have a large, large population, much larger than many of the electoral districts outside of the boundaries of the City of Whitehorse living almost exclusively in mobile home subdivisions and trailer parks. Then the other area being Whitehorse Porter Creek, which would then include part of the Alaska Highway and part of the Klondike Highway.

That, to me, Mr. Chairman, was instead of going the whole Electoral Commission's route, further expenditure of funds, just try and, through the majority of this House, put a political solution to a political problem facing us. I think that if we go along with the Motion as it's presently constituted, that we have to be very, very

clear to the Electoral Boundaries Commission, whoever it is, because they're pretty independent fellows and they may come up with something completely different than what Members would like to see answered in the increase in the size of this Legislative Assembly.

So, I was willing and I'm still willing, but I don't think I'd have the support of the House because politicians are a bit frightened of going through any other route except through the Electoral Boundaries Commission, of seizing the opportunity to let everybody know exactly what we're doing and for what reasons we're doing them and give practical and obvious reasons.

The one thing that I do have a problem with the motion as it presently is, is I would like to move, during debate some time, or after debate, an amendment with it to strike the last four words to accommodate sixteen constituencies. If the Motion stopped after "boundaries", it would leave it open without clear direction to the Electoral Boundaries Commission just how many they thought would be practical at this time to increase the membership of the Yukon Legislative Assembly. I would like to be able to go before the Electoral Boundaries Commission and make the argument I am presently making for fourteen Members. I don't think that I should be precluded on that opportunity nor any member or group or organization of doing that before an Electoral Boundaries Commission.

You know, with fourteen Members, according to the latest population statistics, I think that we have one Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly for every 1,650 men, women and children in the Yukon Territory. If we go to sixteen, we're talking about one Member for every about 1,450 men, women and children in the Yukon Territory. We're getting down to the point where almost all I have to do is hold a block party on Alexander Street with a keg of beer to do my electioneering for a Territorial election.

I think that we have to really wonder, you know, where, in so many areas, elected representatives have to represent so many more members that we have probably even now the closest thing to direct democracy possible in the country, where I dare say that most of us know the majority of our constituents on a first name basis, know their family, know their experiences, know their trade. I think this is nice, but I don't think that we should get it down to the ridiculous by diluting the number of constituents that we all represent to a point which really makes it rather ludicrous and I think holds us up to some ridicule across the country.

I think that we have to temper the advantages of more Members in the Assembly to some of the disadvantages that I hope I have mentioned that could come about by moving too far too fast. I would like to think that we would, if we're going the Electoral Boundaries Commission route, that we wouldn't direct them as to the actual numbers that they will be forced to come up with, because there might be very good reasons which I would hope I could put before them and some very good reasons that they may come up with on their own, that perhaps sixteen is not the magic number.

So, with those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I'd have no problem supporting the Motion, although I wish it had been done the political route as I had mentioned, but I would ask that we would be able to, prior to the close of the debate, move an amendment that would take out the words "to accommodate sixteen constituencies".

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I also have a problem with the Motion, but it's just the reverse of the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre.

I would like to see a different amendment moved in there by not tying the hands of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, but I do have similar ideas of the Honourable Member, like Dawson becoming a separate constituency and creating Old Crow as a separate constituency. I would also like to see Pelly, Stewart and North Carmacks one constituency, and create a separate constituency with South Carmacks and going down as far as the Alaska Highway, because I think those people do have something in common. I also could see more people in more ridings created by separating Ross River and Upper Liard from the present ridings, because I think, there again, I think we're talking about different interests and different interest groups in different areas. Unfortunately, there's not enough people in some areas, but there's definitely a different interest in those areas, and I think we should accommodate them and now is the time to do it.

If those people want to go the political route, fine, I'm all for party politics in this House, because I think it is high time we created party politics, but, again, it's up to the people in this Territory if they want party politics.

I was, and some of the other Members, the Honourable Member from Pelly, were elected on party politics. I know one political party was completely wiped out during election time. But the possibility exists now that people maybe change their mind and I think we should give them that opportunity to look into that thing.

I think if we're really serious about Native participation, I think we shouldn't tie the Boundary Commission up to one specific number. I would have an idea of amending the present Motion to eliminate the last two words "16 constituencies" and making a minimum of 16 but no more than 20 constituencies within -- give them a limit, a minimum limit and a maximum amount and let them look into that and report back to here.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, there is certainly some interesting debate going on and I am very happy to be a part of the Constitutional Committee that has come forward with these Motions.

I feel it's a proud moment in the history of the Yukon that we're finally taking matters into our own hands and doing things that we can do. On that basis, I object to the suggestion of the Motion to amend this Motion, because I think that we have to give clear direction to the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I think the first thing they're going to say to us is, okay, what do you want? They're not going to be able to come here and decide how many people we should have elected in the Yukon. I think that would be a terrible mistake for us to make.

I certainly agree that sixteen is the right number. I have been debating in my own mind the number fourteen, because I did a lot of work on the Committee on Populations and I have to disagree with the Member from Whitehorse West -- sorry, Whitehorse North -- that the population statistics show that sixteen would be an awkward number because, in representing people per -- in the last Boundaries Commission, the alteration made

it so that one Member represented 1,200 people and if the Member says that now sixteen would make us one representing 1,400, that is simply better as far as I'm concerned.

I think population is certainly a consideration, but, as well, we must consider something that the Electoral Boundaries Commission would be calling community of interest or sharing of interest. In that regard, I think we really must keep in mind the ratio between Whitehorse and the outlying districts. I think the present ratio is good and I think we must emphasize to the Boundaries Commission that that is the kind of route that we want to stay in, that an equal representation from Whitehorse and outside communities would not be fair to the outside communities.

Also, I'm quite in agreement that Old Crow should be its own constituency. I've been discussing these things philosophically with people in Old Crow and I find some support for it, although there will be need across the Yukon for more political education. Perhaps the discussions that are going on today and the new Bill on the Legislative Assembly will create those kinds of discussion which are badly needed in Yukon.

I'm proud to be able to support the Motion.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, as the Honourable Member from Watson Lake said, we could play the numbers game and that is very true, but, the numbers game is also very important and I am prepared to accept the concept of sixteen constituencies.

I have misgivings for one reason — the cost. We all know that we are expensive, that every extra Member you have costs the taxpayers of the Yukon money. If we put four more in, it's going to cost them four times that money, but I think it is worth it to take the step at this time. I share very much with the views of the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that if you leave party or groups in this Assembly too small, if you have party or groups evolving and you go to a four-Member Executive Committee, you could well be where the Executive Committee would be in the majority of the party that represents the party in power. By that fact alone, your four-Member Executive Committee would be dominating completely, or would have the majority in this House, and that, I think, would be a very dangerous situation. So you have to play the numbers game a little bit and I think that sixteen would fairly well accommodate a party type of structure within this House and also allow for four Members, elected people, on the Executive Committee.

I was rather interested in the position that the Honourable Member took, from the Honourable Minister of Local Government, regarding a political decision. You know, this is almost suicide for any Legislature to start drawing boundaries of absolutely and barefaced standing up and saying we are going to gerrymander constituencies. I couldn't agree with this; not that I'm not prepared to stand up and say I'm going to chop it up and do it, but I don't think that this is the type of political decision that should be made in this House. It's really — the political decision is, how many constituencies do we have, and it is our responsibility to give this instruction to the Commission, not let the Commission decide this very, very important basic political question. So I

couldn't agree with that amendment.

The Commission, and if you look at the Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance, I think the Commission could be applied and accommodate all of the wishes that have been expressed in this House this morning in the debate. Section 15 gives a great deal of scope and gives some very well-founded terms of reference for the operation of the Commission, where they're taking geographic location, they're taking special community, or diversity of interest of the inhabitants, and they're taking into consideration the means of communication between the various parts of the Territory. That in itself, would be fairly broad and yet give the Commission a message on how the constituencies in the Territory should be allotted.

I do have some problem with section 13 and that is the balance between representation from the Municipality of Whitehorse and the representation from the other areas in Yukon. I would think that that would be one of the most important, or maybe one of the most thorny political decisions that may have to be made because in the past, before this last distribution, the — Whitehorse had the — were very, very close to having the control. Now, this last time, the original report of the Commission did make it half and half. If you remember, there was strong representation made from some of the communities and one of them was that very vocal community of Haines Junction who had — who the Commission then changed their report and made it into a seven/five split.

We may have our say here today but don't forget when that Commission goes around and rolls into gear and has their hearings, there are going to be a lot of other people in the Territory that are going to have their say and that maybe is what we want.

There has been reference made today on quite a number of occasions where opportunity has to be given to minority groups to have representation. I couldn't agree more, however, I don't look particularly from a racial concept. I think of the minority groups from small isolated communities, small communities and some of them that are not so small, that are isolated. These people have a minority position in the political clout in this Territory and I think of communities such as Beaver Creek. What political clout do they get? What recognition do they get, other than my standing up in this House —

Mr. Lengerke: That is a lot.

Mrs. Watson: I think of small communities such as Burwash, of Ross River and to me, those communities, be they primarily of native inhabitants or not, are actually the minority people that we are talking about. We want to see those people represented and have a very clear voice in this Assembly.

There is a danger too when we speak in this regard, that we come to this House representing areas only. We should do that but we also — people should also come to this House thinking that they are going to try to do something for all of the Yukon. Too often, I think that we are inclined to operate almost as a municipal type of structure.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have any problem in supporting the Motion and supporting the concept of the sixteen constituencies, and the concept of using the

Electoral Boundaries Commission and the concept of using the terms of reference that are now embodied in the Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Motion although the number wasn't the one I came up with in Committee. I think sixteen is a very good compromise and I think we should support the idea of sixteen constituencies.

I certainly don't support any suggestion that the Boundaries should be established by this Council, this Assembly. I think that the Boundaries Commission is a means of doing this and the Ordinance was set up providing for this Commission for this very purpose and we should take advantage of it.

I don't think that this Assembly should make any recommendations to the Boundaries Commission as to how they should do their work.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my comments will be brief. I am particularly pleased that Members saw fit to wait to bring this type of resolution forward until we had the report from the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development because, as we all know, any Member could have brought this type of resolution forward for the expansion of the Legislative Assembly but I think it is essential that it is discussed in a package deal and we have brought forward some other recommendations and others will be discussed. I think this is certainly an essential route to go.

I could have supported a Motion for fourteen without going the Electoral Boundaries route probably from this standpoint alone, that I took a look at how the public of Yukon reacted to the last Electoral Boundaries Commission and not too many people had input, not because they couldn't have the input but maybe it was because they were not interested, but possibly with the situation in Yukon the way it is today that we will see a pretty strong representation by the general public at the Electoral Boundaries Commission's hearings and we'll really get some feedback.

The other reason, of course, and it was brought up, was the cost but you know really, the cost, it costs money to make the Yukon and Canada democratic and I think that cost is really money well spent, so I don't think we have to worry there.

I think that if we do nothing else, as Members of this Assembly, we do nothing else before our term of office is up, but to set the stage for a stronger constitutional reform for a stronger assembly, for an expanded Executive Committee, because if we don't go the enlargement of the Assembly today, the expansion of the Executive Committee is one that is questionable as well. I'm reacting now to the man on the street who has said, "we want certain portfolios, we want certain responsibilities under an elected Member." I think that is what we are reacting today because they want to see a better display of their work done in this House and we all well know that possibility with some of the other responsibilities under an elected Member that this will be possible.

Mr. Chairman, I will have no problem supporting the Motion. I like it being specific, I like it saying that we are going to go sixteen constituencies. I think this is certainly a strong resolution and as I say, if we do nothing else but provide a very basic foundation, I think we've done well.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, it's been most gratifying to me to see the work of Standing Committees during this Session producing fruit from their labours. I think that the appointment of these Committees has probably been the greatest step forward made in this Legislative Assembly for many years. They are now taking on as a working group in this House, much of the preparation and study which had been the responsibility of single individuals up until now. As a single individual who has been sitting upstairs trying to cope with portfolio duties while this Committee has been working away down below in the Committee Room, I appreciate the efforts being put into this.

I do have a few questions and I don't want to wish to prolong debate, but this Motion to me gives no direction to a Commission which they ask to have established, the direction is, as far as I know, still a policy paper which this government approved some time ago, Mr. Chairman. I know there's an Ordinance, but there also have to be terms of reference given to the Committee which carries out the work.

The last I heard on this subject, Mr. Chairman, we had a policy paper called "Meaningful Government for all Yukoners" which in effect drafted this kind of an attempt to increase the size of this Legislative Assembly and to ensure participation by Native people in forthcoming elections. I have no problem with that paper. I had no problem in recommending to the Minister of Indian Affairs on two previous occasions that we take these steps and that we do so as soon as possible, and I'm aware of the requirements and the time restrictions to get this kind of action going at this Session in order to meet the requirements for the '78 election.

I have no problem with 16 Members in this House because from the representations made to me from various areas of the Yukon, there have been two or three places which stated firmly they required a voice of their own and weren't getting it. Also they tried to tell me that they've never been consulted the last time the Electoral Boundaries Commission went around, so we really have to beat the drum and make people get out and say what they want to this Commission when it does travel.

I think it's going to be a pretty interesting summer, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to have a touring Boundaries Commission and touring Pipeliners, and touring -- the people in these small areas are going to have a nightly show provided for them. It should be very interesting.

Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with this Resolution Number 20, and I hope that we can move very swiftly to accomplish what it is asking.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Whyard. I think this debate is going to go on a little while, so I will recess until 1:30.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I call this Committee to order. We left off debating Resolution Number 20. Is there any further debate?
Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased with the debate this morning. It's quite remarkable that all Members would take part in the debate and it ran so smoothly without any acrimony involved.

Mr. Chairman: It usually does when I am in the Chair.

Mr. Hibberd: The reason this came forth as a Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is that the Committee did not feel that they had the right to make such a decision on behalf of the Members of the Assembly, but I do think there is a time when this Assembly really must make a decision. They can't, I think to procrastinate or leave it to an Electoral Boundaries Commission to make the decision regarding numbers of members of the Assembly is going a little too far. I think it's our responsibility to make that decision. I think it's a cop-out if we don't make that decision.

Members have mentioned the question of cost as far as increasing the number of members. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that I'm sure members of the Yukon citizenry are much more concerned about getting good government than they are about the cost of it, and I think that the marginal increase in cost, if it were to result in a more efficient and smooth running government, would be well worth it as far as they are concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate?
Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I am completely undaunted and unmoved by the debate so far. I would like to move, if I can find a seconder anywhere in the place, that Motion Number 20 be amended so that all words after "boundaries" in paragraph number 2, be deleted.

That is raw power for you.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. For your information, Mr. McKinnon, we don't need a seconder.

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

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think most of the points that I had wished to raise have been, in one way or another, covered by speakers who spoke them before at this point.

I was interested in the comments made by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North when he proposed the amendment, which is now before Committee, Mr. Chairman, or when he suggested that he would be proposing this amendment, where he stated that he'd like to be able to, a second time, make his pitch, if he lost in the House, to the Boundaries Commission. I find that somewhat odd, coming from the Honourable Member, because it is here within these Chambers where these decisions, political decisions are made and not by any

Boundaries Commission or any external group out of this House and certainly we must define the numbers and make those political decisions here.

I would hope that no one votes for this amendment. My other points, as I say, have pretty well been covered and I would like to see the question posed very shortly.

Mr. Chairman: I'll read out the amendment.

It is moved by Mr. McKinnon that Motion 20 be amended so that all words after "boundaries" in paragraph 2 be deleted.

It would then read, "Whereas the Standing Committee on the Constitutional Development has recommended to this House that the Assembly be expanded for the 1978 Election:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommends that the government bring forward during the Spring sitting amendments to the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission Ordinance to allow a Commission to make recommendations to this Assembly on the electoral boundaries."

All those agreed in the amendment?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Disagreed?

Some Members: Disagreed.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment is defeated.
The motion -

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I'm not discouraged by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre's defeat of his amendment, but I would like to propose also an amendment as I stated before.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, okay. I'll allow it.

Mr. Berger: And again it's for the same reason as I stated before. I think the decision has to be made in this House this coming Fall.

It says in the Motion, "recommendations", it is not singular, it is plural, so in other words, we give the Boundaries Commission an alternative route to follow if they could come back, quite possibly, with two or three recommendations.

Don't tie their hands and I think we do tie their hands with specifically saying, "sixteen members" and I would like to leave the route open to give them an alternative between sixteen and twenty members. I would propose an amendment, Mr. Chairman, to delete "sixteen constituencies" and replace it with "a minimum of sixteen but no more than twenty constituencies."

Mr. Chairman: Could we have a copy of the amendment, Mr. Berger? I hope it is in English.
Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Is this amendment not in the same spirit as the amendment that we just voted on and there-

fore out of order?

Mr. Chairman: It is the privilege of any Member to put forward amendments, Mr. Hibberd.

Mr. Hibberd: Point of order, Mr. Chairman —

Mr. Chairman: By all means.

Mr. Hibberd: If the Committee has already voted on a question, it cannot be raised by another amendment that is to the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hibberd, it is not the same question.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Agreed. Question.

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Berger that after the word, "accommodate", "a minimum of sixteen but no more than twenty constituencies." Is this correct, Mr. Berger? That is the proposed amendment so the Motion would read:

"That whereas the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development has recommended to this House that the Assembly be expanded for the 1978 election:

Be it resolved that this House recommends that the government bring forward during this Spring sitting, amendments to the Electoral Boundaries Commission Ordinance, to allow a Commission to make recommendations to this Assembly on electoral boundaries to accommodate a minimum of sixteen but no more than twenty constituencies."

All those agreed with the amendment?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: All those disagreed?

The amendment is defeated.

I'll read out the main Motion unless there are some more amendments.

Yes, Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: I would recommend to you a recount of the votes, because there was one Honourable Member that had his hands up on my amendment. He also had his hands up on disagreement.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, I'll call for another vote, if that is the concurrence of Committee?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Are we voting on the amendment now? For or against, right now?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on the amendment. Does the Committee concur that I call another vote?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. All those in favour of the

amendment as proposed by Mr. Berger?

All those disagreed?

The amendment is defeated, Mr. Berger.

I'll read the main motion.

It was moved by Mr. Hibberd, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

That whereas the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development has recommended to this House that the Assembly be expanded for the 1978 Election;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommends that the government bring forward during this Spring Sitting amendments to the Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance to allow a Commission to make recommendations to this Assembly on the electoral boundaries to accommodate 16 constituencies.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Disagreed?

The Motion is unanimously carried.

(Motion carried)

Shall we report the Motion?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: The next Resolution is Resolution Number 21. I'll read the Resolution before a debate.

It was moved by Mr. Hibberd, seconded by Ms. Millard:

That whereas the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development has recommended an increase in elected representation on the Executive Committee;

And whereas the Constitutional Development Committee recognizes the need for native involvement in the administration of the Yukon Government;

BE IT RESOLVED that a Member of this Assembly be appointed to the Executive Committee, who has a primary responsibility to provide that all Native people of Yukon participate as residents of Yukon with equal rights, privileges and obligations.

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this motion is, to a certain extent, stems from the same grounds that the previous motion did. It was felt by the Committee that this was, again, was a very important consideration and that all Members of the Assembly should have the opportunity to voice their opinion on it.

Now, the consideration that we've recognized for some time, Mr. Chairman, is that we do need to have improved liaison with the minority native population in the Yukon. The purpose of this motion is to provide a specific avenue where this liaison may take place. In addition, Mr. Chairman, it would assure that native realization of full benefit in all government programs and it would ensure native input into these programs.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it would not be the only responsibility of such an elected Member of the Executive Committee, the load on our elected Members now, I understand, is overwhelming them. He would be

in a position to take over other areas of responsibility that are also politically sensitive, such as Tourism.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, it's merely a step in the progression of fully responsible cabinet type government for the Yukon.

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

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to vote for the Motion because, as I think everyone well knows, as long as we stay here and as long as I'm here I will never vote for a motion, as I said before, to bring one more Member to the Executive Committee. The day I stand here in the House and I see seven out of twelve or nine out of sixteen, or whatever, as part of this government, I'll be quite happy, but until that time, no, we'll take no tidbits from anybody or ask for any tidbits because that's exactly what we'll get, what we got before.

"And that whereas the Constitutional Development Committee recognizes the need for native involvement in the administration of the Yukon Government" -- I've got to agree that we need that involvement, but I'm not prepared to vote for something that just gives anything to anyone and I don't think they would want it anyway, under those circumstances. When the time comes that they can take their position here that says that they got here by election or by something, okay, but when we're saying here, almost, I would say, we're going to more or less somehow either have somebody to take care of the native problem or something, which there isn't going to happen or have a native in that position. One or the other, I don't know exactly what we are saying, but I don't go for either one of them.

So I won't belabour the subject at all. I will be definitely just vote against it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the mover of this motion could possibly explain to me and maybe to some others of the Members of this House, what he really meant by this particular motion, especially the part in the sentence that says, "who has the primary responsibility to provide that all native people of Yukon participate". I've got a suspicion that I know, in my own mind, that that's how the Ministry of Indian Affairs was started in the first place. Is it the intention of this House to create a Ministry of Indian Affairs within the Yukon?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hibberd, do you wish to comment?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, first of all, regarding Mr. Fleming's remarks, this has nothing to do with putting a native on the Executive Committee. This is merely having a representative of this Assembly placed on the Executive Committee from this Assembly who has that as his responsibility. It has nothing to do with ensuring a native representative on the Executive Committee whatsoever.

As far as Mr. Berger's remarks are concerned, it may well be that it will evolve to a certain extent into a department that has as that responsibility liaison with the native population, but that is not the intent at this

time, Mr. Berger. The intention is that the avenues are developed so that there is communication between the native population in the Territory and the Territorial Government so that the programs that involve all people in the Yukon can involve that minority group as well, both from the point of view of having their input into the formulation of those policies and from the point of view that they are able to take full advantage of policies that are available to them.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the intent behind the Motion, I know what the intent behind that Motion really is, but I still have problems by creating such a department, the acceptance of such a department, because I think at the present time, and I think that the Ex-Com Members of this House would have to say that that's exactly what they are doing right now, is trying to get the participation of native people in all their programs. If they don't get this, I can't see how we could achieve it by creating another Ex-Com position just strictly to work there with Indian participation because, if they don't want to participate in Territorial Government programs, I can't see how we can force anybody into participation irregardless of what you call this particular department. I have problems with this particular Motion, especially the way it is worded, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can see the problems and concerns perhaps as the Honourable Member from Klondike has, but perhaps one has to take this in a greater context. I mean, the Resolution states that a primary responsibility with those things that involve native peoples, perhaps special problems that native peoples find that they have in terms of administration of Government in the Yukon Territory at the territorial level. In addition to this, I mean this could well direct us, direct pipeline for native peoples into government, input, to bring their special problems to that level of government. I see it as nothing but a benefit.

I think also, in total context, you've got to consider that the Committee recommended also that we turn over the portfolios of Land, Game, Parks and Tourism, Economic Planning, Transportation, and this type of thing, be also looked after by this one person. I think we must remember that we've got a big empty office sitting up there right now, and one Member gone off the Executive Committee who used to share at least in part the workload, and a heavy workload, that these Ministers and non-Ministers alike do up on that top floor on a day-to-day basis.

Certainly, it's the Minister's prerogative. He can simply say, well, to heck with those people in the Yukon, we'll just get a civil servant and we'll plunk one right in here from Ottawa and that'll settle that. There'll be no more talk about adding another Member to the Executive Committee.

I think that, you know, I was looking through some of my old constitutional files, and I found out that, on December 3rd Jean Chretien, the then Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and I quote from the last part of his address to the Constitutional Com-

mittee at that time, I should say the joint Senate and House of Commons Committee on the Constitution, suggested:

"I suggest to you that the wisest course would be to permit the Territorial Government to develop its potential in the context of the new Executive Committee which has the responsibility for those matters which lie within its legislative framework. I cannot predict at this time what form that future constitutional development will take; however, my approach to this question is a flexible and experimental one, allowing for further adjustments as experience is gained and as the population and economy of the Yukon continues to expand.

Now that was in 1970. Certainly, we've not only gained the experience, but we've shown through the work of our three Ministers that our involvement at the Executive—what is now known as the Executive Committee stage of government, Mr. Chairman, their performance has been excellent. We've shown that we are capable, we've shown that we are far more capable, I think, than some of the other Members on the Executive Committee, because we are more sensitive to the needs and desires and aspirations of the people of Yukon. That includes Native people, and I think that Native people are fully represented here to my opinion, because we all represent all people, Native or non-Native alike.

I think the Native thing is very, very important, because I think that one Minister out of this department, and you may call the portfolio that of Renewable Resources or Human Resources or whatever you want to call it by a rose, by any other name, still, it would be an important move, and I think one that I would think that the Native Community would applaud. I think that I certainly would applaud the move and we could take some of the load off our Ministers, and at the same time, place some of the portfolios now in the hands of appointed Members perhaps into the hands of elected Members.

I certainly support the Motion, I really think that the time has come when we must make this move, and I will be supporting it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Watson Lake confused me some more because, does he want to say that because I am of a different race or creed, a different country, and I came to this country, I've been born in this country in a different colour, that I cannot go to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare, or the Honourable Minister of Local Government, or the Minister of Education, and explain my problems to him irregardless of these special problems, or whatever problems I have, and he wouldn't listen to me? Do I need a special Minister for this position?

This is the problem I have. I would like to ask another question, possibly of the Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Development. It's my understanding that the Committee met with the Native people, and possibly the Committee could explain to this House what the Native people's answer was to some of the questions, if they were raised, to this concern?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I -- in my remarks to the Motion, I will speak later on, and I would have included those, but seeing the Honourable Member from Klondike has asked a specific question I'm prepared to state that -- as you know, as Members know, the Standing Committee did meet with the Native representation, members of CYI. We did discuss the question of Constitutional Development. We did raise, I as Chairman raised the question, and I was somewhat reprimanded by the Members of the Committee because it had not been totally discussed, the question of some sort of a Native -- a liaison person on the Executive Committee. The reaction from the Native people was neither yes or no to that one. They said that they would certainly think about it, and they would some time (and I don't know when) provide us with some kind of answer to that particular question.

They were not prepared at that time to give us a definite yes or no. They said if we moved in that direction I guess that would be our choice, and I think that's the way it was left. Other Members were there; if I am reporting that wrong, certainly any Member is free to make a comment.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Honourable Member on my right cleared up the Native involvement problem; however, I still have the same problem as the Member from Klondike has. I don't know, I'm not so sure that the Native people will be happy with this. They may go around and say again now they're trying to do something for us and we're not going to do it ourselves. I'm not too agreeable with it; however, I would have taken this into light -- in a different light if I had seen something here to the effect that this would be when the Council has enlarged. I may take quite a different view on it, but as it stands here, if the Members are willing to -- the Members that are putting this forth, are willing to add something to it, it would be at that time, I would be quite prepared to vote for it then, although I have my doubts in some ways with some of it, but I would vote for it but not as it stands here.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I hate to be the only one standing up criticizing this thing here, because I do have serious problems with it. Again, I would like to point out, or maybe the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West could wake up to the fact that -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the thing is, we talk about equality of people, equality without race differentiation and everything like this, but we are creating the problem here with a Motion like this.

We're not saying in this Motion that -- the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre does not say in this Motion that this fourth elected Ex-Com person, whoever he may be, also is going to have the responsibility of Game, Tourism, and all sorts of other things. All that we are saying in here is that the specific responsibility is going to be Native involvement and participation.

And this is what really bothers me with this particular motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Klondike has been answering a number of my concerns with his questions. My first problem with this resolution is the word "equal" in the last line, because, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have that now and I think that the intent of this Resolution would be to provide not equal but special rights and privileges because, surely, Mr. Chairman, none of us can sit here and admit that we are not providing equal rights to all residents of Yukon as their representatives here. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to do that.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to appoint an additional Member to Executive Committee with the responsibility outlined in this Resolution, you are going to underline the fact that the people who are already on the Executive Committee are obviously not representing the equal rights of certain residents of the Yukon and I cannot accept that statement in my own Department.

Mr. Chairman, let's take it a step further. If you have another Member on Executive Committee who has this particular responsibility to provide the rights and privileges of native people, you are going to, in effect, condone the establishment of a separate Department of Health, Department of Education, Mr. Chairman; I mean this in all sincerity.

Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Health for this Government, I have been involved for over a year now in discussions regarding, for example, the transfer of the delivery of health services from the Federal Government to this Government and the only reason we have not proceeded with the transfer is that there is consideration being given to the impact of that transfer on the native people. We are holding up discussions and decisions for months, awaiting their co-operation and acceptance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you have another Member on Executive Committee, what part would they play in that kind of a situation? I fail to see how on earth a person charged with those responsibilities could possibly work with Members who already have those responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, are you going to say that there should be separate departments for legal aid for native people, extending the programs we have for them in courts now? I can understand the purpose of the motion and I have no quarrel at all with that.

As you all know, Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Executive Committee said these same things to the Minister in January. We said if you feel it is important to have a native person involved in the Government of the Yukon now who is acting as an ombudsman for native interests throughout the Government, there is nothing to stop you from doing so today or tomorrow or next week. You have all the authority in the world to fill a position on that Executive Committee with a qualified native person and we would have absolutely no objection to your doing so.

Mr. Chairman, that is on the record. There is nothing secret about that and the public well knows that this was the stand the Executive Committee Members took in January, but to say that there must be someone else from this Assembly named to the Executive Committee to provide equal rights, Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept.

To echo the words of the Honourable Member from

Klondike, how that person is going to ensure that all native people of the Yukon participate is an impossible question to answer. The native people have that opportunity to participate now. They did participate as candidates in the last Territorial election. I cannot, I cannot support this motion as it is phrased at present, Mr. Chairman; I cannot accept that, as residents of the Yukon, we are not giving them equal rights in our consideration of government policy in that Executive Committee.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the opinion of this House, then we should resign.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that if the Members on the Executive Committee can't read any better than that, they should resign.

I would like to refer them to the phrasing of the Motion. It states "who has as a primary responsibility to provide that all Native people..." "A responsibility..." the inference is that they are not taking over complete responsibility. The inference in the province would be that if you have a Minister of Welfare, nobody else on their cabinet could be interested in the welfare of the people of the province. That is ridiculous...has "a responsibility" to ensure that natives have input into programs, that their voice is heard.

I am also amazed, Mr. Chairman, that I was under the definite understanding that the Members of this Executive Committee had gone to considerable effort to try and get a fourth elected Member to help them out in their trying duties and here is an opportunity to get one and they are turning it down because they have got a little bit of paranoia going for them. I am very disappointed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I will bow to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, the Member from Klondike said it earlier and he probably said it better than I can and he has not been accused of paranoia.

His interpretation of this resolution is that you are establishing a separate seat for Indian Affairs in this government. Mr. Chairman, how else can I interpret it? When you want someone on Executive Committee to ensure—Please, Mr. Chairman, read the wording, "Equal rights". Mr. Chairman, if that said the special rights of the Native people, that is an entirely different resolution. I would have no problems with one that said "special rights", none at all. It is the equal rights that I cannot swallow, Mr. Chairman, because if we are not providing equal rights for all residents of the Yukon, we are not doing what we were elected to do.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you know, I think that we have always, certainly as long as I have been in the Territory and certainly as long as I have been in this Legislature, if you are going to talk about

equal rights, equal rights don't exist between our native people and our non-native people at this point in time be they working in favour of the native or non-native person. There are people in this Territory who pay taxes, who have to and there are people who don't. There are all sorts of things you could say were really, at this point in time, unequal but I don't think really, at this point unequal but I don't think that is our point right now.

I think if you go on to page five of the report, Mr. Chairman, of the Constitutional Committee, you will find, and concurred in by this House by unanimity, there was dissenting voice, you will find this whole thing explained and already agreed to, in fact, by every Member of this House. I would refer everybody to page five of the Item two of the report of the Constitutional Committee which you have concurred in.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I think that towards the end of a session that perhaps meanings get misinterpreted and that perhaps things are said in the heat of debate that are not actually what people meant to say.

I understand the Motion, unless I am absolutely wrong on the intent of the Motion, I would like to give my understanding as I see the Motion before us today. We all, in government, whether we are responsible for the portfolio of Local Government, Education, Health and Welfare, are primarily involved and busy with the normal problems that face any Minister in the course of his day's duties.

I would like to think, and perhaps I am not, but I would like to think that I am as sensitive as anyone in the government of Yukon to needs of a minority, a certain minority of our population, the Indian people, who no matter which way you want to slice it, have not had the advantages, or perhaps you wouldn't even call them advantages, some people, of sharing in the industrial and economic expansion that has happened in the Yukon in the last twenty years. You don't have to be blind to see that as a fact of life, it hits you everyday.

I think that sometimes, all of us who are in portfolio responsibilities, get so involved in meeting the day to day problems of the people who are placing demands upon us and the lobby groups, but perhaps we are not as sensitive as we should be to what the results of our decisions are going to be on those people who are not at this time fully involved in government programs and government policies. I would think it would be a benefit to me and to all people who are presently elected Members, and appointed Members on the Executive Committee, to have a Member whose one responsibility, one of their responsibilities, would make sure that we don't get totally concerned with dealing with everyday problems, that we don't keep that extremely sensitive ear to a very significant minority of the Yukon people who are not, up to this point in time, fully involved in the YTG as they should be.

I find nothing wrong if there were an elected Member in charge of the Game Department, that was busily and normally doing the day to day functions of that Department, that someone came up and tapped him on the shoulder and said, you know, I really believe that Game is an extremely sensitive area to the Indian people of the Yukon, and fishing and trapping. You know, I see this

policy which I had heard of in Executive Committee that you are proposing, there is nothing wrong with that policy. But let's go a little further, how will that policy affect the Indian people of the Yukon? Wouldn't it be better if we went over and discussed that policy with them before if comes out that it's another policy that was put in for the majority of the people without consideration of how it was going to affect a significant minority of the people who have a vested interest, which every way you slice it, in hunting, fishing and trapping in the Yukon? And what's wrong with that? Nothing as far as I'm concerned.

In Local Government, if I'm busy with Sewer and Water systems and someone says, you know, I think that we can find some accommodation in the Local Government system. I've been talking to the Indian people and they say, you know, that they'd like to become part of the government system, but they want certain, for a time being, certain more considerations so that people from the Village are considered into the government structure. You know? It's a good idea, you know, let's go over and discuss it. Thanks for reminding me, I've been busy on other matters, looking after the Teslin Sewer and Water system at the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua's request. You know, maybe I haven't been as receptive and sensitive to those situations.

We know that happens in Education and we know how busy, at this time of the year, with Department re-organization and with teachers' comings and goings and problems all the way along the line, you know, that perhaps the Minister of Education, before introducing a policy or before getting into some other area or another, you know. Somebody could say, I think that this will have this effect and we can counter it if we do this first, you know.

How we got into the problems that we're getting into on this debate on the resolution, could be because of the wording, because I think everybody is trying to say the same thing. I would try to throw it out but with the success that I've been having on resolutions today, maybe I suggest that somebody else should try an amendment, something to the effect in the last paragraph, that the words after "that" be eliminated so that Paragraph Three would read something like, "Be it resolved that a Member of this Assembly be appointed to the Executive Committee who has a primary responsibility to provide that the native people of Yukon may participate more fully as residents of Yukon in all government programs and activities." That, to me, would be the—I would think anyway, the way around the wording to the motion, which seems to be creating the problem, not the intent of the motion, because, Mr. Chairman, if we sit here and fail to recognize that the economic boom that has hit the Yukon in the last twenty years, and it has, and we're living well and we've probably got one of the best disposable incomes in the country bar none, of anywhere in the country and we live as well if not better as anybody in the country, and that same type of living and standard of living has not been accorded at this point in time because of all kinds of reasons.

I don't want to get into the sociological and psychological attributes that may have caused it, but Indian people have not benefited, to this point in time, in those benefits that have accrued to the majority of the popula-

tion. If we're not serious in government about attempting to cure that type of problem, then as far as I'm concerned, we are just burying our heads in the sand and are not on top of one of the most sensitive and one of the real problems that the Yukon has to face at this time. If we can do it by Resolution Number 21, which I think we can, and still accomplish what we want, a little relief for the Members who are presently elected Members on the Executive Committee, and more of the Territorial programs under the hands of Territorial elected Ministers such as in Game and Tourism, then I think we're all ahead.

Isn't that what we agreed on in the principle of the motion Number 21? I think with a few wording changes we could probably have pretty close to unanimous support of this House for this Resolution, which I happen to feel is an extremely important resolution, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre sort of touched on the crux of the matter I think. I think this is actually what I was trying to get at in the first place.

I think there is something the Member from Whitehorse North Centre forgot to mention is that the responsibility in the past over Native people has always been, I believe it still is, of the Federal Government, not the Territorial Government. At least it's what we were told in the House in the past two or three years, whose responsibility is it over Native people in this territory?

This is why I have such a problem, what responsibility, besides a moral responsibility, and I'm not quarrelling with this, I know it exists. I think I was recorded often enough to say that, that we do have a moral responsibility over minority groups in this Territory, but I think what this Motion does not say is, what responsibility the Territorial Government has now over the native people in programming them in to different things. Do we duplicate services now? I don't hear the Federal Government abandon their Ministry of Indian Affairs.

I still have to say that the primary—it says right here that the prime responsibility is going to be Indian Affairs unless—put it bluntly, this is what it's going to be. There's lots of problems amongst Indian people in the Territory right now. I'm aware of it everyday, more so than maybe the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre who sits there and shakes his head, because he doesn't agree with me. I agree with this Motion in principle, but why can't you come out and say what you want to say with it? That we want a fourth elected Member sitting in Ex-Com instead of going around the back door.

The Honourable Member from Ogilvie has been known as trying for the Indian rights and the Indian people and then comes out seconding a Motion like this, because all that it does, it goes in through the back door.

Let's be open with the whole thing. Don't use Indian people to get a fourth elected Member in here, because we want somebody to take over Game and Tourism. This is exactly, as far as I am concerned is what this Motion does, it uses the Native people. We have been using them for years and here we go ahead again, using them again.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree more with the Honourable Member from Klondike. I've sat back here and listened to the arguments and the wording is, it says exactly what the Minister of Health said, and the implications are exactly there. The implications that she's used and the implications that the Honourable Member from Klondike has said, and I could also agree with the Motion if it said what it wanted to. We're using, again, in order to try and get a fourth Executive Committee Members, and we're using it because Mr. Allmand said we should.

Mr. Chairman, I would sooner drop in my place here at this table than use something like this to please that Minister. Mr. Chairman, unless that Motion is amended, and not try to use a cheap political maneuver, I can't support it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I've been sitting back, listening to the debate with a great deal of interest. I think the Honourable Member from Watson Lake said it very well when he said that let's kid ourselves, the people of the Yukon are not equal. There are people with more right than others and I think it's very common—the public is fully aware of this discrepancy in our system, and it's unfortunate that we do have it, because I think it's to the detriment, in the final analysis, to the Native people of Yukon.

I do think, Mr. Chairman, that there is going to have to be some work done by someone, whether it's elected or otherwise, to define exactly what is the responsibility of the Government of Yukon in relation to Native people. We have the Federal Government who is supposedly responsible in the area of Education. We have taken over some of the responsibility and we're the ones that get blamed for it, and in the final analysis, the native people are right. The Federal Government is supposed to be responsible for it, and it's got to be spelled out, just what is the responsibility of this Government as it relates to the responsibility of the Federal Government.

I think at the same time, Mr. Chairman, that we're, somebody is going to have to clearly define the, as I said earlier, the rights and privileges of a minority group of people so that we, as a government, know where we stand, the native people know where they stand, and the Federal Government knows where they stand. I think the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua has raised that point several times during this Session and even prior to this Session in trying to figure out just who is responsible for what. It's a gray area, Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody really knows who is actually responsible.

I think the other point, Mr. Chairman, just who is going to pick up the financial responsibility that accompanies these special privileges and rights because somebody's going to have to pick it up, Mr. Chairman. I know that the Territorial taxpayer feels he's paying enough and I don't think that this House is prepared to go back to the taxpayer to get more money for various programs no matter what they are, because they're having a tough time meeting their bills. I think we, I think we're fully aware of that.

As I mentioned earlier this morning, we're, we are going to reap the repercussions of the increase in electrical rates this coming year. This year we've had a very good winter and nobody's really noticed it, but next year people are going to notice it and it's going to have a drastic effect on a monthly budget of the individual or the single family dwelling which an individual owns in relation to the operation and maintenance costs and whether or not he'll be able to bear those costs remains to be seen.

I don't know, Mr. Chairman, I do know that we need another member on the Executive Committee. I feel that it should be an elected member. I don't think that we want another person from Ottawa coming in and taking a year to possibly learn the ropes and then a year later leaving once again. Where they stay in subsidized housing, they have a car that is provided for them and to all intents and purposes won't have to live for any length of time with the decisions that will be effecting Yukoners for many years to come. I think it's imperative that we get a fourth elected member on the Executive Committee in order for us to help cope with the daily jobs, the daily work that we have every day.

For an example, my particular Department, I temporarily took over the position of Housing. I personally don't think that I myself, am doing a good job in that particular area because I don't have the time to devote to it. I think the Honourable Member from Pelly said it very well during the Budget debates. The whole area of Housing should be looked at, but I just don't have the time, Mr. Chairman. I know my colleagues, my elected colleagues don't have the time to come back to this House and answer to this House and provide the necessary policies to guide that particular Department in the way that the public wants it guided.

So, I think it's essential that we have a fourth elected member. If people are having problems to the wordings for this particular resolution, I think the people should look at it and be prepared to amend it.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I was happy to hear the amendment being proposed across the floor because I agree with it and I think that this time the Minister may not have any problems getting it passed. I would like to see him go forward with it.

I believe that this is finally a positive and mature response to the native problems that we've been talking about for so many years. I feel very happy about this motion, that finally we are sitting here and recognizing that there are native problems and we are facing up to that fact and we're trying to do something about it.

I certainly dislike the implication that it may be a trade-off with the Minister. If that were the case, I would never be voting for it. When we proposed this motion in the Committee, this part was discussed and there was no way that I was going to go for anything that had, that smelled of anything that was a political trade-off. We had to have recognition of native problems in this Territorial government and this is one way to start.

Mr. Chairman, I haven't been spending my time since we've been discussing this motion, discussing it with native people and I did that deliberately because I feel that as white people sitting here, and that's what we

are, representing native people, it's time we, as white people, showed some recognition of the problems that exist in this Territory with native people. I want to caution the people that may be responsible for carrying out this motion if it is passed, that native people do not want another Indian Affairs. I do not want another Indian Affairs and I would never vote for a motion which established another Indian Affairs. That's the last thing we want here.

We also don't want tokenism. We don't want a nice little advisory committee that's going to put through resolutions that are never acted upon.

That is why it has to be an Executive Committee Member so there is not just tokenism and some kind of fancy little playing around. The Indian people won't stand for that and I won't either.

I should caution the people that are going to act on this motion that native involvement has to start as soon as this motion is passed. It should be in open discussion with them to solve the problems that are being brought forward to this House all the time and to start making some positive steps towards doing something about it. I would say that if the native people say they don't want this Executive Member, fine, then we know. We know what their stand is on it and they probably have good reasons for turning it down if they do, but I think as white people sitting in this House, we have to make a response today, on our own, to the problems that I've spent months and months talking about.

I don't feel we're using native people, I think we're finally showing some responsibility towards them. I'm very happy to vote for this Motion and be part of the Constitutional Committee that proposed it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Resolution provided the amendment suggested by the Member from Whitehorse North Centre is drafted and presented to us. I think perhaps it would be a good time to have a brief recess while that amendment can be drafted.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre, this Chair has not received any amendment to date on what you are suggesting.

Mr. McIntyre: I merely suggested that we adjourn for a brief period so that the Honourable Member could prepare the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I think there are many Members of this Committee that wish to continue the debate. Until that is exhausted, there will be no recess.

Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in response to the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, or the political implications or the games she is talking about, I would suggest to her, why don't we come up with two resolutions and demand a fourth elected Ex-Com Member in charge of Game, Tourism, Information, whatever else you want to think of, and a fifth elected Ex-Com Member in charge, primary responsibility to Indian Affairs to all those things and you will see who is going to get the position, because as the Honourable Member

from Kluane said correct, it's not what this House is talking about, it's the Minister in Ottawa, Allmand, is going to make the decision, he's already made the decision, I'm positive on that.

I think she's not the only one that recognizes the needs amongst the native communities, but as I've said before, the prime responsibility towards native people has always been the federal government and not this House. This is what I am concerned about. Do we take over something which is not our responsibility?

We have a moral obligation, yes, but we are not talking about this here. We're talking about prime responsibilities. I have, like I said before, the federal Minister of Indian Affairs is not abolished yet. He is still in existence. He still dictates to this House what we are supposed to do, and until the time comes that he is abolished, then we can go ahead with this, but not until then.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know how we could be pleasing the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by a Motion such as this. It seems to me that I heard him state quite specifically on a program on just these motions that were before the House, that he wouldn't be optimistic at all about the chances of *ad hoc* constitutional measures that were proposed by the elected Members of the Yukon Legislative Assembly regardless of what they stated if they didn't fit into this beautiful, big, overall Northern policy that we're all going to have input into.

But I'll tell you something else, and the Honourable Member from Klondike is right, dead on, that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, under the Yukon Act, still has the ability of administering the affairs of the government of the Yukon Territory. I'd rather like to think that we were astute enough as politicians to try to cut him off at the pass. If he had any indication of trying to settle this problem in the Yukon through an administrative decision somewhere in Ottawa that would create such a department and that would be an anathema to me, and I think to everybody in the Yukon Territory and all the Members of this Yukon Legislative Assembly.

Let's take the initiative from the political level, even though it puts the poor little fellow into a spot and he has to say, I really don't like looking at these *ad hoc* constitutional measures because maybe they don't just fit into my overall policy of being the administrative hero of the Yukon at the moment and perhaps bringing down some administrative solution to the problem which I have stated many times before the Members of the Legislative Assembly and the people of the Yukon. So, Mr. Chairman, how this fits into the plan of the Honourable Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development seems to me to be absolutely the opposite direction and the proper direction in which this House should be going in trying to seize the initiative of the moment.

I agree with the Honourable Member from Klondike also, that under the terms of the Indian Act the Status Indian people are the responsibility, in certain areas, of the Federal Government of Canada. What we are saying by this Motion, and I think what all Members of this Legislature want to say is, look it, we can prove to you that your future and your aspirations are in a one-

government system with your friends and neighbours and with the people of the Yukon Territory. We can better accommodate those needs and aspirations for you than any Federal Government under a Federal Indian Act can do. This has to be proven and we'd better get started on the ways and means of proving it to the Indian people of the Yukon before they are going to be comfortable with us and before they are going to be willing to accept that their future and their aspirations and their needs and their hopes can be better met by the Government of Yukon than the Government of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move at this time that all the words after "that" in paragraph number 3 of Resolution Number 21 be deleted and the following words substituted: "the native people of Yukon may participate more fully as residents of Yukon in all government programs and activities."

And, Mr. Chairman, with the concurrence of the Chair, I think that that should probably be mimeographed for Members and perhaps we could have a break while that is done.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certainly I'm pleased to hear the amendment put forth. I would have no problem with that at all, but I'd certainly ask all Members to not vote on this Motion, the Motion or the amendment if you're not sincere, if you're not sincere in the involvement of the native people in the support kind of thing that we've got in mind. We're not using the Indian people, that's certainly not my intention and I say don't vote on this thing if that's what you think is going to happen.

I say to you that the responsibility is ours just as much as it is that Minister. It's ours for the native people in Yukon. We're responsible for government in the Yukon. We're responsible for the well-being of people. In the overall and general terms, we're responsible.

How many times have I heard the Member from Kluane tell me when she's had native people come to her and she's acted on their behalf? How many times have I heard the Member from Hootalinqua get up in this House and say that he's done certain things and he's concerned about native people in his riding? How many times, Mr. Chairman? Who's telling who that we're not responsible? What a crock. Think about it. Come on. This isn't a game we're playing and it better not be a trade-off because I don't want to be part of a trade-off. This better be true, down to the last note, that we mean what we say.

You know, the native land claims are going to bring quite a degree of responsibility. They're going to bring lots of activity with respect to native people in Yukon. There's going to be economic development take place and quite a number of things that you've never even thought of before. You've never witnessed it before. There's going to be, there's going to have to be somebody in this government that's going to be tuned to those things and is going to be able to react.

How many times have I got up in this House and it's never been commented at all, where I've suggested another portfolio? You know, I went along with the Department of Resources and what have you and I said, how about the fellow that's responsible for that Department to have some responsibility, a prime respon-

sibility for native people participation?

You know, call it what you want. I remember talking to the Minister of Health and Welfare and she suggested that it may be something like an ombudsman. I don't care what you call it, but it's time we did something like that to show the native people, to show the people of this country that we're not a bunch of red necks and that we do understand the problem and that we will go out on a limb and do something. That's not diluting our strength or anything else. You know, we're not getting weak because we want to go over to talk to the native people. It's time we did.

So, Mr. Chairman, I could carry on here, it gets me a little mad when I hear this. You know, one of these days I'm going to bring a motion in before the end of this Session, and it's coming to a close as I understand, fairly suddenly, and I'd like to have something like a native secretariat or something put forth in this government. I can hear the reaction around the table at that time, but that's where this fellow that I see as the fourth Member, his prime responsibility could well come into play.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'd say, let's take a look at the amendment and I'll have a little more to say about it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: On a point of clarification on the amendment, which "that" are we talking about? The use of "that" in line one of Clause three or the use of "that" in line 3, it's not clear.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: It's line 3, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It's line 3, Mr. Taylor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite sincere about the participating of any race. I don't have to wear a pin in my lapel, or a sign on my back that says I am for such and such race. I don't care what people's colours are or where they come from. I come from another country too, and I have probably a better understanding than a lot of Members in this House what it means to come from another country or be from a different sort of people, and considered differently, because I hadn't spoken the language when I first came over here.

I don't need to be pinned down to one particular item because of some sort of a make-shift identification mark right now. I'm all for natives right now. Tomorrow I am for some other particular purposes. I'm talking about real equality where people do not look at the race, do not look at the creed, do not look at the people what languages they speak. This is the problem right now in Canada, Mr. Chairman, because some Frenchman down in Quebec does not speak English, for years he has been considered as not equal. This is the problem we are facing in this Territory right now, because all of a sudden some do-gooders in this Territory discovered native people.

I didn't need to discover them, Mr. Chairman. I saw them when I came to this country. I worked with them, I slept with them, I ate with them and it doesn't make no

difference to me if that fellow was dirty or clean, if he spoke proper English or spoke his native language. I'm sincere about it, and to me this is not sincere. Nothing to do with sincerity whatsoever, Mr. Chairman. I'm saying it again, we're using the people to achieve one goal, to get a fourth elected Member. If we haven't got guts enough to stand up to that little bald-headed guy in Ottawa, and say we want a fourth elected Member now then we don't have to be sitting here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hibberd?

Mr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, as mover of the original motion, I welcome the amendment that has been put forth for the clarification. It is indeed the original motion. I fully support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, for all Members to concern themselves with the amendment, I will declare a brief recess.

(RECESS)

Mr. Chairman: I call this Committee to order.

We were quietly debating Resolution 21 and there was an amendment put forward by Mr. McKinnon, and I'll read that as follows:

It was moved by Mr. McKinnon that all words after "that" in paragraph three of Resolution 21, is that line three? Okay, to be deleted and the following words be substituted: "...that the native people of the Yukon may participate more fully as residents of Yukon in all government programs and activities."

I'll read the Motion as it would be amended.

THAT whereas the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development has recommended an increase in elected representation on the Executive Committee;

AND whereas the Constitutional Development Committee recognizes the need for native involvement in the administration of the Yukon Government;

BE IT RESOLVED that a Member of this Assembly be appointed to the Executive Committee, who has a primary responsibility to provide that the native people of Yukon may participate more fully as residents of the Yukon in all government programs and activities.

All those in favour of the amendment?

I'm sorry, Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: May I speak on the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, you may, I'm sorry.

Mr. Fleming: I won't have any problem with the amendment because it will be exactly the same as it was before. I don't agree with the concept of the four members, I don't agree with the concept of the amendment. As I said before, I don't know why we always have to bring in native participation and so forth and so on on any motion to have it done.

I resent the remarks made by the Honourable Member from Riverdale and I think I should say that I'm not here to represent the native people and I'm not here to represent the white people only, in one group. I'm here to represent all my constituents and all the people in the Yukon to the best of my ability.

I'll not belabour this subject any further, I will be voting against this amendment also and the motion when it comes forth.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the amendment put forth here, I found the debate very interesting in relation to the native participation within the government. I notice some Members almost apologizing for their ancestry and this kind of thing and I just find that absolutely ridiculous.

The only thing I can say in relation to the motion, Mr. Chairman, in totality, is that as long as the federal government maintains its presence in the Yukon in the responsibility for native people, there will be no incentive for an articulate and well educated native person to participate in this government while the money is flowing in the way it is.

I think, as I said earlier, I think it's a case that this government has to define what its obligations are as compared to what the obligations of the federal government are. I think it is very, very important, it's very much of a gray area at this time, but I think it's important that this government, and if another fourth elected Member was to come on the Executive Committee, that possibly part of his job would be to define just exactly what our obligations are so that possibly we can go from there. Nobody knows what basis we're working from at the present time and I think it's very, very important.

The only further thing I can say in relation to the motion in totality, Mr. Chairman, is I just have to wonder if a young individual who doesn't happen to be of Indian descent from Porter Creek wanted to come into this government to go to work, I'm just wondering if we're prepared to give him work programs and this kind of thing to get him ahead just as well as what we would like to do for the native people.

I just don't think that that opportunity would exist as compared to what we're prepared to do for native people. I have no objections to encouraging native people to participate in this government, and I'll support the motion, but, Mr. Chairman, I just think at the present time, we're just wasting our time.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate on the amendment?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the amendment? Those against?

The amendment is carried.

I will read the motion.

It is moved by Mr. Hibberd, seconded by Ms. Millard:

THAT WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Constitutional Development has recommended an increase in elected representation on the Executive Committee;

AND WHEREAS the Constitutional Development Committee recognizes the need for native involvement in the administration of the Yukon Government;

BE IT RESOLVED that a Member of this Assembly

be appointed to the Executive Committee who has a primary responsibility to provide that the native people of Yukon may participate more fully as residents of the Yukon in all government programs and activities.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I again have to rise and point out to this House the same thing as I said before, that as long as we label people on race, that nothing good can happen from that and by labelling I mean exactly what it says because I went through a period of time where people had to have a label on their clothes. It was the Star of David and in it was written too, and as far as I'm concerned we're going exactly the same direction, labelling people by their race and we shouldn't do this. If we can't accept people just by people, being people, being a human, I think we're going way off in the left field on this, Mr. Chairman. I don't care if the CYI demands special consideration or not, because as far as I'm concerned they're not representing all the people in this country either, in this Territory. They think they do because they're just as bad as the people I just said a few minutes ago, that demanded from certain people to carry that Star of David on their clothes, because they want to differentiate too.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, the reason they want a differentiation is because they have a real good thing going with Ottawa. The more trouble they can create here in this Territory, the more money they're making over there, the longer they assure their position in this Territory, and it's the only reason, Mr. Chairman, that they want to prolong the agony in this country. And we're going exactly the same way, Mr. Chairman, labelling people and I don't want to have any part of that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, briefly, I couldn't agree more with anyone than the Honourable Member from Klondike and I compliment him on the very eloquent way he's expressed it today and I would certainly be supporting the position he is taking.

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared for the question on the motion that is amended?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion is carried.

(Motion carried)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, are you prepared to deal with Resolution Number 2, at this point.

Mr. Lengerke: I am, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Very well. THAT WHEREAS a majority of Yukon citizens and

the Yukon Legislative Assembly reject most recommendations as put forth by the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North;

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has himself been critical of the report;

AND WHEREAS the Minister has indicated other options were open to him to be investigated and in turn acted upon;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development be asked to communicate to the Legislative Assembly forthwith, his findings and decision as to the financial relief for the Northern Canada Power Commission so as to avoid additional consumer electrical rate increases in the immediate future and to ensure the efficient operation of N.C.P.C. by way of "total-debt write off" and the eventual establishment of a Yukon Power Corporation to be controlled, directed and operated by Yukoners with financial guarantees from the Government of Canada;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution be conveyed by telegram to:

- (1) the Prime Minister of Canada;
- (2) the Leader of the Opposition;
- (3) Senator Lucier;
- (4) Erik Nielsen, M.P.;
- (5) Members of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know it's been quite some time since this Resolution was put forward. Since that time, we've had the Chairman of N.C.P.C. appear before us as a witness. You've heard his remarks. I believe some questions were directed to him with respect to the Task Force Report and he had indicated that he was also looking for some further answers.

My position, Mr. Chairman, has not changed since putting the Resolution forward. I would still ask the Assembly to concur that we should get some direct answer from the Minister with respect to his own findings, with respect to his own decision as to how valid the report is, if he was going to take other steps. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there will be a rate increase hearing, I think it takes place somewhere around May the 5th or the 9th, and we are going to - it appears every which way that we're going to be affected by a rate increase, there's no doubt about it. As far as I can see, that increase is warranted on the basis of the way the Act now reads and the way N.C.P.C. has to function, and it can only be by action of the Minister that something can in fact happen to change that.

I don't know if this motion will lodge something in the Minister's memory to say that he better make a decision, but I would hope that Members would concur in sending it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have no problem with the motion, but I would like to propose to you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee here, an amendment. I would rather see it as a typographical error, because there's one other person been left out in the telegrams and that's the leader of the N.D.P. Party. I think there

are sixteen Members sitting in the House of Commons and they maybe have something to say about that too.

Mr. Chairman: Would you prefer this reference be made to the person by name?

Mr. Berger: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: The suggestion you are making, do you prefer a reference by name to Mr. Broadbent?

Mr. Berger: No, Mr. Chairman, I would propose to instead of having the singular in opposition in the "leader" of the opposition, the "leaders" of opposition, named.

Mr. Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for bringing that up.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this motion requests the Minister to do one thing, to avoid additional consumer electrical rate increases in the immediate future in the Yukon Territory and what it is doing is suggesting a means whereby additional consumer rate increases for people who purchase their electricity through Yukon Electric who in fact purchase it from the Northern commercial company, these people, if there was a debt write-off, these customers would then not have the large increases that are being proposed now.

What we're doing by just putting this motion forward, we are not stating, or we are leaving out the people who are buying their electrical power from Yukon Electric and who are generating, who are not getting the benefit of the N.C.P.C. generated power. There are many communities such as this in the Yukon.

There's all of the communities along the North Alaska Highway, there's Watson Lake and Teslin. Now, even if the Minister writes-off the debt for N.C.P.C., these other communities will not receive one benefit from this type of write-off, not one benefit to their electric bill. If the Minister were putting the motion forward, and if the Minister is being asked to provide funding to assist in keeping the electrical rates down in the Yukon Territory, maybe we should be asking for some guarantee that the equalization fund will continue, rather than to do it all in the one pot with the write-off of the debts with N.C.P.C., because we all heard when we were discussing the estimates, that the fund, the equalization fund, is soon to be depleted. The amount that is being added to it every year, is not going to accommodate what's drawn from it every year.

The people in these communities that I have just mentioned really get quite a great deal of assistance through this equalization fund. I would hope that by passing this motion, we do not in fact cut off any opportunity to get a guarantee from the Minister or a guarantee from the government of Canada to help us continue the equalization fund at the rate that we have it now.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Member from

Kluane brings forth a very pertinent point and one that must be dealt with before this House recesses this Session, because she'll recall we did have a discussion with respect to equalization and I think it would be a real opportunity that some Members should bring forth another motion or some direction to this House with respect to the equalization fund, because it is our decision as well as to how that would continue and I would certainly assist the Member from Kluane in bringing such a motion forward. I'm glad that she did highlight that particular problem with respect to this one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, how could we possibly ask for a total debt write-off on this motion and then go and ask for more money for an equalization fund? That just absolutely seems ludicrous.

Mr. Chairman: At this point in time, Mrs. Watson, we're dealing with this Motion.

All those in favour of the Motion?

Against?

Motion is carried.

(Motion carried)

Mr. Chairman: We will go on to Bill Number 13, General Development Agreement Ordinance.

I will commence reading section by section of Bill 13. Clause 1,(1)

(Reads Clause 1.

Mr. Chairman: Clause 2.(1)

(Reads Clause 2.)

Mr. Chairman: Clause 3. (1)

(Reads Clause 3)

Mr. Chairman: I will allow general discussion at this point.

Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it would be foolish of me to stand up here and say that I don't agree with the Bill, I welcome it. I do, I welcome the fact that we can, it looks like on the horizon, we now can enter into some sort of an agreement with the federal government to do some strategic planning and development. As you know, I've stood up in the House many times and suggested that this, one of the things that has to be done before we can answer a lot of very basic questions. It's something that I firmly believe in, that there has to be a basic plan for Yukon's future before other decisions can be made.

This, I think, does allow for that kind of planning, as I said, to be brought forward. I do disagree and I've stood up when we're talking about this earlier this Session, I

disagree to some extent with the way it is to be handled through a socio-economic planning unit that is under the direct, under the directorship of the Commissioner, not that I have no faith in the Commissioner as to its direction, but I feel that anything or anybody that plans for the future of Yukon, anybody should be under the direction of an elected person and where certainly of the--somehow be available and have access to the public or the public should have access to it. It should be answerable through an elected person.

I think that's all that I would say at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, I think there's going to be some pretty fair discussion on it. I do know that this Bill does hold some great potential for Yukon, that there are many, many areas that we can possibly now direct our attention to or could direct our attention to because funding could well be available through the federal government to do so.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate?

Mr. McKinnon.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I approached this G.D.A. with some trepidation and a lot of the same questions as the Honourable Member from Riverdale puts forward.

I don't think that there was really any alternative once the Minister of Indian Affairs announced that they were willing to enter into General Development Agreements in both the Yukon and in the Northwest Territories that there was really little more that one could do than sign the umbrella General Development Agreement. It would seem to me that if you didn't, you would be kind of cutting off your nose to spite your face, on throwing the baby out with the bath water.

I entered into quite a bit of discussion with one of the people in the employ of the Yukon Government who has been under contract with the Department of Local Government on various projects who is used to working under General Development Agreements and used to working with subsidiary agreements. I'm satisfied that the General Development Agreement is the bare skeleton, umbrella, under which one can sign the meat and potato subsidiary agreement. It's up to the Government of Yukon to make sure that the subsidiary agreements, which are signed, are dealing with the type of planning, the types of programs that the people of the Yukon and the Government of Yukon want us to get involved in.

So, the most important thing that we have facing us now, is seeing the first subsidiary agreement which was promised in earlier debate would come before this House before it were signed, sealed and delivered and become a part of the Government of Yukon. I'm satisfied now with the involvement of a person who has been under contract with the Department of Local Government in the planning, in the strategy, in the preparation hopefully of the first subsidiary agreement that will be

ntracted by the Government of Yukon that we will be e to see the type of programs and projects and money c nning that the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale, who is also experienced in working under General Development Agreements and subsidiary agreements can welcome and accept as a benefit to all the people of Yukon.

All I can say is that from what I understand and the limited amount of research that I've been able to come

up with and the amount of knowledge that I have, that the General Development Agreement really is not that important. It's what we can do with the subsidiary agreements which we are now able to formalize that we have the umbrella of the General Development Agreement are the real meat and potatoes of the program. There is no sense in not trying to get this type of arrangement in the Yukon, as the Minister has stated as if it were the Second Coming, this great program of the General Development Agreements being available in Yukon. Because if the subsidiary arrangements don't follow and if the subsidiary agreements do not take into cognizance what we need in the field of socio-economic planning in the Yukon then the General Development Agreement is just window dressing that can sit there in perpetuity and never been enacted upon.

So, I would think that it is up to Government of the Yukon now to seize the initiative and place the subsidiary agreement before this House where people can see that added Federal dollars are coming into the Yukon in much needed areas and that we are actually going to gain from very good benefits out of the General Development Agreement that has been signed.

Mr. Chairman: Any further general debate?
Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I'm opposed to this General Development Agreement Ordinance for several reasons.

I'm opposed to the very basic concept of this type of development of the Territory. The Minister, on several occasions, has stated that there will be no development in the Yukon until the land claims are settled. He has embarked upon a program of certainly showing the mining industry that they can't rely on the ability for any further development with his actions at Baker Lake.

Clause 2, Sub (b), 1(b) "the agreements by the Government of the Territory and the Government of Canada to implement programs for the development of the Territory." There's nothing there at all to show that Canada is going to allow private enterprise to get into the field of development of the Yukon Territory. What we're talking about is programs to development of the Territory, and I wonder what kind of programs are these, Canada Works?

Immediately, when I hear programs, I get goose-pimples because they cost everyone a lot of money and it's very, very difficult to see any advantages to them. Often some of these programs that are initiated give a sense of false economy and eventually the rug is pulled out from under the people and all you have to do is look at the Maritimes where this type of Agreement and where DREE was very actively—there was a lot of money involved in the Maritimes, through DREE. Look at the industry, the programs the businesses that were established under this type of an Agreement. As soon as the government subsidy is gone, the program is gone, the industry is gone, the business is gone and it raises people's hopes and then it dashes them to the ground. So I really don't like this type of concept at all. Also, we say that it's a very harmless, umbrella type of agreement and I spoke on this before. The absolute sweeping powers that are given to the Commissioner of the day in this piece of legislation is absolutely baffling.

"Such other terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Commissioner". That is absolutely tremendous powers. He can commit the Yukon to almost anything. Now people are going to say, yes, we have Members of the Executive Committee in there and this is very true, but who is going to set the priorities? And I cannot support this piece of legislation for two reasons. One, the legislation itself gives unlimited powers to one person, the person who is an appointee of the Minister, with whom the agreement is made.

The second one, I don't like the concept of government programs in the development of the Territory. I like to see a climate for development created for private enterprise. So I certainly will not be supporting this Ordinance.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other general debate?
Mr. Berger.

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's not really debate, I would like to ask a question of somebody. Under this General Development Agreement, will there be any difference made on racial grounds, on any sort of an agreement?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, no, there's nothing in any of these documents that indicates that there will be special provisions on racial grounds of any kind. It does talk about disadvantaged people, recognizing that there are certain groups in the Yukon that may eventually need assistance, but there is nothing in here that commits anybody to any specific project without the approval of this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, in the White Paper on planning economic development of Yukon from Mr. Pearson, there is a mention on Page 2 of, "in keeping with the Territorial Government's stated aim of involving Yukoners more closely in the determination of this social and economic future, we will also seek the views of the people of the Yukon."

I'd like to know, has this been done and if it has been done, how was it done?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Could I have the reference again, please, Mr. Chairman, in the White Paper?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, Page 2 of the White Paper on Planning and Economic Development for Yukon.

Mr. Commissioner: Paragraph, please.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, what section, Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: About four lines from the bottom in the bottom part of the second last paragraph.

Mr. Chairman: Will you run that reference through again for the Commissioner's sake, Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, the sentence begins: "In keeping with the Territorial Governments stated aim of involving Yukoners more closely in the determination of their social and economic future, we will also seek the views of the people of the Yukon."

Mr. Chairman: What was the question again? I'm sorry.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, the question was, if this has been done, how was it been done? I haven't noticed anything.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it certainly hasn't been done at this time. One of the projects which the members of the Economic Research and Planning Office are working on is a dialogue mechanism with various interest groups in Yukon, asking from them, their advice as to how they think a public participation process in Yukon would work and thus provide this decision making body with views of general interest groups in the Yukon. There is no decision made at this time.

The Economic Research and Planning Office now has, I think, eight suggestions from various organizations and interest groups in Yukon. They are putting those together in the form of a report which will go before the Executive Committee for consideration and then will be released and then it's back to these interest groups again for discussion, but there's no plan at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, if I might ask, are they also asking them whether or not they want a General Development Agreement or are they asking the general public what is it they want under the General Development Agreement?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, this project was started outside of a General Development Agreement and it's not to be confused with it although it's hoped that if, indeed, a public participation program or process of some kind evolves, that it could be the funding and the support for such a process could be included under a GDA.

As I see it, in planning for the economic future of the Yukon, there are two very important aspects that must be considered. One is the physical capability of our Territory. The second are the goals and aspirations of the Yukon people, and what we're talking about here in this public participation process is some mechanism whereby the people, the organizations, the lobby groups can feel that their views are being heard and considered by the Legislature in making a final decision as to what route we are going to go, where we're going to go in the future.

Remember, don't confuse the decision-making, the policy-making process which exists here with the public input and the knowledge bank, or data bank, on which a decision is made. A public participation process only provides that a data bank on which a decision can be

made -- the decision always remains here under the terms of the GDA.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to start a question period here, Mr. Chairman, but I believe a similar legislation exists in the Provinces like in the General Development Agreement between the Provinces and the Federal Government, and my question would be: would this Agreement entitle the Territorial Government to participate in all the existing programs the Federal Government has with the Provinces?

The other question this relates to: are there any different programs in the making, especially since the Minister of Northern Affairs announced the policy on Northern Development and would this also be covered with this particular agreement?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question, no, this GDA doesn't commit us, nor entitle us, to any of the programs that are currently in vogue between the Federal Government and any Province. All of the Provinces, I understand, now have GDA's with the Federal Government, but they all read very similar to the GDA proposed here. But under that GDA each Province goes its own route from thereon. The GDA is specifically general enough that the Province can set its own priorities, and then in discussion with the Federal Government they say, well, our priority is this, and discuss it through and write a subsidiary agreement for funding cost-sharing programs to carry out whatever those goals -- whatever the goals and objectives should be.

Secondly, the Minister's Policy Statement is in no way related to the GDA whatsoever at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to pursue just a little further the Member from Ogilvie's question. I asked the Commissioner a question in House the other day with respect to the process that had been decided on as to how we were going to go out and determine the views of the people of Yukon in the planning process. The Commissioner's answer was that he would table that or he'd bring that answer forthwith. I would just like to say that I would hope, and I know that there's only a few days possibly left in the life of this Session, and I would like to see that tabled before the Session recesses, because I think it's very contingent of how we know how that process is going to be, or what that process is, before we enter into -- even consent to entering into a General Development Agreement. I think it's very important.

I also think that, just taking a look at draft number six as it was supplied to us of the General Agreement: it says in general -- under objectives, it says, "in general this agreement supports the national objectives for the North as outlined by the Government of Canada in 1972." I realize this is just a draft, but the Commissioner just said that this has no bearing on the objectives, but I wonder if really we should know what those national

objectives for 1977 are, Mr. Chairman, before we go too far?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, if I'm understanding correctly, what we're hearing is that the ongoing assignments being carried out by the Economic and Research Unit now established in this Government are not dependent upon this Ordinance and that they intend to obtain the views of the public regarding their wishes for future development in the Yukon prior to establishing some kind of policy. Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Commissioner could clarify for us at what stage he visualizes the necessity for implementing an agreement under this Ordinance?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this public participation process, there seems to be a great deal of confusion and intermixing it with the General Development Agreement. They may become entwined somewhere down the line if, indeed, under a subsidiary agreement it is decided that that is a proper process for the Territorial Government to undertake and if it is, and if it involves, for example, an Alaskan example of the public forum for the New Jersey system of a future's project, there are dozens of these projects in North America. If it does, it generally involves expenditure of some public funds and that would be the stage that it would come under a GDA and we would then hope that the Federal Government would agree with the concept and sign a subsidiary agreement with us to cost share such a process. That would be where they would eventually mesh.

But I'm not saying that this would be included under the first subsidiary agreement or under any subsidiary agreement. What I'm saying is that the public participation process is an exercise of research that the Economic Research and Planning Office is going through at the present time in order to search out mechanisms that have been used in other jurisdictions and to seek out the views of the Yukon people and organizations as to what process they might like to see for public participation and vocalization of the goals and aspirations.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I can just, I'd like to just assure the Commissioner that there's no confusion on my part with respect to the signing of the General Development Agreement and certainly the decision as to how the process for the planning is to take place. What I am really doing, I think, is, I could say, fine, let's sign the GDA, but it has been stated in this House that the Committee on Socio-Economic Development has gone ahead and I think that was one of their first assignments or one of their prime assignments, was to get that underway and that they were to report back and have a decision.

I realize that the two probably aren't related, but I'm suggesting that we, and certainly I, would like to know the answer to that before I want to put my name as a supporter of a GDA or anything else. Because, as I've

stated many times, I feel that the planning process for Yukon's future has to involve public participation to the degree that is satisfactory to me and I want to see what process you've decided upon. I well realize that there are quite a number of models you can use, but you have suggested and you have said that the committee was ready with their answer and I'd like to see what that answer is before I move ahead with this, Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never said in this House or anywhere else that the answer will be involved in the first report. What I have said is that it will be a compilation of the research and the views of the organizations who responded to Government's request and that report is nearing completion and must go before the Executive Committee before it comes before this House. It will not involve expenditure of funds at that stage; it will not involve the definitive answer to a process.

It is totally unrelated to either the General Development Agreement this time or a subsidiary agreement, at the stage we're at now, and that's why I say I'm positive there's confusion around this whole process. There is no answer coming from this first go-round which the Honourable Member is asking to see. I'm afraid if I have left that impression with him, I have mislead him.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, just a supplementary comment to that. Yes, you have left that impression with me. As I stated earlier, I realize and I make it perfectly clear, that there is no relation between the General Development Agreement and any subsidiary agreement. I'm prepared to deal with it but you did say to me, I think in reply and I can look it up, but there was an answer coming forthwith. I believe that was the answer you used. To me, unless I don't know what the interpretation of forthwith is, and obviously I don't, I think forthwith means right away and that's really what I was talking about.

I know the Member from Ogilvie was asking the same question and some of these things in our minds are inter-related. I'd like to know what process we're going to use in Yukon so that we can well enter into a subsidiary agreement and I know that the wants and desires of people that I represent are going to be looked after in coming out with a strategy and a formula for Yukon's future.

I've certainly talked to a lot of people who feel that a process has to be put in place whereby they have participation. I know that, in talking to the Commissioner on a number of occasions, I think this is going to be the way it is, but I'd still like to have that answer forthwith as he said it was.

Mr. Chairman: Any further general debate?
Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Commissioner a question regarding the - it would probably be subsidiary agreements. Would

they be replacing the activity of the Economic Branch of Indian and Eskimo Affairs at the present time in the Yukon Territory?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I don't see the relationship. I'm trying to think now, not in any terms of any subsidiary agreement for Yukon, but subsidiary agreements that exist under similar agreements, GDA's, in the Provinces. No, I don't think they replace any existing government structure. They are project-oriented, they are oriented towards planning, the ones that I'm thinking of and they involve utilization of current resources to the best possible end, but they don't replace anything. They are definitive agreements, in other words. They are designed to do a certain activity and then they come to an end, be it inventory, be it particular economic development activity, whatever.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, another further question. Would this umbrella agreement with the provision for subsidiary agreements, could this vehicle be used to implement some of the terms agreed to in land claim negotiations?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it might be a mechanism used somewhere down the line. I would hope that, if we gain approval of the GDA, that we would immediately start talking to the Federal Government with some idea of preparing a subsidiary agreement immediately that would reflect the direction that the Yukon Government wishes to go and gain concurrence of the Federal Government for assistance in following that route for planning for our future.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, does this Agreement and subsidiary agreements then just provide for the planning, or does it actually provide for the implementation, the cost-sharing for implementation?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it provides for both.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I hope you're not going to cut me off as being out of order with asking too many questions.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, I'll let you know when you're going too far.

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, this does give me some concern and I'm very suspicious. I find it rather a coincidence that this GDA is being brought forward now, and the fact that there will be a requirement or there will be certain concessions made to the native

people at the land claim negotiations or at the planning council in order to have one government type of structure in order to bring them up to the economic level of everyone else. I am very suspicious that the Federal Government is going to say, alright, you've got the GDA, we'll enter into a subsidiary agreement with you; you pay so much, we'll pay so much, and we'll implement it. And this is what I'm very, very suspicious about.

Mr. Chairman: Are you asking the Commissioner a question, or are you just stating a fact or remarks?

Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I hope it isn't a fact.

Mr. Chairman: Is it a question?

Mrs. Watson: He may comment, if he wishes.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Watson?
Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that I share the Honourable Member's hope, and certainly I know the Members, your colleagues on the Executive Committee also share that view.

It does say, under "financial", that financial arrangements for each subsidiary agreement -- I'm sorry, that's the wrong clause; the one that's above, 6(1), "the provision of financing by Canada in the Territory for implementation of subsidiary agreements is subject to the Parliament of Canada and the Council of the Yukon Territory having provided funds for such financing for the fiscal year in which such financing is required." So I can't imagine imposition being possible under such a program without full concurrence of this Legislature who must pass a Money Bill to allow the Territorial Government to participate. I see it on the contrary side of things that it gives us a chance to all of a sudden suggest, in very strong terms, to the Federal Government areas that we would like to see investigated, planning, research, the inventory, the programs for economic development that we would like to see implemented.

We just might win a couple now instead of having a decision come the other way.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard.

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I have every sympathy with the Honourable Members who are looking at this piece of paper with some suspicion because I had the same reaction and it looked to me like the old case of the camel getting its head in the tent. Mr. Chairman, we all know a camel is a horse designed by a Committee and that's, you know, you should look a gift horse in the mouth.

My problem, Mr. Chairman, is that there are arrangements now for this government to approach the federal government when it requires funding for a specific purpose or cost-sharing on a specific program. I think it would be helpful so that we can all explain to the people of the Yukon what is involved here, if we could ask the Commissioner to tell us what he visualizes this Ordinance providing, which is not in place now between this government and the federal government?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Chairman, now, at this time, I'm speaking only on my own opinion, based on what I've seen provinces able to do under their General Development Agreements, but I know that the four western provinces have been able, under General Development Agreements, to put into place specific programs for total inventory of baseline information to determine the physical capability of their area of concern. I think that I would get concurrence of all the people here that really this is not available in the North anywhere, and particularly not in Yukon at this time.

For example, we don't know what the Fisheries capability of Teslin Lake is. We don't know what Forest resource in Yukon will or will not support. I know that in the past we have had a great deal of difficulty of persuading the appropriate agencies in charge of those resources, to provide us with this type of information, to come up here and do the work for us. I would see that as a very essential first priority and not just a one year program, but a continuing priority of this government.

You know, you people here will have the final decision, if indeed such a proposition comes forward because, of course, we will be expected to provide some of the funding, but that's the type of thing that I would see, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that would enlighten a wee bit, the Honourable Member.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke.

Mr. Lengerke: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I getting back to direct discussion about the G.D.A. I agree and as I said earlier, the potential is just fantastic and I think there's a great scope here, but what concerns me is that if the four western Provinces, and I have a number of the agreements before me here, have entered into an agreement with another department, other than the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and this is—we're going to enter into a, it says, "a General Development Agreement with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is considered to be most appropriate and effective instrument."

Okay, fine, but I want to know and I think that Minister of Health and Welfare is somewhat touched on that. Is this going to be new-found money over and above the programs that are offered to us now or are they going to dilute the present programs under Northern Affairs and use it as a guidance, say, well, here you go guys, here's some dollars to carry out various activities, that, really, where's the new-found money?

If we can have this kind of assurance, because certainly the four western Provinces still, by signing a General Development Agreement, doesn't preclude making deals with other departments. They certainly can compete with other departments in getting various programs instituted in the Provinces and there's a competitive type of basis to deal with here. We're dealing with one Minister, one department. Our DREE money is going to funneled into the Department of Indian Affairs, or just how is this going to work? I think this is something that we should know, it's a very vital and key question.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that entirely, but I'll explain a little of the background.

Although the Agreements in the Provinces are signed with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, that does not preclude, in fact it encourages all government departments to enter into and participate in subsidiary agreements. DREE just happens to be the federal government's mechanism for entering into this type of agreement with the Provinces. For example, the work in the northern Provinces, it involves transportation facilities or systems is funded by the Ministry of Transport even though DREE did sign the General Development Agreement. Work on the Environmental aspects of hydro-electric projects in the Provinces, baseline inventory and information on Fisheries in the Provinces, baseline inventory and information on Fisheries capabilities is all handled by the, or is negotiated through the Department of Environment, even though DREE's name is on the G.D.A.

Now, as I read the background to this paper, or to this Agreement that you see before you, it was originally thought that perhaps DREE would be the appropriate vehicle to enter into an Agreement with the Government of the Yukon Territory. It was the contention of the Government of the Yukon at that time that this could prove very difficult for Yukon in that we would now have really two Ministers who we'd be working through, a Minister to whom we can direct a great deal of our activities and our programs, or through which we direct these, and another Minister, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. So the Federal Government said well fine, we don't mind if you sign your GDA with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. It's a Minister signing on behalf of the Government of Canada, as you'll read at the top, not Indian and Northern Affairs, but the Government of Canada represented by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

The Agreements with the Provinces say the Government of Canada, represented by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. That's the only difference, so it doesn't preclude DREE money from coming in through subsidiary agreements, it doesn't preclude Environment Canada from coming in under subsidiary agreements, but it does mean that we, the Government of the Yukon Territory, will be part of any of those, and we will know where the money is going. If we feel that Teslin Lake should be surveyed for fish, we say look at Teslin Lake, don't look at Wolf Lake or some other lake where we see little priority at this time.

We will be part and parcel of that planning, so I really hope that I can clear up that misconception about DREE either being precluded from assisting the Yukon or being excluded because of the GDA being signed with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. That's not the case.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have great difficulty with this particular Ordinance. Probably historically so, but I've always felt a little—or I should say a great deal insecure when I read Ordinances that way that the Commissioner can enter into agreements with Canada on his own hook, because really it's Canada making an agreement with itself, and sometimes it has

happened in this Territory that the people got shuffled aside and certainly the Assembly.

In those days, we used to rationalize these Bills by proposing, and in some cases, I think once in a Power Franchise Bill that the Commissioner, by and with the consent of the House, could enter into these Agreements. I feel very--you go down into Sub 3, or pardon me, into 3, and you say the Commissioner's empowered to do every act and exercise every power for the purpose of implementing every obligation. This is a great deal of authority.

If you said that the Executive Committee could enter into these agreements, you know, if we know that a majority of the Executive Committee would be the safeguard that perhaps I would be looking for as Member of the Assembly, then--I just do not feel that I could support this Bill at this time because of the, it just doesn't ring true.

I'd like to see the Bill taken back, I'd like very personally see the Bill deferred until Fall or next Spring Session until it can be re-written to offer those guarantees at this time in our evolution, or until it's worded some other way. I'm just not prepared to lend my vote or my voice or those I represent to a situation which permits Canada to write an agreement with Canada without the safeguards of this Legislative Assembly inasmuch as the decisions and the plans, the economic and social planning and developments that we are talking about here affect all the people of the Yukon were involved in this Agreement.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Member said evolution or revolution I missed that bit, I draw his attention, the introduction of this Ordinance which says, "the Commissioner, by and with the advice and consent of the Council," and if he wishes to come forward with an amendment to implement those words throughout, we're here to hear it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The problem, it says, "the Commissioner of the Territory by and with the advice and consent of the Council, in said Territory enacts as follows". This is like giving the Commissioner a blank cheque and that just scares the living daylights right out of me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Does 1 carry?
Does 1 carry? Does it carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: What is Committee's wishes on Clause 2?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: All those who agree with Clause 2, raise their hands please.
Those disagreeing with Clause 2?
Clause 2 carries.
Clause 3?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Agree? Those agreeing with Clause 3 raise their hands?

Disagree with Clause 3?

Clause 3 does not carry. I'm assuming you're asking it to be stood over at this point. Is that the intention of Committee? Very well. The whole Bill will have to be stood over then.

Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I just don't know the way out of this, because I'm sure that we're going to have to have a constitutional expert to be able to tell us how anybody, other than the Commissioner, can enter into an agreement with Canada. The constitution under the Yukon Act, nobody else has the power and the authority to be able to do that.

You've heard the elected Members on the Executive Committee state that any subsidiary agreement and any agreement would be brought before this House for approval. You've heard the Commissioner give that assurance also. There's just no other way, constitutionally, that such an agreement can be signed. So what you've effectively done is killed this Bill, because there is no way that the monies which we probably could have got into the Territory, under the subsidiary agreement, are now going to be available and that's a loss to the Yukon Territory.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, there is a way constitutionally and that is that if Section 2 was amended to provide that the Commissioner, by and with the consent of this House was empowered, and we've got that power under the Yukon Act. That's your way.

Mr. Chairman: Before we go any further on Bill 13, is it the understanding of the Chair, that the Committee wishes Clause 3 be stood over for further consideration at this point? Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Clause 3, Mr. Chairman, has been deleted by vote.

Mr. Chairman: Very well. Is it the Committee's wishes that I proceed with this Bill?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, there's no way it can be proceeded with because, without Clause Number 3, there's nobody can sign an agreement with anybody so how can the General Development Agreement go forward and be carried by this House. It's just a -- it would be the height of irresponsibility to continue with the Bill in its present form because Clause 3 has been deleted and there is no one who can sign the Bill to make the law effective, so it would be a farce.

Mr. Chairman: As I was saying, Mr. McKinnon, I need direction from the Committee, I'm in a tenable position.

Yes, Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very foolish if we asked, you know, we're certainly not looking to defeat this. This is something that we should -- yes, I realize, you know, the Honourable Minister has

certainly got a point.

I think what we're really looking for and I think we'd better get back to it, that if there is a satisfactory amendment can be made, we've had a couple of suggestions, the Minister -- or the Honourable Member from Watson Lake has said, I don't know if we can get a legal interpretation, if it is possible or not because, constitutionally we should take a look. If we cannot do it, I think we're very, very foolish to let a Bill such as this go by. It's an opportunity, and as I said earlier, there's a real potential here and I think we'd better take a closer look.

Is there any way that we can amend it, Mr. Chairman, through the Legal Advisor to reflect some of the changes desired?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke, I would have to accept a motion from any of the Members in order to move this Committee back again and, as you already are aware, we have two people here as witnesses to give us a hand with this particular Bill. Now, there have been no amendments for Clause 3 and, subsequently, it was deleted.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I have a question I'd like to direct to Mr. Commissioner at this time.

Mr. Chairman: In reference to what, Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Into this Bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I need a motion to carry on moving with this Bill.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, it's based on that I have a question I would like to put to Mr. Commissioner in that regard.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Mr. Commissioner if there is any urgency to passing this Bill at this time or if it could be stood over to another session without disrupting the affairs of government?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Chairman, it would certainly set back all of the wheels that are in motion with regard to getting ahead with planning. It can't do anything but that, because at this stage I am totally confused as to the desires of the House. Do they want to participate in the future planning of the Yukon, or do they not? I am certainly not going to go out and commit, talk to people and talk to governments about this possibility unless I have clear direction as to where we are going to go and whether we want to participate or not. I just have to call everything to a halt at this time and say we can't presuppose anything at this stage of the game.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be possible to report progress, or lack of it, on this Bill at this time so that we could have a meeting of the minds and see if it is at all possible to salvage the Bill at this moment?

Mr. Chairman: Is that the wishes of Committee?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, yes, Mr. Lengerke? I think before we go into reading of Bill 16, Mr. Fleming, are you prepared to go on Resolution Number 6?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I'll read the motion.

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

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

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

Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in proposing this Motion or Resolution, it was, in effect, to change the concept of the Federal/Territorial Lands Advisory Committee made up of, I think, the Members already know, but I will read out the names of the people on the Committee now, so that there is no confusion.

The Committee Members are appointed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the present membership is as follows:

A. B. Hollingshead, Chairman, Assistant Regional Director of Renewable Resources, D.I.A.N.D.;

P.H. Beaubien, Regional Manager of Land Resources, D.I.A.N.D.

T.A. Retallack, Supervisor of Lands, D.I.A.N.D.; and to be appointed, Regional Superintendent of Indian-Eskimo Affairs Branch, D.I.A.N.D.

That is on the federal side of the Committee. On the Territorial side is:

W.A. Bilawich, Director, Department of Local Government of Yukon Territorial Government;

to be appointed, the Director of Game Branch, Yukon Territory;

K. Crosby, Director of Tourism and Information;

W.C. True, Secretary, Program Advisor, D.I.A.N.D. (another Federal).

They have two observers, L. Chambers, Lands Planning Consultant, Yukon Territorial Government; and R.S. Friesen, Research and Special Projects Officer, D.I.A.N.D.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this Committee is actually advising themselves and are the heads of every government department here in the Yukon almost, and they are making decisions on our lands and I presume any cottage lots, or any development that is going to go ahead in this Territory in any way, shape or form.

I have here, in answer to a person who has applied for land in the Yukon Territory to do some developing and just to give this House a chance to see what type of answers we get when we ask for a piece of property from this Committee who I am asking to be changed and have some private input into it from private people, or some people directed from this House. I will just pass these out, you can deliver them around.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate?

Mr. Fleming: I'm not finished, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I'm sorry.

Mr. Fleming: While that is going around, I will read. There was explained the situation, in the Teslin area, not too long ago, there was a person who wished to do a little development of land in that area along the lake, and put in a plan for a campground, cottages, running water, so forth and so on and asked for a piece of property, if he could possibly get a piece of property.

I don't need to mention any names, because it's just a matter of an application, the letter is there, the names are on it, you can see who it was, through the lawyer, and the answer we got back was enclosed, "please find letter from Mr. T.A. Retallack, Supervisor of Lands. We are surprised by the Committee's decision and wait your further instructions."

The lawyers were very surprised at the answer and I'm really surprised at the answer, Mr. Chairman. This person was willing probably to spend some money in the area and develop this Territory a little bit for tourism and so forth and so on, and this is typical of the answers we get from that Territorial Lands Advisory Committee.

This application released after a meeting of a Federal/Territorial Lands Advisory Committee. The Committee recommended that the area has prime recreational value, a commercial application should not be approved at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to say along that area of Teslin, along that lake, it is all prime recreational value and if they are not going to let anybody do anything under this type of thing, we can just forget all about it, because it's all recreational value.

"It was noted by the Committee that there already exists three campgrounds in the area and another one in the planning stage by the Local Improvement District." Now, Mr. Chairman, it makes no difference if there is fifty campgrounds and private enterprise in that area, a person still has a right to spend some money and try to develop this country and to go into competition for himself, I would hope. So that is another excuse which is absolutely a wash out.

The other one is the one about the planning stage of the Local Improvement District of a campground in the Teslin L.I.D.

, now I don't know where that is. I haven't found the answer, I asked for it the other day, but it is not here yet. I dare say it's a myth from somewhere that they heard somebody say or something has happened and they are using it for an excuse.

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that in this letter nowhere does it state that there's a problem in the Yukon with land, that the natives are holding up the land, that there's a land freeze, that his planning was no good, that his buildings weren't going to be built properly, there is no such thing in this letter as that. The old excuses seem to have disappeared and they come up with a little gizmo like this one, which I think is pretty sick. Mr. Berger, on March 3rd, asked the following question: "Is it correct that a land freeze in the Yukon Territory is in effect as of February 1st, 1977 or is it still possible that individuals can apply?"

Now, I'm going to read a couple of articles out of the answer here, the rest of the answer. It goes down to say -- to talk about agricultural grazing leases and leases for recreational cottages and then it says, "all applications for other uses are being accepted and processed in the normal manner which includes review by both the federal and territorial governments." So, I'm presuming, Mr. Chairman, that they are reviewing, this Committee, this type of thing and I'm presuming that that's the normal situation, that type of a letter there.

You go on in that answer and I have a few reasons why we need to change that Committee again. It says adoption of 30 year leases means that it is necessary in court provisions, lease agreements, allowing for rental review at five year intervals during the term, that is if they're going to rent some property. This Committee, Mr. Chairman, you must understand, is going to have, I think, I'm sure, a big say in these decisions and any leases or anything is going to be changed every five years. I can be assured of that Committee on there, we know which way they're going.

It says down here that if they were to adjust them upward or downward, they forgot to leave out the downward, because there's no way they're going to go that way.

It says here that they're working to reduce the speculation in Crown Lands and to improve administration services to applicants for cottage lots or lands. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that if this Committee has anything to say about it, we won't be improving any of the cottages by building any roads into them or working on them anymore than we are right now.

And it goes on to say, "the cottage subdivisions are being developed within a framework which will encompass territorial development of selected lakes and regions." So I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to say is that this Committee is going to be, and I'm sure, having a big hand in all of these decisions that are here. That type of decision made by government heads and advising who, I don't know, themselves, as far as I can see, is going to be a very sick situation.

So the motion, Mr. Chairman, merely asks that "be it resolved that the opinion of this House that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, when appointing Members to the Committee, consider nominations recommended by the Yukon Legislative Assembly" which means, Mr. Chairman, that possibly today if the Game Branch hasn't been filled already, that possibly there's an opening there -- I think it's an opportune time, the Minister might listen, rather than just say, okay, Mr. Chief of the Game Branch from wherever you were hired or whatever, possibly from not even in the Yukon Territory, to be on the Lands Advisory Committee. Maybe we should have Joe Blow off the street on the Advisory Committee and that's exactly what I'm trying to say. I would hope that this House does concur in this motion and possibly the Minister thinks it over and agrees with this also.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, the first memorandum that I wrote on the first day that I became the Minister of Local Government, was to the Director of Local Government, asking him why an elected Member couldn't or shouldn't participate on the Federal/Territorial Lands Advisory Committee.

I got back the minutes of the meetings and also the make-up of the Advisory Committee, but also the terms of reference of the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee. After looking into the subject, I wouldn't sit on that Committee for all the tea in China and I really wouldn't wish it on my worst political enemy, because that poor person is just going to get decimated and completely sliced off at the throat by all the problems that the public would expect him then to be able to solve on their behalf.

The objects of the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee, "to co-ordinate mutual action in the exchange of information between the Federal and Territorial Governments with respect to the administration of Federal Crown Land, including the review as required of applications for Federal land." Nothing at all to do with Territorial land.

The disposition of Territorial land has the broadest public input. If you go to City Hall tonight, you'll see people marching from Crestview on City Hall because they don't want trailers in that area, which is under Territorial control and the City has control of the zoning and planning and full and absolute input by the public as to the zoning and the use of Territorial lands.

Now, let's take a look at the Federal land applications of this day and age. Ninety-nine point nine per cent of those applications are for agricultural, grazing and for recreational residential use. The Federal Government has firm policy decisions by ministerial directive that there is a freeze on agricultural and grazing land, that there will be no development of cottage lots, none whatsoever, unless they are on planned subdivisions, under the full control and administration of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

So, there's your total gamut of applications that come before the Federal Lands wiped out by Ministerial order of a freeze. Anybody that the Territorial Government chooses on that Committee is going to have to bring the needs and the desires of every person who wants those types of land use applications, bring his case to a policy before a Federal-Territorial Lands Use Committee, that has already been dictated and he is going to be the scapegoat for every member of the public in the Yukon, because you can see government members and bureaucrats throw the blame onto a member of the public or an elected Member if they possibly can do so.

So that leaves us with the point one per cent of applications that can possibly be processed with the freeze and other type of development lands, which is for bona fide commercial operations and in that instance where land, and that's the only thing where I've seen land being given out in the last few years for development of commercial type operations, perhaps the Territorial representative could have some real input, as in the case, which are the few and far between ones that the Honourable Member mentioned, where people want Federal lands for commercial development, because people have obtained that land with bona fide applications in the last few years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem at all. I won't recommend to the Minister, because I couldn't be that mean and dirty a member of the public in the Yukon Territory, as to appoint him on to that board where I know what would happen to him because I know the policy. They're not — they're written, they're press releases from the former Minister of Indian Affairs and

Northern Development. He said exactly what was going to be done on agricultural and grazing lots and cottage lots and that forms just about the total of the applications before the Federal-Territorial Lands Use Advisory Committee.

If the Members of this House instruct me, by motion, to name and come up with a name, I'll know that you must hate the guy or the gal who they're putting up, naming onto this Committee; I'll be happy to forward that name, but I couldn't, in conscience, because of my knowledge of what is happening policy-wise on Federal land in the Yukon and decisions of the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee; I really couldn't recommend that a member of the public, upon nomination of this Committee, could serve any other function than becoming a scapegoat for government because of policies which are already in place and initiated, but if Members want to go ahead and recommend such appointment, I'd be happy to pass it on to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe that there's any statutory authority for the formation of this Committee under any act of — there's no statutory authority for it.

After hearing what the Minister has had to say about the Committee, I'm surprised that he permits Members of this Government to sit in that Committee helping these people to pass judgment. If they are going to attend the meetings of this Committee, they should only attend it as observers and let the decisions appear as being made by the Federal Lands Advisory Committee which obviously is making the decisions and the Territorial people shouldn't be involved in making these decisions at all.

If they're all — and all that this Committee is being used for by the Supervisor of Lands is to back up his refusal of applications and all applications are refused because this Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee refuses them. It gives him a perfect opportunity to say, "Well, I didn't make the decision. The Territorial Government people and the Federal people made the decision." I don't think we should be involved in this Committee from a decision-making standpoint.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate?
Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Just an answer for the Minister — a couple of things. I think he does understand the Motion. It is not a Motion that anybody from this House be appointed to that Committee. It's nominations recommended by the Yukon Legislative Assembly and possibly the Minister wouldn't like to put his friends in that position, but I would say this, that if they wanted to go in that position they would, because it is something where they are not told to go there. They are asked. I would hope that we would ask them if they wish to go there. I would hope that nobody would order anybody to go on any committee of any kind. I would certainly like to see the outcome of it, if we ask for somebody to sit on that Committee, because I think that we would get just the opposite to what the Minister of Local Government feels they would get.

I know if I was in a position, and not in this House, I'd be quite willing to sit on that Committee. If I could just poke at one of them every once in a while to help the cause in this Territory. I have to agree with the Member from Mayo, because I don't really know what this Committee is all about at all. I can't quite understand it. It is nothing to do with the Territorial Lands; however, if I read you what happened to the cottage lots in Teslin, they do seem to get their nose in there somewhere, because, through the Territorial Government, through the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee was kept advised of the development of the Federal Recreation Subdivision at Teslin. I know this is Federal. This is something that is affecting everybody in the Yukon, whether it's Federal or what it is. It'll end up probably being in the -- as they call it, the Teslin subdivision already.

These are the people that make that decision. If I thought for a moment there's a motion in this House to get rid of that Committee entirely, or a portion of it in there, I'd have been quite happy to do that, but I don't think that'll ever happen. However, I would hope that most Members do, as I say, concur with this. We are only asking for a try. If we can't make it, and nobody wants to sit on that Committee, I'm sure the Minister will have no problem. He'll do just like he's always done; he will put his chiefs there to advise themselves. So I don't think the motion really is going to hurt anybody in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I think that, in all fairness to anybody that we are going to name -- I'm not going to name, because I'm not going to agree with the motion because I wouldn't put anybody in that situation, but I think that we should check and have checked out the statutory permission for such a Committee to exist. Because if there is no actual committee, there are no statutory provisions for it, then that person could be put in an untenable legal position as far as being sued or even anything happening to him. So I think that, before such a decision is made and appointment made, that the Honourable Member from Mayo is right, that we'd better do some close checking into the constitutionality of the committee, because a member of the bureaucracy is protected but if we put a lay person on that committee he would have no recourse in any way, shape or form if somebody wanted to go after him civilly. I think the Honourable Member raises an extremely valid and a good point and I think that I'll be looking at it from as far as our representation too, if he is correct. I think our people might be in the observer status in the very near future, if the Honourable Member is correct.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Whyard?

Hon. Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, this has been very enlightening, and I wonder if the Honourable Minister for Local Government could go a little step further for my benefit and add a little more information? If this is the Advisory Committee which rules on Land Use Regulations as they affect applications for Crown Land, what procedures does an application go through on Territorial land to comply with Land Use Regulations? Who sits on that?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, all of our land in the Territorial Government is all centred around municipalities, L.I.D.s and unorganized areas. Every bit of Yukon land, except for some which will be done this summer in the Takhini/Mayo area, in the Carcross area, is all zoned after the public has input into it. It's all under a development plan, all the L.I.D.s, the municipalities, if they want changes they change it through their zoning boards and planning boards. It has the total public input of all the elected people and the people in unorganized areas who are not elected. All that land, with the exception of certain areas which have been developed for different purposes, will come under a plan of zoning regulations after the summer study; that is the extent of Territorial Government land.

We're talking about the total rest of the land in the Yukon Territory which is all Federal Crown land, which every application, before it comes before the Federal-Territorial Lands Use Advisory Committee, and that is not the same committee as deals under the new regulations, under whatever Act it is, dealing with exploration permits, company permits, and all those type of development permits dealing with oil exploration, mineral exploration, that have to have Land Use Permits given to them. That's another strictly Federal Committee. I think perhaps we have some input in that in a very cursory manner, but that's all done by another committee of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McIntyre?

Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to clear up one of the misconceptions here. We keep on talking about Territorial land and omit to state that Territorial land is the land that comes under the Territorial Lands Act and the Territorial Lands Regulations and is therefore, in effect, Federal Crown Land. The land that we deal with, the Territorial Government deals with, under the Yukon Lands Ordinance, is Yukon land. We keep on referring to Yukon land as Territorial land, which it isn't.

The only land which the Yukon Government controls is Yukon land which has been -- the administration controls, or has been transferred to this Government, or this Government has purchased it or has otherwise accumulated, but the bulk of the land in the Territory is called Territorial land, and Territorial land is Federal Crown land.

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared for the question on the motion?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion? Please raise your hands.
Those against the motion?
Motion is defeated.

(Motion defeated)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lengerke?

Mr. Lengerke: Mr. Chairman, I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Seconder?

Ms. Millard: I second that.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Lengerke, seconded by Ms. Millard, that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair. Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

(Motion carried)

(Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair)

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

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole adopted Resolution 20 respecting the increase in the size of the Legislature, and Resolution Number 2 respecting financial relief for N.C.P.C., and directed me to report the same.

Committee have also considered Resolution 21 respecting an increase in the elected representation in the Executive Committee, and directed me to report the same, with amendment.

The Committee have also considered Bill 13, a General Development Agreement Ordinance, and directed me to report progress on same.

The Committee have also considered Bill Number 6 and directed me to report that they do not concur in same.

Committee has also directed me to ask leave to sit again.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: And leave is so granted.

May I have your further pleasure?

The Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale?

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

Ms. Millard: I second that.

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

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

(Motion carried)

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

(ADJOURNED)