



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 29

4th Session

25th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, May 9, 1984 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Bill Brewster, MLA, Kluane

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office (including Land Claims Secretariat and Intergovernmental Relations); Public Service Commission; and, Finance.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs; and, Economic Development.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources; Highways and Transportation; and, Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Hon. Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South	Minister responsible for Education; Tourism, Recreation and Culture
Hon. Clarke Ashley	Klondike	Minister responsible for Justice; Yukon Liquor Corporation; Yukon Housing Corporation; and, Workers' Compensation Board
Hon. Andy Philipsen	Whitehorse Porter Creek West	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources; and, Government Services

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Kathle Nukon	Old Crow

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West Leader of the Official Opposition
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre
Piers McDonald	Mayo
Dave Porter	Campbell

(Independent)

Don Taylor	Watson Lake
------------	-------------

Clerk of the Assembly
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)
Sergeant-at-Arms
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Hansard Administrator

Patrick L. Michael
Missy Follwell
Jane Steele
G.I. Cameron
Frank Ursich
Dave Robertson

Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, May 9, 1984 - 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed to the Order Paper.
 Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have for tabling, today, the answer to a question asked by the leader of the opposition, in respect to Parks Canada.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have answers for tabling, today, to the following questions:

(1) a question asked by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, regarding doors on Yukon Housing Corporation Units, April 5th, 1984;

(2) another question asked by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, regarding the eviction policy of the Yukon Housing Corporation, April 5th, 1984;

(3) a question asked by the hon. member for Faro, regarding stock of chemicals for the Yukon Housing Corporation, April 5th, 1984;

(4) a question asked by the hon. member for Faro, regarding consequence of chemical use by the Yukon Housing Corporation, April 5th, 1984; and

(5) a question asked by the hon. member for Whitehorse North Centre, regarding incarceration rates, Whitehorse Correctional Centre, Department of Justice, April 3rd, 1984.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further documents for tabling?
 Reports of committees?
 Petitions?
 Introduction of bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 31: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Bill No. 31, *Energy Conservation Assistance Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that a bill entitled, *Energy Conservation Assistance Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 32: First Reading

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Bill No. 32, *An Act to Amend the Business Development Assistance Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that a bill, entitled *An Act to Amend the Business Development Assistance Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers?
 Notices of motion?
 Ministerial statements?
 Oral questions

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Northern Canada Power Commission

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the government leader. Recently Keith Penner, the well-known chairman of the Com-

mmons Northern Affairs Committee, has said that private ownership may be the answer to the problem of what to do with the Northern Canada Power Commission. Given that this is a remarkable change in position for Mr. Penner, and given that this government had some agreement with his previous position, what is the reaction of the government leader or what is the position of the government in respect to the latest proposal by Mr. Penner?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: We certainly have not taken any position, nor, frankly, has it ever been discussed amongst me and my Cabinet colleagues. However, any proposals or suggestions, I think, are valid and should be looked at, because, obviously, the problem exists and we should find a way to overcome that problem. This may well be a viable alternative. At this point, I just do not know.

Mr. Penikett: I refer to recent press reports that advise us that Mr. Penner met with privately-owned Alberta electrical utility companies, recently — or, one in particular — and told them that if they could convince the territorial governments that private ownership was a good idea, then the private utility might well take over NCPC. Has the territorial government been made aware of these discussions?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, to the best of my knowledge, I have only read the same news reports and heard the same news reports as the leader of the opposition in respect to these discussions.

Mr. Penikett: According to the same news reports, the Alberta company would like to purchase the assets of NCPC and has been pushing this option, in Ottawa, but not, apparently, in the territorial capitals. Is it the intention of this government to express to Ottawa the long-standing preference of the people of Yukon that our electrical public utility be locally owned and controlled?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am quite confident that Ottawa is very well aware of our druthers in respect to NCPC, at this time. They certainly have not changed in any way. If there is serious consideration taking place, I am quite confident that we will be advised of it.

Question re: French language

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Education on French language. Specifically it is about the Franco Yukonais program submission last December. Has that submission been forwarded to the Secretary of State office by this government. In other words, did this government provide the federal minister, Mr. Joyal, with a copy of that submission?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I do not believe we did. I would think it would be inappropriate that we would. The association sends the Secretary of State copies of all the correspondence that they have sent to us. I would assume that they also have sent that.

Mr. Byblow: I am unclear, from the minister's answer. Why would this government not have forwarded a copy of that submission if it was, as stated earlier, seeking a commitment on funding for that very program?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Why would we send it? The Franco Yukonais sent to us a submission and they sent to us various letters. They sent those letters to the Secretary of State. I would assume that they would send the submission if they wish the Secretary of State to have it.

Mr. Byblow: So then the minister is telling me that she is not aware of whether or not the federal Secretary of State office has a copy of that submission?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Does the minister know, for a fact, whether or not Mr. Joyal has received a copy of the submission?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: We have not sent a copy of that submission to the hon. Serge Joyal. If the Franco Yukonais have, the member could perhaps ask them.

Question re: Whitehorse hospital

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question for the Minister of Health. The minister, yesterday, spoke about a costing project for a new Whitehorse hospital. Does the costing study include a psychiatric ward or a psychiatric wing?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: I have not seen the actual study. It is a study being conducted by the federal government on its own physical plant. Until such a study is made public, I would not be

able to answer that question.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the minister aware of whether or not the policy decision has been made as to whether there should be a separate psychiatric facility or a psychiatric wing of the general hospital?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am not aware of what the study says about a psychiatric wing, but I do know, in my brief meetings with the psychiatrist who is in Yukon now, that psychiatric wings and hospitals are actually on the decline. With the new uses of drugs that are now available, it is possible to have people on a day care system, rather than being confined to a hospital.

Mr. Kimmerly: Does this government, or does the minister, have a policy position concerning whether a psychiatric wing should be built either to the old hospital or in any new hospital?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The questions and answers do not seem to be flowing here. The position that the government has taken is that we have an extended care study going on at the present time. There is also the study at the hospital that is going on. We will look at both those studies and I would hope that, from those studies, we would be able to determine what the needs are of the Yukon Territory. From that, I would assume, that we would develop a policy.

Question re: Seizure of Teslin Indian Band monies

Mr. Porter: I have no problem with the location of a psychiatric ward as long as it is in the right wing of the hospital.

On Monday, I asked the government leader why his government did not turn over to the Teslin Indian Band the total amount of compensation owing under the Teslin School Agreement reached in August of 1981. In his answer, the government leader stated "the Government of Canada seized that money". When were the funds seized and what procedure did Revenue Canada use? Was it a court order or simply a notice?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: As I further advised the member the last time we spoke on this subject in the House, the agreement reached by this government was with the Government of Canada. It was that we would pay to the Government of Canada \$100,000. I understand that there was a further agreement between the Teslin Indian Band and the Government of Canada, that the Government of Canada would pay to the Teslin Indian Band \$200,000 for the land that the Teslin School was on.

The agreement between the Government of Canada and this government is clear. The money was to be paid to the Government of Canada. That was what was done.

Mr. Porter: Does the government leader have an explanation as to why Revenue Canada seized the funds that were paid by the territorial government as opposed to the dollars that were owed by the Department of Indian Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No. I would respectfully suggest that question could only be put to Revenue Canada, and no one else.

Mr. Porter: I understand that the Yukon government was notified by Revenue Canada of that department's intent to seize the funds as early as January 1983. Can the government leader confirm this statement as fact?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No.

Question re: Victims of Crime Report

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Justice. The government has had a committee studying the Victims of Crime Report for almost seven months now. Can the minister tell us what the target date is for the implementation of any identified programs?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: As I was saying yesterday, the committee is going through both the federal report and the one done by McLaughlin. They are going through it to see what has been done and what can be done. There is a hold-up. I am advised, on the federal side of things as to what they are going to do with the federal report as well.

¹⁰ We are waiting for some of that input as well.

Mrs. Joe: The problems of victims in crime in the Yukon have been identified in the McLaughlin Report, a report that is over a year old. Can the minister tell us what other evidence it needs in order to put the plan in place for the victims of crime in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: That is exactly what we are working on now to see exactly what we already have in place, that was either addressed in the report or was not. We are acting on it now.

Mrs. Joe: Both the federal and Yukon reports on victims of crime includes specific recommendations and the federal government has recently announced that it will fund a program to treat victims of crime. Can the minister, since this information for funding is available, tell this House if his committee will finalize its study before the end of the year?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I have not been advised exactly what Ottawa is doing yet. They have not got back to my department as far as I have been advised. As soon as I hear about that, the committee will be meeting again to look into exactly what the recommendations are.

Question re: Cabinet ministers' travel policies

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the government leader regarding travel policies for Cabinet members and their assistants. I believe the government leader has enunciated his policy regarding travel for Cabinet members. Could he say what the policy is for assistants for Cabinet members? How is it determined and when is it determined that Cabinet assistants will travel with the minister when the minister travels?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Normally, someone from my staff travels with me, wherever I go. That is normal. It was not normal originally when we started out. I found that it was necessary. Usually my executive assistant travels with me and sometimes it is one of the other people on staff.

In respect to other Cabinet ministers, we are trying to make sure that all of the assistants get around the territory with their ministers at least once. This is primarily as a familiarization function. That is the policy. That is what happens. If a minister is going to a community for the first time, it is likely that he will have his executive assistant along.

¹¹ **Mr. McDonald:** I have just a brief question of clarification on the government leader's remarks.

Is it not, then, the policy of the government that assistants should not travel with ministers, when ministers travel around the communities to attend routine meetings?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know exactly what the member considers a routine meeting. If we are on Cabinet tour, then they do not travel with the ministers. My executive assistant might, but not the others. I just do not know what a routine meeting would be. I do not know how the member is describing a routine meeting.

Mr. McDonald: Of course, I will not make any representations that may clarify the situation. I will just end up by asking a question.

It is my information that, when government officials, including Department of Tourism officials, travel to Dawson, for example, they generally stay in the same hotel. Does the government have a policy to share business among various hotel operators in Yukon communities, where competition exists?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, we certainly do. In fact, we talked about this in the budget process, in Committee of the Whole. It is one of the reasons why we are reluctant to specify specific hotels in the territory, because we recognize that there is competition in the communities and we try to spread our business around to make sure that everybody gets an equitable amount.

Question re: Squatter policy

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

We have been waiting some time for the minister's squatter policy. Will the minister be making a statement on this question in this sitting of the legislature?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It would all depend on how long the sitting were to last. I intend to make a statement sometime over this spring.

Mr. Penikett: We would, of course, prefer that policy statements were made in the House, so I would be interested in if the minister could clarify that, or be more specific. During the last election campaign, at least one member opposite suggested that

squatters would be given an option to buy the land that they occupy. Is this government policy?

Hon. Mr. Lang: All options are presently under consideration.

Mr. Penikett: So, there is no policy, but one is coming.

Has the land claims agreement-in-principle, which was recently concluded, clarified the squatter situation, at all, from the territorial government's point of view?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is a variable problem and I am attempting to clarify the situation. I think we all recognize in this House that we do have a major problem in this particular area as far as the territory is concerned and I feel it is an appropriate time to bring forward a policy on this matter. Once it is accepted by caucus and by Cabinet, I would bring it upon myself to announce the policy.

I should add, while I am on my feet, that we do have some problems, largely from the point of view that our land base is so small and, of course, a lot of the squatting that is presently underway has taken place on federal land and that is a complicating factor. Within our municipalities, of course, there are questions of zoning and other things. So it is not as easy a question to address as perhaps the member opposite would like the public to think it is.

Question re: Predator control

Mr. Byblow: I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Tourism that were raised to me.

Previously, the minister advised that her department was communicating with the travel agencies and tourism interests to clarify this government's position and rationale behind the predator control program. My first question is to establish the extent of that communication. Approximately how many letters were sent and to what regions of the tourism market in this country or the United States or abroad have those letters been sent?

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think that would more properly come as a written question. All questions relating to and asking for data perhaps should be written questions. I do not believe that the minister could be expected to have that information available.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Well, I do, and I have it briefly. We had 1200 letters and they were sent to the major travel influencers explaining the government's position.

Mr. Byblow: Perhaps the minister, in answering my second supplementary, could indicate what regions of the country or other countries the correspondence was sent. I would like to ask what response if any the minister's department may have had from that general 1200 pieces of correspondence.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: Surely the member from Faro is not asking me to list where all of the 1200 letters went. I am quite prepared to start listing, but it may take me half an hour. I believe I indicated in Question Period, earlier in the session, that we were sending the letters to the major areas. We were utilizing offices of the Government of Alberta in areas like Tokyo, Japan and the United States. We are sending them to the areas where the major portion of visitors come from in the U.S., which are California, Oregon and Washington. We utilized the Alaska Visitors Association to send information to their offices in West Germany. We utilized the Alberta government's offices also in the United Kingdom, and there were various offices in the United States that I have not mentioned: San Diego, Washington, et cetera. We have had some responses back from various travel agencies indicating that they would not consider enforcing the boycott and expressing their personal opinions to the travelling public because they, too, wished to continue making a living.

Mr. Byblow: I appreciate the minister's information.

As a result of the response the department has had, and as well as any other communications it may have had, has the department been able to determine if any boycott efforts have had any kind of a negative impact on tourism traffic or bookings?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: To date, we have only received 15 letters from individuals indicating that they would not come to Yukon. We have also sent letters to them explaining our predator control program. The Yukon Visitors Association, I should add, too, has

had no enquiries. So, to date, we have not been able to establish that it has had any impact on tourism in Yukon.

We continue to be in touch with the Ministers of Tourism from BC and Alberta, and they, too, have no evidence of any impact on the tourism industry.

Question re: Beaver Creek nurse

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a question for the Minister of Health.

The minister is aware, of course, as he voted for a motion concerning a nurse in Beaver Creek. What is the minister doing to follow up that motion, with regard to negotiating with the federal government, concerning a nurse in Beaver Creek?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I believe it is in a letter that has been sent to Madam Begin, reaffirming the statements that I made in a private meeting with her. I believe, in January, when the subject was mentioned, the statistics that were brought out in the House, recently, the figure mentioned was 300 or 400 people a night and 100,000 to 200,000 people a year crossing that border crossing, we are following up on that matter.

Mr. Kimmerly: Has the minister collected the information about nursing or medical emergencies, over the last five years or so, and sent it to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The information that the member opposite is mentioning has not been sent directly to the minister, but that information has been contained. I believe, in correspondence with other members of the government that is now in power. Hopefully, fairly soon we will have a general election and we will have a resolution to the problem that we have with the government in Ottawa and will be able to deal with the new government a little more amicably, and maybe will listen to the problem a little quicker.

Mr. Kimmerly: The partisan bent is, perhaps, unfortunate. Until a nurse arrives, what contingency plans exist to handle medical emergencies in Beaver Creek?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The same plans that are in existence at the present time.

Question re: Seizure of Teslin Indian Band monies

Mr. Porter: For awhile, I thought the Minister of Tourism was going to launch into the song, "I've Been Everywhere".

I have a question, again, for the government leader, on the Teslin school issue. If the Yukon government did, in fact, receive a third party demand payment notice from Revenue Canada in January of 1983, why did it take the Yukon government until April of 1984 to notify the Teslin Indian band of the situation?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I do not know. I cannot answer that.

Mr. Porter: I would like to ask the government leader once again: when his government received notice from Revenue Canada, did his government obtain a legal opinion prior to releasing the funds to Revenue Canada?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The member opposite has been advised by me that we had no other legal recourse. I cannot see the basis for the question at all.

Mr. Porter: Had the government leader contacted officials from Revenue Canada and the Teslin Indian Band and put forward a position of negotiations to get over this unfortunate issue?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, the agreement is not between this government and the Teslin Indian Band. Go back once again to the original answer that I gave to all of these questions. The agreement is between the Government of Canada and the Teslin Indian Band. That is where the problem rests at the present time. The Government of Canada has received all of the money that this government was required to pay.

If the Teslin Indian Band has not received some of that money, surely that is not our problem. It is the problem of the Government of Canada and the Teslin Indian Band.

Question re: Child support and alimony

Mrs. Joe: I have a question for the Minister of Justice on which I have given him notice. In regard to child support payments and alimony payments ordered by courts in Yukon, can the minister tell us what percentage of court ordered child support payments are

actually met?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: No, I cannot at this time. The notice I was given was at noon today. That was not enough time to get that information available for the House.

Mrs. Joe: I thought that he might be on top of it. The government of Manitoba has an enforcement program that resulted in an 85 percent success rate in that province. Can the minister tell us if his department has studied the Manitoba model and considered its application here in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Ashley: I am not aware that they have; they may very well have. I would have to take that on notice.

Mrs. Joe: Can I ask the minister if his department will seek that information and consider its implementation here in Yukon?

Mr. Speaker: The question would appear to be making a representation. However, once again I guess we will have to let it go.

Hon. Mr. Ashley: We will look at any and all information that is available to us. If we deem it advisable to follow or implement that sort of thing, then we certainly would.

Question re: Economic Development Council

Mr. McDonald: I have a question for the minister responsible for economic development regarding the economic council.

¹² The minister will know that the opposition has, of course, been asking questions in the House to attempt to establish and identify the character of the economic council. One question that was asked that has not been specifically answered is: has the government decided to encourage the appointment of a private member of the legislature from the opposition to sit on the council?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Obviously, the answer is no. I would find it very difficult, I am sure, to be in a situation where we would have another forum where the opposition and the government could once again be critical of perhaps different issues and it would seem to me that I am looking for a model we can follow that will be constructive to present options to governments — and I say that in the plural — for the purposes of effecting perhaps some change or revisions to policies that will encourage further business opportunities. Once decisions are made by government, of course, they would be presented to this House and the member opposite would have full opportunity to debate them at that time on the pros and the cons.

Mr. McDonald: I would have thought that the economic council could be just yet another vehicle for cooperative action between the two parties. The minister has said that the economic council is yet to determine its terms of reference but will do so soon. Is the minister going to take the position at the next meeting that the economic council should have representation from women?

Hon. Mr. Lang: First of all, on the comment about cooperation from the side opposite, I recall a number of economic initiatives that we would like to have seen in the territory where cooperation was not evidenced in this House and therefore I think that would negate the argument the member put forward. As far as representation is concerned, all facets are going to be taken into consideration in the formation of the council.

Mr. McDonald: The problem with the minister's interpretation of cooperation is that the opposition shall always agree with the government.

Can the minister tell us whether or not it is the government's position that the economic council should tour the territory to get firsthand experience from rural residents about economic initiatives that they may be taking?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is definitely something that will have to be considered. I want to point out to the member opposite, as far as the opposition agreeing with the government, if they did, then things would obviously go quite a bit smoother.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes Question Period. We will proceed with motions other than government motions.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

¹³ **Mr. Clerk:** Item No. 1, standing in the name of Mr. Kimmerly.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 1?

Mr. Kimmerly: Next day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

MOTIONS RESPECTING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: We shall now proceed to motions respecting committee reports.

Mr. Clerk: Item No. 1, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member prepared to deal with Item 1?

Mr. Penikett: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Mr. Speaker: We shall now proceed to government bills?

Bill No. 3: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 3, standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move that Bill No. 3, entitled *Employment Standards Act*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 3 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: This bill has remained at first reading for a lengthy time, in order for the public to become aware of the contents and express any views that they have, either to myself and my colleagues or to the department.

The new *Employment Standards Act* will replace the current *Labour Standards Act*, which was enacted in 1968. Except for some minor amendments, the present legislation has not undergone significant change for the past 15 years.

In assessing the needs for possible policy changes in Yukon, this government reviewed its experience with existing legislation, considered in detail the intervention by employers, workers, labour organizations, women's groups and others and studied trends and developments in neighbouring jurisdictions across Canada. From this starting point, the policy objectives of government were defined and the principles of the new legislation set out.

The result has been a fair and equal consideration of employee and employer interests, in the context of Yukon's labour force environment. Particular attention has been given to the highly reasonable characteristics of much of Yukon's economy.

A major change is the removal of the restrictions concerning the maximum hours of work that may be performed in a day and in a week. Former provisions placed restrictive controls on the workers and employers, whose livelihoods depend on the ability to maximize earnings through seasonal employment.

These new provisions will be beneficial to both employee and employer, and will be introduced in two stages. The first stage will be the removal of the maximum hours of work provision and the implementation of specific safeguards to prevent abuse. These safeguards include a requirement for a specific rest period of eight hours between shifts and the ability to regulate excessive hours where they are found to be detrimental to the workers' health and safety. An employee who works for more than eight hours in a day and 40 in a week will continue to receive one-and-one half times his regular rate of pay.

An amendment will be introduced proposing that, as a second stage of this change, and effective January 1st, 1985, all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in a day and 60 hours in a week, will be compensated at double the regular rate of pay. The two-stage phase of this new provision is necessary, since many employers are already into their work season or contracts and require time to complete these works and make the necessary adjustments for 1985.

The removal of the maximum hours of work requirement, together with these new provisions, will remove some of the costly limitations placed on employers, particularly those working in isolated areas of Yukon.

¹⁴ Further, it will allow seasonal employees to maximize earnings during the short summer season.

Participation of women in our workforce is exceptionally high. A major aspect of government objectives in this new legislation is to remove barriers to this participation where possible, and to ensure that women working under the jurisdiction of our legislation enjoy the same advantages that have been extended to women employed in federal works and undertakings in Yukon and all women employed in other jurisdictions within Canada, other than the Northwest Territories.

The legislation extends the right to a female worker who has at least one year's continuous service with an employer to leave her job because of pregnancy for a period of 17 weeks without pay and to resume her employment on the expiration of that period.

To further ensure equality in the work place, this legislation prohibits discrimination in pay between male and female workers or vice versa, for similar work in the same establishment. Any difference in pay must be based on a factor other than the sex of the employee.

Recognizing that labour stability is important to economic recovery and development, the legislation introduces a requirement on the part of the employer and the employee to give advance notice of termination of employment to each other. Notice will not be required under certain circumstances such as when the employer fails to abide by the terms of the employment contract or where the employee is terminated for just cause.

The construction industry and any other undertaking of a seasonal or intermittent nature operating less than 6 months of the year, together with those employers and employees working under a collective agreement, will be exempt from these provisions. One week's pay may be either paid or forfeited in lieu of the required notice.

Recent experience has clearly demonstrated the need for a government to have advance notice of major group termination and layoffs in order to provide lead time to undertake the necessary planning to mitigate the problem and ramifications resulting from such actions. The closure of a large scale business has significant impact on the government services and revenues by reason of size.

This notice, which is to government only, will allow for the development of new programming to compensate for closures or temporary layoffs. The legislation sets out the requirement for advance notice of group termination or layoff beginning with four weeks notice on the termination of 25 employees, to 16 weeks notice on the termination of 300 or more employees. Advance notice of 4 weeks will also be required when a temporary layoff of 50 or more employees is about to occur.

As an additional move to workforce stability, the legislation introduces a degree of job protection in the event of illness or injury suffered by an employee and in the tragic event of death of an immediate family member.

An employee will be entitled to accumulate a maximum of 6 days leave without pay at the rate of 1 day per month and will not be dismissed or laid off because of absence from work due to illness or injury if the absence does not exceed his or her accrued entitlement. Once the employee has used the accrued leave without pay, he or she is not eligible again until he or she has worked long enough to accrue additional benefits. In the event of the death of an immediate family member, employees will be entitled to a maximum of three days' bereavement leave without pay.

Moving to address the ever-changing workforce environment, the legislation recognizes the increasing number of part-time workers and extends general holiday and vacation pay benefits to this group. When part-time workers are entitled to general holiday pay, the entitlement will be established by calculating the average number of hours worked per day during the previous two weeks. The legislation reduces the number of days required for entitlement to vacation pay to 10 working days.

Of major importance in employment standards legislation is the mechanism for the recovery of outstanding wages owed to employees. The amount of wages recovered each year in Yukon on a per capita basis is extremely high. During the past three years, approximately \$259,000 in outstanding wages were recovered. During the same period, in excess of \$112,000 could not be recovered. The present system of wage collection is time consum-

ing and inefficient. The new legislation establishes the certificate system of wage collection that is in common use in other jurisdictions. These new measures will remove wage collection procedures from the judiciary system to the greatest extent possible, thereby relieving the courts of an ever-increasing burden.

The loss of wages earned is an extremely devastating experience and, in order to reduce these losses to the lowest level, the legislation establishes a high priority for unpaid wages. Unpaid wages set out in the certificate will constitute a lien, charge and secured debt in favour of the employee against all the real and personal property of the employer, including money due or accruing to the employer from any source.

The new provisions also provide for collection of wages under third party liability and for directors of corporations to be jointly liable to a limited extent for wages owed.

Where a claim for wages cannot be resolved between the parties, the intervention of the director of employment standards and the evidence supported by a statutory declaration from the employee indicating that wages are owing, the director may issue a demand for wages. Then and only then, after further review, when this demand remains unresolved and the employer has been served with a copy of the employee's statutory declaration and the employer refuses to answer yes or no to whether or not he owes the wages in question, the director may issue a wage certificate and file the certificate in the court. It then becomes a judgment of the court. Parties to the dispute may appeal the certificate initially to the employment standards board and lastly to the court. The certificate system of wage collection provides an opportunity to enter into reciprocal agreements with neighbouring jurisdictions for the collection of wages outside Yukon.

These measures are necessary to deal primarily with the small minority of employers who deliberately attempt to avoid the payment of wages or whose insolvency renders payment of wages impossible without extraordinary measures.

Further, in regard to wages, the legislation establishes a regular pay period of 16 consecutive days and a requirement to pay wages not later than seven days after each pay period.

While recognizing that it is the responsibility of government to establish employment standards that promote stability and productivity, it is the view of this government that the employer and the employee share the responsibility of maintaining good relations in the work place, for ensuring that the conditions of the work place do not contravene legislative minimum standards. However, where redress is required, it is in the interests of both employer and employee to have access to quick and equitable solutions.

Where problems in the work place cannot be readily resolved by the employer and the employee, the legislation provides for third party intervention by the director of employment standards. In many areas of the legislation, there is provision for resolution of disputes by the director. This is an administrative necessity. However, in all instances where the director is given decision-making powers, there is provision to appeal these decisions to the employment standards board. The legislation provides for the establishment of that board, consisting of two representatives of employers and two representatives of labour, with an impartial chairman, to be the appeal board for decisions of the orders of the director. The board will also be responsible for recommending minimum wages, from time to time.

I have given here a brief outline of the major changes in the new legislation. There are other minor amendments and a large portion of the old act, which has been incorporated into this act, has undergone only administrative amendments.

I will be introducing two other amendments to this bill. The first will be an amendment to section 67, to require that any document removed from the premises by an employment standards officer be returned within 72 hours. A further amendment will be proposed to section 105(1), to change the presumed date of service by certified mail to the seventh day, rather than the third.

There will be a need to issue several regulations under this act, the principle regulations being those covering the minimum wage and the fair wage schedule. Regulations now in effect under the old act that are not inconsistent with the new legislation will also be

reissued. Examples of these are the exemptions for the business of guiding and outfitting and the industries of exploration and security services.

This government is aware that the majority of employers in Yukon provide their employees with standards equal or superior to those we are proposing. Unfortunately, however, there are employees who require the minimum protection by employment standards legislation.

This new *Employment Standards Act* recognizes the important contribution of both the employee and the employer and encourages an atmosphere of responsible action and self-regulation in the relationship between these parties.

¹⁷ I believe this act is a good act. Although it addresses some aspects of labour legislation that some would not want to see included and does not address other aspects that others would want to have included, I believe it is a bill that addresses all the major areas of labour legislation in a manner that will satisfy some of the unique problems of Yukon.

Mr. McDonald: It is my opinion that employment standards is one of the most important and necessary pieces of legislation any government can propose. It is through these legislated standards that inequalities in the employee and employer relationship are addressed. To the degree that the inequality and the bargaining power between the individual employees and employers is redressed reflects our understanding of the employment relationship. It also reflects our view of society.

What makes the need for employment standards legislation seem so important and so urgent now is the depressed economic climate. Workers compete with each other for the available jobs. Some employers use the spectre of long unemployment lines to spur greater productivity from the employees. Everywhere there is encouragement to ignore many of the minimum civilized work standards that are a hallmark of a civilized society.

It is this environment in which government must act to promote a healthy employment relationship. We have to understand clearly the positions and relative strength of the employer and individual employee. In a society where there is chronic unemployment, it is simply not realistic to suggest that working people are as free to enter or as free to withdraw from an employment relationship as they otherwise might be.

Economic constraints often hold people to jobs much longer than they would wish and prevent people from getting work more to their liking. Labour for the most part is not freely mobile and certainly is much less so than is capital investment.

Nowadays, because working people are much less likely to move from their jobs, they are less able to manoeuvre amongst employers to bargain for the best possible wages and working conditions. There immobility forces them to be more tolerant of poor working conditions and low wages.

The individual's bargaining power to secure a fair wage if he or she can be said to have had any bargaining power in the first place, is greatly reduced. Even when economic times are good, when the economy is buoyant and when jobs are plentiful, the individual employee has little chance or scope to bargain successfully with an employer to ensure that he receives a fair wage.

¹⁸ The best an individual can do if he fails to strike a fair deal with his employer is to leave his job and look for work elsewhere. He does not have the authority, nor the power if you will, in the employment relationship to secure a fair return for his investment which is, in essence, his time, his labour, his life. The individual in a sense has no power to stand his ground and fight for his rights. Therefore, he must be able to move freely and easily within a surplus job market in order to get the best possible deal and return for his investment, his labour. Even then, in an ideal situation, when he has little or no competition for the available jobs, he still has no guarantee that he will receive his due or his fair share for his work.

Now, of course, there are few jobs. In Yukon there are well over 2,000 unemployed people registered with the Unemployment Insurance Commission. This does not count those people who have given up hope of finding work altogether. For a few employers, the situation translates into the belief that the employee is a highly

replacable component of his business. The employee sometimes gets depersonalized into a cost factor that should be lowered as much as possible. Businesses, especially small businesses, are often in themselves the victim of the economic malaise. It is not unreasonable to expect that they, in order to ensure their own survival as businesses, would like to keep costs down. But all must remember that when people are hired to perform a service, they themselves have costs. They have expenses to pay, they have families to raise. Hired people, as people, desire and require civilized working conditions.

There we have it. Employees have lives to live and bills to pay. They are people. Conditions of employment must conform to their needs. Conditions of employment must conform to peoples' needs. Even though it is said that most peoples' lives revolve around their work, they still require daily rest periods and they need to enjoy leisure time, whether it be on a weekend or an annual holiday, and they need to gain sufficient wealth to at least meet basic living requirements. It is obvious that employment standards legislation must respect these needs.

But that is not enough. Legislation must also respect society's values. What is popularly meant by society's values often changes. For example, today we do not accept a great disparity of wealth that would leave a few very wealthy and the majority of working people poverty stricken. We are even drawn to reject the pockets of workers in job ghettos who receive starvation wages and enjoy next to no job satisfaction. Society's values change.

It is interesting to note that, in the 1880's, a royal commission studying the state of working peoples' lives said there was no reason why every house could not have its own outhouse and why every working person could not have his or her own bed.

I believe it was suggested that families with over eight members should have houses with more than two rooms. Today, I would suggest that most people believe that when people work, they are entitled to a fair wage, even a fair share of the wealth they help to produce. At the very least, most people believe that people who work are entitled to more wages than they would receive had they been on social assistance or unemployment insurance.

At the same time, I would respectfully suggest that most people believe that both men and women have the right to work and have rights to equal pay and advancement in their work. Of course, these and other commonly held assumptions about such things as a living wage and equal rights for men and women have tremendous impact on how we approach employment standards legislation.

For example, if you believe that both men and women have the right to work and both have the right to receive equal pay and equal opportunity for advancement, you should have no trouble accepting equal pay for work of equal value, at least in principle. Furthermore, if both men and women have the right to work, then allowances must be made to permit the rearing of children and the opportunity to work. The current belief is not a concept, therefore, that people should reject.

The legislation the government has tabled in the House is generally considered to be a large improvement on both the old *Labour Standards Act* and the *Wages Recovery Act*. It addresses many of the basic rights that employees across the country are accorded. The list is a standard one and includes hours of work, overtime, mode and interval of wage payments, daily and weekly rest periods, statutory holidays and vacations and vacation payments.

The legislation also modestly attempts to deal with the minimum wage issue, which we shall return to later, and, for the first time, the issues of maternity leave and equal pay for men and women.

These are all standard provisions in modern employment standards legislation in this country. However, as the minister has stated, this bill is also an omnibus bill, in that it incorporates provisions that sometimes are left to separate pieces of legislation. It incorporates the issues of non-payment of wages and collection, as well as, for the first time, the issues surrounding the termination of employment.

²⁰ This last part signifies the government's first very small step in involving itself with what is commonly referred to as the employment relationship.

We do disagree with the details of some provisions of the new legislation and we will be making some positive suggestions to improve it during committee stage. We should now probably highlight some of the major problem areas to give notice of our concerns.

Perhaps, we could deal first with the government's timid adventure into the world of the employment relationship. I say timid adventure, because the surface of this issue is only slightly scratched. The new provision essentially calls on the employer to give notice of lay off to the government. It further requires the employers and employees give notice one to the other should either party decide to terminate the employment relationship, they would be subject to penalty.

The penalty in this case is exactly the same for the employer as it is for the employee. Specifically it amounts to one week of the employee's wages. We suspect that this provision would betray a misunderstanding or ignorance of the relative strength and weaknesses between employers and employees in the employment relationship. It assumes that the employee is better able than the employer to absorb the cost of the penalty. The employee is forfeiting a week of his entire personal revenue, while the employer forfeits a small fraction of the business revenue. This is unfair. This provision, which is not common to other jurisdictions, should be removed. If we were to expect the employer to forfeit a week of business revenue for failure to give an employee notice of termination, then it would be more fair, but equally unrealistic. When wages are earned, they should be paid.

The provision here regarding the forfeiture of wages earned for failure to give notice of termination is a serious problem for us. However, it, included in the act, is not as serious as the omission of a provision that bars wrongful dismissal. There is no provision in the act that prevents employers from discharging employees without just cause.

²¹ Essentially, this means that some employees may be fired in the future for no good reason and they will have no recourse to an impartial arbitrator. This offends our sense of fairness.

The employee's individual bargaining power and the employee relationship to secure a fair wage and reasonable working conditions, as I have said, is negligible. Yet, here, there is not even rudimentary protection and there is no recourse to the employment standards board to ensure fair play is exercised between employers and employees, when it comes to the termination of an employee.

Besides this, you will note that the definition of "lay-off" is so loose and open-ended that lay-offs may soon become another euphemism for termination. On this side, the bills excursion into the realm of the employment relationship has been somewhat misguided and, to a certain extent, inadequate.

Another problem area for us is that which deals with the exemptions to the minimum standards. You will see in the act that the power to exempt employers and whole classes of employers is quite extensive. There is, believe this or not, power of the Cabinet to exempt any person or class of person from some or all of the provisions of the act. This, not surprisingly, is something we feel defeats the whole purpose of the act. The act can conceivably be rendered meaningless.

Along with this is the fact that, for exemptions to take place, there is an inadequate procedure to ensure that an exemption is truly required and to ensure that employees who are to be affected by the exemption are canvassed as to their views. We feel that exemptions should be allowed only in extraordinary circumstances and should follow an established procedure to ensure working people's input and to establish true need. The act is silent on the issue of procedure, as we conceive it, and this we would like to signal as a significant problem.

This brings us to the issue of the minimum wage.

²² There is perhaps no need to remind members that a report of the select committee of the legislature including members from all parties dealing with employment standards made the recommendation that the minimum wage should be raised to \$6.00 per hour to reflect the cost of living in the north and to attempt to ensure that people received a living wage for services rendered in Yukon. That was the idea. Now it appears that government would wish to pawn

the issue off on a board for a board to decide.

We disagree with this. The pegging of a minimum wage is one of the most significant decisions a government can make. It is not a responsibility that should be assigned to an appointed body. We cannot avoid — or should we avoid — this issue, we are going to have to reconcile the fact that this is our responsibility. We, on this side, believe in a minimum wage that is a living wage. We believe in a wage that, during tough economic times with high unemployment, prevents unfair wage competition amongst employers. And we are firm in our belief that the legislature must decide the issue. To a certain extent, we thought that the all-party committee's recommendations on this subject had given us guidance.

The new provision in the act, the provision dealing with maternity leave, is, for this government, a very progressive step. However, it is our opinion that the stark provisions allowing for maternity leave without pay do not necessarily conform to the way women have children and they are not sensitive enough to society's values. It should be wellknown to the government that childbirth is often premature and that there are times when pregnancy-related illnesses might prevent a mother returning to work. You should not draft rigid legislation that ignores these facts of life and birth. It is commonly acceptable, as well, in our society to encourage parents to adopt orphan children and to provide them with a family life. There is no provision in the act to accommodate adoptive leave.

²³ When dealing with equal pay for men and women the act touches on the problem admittedly for the first time. Yet it does not actually come to rest and deal effectively with the issue.

The concept of equal pay for similar work in the same establishment is not the same as the concept equal pay for work of equal value. The former addresses the issue only if both men and women perform the same or similar work. That is to say, it would only address the issue if both men and women were performing work such as secretarial work in the same establishment, which roughly bears the same characteristics, one job to the other. It does not address the issue when men and women work in different jobs, with the same effort, skill and responsibility. In effect it maintains what are considered to be job ghettos for women, which does not necessarily lead to equal opportunity for advancement.

We will have more to say about this. Perhaps I should wind down by giving notice of some other minor problems that we have - some other irritants. One, of course, is the recognition of the right to be sick enshrined in this legislation. You have a right now to be sick without fear of discipline so long as you are not sick for more than one day a month. This, we feel, is an unwarranted dilution of the principle.

Another problem area is that there are total exemptions for government employees. Some might say that what is good for the private sector is good for the public sector. We tend to agree with that. These are minimum standards, and if the government can do better by its employees through collective bargaining, so much the better for the employees.

²⁴ But the employees and the government should still abide by the same minimum basic civilized work standards that would apply to every working person in the territory.

The act gives expanded powers to what is now called the Employment Standards Board. As I mentioned, one of the powers, the power to determine minimum wage, is something we should discuss further. We, on this side, of course, are not convinced that this should be the prerogative of the board. There are improvements we would like to make to the concept of the board in general in any case and one of them is to ensure that employer and employee representatives truly represent their peers. There is some question as to whether or not the labour representatives or the employee representatives truly reflect the views and wishes of working peoples' organizations in the territory. There has been some question, too, as to whether or not employer representatives truly reflect the interests and the views of employer organizations. So, I think that is one area where we are going to have to discuss more detail in the future.

We have to ensure, given the new direction of the legislation regarding the acceptance that women are going to be working in society and that they are going to be accorded rights at the

workplace, there is going to have to be some assurance that women are placed on the board. From a rural representative's perspective, I think it would be wise to ensure that rural representation is also on the board where practicable.

There are a few other aspects to the board that we would like to pursue. One, of course, is that there ought to be public access to the board where appropriate, and there seems to be a crying need to permit advocates to have access to the board, advocates who act on behalf of employees and employers.

25 So, in conclusion, this bill is a large, comprehensive and important piece of legislation. We would like to try to improve the bill beyond those improvements that have already been made. We will make numerous suggestions in committee to try to effect that improvement. Before I sit down, I should point out, if only once, that we are happy to see the bill in the legislature, today. It has been a long time coming.

Mr. Penikett: My contribution will not be lengthy, but I did want to say a couple of things that were not said by my colleague.

He closed by saying that the bill had been a long time coming and, I guess, the public will be left with the question as to whether it was worth waiting for. Well, I want to say, at the outset, that it is decidedly better than what we have now. It is not, as my colleague for Mayo said, perfect, but it is a considerable improvement.

Let me briefly list some of the issues that I believe all members will agree are important. There is proposed in this legislation a new system to collect delinquent wages and I think that is highly commendable. I know the officials in the minister's department worked very hard on this problem, previously, but I do believe that they were labouring under some inadequacies in the existing legislation, in that their ability to collect from employers — particularly non-resident employers or transient employers — was quite difficult.

I am pleased, of course, and prepared to support the provisions about bereavement leave. I think there are improvements in the vacation pay provisions. I share some of the uncertainty of my colleague, about the illness and injury provisions.

While I also laud the proposal for employers to give one week notice of termination of employment to employees, I must say that I think it is a mistaken notion of equality to require the same thing of employers, because, as my colleague for Mayo said, the case in such matters is not one of equals.

I think the hours of work provision, in the legislation, is an adequate one. I think the overtime rates are probably correct. I think the difficulty we will have in this area is the same one we have in the old legislation and that is the power of the Cabinet, if you like, to exempt industries or classes of industries from these provisions.

26 The minister will also be aware, because I expect that he follows these things, that there is a growing debate not only in this continent but in Europe, on the whole subject of hours of work. There are some jurisdictions that are giving serious consideration in their legislation in this area to lowering the basic number of hours of work as a measure to share or re-distribute employment or to reduce unemployment. I do not think that is an issue that we have really joined here in the territory. It may be one that events cause us to address in the near future.

I share the same concerns of my colleague in respect to the decision made in respect to this legislation to have the board make decisions about fair wage schedules and minimum wages. I can understand the politics of such a decision. I am not sure that I will be happy with the economics of it, but much of that will depend on the makeup of the board. Members opposite have heard me express my concerns about their methods of appointing to boards before. I think we will be looking very carefully at the appointments that are made in this case.

My colleague has mentioned the maternity leave provisions. This is a considerable improvement over the proposal, or the official position, made by the Chamber of Commerce and its then president: the first time a committee of this House heard about this subject. That would have been 1978. We have come a long way on that.

I want to change tack here slightly though and say something

about the public debate that has gone on about this legislation, not only this year but in years previous. Public notice has been made of the great interest that trade unions have taken in the provisions of this legislation. Members will also be aware of debate, if you want to call it that, that has been precipitated by members of an organization — I guess you could call it an organization — called IATUM, Individuals Against the Union Mentality, which has published ads in the local newspaper. I was interested the other night to hear the Minister of Education refer disparagingly to what she referred to as the union mentality, although she did not define what she meant by that.

I think a piece of legislation such as that before us today really ought to cause us to ask ourselves the question: is it really in the interests of the majority of people in our society that the trade union movement and its members, the working people of the territory, should be put on the defensive.

27 It is, I think, and it has been said elsewhere, that the unions have been under such a systematic and sustained attack for such a long time now that many people almost automatically accept that trade unions are responsible for many of the economic ills that beset us. In fact, it would have amused me if it were not so sad that I have heard people, the same person, in fact, criticize the unions at Faro, for example, for pricing the labour for workers there out of the market — in other words, our union was too strong, too powerful — and at the same time criticizing the unions at that workplace for their inability or their failure to prevent that mine being shut down, in other words, criticizing them for being too weak. Unions cannot seem to win either way.

But I think it is important for those of us who have some political responsibilities, who have duties as legislators, to remind the public in the middle of debates such as we are having here today of some of the benefits that have been achieved for society as a whole by the labour movement. It is common today to criticize the labour movement and unions as essentially selfish or entirely self-interested organizations. People who do that do not know or have forgotten that it was the labour movement that fought for and won the battle for universal education in the days when education was almost exclusively the privilege of the well-to-do. People who make that case have forgotten, if they ever knew, that battles for things like the right to vote by ordinary working people, the right to vote for women, the first early battles for pensions and, even more recently in our history, the battles for things like medicare. They have been battles within the early stages initially led by the labour movement.

It is in fact no accident to me, or seems no accident to me, at this point in our history when many of those kinds of achievements in social policy and legislation are also under attack that at the same time the institution of the movement that led to their establishment is simultaneously under attack.

28 There are those who believe, and believe sincerely, that unions have a negative effect on employment. Those people find themselves with louder voices in the kind of economic environment that surrounds us today.

A few days ago, I had the rare pleasure of having a long conversation with a guy named Olaf Palme, who has had a government job in Sweden for a great many years. He has rhetorically asked the question, "are trade unions a threat to employment?". The unions say that one of their main objectives is to work the policies that will result in full employment. There are some who are of the opinion that the resistance of trade unions to changes in the structure of production has pushed up unemployment. Palme has pointed out that it is not difficult to find examples of trade unions pursuing unwise wage policies that have had adverse affects on both individual companies and on national economies. Nor is it hard to find, he points out, examples of unions trying to prevent effective structural changes in industry. He believes, and he has said that he has often found, that the explanations for these sometimes unwise policies can be found in the poor organization or even internal battles inside some of those organizations.

However, notwithstanding these admitted facts, there is a good deal of evidence that countries with strong and coordinated trade

unions have comparatively high employment and low unemployment. Palma gives as examples: Austria, Norway, and Sweden. As all members know, there is long standing tradition of strong trade unions in the nordic countries. One reason for this is that they have not had to cope with the situation we have in North America, for example the building trades, of a large number of small competing unions. In the nordic countries employees have organized themselves in accordance with the principle that all the workers in the same work place belong to the same trade union. This principle also applies in that part of the world to salaried employees.

This is probably one of the main reasons why so many wage earners in those countries are trade union members. The most recent figures that are fairly comparable are from 1980. There, 85 percent of wage earners in Sweden for example, are members of trade unions. That number has been increasing all the time, whereas in the English speaking world, the trend has at least in the last few years been somewhat in the opposite direction.

For example, in the United Kingdom, I think 54 percent of the work force is unionized. In the United States, it is 25 percent, and in Canada it is somewhere between 30 and 33 percent.

If you put these figures in relation to unemployment, the figure for Sweden was 3.5 percent, in 1983; in the United Kingdom, over 13 percent; in the United States, over 9 percent; and in Canada, as we all know, the figure was in the same neighbourhood. Sweden, as Palme has pointed out, has a very high labour force participation. In 1980, 51 percent of the active population and 74 percent of the women were in the labour force. Yukon, as the minister has mentioned, has had figures not quite that high but, certainly, approaching that, because of the unique nature of our demography. In the United Kingdom, the overall figures was 74 percent and in the United States, it was 72 percent. In those countries, no more than 60 percent, at the best of times, of women were in the labour force.

There are other studies that show that a high level of trade union membership results a more even distribution of national income. There is, as has been pointed out to me by Palme, a Swedish sociologist by the name of Professor Walter Korpi, who has demonstrated the degree of inequality in the distribution of income after taxes, tends to be lower in countries with high levels of unionization, than in countries with weak union movements. That man draws the conclusion that distribution of power to influence decision making can affect the shaping of policies of importance for the distribution of income.

Naturally, conditions vary from country to country. These govern both people's values and political priorities and practical politics. Therefore, there is a limit to the extent to which one can make comparisons. Of course, the strength of unions depends on political relations, as well as on the level of union membership.

It is true that there are some highly unionized countries that have experienced high unemployment, but it does seem to be fairly well established that, in countries with strong unions that can rely on support from social democratic movements, we also find policies that aim to achieve full employment and a more even distribution of income and there is, in practice, often a more stable labour market.

In any case, it is true, as we know here, that in country after country, we now see the trade union movement as on a stronger tack. This is true in the United States, it is true in Canada, it is true in BC and recently, in a small way, we have seen that in Yukon. These campaigns follow in the wake of what some people call neo-conservative and other people call it neo-liberal tendencies to give greater scope to market forces.

People who tend to see trade unions as a market disrupting element in this sense are said to be a threat to ideals of freedoms. Some even go one step farther to suggest that trade unions are actually incompatible with democracy.

But it is only, I think, the most enthusiastic advocates of the free market who really question whether a system of collective bargaining is fair or not. But whatever, unions or no unions, the efficiency of the market economy is severely limited in the labour market. According to Palme, Professor Thurow of Harvard is right when he says that to deny the existence of unions or to ask that they disappear is to develop an economic model of a non existing

economy. As Palme said in a public lecture in the United States, it is my conviction that labour unions, by strengthening the voice of common people, play a vital role in strengthening democracy. They are rooted in democratic mass organizations where people join together to assert claims that they were too weak to assert as individuals. Work in a union was, in itself, a democratic experience based on equal rights.

This has been of fundamental importance. It was quite simply an exercise in democracy. Unions represent a countervailing force to employers and to governments and thus have a self-evident role to play in the democratic process.

Over the years, unions have gradually entered new fields other than collective bargaining for wages and they obviously, I believe, in the current situation, have an important role to play in efforts to renew working life in our economy. They have a lot to say, and should have a lot to say, about what goes on in the workplace. It is very important that we realize that their argument is that it is better to strengthen the position of employees at the workplace so that they have a chance to influence their own situation. This cannot always be done simply by legislation.

It is true that this bill does something to improve the minimal working conditions for people in the territory. It is also true that most of the organized workers in the territory, in a situation of normalcy such as applied a couple of years ago — if that is what we can still accept as normal — or most of the higher paid workers outside of the public sector were in fact men. Most of the unorganized workers and most of the workers earning minimum wages in this territory, were women. There were women working in the service industries. There were women working in the hospitality trades, and there were, as well, young workers, people working part-time work. Therefore, it is in some people's mind a very serious question why unions, which have as I said been admittedly male dominated and have been higher income earners, should have a special interest, or any interest at all, in their fellow workers who are not unionists.

I think it is a very old tradition for the unions to take this kind of interest. Naturally there are those who say that unions should be careful not to set their sights too high. At this time of unwarranted attacks on trade unions, I think it is important for us, if we can, to stress their positive role in society in our history. I think it is worth noting, not to exaggerate at this point, that dictatorships, whether on the right or the left, first crush unions and then jail union leaders. To me this is in itself proof of their importance to democracy. Today we can witness this process going on in Chile and Poland. It is not surprising that right wing dictators dislike organized labour, but the emergence of the solidarity movement in Poland has a deeper significance. It seems that the communist dictatorships in eastern Europe have been unable to come to reasonable terms with the wishes of their ordinary people. In this situation, it is the people who turn to the unions as a democratic institution for shaping their future, rather than their dictatorial government.

This is why I think this kind of legislation we have before us today is important for working people whether they are in unions or not. It is important for us when we are dealing with legislation like this, to listen especially well to the labour movement. We should also listen to employers because it affects them directly, but it is important for us to listen to the labour movement when we are debating a law like this, not because it affects union members — most people in unions with an adequate collective agreement would not be affected by this legislation — but because this kind of legislation affects people who are unorganized, and are isolated and who have no one to speak for them except the labour movement and its political friends.

I am not happy that it took us so long to get this legislation before the House, but I do want to compliment the minister who has introduced the bill for bringing before us measures that are a substantial improvement on the existing law. I hope that he will understand in the course of the debate, no matter how brief, that there will be particulars in this measure about which we will want to make representations. We sincerely and honestly believe that they will be served the issue, ends or goals of justice, and equality and fairness for working people, particularly working people at the bottom end of the scale, who are the

people who are going to be most affected by this legislation.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am not going to give a general speech or an all-encompassing speech. Our critic and our leader have already done that. I will give a fairly short speech, not brief because the topic is unimportant, but brief only because it is only necessary to identify a very important concern and explain it, in fairly few words.

Just before the last election, the committee studying the principles in this bill made a report to the House. The report was sent back to the committee with instructions to look at the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. It was at that time that a number of Cabinet ministers expressed support for that principle and the House voted to send it back for that reason, and *Hansard* speaks for itself.

I am not naive enough to think that substantial politics were not involved in that particular motion. The government House leader, who is the present House leader, went around, during my speech, in fact, and garnered support for the motion I presented. The real purpose, of course, was that the government was opposed to a \$6 an hour minimum wage and did not want to express that just before the election. They did, though, and the House did pass a motion supporting, in principle, the concept of equal pay for work of equal value.

Well, approximately two years have gone by and the government position is not equal pay for work of equal value. I am rising to speak on that particular principle.

It is true that this bill addresses the concept of equal pay for women. However, it does so in a very, very moderate and mediocre way and does not grapple with the real issues. We all know that it used to be that teachers in the schools, in the elementary grades, were primarily women and they received, basically, a starvation wage or a very low wage.

That is changing, very fortunately. However, the practice of job ghettos for women has not substantially changed. It is still very much a fact of life here and in the western world. Indeed, I was in a bar not too long ago, and, on the washroom door there were signs that said "Bosses" and "Secretaries". I was proud to see some women going into the door marked "Bosses", which should be their right.

Secretaries are primarily women. Bank tellers are primarily women. Store clerks are primarily women. Telephone operators are primarily women. Operators of video display terminals are primarily women. Nurses are primarily women. Nurses do not make as much as miners. Who is more important? Bank tellers do not make as much as assembly line workers in auto plants. Who is more important? The women in those categories of work are not protected by this legislation and a very, very substantial injustice is not addressed in this legislation.

It is our party policy and it has always been, at least in recent years, to support the principles of equal pay for work of equal value. The fact that this bill does not do that leaves a substantial number of low paid workers unprotected: among them, telephone operators, store clerks, bank tellers, secretaries, maids, housekeepers and waitresses in hotels, nurses. Those job categories occupied primarily by women deserve our attention and they should be making as much money as other job categories. It is clearly a fact that child care workers in day care centres are making very low wages, and they are primarily women, almost exclusively women. That problem should be addressed by passing a law that expresses the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. It is most unfortunate that the government is not proposing that particular measure.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There is some interesting debate coming from the members opposite. I am particularly interested in the last member who spoke. I wonder what value he would put on his profession versus the member behind him as a miner. I was particularly interested to note that most of the debate coming from the other side did not deal with employment standards; it dealt with the industrial relations bill. If we were speaking to industrial relations, I could understand the speeches that were coming from the other side but, basically, they were dealing with industrial

relations and not with employment standards.

Employment standards set the basic criteria that everyone operates under. Everyone has the right and the ability to form a union and increase their standard of living or their method of working in the work place.

It is going to be interesting. I know, going through the debate, that we have known for quite some time that we are not going to get concurrence from members on the other side to pass the bill without debate. Certainly, there is a difference in philosophy between members on this side of the House and members on the other side of the House.

I was particularly interested in a statement made by the leader of the opposition that some political parties are speaking for labour. I suspect that what he was suggesting was that his political party spoke for labour. I think that this political party, on this side, speaks just as much for labour as the party on the other side does.

As I have stated earlier, I have tried to bring in an act that is fair and equitable to everyone in the territory, employers and employees. In some cases, such as the case that the member of the opposition brought up, regarding exemption from hours worked, the reason for bringing exemption from hours of work was not for employers, as is intimated by the comments that were made, but for the benefit of employees who work for a very short time in this territory. During the summer they have a very short season and, if they are not allowed to work in excess of the hours of work that would ordinarily be performed in most other cases, they would not make enough money to survive on and we would then have to provide them with welfare to tide them through the rest of the year. So, it was not done for the benefit of employers, it was done for the benefit of employees.

It will be very interesting, as we are going through debate. I am sure that there will be some interesting comments from both sides of the floor.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 28: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 28, which should be standing in the name of the hon. Mr. Philipson.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I move that Bill No. 28, the *Young Offenders Agreement Act*, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Health and Human Resources that Bill No. 28 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: Since the *Young Offenders Agreement Act*, Bill No. 28, is a brief piece of legislation, my comments on speaking to this legislation will also be brief.

As all members are aware, the federal *Young Offenders Act* was proclaimed on April 2nd, 1984. As a result of this federal legislation, a number of changes have already been made to the juvenile justice system and others will also be necessary here in Yukon. To bring about these changes will require funds, which we do not now have. It will, therefore, be necessary to enter into agreements with the federal government, through the Solicitor-General's department and, perhaps, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, to obtain the necessary funds or services.

We have in hand, at the moment, an agreement-in-principle from the Solicitor-General that sets out the broad parameters of those services required as a result of the proclamation of the *Young Offenders Act*, which will be cost-shareable.

These services range from screening carried out by the police to pre-trial detention in an open custody facility, to post disposition secure custody. A more detailed agreement within these agreed upon parameters will be negotiated later this year between the two governments.

Members will recall that there was reference in *The Children's Act* to agreements between the Government of Yukon and the Government of Canada in section 184. That reference was specific to *The Children's Act*. Bill No. 28 would enable us to enter into agreements for cost-sharing or information exchange, or whatever other area as required with the federal government beyond those aspects effected by our children's act.

There is some urgency in this matter in that once the agreement in principle that I have already mentioned is signed, our government

will receive an implementation grant. This grant will enable us to continue to do the work of implementing the *Young Offenders Act* in Yukon. As members will no doubt recall we require a separate secure custody facility for young offenders. A portion of the implementation grant could be applied perhaps to the pre-engineering study for such a facility.

Those are all the comments I wish to make just now. This is a brief bill, but it is a necessary one to enable us to continue implementation of the *Young Offenders Act*.

Mrs. Joe: We, on this side of the House, have no objection to this bill. We agree that it is a very necessary thing. I look forward to many agreements that could be made very shortly in regard to some of the problems that are already existing as a result of the implementation of the *Young Offenders Act* in the Yukon, especially in terms of the facilities for young offenders. We do not like to see 12-year-old children put into jail cells along with or next door to adult inmates. We also realize that circumstances in those facilities, at this time, could have some damaging effect on some of these young children.

We also realize that there are problems within the courts. Also, a lot of legal type training that has to be involved in trying to set up a juvenile court to make sure the young offender knows his rights and is aware that there could be legal representation for him. We certainly look forward to any agreements that could be made very quickly.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

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

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I call the Committee of the Whole to order. We shall recess until 3:30 and from now on our recesses will be cut to 10 minutes so that we can proceed a little faster. When we return we will go on to Health and Human Resources. When we complete that we will go on to Bill No. 3, *Employment Standards Act*.

Mr. Chairman: I now call Committee of the Whole to order. We shall now go on to Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act 1984-85*, and we are on general debate on the Department of Health and Human Resources.

Bill No. 12: *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85* — continued

Mr. Kimmerly: I want to follow up a bit on the question I asked in Question Period about mental health facilities, and to generally express a concern. It was in vogue — I suppose that is a good way to put it — a few years ago to say that psychiatric patients or mental patients should be in general hospitals as opposed to separated out in their own hospitals. That policy has generated a fair amount of debate and I am perfectly well aware that the staff, especially in general hospitals, have some probably well-founded objection to combining treatment especially to seriously mentally ill people and there is a strong argument concerning the reduction of the stigma of being housed in a mental hospital if in fact the residence occurs in a general hospital.

There are good arguments on either side, and I raise the question because, of late — that is, in the last year or so — the number of actual patients residing in the medical ward in the Whitehorse hospital has been substantially more numerous than in previous times and it appears that, practically speaking, we have a psychiatric wing or a multiple purpose wing that is in the medical ward of the Whitehorse General.

¹⁷ I am interested in the policy that the government is following, concerning building a new hospital, if they do, and the decisions that are made about whether or not psychiatric patients are going to continue to be in the Whitehorse Hospital, or if alternate

arrangements are to be made, in the long term future.

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: As I tried to say in Question Period, today — and I think it was adequately explained — I really cannot give an answer until I have looked at the reports that are coming out.

It is my understanding, from the psychiatrists who I have talked to, that the need to keep patients in closed facilities is lessening with the availability of certain drugs that stabilize patients and let them live a normal lifestyle, with, maybe, a daycare type of facility. Therefore, you would have an outpatient type of psychiatric care at the hospital facility, and I imagine that we would probably have two or four rooms that are designated for a secure facility in the new physical plant. I do not envision more than that.

I might also add that, at the present time, the number of psychiatric patients, I believe, have been reduced significantly over what it was around Christmas.

Mr. Kimmerly: There is another related question and I will ask it in a minute. First, however, let me say that I understand the minister's answer and I am raising the issue, primarily, to force attention on the problem and that is my real goal, I frankly say. I have raised it in the past.

¹⁸ A related question is that there is a mental health unit with a regional psychologist and a director and psychiatric nurses, and they are initiating such programs as a day program and also there will be a program for battering spouses. They in fact treat people but not on a residential basis. Across the road and down a bit, there is a psychiatrist in the general hospital. Is it the intention or is it the policy to better coordinate those two functions — the medical psychiatric function and the mental health unit — and are there initiatives under way to bring it all under one administration or one roof?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: I do not know whether we could speed things along by telling the member for Whitehorse South Centre that we are very well aware of the problem. We are studying it and we have a study now being done. There is a study being done by the hospital. I do not know why we have to cover this ground over and over again. When the study is complete, when we have those reports and when we are able to look at them, we will then assess our position. We will be formulating policy on the reports and information that are available to us at that time, and at that time we will bring forward a plan on what we are going to do. Whether that means housing everybody in one building — one physical plant or two physical plants — or whether the federal government will build a hospital for us, or what will happen, will all be known at that time. Everything we are talking about now, before we have that report, other than to raise it to ensure that we all realize there is a problem, is hypothetical.

Mr. Kimmerly: Let me finish off the debate or finish it off as far as I am concerned, and if the minister wants to respond I would be very pleased to hear it, by saying that I have a healthy skepticism of the report process that is going on. The minister did not specifically say it before, but he said in Question Period that this is a federal study. I have seen these federal studies. They will probably bring up experts and consultants from outside — probably all in the summertime — and they probably will not even go to Beaver Creek. I am particularly concerned about the conclusions that the kind of study which is talked about will come to.

¹⁹ It would be a more useful exercise to talk to people in the communities, I am not talking about a legislative or a ministerial initiative, but the people preparing the report could just as easily be Yukoners as experts from outside. They should understand the problems of rural Yukon that I firmly believe are unique to this area. I firmly believe it is necessary to be here a little time in order to really understand them. The reports compiled by experts generally model the conclusions on facilities that may be appropriate in the cities outside, in the south. I would welcome a more localized study and a study over which we had control, we being resident Yukoners including rural people and, for example, a representative from Beaver Creek, or native people.

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: The study that is being conducted is by the federal government on a federal government facility and a federal government plant. We have a study that is being conducted by the territorial government that dovetails into that study. That

study has a steering committee. On that steering committee we have members of Yukon society, the CYI and we have members of the Department of Health and Human Resources.

I can assure the member for Whitehorse South Centre that although some people may not have been to Beaver Creek, I have on a number of occasions, and I have been to every other area of the Yukon territory, probably as often as any member of this House - before I was elected - at the expense of White Pass with whom I was working. I will be reading the report. I am sure that other people who have been in those communities also will be reading that report. If there is a time to be skeptical and perhaps critical of the report, I would suggest it would be after reading the report, not before.

Mr. Penikett: I have some quick and easy questions I want to put to the minister while we are in general debate on his estimates.

They have to do with health. In January, I enjoyed a change of letters with the minister about fees. I had a number of questions. Just let me read the minister's reply to one of them: "The charge for a visit to a physician depends on whether a physician is a general practitioner or a specialist and on the nature and complexity of the service provided. Most of the services are 0-100th visit for any condition not requiring partial or re-heal examination and the straight fee is \$21.20". Who negotiates that kind of fee? How often it is done? When was the last time an agreement was concluded? Have the amounts increased since the time of the minister's letter?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am not aware of an increase since the time of the letter. There is a possibility there could be a slight increase.

⁴⁰ The agreement is a two-year agreement. I believe the agreement is now one year old and it will go for another year. We have entered into a fairly unique system of negotiation with the medical practitioners in town, whereby every three months they meet and discuss problems and keep on a very current basis, so that they just do not, once every two years, go into negotiations.

It is felt by both parties, and even the Canadian Medical Association felt, that it was fairly unique and they said that we had probably the best working relationship between doctors and the government in the country: the Department of Health and Human Resources and the Yukon Medical Association. We are all very proud of the working agreement and the way it functions.

Mr. Penikett: Will the minister then answer the other question: who actually does the negotiations? Is it an official, is it the minister, is it a deputy minister, or is it someone of a lower level but a more specialist function than the ministry?

When the minister is answering that, could he also answer a question arising out of the second point he made in the letter, where he says "medical fees, excepting counselling, psychiatry and anesthesia, are based on the nature of the activity of the procedure and not on the time the activity or procedure normally takes". There is implied in the minister's answer that there is a schedule of fees for a number of these kinds of procedures and activities. Can the minister tell me if that schedule is entirely developed here, as a sort of Yukon, homemade schedule or if it is one that is based on the schedule in some other province or jurisdiction? If that is the case, what is that province or jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: In answer to the first question, the individual who does the negotiating, on an ongoing basis, and does an extremely good job of it, is the director of health.

The other question, I am sorry, I cannot answer specifically, because I do not know the answer specifically. What you are talking about is the same as a mechanic's flat rate book and I believe that that, probably, is a procedure that is followed, generally, throughout Canada. I am sorry, I cannot tell you, in all honesty, whether it is.

Mr. Penikett: I am curious because I suspect it would be a lucky mechanic who would be able to have five cars in his shop, at the same time, and charging for all of them simultaneously. It is just different professional practices, I guess. I assume, the minister would take as notice and get back to me, at some time, with no urgency, about where the fee schedule is based.

He talked about, in the fiscal year 1982-83, the total value of in-territory claims, under Medicare, was \$3.8 million, which works

out to, with 29 doctors who share the fees, an average of \$131,000. Does the minister have available — I assume the ministry does — or could he provide me, sometime, not now, some kind of comparison, if there is one, province to province and territory in Canada, about the different levels of billings for doctors, under the different schemes in the country? I ask the question, of course, because there is a lot of interest in this area as a result of the ongoing debate about extra billing and opting out, and so forth, that is going on elsewhere.

⁴¹ Can I assume the minister does not have that information handy?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I do not have the specific figures in front of me, but I assure the leader of the opposition that on the conferences I have been on, when discussing doctors who are being paid strictly through medicare, I have heard of two doctors in Alberta and one in British Columbia who went over the \$1,000,000 each through medicare and one chiropractor who went over \$750,000 per year in medicare. The only amount that he is allowed to have per patient per year is \$375 and I was visually trying to see what type of a line he had going through his office and I would have liked to have seen the size of his hands from the manipulations that were going on to reach \$750,000. I believe, in one of the instances, one of those doctors was brought up on charges and actually had his licence removed because medicare examined what was happening and found it was greatly in excess.

I would assure the members opposite that it is my understanding that we are nowhere even remotely close to anything of that nature and are quite satisfied with the bills that are being sent in by the doctors at the present time.

Mr. Penikett: I want to emphasize that I was in no way making any allegations here. I just asked for the record if the minister has any information on provincial comparisons available, which I would expect is the kind of information generated by National Health and Welfare, and that at some point, not now, he might make that information available to members of the House.

I would be interested in some information, if the minister has it available, on the data that was generated in the territory, which concerns the fourth point in the letter he wrote me on January 11th. The fourth point said as follows: "There were 66,104 office visits (general practitioners) in 1982-83. The total for all services was 144,216 for the same year". I assume, with the medicare billing, that some kind of assessment of the utilization and the fees and so forth by the director of services, the person who has to negotiate with the doctors. I would be interested, at some future point, if the minister could provide the House, perhaps at least prior to next year's estimates debate, some information about the pattern of the visits within the 144,000 number. Let me explain what I mean by the pattern of visits. I assume that, when we talk about this, there is an average number of visits. For example, if there were 66,000 office visits and there are 20,000 people, it is quite easy to talk about an average — that as an average each person is visiting a doctor three times a year — but I would also be interested if the Director of Health Services has any information about the pattern. Some people are going to be visiting the doctor no times a year, and I suspect some of those people are living in rural communities where there is no doctor accessible. Some people are going to be visiting a doctor very frequently, such as perhaps elderly and infirm people, and I would be interested in any kind of information about that pattern in the Yukon.

I would also be interested, because it has a bearing on the question raised by Mr. Chairman, whether there are different patterns in Whitehorse here, where most of the doctors live and work, and the pattern for the rural areas. There is a doctor in Mayo, there is often a doctor in Dawson and there is a doctor in Watson Lake, but there are often communities where there is no doctor available and they are somewhat distant.

I would be interested in that information, if it is not available now, if it could be generated by next year's estimates, because I think there is a useful debate to be had here about levels of services and the funding of those services that connect to the question raised by Mr. Chairman, — but I do not want to pursue it now. I would just like to ask for it as an undertaking.

⁴² **Hon. Mr. Philipsen:** I would take that undertaking.

Mrs. Joe: I have a couple of things I would like to bring up with the minister. One is a compliment that I am sure will not need an answer for and the other one is a complaint that I certainly would need an answer for.

In regard to a medical problem in my family, I just want to state that I did not know that this service existed. We found out that a member of our family had something called Perthes' Disease, which had to be treated in Vancouver. My daughter, who went along with my granddaughter, was able to take advantage of services available to people of the Yukon. We were very grateful for that. We also found out at a later time that she had to go out again. She was fitted with a brace and the Yukon government had paid the total cost of the brace, and we found out that the BC government did not provide the same services. It was one good service and we did appreciate it.

I have something else that I would like to bring up with the minister. It is in regard to something I brought up during Question Period. It had to do with the workshop of social workers that was held a while ago. It was in regard to a person who was with the RCMP who came up to do a workshop. He supposedly was an expert on Indian culture. We have been hearing reports in the last little while from Northwest Territories in regard to judges sentencing, for instance, 3 men for raping a 12-year-old child. They were given very light sentences because, as the judge said, it was an accepted part of the Indian culture to accept that type of thing in the families. Of course, there were a lot of groups that opposed that decision. We all feel that that is very disgusting way to deal with something like that.

This person who came up from Ottawa and held his workshop for human resources had given that same kind of information to the people at the workshop. From reports that I had received he, among other things, had told the social workers that that sort of thing was accepted in Indian families. So very often they did not deal with it if they had a complaint about something like that happening with a family. Sometimes they just did not deal with it because it was an accepted way of living. I talked to a person who was there. They asked that a letter of complaint be written about this person who came up to do this workshop. I do not know whether or not this same person, who was with the RCMP, does the same kind of workshops with the RCMP members. When they come up to the Yukon, a lot of these people do not really understand the situations in the north with Indian people and with white people as well.

« If they are going to be doing a cross-cultural workshop, then I think they have to have some kind of expertise. I can speak from experience of going to one of these workshops, held by the RCMP, and I, as a person who had lived here for a number of years, was not very impressed with the cross-cultural workshop that was held.

I would like, at this time, to ask the minister if he can tell me whether or not he was able to find out any more information about this person and about the workshop in question, because I have had some very serious complaints about it? I do not think that somebody from Ottawa should come up to Yukon and pass on that kind of information to people working for this government. I think he or she could find himself in very serious trouble, because a lot of those allegations, or that information, was totally untrue. There is no way that Indian families would put up with that kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: The question that we are now speaking of was a workshop that was conducted by the RCMP. The RCMP member, who recently conducted the training workshop, in Whitehorse — it is the opinion of some people — is an expert on native culture.

I am advised by the RCMP that the workshop was not conducted by Mr. Bill Holmes, as was asserted and is still being asserted by the member for Whitehorse North Centre. Mr. Holmes was here, in fact, for an entirely different purpose.

The cross-cultural workshop was conducted by Staff Sargent Jim Potts, RCMP Training and Development Branch, Ottawa. Mr. Potts is, himself, a native Canadian, who has spent many years organizing and conducting these courses. So, I do not know how I can comment further on a course conducted by the RCMP, with people from their department, who are sent here and deal in these areas.

I am sorry I cannot go further on it, but there is no way that we

wish, through health and human resources, to have any cross-cultural training programs that are derogatory to any group of individuals. Our cross-cultural programs are done by our own training officers, who we hire locally.

Mrs. Joe: I have met the person, Mr. Jim Potts, as a matter of fact, at a cross-cultural workshop that I did go to with the RCMP, a few years ago. I am only going on the information that I have right now and, because the information that I have received is very serious and a number of people who were there had shown disgust at some of the information that was given out. It also could have been very possible that new people would have believed that information to be true. I would just hope that anything like this is really checked into a little bit more thoroughly.

Maybe that person should let whichever department is having the cross-cultural workshop know exactly what kind of information they are going to be giving out. As I said, I went to a cross-cultural workshop and none of the information that was given out was relevant.

« **Hon. Mr. Philipson:** The only problem I have here with this whole thing is that we have been discussing one individual — and having it on public record and talking about the things he has done — when it was someone else who was doing it. I think maybe we should do a little more investigation into the facts of what is going on before we damage somebody publicly.

Mrs. Joe: I think that a lot of Indian people have been damaged by that information. It does matter where the information came from. There have been a lot of Indian families damaged by that information. I am an Indian with a family and I thoroughly disagree with that information that was given out. I know other Indian families disagree with it as well. If I name some person in error, of course I would have to apologize. That was the name that was given to me. I asked the name in Question Period.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: If the name was in error, I would have to ask whether some of the information may not have been a little bit in error also, or been given in a little different light than the information was being given by the individual who was disseminating the information in the first place.

Mr. McDonald: I have a brief question to put to the minister regarding hospital services around the territory. Obviously, we all recognize that the hospitals are a federal jurisdiction, however, the minister has some responsibility that I assume he takes seriously to ensure that hospital services were adequate for rural residents.

There have been reported to me through reliable resources, who I will not name, that certain types of emergency equipment for handling emergency cases is not currently to be found in certain rural hospitals and nursing clinics. In one case, a piece of equipment called a fibrillator, which is a piece of equipment that is meant to resuscitate heart attack victims, was not to be found in my riding.

As the minister knows from his extensive travels around the territory in the employ of White Pass, there exists the hazard for the rural residents that when they get into an accident they are not in the same position as urban residents with regard to immediate medical assistance.

« They, for example, must, in some cases, travel considerable distances on gravel roads, or rough roads, to get to the nearest nursing clinic before they can be airlifted to the nearest decent hospital facility in the territory. That brings to mind the question of whether or not it would be wise to ensure that a certain inventory checklist of emergency equipment be placed in hospitals and nursing stations around the territory to ensure that emergency cases can be handled securely and legitimately in rural outposts. I am wondering if the minister could comment on my remarks and, perhaps, elaborate a bit on the efforts that he is taking, to date, to ensure that such emergency equipment has been placed in hospitals around the territory?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: That is a question that I am almost unable to answer with any kind of authority, because it is a question that would have to be asked of National Health and Welfare.

A National Health and Welfare study and our extended care study may point out inadequacies in the system, which we can go back to National Health and Welfare and ask them to correct. However, it is

National Health and Welfare's mandate to ensure that residents of Canada can enjoy the highest level of medical services that it is possible to give or would be available in any specific area.

We, as a government in Yukon, go beyond National Health and Welfare's mandate in a great number of areas. One of the areas is medical travel. I feel quite proud of the fact that this government funds medical travel in excess of \$500,000 to ensure that people get to the best possible medical aid, for whatever the problem, as quickly as possible.

I might point out to the member for Mayo that people in Whitehorse feel that they have medical problems that cannot be dealt with here and feel the same was as a person in Mayo having to come here for their medical problems, when they, indeed, have to be moved from here to Vancouver for a particular service that is not available here. If a person were living in Atlin or northern British Columbia, that person would be paying the bill himself and paying all those types of cost himself. Here, we fund it for them.

I might point out that there are some types of equipment that we could have available, at large expense to us, but we would not be able to afford to have the people who are trained in those procedures on hand, on an ongoing basis, for the relatively small number of people who would need them on an ongoing basis. So, sometimes it is not the capital cost of the instrument to be used, but the availability of trained people to use the instrument that would be available if you had the money to buy it in the first place.

Mr. McDonald: The minister said a number of things which I would like to address. I would like to remind the House that we expressed ourselves only recently on an issue that is in essence a federal issue. We expressed ourselves on the issue of a nurse at Beaver Creek. We did not hesitate and we did not pass the buck; we expressed ourselves on that issue. That was the perceived need by a rural MLA and he brought the need to the House and the minister has undertaken to transmit that need.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: *(Inaudible)*

Mr. McDonald: The government leader insists on participating in the debate. If he would like to say something, perhaps he could say it when he has his turn.

There was a perceived need by you, Mr. Chairman, as a rural member, to address the problem. You transmitted the problem to the House and the minister has undertaken to transmit that problem to the federal minister responsible for national health and welfare.

Now, in this case, we have made it our business to address the problem. It is true that, technically, National Health and Welfare has the mandate to provide services of this nature. However, it is our mandate as rural residents, as Yukon residents, to express ourselves where we feel there may be some gaps or some flaws in the service offered by National Health and Welfare. I think it is legitimate that the Minister of Health and Human Resources transmit our concerns.

That is the first point I would like to make, and I would hope that if there is a legitimate concern here, and I believe there is, perhaps the minister's department could investigate it even in a rudimentary way and transmit a concern to National Health and Welfare, if in fact the need exists.

The minister mentioned the issue of medical travel — the fact that it is good — and I concur with that. The people in my riding, of course, require medical airlifts pretty regularly because of the basic or the rudimentary facilities in Mayo. Those facilities are not sufficient to handle many of the common problems that people face. The minister made mention that, of course, Whitehorse feels similar problems to those people living in Mayo because they, too, have to be airlifted out to even more sophisticated facilities down south. I am sure the minister was not meaning to be insensitive by suggesting that, because Whitehorse has feelings of this sort, they are the same as the feelings that rural residents have, because rural residents deal with medical services in a very rudimentary way. In my riding, for example, we are very lucky. We have two doctors, not one, most of the time, but the facilities there are so basic that many things, such as even delivering of children through Caesarean section, have to be done in Whitehorse.

⁴⁷ That is a requirement that some people have to go through. They do have to travel from the rural areas to Whitehorse. At the same

time they still may have to travel to more sophisticated centres down south and put up with the same hardship that Whitehorse residents have to put up with when it comes to medical air travel. They not only have to travel from Whitehorse as well as the Whitehorse residents travel from Whitehorse to sophisticated facilities, but they have to travel to Whitehorse from the rural area for even more basic services which the rural areas cannot provide.

There is some indication that there is some equipment lacking in facilities such as the Mayo Hospital. I am not connected in any way with the medical fraternity. I am not sure what a fibrillator is or does, but nevertheless I am sure that the doctors in my riding could operate that piece of equipment. I am certain of that. They tell me they can. If there is a piece of equipment like this that is lacking, and they feel a need for, that they can operate, then perhaps we should make representation to the minister of National Health and Welfare to provide that piece of equipment.

The minister would like me to sit down so he can comment on these points. I will certainly be prepared to do that.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I will be very brief. If the member for Mayo would bring his problems forward to the Department of Health and Human Resources, we always listen to those kinds of problems. We will then, in turn, take those problems up with the National Health and Welfare, whom I may assure the member for Mayo, probably will be reading every word that he has spoken in *Hansard* and I am sure that if there is a problem that can be solved reasonably and simply and logically, it will be solved.

Mr. McDonald: We finally got around to the answer that I wanted. Thank you.

Mr. Kimmerly: Just a final comment concerning the complaint about cross-cultural training. I was left a little unsatisfied with the conclusion of the debate. There were allegations of misinformation and things like that. I would like to say in a noncombative and constructive way that there may well be misinformation on all sides or on any side. The important point is that a number of native people — not one, but a number — felt slighted and seriously maligned. It is my opinion that the best way to address that is to see that the problem does not occur in the future — if there was a problem — and to correct any misinformation and also correct any feelings of cultural bias with the group of people who received the alleged wrong information in the first place.

⁴⁸ That would be a very constructive approach.

I have a final question in general debate. I am slightly confused, or I am, perhaps, potentially confused, as to the studies being done. I am aware of a study being done by consultants, concerning geriatric services, in the very general sense. That is a study sponsored by the Yukon government, I understand.

I am also aware of a study — or I was told of a study into geriatric and rehabilitation services — that includes homecare services, done, either in whole or in part, by Dr. Sally McDonald. Is that the same study or a different one, or does it exist at all or what is it? The minister has announced a federal study into a new building in Whitehorse. Are there three separate studies or more and is the federal study exclusively into the facilities in Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I believe that I have been talking about two studies. One study is a federal study that is being done in regard to National Health and Welfare in Yukon, specifically with the physical plant and services that are being offered by National Health and Welfare in Whitehorse. I believe they have also looked at the services they are providing in other areas of the Yukon Territory. That report is not available yet. I believe it will be made public, probably, within the next month. I think it has taken somewhere in the neighbourhood of one year and it is an ongoing study.

The study that I am talking about, which I referred to on occasion, is the study that the Yukon territorial government is doing on extended care in Yukon. This would encompass psychiatric care, which would encompass disabled people, and also geriatric care in all areas. That study is dovetailing into the study that is being conducted by National Health and Welfare and, hopefully, between the two of them, we will have a fairly comprehensive report and something that we will be able to work with so that we can

determine what our needs are, where we should go from here, whether we should be trying to get the federal government to put in new physical plants, the area of nurses in different communities in Yukon and the area of different buildings in those areas.

I must point out that, in all the work that is done by National Health and Welfare, they decide on the needs, at the present time, and it is cost shareable 70-30. We pay 70 percent and they pay 30 percent, but they make the decision on where they are going to build the physical plant and how they are going to staff it.

⁴⁹ Perhaps the study will tell us where we stand in that regard, and we will carry on from there. Unfortunately, we can talk about it from now until the studies come out but we cannot reach any conclusions until we have been able to read the studies and form conclusions and then we can carry on from that point.

Mr. Chairman: There being no more general debate, we will turn to page 112, administration, human resources.

On Administration — Human Resources

Mr. Kimmerly: I am particularly interested in this line because it is where all the person-years are, and I am interested in pursuing a question or two about person-years.

Last year, there was a debate about training, in-service training and especially cross-cultural training, and I am particularly interested and pleased about the announcement of a training person or a permanent person-year for training in the department. What is the focus or the goal of the training? Could the minister give us a little more information about the general job description of the person and the training that will be occurring in this budget year?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The person we are speaking of is a social worker training officer and that, I believe, is specifically what the member from Whitehorse South Centre is discussing. That social worker training officer will be a person who will be working with people in, as we put it, the underfill position. I believe, people who do not have the specific requirements at the present time to fill a particular job but they can fill the job as an underfill and be trained while they are doing that job to in fact take over the job that they would apply for. It would also be something that we would be using. I would imagine, for training in areas where individuals wish to get into projects through the contracting out of services and I am sure that this person will be instrumental in helping train individuals in those regards to ensure that the service is adequate and adequately met for the contracted services that we will be contracting out.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am pleased to hear that, and I support it wholeheartedly. I am interested not in the individual but in the policy considerations that go into deciding the qualifications of that position.

⁵⁰ I am particularly interested in the cross-cultural aspect and in the relevancy to, especially, rural Yukon interests aspect. It appears to me that you can probably get a very good trainer by looking in the academic institutions in the south and getting a person who is extremely well-qualified to train social workers, in a generally accepted way.

However, my opinion is that that person, however competent the individual is, is probably inferior to a person with a substantial cross-cultural experience and cross-cultural interest and with rural Yukon experience. I am interested in the policy question about the selection of that person and the qualifications of that person, or are those questions addressed yet?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I would like to assure the member opposite that, in the area of training officers, we take into account all items of cultural and cross-cultural awareness. We are extremely aware, because we deal with it on a day-to-day basis, of the numbers and the incidents of contacts with people of different cultures. This makes us absolutely aware of the fact that we need someone here who understands cultural differences in the north. I would assure the member opposite that this is taken into consideration on the hiring of the individual who will do the training.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask the minister to take this question on notice or, perhaps, to give an undertaking that, if the decisions are already made, if he would send along a copy of the qualifications required and the job description of the person? If it is

not established, yet, I would ask to receive that information, when it is decided.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I will make that undertaking.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am interested, also, in the personnel involved in Alcohol and Drug Services. This area has been reorganized, it appears to me. I think every year I have been a sitting member of this place I have raised it; in fact, every year.

The situation, as I understand it — and I would ask the minister to correct me if I am wrong — is that approximately a year ago there was a reorganization and there was a director of Alcohol and Drug Services and another administrator, under the director, and then a number of positions, two of whom were primarily involved in direct service in outpatient counselling.

⁵¹ It is my understanding that the incumbent in the administration job, which is probably second in charge in military terms, has been transferred temporarily and is doing some other job in the department.

I raised the matter in Question Period before and I would ask: what is the intention in the next year regarding staffing in alcohol and drug services? What are the person-years actually planned for the next year?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Correct me if I am wrong, I may have made an error, but I thought we were on page 112 and discussing the general program?

Mr. Chairman: General debate on Administration - Human Resources.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I would prefer, if possible, to discuss alcohol and drug services when we are on alcohol and drug services.

Mr. Kimmerly: No problem at all. I raised it because all of the person-years are under this line. I assumed it was appropriate, but I will have no problem asking the same question on page 122.

On reflection, all of my other questions are about person-years and they reflect on programs. I can easily ask them under the program lines. Perhaps I will do that.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: On the matter of person-years in alcohol and drug services, the person-year is still in alcohol and drug services. There has not been a movement. The person is still a person-year under that program.

Mrs. Joe: I just have a couple of questions of the minister. I am not sure whether I am just confused or what. It is in regard to the statistics on page 113. We have listed here a forecast of 87 children, under adoptions, and an estimate of 90. One of the questions I have is those adoptions. I would like to know if the minister can tell me whether any of those children are being placed in homes outside of the Yukon. While I am also on my feet, we have another statistic here that says the estimate number of children in care would be 135. Also, farther down it says foster homes are 80.

⁵² I guess what I am looking for is just some kind of clarification, because children in care and foster homes almost appear to be the same but I do not know. Could the minister just straighten my thoughts up on that?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: On the matter of adoptions, I am afraid I cannot be very specific about where all the children have been placed. It is the policy, however, to keep children within Yukon if at all possible. In the area that I think probably the member from Whitehorse North Centre might be wondering about, I believe there were two status native children adopted and they were both in Yukon Territory. I am sorry if that is not a specific answer but I believe, from what I remember, that it is so.

There is a difference between children who are in foster homes and children who are in care. Children in care could be in the three homes we have other than the foster homes; rather, the five homes.

Mrs. Joe: I was going over a list last night of beneficiaries to the Yukon Indian land claims and I ran across a number of names of people who were in the care of health and human resources. Some of those names were not names that were known well to me or to some of the people who were with me, and I just wondered if the children who are placed in care sometimes used the surname of their foster parents?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am unaware of the names people are

using when they register for land claims, but I am sure that any person of native ancestry who would be eligible, who was placed in a foster home or at a home, would be made aware of the fact that they are eligible for land claims and therefore would be applying for benefits under that program.

On General

General in the amount of \$523,000 agreed to

On Field Services

Field Services in the amount of \$871,000 agreed to

On Human Resources

Mr. Kimmerly: There is probably some kind of reorganization going on here. I would ask if the minister would explain it.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The major change is in human resources. For this year, a new person-year has been added and that person is a clerk-typist-receptionist to provide necessary support to the director. Transferred from this activity to children and family services were all person-years and salaries of social worker staff contained within the community and family service unit. This unit holds responsibility for all the child welfare protection services within the Whitehorse area and was reorganized under the Director of Child Welfare to better reflect legislative responsibilities.

Human Resources in the amount of \$343,000 agreed to

On Children and Family Services

Children and Family Services in the amount of \$711,000 agree to

On Yukon Family Planning

Mr. Kimmerly: There is a slight increase in dollars; a 38 percent increase. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The expenditures have only increased marginally to reflect higher costs.

Mr. Kimmerly: Have any policies changed concerning the availability of contraceptive devices?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That is matter I have not delved into. I do not think so. There is no change from the previous budget level. I do not believe we have expanded any of our programs, so to speak.

Yukon Family Planning in the amount of \$54,000 agreed to

On Policy, Planning and Evaluation

Policy, Planning and Evaluation in the amount of \$48,000 agreed to

Administration - Human Resources in the amount of \$2,650,000 agreed to

On Child Welfare Services

Mr. Kimmerly: This is a very interesting program. It has received lots of attention in *The Children's Act*. *The Children's Act* has delineated various policies, but the real protection for children will occur in individual cases and will be related to the dollars available and the personnel available to actually do the job in individual cases.

The minister has announced previously and has explained statistics about increasing child abuse or increasing child abuse statistics, which may be a different thing. I am particularly interested in the forecasts. I have studied the information on page 115. Is the budgetary planning taking into account a forecast of substantially increased numbers of children in care or substantially increased services to families in order to avoid taking children into care?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We take all factors into account when making our projections. These costs include costs for children in care such as health care services, clothing, school supplies, professional and special services, and travel of wards. There has been a 5 percent increase in the clothing rates and that has been provided to offset the increase in cost of these articles. Professional and special services funds have increased in order to enhance the provision of home preventive services in order to alleviate the necessity of bringing children into care.

Mr. Kimmerly: The reason I asked the question is that, looking at page 115, the figures indicate, pretty generally, a steady increase in the number of children in care or an increase of less than 10 percent. Considering the number of cases opened and the number closed, those figures are consistent, with no real change or a steady level of activity, in the area of child protection.

I was wondering if the figures reflect the predictions of the policy

people and of the director that child abuse is on the increase or if they do not, and, if they do not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Is the member opposite trying to say to me that we gave numbers before that are not consistent with the numbers that are here now?

Mr. Kimmerly: No, not at all, but, looking at the 1982-83 actuals and the 1983-84 forecasts on page 15, those figures are very much in line or are quite consistent with the 1984-85 estimates.

I am not implying that the figures are wrong. I expect the figures are quite right. The conclusion I draw, in a very general sense, from looking at page 115, is the expectation of activity, this year, is going to be fairly similar to last year, or it involves a very slight increase or, in some cases, no increase at all.

There has been public debate about the level of child abuse and whether it is increasing or not. If it is increasing, I would have expected estimates to be substantially higher than they are here. Are the estimates here arrived at through a formula process or a computerized process or does it reflect the belief of the people in the department that the levels of child abuse are, in fact, increasing?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: These figures are arrived at by taking all the knowns that we deal with, on a day-to-day basis, and extrapolating them.

I would point out that taking the 1982-83 actuals and the 1984-85 estimates, on one line, of cases opened, is 64 higher than in 1982-83. I think that if we looked at the population in Yukon, in 1982-83, as opposed to the population in Yukon in 1984-85, you would find — I would say — that that is a fairly significant number more, percentage-wise, per population than in 1982-83.

The figures that I have stated previously, in this House, were actual figures. Possibly some of the figures that are reflected in this book indicate, and would indicate to me, that every attempt is being made to ensure that children are being kept in their homes, if at all possible, rather than being taken into care.

On General

General in the amount of \$261,000 agreed to

On Group Homes

Mr. Kimmerly: There was a discussion specifically about the Watson Lake group home in the past year, and I would be interested in the minister's comments about the present situation in Watson Lake.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We have conducted regular looks into the group home in Watson Lake and we are convinced that the people who are giving the service there are giving a good service and the building is as we would expect it would be, and the people who are running the home are following the contract that they have signed and we are quite happy with the service at the present time.

Mr. Kimmerly: My information is that there continues to be public discussion about the issue in Watson Lake and I do not wish to be critical or combative, because that is probably unconstructive at this stage, but simply informational. There is continued controversy and the minister should be aware of that as it may influence his future dealings.

I am interested in group homes generally, and I am aware that there is a group home in not every community but every major community, and there is a balancing of factors in considering the opening or the maintenance of a group home. I know for years in Dawson City the group home existed and was rarely used, and the cost per day of child care would have been astronomical if calculated that way. However, it is important to maintain a group home or a receiving home in every community of any size.

I would ask if there is a continuing review of these policies and if in some communities there is a consideration given to better utilizing the total number of dollars spent in, for example, supporting foster homes that could essentially be used as receiving homes in areas where there is little activity or if the policy remains that there should be a group home in every community of any size.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We are continually reviewing the need. A demonstrated need in a particular area would be what we would base our final determination on as to whether there would be a group home going in a new area.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask if the figures are available — I

expect they are — identifying the number of actual days stayed in a home, in the year, in each of the rural homes?

The minister may not have that information at his fingertips, but I would be interested in looking at the policy question of using the dollars that are spent in the communities to the best effect. It may be, in some communities, that where the cost per day of child is very, very high, because a facility is maintained for very few children and, at some times, no children at all, that it would be better to spend the same money supporting identified foster homes that could fulfill the need of being a temporary home and spending the remaining money on homecare services in that community. That may be a fruitful area to look at and I would be very interested in the relative costs, by community, considering the use of the community group homes.

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: There is one community that comes to mind that has its own group home and that has children who stay in it. They stay on a per diem basis, which seems to be a fairly good way of doing it.

The number of resident days in the group homes — and it is not broken down into particular group homes as to whether it is rural or in Whitehorse — for 1984-85, the estimate is 8,669.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am aware of that information on page 115, but if it were broken down it may tell us something about the economics of group homes in specific communities, and would be useful information. I will leave that topic, for the moment, and simply identify a concern for improving efficiency, if possible, in the communities.

What supervision is given to group homes, now, in terms of inspection? Does the director of child welfare inspect all group homes in the territory, once a year?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: The social workers who are in the areas that the group homes are in are in those group homes on a day-to-day basis. We feel that that is sufficient, at this time. The group homes are also contracted. At the time of the contract they have to meet certain specifications that group homes have to meet in order to be contracted group homes.

Mr. Kimmerly: The director is responsible by statute and it may be, considering the debate and the public discussion about licensing or the lack of licensing of these facilities, that a close look at the inspection or supervision policy is a good idea.

Concerning the policies about length of stay in group homes, the considerations are primarily based on individual cases. Is it the policy that in matters of what may involve discipline of a child staying at a group home that they may be transferred to a group home out of the community which in the past has occurred as a disciplinary measure. Is that the policy now or has it changed?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: If a person was not able to be handled in a group home situation, as it exists, probably, if it was felt necessary to move the person to a different group home where more attention could be given to the individual in order to help solve whatever problem the individual is facing at that time, I am sure that the individual would then be moved to a group home with the things that were needed in order to help that person straighten out his life.

Mr. Kimmerly: That is another way of putting the problem. The child perceives it as a disciplinary measure and perceives the situation as the child being removed from a familiar community and frequent communication with relatives as a disciplinary measure. Even though it is not primarily intended as that, it has that effect. I know of children who have been substantially angered at that procedure.

In the Whitehorse group homes — there are a number of them I am aware of — what is the policy concerning the maximum length of stay, or is there one? Is there a guideline about children not staying in group homes for in excess of 6 months or a year, or is it entirely an individual consideration?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: As far as I know, it is an entirely individual situation.

*Group Homes in the amount of \$461,000 agreed to
On Foster Homes*

Mr. Kimmerly: This is another area where there may be some change in policy over the years. There are foster homes that are essentially short term residences where it is intended that the foster

care is primarily physical care of the child and there is a significant attempt to not allow a bonding process to occur between the foster parent and the child. Although that is unfortunate, it is necessary in some cases. There are, of course, long term foster placements where foster parents ideally become bonded and the placement occurs for years and years and may be, in some cases, for 15 or 18 years. Are the policies changing concerning long term placements now? Are they avoided if at all possible? What, in a general sense, are the guidelines that are now followed about supervision of foster families where there is a long term placement?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: The policies on foster homes, to the best of my knowledge, have not changed significantly in the past year or two. The only change that is in this budget over previous years is a five percent increase to the per diem rates to offset the increased costs of food.

Foster Homes in the amount of \$212,000 agreed to

On Special Rate Foster Homes

Special Rate Foster Homes in the amount of \$16,000 agreed to

On Receiving and Assessment Home

Receiving and Assessment Home in the amount of \$237,000 agreed to

On Other Resources

Mr. Kimmerly: There is, of course, a 33 percent increase. I would just ask for an explanation of that.

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: This is the area that has been discussed before and has the increased cost that has been passed on to us by homes outside. This activity encompasses the cost of placement of children in care in outside facilities, who require specialized services that are not available within Yukon facilities, such as Ranch Irluo, Bosco Homes and the William Hooper Hall Home, that are used for such placements. We cannot do anything about the cost there. It is passed on to us and is fairly significant.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to make perhaps a little speech rather than a question about this area.

⁵⁷ I promised it, in fact, when going through the last supp.

We are now spending almost \$300,000, or, \$293,000, to send cases outside. These are mostly boys and they are mostly discipline problems in the Yukon facilities. I would be interested in any information that contradicts that statement, because I am confident it is right, through my own experience especially in the juvenile court.

It is a very significant decision, in the juvenile court and in the child welfare court, to send a child outside of the territory, away from family resources, if there are any — and there usually are some — and away from the community. Although the benefits of fairly specialized homes are evident, there are substantial disadvantages, one of them being the removal from the community.

We are now spending \$293,000 on a very small number of cases. I would be interested in the projected number of cases, and I would predict that it is under a dozen and probably in the nature of half a dozen. We are paying travel costs and very high per diems. It seems to me that, for \$300,000, we could be developing a facility here and especially with the funding, such as it is, under the *Young Offenders Act*, there will be more money available.

Another factor that has not been considered, I believe, is that, in every province in Canada, there are waiting lists to get into these places. If we opened a place here, we would probably get people from the northern parts of the western provinces, here, and we could charge the high per diems. The advantage of that is the total number of dollars available would make a facility economic and to the benefit of Yukon children. I would ask the minister if he has considered this possibility, especially in light of the very much increased expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Philippsen: Yes, I have considered the subject matter and I thank the member for Whitehorse South Centre for his thoughts on the matter.

However, I think he would find, if he took into consideration the support staff, the capital costs of the building, the child psychologist and the people who deal with these problems on a day-to-day basis, the number of people you would need, in order to make a facility like this run, we would be in a position where, in order to keep the number of children from Yukon who are in need of this

type of care here we would not be able to operate it without it being operated at a fairly great loss.

Mr. Kimmerly: I do thank the member for Whitehorse South Centre for his thoughts on that matter. I assure him I will continue to look into it. If it becomes a viable situation, I am sure that we will be happy for his support if we ever bring it forward for approval in this House.

Mr. Kimmerly: What is the projected number of children involved here, or approximately so?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Eight to 12.

Mr. Byblow: Before we clear this item, it may be appropriate for me to just raise with the minister a subject that he is quite familiar with. That is a question surrounding a constituency case, raised with the minister in correspondence previously and in Question Period. The subject is home care in extraordinary circumstances.

Having completed this particular vote in the budget, I am at a loss to identify where something of this sort may be drawn from. Before that, before I ask the question about specific funding, I want to clarify from the minister what his understanding currently is of the policy towards home care in the extraordinary situation that I am referring to; that of the triplet case.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We have a policy in human resources that deals with people in need of home care services. If a person will go to the Department of Human Resources in the area that he lives in, in this case, in Faro, and identify your problem and your position, a determination will be made whether you come under the definition of a person who is in need of home care services. If the criteria are met, then home care services will be extended. If the criteria are not met, then there are no extenuating circumstances that I am aware of that would give you a different status than anyone else in the Yukon Territory would have with children, regardless of whether they were born as twins with a third one 10 months later, or whether they were triplets born at the same time.

Mr. Byblow: The procedure that the minister describes essentially amounts to the procedure of qualifying for social assistance. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That is what it is, but if a person is looking for help from the government, that help from the government, whether it be called social assistance, or whatever, is still help from the government. Our legislative authorities are specific in certain areas. That particular area is social assistance. That is where a person would have to apply.

Mr. Byblow: Is the minister telling me that the only legislative authority that exists for the type of assistance that I raise with him, exists only under social assistance regulations?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Yes, that is where the help would come. Home care service would be available through social assistance if that need is demonstrated.

Mr. Byblow: On that subject, then, can the minister tell me at this point whether, as a result of a couple of the studies or particularly one of the studies that his government is currently doing and dovetailing with the federal study, home care of this sort is being examined?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: All manners of extended care are being examined but, to be specific, whether this particular area — whether home care should be given for triplets — I do not know whether it has been taken to that length. The study is an extended care study for disabled, psychiatric, geriatric people in Yukon.

Other Resources in the amount of \$293,000 agreed to

Child Welfare Services in the amount of \$1,480,000 agreed to

On Social Assistance

Mr. Kimmerly: I am not going to be a long time but I cannot let it go by without referring to the policies that were established about a year-and-a-half or so ago or so about a bus ticket welfare. In essence, a number of people were encouraged to leave because of the policies of this department and that is a terrible shame.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I could sit quietly and let that remark go on the record, but I am not about to. It is not a terrible shame. It is a fact of life. The Canada Assistance Program has studied our requirements for assistance and they find absolutely nothing wrong. If the Government of Canada finds that there is nothing the matter

with them and we are operating within the mandate of the Canada Assistance Plan, then I will say it is not a terrible shame. That is to get my remark on the record as well.

Social Assistance in the amount of \$2,577,000 agreed to

On Rehabilitation Services

Mr. Kimmerly: In looking at the total number of cases, on page 119, I see 70 cases. In looking at the number of dollars and doing rough statistics, there is a lot of dollars per case. However, it is substantially taken up, to the tune of approximately 11 percent of the total in administration costs. In view of the efforts of the Rehabilitation Society, here, and the Child Development Centre and other related services, is the minister satisfied that the administration costs are quite in line with the real service to 70 people?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Yes, I have no problem with the administration costs. The greatest cost here is the training and training on-the-job. I may mention that, until now, there have been two people, which the Province of British Columbia have been paying for and not charging us for, who have been identified as Yukon residents. We have to start paying for those people now, and that is a fairly expensive item in one shot.

The other areas that we are dealing with here are: repair and maintenance, there is no change; in materials and supplies, there is no change; the increase to provide for clientele visitations at outside facilities by a coordinator and follow-ups on clients' progress, there is a slight increase there. The other increase is to accommodate the increase in allowance for fringe benefits and merit increases.

Mr. Speaker: We shall go on to line item Administration.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$118,000 agreed to

On Assessments

Assessments in the amount of \$8,000 agreed to

On Training and Training On-the-Job

Training and Training On-the-Job in the amount of \$1,086,000 agreed to

On Prosthetic Application and Restoration Services

Prosthetic Application and Restoration Services in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to

Rehabilitation Services in the amount of \$1,221,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We shall go to page 120, Grants.

On Grants

Mr. Kimmerly: A couple of years ago I raised the general question about the government policy concerning grants. The policies concerning the supervision that these are primarily voluntary agencies, by putting a civil servant on the board, and things like that. Has the government now got a policy relating to voluntary agencies?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: To the best of my knowledge there has been no policy change in the grants and contributions.

Mr. Kimmerly: So far as the budgetary predictions go, it is my understanding and my information from sources within voluntary agencies that the guidelines this year were essentially last year's budget plus five percent. That is objectively seen here, considering the last year's budgets and this year's.

It strikes me as odd that the overall change in the department was not five percent and yet the voluntary agencies were held to five percent. It strikes me that if the government recognizes that some of their costs are in excess of five percent increase they could have recognized in certainly some of the voluntary agencies the same considerations.

The five percent increase appears to me to be quite arbitrary and it would be in order to look at the needs and the forecast and projections of the various agencies in the same way that the government programs were looked at, to develop the cost increases in that way.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am sorry the member opposite feels the way he does about our grants and contributions. I think that if the member were to look down at the transition home, Kaushee's Place, which I would like to point out on page 120, someone has put in Yukon Indian Women's home and it should not be. It should be Yukon Women's Transition Home. That piece about Indians should

be removed.

⁸¹ There, you will see an increase of 111 percent. That 111 percent I think shows our commitment to our grants and contributions in a rather remarkable manner. When the federal government, who institutes programs in areas of Canada, and specifically in Yukon, comes in, starts a program, gets the program going for three years and then walks away and leaves the program to be funded by government, which they do on a fairly regular basis — I could probably think of three or four offhand, immediately — and out of our budget we are expected to pick up the differences. In this regard, if you were to look at the 111 percent change, you would find that the transition home is now being funded by the Yukon Territorial Government fully, aside from whatever recoveries we can get from the NADAP program for status Indians on a per diem basis.

So, I think that we deal very fairly and equitably with our grants and services and contributions. If a five percent increase is not found to be the amount that people can operate with, they do come back to talk to government, and we do look at it and we do try to help them with their books and with their programs. If possible, if we do have funds available, we try and help them with a monetary source as well. I am quite satisfied that our grant program is working very effectively.

Mr. Chairman: Is the general debate completed?

Mrs. Joe: I have something. It will probably take more than three minutes.

Mr. Chairman: In that case, we shall recess until 7:30 p.m.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Committee will come to order.

Mrs. Joe: are you going to defend everybody?

Mrs. Joe: Yes, I stood up to say something, before we adjourned at 5:30.

I just wanted to speak a little bit on Kaushee's Place. There is an allotment here of \$154,000 and I just wondered if the minister might explain a little bit about that to me? I understand that, last year, there was block funding from Indian Affairs and block funding from YTG and I am not quite sure why the YTG has more than doubled — I am not complaining, mind you, I just wondered if I could get an explanation?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The explanation is that the federal government will start programs and they will give a start-up amount of money and fund a program for a certain amount of time. The amount of time they funded Kaushee's Place was three years. At the end of three years, they walk away and Kaushee's Place either sinks or swims on its own. We had been funding one-half of the program and we picked up the other half.

There are recoveries that Kaushee's Place can get back, but those recoveries are on a per diem basis, through the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, for status natives. It is very, very difficult to try to operate a facility like that with half the money and trying to get the rest of the money into your budget based on how many people are coming in after the fact, not before the fact.

So, we picked up the funding so that Kaushee's Place can operate on as much of a normal basis as possible. The returns, if we can get any from the per diem, will come back in.

⁸² **Mrs. Joe:** I am aware of the demonstration grants for the National Health and Welfare. I think in a lot of cases they are good programs, as was the case with Kaushee's Place. It gave us something that was absolutely necessary in Yukon and a chance to prove to this government that it was needed. The government has taken it over, which I also think is a great move.

I would just like to ask the minister if he could tell me if he thinks that he may get back the amount of money, half of the funding, from Indian Affairs through the per diem rate. I do not understand whether there were records kept of the status Indian women who were in the place last year or not.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: What will happen is, we will directly fund the program and when the per diem comes back in it will be returned to the department.

The actual increase is five percent plus the amount that we have

funded. The portion that we expect to get back, we would hope, would be 50 percent through the per diem rate now rather than through the original cost-sharing agreement.

Mrs. Joe: As a result of some of the statistics that were taken last year, I just wondered if you might come out getting more than your half back, which would be good, but I just wondered if there was that possibility?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Chairman: Any more general debate on grants? We will go on to line items.

⁸³ *On Pioneer Utility Grants*

Mr. Kimmerly: This item and the one down the way about, the income supplement for senior citizens, of course, is of prime interest to senior citizens. It has been expressed to me, and it has been expressed in the media before by other people, that it is a good thing that an election comes around every now and again because, just before an election, these grants are increased. It seems that at no other time are they increased. We all know costs are rising. We all know it is a time of restraint, 6 and 5 and all of that, but this has not even gone up five percent. It is something that I have made a mental note about to keep track of and I would predict that, just before the election, there will be a nominal increase.

During the debate on the last increase on this item, and also for the income supplement, I argued as strenuously as I was able to that the increases should reflect a real increase in costs but, in fact, the increase did not. The increase occurred, characteristically, just before the last election and was a nominal amount, or a fairly small amount and, in fact, was lower than the real increase. This government occasionally likes to pat itself on the back and say that we are supplying good services to seniors.

⁸⁴ Here is a case where the costs are going up. The costs of the utilities are clearly going up. The government introduced and gave second reading to a bill, yesterday, to allow Yukon Electric to pass on the costs that it has, through NCPC's power rates, in excess of five percent. Yet, the Pioneer Utility Grant does not even go up the five percent; it does not go up at all. Now, I would ask the minister, how is that possibly fair?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The member for Whitehorse South Centre has raised an issue that I would never, ever have thought of myself: an increase in an election year. I could not have imagined myself thinking of that as the only time that I would have an increase in the Pioneer Utility Grant. The Pioneer Utility Grant, this year, is increasing by five percent. It has gone from \$480 to \$500 and I believe that is five percent.

We do not give ourselves a pat on the back for the way we treat seniors in Yukon without good cause. The seniors in Yukon are being treated as well as any seniors in Canada, bar none. It is due, in large part, to the government that is now sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. Kimmerly: When is the increase going into effect?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: It is in this budget.

⁸⁵ **Mr. Kimmerly:** When is the increase going into effect?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I thought you just cleared this out, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister is announcing that the utility grants are going up by five percent. The power costs are clearly going up more than that. The bill we spoke about yesterday is a clear indication of that. A substantial number of senior citizens are on fixed incomes. Why is this amount not going up in the same percentage as the power costs are going up?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Tying it to one individual thing that has gone up any percentage would be unrealistic. The five percent is what the grant programs are going up by. That is what this is tied to.

Mr. Kimmerly: I understand that, but I am saying that it is quite unfair for the government to allow utility costs to go up in excess of five percent and the pioneer utility grant go up only five percent. It is fair if the utility grant goes up in the same percentage as the actual cost goes up.

⁸⁶ It is a most worthy program and it should go up even more and we should put our senior citizens in an increasingly better position.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Just on a point that I would like to raise with

the member opposite, I think it is safe to say that I have had a number of senior citizens who have travelled outside, with the intentions of living outside, and, for some reason or another, have come back to Yukon. Without exception, they say that the benefits through this government that are provided, along with the municipal government's, far exceed what is provided in any of the other provinces. I think it speaks well for all members of this House that that statement can be made. I think the key area that the member opposite should not forget, with respect to talking about the pioneer utility grant, which is to offset the costs of utilities that are charged on an ongoing basis, is that simultaneous to that we have had a program of retrofitting that has been made available to cut down on consumption of importation of fuels, which has lowered their costs. I think that you cannot isolate yourself into one particular area without taking the whole norm and having a look at what is being done throughout government as far as this particular area of our society is concerned.

I do not want to get into a long debate on who feels stronger about the senior citizens — whether it be Roger Kimmerly or me — because one has grandparents or a mother here who is a senior citizen and how well they are taken care of. I do not think that that is the argument. I think it is wrong to key into one area.

I believe the retrofit program to be a very successful program. We had a function here, about two months ago, where a number of the seniors, who had taken advantage of that particular program, had really noticed a decrease in the dollars that they have to pay for their utilities. It has been very much of a plus for them. I would like to caution all members to look at the global situation as opposed to isolating it and going into one particular program, which, by the way, we are very fortunate to be able to continue.

Mr. Kimmerly: That is exactly what I am doing. I am looking at the global situation.

¹⁰⁷ It does no good to try and personalize the debate. It is quite clear that utility costs are going up in excess of five percent.

There is a retrofit program, which some people have been able to take advantage of — not all, by any means at all. There are senior citizens who are on a fixed income, who are going to be in a worse position this year than they were last year. One of the things that this government could do and should do, at the very least, is increase the Pioneer Utility Grant to the same level as the increase in actual costs. That is the least the government could do for senior citizens.

We, on this side, are substantially critical of the government for not doing that. It should do that. Even more, considering increases in the Pioneer Utility Grant that would not, in any way, be out of line. We would support that. We are in favour of increases to the Pioneer Utility Grant.

I predict we will see a nominal increase just before election. I am going to write down the page number of *Hansard* on which this debate occurs. I am going to keep it in my desk and when the increase is announced, I will know an election is coming and I will refer to this page number. I am fairly sure that it will occur that way.

I would like to emphasize and state that we are substantially critical of this program being increased less than the actual increase in costs. It is a callous disregard, I say, for the welfare of Yukon senior citizens and it is unjustified and it is unfair.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: It is fairly obvious that the member across the floor or his party did not raise the Pioneer Utility Grant at any other time. It is this government that is interested in supplying the utility grant to the pioneers. It is called a Pioneer Utility Grant only because it is to cover all utilities. It is a grant to keep them in their homes.

The member across the floor is trying to tie it to electrical bills. It is not tied to the electrical bill, it is a grant to them to pay their water and sewer and electricity and whatever else they have.

¹⁰⁸ For him to attempt to try and tie it to electricity to try to gain political brownie points in his constituency, because there happens to be a couple of old folks homes there, is pretty low on the totem pole.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: If we want to have things etched in our mind, and we want to tie grants to development, go read pages 409

to 419 and we will talk about development on the north coast and a motion that is in *Hansard*. I have things in my mind too.

Mr. Kimmerly: We can all play the game if we want to. The fact is that electrical costs are part of the utility costs. The total utility costs are going up in excess of five percent. We are told that the utility grant is going up only five percent. In a relative position, seniors are going to have less money in this fiscal year than they had last year. That is wrong. We do not support that.

I would ask a question of the minister on the supplemental information. On page 121, there is an estimate of the number of applications for the pioneer utility grant and it is a decrease of almost eight or nine percent over last year. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Because there are not that many people applying for the grant.

Mr. Kimmerly: I could make comments about — well, I will not. There is an overall reduction in the estimate of three percent. Given that the grants are going up five percent, how does that square with a reduction in the total amount of money in this line?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I believe I answered it very briefly in the last statement I made. There are 250 grants times \$500 per grant, which comes to \$125,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: Not only is the government not keeping the grant up to the real cost, it is going to be spending less money on this item this year, compared to last year. It could be an excellent year to increase the grant. If the number of applications are going down, the total amount of money could be increased five percent, and the actual grant to individuals would go up in the neighbourhood of nine or 10 percent.

¹⁰⁹ Why is that not possible?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The figures are as you see before you. There is a five percent increase. There are 250 grants at approximately \$500 a grant. That is \$125,000. The program is stated here and I do not know what else I can say about it.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister is saying that the grants are \$500 a grant. Was that the amount of the grants last year?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: Obviously, the member for Whitehorse South Centre is not listening. \$480 was the amount last year, and \$500 this year, a five percent increase.

Pioneer Utility Grant in the amount of \$125,000 agreed to On Yukon Family Services

Yukon Family Services in the amount of \$59,000 agreed to On Child Development Centre

Mr. Kimmerly: This is an increase of five percent, as well. I would ask if the Child Development Centre asked for expanded funding this year for any specific purpose?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: There was a time, during the year, when the Child Development Centre did come to discuss more funding but, on taking a look at the books and examining their programs, they were able to find the money from within and they are still functioning fairly well. There are members on the board now who assure me that a five percent increase for this coming year will be adequate to keep the program going.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am sure it will keep the program going, but that is most unfortunate. It is a most worthwhile program and, ultimately, will save other departments — education, for example — substantial amounts of money in the future.

It is certainly our view that more than simply keeping the program going is in order. The program here, to assist children with handicaps, should be expanded in an organized, regular way, on something like a five-year plan.

I am aware of a proposal to provide services to rural Yukon out of this organization on a travelling basis, and that is certainly extremely worthwhile. I regret there is no increased funding for that.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I would just like to add some comments to the ones that my colleague, the Minister of Health and Human Resources, made, just to reassure the member that we are providing more than just sympathy in the way of support.

The Child Development Centre is, of course, in a building that is located on property that belongs to the Department of Education. They have a submission into us, right now, to look at expanding the services that they are giving. We are reviewing that proposal. We

have always worked very closely with the Child Development Centre and, cooperatively, both in the Department of Education and in the Department of Health and Human Resources, in that we provide the physical facility and health and human resources provides the funding.

I think this government has made a very strong commitment that that funding is going to continue and, if there is growth of the program to be developed, that we will assist in that.

As they approach us for assistance we will evaluate their proposals and respond accordingly.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I also have a bit of a problem with this, but I am - as everyone realizes - fairly new to this whole procedure. It is becoming very interesting and enlightening in the areas we are being criticized for for not enlarging our amounts of money. I am going to be very interested to see whether this is the same procedure we are going to go through on all the rest of the grants.

Mr. Kimmerly: This is a particularly worthwhile program. This particular organization has taken the brunt of the necessary rehabilitative action for fetal alcohol syndrome children. They could easily expand their services. They could expand services to fetal alcohol children in the communities, but they are not funded to that level, and that is a terrible shame. That is our point. A greater priority should be given to this area and the very worthwhile work the child development centre does.

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I am just going to make one more comment on the matter. I do not think it would be appropriate to let the member for Whitehorse South Centre get away with that last comment.

This government certainly fulfilled its commitment in assisting the people in the child development centre who do not work only with fetal alcohol children, they work with all children with developmental delays at a pre-school age. In education, we recognize the significant contribution they do make and the assistance they provide for these children.

I think it is wonderful that they have people who work there on a volunteer basis who do not come to the government and keep saying we want more money, we need more money. They work within the limitations. They provide an excellent service to this community and the government always thanks them for that. I think it is very healthy and very good for the families of these children to see this work done without a lot of government assistance. As I have said before, the government has shown that it has made a commitment to this service and that they are going to continue to support it.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister said she did not want me to get away with my last statements, but she has made statements that she would support the aspect of volunteerism in this program, and it is a wonderful program, so let us leave it as it is. That philosophy is not our philosophy at all. Because it is such a good program, it is deserving of expansion. The volunteer work emphasizes the strong feeling and the dedication of a number of citizens. That should signal to the government an area where increased service and increased funding is most appropriate.

In this whole budget, it is simply "a same as last year" document; a maintenance of the existing system. It is in some areas, such as this, that it is most appropriate to increase the government assistance available to these programs so that the service can be greatly expanded. That is our position and, if we were government, we would expand these services as opposed to simply maintaining them.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: Although I would just like to sit here quietly, I have a suggestion that we number these one to eight, or whatever it is, and then the member opposite can stand up and say the same thing and give a number and then we could have the debate finished with.

Child Development Centre of the amount of \$68,000 agreed to On Daycare Subsidy

Mr. Kimmerly: Has a survey been made of the real costs of daycare service and if the subsidy increase reflects that?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: Yes.

Mr. Kimmerly: What is the percentage of real cost here?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: The real cost differs from place to place. A \$25 increase is the amount that we were able to give to increase

and enhance this program.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the increase in excess of five percent?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I believe anyone who could add could figure that out very quickly.

Mr. Kimmerly: I can easily see that the percentage is 12 percent and that the forecast of the number of applications is relatively stable. It increases by two, which is about three percent or so. Obviously, some effort was made to increase the subsidy in accordance with real costs. I am very pleased to see that. As far as I am concerned, I can stand here and compliment the government for doing that, but why could you not do it for the seniors as well?

Daycare Subsidy in the amount of \$108,000 agreed to Alcohol and Drug Services

Mr. Kimmerly: Of course, there is a decrease here of five percent over the 1983-84 forecast, although I understand the budget is about last year's budget plus five percent.

It follows the same guidelines as other organizations. However, I am advised by Crossroads that last year was a maintenance year. They did scrape by, they did get a supp. I understand, in the middle of the year, or extra money, but they just scraped by, last year.

This year, the money estimated is less than last year's forecast. I would ask how that can be justified.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: This budget has a five percent increase over the O&M budget of last year, less the anticipated grant from NADPP. It is actually a five percent increase over the amount that we gave last year.

Mr. Kimmerly: Again, I would make the point that the overall increase of the government budget was in excess of five percent. Their expenses can be expected to go up in excess of five percent and they will probably be in a worse position, this year, than last year. We find that most unfortunate.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: It is unfortunate that the member opposite finds it most unfortunate.

Alcohol and Drug Services in the amount of \$294,000 agreed to On Community Alcohol Grants

Mr. Kimmerly: Where are they going in this next year and what is the program going to do in this next year?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: Community Alcohol Grants?

This program was established to provide funding to communities and/or special interest groups for a variety of community initiated alcohol and drug addiction projects, campaigns, education or awareness activities. Approval of individual funding requests is dependent upon application to the department, coupled with the requirement that the proposal may not contain commitment to any continuing, ongoing costs.

In other words, if a bunch of individuals should come in, or an individual, with a project, this is a one-time funding grant to enable that project to go ahead. To date, the funds that have been allocated for this program have been sufficient to meet the demands on the program.

Mr. Kimmerly: I could have read that, myself. I could have written it, in fact. Is there any information as to where the grants are going, in the next year, and what they are for?

Hon. Mr. Philipson: There is no information, as yet, on the people who have applied. As I said, they are one-time grants and this money is for the coming year. I do not know whether there have even been applications, to date, for any of these grants.

Mr. Kimmerly: I wonder if there is any information about the grants last year, in that case, to give us an idea of what we may expect in the next year.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I have no specific information of the grants, but I believe there were only a couple of them. It was slightly less than the money we have budgeted here. We do not anticipate any great increase or any demand upon this grant, above what is already indicated here.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would ask if at a future date the information could be provided. I am interested in the total amount actually spent and to which communities it went and for what project, identified by the name of the project.

Hon. Mr. Philipson: I cannot be absolutely sure, but I believe one project last year was at Pelly Crossing. I am not sure of the amount.

Mr. Kimmerly: If the minister provides the information at a future time, I will be quite satisfied.

Community Alcohol Grants in the amount of \$20,000 agreed to On Income Supplement for Senior Citizens

Mr. Kimmerly: Again, this is a six percent decrease in absolute dollars. These particular senior citizens who get the supplement are among the poorest of people in our society. I see that the number of estimated applications is approximately the same as last year, a decrease but a very slight decrease.

This program was brought in just before an election, as all these programs are. I would ask this year, with a \$4,000,000 surplus, with a decrease in applications, with very severe economic times, why cannot there be an increase here as opposed to the figure that we see?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That is the same question that has been asked on every grant. Why can there not be an increase? The maximum is \$100. No one is turned down. It is an income supplement to the old age security. The program is funded. No one is turned down. Everybody gets the \$100 who applies. To the best of my knowledge every senior in Yukon is getting it now.

Mr. Kimmerly: Why is there not, or is there, a five percent increase in the amount granted?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The maximum of \$100 is the amount that is specified in the budget and that is all that I can go by.

Mr. Kimmerly: Of course, other people are getting a five percent increase. It would be nice if this category, if these senior citizens could get at least a five percent increase this year. Indeed, it is my opinion that the increase ought to be greater than five percent this year. It is extremely unfortunate that the government did not see fit to raise this payment to our worthy senior citizens.

Income Supplement for Senior Grants in the amount of \$382,000 agreed to

On Yukon Women's Transition Home

Yukon Women's Transition Home in the amount of \$154,000

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: For the record, is it not something to speak about on 111 percent. Does the member opposite not wish to make a little comment about 111 percent?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order please.

Mrs. Joe: For the record, I just wanted to show that I had already spoken on it and we did not object to it.

On Whitehorse Transit System

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am sorry that we cannot go back and talk about the 111 percent a little bit.

Whitehorse Transit System in the amount of \$53,000 agreed to Grants in the amount of \$1,263,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go to page 122.

On Alcohol and Drug Services

Mr. Kimmerly: I have already asked a question about this. There are seven person-years. What were they last year and what are they expected to be this next year?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: People.

Mr. Kimmerly: I can play that game. If they are short answers, I can ask very, very long questions. I will ask the question again.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: When I am asked a question that can be understood, I will answer the question. And, if we stop playing games in here, I will be quite happy to go through the budget in a reasonable manner.

The people who are reflected in this are community alcohol worker positions. There are, I believe, six of them.

This reflects the change in the reporting relationship of the community alcohol workers to the area social worker. In turn, actual program staff person-years and salary dollars were reflected into this activity to better reflect the program structure and organization.

Mr. Kimmerly: I am not interested, immediately, in the community alcohol worker positions. I asked, on page 112, about the 62.7 permanent person-years. It was information given to me, in previous years, that, among that 62.7 are the people who work at ADS, at the office on 6th Avenue. I have asked every year about it.

I asked, in Question Period, about the transfer of one of the positions — the individual was Gerry Phillipson, I believe, but the

position was temporarily. I was told, moved from ADS to some other service. I am interested in the administrative structure, next year, in that unit, because I know that it has changed in the last year. I am interested in what the plans are for the personnel in that particular area.

I am also aware that there was a study ongoing, last year, concerning the program. I am aware of efforts of long-term planning — for example, a five year plan — to deliver these services.

I have asked these questions, every year, and I am simply asking again: what are the plans for the next year to deliver the service in Alcohol and Drug Services? What person-years are planned for this program?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The person-years are as we have stated here and the person-year that the member for Whitehorse South Centre is discussing has not been moved from this program. He is still part of the personnel under this program.

The reason that he is now working in other areas is that we have some other programs where we need a man who has the abilities that he has in the department working for a period of time. Some of those are detoxification services, treatment services, education and prevention programs, outpatient counselling programs, training sessions for professions. They will all still continue in the alcohol and drug program area.

We are now able to address many of the program issues in some of the higher priority areas. Also, when we do something like this, we do not do it just out of hand. We ensure that we are able to maintain a fairly high level of service in these areas and that no one is being overworked unnecessarily by utilizing an individual from one of these departments in other areas of the department. That has been taken into consideration.

Mr. Kimmerly: That is a very interesting answer. How many persons are involved in direct delivery of outpatient counselling? How many people actually do it, and what is their average caseload?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: We have four and a half people working currently as social workers in that program. Their caseload is somewhere between 46 and 102, with an average of 61 cases a month, for the entire service. That compares very favourably with other areas of Canada.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have contrary information about it comparing favourably with other areas of Canada. I have contrary information about the average number of cases carried. I have contrary information about the ideal or the optimum caseload carried by people in this area. I have contrary information about the number of people actually working as case counsellors, as outpatient counsellors. It is my information that the optimum level on a caseload for a case counsellor in alcohol services is approximately 24 to 30 per person. If the caseload exceeds that, the worker is basically processing the clients in a perfunctory way. The counselling that occurs substantially suffers.

I have a number of clients who use this service and there are long waiting lists. The courts frequently ask for assessments. The waiting time is extremely long.

I forget the figures given in previous years, but they were approximately 50 to 60 cases per month for the two people who, primarily, do the counselling work. I am also aware that the people who do the outpatient counselling work also do other activities, as lectures at Crossroads or Detox, or who carry out staff training, in other areas, for other social service agencies.

I understand that the average caseloads, as I said, approach almost 60 cases in a month. I seriously question the source of those figures given previously.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am not sure what the member is saying, whether he seriously questions me or the figures I am giving. The figures I have given are 61 cases, on an average, per month; that is for the entire service.

The member is probably not aware that, in Alberta, counsellors carry 75 to 125 cases, monthly, per counsellor. The member is also probably not aware of the fact that, in Ontario, their counsellors are providing intensive alcohol counselling to approximately 20 clients per week. So, he can seriously question any figures he wants, I

have facts before me.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We shall recess for 10 minutes. I must once more point out that at the end of that time we will expect you all back here. I have looked in the rule books and this recess is a privilege. It is not in the rule book. So, we either get in here on time or we will take it away and you will be the same as Mr. Speaker, and have no coffee breaks.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Committee will come to order.

We are now on general debate on Alcohol and Drug Services.

Mr. Kimmerly: Could there be an identification by title of the people in the program, now? That would assist in the debate about it.

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: We have a Social Worker III, who is the person running the service; a Social Worker II, who is Mr. Phillipson, who is now working on some other programs; there is a Social Worker I; there is a half-time Social Worker I; there is a full-time Social Worker I; and a half-time Social Worker I; and there is a community alcohol worker here and the other community alcohol workers are not in Whitehorse, they are in the communities. There is also one full-time Clerk Typist II.

Mr. Kimmerly: The Social Worker II does not exist in the actual day-to-day operations of the program, now, and is off somewhere else. So, there is a Social Worker III and three person-years of Social Worker I positions. Is that accurate?

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: That is what I said at the onset. There are four people in that area working, at the present time. That includes the Social Worker III and I have explained where the Social Worker II is, but he is still in Alcohol and Drug Services. That is the program area that he is in.

Mr. Kimmerly: The three Social Worker I person-years are the people who are actually doing direct service to clients.

¹⁹ It those people also carry out other functions, for example, speaking at schools, putting on staff training or assisting with staff training efforts. They are involved in lectures at Detox and Crossroads, at the impaired driver's program. They occasionally do media programs, and distribute resources among other departments in the government, as I understand it. It is my understanding, from contact with the department, that there are basically two people who are actually doing day-to-day counselling of patients. Is that not accurate?

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: I have described the number of people and I have described the caseloads. Any way you wish to cut it, whether there were two people or three people, if you take 60 cases in a month, and there are two people, that would be 30 cases each per month. If it were three people, that would be 20 cases each per month. I have described that Alberta caseloads of between 75 and 125 are carried per counsellor. It is not unusual in Ontario for intensive alcohol counselling to be 20 clients per week.

I do not know where the line of questioning, if that is what the questioning is, is going. I think the facts are facts as I have before me. The department is the department that I am responsible for. The facts I have are unquestionably sound facts. I am unsure of what the member for Whitehorse South Centre is trying to say. If he is trying to say that the people are overworked, then I would save him the trouble because I will tell him that I do not believe that that is the case.

²⁰ **Mr. Kimmerly:** Is the minister satisfied with, as it exists now, the present person-power level in the department?

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: Yes, I am.

Mr. Kimmerly: Does that mean that the Social Worker II will not be returned to the department in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: That will be determined by the department that he works for, after he is finished doing the other services that he is doing, which I have already said are directly related to the program area that he is involved in, and that is Alcohol and Drug Services.

Mr. Kimmerly: Whether they are directly related or not is a debatable point, but I will not spend a lot of time on it.

The minister is answering my question by, essentially, telling me

that that will be determined in the course of the year and he is not giving a policy reason or a managerial plan as to what is going to occur in this department.

That is unfortunate, because it is an indication of a lack of direction for the department. It is an indication that the department is not treated with the priority with which it should be treated. If there is a person-year off somewhere else and he may come back, when and if the other duties are completed or needed, it clearly indicates that the managers in the department feel that those functions are less important than the Alcohol and Drug Services branch.

²¹ Frankly, I believe that there is a substantial confusion, indeed, a substantial mismanagement, in an organizational sense, around this department. There has been a, more or less, constant reorganization for almost three years. The previous minister spoke about evaluations and studies and we have never seen a clear policy direction and a stable department that is delivering service in a consistent and civilized way. It is obvious to people who use the service, or who have clients who are using service, that there are long waiting lists, and that the staff who directly serve the clients are substantially overworked. It appears that there is no recognition of those facts by the departmental administrators, which, in my mind, is extremely bad administration.

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: That is a matter of opinion, Mr. Chairman.

²² **Mr. Chairman:** We shall now go on to line items.

On Administration

Administration in the amount of \$261,000 agreed to

On Education/Prevention

Education/Prevention in the amount of \$18,000 agreed to

On Out-Patient Treatment

Out-Patient Treatment in the amount of \$2,000 agreed to

Alcohol and Drug Services in the amount of \$281,000 agreed to

On Residential Facilities

On Youth Services

Mr. Kimmerly: This is interesting because it does not take into account the changes necessitated by the *Young Offenders Act*. What adjustments are expected if, in the next fiscal year, no new facilities are actually built to accommodate the *Young Offenders Act*? What adjustments are expected, or is the department planning essentially the same level of service as last year?

Hon. Mr. Phillipsen: I believe I have gone through this area a number of times since the House has been sitting also. We have met with the Solicitor General. I have explained the problem that Yukon is faced with without a secure facility. The Solicitor General and his people have informed me that anybody who is housed under the previous act, before April 2nd, could stay in the facilities they are in.

If there was no secure facility, then it would be possible to incarcerate a young offender in an adult facility until such time as a secure facility could be built.

I have mentioned to the Solicitor General that we have absolutely no funding whatsoever to build a secure facility. I have mentioned to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs that we have been placed in a position where we have to be in contravention with the law that was passed by another department of the federal government, in that we have no money for that facility.

I am in the process of signing an agreement in-principle that, on signing, will give us an implementation grant. With that grant we will be doing the pre-engineering studies and reports for a secure facility. Hopefully, the Department of Indian Affairs will realize the problem that we have been placed in by the Solicitor General and will release funds to make it possible to build a secure facility before the date that the secure facility is supposed to be built for, which is next April 1st.

We are working towards all those goals at the present time, as hard as we possibly can and on an ongoing daily basis.

Mr. Kimmerly: The minister has given that same answer before but the questions are different.

²³ It is clear that there will not be a new building built before April

1st, next year. I mean, it is fiscally impossible. There will be implications in the caseload in the youth services area and in the jail.

It appears to me to be very bad planning to know that there are going to be serious adjustments and to simply not adjust for it. There should be a serious attempt at estimating what is going to occur in the next year and at budgeting for it.

I am aware of the negotiations with the federal government, but it is clear and obvious that the problem is with us, this year. Adjusting services and the clientele, in the various facilities, will be changed. It is craziness to simply estimate the same as last year and these estimates are totally unrealistic.

*Youth Services in the amount of \$792,000 agreed to
On Macaulay Lodge*

Mr. Kimmerly: I am going to raise a few points about this, because I have emphasized that in other ways, but not in the budget before.

I feel it is very important to raise the issue of homecare services here. The minister indicates some frustration, however, it is an extremely important area that should be addressed here in the budget for next year.

Now, we are aware that there is a consultant's study about homecare and other things. However, the government could act, this year, by establishing a homecare service and budgeting for it. It has clearly been brought to the attention of the government several times, through motions that have passed this House, that there is a need for homecare service.

There is a pressing and immediate need and that it probably would save money as well because it would cut down the number of occupants in Macaulay Lodge. The government appears stubbornly not to act. It is most appropriate that I say, at this stage, that the government occasionally speaks politically and says that we support seniors and increased services, but there could be here an extended service out at Macaulay Lodge to establish a homecare service. All it requires is the political will to do it. The government is demonstrating that it does not have the political will to establish a homecare service in the next year. It could be done. It is not done. It clearly indicates that there is not now the political will to do it.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I suppose if I was to say that is a "crock", I would be ruled out of order?

Mr. Kimmerly: The quality of the debate will be very interesting in Hansard.

*Macaulay Lodge in the amount of \$885,000 agreed to
On McDonald Lodge*

*McDonald Lodge in the amount \$297,000 agreed to
On Detoxification Centre*

*Detoxification Centre in the amount of \$308,000 agreed to
Residential Facilities in the amount of \$2,282,000 agreed to*

On Administration-Health Services

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go to page 126, Administration-Health Services, general debate.

On General Administration

*General Administration in the amount of \$182,000 agreed to
On General Health*

General Health in the amount of \$94,000 agreed to

On Yukon Hospital Insurance Services

Yukon Hospital Insurance Services in the amount of \$165,000 agreed to

On Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan

Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan in the amount of \$151,000 agreed to

Administration-Health Services in the amount of \$592,000 agreed to

On General Health Services

Mr. Chairman: We will move on to page 128, General Health Services.

On Dental

Dental in the amount of \$380,000 agreed to

On Mental

Mental in the amount of \$260,000 agreed to

On Environmental Health

*Environmental Health in the amount of \$130,000 agreed to
On Health Education*

*Health Education in the amount of \$45,000 agreed to
On Special and Chronic*

*Special and Chronic in the amount of nil agreed to
On Health Centres*

*Health Centres in the amount of \$794,000 agreed to
On Health Stations*

*Health Stations in the amount of \$15,000 agreed to
General Health Services in the amount of \$1,624,000 agreed to*

On Yukon Hospital Insurance Services

Mr. Chairman: We will move on now to page 130, Yukon Hospital Insurance Services

On In-Patient Services

In-Patient Services in the amount of \$12,541,000 agreed to

On Out-Patient Services

Out-Patient Services in the amount of \$771,000 agreed to

Yukon Hospital Insurance Services in the amount of \$13,312,000 agreed to

On Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan

Mr. Chairman: We will now move on to page 132, Yukon Health care Insurance Plan

On In-Territory Doctors

In-Territory Doctors in the amount of \$3,910,000 agreed to

On Out-of-Territory Doctors

Out-of-Territory Doctors in the amount of \$640,000 agreed to

On Reimbursement to Residents

Reimbursement to Residents in the amount of \$40,000 agreed to

On Payment to Dentists

Payment to Dentists in the amount of \$15,000 agreed to

On Pharmacare-Extended Benefits

Pharmacare-Extended Benefits in the amount of \$140,000 agreed to

Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan in the amount of \$4,745,000 agreed to

On Mental Health Services

Mr. Chairman: We will now go on to page 134, Mental Health Services.

Mr. Kimmerly: There was a debate on a motion about this in the last year. There were statements about reviews and the identification of people who have been in long term care outside. I wonder if the minister is now able to say, of that 2,100 days that that represents, are we able to say the number of individuals who will be expected to be in care all year?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I am sorry, I do not have the number of patients that this figure represents, but I would try to get back with the number at a later date and let the member for Whitehorse South Centre know, when I get those figures.

Mr. Kimmerly: The percentage change is 32 percent. Why does that occur here?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: The percentage increase would be, probably, something to do with the number of cases that were coming forward around Christmas time, this year. I might point out that the actual increase to accommodate the anticipated minimum, a five percent increase in the outside placements, is what we have gone on.

Mr. Kimmerly: The cases around Christmas, first of all, were last year and not this year. Secondly, most of them are not in care. As a matter of fact, I do not know if any of them are and that could not possibly account for it. On page 135, the number of patient days estimated decreases by a substantial amount. I do not understand why, if the number of patient days is estimated to decrease substantially, that the cost increase by one-third.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: That would be because the costs outside have increased substantially to the territory.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the minister telling us that the costs outside are increasing approximately 40 percent over last year?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: What I am telling the member opposite is

that the budgeted cost for charges for placement in psychiatric institutions outside is approximately \$230,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: Yes, well, last year it was \$188,000 and, in the year before, it was \$202,000. The number of patient days is forecast to go down. I do not understand the 32 percent increase.

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I have just explained it. The cost that I have — the cost of almost \$230,000 — is for placement in psychiatric institutions outside. Those are the figures that I have to deal with here.

Mr. Kimmerly: I understand the answer very well and, obviously, my question is calling for information that is not in front of the minister, so he cannot read it off. It is calling for additional information. Perhaps, being constructive about it, the only thing I can hope is that an official will read *Hansard* and address his mind to the question I am asking.

²⁷ I will be interested in the figure for next year, as well.

The number of dollars we are now spending is approximately one-quarter of a million dollars and I am very interested to know the relative merits of spending that money or some of it on a facility here or probably more importantly a program here, such as a day program, the expectation of saving in economic terms but also in more important emotional terms to avoid the necessity of sending people out or possibly getting people back sooner, if the support facilities existed. Is the minister able to tell me what percentage of these patients go out for short periods and has any study been done to look at, for example, all the cases in a year, and to determine in retrospect whether any of them could have stayed here or could have come back earlier if increased facilities were available here?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: These are figures and facts that I would hope would become available on finally getting our extended care consultant's report.

Mr. Kimmerly: In light of the answers we are getting about the reports, I am increasingly confused about the reports. I had understood that the report, as first announced, was into basically areas involving senior citizens. As I ask further questions, it appears more answers are coming back that it will be in a report. The answers are not quite as bad as those of the Minister of Justice. The report, I am sure, is not going to be definitive on all of these issues.

²⁸ I will ask about the report. Is it part of the terms of reference that mental health services be studied by the consultants?

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I can play the same game. The questions are not quite as good as the leader of the opposition's questions are, either.

I have stated here, and I will state it again, the report is an extended care report. I stated it this evening, I will state it this afternoon and I have stated it previously. It is a report looking into geriatric care, disabled people and psychiatric care in Yukon. I am waiting for the results of that report to make other determinations.

I am sorry if the member opposite does not like the answers. As I have said, there are times when I do not particularly like the questions.

Mr. Kimmerly: I will be very interested in debating this area, next year, when the report will have been thoroughly studied. I would expect to see that there are some changes made and be very glad of that.

Mental Health in the amount of \$249,000 agreed to

On Subsidized Medical Travel

Mr. Chairman: We will now go to page 136, Subsidized Medical Travel.

On Travel Outside Territory

Travel Outside Territory in the amount of \$399,000 agreed to

On Travel Within Territory

Travel Within Territory in the amount of \$189,000 agreed to

Subsidized Medical Travel in the amount of \$588,000 agreed to

On Disease Control

Mr. Chairman: We shall now go to page 138, Disease Control.

On Venereal Disease

Venereal Disease in the amount of nil agreed to

On Tuberculosis

Tuberculosis in the amount of \$2,000 agreed to

On Cancer

Cancer in the amount of \$93,000 agreed to

On Communicable Disease

Communicable Disease in the amount of \$52,000 agreed to

On Chronic Disease

Chronic Disease in the amount of \$47,000 agreed to

Disease Control in the amount of \$194,000 agreed to

On Speech Pathology

Speech Pathology in the amount of \$220,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Before we clear the department, are there any questions on page 142 or 143?

Department of Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$33,278,000 agreed to

Hon. Mr. Philipsen: I would move that you report progress on Bill No. 12.

Motion agreed to.

²⁹ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the motion, do you agree?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

Mr. Speaker: May we have a report from the Chairman of Committee?

Mr. Brewster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 12, *Second Appropriation Act, 1984-85*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Firth: I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Education that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

The following Legislative Returns were tabled May 9, 1984:

84-4-10

Territorial participation in development of maine park policy (Pearson)

Oral *Hansard* p 230 84-04-11

84-4-11

Replacement of doors on Yukon Housing Corporation units (Ashley)

Oral *Hansard* p. 189 84-04-05

84-4-12

Eviction policy of the Yukon Housing Corporation (Ashley)

Oral *Hansard* p. 188

84-04-05 84-4-13

Stock of chemicals held by the Yukon Housing Corporation (Ashley)

Oral *Hansard* p.189 84-04-05

84-4-14

Consequence of chemicals used by Yukon Housing Corporation (Ashley)

Oral *Hansard* p. 189 84-04-05

84-4-15

Fine option program and incarceration rates (Ashley)

W.Q. #3

