

See p. 270 - Speaker's Ruling

Property of
M. L. A. Lounge



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 11

2nd Session

23rd Legislature

Debates & Proceedings

Wednesday, March 19, 1975

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Volume 11 Session 11 1987-1988

Debate & Proceedings

Monday, March 23, 1988

The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, March 19, 1975

Mr. Speaker reads daily prayer

Mr. Speaker: Madam Clerk, is there a quorum present?

Madam Clerk: There is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will now call this House to Order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed now with the Order Paper. Are there any documents or correspondence for tabling this morning?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning, a report on Yukon Agriculture, A Policy Proposal prepared for the Government of the Yukon Territory by R.W. Peake and P.H. Walker.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling this morning, a report on the Development of Power in the Yukon, prepared for the Northern Canada Power Commission by Sigma Resource Consultants Limited.

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today, Legislative Return Number 3.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today, Legislative Return Number 2.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Is there any further tabling of documents or correspondence?

Are there any Reports of Committees
Introduction of Bills?

Are there any Notices of Motion or Resolution?

Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker: And we have Motion Number 7. Is the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek prepared to discuss this Motion at this time?

Motion No. 7

Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Motion Number 7 is seconded by the Member from Whitehorse Riverdale and reads:

"THAT it is the opinion of the House that suitable arrangements be made to keep the Whitehorse Public Library open on Sundays".

I believe this is a very self-explanatory motion, as everyone is aware that they are planning on cutting back the hours within the Library. I think it should be noted that three services will not be available if this does occur. It's not only the Library and its educational services which will be lacking, it's the Archives which can be used if previous arrangements are made. Also the conference room which is in constant use throughout the year.

We have seen through, going through the budget we have seen monies spent in areas which are very questionable, for example the \$100,000.00 for the French program; over \$80,000.00 increase in the Intergovernmental Affairs, which is very questionable, because I don't think anybody really knows what is going to occur there, and now as well we have \$800,000.00 for the installation of a VHF radio communication system.

Surely this Administration can make monies available for this public service, which is one of the few government agencies which services all segments of society.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion? The Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have no trouble at all in supporting the Motion presented by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek. I think the monies involved are in that miniscule amount that it can be found within the vote of the Library Services.

Just for my own information, Mr. Speaker, following the knowledge that the Library Services would be terminated on Sundays following the passage of this budget, I went by the Library on Sunday just to have some idea of the amount of use that is made by the Library Services in Whitehorse on Sunday, and Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, the Library Services are being used and being used extensively on a Sunday afternoon, when I inquired as to the amount of service as it was being used on Sunday.

So I think that this is the type of amount that can be found within the vote. I would hate to see the Library Services terminate on Sunday.

I think that it is a good idea at this time though, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at actually the territorial budget for this year, and the pressures upon this

Council, particularly a newly elected Council, by all the various lobby groups and interest groups as to where money can be found for services in the following year.

I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this Assembly are not losing sight of the fact that the budget, which we have just gone through, was signed, sealed and delivered in Ottawa more than one year ago, and I am certainly not reluctant to stand here as a Member of the Executive Committee and state that the only meaningful change that the elected Members of the Executive Committee had on this year's budget, was the television services for smaller communities, that we were able to get as an ongoing program, because we saw the termination of a program that was included in this year's budget. So actually, we didn't find any new money at all, we just transferred some funds from one area to another to get an ongoing program that we thought would be beneficial in years to come for the people of the Yukon Territory.

I don't think that we should lose sight, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that the VHF equipment, that the French language programs are programs that were agreed by the Treasury Board of the Government of Canada, that the programs such as the Social Service programs which is increased to \$40,000.00. If it's increased any more, even if we terminate the VHF program and the French language program, --which we have the ability to do, eliminating it from the budget, we don't have, under the Yukon Act, Section 24, the ability of using that monies for other programs which we feel have more priority, and of course, this is the problem of government in the Yukon. The elected representatives don't have the say in the priorities.

It goes so far, Mr. Speaker, that even after Treasury Board, which should be the be-all and the end-all, have accepted the budget of the Yukon Territory, that the Cabinet of Canada made a further cut in the budget. Usually once you're through Treasury Board you're through everything, but in this instance, in this year's budget, even then the Cabinet of Canada decided to make a further cut.

So the question considering the absolute fact of life in the Yukon Territory that we can raise taxes, but the people of the Territory still don't have one say as to how that tax dollar should be spent, and we shouldn't lose sight of this fact. The fact remains that this Assembly wants to make priorities, which is absolutely their prerogative, in any of the areas under which they are now getting pressure from different groups on. But the Government of Canada has no reluctance at all in saying "Fine, that's a Territorial program, boys, you raise the revenues, you get the monies, don't come out of the programs that we've accepted already, those are untouchable", which they are, "but if you guys want any new programs under any new ideas that you want to, go ahead, raise taxes, find the revenue." I don't like it any better than you. I'm appalled by Section 24 of the Yukon -- I think it's the most absolute Colonial, medieval and anachronistic thing remaining in the Yukon Act, where we don't have any say at all in the budget.

But let's not lose sight of the facts of life under which the Yukon is governed, and maybe, Mr.

Speaker, we shouldn't have changed the term into Assembly, because though we want to act as an Assembly, and though we are attempting to act as a responsible legislature, as long as these terms in the Budget Act -- or in the Yukon Act are there, we are incapable of really doing so.

So as I say, I think that the vehicle of the Sunday opening of the Library might have been an opportune time to really set the record straight to all the people of the Yukon, who are looking to this government to be responsible, and I think that we have been extremely responsible in the budget, because, Mr. Speaker, where every other area, whether it's a swimming pool, whether it's minor hockey, whether it's the City of Whitehorse, whether it's the grocery stores, the gas stations, have just nailed the poor consumer this year. There is one government and one area of life that said "No, we will hold the line, we will be responsible," even though we realize that we are not going to be able to increase any services, we are not going to be the straw that broke the camel's back, and we are not going to be the government, or not going to be the organization that are further going to sock the people of the Yukon in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the Motion made by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, but I think that in this area, this amount of funds, that to terminate a service that certainly there are other areas in the Library Vote where monies can be found to make sure that this much needed service is not terminated on Sundays to the people, particularly of the Whitehorse area, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker I feel that I must support this motion and support in principle the remarks that the Honourable Member from Whitehorse North Centre has made.

I also agree that the amount of money that is involved to provide this service certainly must be in that Library Vote. I think if some proper management techniques were applied that the service could be continued on a continuing bases.

I would like to come to the defence of the French Language program, for the simple reason, as the Honourable Member has said, if we had not taken advantage of it, we would not have received the money. There are a great many people and a great many students, and a great many of our teaching staff in our schools who would have been very, very disappointed if the Yukon had not taken advantage of money that was available to them.

There is one problem related to this. We are going into this program, it is completely funded by the Secretary-of-State, this year, next year, for three years, then after that what happens? Then they are going to say, "Yukon people, if you want to continue your French program at the same level that you have had it, you are going to have to accept the costs solely from your Yukon taxpayers." This is one of the biggest dangers that I see with these cost sharing programs.

We cost share them on their own terms. I think of the Canada Assistance Plan where people feel, and so

many people feel that social services, across the board, are cost shared 50 per cent under the Canada Assistance Act. This is misleading, and most misleading. I often feel that it is a political manoeuvre, not a Territorial political manoeuvre, but a Federal political manoeuvre to get people sucked in to put pressure on. So often people are misled in this direction.

I agree with the Honourable Member that we do not have too much control over the budget. We have some ability to move funds and this year, because of the restrictions, we had to be very realistic and say, "look the priorities we set, are we going to forego them for the reason that we don't want to hit the individual taxpayer in the Yukon Territory." That is the only way that we can raise revenue in the Territory. We can't tax resources. We have to hit each individual pocket book.

We made the decision that we would have to let priorities go by the way to save the extra taxation which would have resulted if we had tried to establish further programs and priorities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate?

It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale that it is the opinion of the House that suitable arrangements be made to keep the Whitehorse Public Library open on Sundays.

Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to the Question Period. I am wondering if Madam Clerk could ascertain if Mr. Commissioner would be available to the House this morning.

Madam Clerk Leaves the room.

Mr. Speaker: I will declare a brief recess.

Recess

Mr. Speaker: At this time we will call the House to Order, and we have arrived at the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Have you any questions this morning? Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, I was asked yesterday about the distribution of the Commissioner's

Annual Report. In reply I would advise that the report has a broad distribution aimed at filling both informational and promotional functions. Internationally, it is available at all Canadian government travel offices overseas, and nationally it is sent to all heads of federal and provincial jurisdictions, and a large number of government agencies at both levels.

It is also distributed to university libraries and sent out in response to inquiries from business and industry. The actual distribution list is quite lengthy, it is available from the Department of Tourism and Information and likewise is maintained -- a similar list is maintained for reference purposes at Yukon House in Vancouver.

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

Question re: Commissioner's Annual Report Publication Numbers

Dr. Hibberd: A supplementary question, Mr. Commissioner. How many are published annually?

Mr. Commissioner: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't know just offhand, but I can get that information for you.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Question re: Employees, Employers and Wages

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Commissioner a question in connection with employees and employers and wages.

In the case an employee is possibly overdrawn in debt to an employer, can the employer retain such money from that owing to him from items such as possibly promised bonuses or holiday pay, when he is leaving the employer?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate very much to answer that question in generalities, because I think it is almost a legal question and perhaps the Honourable Member might like to ask the Legal Advisor, you know, for an interpretation of that, but I personally would hesitate very much because I would think -- personally I would want to see each separate circumstance and relate it to the Ordinances and the laws of the land before I would be prepared to pass a comment.

But perhaps Mr. Legal Advisor might like to offer some legal advice.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Legal Advisor?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Speaker, I would rather not expand on the Commissioner's answer, because each case would have to be decided on its own merits. It's a question for the employer to obtain legal advice in relation to the particular debt and the circumstances of it, as related to the Labour Standards Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua.

Mr. Fleming: I would ask Mr. Legal Advisor, or Mr. Commissioner then, if there is a possibility of receiving the legislation that does cover this and make it available some day to me.

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

Question re: Price of Fuel

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I see fuel oil transportation, Sessional Paper Number 6 and on page number 5 I see prices listed at Burnaby, cost of barging Vancouver, so on and so forth. I see price at Burnaby refinery, 34.5 and a big question mark alongside of it. I just can't understand why if we are going to know what the price of fuel is in Vancouver and what the price of barging it is and what the price of freighting it is, why the question mark on the price there?

Mr. Commissioner: Well very obviously, Mr. Speaker, the answer that has been given here is the best information and the best deductions that the group that were set up to study this question could come up with. I think that you will likewise see in the paper that the unanswered portions or the portions in which certain assumptions have been made on the Minister's instructions are to be the subject of further discussion with the parties concerned, and one of the questions is, is this indeed the price that is charged at that particular time, I may say, at the base point and rightfully so, that there's a question mark beside it.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Hootalinqua?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Commissioner, are we going to get that information?

Mr. Commissioner: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are pursuing and if the Honourable Member checks the paper he will see that that is clearly indicated there, because before any kind of an intelligent assessment can be made as to whether or not the question raised here in the Council can be properly answered, we've got to fill in every one of these missing links, and that is indeed the answer that is very necessary in order to fill that in. The answer is yes.

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

Question re: Position Paper On Land Claims

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question towards the Commissioner. The question I asked approximately two weeks ago which was, last week the Administration gave to the Members of this House Yukon Government Position Paper on Land Claims, in confidence. Will this position paper be made available for the public? The answer is: "Unfortunately I must advise it is not possible to answer this question at this time".

I presume as soon as, Mr. Commissioner, as soon as this Position Paper will be made available to the public, you will come before this House and let it be known?

Mr. Commissioner: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? I would like to thank Mr. Commissioner for his assistance in Question Period in the House this morning, and we will now proceed to Public Bills.

PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: The first Bill is Bill Number 7. What is your pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number 7 be now read a third time.

Bill No. 7, Third Reading:

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number 7, namely an Ordinance to Repeal the Disabled Persons' Allowance Ordinance be now read a third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to Bill Number 7?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo that Bill Number 7--the title to Bill Number 7, be adopted as written.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that the title to Bill Number 7, "An Ordinance to Repeal the Disabled Persons' Allowance Ordinance" be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the Motion is carried and Bill Number 7 has passed this House.

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker: What is your further pleasure?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number 8 be now read a third time.

Bill No. 8, Third Reading

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number 8, entitled "An Ordinance to Repeal the Old Age Assistance and Blind Person's Allowance Ordinance" be now read a third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the Motion as carried, and are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Motion Carried

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that the title to Bill Number 8 be adopted as written.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, and seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number--the title to Bill Number 8, "An Ordinance to Repeal the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowance Ordinance" be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the Motion as carried and that Bill Number 8 has passed this House.

Motion Carried

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo that Bill Number 9 be now read a third time.

Bill No. 9, Third Reading

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number 9 entitled "An Ordinance to Repeal the Unemployment Assistance Agreement Ordinance" be now read a third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Motion Carried

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

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, that the Title to Bill Number 9 be adopted as written, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Kluane, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that the title to Bill Number 9, "An Ordinance to Repeal the Unemployment Assistance Agreement Ordinance" be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare the Motion is carried and Bill Number 9 has passed this House.

Motion Carried

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 10, "An Ordinance to Repeal the Adult Occupational Training Agreements Ordinance" be now read a third time.

Bill Number 10, Third Reading

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 10, "An Ordinance to Repeal the Adult Occupational Training Agreements Ordinance" be now read a third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Motion Carried

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

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane that the title to Bill Number 10 be adopted as written.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable

Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that the title to Bill Number 10, "An Ordinance to Repeal the Adult Occupational Training Agreements Ordinance" be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the Motion is carried and that Bill Number 10 has passed this House.

Motion Carried

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 11, "Occupational Training Ordinance" be now read a third time.

Bill No. 11 Third Reading

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 11, entitled "Occupational Training Ordinance" be now read a third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare that the Motion is Carried.

Motion Carried

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

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that the title to Bill Number 11 be adopted as written.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 11, "Occupational Training Ordinance" --or the title to Bill Number 11, "Occupational Training Ordinance" be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the Motion is Carried and that Bill Number 11 has passed this House.

Motion Carried

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 15, "Young Voyageur Agreement Ordinance" be now read a third time.

Bill No. 15, Third Reading

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that Bill Number 15, entitled "Young Voyageur Agreement Ordinance" be now read for the third time. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

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

Motion Carried

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

Hon. Mr. McIntyre: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane that the title to Bill Number 15 be adopted as written.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kluane, that the title to Bill Number 15, "Young Voyageur Agreement Ordinance" be adopted as written. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the Motion is carried and that Bill Number 15 has passed this House.

Motion Carried

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill Number 16 be now read a third time.

Bill No. 16, Third Reading

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member from Ogilvie?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move at this time, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek that Bill Number 16 be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the Motion, the Procedural

Motion would be quite in order and precede the original motion on third reading.

Could I have that motion stated again please?

Ms. Millard: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, that Bill Number 16, "Transfer of Prisoners' Agreement Ordinance" be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek, of Whitehorse Porter Creek, that Bill Number 16, "Transfer of Prisoners' Agreement Ordinance" be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I believe there's a Motion on the floor now that you have to deal with first. My motion for third reading.

Mr. Speaker: The -- procedurally, the Motion to refer to Committee of the Whole can take precedence over the motion for third reading of the Bill. If once decided in the negative -- in the positive, this would have the tendency to refer the Bill to Committee. If it's decided in the negative, then the Bill would then be -- or the Chair would have to accept the motion for third reading.

Is there any comment on the Motion now before the House? Possibly the Honourable Member could explain the reasons for this referral?

Ms. Millard: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Late yesterday while we were considering this Bill, it occurred to me that there's a lot of positive aspects in it, but also some negative aspects which were not being controlled under the way the Bill is written, and particularly for appeal by the prisoners of his transfer to an outside prison.

I would like to add to the Bill an amendment to enable the prisoner to appeal to the Magistrate or Judge who sentenced him, should he not be willing to remain in the prison to which he is sent outside.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I will at this point allow further discussion--further debate on this motion if anyone wishes to debate it.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Question.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the Motion is carried and Bill Number 16 has been referred back to Committee of the Whole House.

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker: What is your further pleasure?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve in Com-

mittee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Mr. Fleming: I second that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Porter Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Bills, Sessional Papers and Motions. Are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that the Motion is carried and the Honourable Member from Whitehorse Riverdale will take the chair in Committee of the Whole.

Motion Carried

Mr. Speaker leaves Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I will now call the Committee to Order and declare a 10 minute recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will now call Committee to order. I have been advised by Madam Clerk's office that Mr. Woods will not be available on Monday next at two, and it would appear that a Mr. Putters might be invited as an alternate for Mr. Woods, as he has some expertise on the program. What is the feeling of the Members?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a difficult position in that I have made the original proposal for these people to appear as witnesses --

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Dr. Hibberd: -- but I also find that I might not be available myself in the House.

A Member: Agreed.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, in that case I think I can carry on for Dr. Hibberd.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Miss Millard. Another matter is the motion before the House, and I understand that Jack Hadden of C.M.H.C. would be

available Friday next after Orders of the Day, so is it agreed that we should invite Mr. Hadden to appear before Committee of the Whole?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: We will then proceed.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder before we get into the regular business of the day, I have been informed by His Worship, the Mayor of the City of Whitehorse, that there is a public reception planned for the Don Twa rink, and it was at the request of the Whitehorse Curling Club that they be the hosts of the public reception for the rink, so I think that perhaps maybe some of our misgivings could have been allayed if we had had that information available to us prior to the information that was given to us.

So the Territorial and civic dinner was planned because the curling club had already taken care of the public aspect of the reception for the rink, and it was the feeling of the organizers on the Territorial civic level and particularly from the Territorial end, it would allow people from each area of the Territory to give their congratulations to the rink for the fine job that they did.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, what day is this planned for the Twa rink?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: As far as the information that is available as of yesterday, it is on March the 25th, Mr. Chairman. No, that's -- Mr. Chairman, the date of the public reception is not known yet, because evidently there is some desire of the curling club to honour all those rinks that went out representing the Yukon in national playdowns at the same time. This would include the school boy curlers and the mixed rink skipped by our own Herb Taylor who did so well in the national playdowns this year also.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, with deference to the immortal bard, the day so chosen will be called Twa -- we shall call it Twatown on that day.

(Laughter)

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, before we go into the Bills, I have some answers to questions that were asked while we were discussing the Social Welfare estimates. They are rather lengthy answers, so I've had written answers prepared and I will distribute them for the Honourable Members.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Watson. Perhaps we could have those distributed and if there are any questions arising from them, we could deal with those questions after we read clause by clause in Bill 14.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I believe we will be going into Bill Number 2 again, will we not, a second review?

Mr. Chairman: Oh yes.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: And at that time then, the questions could probably be brought up.

Bill Number 14

Mr. Chairman: Oh, very well.

Well then, if there is nothing further, we will commence clause by clause reading of Bill 14. Clause number 1:

(Reads Clause 1)

Mr. Chairman: 2:

(Reads Clause 2)

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I would like some kind of definition of head of the household. Would that include a woman who was the employee where the man was not, in a married household?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it would include that lady if she was the head of the household, but the draughting is intending to reflect the position that there are sometimes women who are employed with the Territorial Government, when their husband is employed with another organization, and it's intended to allow -- the definition of head of a household to be a factual matter and not a sexual matter.

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Legal Advisor could expand on a factual matter.

Mr. Legal Advisor: It's a case which would have to be considered in each individual instance, whether or not she was the head of the household.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman --

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: -- then we do have assurance that head of a household could also be a woman in a married unit?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is so -- on this draughting, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I would like more clarification on point 4, a person seconded to the Government of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, that would in-

clude for instance, as may happen from time to time, but if somebody such as Mr. Holden as the House is aware, was seconded to this government from the Government of British Columbia, there is in contemplation occasionally in different Departments a person would come here for a year or two years for a specific task, to provide special expertise not available here, then he would not be a permanent employee. This is including a special classification which keeps the terms and conditions usually of the service to the advantage of both governments.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Any further questions or comments?

Mr. McCall:

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just curious under these explanations, sub-section (2), I'm curious just how many employees it does cover with all this explanatory wording here?

Mr. Legal Advisor: It's perhaps draughted backwards to reflect the fact that we are talking about our permanent employees.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions or comments?

3(1)?

(Reads 3(1))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (2):

(Reads Sub-section (2))

Mr. Chairman: Sub-section (3):

(Reads Sub-section (3))

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions or comments on this section? Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. (e) reads here "Subject to this Ordinance, every employee is eligible for the benefits of this plan who is laid off by the employer". I don't quite understand that, eligible for the plan after they have been laid off by their employer?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, what the draughting or effects is a double condition. The person must have been a permanent employee, and then the plan is triggered, the benefits are triggered when he is laid off.

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'm curious under section 3(2), "Where an employee dies, his widow or such other person as may be entitled to the housing unit", would that also include her widower?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions or comments? Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: In view of what Miss Millard said, I was just wondering if this wording in sub-section (2) can be reviewed? It should be the widow or widower, instead of "his widow".

Mr. Legal Advisor: We try to do that in a gentler way, Mr. Chairman, by saying "such other person as may be entitled to the housing unit", which would include a widower.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I understand, Mr. Legal Advisor, they are only affected -- I would to have a definition I guess of "laid off" first, against say being fired due to some misconduct or otherwise. In this case does it still just mean laid off, you are still eligible for all these?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Well I think perhaps the Honourable Member doesn't understand the -- the operation of the plan is that people will register their houses within the plan, either on purchase or when the bill comes into force, they ask to be included and then there's an evaluation or something and a Register kept.

Now, the scheme is that the person will be enabled to sell his house and the government is obligated to buy when certain things happen. In a lay-off situation, it's visualized that the person is in fact dismissed, but has eligibility to be re-employed.

But he may not be re-employed, depending on the market situation, so I think it's only fair to give a laid-off employee the right to claim to sell his house. He may not want to sell it, but the option is to him, but he can say "Please buy my house, I want to leave the Territory".

Mr. Fleming: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions or comments? Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see that wording changed, if I may. I think that is not explanatory enough to any person reading that. I think it should read in sub-section (2): "Where an employee dies, the widow or widower or such other person". I think that's the way it should be read.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, shall I say that the matter will be considered and it may be redraughted.

Mr. Chairman: Is that satisfactory, Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, that is satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. McCall. Any further questions or comments on Section 3? Section 4:

(Reads Section 4)

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Does it mean that if an employee leaves, he has been working say, for the government for three years, and he's laid off or he resigns for personal reason, and he fails to register his house, or say something unforeseen comes up and he has to, and he has no intention of selling the house, and he fails to register with this particular plan, he is not eligible for this?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, Section 4 is dealing with two different things. When you are eligible, you must have your house registered. I think it's fair to insist that a register be kept and people do it as they become eligible, and then the house is valued and certain things happen.

Now, for making an application to the government to purchase the house, there are basically two conditions: One is, that he must offer the house for sale to the public generally, because the government does not want to buy every house, just one where the market fails to satisfy the reasonable appraised price. So the 60 day period mentioned in paragraph (b) of subsection (1) is not a 60 day period, it's a 120 day period. A person who is moving towards retirement can put his house on the market earlier, and satisfy these conditions, but they are very carefully and precisely draughted, and I would request the Member not to interfere with the draughting because it took several gallons of perspiration on the part, not only of me, but of a number of other people to hammer out something which was fair and equitable to the employee, and give him wide parameters within which to operate, and at the same time not require the government to be unnecessarily buying houses which the public would in fact buy.

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I still have difficulties with the definition of "the head of a household", and specifics on whether or not a woman and a man are given equal opportunity under this Bill, under 4, section (1) it just refers to "he". I know that means he or she in law, but the implication in this is that the head of the household is a man, and this is not always the case, and I know in practice the government has often given fewer benefits to a family that have the woman as the employee and the man working for someone else. Certainly this is the case in several families that I know of, and things like travelling expenses, the man -- where if the man is being employed, the wife is considered in the travelling expenses when they move. However, a woman if she is employed, her husband is not considered in the travelling expenses when they move. These kind of conditions can certainly be taken from this Bill, and I don't think it's specified enough just that there's equality of opportunity for both sexes in this.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, there's no question about allowance being paid in this. It's a question of selling a house. The house only falls to be purchased by the government when there has been a failure of the market to purchase the house at a satisfactory price. We are dealing with a house.

The question then is, is the employee, who is a permanent employee of ours, the person who is the true owner and operator on behalf of a family for that house?

Now, as this is draughted, if the woman can fairly say it is in effect my house which I keep on behalf of my household, then she is covered by this. If, however, there is a situation arises where we employ, as commonly happens, two teachers, we want the head of the household to deal with it so they -- we can get a legal transfer. We want to be able to decide, that the person who owns the house is the person who sells it to us, and that person must be the permanent employee. But if this situation arises, it's got to be dealt with on a case by case basis, and we don't want to have to deal with a quarrel between husband and wife, or deal with a situation where we employ, say a secretary, and her husband is employed we will say, by White Pass, and difficult situations of this nature. They have got to be resolved on an actual case by case basis.

But the Member should accept my assurance that my instructions in draughting this was to make complete equality between men and women, but we still have to pick one of a married pair to deal with.

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but the choice is often more generally the man than the women, and there's no assurance here that it wouldn't be. I don't think you have given me any assurance that under those conditions that the woman would be considered equally, because does it have to in law have one head of the household? Why couldn't it be a joint head of the household if there are two teachers employed, certainly they are both contributing towards the upkeep of the house. How could you ever, a judge be able to decide whether it's the man or the woman who is the head of the household?

Hopefully, in this day and age it's a joint effort.

Mr. Legal Advisor: What happens -- Mr. Chairman, what happens if it's not? We want to deal with an individual who can give us a title. We are committed to paying out perhaps \$60,000.00. We cannot pay out the money until the title is transferred to the government because we are buying a particular thing, and we don't want to become involved in a quarrel between two individuals as to who is the head of the household.

All we are really looking for is to produce a guarantee that when the house is tendered to the government by a permanent employee, or if they agree by the permanent employee and his wife in the case of a joint ownership, that we will get the house which we are paying for, and there's no sex differential at all. It's a question of buying a house.

Ms. Millard: Well certainly and the marriage contract is quite legal, and wouldn't it be a partnership between the man and wife in that they were jointly owning the house, not the head of the household, but the heads of the household?

Mr. Legal Advisor: There are cases where we don't employ both parties, Mr.

Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, he is really diverting the question. Certainly there are cases where we don't employ both, but there are cases where we employ both, and there are cases where we employ only the female member of the marriage, and I think you are just diverting the question.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, doesn't it actually boil down that this is a decision that individuals, or the couple has to make? We can't make the decision here for them. If they want to have it in joint ownership, fine, or if the wife wants to have it in her name, or the husband wants to have it in her name, we are not -- this doesn't raise that issue at all.

The whole idea is so that you find out whose name the house is in, so that you -- and if they are an employee, then -- and they want to sell the house, then the house will be purchased by the government. I don't think we have to go into the question you're raising at this time, for this Bill. Maybe for other Bills, but not for this one.

Mr. Chairman: If I might just interject here -- I understand, Miss Millard's concern with the words "head of a household" because I think she is envisaging the situation where a person might be employed as a secretary to somebody in the government; the husband might be employed with a private firm in town, and what she is concerned about is that the secretary may not come under this plan because of the words "head of a household", no matter who in that family unit had the legal ownership.

I think it's a valid, it's a valid criticism. Why, and I think I have to support her, why shouldn't any permanent employee come within this Ordinance, whether or not he or she is sole owner or possibly a tenant in common, or joint tenant with the other partner in the marriage?

Mr. Legal Advisor: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that, but the basic policy decision on which this Ordinance is predicated, and on which I have draughted the order, is on the basis that we are dealing with our own permanent employees, and we are dealing with an individual who is the head of a household, and it had to be draughted in such a way as to obviate the case that a person who happens to be, we will say a secretary to take the case in hand, --

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Legal Advisor: -- with the husband, say, working as some of my staff do, the husband is working for Forestry.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Legal Advisor: Now, that person would not claim to be the head of that household, so if they

happen to leave our employment, to resign, the government should not be obligated to buy the house, because the household is not moving away from town, and is not moved from the location.

Mr. Chairman: Well that could be the case where the male resigns, he may be remaining in the Yukon.

Mr. Legal Advisor: I said I don't want to get involved in a discussion on draughting on this, which appears to be a major policy point. It is not a benefit which is draughted to give a benefit to every employee, only the employees who, in common English, are said to be the householder, the house owner and the head of the family is described here as being the head of the house.

It has not been draughted to give subsidiary employees within a house, say the eldest child, for instance. If we extend this benefit beyond the parameters within which it was draughted we may have the situation that a daughter of 19, who becomes a permanent employee, can then claim to be the house owner and the house holder although her mother and father and all her brothers may be working.

It is not draughted to be as wide as that.

Mr. Chairman: Just to pursue this, why shouldn't that daughter who is 19 or 21, or whatever, if she is the owner of the house, why shouldn't she be entitled to sell the house when she meets the conditions set forth in Section 3. It is only going to be a one shot deal no matter, you are only going to have one shot buy-back by the Corporation no matter who in the family is the owners.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, take the daughter of 19 she might be living at home with her father and mother and they are both working so they transfer the title to the daughter in order to get the benefit of the plan. I don't think that this is what we are trying to do. If that girl, 19 year old girl, was the head of a household and the title to the property was in her name, and she was supporting her mother and father and she was the only working person, and was leaving, then you would consider her as somebody who should come under the benefits of the plan.

Mr. Chairman: With the greatest of respect, Mrs. Watson, if the daughter, to fall under the plan would have to have been working for a minimum of two years continuous service.

Why shouldn't she receive the same benefit as anybody else that is employed by the government? I don't see the distinction.

Mr. Legal Advisor: It is not a benefit, it is an insurance. It is not intended to be a benefit or to give that employee anything. It is to encourage people to buy their own houses and own their own houses and to insure them against the risk that in the particular community where they purchase a house, or build a house, that they will be protected against a falling market.

It is expected that the main beneficiaries of this Ordinance will not be in Whitehorse at all, they will be -- people will be encouraged to go to smaller com-

munities and buy a house knowing, that if they--in a particular district there was a down turn in the economy that they would have a guaranteed market by the government to sell the house regardless of the falling market.

That is the intention. It is an insurance, not intended to give benefit to all our employees as such, at all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know, if, take for example, if a woman was working for the government and was in the Income Tax bracket of \$12,000.00 a year, the man was working for a private firm and was in the area of \$12,000.00 as well, how would you determine the head of the household?

Mr. Legal Advisor: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, in that case you would ask them.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, a further question. Say they said the woman was the head of the household, would that be acceptable?

Mr. Legal Advisor: It is a matter for the Administration, I can't give an answer at this time to that kind of a question.

This is the way the Ordinance is draughted and it would have to be interpreted and administered by consent of the people who are registering.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on what Ms. Millard said right at the beginning of her query. I think we are losing sight of the language we are viewing here under this Ordinance. No matter what our Legal Advisor says as far as assurances, once that is enacted that is law. As far as I am concerned, I would like to go back to, if I may Mr. Chairman, the definition of an employee.

I don't think it is stated properly in this Ordinance what the definition of an employee, which I also feel will help to clear up this group of curious questions.

The term employee would mean male or female, but this is not termed in this Ordinance. Now, as far as I am concerned, this is where I feel the area of confusion starts.

If it is the opinion of the Legal Advisor to leave this out, as far as explanations under this Ordinance or legal interpretations, fine. I think it would help to clear up a lot of problems as to the term or definition of employee, which is male or female.

Mr. Legal Advisor: I am somewhat taken back, Mr. Chairman, by a requirement that in the 1975 that we have to say that an employee includes both male and female.

If this will help to make people understand that employees are of either sex, or both, then we can do it.

We are talking about a person. A person to me is a male and female. I would honestly be amazed to have any suggestion that there is anything in this which can

be, in any way, discrimination against women. I am shocked that the suggestion is made that my draughting is so poor that I haven't done exactly what I was told to and made it equal for all sexes.

Mr. McCall: Well, Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the Legal Advisor, but you will find that most languages today, in 1975, that is the case that the definition or term of employee will now be stated as male and female because of the confusion like we have here.

You are not being explanatory in this particular wording.

Mr. Legal Advisor: It would be a harrowing task, Mr. Chairman, because the definitions here are taken precisely from the Public Service Ordinance and the School Ordinance and Regulations. This is where they come from.

The suggestion that the word employee, with two 'e's is a male term -- well it shocks my sense of English.

Mr. Chairman: I must interject to support Mr. Legal Advisor on what he is saying.

I think the concern really is over the words "head of a household", and I just can't understand why that need be in section 2 at all.

I know, from personal experience, that the hiring practices, or the benefits that are accruing to certain federal employees and employees of Crown Corporations such as C.N.T., where the Corporation has been making decisions about just who is head of the household has been the cause of a lot of complaints amongst the employees and I don't see why our government should be placing itself in a situation where we are going to have this kind of dissatisfaction.

Why should we care if the person is the head of the household or not, it is one house. It is discriminatory in my humble submission. Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, the part that confuses me is, I realize that you are going to have a head of the household, but what I want to know is who is going to decide who is the head of the household. You say you go to the Registrar or whatever?

A Member: The Yukon Housing Corporation.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, under the terms of the Ordinance it will be in the hands of the Yukon Housing Corporation to decide upon who the head of the household is.

If it is a simple matter, such as Mr. Legal Advisor seems to think, that there would be no difficulty that a couple go into the -- and say that we want to sell our house under the government Employee Housing Plan Ordinance and the Manager of the Yukon Housing Corporation says "who is the head of the household" and they have decided, because the woman in the house is the one who is the government employee, says that I am the head of the household, then that is the end of it. Then there is no problem. How do you transmit that type of instruction to the Yukon Housing Corporation, I don't know.

I think that that is the problem that we are facing in this instance.

Mr. Chairman: Possibly, before we carry on further. I would just like to say that Mr. O'Donoghue has referred to policy and I understand that Mr. Miller might have some comments about the policy because this a program that was some time in coming. Perhaps we should ask Mr. Miller to be present on this important point.

Is that agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Madam Clerk, would you ask Mr. Miller to attend.
Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think it goes a lot deeper than just this piece of legislation, this specific thing. This head of household thing comes up very often and I think our laws across the country, as I said yesterday, are going to have to define this, and until such time, what are we going to do?

Now, right at the present time we see women wanting the recognition, and I can understand them wanting the assets -- a sharing of the assets of a partnership, a legal marriage, I can understand this. What is happening at the present time, and this is my opinion, is this head of household thing is jockeyed back and forth to which every way the household or the couple can get most benefits.

One day he is the head of the household when it is to their benefit to have him the head of the household by law, and then the next day she is the head of the household when it is of benefit to them to have her to be the head of the household.

I think somewhere along the line this has to be eradicated, because under your Income Tax Act, all of these, if you are going to make it equal status then you have an awful lot of legislation and an awful lot of legal obligations that has to be changed in order for us to tie in with that. We just can't eliminate head of household in this legislation and feel that it is going to be equitable with Income Tax and all the rest of it.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, to get back to what the Honourable Minister for Local Government has said, if the Yukon Housing Corporation is the one who is going to be deciding on a definition of the head of a household, I know from experience, from working with them that the head of the household to them is a man. When they are figuring out the rent for various people that are involved in the Housing Corporation this has been the case, inevitably.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Ms. Millard. Mr. Miller has now joined us.

Mr. Miller, before further comments are heard by the Chair, the problem has come up, over Section 2 of the Government Employee Housing Plan Ordinance and some of us are rather concerned as to why the words "head of a household" are inserted in the definition of "employee". That is what the discussion is about.

Mr. Berger, do you have a comment to make?

Mr. Berger: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I completely disagree with the Honourable Member from Kluane on the benefit that the heads of household could get. I think the government administration right now is using it to their advantages, because women hired as teachers or any other position and they are not considered as head of household.

If I as a male be hired by the government tomorrow, I am considered automatically as the head of household. I beg to differ with you, it is not the family that is going to get the advantages on it, it is the government that is using this.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Berger. Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I find this Ordinance very inadequate in the fact that if--and I am going to make comment on this, if and I'll use myself for example possibly or anybody, your wife is drawing \$12,500.00 per annum from the government, I am drawing \$12,500.00 per annum from the government, and we decide that we must sell our home or anything, this Ordinance does not, in any way, say who is even the head of a household, or who--who are they going to decide on. I does not say in here anywhere, and I think it does need to be changed so that there is either the person that is drawing a higher rate of wages, or is a male or female or otherwise or whatever, but in any case whatever, I think it must be decided.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Fleming. Perhaps I could direct a question at this point and I recognize Mr. Lang wishes to speak, but I would like to just direct a question to Mr. Miller. Why do we have to have those words in that Section, Mr. Miller?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the prime reason for having them there is so that employees of the government, and I'll try and city an example. There are many cases where we have employees of the government, male or female, whose wife or husband is working for some other company and has the benefit of a housing plan with that other company.

Under this circumstance, these people--this couple could be eligible for the benefits of two plans, one provided by someone else and one provided by the government. So this is what we were trying to cover off, is somebody not being able to make, if you like, some deal not to the benefit of the government, that's really all we were trying to cover off.

Now, the question raised regarding head of household, we have many instances in the Yukon Territory where women are considered to be head of household, these are employees of the Government of the Yukon Territory, many instances, where their husbands are unemployed, or where they are working at some other job. It depends, in alot of circumstances, on when they were hired.

I can think of two or three teachers over the last couple of years who were hired, the wife was a teacher, the husband was not. They decided to come to the Yukon. As far as we were concerned, that woman teacher was head of household because she was employed by the government. Her husband was unem-

ployed at the time, so there was only one head of household, one wage earner, if you like.

Now, you can argue this one til, I suppose, the end of the weekend--

Mr. Chairman: Til the big freeze?

Mr. Miller: 'Til the big freeze, yes. It's a question of rationale. Now, we don't intend to discriminate against anybody.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, what I want to know, is the head of household decided by income?

Mr. Miller: No, Mr. Chairman, the head of household wouldn't be decided by income. The head of household could be decided by, on the basis of who was supporting the family or who wasn't, on who the house was registered--whose the name the house was registered in. There could be any number of criteria.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, therefore, if you have a permanent employee in the Territorial government, in all likelihood they could be classed as head of the household as far as this Ordinance is concerned?

A Member: A woman?

Mr. Miller: Oh certainly, there is no intent to discriminate here.

Mr. Chairman: Well I must be awfully naive or slow, because I still don't understand why those words are there. Miss Millard, I understand that you would like to make a motion?

Ms. Millard: Yes. I would like to move at this time that the words "Head of a household" be removed from this Section. Do I have a seconder?

Mr. Berger: I second that.

Mr. Chairman: We will have discussion.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, does this mean that in other words, if you are an employee of the Territorial Government, permanent employee, you are eligible under this plan?

Mr. Miller: No, it wouldn't necessarily mean that every--

Mr. Lang: I mean if you qualify for one plan. I see your point before in taking the idea of them being eligible for two plans, when one is in private industry. But if they were only eligible, say a couple are only eligible under this one plan, that Territorial employee could make use of this plan?

Mr. Miller: I don't know of any reason why they couldn't.

Ms. Millard: Only within the--excuse me, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me only within the definition of head of the household, and that is being defined by the Yukon Housing Corporation we are being told, and I know from experience, that the definition that the Yukon Housing Corporation has, it is generally a male, and a lot of times even when the unit isn't married, the head of the household is considered the male of that unit.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman--

Ms. Millard: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I'm really sorry to have to leave at this point, but I have to go over to the Travelodge and be interviewed. I would rather be here, but I must leave if I have your permission.

Mr. Chairman: We have a motion before the Committee that has been moved by Miss Millard and seconded by Mr. Berger, that the words "head of the household" be removed from Section 2 of the Ordinance.

Is that the -- that's the Motion?

Ms. Millard: Yes, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: You're going to have to make a deal with somebody. I can see the Legal Advisor's viewpoint, that you either have a head of a household or whatever the terminology is concerned. I think the main criteria is that an employee, a permanent employee of the Territorial Government qualifies under this plan, and this is what Mr. Miller stated, that this is true.

Mr. Chairman: Well, Mr. Lang --

Mr. Lang: To me this is the --

Mr. Chairman: -- if I might just comment on that. The deal that's made is with the owner of the house. That's who is selling the house.

Mr. Berger?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, couldn't it be possible to put the determination on the permanent employee who is the title holder of the house.

I think it would solve all the problems.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: They could just transfer it back and forth.

Mr. Berger: This is not our business what the people do with their house, just as it is the employees business, I think.

I think it should be up to them, the family to solve their own problem. I think, leaving this in there we are giving too much power to the Housing Corporation and I can't see your good intent in this plan and I actually think it is one of the best plans the government came up with but I think to give one person so much power, I don't think it is right.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Chairman, there's no intent here to give the Housing Corporation any power. The Housing Corporation, to my knowledge, has never discriminated against either male or female when it comes to head of household. It's a question of who determines they are head of household.

The question about title, the individual selling the house to the government must be able to deliver the title in this Ordinance. That comes further on. Most titles today are joint tenants' titles, they are not individual titles, so what do you do when you get a joint tenancy title? They both own part of it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, in other words do I take it that you can have a joint tenants' licence, even if one of you are working for the government? That's the question. Now I would like to comment on this. I see nothing wrong with the plan or anything else, except that I just don't have a definition of who is head of the household. It's just that simple.

Who is the one that has the contract with the government for the home? As the Honourable Member from Kluane stated, just mentioned a minute ago, it could be transferred so it would be a problem. I agree again if they transfer it, transfer it, transfer it down the line, but under this plan, do you mean that somebody can just transfer what ownership he has in that home up until the time it is not his, to just anybody in the Territory? I can see him transferring it to another employee, that is working for the government, but I can't see him transferring it to me or just anybody. But this is all that I am not clear on, is the definition of head of a household. Fine, but who is it? Who is going to make that decision?

If two people are all of a sudden leaving the Territory and they get into a hassle which can happen between man and wife very easily over something like this, and it goes to court and who makes the decision in the final analysis, as to who actually owns that house if they say, they both own it.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Fleming.

Just before we hear from Mr. Legal Advisor, Miss Millard does have an appointment with the CBC crew, so I think possibly this might be a good time to recess.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson wants the last word.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Rather than go along with the motion to automatically leave "head of household" out of the Section 2, the Honourable from Hootalinqua has brought up some really valid ideas, and I would ask the Committee to give us the opportunity to take it back and see whether we can come up with something more explicit under head of household, rather than, you know, just drop it right now, whether we can come up with something a little bit better and more explanatory than what this is.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson, we will be recessing until two o'clock this afternoon. We have got a very full afternoon, and full two or three days. I don't think we are going to get back to this particular Bill until next week.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Well, Mr. Chairman, that would be just fine, that would give us the opportunity to review that Section, because I don't think you can do it overnight.

Mr. Chairman: Possibly as well as just reviewing the Section, we might also expect some good reason as to why the words are there anyway.

On that note, and being the Chairman and having the last word --

Mr. Fleming: I would like also -- we came to 4(b), and in this case they are going to take this Ordinance back and look it over, and I am very confused as to this unit has been -- satisfies the Corporation that the housing unit has been on offer for sale.

Now, I would like --

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming, if I might interject, I will allow that question, but we seem to have moved back to the specific issue of head of household, and I will certainly entertain your questions when we get back to that Section.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, it will come back to that Section?

Mr. Chairman: Oh yes, you will certainly have the chance. Thank you.

Mrs. Whyard would like the last word on this.

Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, I tried to get up earlier to say that I'm not entering this discussion, which may be of valuable one considering other legislation as well as this particular Bill, because I'm opposed to the principle of the entire Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Whyard.

We will then declare a recess until two o'clock.

Mr. Miller, we won't expect you back this afternoon.

Recess

Bill Number 2 Continued

Mr. Chairman: I would now call the Committee to order. At this point we are moving back to Bill Number 2 more particularly to an item that comes under the grant for Social Service Agencies of \$40,000.00 That's in the green book at page 31, and that's item 534, and as the Honourable Members will recall, we had some debate on this item and then we agreed to call the interested social service agencies themselves before us as witnesses.

The main reason for this is so that they could each give us some brief background as to exactly what

functions they are trying to perform, and to give us an idea of their budgetary requirements.

Now, we have a good number of witnesses present in the gallery, and before we invite them, or any of them to appear before us, we ought to agree on the general format. My first comments would be that, as Chairman, I would like to limit debate so that Honourable members will try to restrict themselves to asking fair questions of the witness relating to clarifying their role as an agency, or as a society, or relating to any assistance they can give us with regard to any aspect of the availability of monies for them from other levels of government.

I simply want to warn the Honourable Members that I am really going to try to be fairly stern about limiting the questions, the time for debate, and I am sure that many people here are very much in favour of the agencies involved, but the time for debate about their importance and the importance our government should place on them in the budget, will come at a later date when we once again go back to item 534 in the green book for the first time, to clear it the first time.

So, are the Honourable Members agreed with this -- these limitations firstly?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Now, we all have a list, I believe or have we -- of the main participants that have been invited. I guess I'm the only one. Well, the witnesses are as follows:

Mrs. Rene Alford, and she would be representing Social Services Society. She's the President.

Mr. Don Roberts --

Mr. Fleming: Could you go a little slower, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Mrs. Rene Alford, Mr. Fleming, and she will be representing Social Services Society. She's the president of that group.

And we have Mr. Don Roberts, and he is representing Yukon Family Services Association. He's a director, and that Association is a member of the first Society, the Social Services Society. They were more or less formed under the first group.

The next witness named in this document is Mrs. Kip Veale, and she's representing Yukon Child Care Association, and she is the president. And again, the Y.C.C.A. is a member of the first group, the Social Services Society.

The next name on this list is Mrs. Jo Anne Waugh -- that is W-a-u-g-h, and she is president of Y.W.C.A.

The next name is Mr. Jeffrey Choy-Hee, and it's hyphenated, C-h-o-y dash H-e-e, and he is a director of Skookum Jim Friendship Centre.

Now I have briefly discussed the format with some of these witnesses and what I thought might be the best way of approaching this large number of witnesses is, possibly, to have Mrs. Rene Alford give us an introduction to her Society and explain, briefly, how the other members, or sub-societies were formed, and any comments that she might have on the budget of the Y.T.G. and what she feels, in the broad sense, ought to

be the aims of our government with respect to their treatment of the private agencies.

That will be rather brief and then we could have some questions at that time.

I would then ask her to remain at the witness table and she could be joined by Mr. Don Roberts. Possibly Mr. Roberts could come forward with her initially, and Mr. Roberts could give us a brief outline of his society and answer questions about their budgetary needs.

When we finish with that society, we could then have witnesses from the Y.C.C.A., I understand that Mrs. Veale has two other members -- or directors from that society, I rather suspect that that might take up a fair amount of time.

After we have questioned those witnesses about Y.C.C.A., we could proceed on to Y.W.C.A. and then Skookum Jim.

I would then like to hear further, as a sum up, a summary, possibly from Mrs. Alford and we could ask her some general questions and conclude.

Does that sound like a reasonable approach?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Fine. I would then ask Rene Alford to come forward and Don Roberts.

Mrs. Alford, possibly you could give us a brief outline of your society and generally the kinds of things I was intimating the Honourable Members could expect as an introduction.

Mrs. Alford: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify something, the Family Services Association and the Child Care Association have had, in the past, some connection, originally, with the Yukon Social Services Society, but they are not, at this point, or have never been once they were constituted as separate associations, are members, we are not members of the Yukon Social Services Society at this point.

The Yukon Social Services Society did develop the Yukon Family Counselling Service, which is now Yukon Family Services Association, and applied for their first grant and we did develop the first child care centre in Whitehorse and helped with their funding at the time.

In order for them to be able to qualify for government grants, it was requested at the time, you could say, it was required, absolutely required that they become separate or permanent associations and although we have maintained some informal association with off-springs, you might say and certainly a great deal of interest, there is no formal membership of those two associations in the Yukon Social Services Society now, as a body. There are members who are common members of both, but there is no group membership.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. I was misled by the document before me. Sorry. Thank you for that clarification.

Mrs. Alford: We have worked together on different projects too, but more as an ad hoc kind of association rather than a formal membership relationship.

The Social Services Society, as I have mentioned, has as I have just mentioned, has developed over the past several years, 12, 13, 14 years several social services in the Territory.

We have not, however, submitted a grant request to the Territorial Government for this coming fiscal year, but our involvement and our interest in the grants to social service agencies is still very great, however it is more from the point of view of what the grants policy is and how it is set up.

Because several of the Associations that are now seeking grants from the Territorial Government were originally formed by this society, we have retained a great deal of interest in them, on the one hand, and on the other hand following Sessional Paper 15 last year, we became very interested in the opening that seemed to be given by the government to some kind of more organized approach to the grants policy. At the same time this led into the question of the government view of private social services, and these two questions are really the ones we feel are central.

In other words, the budget items can be discussed year after year, and they are being discussed year after year, and it is certainly very gratifying that you are taking a great deal of interest in this particular small item this year, but on the other hand, what we need is a continuous type of well established policy that will help social service agencies understand how their grants are established and how they are being considered, so that we don't feel all the time that they are in a constant state of instability and insecurity and at the mercy, really, of things over which they know nothing or have no control.

So in this respect, I would like to say that following Sessional Paper 15, the Social Services Society did get together with social service groups that were seeking grants or had already received grants and were hoping to keep receiving them to maintain their services. The common concern was very clearly shown as being exactly this, that we would like, at this point, to start working towards a more organized approach to the grants policy.

We did quite a bit of work with some of these groups following Sessional Paper 15, and we are hoping that some of this work can be used in whatever plans are contemplated by the government in the future, either to follow up on Sessional Paper 15, or to revise the general policy regarding grants and regarding private social services.

We hope that the objections we'd have to Sessional Paper 15, based on the fact that it had been prepared without any consultation with any of the private groups, will not be again -- will not again have to come to the floor, that the mistake will not be repeated that whatever policy is going to be prepared, will be prepared without consultation with us. We hope very much that all service groups, all social service groups will have a chance to express their views, express the way they see their role and why they see it that way, and have some input into the official policy.

I think at this point, in brief, this is really our main concern. I have a more elaborate paper here which I would be very happy to reproduce for each Member to have a copy later on, but this is really the summary and the basis of our position at this point.

I just want to add as a last word, that I very much appreciate the interest of all our Elected Members in the efforts that private groups of citizens have put over the past few years, in the hope of serving the needs of their community.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Alford. Mrs. Whyard?

Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it could be explained that Sessional Paper 15 is the proposal to have an umbrella group which would assign all monies budgeted for such private services.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Anything further? Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I realize the primary consideration of Mrs. Alford regarding an overall plan, as far as the development of funding, et cetera, as far as the voluntary agencies are concerned, but I think this is going to take time to evolve.

I am wondering about your budgetary requirements as of this year, as of March the 31st?

Mrs. Alford: As far as the Social Services Society is concerned, we really have not been used to hope for any particular money for ourselves, because we were several times told in the past, "Unless you have a very specific project that can become an operating service, there's no need to come to the government for money for your own activities". It has been a very great difficulty but we are now resigned to the fact that fiscally speaking at least, on the very narrow basis, there is some merit in this viewpoint and we just have to keep going without any resources, financial resources.

When we have requested money it was for a specific project, like, we did the first study of the counselling needs, and we presented the detailed work plans for Family Services and made the request for their first year grant, and it was turned to them and didn't even come to us -- well it came to us just with a condition that it be turned to them.

We--this past year, in conjunction with two other organizations, the Mentally-Retarded and the Learning Disabilities Association, we requested the grant for feasibility studying to general rehabilitation centre, and we have gotten this, but those grants are very specifically earmarked for very special projects and they certainly are not coming to the society as part of its general revenue.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Any further questions? Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman--Mrs. Alford, have you ever in the past approached the Federal Government under your Association for any of that type of grants that they have, other than the Territorial Government?

Mrs. Alford: We obtained, I believe it was an Opportunities for Youth Grant --some years ago, I forget the exact date, five or six years ago, from the Federal Government to conduct one particular project

again. This past year we have, in conjunction with some of the other social service organizations, prepared and presented a fairly --a fairly big grant request to the Department of Health and Welfare for a demonstration grant precisely on this work for coordination and strengthening of also private social services, yes, and I believe we have sent each one of you a copy of this.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, what is the amount of the monies that you say you have applied for? What is the amounts you have applied for through the Federal Government?

Mrs. Alford: The amount for the first year would be \$77,000.00.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, when will you know whether or not you are going to receive this grant?

Mrs. Alford: At this point the proposal has to be, let's say, reworked, because we have now been informed that the Territorial Government would not be interested in supporting this project, and from our contacts with the Department of Health and Welfare in Ottawa, we understand that we now have to take another route if we wish to keep with the project. And instead of presenting it on the basis of cooperation or tie with the Territorial Government in the matter of funding and support of private social services, we have to do it on the basis of just the private social services themselves, so that the brief has to be reworked on that basis. All we have from National Health and Welfare is that they will be interested in that other approach, and depending on how fast we work and how fast and favourably they look at it, I can't really tell you. We are still struggling in other words.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I still don't understand--you have applied for a sum of \$77,000.00. Now, I get the impression from what you have said that you are more or less the mother organization of these other organized societies here. Now, whereabouts are these funds going to be spent? Are they going to the smaller groups, or--?

Mrs. Alford: Yes. It's a difficult question in some ways. It would require a fair amount of time to cover the details, and I'm afraid that a short answer might not do justice to all its ramifications, but briefly the proposal has two main thrusts. It goes into something which has not yet been attempted, and which, practically every group, has found to be to its detriment, that it hasn't been attempted, namely some sort of coordination among social services themselves, and some sort of supportive services on an overall basis, either in the planning or in the development of new activities to meet the needs that we encounter every day in our operation, or simply the type of services that

are not covered by the very minimal grants that those associations receive, and that could then be pooled.

And certainly also it has a very ambitious side to it, to involve more than the Whitehorse community in this development of social services. It has always been a sore point with many of the established organizations that they are called the Yukon something or other, and they very much want to be totally for the Yukon, but because of their very, very small resources, financially and consequently in personnel, they cannot help other communities.

Now, the Social Services Society at some point itself, had a branch in Mayo, and our constitution provides for branches anywhere in the Territory. We found it practically impossible to be of any service to that branch, because we just haven't got the resources to send somebody there, you know, and somebody would have to go their own time, and some of our members did it on their own time, but you will all realize that as long as we are restricted that way, we have no money to cover travel expenses. I mean, these are only very small examples, but of a very big over-all problem.

So certainly strengthening existing services, helping the picture to become more available to every community in the Yukon is another aspect of it. I will admit it's a very ambitious project. I will admit it might have to be revised in a way that we will start it smaller, but after so many years of frustration, of not having enough to do what we felt should be done and could be done, I guess some of us suddenly decided we might as well go for what we know is really needed even if it looks staggeringly big.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Alford. Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I think that reply answered most of my questions, but I would appreciate it, if Mrs. Alford would give us the opportunity to hear her clear definition of what her society and the various organizations, how they can function in contradistinction to how the government could function in somewhat the same areas?

What are the advantages of having a voluntary organization where government organizations are in the areas with which you represent?

Mrs. Alford: As a matter of fact this is something that we are working at right now, to put it in, let's say, well organized and well developed form. In a way I am sorry that I have to go ahead and do it just out of the blue.

I will try. We are very much aware that social services have to be-- you know I would not just say supported, but have to be performed by government in, I would say, a very large proportion. We are very much aware of the trends in our society and the conditions in our society that demand that government, which is set up for all the good of citizens, take care of social services.

This is certainly not our position regarding private social services. It is certainly not one of either hostility or refusal of the government's role, as has been mentioned before.

There are such things as statutory programs in the

field of social welfare, which obviously only the government is equipped to discharge. However, there are two things here. Number one, in some areas-- there are still areas rather, where we maintain that private services can function better than government.

Number two, from the users' point of view, rather than the planners' point of view we maintain there is a great role for private agencies to play even in areas which are the responsibility of government, and I am stressing the users point of view.

Now, we have had over the years, many representations at some of our meetings from various groups, or even just ordinary private citizens telling us that when they are in the process of being helped by one particular government agency or another they often find it bewildering, they often find that there are, as was quoted in this Chamber last week, several agencies that offered to help them and they really feel incapable of coping with the help that has been given them, very generously and very competently, no doubt, but still the user himself or herself, needs to have somekind of help, if you want, to receive the maximum advantage from what is actually available.

We have people saying to us when they come to seek help from one agency, they say, "sure we can do this for you, but you should also see that agency." So they go to the other one, the other one says, "yes we can do that for you, but have you seen the other one?" "Oh, yes we have", "Well then we will try to do what we can and you will get from them what you can, but there is also another one."

Eventually it is a very pragmatic picture for the user of social services. Somehow or other even because of their own misery or because of their own inability to follow through or to understand what is going on, they cannot get all the benefits that are actually available.

Now, many of the private social services that are now functioning have made this point over and over again over this past year when we prepared this total big project that we just mentioned.

What is desperately needed is a person, or persons, if there are too many cases, that can help follow through with the user of services.

I have heard this Assembly debate or consider the need for co-ordination and I agree there is need for co-ordination. We must not think of co-ordination only at the planning level or at the service level, we must think of co-ordination at the users' level. I maintain at the users' level the private agency or private involvement is necessary for it to be human, and for it to be effective.

That is the users' level of social services.

There area, as I said, also some social services which, by their nature, are better discharged by a private agency. As far as I am concerned, counselling, the type of counselling that the Family Services is doing, and I know some of it because we helped--we set it up originally and I am still interested in it all these years, is a prime example of this. I am sure Mr. Robertson mentioned this.

Certainly it is the type of help that needs to be done in a more private, in a more, let's say, immediately -- I hate to say human, I don't mean that government isn't human, or that the workers' that are in government agencies aren't human, they certainly are, the more administrative approach that is required, that is ab-

solutely necessary for government well-being, for government safeguard, does cut out a lot of what is needed in some level of help.

Now, Child care for example, it is another area where, a lot of what is involved has to do with the family unit, with family relationships. Those has to be very careful, not only understood and maintained but they have to be a part of the work that is being done.

It is much easier for a private agency to have a relationship with family on the personal basis than it is for a big government administration. This particular view is not just our own. We have done extensive reading and research in the matter across Canada and North America as a whole and we find that it is a view that is largely accepted that there is a place for private social services. I have only mentioned two examples, but I could go on and on and give several others where this need for personal human contact, personal touch, if you want, personalized service is absolutely prime.

Another thing, it is much easier for private groups to be in tune with the needs as they exist at the grass roots level.

It is much easier and I would say that this is their prime function, this is what they are set up for. To help government. They have to pass on to government what is going on and still they have to pass on to the people the help they get from government in its translated form of personal services.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Alford. I think what I would like to do Dr. Hibberd is, move on to the next group because Mrs. Alford will be available at the end of us hearing from all groups. Possibly we could get back to her if there are any further questions at that time.

I think that has given us a fairly good introduction, unless you have something that you are adamant about.

Dr. Hibberd: We have a subject that we really haven't touched on and it may be very pertinent at the time.

I was going to request of Mrs. Alford what form of jurisdiction would the voluntary agencies accept from the government if they were to be funded by the government?

Mrs. Alford: Are you relating this to the question of the accountability?

Dr. Hibberd: Yes.

Mrs. Alford: Well this certainly has to be accountability. We receive -- private agencies receive money, they have to be able to account how they spend it. On the other hand, I certainly wouldn't see this jurisdiction, as you call it, of the government, extending to deciding what policies private agencies should follow, and of course I think probably it is a very burning point, and a point that has already led to some degree of let's say misunderstanding, or dissention.

There has to be some accountability, but there also has to be some trust on the part of the government to the group that they are actually supporting. In other words, accountability is not just a series of figures on a piece of paper at the end of the year to show you what

the money had been spent for. Accountability also comes from the actions and the support that the citizens, the individual citizens give to those groups that decide whether they are devoting a lot of their energy and efforts to devise policies that are not to their own interests. I mean, they don't do it for their own interest, they do it for the benefit of the community and they can, if they can give justification and reasons for those policies, I think they are going to have to be accepted as meaningful. In other words, they can still be discussed, but they should not be dismissed just because they haven't been the policies that one or other official of the government, himself or herself might hold. This is the big danger.

In the realm of social services, of social welfare, one thing I have found after several years of reading and listening and studying, is that there are many, many views about practically everything, so one cannot say that only one view is the gospel truth. Certainly one person is going to hold one view, and let's hope strongly only strong opinions can help society progress, but unless there is a willingness to listen to other people's strong views and their reasons for them, it's not going to work, and this is what I personally would ask the social service agencies, that they be given the chance to develop their policy. Mind you, so far they have been given this chance to develop them, maybe not to keep on implementing them but certainly to develop them, that they be given the chance to develop their policies; that they be given the chance to justify their reasoning, and thus be taken into account, rather than just somebody else's policy who happens to be a government administrator.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Alford. Perhaps the -- we could now hear from Don Roberts, just a brief outline, Mr. Roberts, of your agency's functions, and I think everybody has received some materials, so that could be fairly brief.

Mr. Roberts: I would like to take this opportunity to thank the House for inviting us here.

I think if you refer to the green sheet which is the main thrust of our work in Family Counselling and has been for a number of years, what we have done is to break down into statistical form, the kinds of things that we have been doing.

The title of our Association has been Family Counselling. We felt that in order to encompass a more broad title and the work that we are doing that we should change it to a more acceptable term, so we have changed that to Family Services, but counselling is still one of our main thrusts in our organization.

You will see there a breakdown of the numbers or the types of counselling that we do offer and have offered, and you can look at the date -- this is from January the 1st to March 15th. We just took a sample time, we didn't take the whole period. One of the main reasons that we have had extreme difficulty in the past in having a full time director. This is only our second year of operation under a full time director, and of course before that it was half time. And as Mrs. Alford has mentioned, the idea of going from one year to the next without knowing whether you can operate the next year is a very crucial situation for our services.

There's no point in me going through the number of hours that are spent in the various categories. I think you can see them for yourself there, but this is the main thrust of our organization, that of counselling. Some of them are hypothetical, for example within the last number there, number of possibles, you can see possible, it's underlined, I think this is from the point of view of the counsellor, and again it's a trust factor that he feels the situation has been corrected.

Another aspect of our role is that of Family Planning and Family Life Education. The Family Planning organization works under our umbrella, if you want to call it. They have a Committee which is answerable to our board, and of course they are responsible for certain aspects of family planning, and again you can see that from the things that are listed, that we have done a number of things there. We advertise, we've had a seminar for students of the Carcross Community School. We had a very successful three day Family Life Conference last December, where 50 professional persons -- I'm sure there wasn't only professionals there, there were many housewives, there were many walks of life at this conference and it was very successful, at least the feedback that we get from the people that attended it, and we would hope that we could carry this through in the forthcoming year.

By the way, this didn't cost the government any money from the point of view that it was funded through the Family Planning Association.

As well, we carry on programs in Family Life Education at some of the schools. The director has been involved with an ongoing committee that is now in the process of trying to establish a program in Family Life Education. This is an ongoing situation where there are parents and teachers involved in trying to set up a program that will be workable and feasible in the schools in the Yukon.

We have also had two seminars on parent/ child relationships, where we've had a number of people take part. These were at Whitehorse Elementary and Jack Hulland School. We've had small seminars as well for small groups and so on.

We have also -- our director has been involved in service to single parents, and again you will see the blurb there that this was in cooperation with the Status of Women Centre, where our director was involved in working with their organizer in planning a Bible organization, and which is today still functioning, and has served a very worthwhile purpose for these people.

As you well know, there are many single parents living in Whitehorse, and of course trying to maintain a standard of living as well as social contact, it's very difficult, so as a result, this kind of an organization has definitely aided people with common problems.

Now, that basically is the thrust of what Yukon Family Services is doing, but last year we were asked to take on another service, that of the Whitehorse Homemaker Service. The reason why they are separate is because we took this on as a condition of the grant, because it was going to be dropped. I think if you have had a chance to read it, you will see that the history of it has again started from a Federal funding, which eventually worked through the Y., and then gradually the Y. took it over for a period of time and then, of course, as most L.I.P. grants, they do run out

and as a result they end up with the society or the particular organization that they started is no longer there.

When we took this on, I suppose we were very green, and that's why the paper is green, in the sense of how we were going to fit this into our organization. We didn't really understand the ramifications of the Homemakers, and I think the people that were involved in Homemakers initially had a true concept, but again many of them were gone, so you really couldn't consult and find out how much trouble we had really bought.

And so through the Board, the Family Service Board, we decided that if we were going to do any logical approach to this whole Homemakers situation, that we better evaluate where it is, and of course, on this we did, through the limited funds we had, we were able to hire a part time coordinator, someone who could get together and discuss and evaluate where we are at.

It was felt, and as you can see through the brief, that it is something completely different. It is a total picture in the sense of a service all on its own. Its financial ramifications are very, as you can see very -- almost equal to the financial requirements of our services to operate the counselling aspect plus the other particular aspects that we do offer.

I suppose I should make one correction in here first, if you refer to the second last sheet where the budget, the second last sheet of the yellow, at the bottom there where it says "Approximate recoveries from clients' fees", there should be \$10,000.00 marked in there. That was a typographical error, and then the \$29,205.94 was a subsidy required. That would be what we would be requiring if we were going to operate a homemaker service on the basis that is set out here.

The budget for Yukon Family Services is the one that you received with no title on it, and it's this mimeo sheet. On it, you will see the projected budget that we are forecasting for the 75-76 year. The item that we did -- and again, this was the budget that was submitted last fall when the Executive Committee at that time requested the budget from all social services. And of course, we did not know what the cost of the Homemaker service would be at that time, so you can see at the bottom there where it says "Homemakers, \$2,000.00". To date, we have spent close to \$4,000.00 on Homemakers, offering it on a part time basis. So we would be deducting that amount of money from our total budget year for just social services, from the point of view of the Homemakers Service being a separate entity, or a separate budget requirement. So that would mean our total request would be \$28,500.00.

There's no way you can operate a Homemaker Service on \$2,000.00. We haven't been able to operate it from October on \$4,000.00.

What is going to happen as at the end of March? Homemakers will once again cease, because we have no monies whatsoever in order to fund this type of organization. If we are going to carry on with a patchwork type situation, which means and has all kinds of ramifications to it, then I suppose something could be carried on, but it wouldn't be satisfactory. - It wouldn't even be adequate.

We found ourselves, when we took on the

Homemaker Service, that we weren't even insured, we didn't even have disability insurance, we didn't even have many types of coverages that you need when you are working in other peoples' homes.

So what has grown from a 2,000 item, has grown to probably 10 and maybe more, and that's why it's on a separate submission altogether.

I'm afraid that we have made it very brief, but knowing that -- I think that facts and figure mean much more, we felt that this was the only way to do it, in giving you the information as we see it here.

Now, I am ready and available to be able to answer any questions as best I can. If something is not clear, please don't hesitate to let me know.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness if there is -- to his knowledge, is there any government agency that is capable, either is or is capable of carrying on these two functions about which you are speaking.

Mr. Roberts: Well, I suppose the reason why we are in counselling services is because again the grass roots participation that we get from the community, and these are volunteers who are in the community and working in different sectors of the community, see a need in this area. And to this date, again there is some potential I suppose you would say, in the Welfare Branch of maybe offering some of these services, and some of them probably are offered but to the extent that we offer them, I would say no. I would say that they do not offer as an extensive counselling service as we do, in the sense of cases that we have.

And in many ways, alot people don't want really to go to a welfare office for this kind of counselling. I think this is another thing.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, is there any confidentiality to these counselling reports that you undertake on the part of your clients? Are they made available to anyone outside your office?

Mr. Roberts: This is something that again, from the point of view of our director or our counsellor, has to be highly maintained. The confidentiality of any of these records is highly maintained within the office.

Now there can and has been, consultation with doctors, with psychiatrists, with welfare workers through our director, and I think through that avenue there has been some discourse and organized understanding of different cases.

Dr. Hibberd: A supplementary question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Does the Director of Welfare have any access to your files?

Mr. Roberts: Well part of the agreement, and we

talked about accountability a few minutes ago, and we are accountable for the funds we receive, and so we go through what we call the social audit, which is conducted by the Welfare Branch, Department of Welfare, Health and Welfare here in Whitehorse, and the files have been available to the person who has been doing the auditing. Just for the particular case, or the particular survey that they were doing.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that if I was in the same position in my own personal practice, that it is a completely untenable situation that such information can be released to any agencies whatsoever. This is confidential information, which should not be made available to any agency, except under court of law.

Mr. Roberts: I would say that's the only avenue. That may be only a sample.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further questions? I have a question. We are of course looking at this sum of \$40,000.00 to be made available to all private agencies, social service agencies, and I'm just trying to get straight in my mind exactly what your requirements will be from those funds, and it seems that if one looks at the budget you've given us without the heading on it, the white sheet, that if you cut the Homemakers portion which is \$2,000.00 and the seminar, you would still be in the neighbourhood of \$28,000.00?

Mr. Roberts: Right, right.

Mr. Chairman: And you would be looking really to this government and more specifically to have \$40,000.00 for those monies, and this would only keep one facet of your operation going, is that right?

Mr. Roberts: Well, we would have to -- there's no way we could offer Homemaker service under the current budget as you see it there on the white sheet.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the 28 would mean nothing to Homemakers at all?

Mr. Roberts: Nothing to Homemakers.

Mr. Chairman: And I was a bit confused about your proposed budget on the Homemakers service. If you were to carry on in the manner that you've been carrying on to this date, March 15, '75, what would your projection be for this year, this fiscal year?

Mr. Roberts: For Homemakers?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Roberts: Theirs would be \$29,205.94.

Mr. Chairman: I see, the \$10,000.00 is money recovered as fees?

Mr. Roberts: Right.

Mr. Chairman: Anything arising? Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, I think everybody here is very sympathetic to what you have said. I would like to state one thing here and I think it was ably stated here this morning by my Honourable Colleague, Mr. McKinnon, but the fact is this budget that we have before us was signed, sealed and delivered here last year. We are dealing with dollars and cents just like you stated earlier, and the fact is we have \$40,000.000, not that everybody in this room likes it or dislikes it, but it's a fact of life, and I think the matter is that it's going to have to be divvied up accordingly to where you people see fit to -- for the most appropriate places the money should go.

Mr. Chairman: Just before we get into this, Mr. Lang, I'm going to rule any further comments along this line out of order. This is something we are going to be getting at once the witnesses are finished, and we get to this item as a Committee of the Whole. I think I made it clear at the outset that we didn't want to get into the overall policy, because I think that Dr. Hibberd will have something to say about it when the time comes.

Dr. Hibberd: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I resent him having the opportunity to make a remark without a reply.

Mr. Chairman: You will have your opportunity to reply, Dr. Hibberd. I am sure that all interested parties will hear from you.

Anything further on this budget?

Mr. Roberts: May I just offer one comment?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Roberts: We have really no source of revenue and it's either, I think one of the situations that we're put into if we do not receive the amounts requested, then there is no way that we can operate. I don't know where we are going to get the money. I'm not a magician and I don't think anybody is really, and I thought I had better just lay it right there on the table, that unless something of this nature materializes, then there's no way we can operate. We close our doors March 30th.

Mr. Chairman: Just so that I can fully understand your position, you definitely need, I can see the \$28,000.00 for the Family Counselling end of it?

Mr. Roberts: Right.

Mr. Chairman: And I'm not quite clear in my mind on exactly how much you need to provide some service on the Homemakers end of it.

Mr. Roberts: Well, a lot of work has gone into this through the person -- or the coordinator that we did hire for this purpose, and it was her feeling that unless we operate along the lines that has been suggested here, that again it becomes just a patchwork type of

situation. It doesn't become a feasible organization in the sense that people will not use it, because they don't know if it will be here today or gone tomorrow, and it's a very dangerous situation for people wanting to rely on the service.

And I think as mentioned in the brief here, a lot of people live up in the Yukon, they don't have families, they don't have people that they can rely on to help them out in times of a crisis, and I think this is where we feel we're at right now.

To offer it on a part time basis, I don't really -- we tried that for a couple of months and it didn't work. We tried it within our organization. There was just too many requests.

Mr. Chairman: Well you are going to lose some resource people in effect, if you can't keep them on. Isn't that the main point?

Mr. Roberts: That's right.

This is separate, that's why I consider them a separate item.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Roberts: I think we have got to keep it that way.

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: I would just like to clarify some aspect here, the accountability you were talking about. I understand that the Director of Welfare has had access to your files in part of your accountability. I really am not clear on what this is -- the funds you've been given before have been --

Mr. Roberts: We have been audited, right.

Ms. Millard: Audited by the Director of Welfare?

Mr. Roberts: By his representatives.

Mrs. Alford: If I may say, Mr. Chairman, I was president at the time this came as an absolute requirement, and it simply was stated in a letter that this was a condition for our grant, that we would agree to a social audit, and when we asked what the social audit would be, we were told examination of the file, the case load and that sort of thing so this is definitely -- this was given as a condition for our grant.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the results of that social audit might be available to us?

Mr. Roberts: I have a copy in the --

Mrs. Alford: We have last year's social audit, which was the first time it was done, and we only have the summary of it that was given to us. I cannot say that's the full document, that we could give you the full document because we don't have it. We were never given it.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, would the Director of Welfare have that?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a lot of misunderstanding on this. When grant monies are given, and this is my understanding of the situation, when grant monies are given by various departments to various organizations, be they social service or whatever they are, we have been asking for a financial audit and a program audit, and I think this is what the social audit -- and I would hope that the program audit that is done by the Welfare Branch, is a confidential document between the organization and the Department.

It's an audit done of the program in order to provide assistance, and it's done by professional people who are on the same level as the professional people that are working for the Yukon Family Counselling. You have that type of audit done in your school system, it's a professional type of thing, and I would see possibly assistance, various recommendations made, suggestions made between the two groups, rather than a type of confrontation as the implications are here today.

I don't think this is the situation at all, and I don't think we should try to make it into a confrontation. It's a purely professional undertaking between two groups, professional groups, and I would certainly hope that this isn't the type of thing that evolves from this. I'm sure the counsellor for Yukon Family Counselling is able to explain the program, and that the people that one person from the department who is also a professional person, would be able to review the program with the counsellor, and I would hope that it's not going to be made into a big issue and a big confrontation, and I would hope that it is kept confidential, because I do feel that there is some confidentiality between the two professional people, and between the client and the counsellor for Family Services.

One other thing that people don't seem to realize, that there are audits done on government too by the auditors, and regardless of how confidential files are marked, they're not confidential to the auditors, and they do -- they periodically bring in professional people to do program audits too.

So, you know, it's just a routine thing, and I would hate to see an issue made of it.

Mr. Chairman: Just before we hear from you, Miss Millard, do the witnesses have any comments to make about this aspect?

Mrs. Alford: All I can say is that this social audit, as I have stated, was listed as one of the conditions to our grant.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not in any way want to have any confidential files in front of me. As a matter of fact, I have been given some confidential information in the last few days which one of our Honourable Members will -- can testify that I gave it back to him because I didn't want it, and the last thing I want is that.

I want statistics, and I would really like to know exactly how this money has been spent. Obviously there is a resource in our government that is being

used, the Director of Welfare is being used as a resource to audit this private agency, and yet we are not able to get the results of that audit, and I find it rather remarkable.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the very purpose of this meeting this afternoon and calling these witnesses is a confrontation. The confrontation is occasioned by the fact that the budgetary item for all the voluntary social services is \$40,000.00 which we now consider totally inadequate, and we are forced to confrontation to try to do something about it.

Mr. McCall: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Dr. Hibberd. Once again, we are on the very boundary of --bowing to you at this point.

(Laughter)

Mr. Chairman: I certainly expect to hear a lot more on that aspect, Dr. Hibberd, when we get back to this issue and this subject in the budget, item in the budget. Are there any further questions of Mr. Roberts as a witness?

Well thank you, very much, Mr. Roberts.

Mrs. Alford, possibly we could ask you to come back when we have finished with the rest of the witnesses.

We will be hearing from the Child Care Association next. It might be an appropriate time to break, say for 15 minutes?

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I would now call the Committee to order.

Mrs. Veale, could you introduce your fellow witnesses?

Mrs. Veale: Frances Willoughby is the vice-president of our Association and is a director of Them' Mah Day Care Centre, and Marion Jensen is our new treasurer of the Association, and she is the new director of Northern Light, new President of Northern Light.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Veale, maybe possibly you could give us a brief introduction to your Association and we are, of course, particularly interested in the budget that you require to stay alive this year.

Mrs. Veale: Well, first of all, thank you very much for asking us to be witnesses here. We're not able to sit down and really talk about our achievements of the last year, for the last several years as the other Associations have done, because we are only a year old, and really what I think we need to do is perhaps interpret what we are, who we are, what we represent, what we believe in and why, and perhaps that's really more relevant.

As you know from our letter, we are making really two requests. One that you consider in some aspect of

your budget, some money to help our centres that are in desperate financial need at the moment, but primarily we are asking the representatives here that they make a commitment to a policy of subsidization in future budgets. I think with that in mind, I better go into a little bit of background.

Yukon Child Care Association is named the Yukon Child Care Association, rather than the Whitehorse Day Care Association, with a great deal of thought and concern for the child care needs throughout the Yukon, whether it be in a day care centre, a drop-in centre, a parent co-op, a playschool, or whatever a particular community feels meets the needs of their children and families.

This is because we are really primarily concerned in the kind and quality of care that children receive when they are not in the care of their parents. This is why we spent all last spring drawing up our day care standards, guidelines for day care standards, which we borrowed very heavily from our Bible, which is the National Guidelines for the Development of Day Care Standards in Canada, put out by the Canadian Council on Social Development. And this was two years in the making.

There is input from every province in Canada and both territories, through working papers, through working sessions, through people involved in day care, to parents to concerned citizens, to social workers, to anybody who expressed an interest, and together after about a two year period, they came together with a consensus of what they felt were the real needs of children in care, away from the care of their parents.

We tried to summarize this, and we would be very happy to give copies of our standards to each of the Councillors, and we have adapted them somewhat to Yukon conditions.

We feel too that perhaps we should take an opportunity here to explain what we think day care is, or is trying to be. Because I think people who are unfamiliar with day care equate baby-sitting equals day care equals babysitting, and although babysitting is a very important function of what we feel day care is, we really feel that we go much further than keeping an eye on children, trying to keep them out of trouble and looking after their physical needs.

There probably is many different views on child rearing and discipline in this room as there are people, but I think one thing that we all agree on, anyone who is a parent who has done any reading of background with children, is that the years that the children are within the age group to use day care, the pre-schoolers, are the formative years, and these are the most important years of a person's life.

It is a very onerous responsibility for our staff, or for any parent for that matter, to mould a child, to help form his habits and attitudes, and it's a responsibility that we as day care staff and as parents who make up the boards of the day care centres, do not take lightly, and this is why we are very concerned with standards, and this is why we are asking for the kind of money we are asking for.

Children in full time care spend most of their waking hours with the staff of our centres. Our staff is therefore as much, or more of an influence on these

children, than their parents. Therefore we must meet the child's total needs, his nutritional needs, his dental needs, his needs to create, his needs to explore, his physical needs, his mental health needs, his cognitive and learning needs, his needs to socialize, and this goes much further than simple babysitting.

Some parents prefer babysitting, they have the right to this. We are not in any way trying to put babysitters out of business. Many parents prefer forms of group care, and this is why we see a development of day care centres. Nobody is forming day care centres to make money, as you can see by all our deficits each month; it's because we are responding to the needs that we see in the community, and this is a kind of need we are seeing all over the Territory and not just in Whitehorse.

Our pressing need today is outlined in our letter that each of you received. We have approximately 110 children in centres in Whitehorse today. We cannot wait three to four generations for a universal scheme which subsidizes every mother, babysitter and child care worker in the Yukon. We have to meet the real needs of 110 real children now.

This is not, and I want to stress this, a woman's issue. This is a child's issue, this is a family issue. We know it costs more to put children into group care than babysitting. We have rent, utilities, equipment, liability insurance, maintenance, many costs that come out of the parents' fee. A babysitter already has this covered in her living expenses, and in many cases a babysitter's income is tax free because there are receipts issued.

Therefore, to try to equate the cost of child care in a group situation to what the cost is in a private home is totally unrealistic.

We know that to provide the best possible care for our children, which surely is your concern as much as it is ours, costs approximately, if you look at our projected budget, \$200.00 per child per month. Slightly more for children under three. This takes in all costs, rent, food, supplies, depreciation of appliances and equipment, toys, replacement of equipment, et cetera, and a decent salary for our very hard working staff.

At the moment they are making \$4,800.00 a year to a top figure of \$6,000.00 a year. \$200.00 per child per month is approximately what it costs for a school age child in school, and yet we are meeting -- trying to meet all the children's -- the total needs of a child for eight to nine hours a day, twelve months of the year, and we don't feel that is particularly expensive.

We know that the very poor can have a subsidy to help pay their fees and meet the cost. We know that the very wealthy may be able to meet that cost, but we also know that 85 percent of our parents are in the middle or lower middle income group. They have no access to subsidy, and they cannot meet those costs. So, to keep the prices reasonable, which is approximately \$125.00 a month at two of the centres, slightly lower in the other two centres, what do we do? We do not replace or buy equipment, we do not get enough art and craft supplies. We do not have enough toys' we do not pay a high, even a living wage to our staff, and we do not have what we consider really enough staff to provide the quality of care that we want to provide and that we feel we could provide.

Our financial problems are compounded by fluctuations in the number of children attending our day care centres throughout the year. In the fall, every centre is jam packed. In December, there seems to always be a slight decrease in attendance. In one centre alone, 7 families left due to marital breakdown. The women left the Yukon with their children and the husbands in several of the cases stayed up here.

In the summer, people are on holidays and take their children out for a few weeks. Today, although two centres have as many or more children than they feel they can handle easily, another centre, for a variety of reasons has some vacancies. That's not going to go on forever, but things are so tight financially, that the centres with the extra children feel that they need that revenue. All centres suffer from fluctuations because, through the year, but because the revenue fluctuates, doesn't mean our costs fluctuate. Nothing but the food cost fluctuates. We still have to meet our payrolls, and this is why we are asking from you, \$29,000.00, whether out of that \$40,000.00 elsewhere in the budget, divided into two sums: \$5,000.00 to help pay off our debts, \$24,000.00 to pay for four salaries, one in each of these centres.

We do not feel that this is a frivolous request. Of all our pressing needs, are art supplies, playgrounds, equipment, toys, et cetera, our top priority is to increase the number of staff. The staff cannot spend their whole day with the children, because we have a ten hour day and they're on shift, because they have to cook, clean, do all sorts of maintenance jobs away from the children, and we feel strongly that the single most important factor in giving really good care is the amount of time that a child can spend with a staff member.

Now, funding. When we were looking for ways to finance what we felt were decent standards, over and above the parents' fee, and at no time have we considered free day care, universal day care, or getting rid of the parents' fees, we have kept hearing from private foundations, private businesses, various federal schemes, from L.I.P. to welfare grants to student programs, that they could not fund us because of the Canada Assistance Plan.

Last June, Howard Clifford, who is the Day Care Consultant from the Canada Assistance Plan Directorate from Ottawa, came to Whitehorse to meet with us to interpret what the Canada Assistance Plan was all about. He had no written material with him, the policy guidelines were not available, but during the meeting we asked a lot of questions and the following is our interpretation -- is his interpretation and our understanding of the interpretation from last June's meeting.

That number 1, parents in need can receive a fee subsidy.

2. That the centres' operating costs are 50 percent cost shareable with the Federal Government, and he went into this whole business of the amendments to the Act, to the Regulations of the Act, of November, 1972.

This amendment talks about day care is the only welfare service where the operating costs are cost shareable. The cost of rental of equipment, including

vehicles, the cost of either the purchase of or depreciation on any equipment. The cost of materials that will be used and consumed in the course of the operations of the day care services. The cost of rental of land or premises, or the cost of depreciation on any premises. Other operational costs that are directly attributable to the operation of the day care service, et cetera. It sounded marvelous.

In November during the election campaign, we telephoned Mr. Clifford in Ottawa to clarify the situation. Our understanding remained the same. Mr. Clifford offered to come to Whitehorse to explain the situation to us, and to Council. On Monday this week I again spoke with Mr. Clifford to ask specific questions relating to what we have proposed to you people. It appears that the interpretation of the plan from last June is no longer the case, but instead it is the following, and I've got his writing -- or his words written down.

There are two ways to share.

1. The welfare assistance route. Purchase day care on behalf of the welfare recipients, or a person who makes no more money than the person who is on welfare.

2. The welfare services provision, which is what we fall under. Not only for those in need, but those who are likely to be in need, and there's a rather hazy definition. There are principles involved in this. The whole financial aspect is the income test versus the needs test.

The needs test is an item by item expenditure, and the difference between the expenditure and the income leads to your subsidy.

The Territory can allow a family to have a full subsidy up to the amount welfare gives that size family, plus a reasonable amount for other expenses, plus a reasonable amount for non-cash benefits, plus a reasonable non-reoccurring expenses, such as clothing that might be quarterly or half a year.

But they cannot share in more than what the family would receive. The net -- the average net amount of income of the average Yukoner, so whichever comes first is where they stop.

There's a social needs test that is applied as well. Number 1, you must show the need for day care. For example, a one parent family working or in school or training, or a personal assessment made by a social worker from the Department of Welfare that there is either a problem in a home or a problem with the child that they feel that day care will alleviate.

If two parents are working, the social need test would be that both parents are working, or one is working and one is in school or training, or there is a problem in the home, or there is a child that has a problem that day care may alleviate.

The Territory can agree to subsidize anyone who may wish, but CAP will share only in the above.

Now, this whole confusing area of operating costs. Our understanding was clearly that there could be operating costs to the centre. Yes, there can be operating costs to the centre, but only through the individual, i.e. through the fees.

It means too that they will subsidize the full cost of

the service for that fee, which is not true in other services, so that if we feel that everything, including maintenance, capital costs and mortgage payments, whatever, comes up to a grand total of \$200.00 per space per month, that is what they will subsidize, 50 percent cost shareable, and that is what this actually means.

So here we are back to our dilemma. The people who are in need or likely to be in need, the people who are the very lowest income, can afford under a subsidy to pay the full cost of the service, and that's 15 percent of our families, but really the low middle income and the middle income families do not feel that they can pay \$2,400.00 per year per child for day care costs.

Now, I asked him a specific question, "What about the \$29,000.00 we asked from the Territorial Government, is that cost shareable", and I explained how we wanted to divide it in terms of \$5,000.00 to debts, \$24,000.00 to salaries. He said the answer is not "no". Marvelous.

Ottawa would be interested in any proposal the Y.T.G. comes up with. It would not be 50 percent cost shareable, but they would be interested in some form of cost sharing, depending on the income levels of our families.

Our needs are clearly outlined. The outside communities are expressing their needs. They are not eligible to any kind of a CAP assistance, because they are not full -- you don't have two working parents or you don't have, in most cases, one working and one full time in training. Many provinces, however, have met this by subsidizing over and above what is cost shareable. We know that there was 8 million dollars spent by Ottawa in 1973 on cost sharing arrangements. We also know that Saskatchewan alone spent eight point something million dollars in the year of 1974. There's no way half of that came from Ottawa.

We do not have access to United Appeal. We do not have access to all the other funding areas we have asked for.

The other thing I wanted to say is that we are also not a small interest group. Eleven point five percent of the Yukon population is under the age of 4. Twenty-eight point nine percent of the Yukon population is between the ages of 20 and 34, and this is the age of people who have pre-schoolers, and this is compared to much lower averages in the rest of Canada.

The kinds of surveys we've had from the outside communities bear out that it's not just Whitehorse that is asking for this. We have so far back from different communities, six communities that have answered, asking what are your needs, do you feel you ever need any place to leave you children, or what about a playschool type of program, and out of the total in these six communities, now three of them aren't complete -- Carcross, Carmacks and Mayo -- but Upper Liard, Watson Lake and Whitehorse, and the Whitehorse group is from the low income housing area, we have 175 questionnaires. Do they need babysitting during the day? Yes, 67.3 percent, they do.

Are you happy with your arrangements? 55 percent are, 45 percent are not.

Would you use a day care facility? Total average,

91 percent, yes. No, 9 percent.

Approximately 45, 50 percent, kind of half and half, now leave their children either with friends or with relatives. Thirteen percent leave their children with no one. We even have written into some of the questionnaires, I lock my children in the house. It's because they feel there is nowhere else they can leave their children.

I think I'll just, if you don't mind, read just a couple of comments; from Upper Liard, a mother writes, "Living in an isolated community which is snowbound six months of the year, there are often days together when preschoolers do nothing but sit at home. I feel their social needs are severely curtailed, and that they need the experience of other children. The number of resources available to a child in a small community are very limited, unless a mother is super-human, is a super woman, there are areas of play such as music and crafts that a child misses".

Another one from Mayo, "The summer months are very important. I would think three out of every five mothers work during the tourist season. Even in winter, I believe about 40 percent of the married women in Dawson have either part or regular jobs. I would rather leave my child in some kind of controlled care. Local babysitters can become most unreliable at times."

We get this kind of answer time and time and time again. And this from Watson Lake,

"I feel that there would be less welfare, happier mothers, especially single working mothers, which make happier families plus prouder families".

We are finding all levels of sophistication and non-sophistication in the kinds of responses we are getting. The need is there. We now are saying to you, our elected representatives, if we don't -- if we can't afford this, if we feel it is an important need for our children, will you help us, will you somehow find some way of getting us out of a very difficult situation?

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Veale. Are there any questions? Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mrs. Veale on the part -- I think this, I am referring back more or less to the letter from Lower Liard. Now can I take it --

Mrs. Veale: Upper Liard.

Mr. Fleming: Upper Liard, I am sorry -- from your point of view that you wish to run a service which is for the children actually, whether the husband and wife or whatsoever may be at work, or is it also a program just to cover children, regardless of whether the parents have to work or not? Are you backing such a program both ways, or just for people who are going to work?

Mrs. Veale: Mr. Fleming, first of all we aren't running the program. We are hoping to be in some way a help to the communities to run the kind of program that they feel best meets the needs of their particular community, and this varies from community to community. The kinds of requests that we are getting are primarily in Watson Lake, where there are a large number of working mothers, in Dawson a large number of working mothers. Their needs are a little

different, than in another community where there aren't very many jobs, but the women in those communities where there aren't very many jobs are also expressing a very real need.

In your own riding, there are two playschools. I don't know whether you are aware of them or not. In Carcross, Teslin starts on April the 1st, these are community efforts, and certainly people feel it's very necessary in terms of meeting the needs of their children, whether they are working or not.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, I would just like to ask Mrs. Veale a question. Do you know of any operating costs of the cooperative community day care in Faro?

Mrs. Veale: The day care costs in Faro, they are paying their staff minimum wage. It pretty well evens out what they have in revenue and what they spend in cost, because they are rent free in the recreation centre. They have a number of -- they have 90 families actively involved in Faro and Ross River in that Faro Coop Centre.

They have usually about 37 children there, so these are -- there are only 8 full time children, and the rest are part time children. They've had a terrific amount of community spirit where they have had a lot of donations, and I think their staff costs pretty well even out to what they are charging, 75 cents per hour.

The parent who volunteers time gets a reduced sum of -- rate of 50 cents an hour if she is going to give, or he, which is great. Faro is terrific with their shifts. There are a lot of men who are involved too in this. If they go in more than I think it is once or twice a month, that they pay 50 cents an hour when their children are there.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: I would like to thank the witness, Mr. Chairman, for a very excellent presentation.

It has been my understanding that there was a Committee that was drawn up to look into the regulations dealing with the standards of child care facilities in general, and I believe you are a member of that Committee. Is that -- are the conclusions of that committee available?

Mrs. Veale: They're not available to us. That committee sat for the last time with us as a member of that Committee last June. The -- when we left, the standards that were in the -- these are regulations that are attached to the Child Welfare Ordinance, we understood that they were pretty well finished. There was a great deal of talk about how much should go in for child care facilities; for day care certainly there were going to be more stringent regulations for facilities that looked after children 24 hours a day.

I left for a two month trip out, and was told that I would get a copy of the final draught, which I never found, and since I have been back I have not been able to see what those regulations have said. I think they are sitting on the desk of legal advisor at the moment, and I don't know what the condition of it is now.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd?

Dr. Hibberd: A question, Mr. Chairman. If you were a member of that Committee, I consider it rather remarkable that you don't have that information available to you. I would presume that these are the conclusions that you reached with the other members.

What was the reason given that this was not available to you?

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Hibberd, I think we are getting into an area that really isn't relevant to this particular subject, although it may be of concern to all of us. Can you restrict your questions to the budget problem and nothing else?

Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just would like to follow up on the question I asked before, Mrs. Veale. You did mention about the community spirit in a location like Faro. Do you feel that this is pretty much a set-back in the City of Whitehorse, when it comes to the total analysis of the program, the community spirit?

Mrs. Veale: I think the problems in Whitehorse, really stem from the fact that number 1, we are much, much larger. We are divided into, as you know, five different residential areas, that the over-riding need for day care is by working mothers, and that they just don't have the time to give that a non-working or part time working mother has in terms of making a parent coop work.

I think that really the situation in Whitehorse is unique from the situation -- I would see Faro as being a pretty good model for most of the outside communities, the kind of centre they could run.

We have a lot of energies expended by our parents in things like bake sales and bazaars and anything we can do to raise money and selling raffle tickets, but it's not that whole sense of community -- we aren't using a community facility like the rec centre at Faro.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCall?

Mr. McCall: Yes, and the reason why I said this is in my opinion, this is why I feel where you have a greater financial burden, this is correct?

Mrs. Veale: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Veale, the figure 29,000, that's your bare bones minimum, is that correct? It's that or shut down?

Mrs. Veale: The parents have made the decision that they will not shut down, because there aren't alternate forms of care. When, for instance, one of the centres raised their fees to \$125.00 a month, they lost three families. The next week, all three families were back saying we can't find private arrangements, will you please take our children back? The decision has been made by the parents, we simply cannot shut down.

So our only source now of keeping open is to bring in more children, and really compromise ourselves in the quality of care we are giving.

Mr. Chairman: I see. Are there any further questions? Mrs. Whyard?

Mrs. Whyard: Mr. Chairman, since it was my motion in council the other day that we bring Mr. Clifford in to give us a clarification of what federal funds were available for subsidization of day care, would Mrs. Veale agree that it is still worthwhile having him come to consult with Council?

Mrs. Veale: I would recommend that very highly; and he again expressed an interest in coming.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I really don't think that's necessary. We just received the policy guidelines relating to the provision of day care service for children, and it ties in very much with your last conversation with Mr. Clifford. And they're quite explicit, I don't think there would be any argument in the interpretation of it at all, and I believe the Clerk's office made several copies of it for distribution if people want to have it.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Watson.

Mrs. Veale: I take it that one of your primary concerns is to have a policy from our government, so that you in turn have some security of your future from year to year. Would that be -- ?

Mrs. Veale: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: So it's really a matter, I would take it, of your getting together with Mrs. Watson at some future date to try to work out a long range program, and this is really a stop-gap measure?

Mrs. Veale: M'hmmm.

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

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: I would like to thank all the witnesses who have appeared even prior to Mrs. Veale for their presentations before Committee this afternoon, and I know of their interest in the work that they have done in the Yukon over the number of years that they have been involved, and I think that the brief that was presented to all members of Council by Mrs. Veale was excellent. It's right on, and I agree with just about everything that's in this.

I do have a few problems: One of them is before when I was in private enterprise, I was relatively affluent. I opened my big mouth too much and found myself in government at a rather lower level of income that I used to be at, which corresponds roughly to a truck driver or a person who is a person who has a trade.

Now, my wife as head of the household has made the decision that she is going to remain in the house raising the children at least until they are old enough to go to school, a decision which I happen to agree with, but she would do anyway even if I didn't agree with it, but I do.

So at any rate, you know, we have problems as any person on a middle income salary does, with meeting the demands of the mortgage, a house and food and clothing and everything that happens in trying to raise a family in Whitehorse.

Now, the problem that I have with the presentation, because it seems to be a universal one now; I know and you know very well of many people who are working at a second job, who could get by on the one income, on the upper middle income salary, but have decided that they want material things. They want a summer home, they want a recreation vehicle, they want a boat and a motor, and they want a big car, material things which we have decided, well we will drive a small car and go by canoe instead of a big motorboat, and go in a tent instead of a motor home type of thing. We have made that decision, but should it be a universal subsidization? Should I be paying because this is the reality of life as I see it in the Yukon for a person who wants a double income into the 25 or 30,000 income bracket, because they want to keep above the Joneses.

That is, I think I should be rewarded for the type of lifestyle that I and my wife have chosen rather than those who are really interested in having a big home and having material goods.

And I see nothing in this which separates it from being a universal program to people in a certain income area with the combined salaries. I wonder if I could have this clarified?

Mr. Chairman: Before we hear the answer, Mr. McKinnon, you're also getting, I'm afraid, a bit away from the topic, but possibly a brief reply, Mrs. Veale.

Mrs. Veale: I would agree that those families who can afford to pay a higher fee should be paying a higher fee. My feeling is, however, that the majority of the families are not in that upper middle income, even with combined salaries.

I would agree that a priority should be made, that if it's a third car and a colour T.V. set over your child care fees, that perhaps that shouldn't be looked at terribly sympathetically. But on the other hand, you know we all of us pay taxes for things that we don't use and we don't object to that, and if this is a very real need which is expressed by such a large percentage now of our population, I think it's something that it behooves us to do.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Veale. Any further questions? Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: I have one question for Mrs. Veale.

Mrs. Veale, could you tell me the enrollment in your four centres, if you don't mind? You say you have a hundred and ten children.

Mrs. Veale: There are about 110 children. As I say, it fluctuates in different parts -- times of the year, and this would include our part time children who are in as well, but there are about 110 children, or 100 families in Whitehorse.

Hon. Mrs. Watson: Further, Mrs. Veale, are they

all at the same age group? Do you segregate them and have junior pre-schoolers in one group home, or do you have a mixture?

Mrs. Veale: It depends on the facility, which depends really on the size. At them' Mah they have a unique situation where they have approximately two and a half times the square footage that any of the other single centres have, and they're able to look after children from just under a year, right up to the kindergarten age child, before and after kindergarten, and in some cases older siblings also when they are serving lunch and after school care.

In one of the centres it is from one to three year olds, and the other two centres are three to five years olds.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions? Mrs. Watson?

Hon. Mrs. Watson: One more question. Mrs. Veale, how do you set your fee? Now, you said that you charge a fee of \$125.00, you had to raise it, I believe in some of the other centre, you charge a fee of \$100.00, \$110.00. What criteria do you use? Do you try to recover the costs of operating it? Are you establishing a per unit cost in your fee per child costs?

Mrs. Veale: Two of the centres have just completed one year operation, and in many ways we didn't really know what the full operating costs were going to be until the end of that fiscal year.

The individual boards, and this is something that we are very careful to preserve in the Association is the autonomy of the individual boards, the decision as to whether or not to raise the fee and to what level, is up to the board of the centre, which is made up of the staff and the parents who use the centre and some other concerned citizens.

Now, the centre that is charging the least is also paying their staff the least, is how it's worked out at the moment. The centres that have raised their fees have raised their salaries somewhat. Again, below the \$6,000.00 level, but raised from \$4,800.00.

It's kind of month by month. Very often we don't realize the kind of costs we are getting into. What it costs, for instance, to put in new plumbing. We don't have wealthy landlords, all our landlords are also churches that are missions who have no money themselves, so that when we have an expensive cost like a fire door, an extra entrance, any kind of problem with the flooring or ceiling, this is the kind of thing we are not expecting, and we try and incorporate that within the fiscal year, and that means jumping the fee somewhat, but it's made individually by the centre. There is no -- the Association is not making any decision on that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Veale, I would like to ask what you do in the case of a young mother, we will say, with no other support of any kind, except herself with the child of say three or four years old, and I'll just give an example, which I think it's terrible they have to work

this way, I don't even like to have to mention that a girl has to work for \$2.30 an hour, but that is still the facts of life.

Mrs. Veale: That's what we pay our staff, Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Fleming: And this lady is working say in a cafe or somewhere where this is the wage today, more or less, and under these circumstances I can see no way in which she would pay \$125.00 a month to keep her child while she works. What happens in a case of this --

Mrs. Veale: She is eligible for a fee subsidy through the Department of Welfare, and that's what is your 50 percent cost shareable under CAP. Each of the directors of each of the day care centres has forms that they fill out, which specifies all sources of income, all sources of expenditure, and if there's a difference -- at the bottom for the Department of Welfare will pick up a full subsidy of her fee or partial subsidy of her fee.

So she would be eligible to that and probably -- well it depends on expenditures, probably the full subsidy.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. If there is no further questions of these witnesses -- Mr. McKinnon?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there is any statistics available, but I have every indication that the area which I represent must have one of the highest number of both parents working of any area in the Whitehorse region. When I was going around during the last campaign, I asked the going of as many people as I possibly could, "If you had your druthers and if the government were setting priorities, would you rather have subsidization of day care centres on behalf of the government, or would you rather have government programs available which would allow the mother to stay home with the children without financial burden". And almost universally, the latter was the choice that I got, and I was quite surprised with it, because I didn't realize that the younger working couples were almost as square as I were really.

And I wondered, Mr. Chairman, if Mrs. Veale would agree with that assessment, that if there were priorities set, that there were government programs originated that would allow these middle income families to own a single residence dwelling and the decision made that the head of the household remain at the home, and take care of the children?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McKinnon, are you asking for a yes or no answer or an all afternoon answer?

Mrs. Veale: I will give a short one, and that is that I have no idea of the percentages. I haven't talked to every parent individually. I know a lot of people feel they have to work to buy a home to settle in this community, and that's important to them. They would prefer to stay at home, I am sure, a lot of mothers would.

We would certainly encourage the woman who wants to stay at home to care for her child, to stay at home and care for her child. We are not trying to say we are giving better care than a mother can give her

child, but I think when you are looking at that you are considering a guaranteed income scheme or a negative income tax, and that's a federal responsibility and not the responsibility of this House.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Veale.

If there are not further questions, I would like to thank the witnesses. It was a very excellent presentation, and thank you for attending today.

I think we could call another brief recess. We have got two more groups to hear from and a wind-up from Mrs. Rene Alford, so a 10 minute recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I would now call the Committee to order, and our next witness is Mrs. Jo Anne Waugh, president of the Y.W.C.A. Mrs. Waugh, would you like to give us a brief introduction to your problems?

Mrs. Waugh: Thank you.

Although the Y.W.C.A. of the Yukon's history has been well documented, before I start I would like to explain the primary reason for our existence in Whitehorse today, and that is in the early '60's a housing survey was undertaken with employers, including I believe the government, to investigate the need for housing for single women.

The result of the survey, very briefly, was that there was a great need. At that time there was a large housing shortage for everyone, especially single people, and accordingly, plans were undertaken by the Association here to construct a building to house single women.

However, when it came time to open our doors in November of 1971, we realized that there were not enough women to fill the residence part of the building, and accordingly, allowed a certain percentage of area space to be turned over for housing for men. Of course now we are looking at do we have a moral obligation to continue to house men, as well as the financial consideration, because this is always in the backs of our minds.

The residents over the past year -- I will briefly give you statistics, because that's the best way for us to indicate the need for the Y. in this community, and that's 1,400 people, not bed nights, used the transient facilities in the Y. last year; 378 people were housed in what we consider permanent or cluster accommodation. In the programming aspect of the Y.W.C.A, which is very important, whether it's running a hostel in the summer or a drop-in for school children, 750 people participated in programs at the Y., and this does not include facilities that were rented out for groups or given to group space. Space was provided for groups that are not financially funded for a meeting.

Our program priorities in the coming year, because essentially what a Y. does is try and determine the community needs, in other words where there's a gap in programming, the Y. tries to pick that up, will be towards programming for youth and senior citizens.

Deficit, which was recorded last week, for the last year was \$75,699.95; monthly, \$6,308.000 and some odd cents. We don't consider ourselves highly staffed, we only have about five full time employees, everyone else

is part time but they are all essential to the running of the operation.

As far as the \$40,000.00 that is being considered at this time as part of the budget, we have two concerns: One, that it's not enough, needless to say, and (b) As soon as you start asking organizations to apply for that little amount of money, you're asking them to compete against each other, and we can't afford it in a town or community the size of the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Waugh. Are there any questions? Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask, are the directors on the -- it is an association?

Mrs. Waugh: That's right.

Mr. Fleming: Are the directors on that association actually involved in the work at the Y? I mean actually in the work at the Y?

Mrs. Waugh: The day to day operation of it?

Mr. Fleming: The day to day operation of it

Mrs. Waugh: No, the Board of Directors is essentially a policy making board. We are all volunteers.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions? Mr. Lang?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman, what is happening as far as C.M.H.C. is concerned with the Y? I understand that there are some talks or something going on with them?

Mrs. Waugh: That's right, there's talks going on between C.M.H.C. and Yukon Housing Corporation for a subsidy arrangement. At this time, I cannot give you any details because our Board of Directors, who should have the first access to information, have not received it yet and they will not until tomorrow night.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Waugh, I understand that you won't be applying for any of this particular item in the budget for the \$40,000.00, but you do have a request in, is that correct, presently for funds from last year?

Mrs. Waugh: Yes, on January the 7th we submitted an application for a social coordinator's program.

Mr. Chairman: I see. And how much was that for?

Mrs. Waugh: \$16,000.00 -- a little over that.

Mr. Chairman: Right.

Mrs. Waugh: Not 17.

Mr. Chairman: And the arrangements being made with C.M.H.C., when you refer to your deficit of \$6,300.00 per month, this would alleviate that from the point of view of the housing aspect of your budget?

Mrs. Waugh: The housing aspect. The program would -- it would be up to the Association to fund the program--

Mr. Chairman: Yes

Mrs. Waugh: --the programs in the Y., although the indication has been that we will be allowed to continue to use the facilities, for our own programs.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I see.
Any questions arising, gentlemen? And ladies?
Thank you very much, Mrs. Waugh.

Mrs. Waugh: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we will now have Mr. Jeff Choy-Hee, and he is the Director of Skookum Jim Friendship Centre, and he has supplied us with some background material.

Mr. Choy-Hee, do you have any information, background information you would like to give us, in addition to what we have received?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Not really. I think the background information sheet is self-explanatory in itself. If you have any specific questions to ask me, I would be happy to answer them at this time, I understand there is some mention of different issues or problems that you are being faced with, and if I can be of any assistance in helping you make up your mineds, or give some practical or whatever from my experience, then please feel free to ask, besides what I have here before you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the Friendship Centre is available and open to any nationalities whatsoever?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Yes it is.

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Miss Millard?

Ms. Millard: I would just to like a financial question. Are you finding the grant that you have now adequate for your needs, or are you planning to expand?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Well our philosophy and our approach to social service has always been that one day that we will be self-sufficient in our endeavours, that we hope to evolve to a point where we can support ourselves totally, as a service.

Mr. Chairman: Do you mean in the sense that you would be charging for your service to those that utilize the services?

Mr. Choy-Hee: I can't predict the future at this time as to what costs we will be tied into two or three years from now. I can say that we are trying to instill certain things, like leadership, and get some experience in that area towards the "dreamday" so to speak of self sufficiency.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Mr. Chairman, that still doesn't answer my question.

Mr. Choy-Hee: What did you ask?

Ms. Millard: I believe that you get a \$30,000.00 grant?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Yes, the total amounts received throughout the year is approximately \$60,000.00. The Territorial contribution is approximately \$15,000.00 of that total 60.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Millard?

Ms. Millard: Is that -- that \$15,000.00 is that used exclusively for the Court Worker Program?

Mr. Choy-Hee: No it isn't. The \$15,000.00 goes to what we refer to as core funding or core operations that programs such as the Court Worker Program, alcohol work and so on and so forth are, you might say, special programs that we try to get funding for from other sources.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Mr. Choy-Hee.

I am not clear from his submission, as to what specific amount of funds would be requested, or if indeed, if you are asking for funds.

In perusing the budget, we note under item 4, Fund Raising, raffles ticket sales, fees, \$2000.00. It seems to me, beyond that, your current budget is provided for. Could, possibly, Mr. Choy-Hee elaborate on that?

Mr. Choy-Hee: I don't understand what you mean by provided for?

Mr. Chairman: Possibly what Mr. Taylor is getting at is this \$40,000.00 that you have heard discussed this afternoon, you are not really after any portion of that, is that the --

Mr. Choy-Hee: Not at this time, no.

Mr. Chairman: No. Are there any further questions or comments?

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman I wonder if I could ask Mr. Choy-Hee if other Friendship Centres open in other areas of the Yukon, whether it is Dawson or Mayo or Watson Lake or Haines Junction, that would be -- mean the dilution of the grant that is now available from the Secretary-of-State and the Government of the Yukon Territory. Would that mean that the Skookum Jim Hall here would have to curtail its program or would there be other funds or funding available to it?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Okay. I will just explain how a Friendship Centre evolves basically and maybe in that way answer your question.

A Friendship centre from day one, usually takes approximately five years to evolve. The first two years of operation, and I mean from the time you decide that you wanted to start a centre, the first two years a centre does not receive any financial support from the Territorial Government, Federal Government or whatever. The first two years is spent in proving, really, that there is community support. That there is use of available resources, that there is enough interest for future funding.

After the second year, excuse me, the third year, the centre is incorporated into a society and at that time it is free to solicit funds from all available sources.

We have a National office which will contribute approximately \$2000.00 for the third year. It is pretty well feed money to see if that centre is accountable or can account for its finances.

After the third year, and if everything goes correctly and everything is progressing smoothly, then the next two years the centre will receive approximately \$20,000.00. It is a slow progressive work up stage type of approach where each year it slowly increases in its responsibility and at any given stage, say if it doesn't work out, say the centre cannot handle the \$2000.00 or whatever, account for it properly then it stops there.

Because it is sort of a -- we have, you might say, a long range approach, that we really want to build a solid base under a centre before we actually start to talk money. It means a lot of volunteers, a lot of fund raising, a lot of committee work and so on and so forth. Then as it goes on, money also increases, but again, it still can be cut back if we don't pan out so to speak.

Mr. Chairman: In other words you are demonstrating a demand and need first and then getting the money?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Oh yes.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: -Mr. Chairman, do I take it that any other friendship centre that started operation in the Yukon would go through the same process --

Mr. Choy-Hee: Oh yes.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: --prior to being eligible for the 50/ 50 cost sharing grant?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Yes. In other words the name of a friendship centre, as I said, the centre would not be incorporated until two years after it has gone through its initial stages like locating a building or office space or whatever.

You know those work up stages take about one or two years, three years to do. When it incorporates it, it's pretty well, the skeleton is there. And it progresses so to speak.

Hon. Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Chairman, I see that the Skookum Jim Hall Friendship Centre still has as part of its recreational program the Skookum Jim Rodeo. Is it the intention of the Skookum Jim to reactivate the

rodeo this year as they did in the past.

Mr. Choy-Hee: Well we've had a few cowboys come by and express interest in it and people are still talking about it, so it's always -- when it comes down to the wire, who's going to, you know, put up this thing and -- we always start out with the best intentions, I think.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Mr. Lang: I would like to ask a question. I see Special Programs which is L.I.P., which I think is -- these are grants I gather, are they not? And this \$25,000.00. Are these grants given every year? Like --

Mr. Choy-Hee: No they are short-term interim grants. I don't know, for example, that \$25,000.00 includes for example the recent Court Worker thing that has gone through the Budget, or was mentioned in the Budget. I can't quote figures because I wasn't involved in it. But the way she goes is that, say, if you put up some money, Federal will put up its share and that's accumulated in special -- I put it under a special program there. It's included in that \$25,000.00.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Chairman --

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lang.

Mr. Lang: -- do you mean to say that these are cost-sharing with the Territory, or are they strictly Federal?

Mr. Choy-Hee: Federal. Cost-sharing with the Territory and Federal. These programs.

Let me state again that as a Social Service, we have to receive funds from all sectors of the community which we live in. In other words, we cannot, like say for example if Territorial Government wanted to give us all total support \$60,000.00 we could not accept it. Because it violates the very principle of Social Service. It's structured so that all segments of the community can participate and that no one body controls it or, you know, sort of that way.

Mr. Chairman: This goes to your independence as well as the philosophy. It goes to your independence. One of the reasons for this is to continue being independent of the Government.

Mr. Choy-Hee: Well the philosophy ensures that we are non-political.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Choy-Hee: That no one party puts in, you know. So in other words every program that we do, we have to come up with a portion or a third or a half or whatever it is. Through fees or whatever.

Mr. Chairman: I see. Any further questions or comments? On behalf of the Committee thank you very much, Mr. Choy-Hee.

We will now hear a conclusion from Rene Alford. She's --

Before we begin, there wasn't any other agency that

wanted to be represented that didn't let us know is there.

Some Member: No.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. Mrs. Alford, we have heard from you of course already and you have heard what the other witnesses have had to say. Do you have anything in conclusion that you would like to comment on?

Mrs. Alford: First of all, I would like to say that I'm rather overwhelmed by the fact that I'm asked to draw a conclusion. I don't want to seem to refuse your invitation but I certainly don't want to presume either that I necessarily should assume this role.

I would very much like to second a remark that was made by Joanne Waugh. We have to be very careful that by restricting very, very much the amount available to Social Services, we do not start a competition situation.

I am a member of an organization that probably has been the oldest established Social Service organization in the Yukon. I can't take credit for it, I haven't been with it from the beginning myself, but I listened to Mrs. Waugh's word the other day and she certainly has explained the background of Yukon Social Services Society.

We have tried all along to do as we were asked at the beginning and we ourselves found we should do. That is to study the conditions of our Communities and to be very attentive to the needs that we saw. And find ways in which those needs could be served. To do this we have set up various separate special agencies which we felt were needed which extensive research and consultation at all levels in the community showed us were needed, we feel that the importance of private services in this area is very great. We want to help this importance to be recognized. The basis of it unfortunately has to be dollars and cents. We feel that only cooperation among the private agencies themselves and between the private agencies and the government policy makers can help solve the situation we have now reached in the Yukon which because of our growth of the Territory, but unfortunately growth of the problems as well, has become practically impossible to cope with any more, unless we reach an organized approach to it.

And really this is the way I would like to sum up with a plea that you see to it that apart from answering in dollars and cents as much as is possible to you the needs that has been put before you, you also take the lead in ensuring that this kind of organized approach based on cooperation at all levels is going to very soon become a fact in the Yukon.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much.

That then concludes the witnesses. I would entertain a Motion at this time, Mr. Lang?

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

Mr. McCall: And I'll second that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Lang,

**Speaker's Ruling*

seconded by Mr. McCall that Mr. Speaker resume the Chair. Question?

Some Members: Question.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Motion carried.

Mr. Speaker resumes the chair

x

Mr. Speaker: At this time I will call the House to order.

Before we call for the report of the Chairman of Committees, I would like to deal with a matter which occurred in the House earlier this morning. When I made a Ruling allowing a Motion which would have the effect of referring a Bill back to Committee for further consideration notwithstanding that immediately prior to this point in our proceedings, a Motion proposing third reading to the Bill in question had been made by another Honourable Member.

It is clear to me that once a Motion has been moved, it first becomes the possession of the House. However no Motion is regularly before the House until it is first read from the Chair. The question is of course the subject matter of the Motion and on the merits of that subject matter the House has to give a decision either unanimously or by the majority of the members present. The Speaker then proposes the question in the words of the mover.

Every question when agreed to then assumes the form either of an Order of a Resolution of the House.

Mr. Speaker: In the case of third reading of a Bill, a member may move that the Bill will be referred back to the Committee as a whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular. This is a debateable motion.

As you are aware, Bills may be recommitted with or without a limited -- pardon me -- a limitation to Committee of the whole for further amendment. However, a Bill cannot be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House when the question has been proposed that the Bill do passed.

In defining my ruling, I must accept that the question had not in fact been proposed in as much as I had not yet read the motion to the House permitting it to become the question. I then accepted the motion for committal as being a privileged motion. It would now appear to me that this motion was and must in fact be considered not a privileged motion but a subsidiary motion, and so I feel that I must allow my Ruling of this morning to stand.

Perhaps as we proceed further along on our legislative experience as a new House, we may design our procedures in such a way as to resolve any further problems in this area. I also wish to offer my apologies

to the House for the uncertainty I have created in this matter. As it is a grey area so to speak.

Perhaps further consideration of this question may reveal a more permanent solution should this matter arise again.

May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Phelps: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Committee convened at 10:30 a.m. to consider Bills, Papers and Motions. It was agreed that we would have before us Mr. Putters as a witness on Monday as an alternate for Mr. Woods. And we would hear Mr. Hadden on Friday this week. On the Motion before the Committee of the Whole.

I can report progress on Bill number 14 and progress on Bill number 2. Committee recessed at 11:50 and reconvened at 2 p.m. The Committee heard the following witnesses this afternoon: Mrs. Rene Alford, representing Social Services Society; Mr. Don Roberts, representing the Yukon Family Services Association; Mrs. Kip Veale, Francis Woolsley and Marianne Jensen, all representing Yukon Child Care Association; Mrs. Jo Anne Waugh, representing the Y.W.C.A.; and Mr. Jeffrey Choy-Hee, representing Skookum Jim Friendship Centre.

It was moved by Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. McCall that Mr. Speaker resume the Chair and this Motion was carried. Thank you.

The Speaker: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees, are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

The Speaker: What is your further pleasure?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we call at 5'clock.

The Speaker: Is there a seconder?

Ms. Millard: I second that, Mr. Speaker..

The Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ogilvie that we now call at 5 o'clock, are you prepared for the question?

Some Members: Question.

The Speaker: Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I shall declare the Motion carried.

This House now stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Adjourned

LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 2
[1975 Second Session]
March 19, 1975

Mr. Speaker,
Members of Council

On March 6, 1975, Councillor Lang submitted the following written question:

"Last week the Administration gave to the members of this House a Yukon Government Position Paper on Land Claims, in confidence. Will this Position Paper be made available for the public?"

Unfortunately I must advise that it is not possible to answer this question at this time.

James Smith
Commissioner

LEGISLATIVE RETURN NO. 3
[1975 SECOND SESSION]

March 18th, 1975

Mr. Speaker
Members of Council

On Thursday, March 13th, Councillor Hibberd asked the following written question:

"We have received a bequest of \$100,000 from the Federal Government for the implementation of a French Language Instruction Program. In response to several inquiries, I would like to ask the Minister if he could supply this Assembly with information re: the specifics of how these monies are being spent. Are these facilities to be available on a territory wide basis? Can these facilities be used for any other purposes?"

The answer is as follows:

The \$100,000 is a capital grant for the establishment of a language training centre, to be made available during the 1975/76 fiscal year. This is over and above the \$53,500 allocated annually for a period of five years (1974-79) for the purpose of improving the present French language program in the Territory.

The interpretation of the "language training centre" is very broad, and could be applied to any expenditure of a capital nature that would be useful in our situation for the support of French instruction.

A memorandum dated September 30th, 1974 from Mrs. Watson indicates that "the capital expenditure for the Bilingualism Program, which is 100 per cent recoverable from Ottawa, was approved with the recommendation that planning--must be done by the Department of Education in conjunction with the Personnel Branch". Also "any of the items purchased

or acquired by the government must be available either to the Department of Education or to the Personnel Branch".

The general plan to date for use of the capital grant is as follows:

a) To provide equipment (tape recorders, record players, etc.) on a loan basis from the French materials centre to any schools requiring such items for effective teaching of their French program.

b) To utilize the larger part of the \$100,000 to establish a French Language Centre.

The French Language Centre will include:

- (a) a language lab of 15-16 booths.
- (b) a small classroom area, suitable for 12 students.
- (c) a workshop and storage area.
- (d) a large conference room, suitable for seminar groups, teacher-training, etc.
- (e) shelving for the items purchased from the annual grant, forming the nucleus of a materials or resource centre, available on loan to all schools of the Territory.
- (f) office space for the French Language Co-ordinator, and also for the instructor for the government program.

We have obtained approval for the conversion of two classrooms at F.H. Collins for the above.

The facilities should then be available:

(a) for those Territorial employees who wish to avail themselves of the federal language training program, operating costs to be subsidized by the Federal government at up to \$500.00 per student per year.

(b) for use by senior students at F.H. Collins at such times as they are not in use for the government program.

(c) for possible eventual use for night school and other adult language programs, as can be later arranged.

(d) for use for refresher and upgrading programs for teachers who wish to improve their oral skills.

(e) for use for workshops and training sessions for French teachers from all areas of the Territory.

(f) for use as a seminar or informal discussion area for senior students at F.H. Collins, or for night school or other adult language classes.

No details of costs have yet been worked out.

I would assume that the above facilities could also be used for study of any language, provided trained instructors are available.

Gordon McIntyre
Minister of Education

