



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 70

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, February 3, 1987 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Tony Penkett	Whitehorse West	Government Leader. Minister responsible for: Executive Council Office; Finance; Economic Development; Mines and Small Business; Public Service Commission
Hon. Dave Porter	Watson Lake	Government House Leader. Minister responsible for: Tourism; Renewable Resources.
Hon. Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre	Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.
Hon. Piers McDonald	Mayo	Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

Willard Phelps	Leader of the Official Opposition Hootalinqua
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East
Alan Nordling	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Doug Phillips	Whitehorse Riverdale North

Liberal

James McLachlan Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	Frank Ursich
Hansard Administrator	Dave Robertson

01 Whitehorse, Yukon

Tuesday, February 3, 1987 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.
We will proceed at this time with Prayers.

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Point of Order

Mr. Phelps: I would like to take this opportunity in the House to offer my sincere congratulations to Danny Joe in last night's by-election, and to also thank each and every candidate for putting their names forward and participating in the democratic process.

Applause

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I want to, from this side of the House, indicate that we express our appreciation for the noble gesture of the Leader of the Official Opposition. I want to join him in his sentiments and hope that he will be understanding today if certain fragile persons on this side of the House take some questions as notice, which they might otherwise more energetically respond to.

Mr. McLachlan: I would like to join in the Leader of the Official Opposition's congratulations to the opposing side for their well thought out campaign and my congratulations to Mr. Joe, as has already been expressed by our candidate on public media, for a campaign well fought and a victory well earned.

Speaker: Introduction of Visitors?
Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I have two reports for tabling. One is a preliminary feasibility study of a glue-laminated beam, manufacturing plant in the Yukon Territory, and the second is a report on the feasibility of Yukon-based furniture manufacturing.

Speaker: Are there any Reports of Committees?
Are there any Petitions?
Introduction of Bills?
Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion?
Statements by Ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**The Opportunities for Import Substitution**

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Among our government's many efforts to diversify the Yukon economy has been the encouragement of import substitution: producing right here in the Yukon more of the goods we use, such as building materials, food, energy, and manufacturing goods.

Last year, the Department of Economic Development convened a workshop of private operators in these sectors to examine opportunities for import substitution. We followed this up by commissioning a systematic study of these ideas. That study was released late last year.

Last weekend we convened a follow-up workshop to review the study and make recommendations on how to pursue the Yukon's best opportunities for import substitution. Thirty-six people, including agriculturalists, forestry operators, small producers and manufacturers, provided the government with recommendations on how to implement its new capital programmes; with suggestions on how to promote sales of locally made products; and with ideas on what new opportunities should be promoted. I was very gratified that so many small business operators would spend two days on the

subject, and I believe that it demonstrates the level of interest in promoting a more diversified economy through encouraging import substitution.

I advised workshop participants that the government's initiatives to promote local production included studies on the feasibility of local furniture manufacturing and on the production of glue-laminated beams and that both studies would soon be publicly released. Today, I take pleasure in tabling both these studies.

The Yukon-based Furniture Manufacturing Study confirms the initial assessment last spring that such manufacturing would be economically viable. It states that the local market is sufficient to support a local industry of half a million dollars a year and that there are export opportunities for up to a quarter million dollars a year, creating many new direct and indirect jobs in woodworking, management, marketing, and forestry.

The study dramatically demonstrates why this local furniture manufacturing opportunity exists. For every dollar spent on imported furniture, 75 cents immediately goes South. Local furniture made even with imported lumber cuts the loss to the Yukon economy to 33 cents. If local lumber is used, then the leakage is reduced to 20 cents of each Yukon dollar spent. Local furniture production is one way to plug some of the leaks in our economy.

Concern about the need to increase the use of local materials is not limited to this government. It is recognized as a necessity by most organizations that are interested in strengthening our economy. Most recently this was expressed by the Yukon Forest Industry Association in a resolution calling for more value-added use of local resources, including the promotion of furniture manufacturing.

The Glue-laminated Plant Study concludes that not only is a Yukon-based facility feasible, but that it could be done without government financial assistance if a pre-purchase commitment could be established. It also demonstrates that while such a plan could operate economically with stock imported from British Columbia, it could provide the catalyst to get local drying and planing facilities established in proximity to the glue-laminated plant.

The Glue-laminated Plant Study has been distributed to all firms that have expressed in such a venture (from an advertisement placed in Yukon newspapers), and already two groups have expressed interest in proceeding with such a facility.

The two studies identify potential business opportunities. They also stress that a lot of work and entrepreneurial spirit will be necessary to make them a reality. But if the private sector interest is there, then the government is anxious to facilitate their development.

Participants at the weekend workshop also recommended several steps to encourage more Yukon agricultural production. These included a long-term development strategy, more local research, and marketing assistance such as packaging, trade shows, and storage facilities, and we will continue working with agriculturists to develop their industry.

I should mention that our government's ability to assist with import substitution has been greatly increased by our five-year, \$4.6-million Small Business EDA Sub-agreement recently signed with the federal government. This is specifically designed to build up the territory's manufacturing capacity.

Finally, we believe import substitution is a strong element of economic diversification. This has already been identified in the Yukon 2000 Development Process, and we look forward to building this into a long-term strategy for all sectors and regions of the Yukon.

⁰³

Mr. Nordling: I see this Ministerial Statement not as one of substance, but as being used as an opportunity to make a speech, along with the tabling of the two studies, on local furniture manufacturing and on glue-laminated beams.

I am looking forward to reviewing the studies and seeing the recommendations made by the workshop on how to pursue the best opportunities for import substitution. I am sure that we will have many questions resulting from our review of the recommendations

and the studies, and am especially interested in the study on local manufacture of furniture, in light of the fact that the locally-manufactured furniture purchased for the Minister of Justice was in the range of \$8,000 to \$10,000. We will be interested in seeing where the \$500,000 local market and \$250,000 for export market is seen to be.

I do look forward to reviewing the studies.

☞ **Speaker:** This then brings us to the Question Period. Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Rural tax rates

Mr. Phelps: I have deliberately selected a couple of easy questions for the side opposite today. They will be directed to the Minister of Community and Transportation Services. They have to do with an article that appeared in the *Star* on January 28, reporting on the Association of Yukon Communities' meetings in the previous weekend. It is reported that the Minister said that he would be reviewing rural taxes around Whitehorse, Dawson City and Watson Lake prior to setting this year's tax rate.

The quote attributed to him is, "In the meantime my department will undertake to review the general property tax structure following under the authority of the Yukon government with a view to ensuring that some degree of relativity exists between services, access to services and municipal tax rates that exist in proximity to such rural areas." Is the Minister suggesting that the tax rates around Whitehorse and the other two cities are too low?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I indicated at the AYC meeting that we would be reviewing, over the course of the next year, the tax rates on the peripheries of the communities, as the communities had made the argument that the services provided to those people, as well as the taxpayers in their communities, were the same, yet the tax rates were different. I indicated that, over the course of next year, we would be reviewing those tax rates and the community's argument to see whether or not there was any requirement for change. I do understand the character of the AYC's arguments. We have not taken any position on whether or not we are going to change tax rates substantially as a result of their arguments. We will have to assess the arguments and make a decision in the course of next year.

☞ **Mr. Phelps:** I am very concerned about this, naturally, since my riding surrounds Whitehorse, one of the cities mentioned in the report. Does the Minister not realize that many residents near to these cities have large areas of land that they own and they pay a tremendous total tax for very minimal services?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That is exactly the kind of issue that we want to address in our review of the tax structures around municipalities. Taxes have not been raised in some years. There is no suggestion that taxes will, in fact, be raised. We are going to study the problem as it was put to us by the Association of Yukon Communities to assess whether or not their implementation makes sense.

I did not indicate that we would permit the review to be completed prior to the setting of tax rates this year. I think the review not only has to be done on a technical basis, evaluating the argumentation from both sides, but there has to be a full consultative process with the persons involved. Clearly, nobody wants their taxes increased, and I can understand that, but there has to be some understanding that there is some relativity between services provided and the tax structure in place. We will undertake to do that, but not without full consultation and not without an understanding of the issue as put forward by individual municipalities on their tax structures.

☞ **Mr. Phelps:** I hope the Minister will forgive me for being alarmed, but the very short time period makes me wonder how the Minister proposes to undertake an effective and fair review.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There is no reason for the Member to be alarmed about the time limits. I am suggesting, as I said to the AYC, that we would make this a priority of the Department of Community Services over the course of the next year. They will be

reviewing this matter over the course of the next year.

If we come to some conclusions and are satisfied that consultation has been done and the reasons for any changes are reasonable, we can then decide whether or not we are going to proceed with changes to tax structures.

If, at that time, we do not feel that the consultation has been completed, then we will continue the consultation.

Question re: Rural tax rates

Mr. Phelps: What we are looking at, in this line of questioning, is the issue of process. What kind of a process is the Minister going to be proposing that will ensure adequate consultation and ensure that those people who live around the three cities have an effective voice. We know that the Association of Yukon Communities has an effective voice and the Minister's response was to a resolution of that body.

My concern is that rural residents around Whitehorse, for example, have no form of local government. I would like to know more about the structure of the review process and what safeguards will be there to ensure that my constituents will have a fair say.

☞ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** First of all, this initiative by the government is not only in response to a resolution put forward by AYC. Tax rates in rural areas have not changed in many years and we want to assure ourselves that this tax structure is fair, given the level of services we provide to organized and unorganized communities, and what is commonly classed as "all other areas", which would encompass most of the Member for Hootalinqua's riding.

Firstly, I would suggest that the appropriate response would be to review the arguments put forward by the AYC, as they feel they have a very strong case to make. We will assess it. We have already indicated to them that their proposal for tax sharing is not something we are prepared to support. We will assess their arguments from a technical standpoint, and then we will...

Speaker: Order please. Would the Member please conclude his answer.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I understand. It is very difficult to provide a thorough answer to this long question. This question takes a long answer. There will be a thorough public consultative process in order to ensure that people from Hootalinqua, Watson Lake and any other community are fully informed and have had a chance for input.

Mr. Phelps: What the Minister has said is interesting, but my concern really has not been addressed. What is the consultative process going to be about? On the one hand you do have organizations who have banded together under the umbrella of the Association of Yukon Communities with their arguments. What body or bodies are you going to go to to get the arguments from all the people who live around Whitehorse, for example, and in all that vast area there is only one community club, and absolutely no formal local government. Just exactly how are you going to ensure that kind of consultation?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If the Member is suggesting we establish some sort of government structure some time between now and next year on the periphery of Whitehorse, obviously it cannot be done. With respect to ensuring that the public is not only kept informed of what the arguments are, but also has had a full chance at input. What we would intend to do would be to inform the residents of all of the affected areas as to what is being studied and reviewed, and through a variety of ways make contact with all the residents to make sure they have a full chance at input, that they have had a chance to essentially debate the issue in public forums in and around communities between now and the time we conclude the consultative process:

Mr. Phelps: I take it then that the Minister's department is in the process of setting up public meetings throughout Hootalinqua, Rock Creek and the area around Watson Lake. I would like to know when these meetings will occur and which facilities will be used. Will it be the Baha'i Institute, the Hot Springs Facilities or the Lakeview Marina? Which facilities are going to be used and when?

☞ **Hon. Mr. McDonald:** That is a detail. The Member knows that it cannot be provided now. When those details are finalized, I will

undertake that the Member will be one of the first to know.

Question re: Klondike Highway

Mr. McLachlan: With respect to the Klondike Highway, between Whitehorse and Carmacks, the condition of the highway has rapidly deteriorated to a point where, in some places, it is almost unsafe to drive. The highway has numerous hills and valleys that, in some areas, seem to resemble the Ogilvie Mountains. I am referring to the section around Fox Lake and approximately eight miles out of Carmacks.

I remind the Minister that we have not reached the most troublesome time of the spring breakup. Can the Minister of Community and Transportation Services advise the Legislature if it is his intention to rebuild these sections of the road in 1987, where the surface has deteriorated or where the roadbed is insufficient to meet the increased weight of the Yukon-Alaska trucks?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As I mentioned twice on two separate Capital Budget periods for this House, the chipseal that was put down on the Klondike Highway between the pavement at Carcross and Fox Lake, was put down as dust control. It was not put down in the same manner as it was put down between Whitehorse and Carcross. The base was not prepared to accept heavy trucking.

I also indicated it was put down at a time when the trucking activity had essentially been completed from the old Cyprus Anvil ore haul. There was a strong suspicion that the road would not stand the heavy trucking to the extent that it required. We indicated that we had budgeted funds in this budgeting period for the work to begin on the Whitehorse to Carmacks section. I would presume that that work would begin this summer, but it will not be completed. It is the beginning of a capital program that will see the full rebuild of that section of highway.

Mr. McLachlan: That sounded strangely like an apology, rather than an answer. I simply wanted to know if it were to take place.

Why do we have to wait until 1987? Why was some of this work not done in 1986?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member's memory is quite convenient. It was not an apology; it was an explanation as to what was happening. I had indicated to Members in the House, on a number of occasions, our planning procedures over the course of that year.

In November, 1985, there was no road agreement at all. There was no suggestion that budgeting should start to commit large sums of the government's money to upgrade the road. This year we do know that the trucking activity is going to be on the road. We know because the trucking activity has commenced. We do know the effects: they are physical and visible. We are going to respond to what we assume was going to be the case — deterioration of the road — by beginning a rebuild.

Mr. McLachlan: I notice some degree of sensitivity in the Minister's answers, but he definitely remembers standing in this Legislature in April 1986 as the trucking deal was about to be signed admitting that there would be trouble with the section along Fox Lake. That information was obtained with the Brinkleman-Beam test, which measures the deflection of the road surface under a simulated load.

Is the Minister now saying, with the full knowledge, that there would be trouble...

Speaker: Order, please. Would the Member please get to the supplementary question.

Mr. McLachlan: Is the Minister now saying, with the full knowledge of the results of this beam test, that the Minister was prepared to wait a full year before taking remedial action and, thus, jeopardizing the safety...

Speaker: Order, please. Would the Member please take his seat.

New question.

Question re: Lottery contract

Mrs. Firth: I have a question for the Minister of Recreation on the Lottery Commission. I want to follow-up on the comments that the Minister made in the House yesterday in answer to a question. He mentioned that the purpose of the change was to allow the

Lottery Commission to assume more direct management of the lottery sales.

Can the Minister tell the House if he sees the positions within the Lottery Commission becoming full-time positions within the government?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As I indicated yesterday, the relationship between the Lottery Commission and the government is not going to change. There is a legislative mandate and that will be fulfilled to the best of our ability. If the Member is asking whether or not the Lottery Commission members are going to become full-time civil servants, the answer is no.

Mrs. Firth: That was the answer I was looking for. On the converse of that, is the Lottery Commission really in any danger of becoming just an advisory body in light of the Minister's comments?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No. I indicated that it was not only an advisory body, but it had a legislative mandate. That legislative mandate is being exercised in the way that Members are aware. We are not going to undercut the Lottery Commission in any way. The mandate that they have is in legislation as a mandate of the Court.

Mrs. Firth: I would like to follow-up on the comment made by the Minister yesterday about the desire by many groups to have a fair allocation of retailer licences. Can the Minister tell us if there were local retailers who were denied licences or had been treated unfairly?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not know the details of any particular retailer who may have applied but was turned down for any specific reason. I would not know the reasons. There certainly are a limited number of retailing positions. I know that there are more applications for retailing positions than there are retailers. Whether you would interpret that as them being denied or whether there is simply a desire for strict allocations, I do not know.

Question re: Lottery contact

Mr. Lang: I want to follow up on this with the Minister. In view of the fact that we presently have a contract between the government with Sports Yukon and the Yukon Arts Council; and in view of the fact that everyone in this House says they have done a good job with respect to the obligations they have taken on, yesterday, in Question Period, the Minister stated that one of the major reasons for the government taking over is, and I quote, "Because of the desire of many groups to have a fair allocation of retailer licenses." Could he inform this House which groups he is referring to?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am referring to every single group that is not affiliated with the Sports Federation or the Yukon Arts Council. When I indicated in debate that it was my information that the Yukon Arts Council and Sports Federation were doing a good job in managing the lotteries, I meant that they were doing a good job on behalf of their members, as is their mandate. We have a mandate as a government, and the Lottery Commission has a mandate as the Lottery Commission, and this Legislature has a mandate as a Legislature to be concerned about the health and life of all groups equally. All the groups are the groups I am considering in this equation.

Mr. Lang: Would the Minister make an undertaking to report to this House how many organizations have applied for a retailer license and have been turned down? This is one of the reasons the Minister has given for a change. Could he give us that information?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Clearly, I would suspect that many groups not affiliated with the Sports Federation or the Yukon Arts Council have not applied specifically for a license because it was clear they were the winners of the contract. If the Member is asking me how many people within the Sports Federation itself had applied for a license and were turned down, I could seek that information and supply it to the House.

Mr. Lang: Could the Minister inform us who approves the retailers licenses? Is it the Lottery Commission or is it the Sports Federation and Yukon Arts Council?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Under the contractual arrangement, the contractor would be responsible for allocating the retailers licenses.

Question re: Lottery contract

Mr. Lang: I think the Minister better go check his facts. Is it not true that the Lottery Commission makes the final decision who is going to get a retailer's license.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am perfectly prepared to review the matter again, but it is my understanding that the managers of the lottery ticket sales are responsible for allocating who is going to retail and who is not.

Mr. Lang: In view of the fact that it is the Lottery Commission who makes the final decision with respect to the allocation of retailers licensing, could he explain how the system is going to work differently with respect to applying for a retailers license?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Lottery Commission has contracted out the management of lotteries to a group who, in turn, ensures that the ticket sales are undertaken, et cetera. The character of the change is that the Lottery Commission would manage the system, to the extent that they had allocated the system to a contractor. That is the extent of the change.

Mr. Lang: We are in a situation where the Minister does not really know of what he speaks. The Minister should re-evaluate the position of the government, in view of the fact the Lottery Commission does make the final approval of retailer licenses.

Who else wants these retailer licenses, the ones that presently applied and have been successful in getting the necessary authorization?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If the Member wants detail of that nature, I will have to secure it and bring it back to the House. The Member wants to know exactly who. I do not know exactly who. I will provide the information, if I can find it.

Question re: Lottery contract

Mr. Lang: I go back to his statements of yesterday, where the Minister said to the people of the territory and to the Members of this House that the major reason for the government taking over the Lottery Commission was as follows, and I quote: "Because of the desire of many groups to have a fair allocation of retailer licenses."

Could he please substantiate, to the House, what groups he is talking about?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member wants to know exactly who. The Member says I made a statement. I did make a statement with respect to providing information to the House with respect to who, generically, wants access to the sale of tickets. The Member has stated a couple of times that he wants to know who else would want the right to sell tickets. I will provide the information to the Members when I can secure the details that the Member wishes.

Mr. Lang: I think the question is legitimate. He informed this House yesterday that the reason he was moving in and big government was taking over was because of the desire by many groups to have a fair allocation of retailer licenses.

Who is going to get those licenses? Could the Minister tell us why he made that statement yesterday, since he does not know who these groups are?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Firstly, it is not government taking over the management of lotteries. It is the Lottery Commission, as mandated by this House and, presumably, supported by the Member, who used to be a Minister in the Cabinet that made the decision in the first place.

With respect to who gets licenses, that would have to be determined by the managers, who will be the Lottery Commission.

With respect to the details the Member requests as to what other groups out there are not affiliated with the Sports Federation or Arts Council, I will get the detailed information the Member requests and provide it to the House.

Mr. Lang: I am sure we appreciate it. I just want to point out to the Minister that he has a responsibility. When he makes a statement as a Minister of the Crown, it has to be substantiated, and he has not done that. He has stood up in the House and said that the reason he is doing something is because...

Speaker: Order, please. Would the Member please get to the question.

Mr. Lang: I would like to ask a further question. Is it now the position of the government that with the take over by government

that no longer will any non-profit organization be eligible to have a retailer's licence.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I did not catch the intent of the Member's final question. Perhaps the Member could repeat it so that I could understand it better. Certainly, I take my responsibility very seriously with respect to providing information to this House.

Mr. Lang: It is a two-way street.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If I thought the Member's request for information was frivolous. I would have denied his request.

Question re: Lottery contract

Mr. Lang: It is a new question, Mr. Speaker. I will try it again, since the Minister did not hear my question and also stated that he did not understand it. Once the take-over by the government of the distribution of lottery tickets takes place, is it the government's position that non-profit organizations will no longer be eligible for retailer's licences?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The short answer is that the government is not taking over lotteries. The second part of the answer is that non-profit organizations would still be eligible.

Mr. Lang: I asked a question last Thursday in respect to a letter sent to the Minister, delivered by hand, signed by the President of Sports Yukon and the President of the Yukon Arts Council. The following statement was made in respect to that particular letter. "Sports Yukon and the Yukon Arts Council were not consulted during the review process, either as the contractor in the Lotteries Yukon Distribution Agreement, or as an umbrella organization representing sports and art organizations."

In view of this statement in the correspondence to the Minister, and the Minister undertook last Thursday to double check in respect to the review process and the consultation process, could he report his findings to the House?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: First of all, the Member assumes there were findings last week. There are no findings today either. I have asked the department to review not only the statements made by the authors of that particular letter with respect to the consultation, but also with respect to the questions put in the House by the Member for Kluane with respect to consultation and to query the contractor as to his position with respect to consultation.

Question re: Lottery contract, consultant's report

Mrs. Firth: I would like to follow-up on the consultant's report that was done on the Lottery Commission. Can the Minister of Recreation tell us how much the consultant's report cost the government?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not have that detail with me, but I can provide it to the House.

Mrs. Firth: If the Minister will bring that back, we would appreciate it.

Can the Minister tell us if the contract is tendered, or if it was an invitational tender?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am not aware of either. I can provide that information as well.

Mrs. Firth: My final supplementary would be to ask if the Minister is prepared to table the contract, then we will have all the answers to our questions.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Sure.

Question re: Overdue government accounts

Mr. McLachlan: I have a question for the Government Leader. During last spring's budget in April 1986, the Government Leader announced a new policy of 30-day payment and an off-setting interest charge against the particular department that violated the policy.

Can the Government Leader inform the Legislature, say for the 10-month period ending January 31, 1987, the number of times that that policy was violated, which department was most guilty and how much interest was paid out under this policy?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I thank the Member for his question. I take it when he refers to violations, he is talking about offences to the 30-day provision. I would be more than happy to come back with an answer to that question. Whether I can provide it in the terms

that the Member requested, in other words in a specific 10-month period, or not I do not know, but I will give an undertaking to provide a written answer. Perhaps I will be able to do it on a departmental basis, and I hope that will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. McLachlan: I have a complaint from at least one Faro business that proves the policy is not working, and, in fact, the payment of invoices is more in the nature of 90 or 120 days rather than 30. It appears to be 15 isolated cases with one from the Department of Education and the other 14 all relate to the Department of Health and Human Resources, which appears to be having a problem in their accounting administration in paying invoices. Can the Minister of Health and Human Resources identify any specific reason why her department is obviously having problems paying invoices on time, within the 30-day period, as mandated by the Government Leader?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: If the Member will permit me, having taken the first question as notice, I will take that question as notice also. The problems, as the Member opposite I am sure will know, are not always internal to the government. Sometimes they have problems with the mail, sometimes other problems, but we will bring back a specific response to the concern addressed by him about the Department of Health and Human Resources.

Mr. McLachlan: More basic to the problem is the policy of the interest payments to the vendor having the effect, literally, of seducing the businessman, the taxpayer, with his own money as in deference to making the payment. In other words, \$2 on a \$200 bill does very little for the businessman. Will the Government Leader agree to review the policy of paying interest on the payments within the 30-day period because of the problems that are very obviously occurring in a number of instances, which I believe will be substantiated by the review, in order that the Department of Government Services, or Finance, may further streamline its policy of invoice payments.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I cannot say that seduction of any kind is involved. I do want to point out that we do intend to try and give satisfaction to the people who do business with this government. I am quite prepared to take a look at the policy, in terms of its effectiveness, but I am not sure it has been in place long enough yet to really know whether it is an effective deterrent for departments or agencies that may be offending against the 30-day rule.

In any event, we are taking a wide look at the administrative functions in different departments. The Member will know that departments vary in size and, therefore, in their ability to handle such administrative matters. I hope I will have an opportunity to report back to the House as a result of that review.

Question re: Flow-through Tax Incentive Program

Mr. Nordling: Further to the motion in this House, January 14, that the Government of Canada should be urged to retain the existing flow-through share tax incentive program, has the Minister made contact with the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Wilson? If so, has the Minister received any reply?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am aware of several communications, some of which are specific to this issue, and some which took place in conferences. As the Member knows, as the House is sitting I am unable to attend Minister of Finance meetings, including the most recent one where this one was the subject of some discussion. The views of this government on that subject have been conveyed very strongly to the federal Minister, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Nordling: I am pleased to hear that. Does the Minister know when the decision on the tax reform package will be made?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not know when the final decision with respect to all the issues will be announced. In some areas, it is a matter of quite complicated negotiations and discussions with provinces, as there is some shared jurisdiction. I would expect that, in his next Budget Address, the federal Minister of Finance will make clear the kind of agenda and kind of timetable that he has for this program.

From the information that I have at hand now, I do not believe that it will be possible to complete the original ambitious program of tax reform contemplated by the federal government before they next have to go to the polls.

Question re: Diversion committees

Mr. Phillips: With respect to diversion committees, can the Minister of Health and Human Resources tell this House if diversion committees are working presently in all communities?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: No they are not, I believe they are working in Haines Junction and Watson Lake, I am not familiar with any others. The Diversion Committee in Whitehorse right now is not an active committee.

Mr. Phillips: Many months ago, various groups in Whitehorse were asked to appoint members to the Diversion Committee. Can the Minister tell us why the Diversion Committee in Whitehorse is not operating at this time?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am not really familiar with what has happened to that Committee. I did talk to a couple of the members, and I agreed that I would sit down and have a meeting with them as soon as possible to find out what the problems were.

Mr. Phillips: It is obvious that the Diversion Committees, from this Minister who cares so much, are not a priority in your department. Whitehorse has the largest number of young offenders who are charged through the Court system. Can the Minister explain why it has not started in Whitehorse and when the Minister expects the Diversion Committee to start taking an active role?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The Member is wrong. The Diversion Committee is a priority with me; I use to be a member of it. I will be meeting with them some time soon. They were active for a while; they are not active now, and I will find out why, and I will come back to this House and I will let the Member know.

Question re: Job Evaluation Study, appeal process

Mrs. Firth: I have a question for the Government Leader regarding the job evaluation study. I asked him some months about the appeal process. Can the Government Leader tell me how many appeals there were and how many have been settled?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I would be happy to answer the question, but I am sure the Member opposite knows that without notice I could not reasonably be expected to have that information at my fingertips; however, I will take the question as notice and if the Member wishes great detail I will provide a written answer; if she does not, I will simply come back with an oral response very shortly.

Mrs. Firth: When I originally asked the question, I was given a commitment for an answer and I still have not received one, so I would like the Government Leader to bring me back an answer, soon if he could. I would like also to know how many appeals there were in total and how many have been settled and what the government's expectation is for all of the appeals being dealt with.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I take it that in essence the Member is asking for a progress report on JES appeals, and that would lend itself to a written response, which I will be happy to bring.

Question re: Carcross-Fraser Road

Mr. Lang: I have a question to the Minister of Community and Transportation and it has reference to a question I have raised a number of times on safety on the road between Carcross and Fraser and the question of a sanding truck has been brought a number of times, and I want to also point out to the side opposite that it was raised once again by a number of truck drivers over the weekend. I would ask the Minister: in view of the fact that he made the commitment last week that he would have a final report at the end of last week, is it the position of the government that they will be putting a sanding truck up at the Fraser Camp?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: After the questions last week, I indicated to the department the clear position that if conditions warrant it, it will be sanded. If the road was slippery and icy, they should sand the road. That is the direction that I have provided to the department.

Mr. Lang: Is there going to be a sanding truck at Fraser? There is presently one at Carcross. If they get called up, it takes them an hour-and-a-half to meet the real needs of, primarily, the truckers with respect to the hills around Fraser. Has the Minister instructed the department to locate a sanding truck at Fraser?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The answer is: no. I have indicated to the department that if the road is icy, they are to sand the road. If they require a truck at Fraser in order to sand the road, then they should locate a truck at Fraser to do the job. If they can do the job with a truck from Carcross, then they can do the job with a truck from Carcross.

The bottom line is that if the road is slippery, they should sand the road.

Mr. Lang: The point is that right now you have a sanding truck stationed in Carcross and it is needed around Carcross. Is it the policy position of the government that a sanding truck be either purchased or relocated at the Fraser camp to meet the varied weather conditions of that particular area, which is very treacherous and very dangerous, and get a truck there prior to having a major accident? Will the government undertake to have a sanding truck located at the Fraser camp to meet the needs of that area?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The policy of this government is to provide for safe driving conditions. The policy of this government is that if those safe driving conditions can be met with sanding, then the road should be sanded. That is the policy position of this government.

Whether a truck is located in a particular spot, whether we provide 10 bagfuls of sand or five tons of sand, or whatever the Member wants me to refer to, those are not policy positions, those are administrative matters. The policy position of the government is that the road will be sanded, so the road will be sanded.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed. We will now proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

17 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chairman: The Committee of the Whole will now come to order. We will resume with Bill No. 7 after we take a 15 minute recess.

Recess

Bill No. 7 — First Appropriation Act, 1987-88 — continued

Chairman: We will continue with the Department of Health and Human Resources.

On Juvenile Justice

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have some information that was asked for by the Member for Riverdale South with regard to the health centre in Pelly and where it will be situated. The new health centre will be situated across from the current site.

Chairman: This does not pertain to Juvenile Justice, does it?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: No, it was held over, so should we go ahead with Juvenile Justice and then return to this?

Chairman: Yes, let us finish this one and then we will return. Now we will do Juvenile Justice.

Mrs. Firth: Just to follow up on the Juvenile Justice debate, I was going through the comments the Minister made regarding Juvenile Justice and the facility that is going to be built. The Minister was going to provide some information regarding the costs of sending young offenders outside to Willingdon, and to do a comparison of the \$1 million O&M costs we are going to have for the new facility we are going to be building here in the Yukon.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have a correction with respect to some information I gave the Member yesterday. I indicated, in general comments about the young offenders facility, that 15.6 person years

would be required to operate the facility. The Member for Riverdale South heard the number as 50. The number is not five-zero, but one-five. She suggested there was an increase of 30 person years.

The cost of maintaining a young offender at a BC institution at a flat rate is \$165 a day. That does not include the cost of transportation and travel expenses for young offenders and the escort, plus ongoing visits sometimes required by the family and their other travel expenses.

The average length of order for young offenders from Yukon was 119 days. The average cost per young offender, including travel costs, is \$26,135. Estimated costs to maintain a young offender in the proposed facility will be \$240. This per diem is based on an O&M operational estimate of \$1 million a year and accommodating 12 offenders. The differential consists of the higher cost of living in the north, utilities, food cost as well as higher salaries and benefits paid to the youth workers.

Mrs. Firth: I guess the figure we are looking for, for a comparison, is \$165 per day, as opposed to the \$240 per day cost of actual — institutional care is not a very nice term and I do not like to use that, but I guess we would call it a cost for care for a young offender in a facility.

The Minister made an interesting comment about family visiting young offenders. Do I understand that young offenders' families are provided with money to visit them in Willingdon?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Sometimes there is follow-up counselling that is required by families in order to deal with the youngster better. It is not a family visit when a family wants to go out, but it is part of the counselling program. If that young offender is outside, then that kind of thing would happen here in the Yukon.

Mrs. Firth: I just want to ask one more question about the person years. The Minister said that 15.6 person years will be required for the 12-bed secure custody facility, and the O&M costs of that facility are going to be \$1 million. Can the Minister tell me what allocation of that million is for salary dollars?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am informed that it is \$350,000 to \$400,000.

Mrs. Firth: Do I understand correctly from the *Hansard* yesterday, the Minister said that we have an established number of 20 person years working with all of our facilities, and that was the 5030-5th Avenue group home, 501 Taylor, the Assessment Centre, and that this 15.6 will be an addition to that 10, so that there will be a total of 35.6 person years that will be responsible for these facilities.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We will be using a total of 30 person years. We will also require an additional 40 to do other things within the department, but those are people who will be working three shifts.

Mrs. Firth: Perhaps she could clarify the additional whatever she just said; I heard 40. I saw the official just have a heart attack.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: He did almost have a heart attack. The number was four.

Mrs. Firth: In a general context, in the event that the federal government does not pay for this, are we going to have to pay for it? Is there some question that the federal government may not fund this if it is not according to their speculation or their wishes of what a young offenders secure facility should be?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The money that we are seeking right now has been approved, and that is 100 percent cost shared by the federal government. I believe that ongoing funding will be 50 percent cost shared by the federal government. I do not have any commitment from anywhere saying that that will last for another 10 or 20 years, but I am sure that when the time comes that the federal government decides not to cost share they will give us enough time. Whether or not they do, we still are obligated to prepare for those young people who come into our care.

Mrs. Firth: My concern is not time, my concern is money. It is very nice for us to build the facility and to have a good quality facility, but I want to make sure that it is being taken into account that in the event that the federal government says we are now responsible, there will certainly be no money coming from the federal government to assist us and we are going to be responsible for the cost. I hope that has been taken into consideration when it is determined whether it is going to be a 12-bed facility, and what kind of facility it will be.

Mr. Phillips: I would like to go back to something the Minister said yesterday. I quote from *Hansard*, "What could happen very often is that they could be raised to adult court, if they are old enough. That does happen and they are treated as an adult. If that happens they will identify a person whom they believe is too dangerous to keep in a secure facility and they will be sent out to Willingdon or to other places that do have bars."

I have understood all along that the Minister's aim, or main direction here, is to build a secure custody facility in the Yukon so we could keep our youths in the Yukon. Secure custody facility, in my mind, is for young offenders with serious offences. We may not have 501 Taylor, but we have open custody such as this for young offenders with less serious offences. It seems we are slipping down one notch now where we have sort of intermediate-type offences. Is the federal government going to be prepared to give you this funding if you do not build the type of facility that will keep our young offenders here? I thought that was the purpose of the whole Act, to keep the young offenders in the area.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The plans that we have been talking about for a long time are the same plans we have always had; they have not changed. We have had a different philosophy toward dealing with young offenders. If we had a young offender who could be dangerous to other young offenders, we would not expect to keep him in the same building. There are certain types of individuals who may not be able to stay within a young offenders facility.

The Member talks about keeping all of these people in the Yukon. We would dearly love to do that, but sometimes you have to make an exception for a certain case. The fact is that even when the young offenders were a younger age, they could still be raised to adult court. That could be done and, if it is done, that person will be treated as an adult, and if that person has to go to custody it will still be here in the Yukon. There could be an exception, where somebody who may not be as old as we feel should be raised to adult court, that we would have to possibly send that person out to Willingdon. I would hope that never happens, but it could. We have to look at that possibility. I do not know whether we will have one young offender in the next year who will require that, or if we will not have any. It is still our desire to keep our young offenders in the Yukon. It is still our desire to keep our young offenders in the community, if we can.

Mr. Phillips: I think everybody in the Yukon who has heard this issue, which has been ongoing for several years, felt that we were building a secure custody facility for young offenders with more serious offences.

From this side, we believe that all our young offenders should be kept in Yukon. We are spending a great deal of money to build a facility. Yet, you are still telling us that the more serious offenders are going to be sent away. I would suggest that if they are more serious offenders, that the best place to have them is at home, near their family, where they could be put into programs and treated accordingly, instead of sending them to Willingdon, the place the Minister so hates.

If she really cares for these young offenders, she would have come in here with a reasonable budget. The fact of the matter is, it would have cost more money to build that type of facility, and the Minister is just playing politics with our young offenders.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I apologize, but I have to laugh. I have not been playing politics with young offenders. I have been fighting to keep the young offenders here. I have been fighting to give them better accommodation. If I did not care about them, I would not have fought so hard to keep 501 Taylor, contrary to the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North.

It is my opportunity, and I am doing it, but I am not going to build a facility that is going to be a youth jail. I refuse to do that. I think that there are better ways of dealing with young offenders, and there are a large number of Yukoners who agree with me. I can tell the House that right now; that is a fact.

It is not just my great idea about how to treat young offenders. I do not play politics with little kids.

Mr. Phillips: It is obvious the Minister will not build a youth jail in the Yukon, but does not hesitate to send these more serious young offenders to a youth jail at Willingdon, outside.

It is hypocritical for the Minister to even state that.

If we are building such a facility and we are sending all our serious offenders outside because we do not want them mixing with other young offenders, that means that this facility is not going to be secure at all. It is a carbon copy of the assessment centre, at a cost of \$1 million or so to the taxpayers.

The Minister claims to be very serious. I am sure the Minister is very serious about doing this, but I do not understand why the Minister has decided to build half a secure facility. It is not the secure facility the Minister is talking about, it is a carbon copy of the assessment centre.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It is a facility for young people who have been sentenced to secure custody. It does not necessarily mean that it has to be a jail. We do not know whether or not we will have one person who may have to go somewhere else, whom we cannot control here. We do not know that, but we are not going to build a facility that is going to hold 12 young people who do not require that kind of accommodation. We may not even get one person in the next year.

The Member is making a big issue where it does not have to be made. He is doing that. We are building a 12-bed facility for young offenders in secure custody. We would hope that we would never have to send a youngster outside but, when we do, that is ordered by the court, not by this department.

Mrs. Firth: There is a principle here that the Minister seems to be intentionally ignoring. I have listened to much debate about the young offenders facility, and I have talked to many people about this government's direction when it comes to this facility.

The Minister maintained that Willingdon was the worst place in the world to which we could send our young offenders. I heard her say that in this House. She had a tour of it, she did not like it, and it was a terrible place. The impression that this government left with the public was that we were going to have our own young offenders facility for young offenders who were in secure custody. Whether the Minister likes it or not, the public interpreted that as I did, that the government's intention was that they wanted to keep the young people here in the Yukon, at their home. The Minister said, in *Hansard*, that if she had her way not one young offender would leave the Yukon Territory. We all agreed with her.

The Minister then came in with a smoke and mirror display about how the former government wanted to build this tremendously expensive facility for open and secure custody. All along, the principle of this government was that the young offenders would be housed at home. To me, that means that all young offenders, whether they are in open or secure custody, will be at home. The Minister is now telling us that that is not going to be. If there is a young offender who has some particular quality, that young offender will go out to Willingdon; they will not stay here. She refused to have a facility to house these young offenders. I would like to know why there has been a change in the policy of the government. Why is it now okay for some of the young offenders to go out to Willingdon? Why do they no longer believe that all of them should be kept here in the Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have not changed my mind. I still maintain that I did say things, and I believe that I did say them. The Member talks about talking to the general public. There is a public that talks to her and a public that talks to me. Things do not always look the way they do. We have talked to a number of individuals who are very concerned about dangerous young offenders in their neighbourhood. We have talked to those individuals to tell them what their options are. A lot of those people were quite satisfied.

I still agree that I would like to see all of our young offenders kept here in the Yukon. I do not have any authority over the court, and when the court orders that those young people have to be sent somewhere else because of their behaviour, I have no control over that. I do not tell the judge what to do with those children. I am telling this House right now that there may not be a young offender who may have to go out there, maybe for the next year.

Here we go again saying, "Oh, the Minister is telling a different story." Those are only options, and if a person has to be sent somewhere else, he will be. I can only hope that it never has to happen.

23 Mrs. Firth: This is the way it is. The court orders a young offender to be placed in either open or secure custody. That is what the court orders. It is the government — the Minister of Health and Human Resources — who interprets the *Young Offenders Act* and determines what kind of secure custody they are going to provide. That clause in the *Young Offenders Act* is relatively open and can be interpreted in a very vague way and can be interpreted as having secure custody, which is not really secure in the sense that there are bars on the windows and locks on the doors.

An interpretation can be made that secure custody is going to be considered the kind of facility the Minister is talking about, which is a rather open facility, I gather from what the Minister said. They have been to Manitoba and have visited the 100 young offenders in secure custody and they had no fences, no locks, no bars on the windows. She has obviously chosen — as a policy decision this government has made — to interpret that clause in the most open context she can with respect to her interpretation of secure custody. That is a decision this government makes, not the courts. The court assigns them to closed or open custody, or whatever. It is the Minister who makes the decision as to what kind of secure facility is going to be provided.

I do not agree with the Minister. I talked to some of the public and she talked to some of the public, and they are two different publics. In some context, maybe so, but I would think that there are probably people whom we both talked to. I read the report that the Minister tabled in the Legislature. I also listened to the Minister's comments and her Ministerial Statements about young offenders. Her comments were that it was a comment they heard constantly from all groups across the territory, that they wanted their young offenders kept at home.

That was the overriding principle of us having a secure facility here, and of us having 501 Taylor Street, which is considered an open facility.

There has been a change. I am asking the Minister not to get up and make accusations about anything. We are not making accusations. I am asking the Minister some precise policy questions, and I would like some precise policy answers. I interpret this as a change in the government's policy. The Minister is shaking her head and saying no.

You cannot have it one way one day and have it another way another day without anticipating that you will be asked these questions. We are either going to keep young offenders who are given secure custody here in the Yukon, or we are not. From what the Minister says, I gather that we are going to have young offenders in open custody facilities here. We are going to have them in a semi-secure custody facility, depending on the interpretation of the Act as the Minister has given it. Then, secure custody young offenders are also going to go to Willingdon.

The position of the government has always been that they were to stay here. I think we are justified in asking for a clarification of the Minister's change in policy direction.

24 Hon. Mrs. Joe: There has not been a change in policy direction. The Members, as they always do, and it is their job to do, find criticism for everything that this government does, and they do it well. I have mentioned to the Member that there could be young offenders raised to adult court, and that happens. That happens now; it happened ten years ago. That will continue to happen.

It is still our position to keep young offenders in the Yukon. Sometimes, you just cannot always do what you want to do. If there is any way at all that we can keep our young offenders in the Yukon, we will; we will do that. We would only hope that we will not have a lot of young offenders who we have to send out to Willingdon. We have. That happens right now. We have young offenders who are sentenced to open custody who get into trouble, and they do things that are not very acceptable, and they do get sent out to a place where they have to be in custody — somewhere where they can be watched and taken care of. We do not really appreciate that. We would certainly hope that the facility we build for secure custody — and it is a secure custody facility, it is not semi, it is a secure facility — built in a different way. It is built different from what Members across the room would have built, without the jails and the bars and whatnot.

We would hope that we would be able to implement programs that work that will keep those young offenders here in the Yukon. We would hope to improve on that. We are always talking about prevention, and that is what we are looking at. We do not intend to just lock the kids up and leave them there.

There are a lot of things that go along with the secure facility, or the secure order, and we have programs that try to help those kids. Some of them are working in other parts of the country. If we see a program that we think will be good for the Yukon, then, of course, we will look at the possibility of using that. But, my position is that we would like to keep our young offenders here in the Yukon. I do not believe, and I do not have the fear that the other Members on the other side of the House have, that we are going to have to send half of the kids out to Willingdon.

Mrs. Firth: Number one, I never expressed anything about a fear. Number two, I never, ever said that we were going to send half of the kids to Willingdon. Number three, this side does not criticize everything that the government is doing. I wish the Minister would be more cautious in her choice of words. She really can be quite misleading, and, I think, in an unintentional way. Maybe that is what happens. People have the ability to take a line out of *Hansard*, and if the Minister is saying that and it is not intentional, she should be very careful in her choice of words. As I try not to put words into her mouth, I wish she would not do that to me.

This Legislature unanimously agreed with the principal of young offenders all being kept in the Yukon, if they could be. The Opposition Members agreed to that, and the government agreed to that. Now, it is the government that is coming back and saying that that is not going to be so, that young offenders sentenced to secure custody are going to be going out to Willingdon, anyway.

25 That is what initiated the whole debate — that they not go out to Willingdon and that they remain here in the Yukon. The Minister criticizes us for wanting some kind of containment that has locks and bars. The Minister is prepared to completely depart from the principle that we agreed to as Legislators and to send these people out and isolate them from their community, and, in some cases, probably from their culture and family, and put them into another environment. Those were all the principles and points that were raised when we agreed to the concept of young offenders being kept at home.

The Minister keeps going back to this raising young offenders to adult court. Why were the young offenders in Willingdon now not raised to adult court? That would have kept them here, why does the Minister keep using that as an argument? Why were the ones who are out at Willingdon, I think the Minister said seven, not raised to adult court?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: There are certain reasons why young offenders are raised to adult court. Some of them are not to keep them in a certain place. Some of their crimes might be a little more serious than they have been in the past, and they are starting to commit more serious crimes and they are still young people. They may then get raised to adult court. They never know until they go before the judge whether they are going to get secure or open custody.

I do not know what more I can say. I can only anticipate that we will not be sending any of our young offenders out to Willingdon or anywhere else. Willingdon is getting pretty full of its own people from British Columbia and possibly they will not have the room.

Our facility will have space in it where a young offender can be kept and watched a little more closely. Who is to say that somebody may commit something a little more serious while they are in there? We hope it will not happen. I look to the future, and I see certain things that could happen in a young offenders facility, and I hope those things will not happen. I think I look to the future in a more optimistic way than some other people do. I think that is a good way to be, but we still have to be prepared for something that may happen that we will have to deal with. In that case, we could be dealing with someone we may have to send to Willingdon or to another section of the Whitehorse Correctional Centre, which happens now. We do have some young offenders who do go there rather than being sent outside.

26 Mrs. Firth: I just have one final comment I would like to

make, and then I know the Member for Riverdale North would like to ask some questions. It is not the government that decides whether a young offender is going to be raised to adult court, and I would like to ask that Minister not to use it as an excuse for sending young offenders to Willingdon. It does not apply, and she made the comment herself that you could not use it as an excuse and I would ask the Minister not to. The fact is that if the court orders a young offender to be placed in a secure facility and that they are going to have to go out to Willingdon, which is the secure facility, because we really are not going to have a secure facility *per se* here in the Yukon, or it will be a facility interpreted in the loosest terms of the clause in the Act that defines secure custody facility.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The Member, as mostly happens on the other side, is always looking at the negative of anything that happens. We will have a secure facility here, despite what information she gets from the lawyer to the right of her. A secure facility can be built in different ways, and the Member knows it. If a person is sentenced to a secure facility when our facility is ready to be used, then that person will go to that facility. It is a known fact right now that our young kids who are sentenced to secure facilities and go out to Willingdon are so much out-of-place down there because they get sentenced to a secure facility for minor, minor offences compared to what the secure facility kids are sentenced to down there. There is no comparison in the different kinds of crimes that are committed, there is no comparison in the different kinds of way the kids are. We are looking after Yukoners here. We believe that we can do it in a secure facility setting, the way that we have proposed it and the way it will be built.

Mrs. Firth: I am sorry the Minister is interpreting this as negative debate; I do not. I know how well prepared the Minister was for Question Period today, which was something that deals with young offenders. I guess my question to the Minister is: who is going to determine, then, whether the young offender who has been confined to secure custody, whether they stay here or whether they go to the Willingdon facility. Who makes that determination?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The Court decides that.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister has told us that the types of youths who will go to Willingdon or go outside are youths who have been elevated to adult court. That is what the Minister said.

Mrs. Firth: That is right, yes.

Mr. Phillips: I will have to quote out of *Hansard* again so the Minister can remember what she said: "What could happen often is that they could be raised to adult court if they are old enough. That does happen and they are treated as an adult. If that happens and they identify a person whom they believe is too dangerous to keep in secure facility they will be sent out to Willingdon or to other places that do have bars." That is out of *Hansard* on February 2nd, and that is what the Minister told us yesterday. What I would like to know from the Minister is: will there be any young offenders who are sentenced in the Yukon, who have committed fairly serious crimes and are not elevated to the adult court, who are sent out to any other facility, or will they all, regardless of the seriousness of the crime, as long as they are not elevated to adult court, be kept in this facility?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have not read *Hansard* today. I was not saying that they would be raised to adult court to be sent out to Willingdon. I said they could be raised to adult court, be treated as an adult, number one. Or, number two, they could be sentenced, remain in the juvenile court and be sentenced to secure custody and be sent to Willingdon. I was talking about two different things, not as was indicated by the Member there.

Mr. Phillips: Could the Minister tell us who goes to Willingdon? If he or she is a Yukon young offender and has committed a fairly serious crime and is not elevated to adult court, will that young offender be sent to Willingdon or any other outside facility other than our secure custody facility?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am the Minister of Health and Human Resources. I am not the judge of the Territorial Court. I do not know. I cannot give him that answer.

Mr. Phillips: We are building a secure custody facility. In that facility, can we contain all young offenders who are convicted under the *Young Offenders Act*, and can we keep them here in the

Yukon? That was the whole purpose and the whole plan behind the Minister's statements. Can we do that with this facility? If we cannot do it, then why are we not building a facility that we can do it for?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We are building a secure facility to house young offenders who are sentenced to secure custody. We will be keeping those young people here in the Yukon.

Mr. Phillips: When a judge sentences a young offender to secure custody, does the judge specify what facility they go to?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: No, they do not. Sometimes, when the person is sentenced to open or secure facilities, that youngster may or may not get into trouble, but sometimes they do, and sometimes they have to be dealt with, as they are right now. If we have a young person right now who gets a little bit obnoxious and maybe starts to take a round out of the youth worker or some of the other kids, then they have to be dealt with. They cannot keep them in the same place as the rest of the people. Sometimes they are sent to the Correctional Centre here in Whitehorse, and sometimes they end up back in court and are given another sentence to secure custody or are sent out to Willingdon.

We would hope that something like that would not happen. It could happen. It should not happen as often as it has in the past, because these young people are getting better facilities; the living conditions are better. People say we should not give all these nice things to our young people, but if they have a decent place to live where there is not a lot of stress, they react to that kind of environment. With all our new facilities and possibly new training programs and the kids working together — it is a hard job for anybody who is going to do it — I am hoping that these will improve and that we will not have the kind of serious incidents that happen now. There is no question that they do. People know that they do.

We want to keep our kids in the Yukon. It is our intention to keep our kids in the Yukon. There might be one isolated incident where we cannot.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister is telling the youth of the territory that if it is a serious crime you may not be here because they are still going to ship you out, with this statement.

When a young person is sentenced to secure custody, who will determine whether that youth will stay in the Yukon or leave the Yukon for another facility? Who makes that determination?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: When the young person has to go to court, if he has not lived up to his obligation at the facility he is in, he then will have to go to court, and the court will decide what he has to do. If we stand here and be very pessimistic about the whole thing, we are not going to get anywhere. The Members on the other side are trying to get me to say, "Well, tough, you have not been able to live up to your promises," which is not the case. The real fact is that our young people will be staying in the Yukon. Possibly, in an isolated instance, they may have to go somewhere else. We may have a room built into our facility where they can stay until they cool down. I am not looking at the same kinds of things the Members across the House are. I am not looking for half the youths protesting and saying, "Gee whiz, we are going to be bad and be doing this and doing that." We are hoping to be working with those youngsters, not against them.

Mrs. Firth: This is going from bad to worse. Maybe it was last night, I do not know. We are simply trying to find out what the Minister's intentions are and how she sees this facility working. I have been listening for the last five or ten minutes to what the Minister is saying, and I have determined a few facts.

I have determined the fact that when a judge sentences young offenders to secure custody, they do not specify what facility they go to. I then heard the Minister say that they would go to the secure facility here. This is what she is saying in effect. She is saying that if a young offender is sentenced to secure custody they will go to our facility here in the Yukon, which she admits will be a nicer facility than Willingdon. But, if they get into trouble or if they are bad or misbehave, then they are going to have to go to Willingdon.

That is what the Minister is saying. She is chuckling now, but that is effectively what she has said, that because the judge has sentenced them to secure custody they are going into secure custody

here, but there may be some instances where the youths are bad and they may have to go to Willingdon. Is that going to be some kind of threat that is going to be held over the youth's head? Who makes that decision? The Member for Riverdale North asked who made that decision.

I do not want the Minister to get all huffy and flustered. I am asking a legitimate question here. The judge does not say you go to the Whitehorse secure facility or you go to Willingdon. The Member for Riverdale North asked how that decision was going to be made.

I am not making the accusation that the Minister is going to use that as a potential threat, but she must be very cautious about the way she puts words, because that is the way it can be interpreted. On some basis, based on behavioural attitudes, the youths sentenced to secure custody may have to go out to Willingdon. I would like the Minister to clarify the government's position. Who is going to determine whether that youth goes to Willingdon, or will it be based on the number of times the youth gets into trouble in the secure custody facility here, or is it going to be some determination made by someone at the facility?

» **Hon. Mrs. Joe:** The Member keeps harping on Willingdon. I did say that they could be sent to Willingdon. I also said they could be raised to adult court and could be sentenced to an adult jail.

The Members on the other side of the House are making the issue that I am saying that if you do not behave yourself, kid, you are going to Willingdon. That is not the only option. There are other options, as well. There could be disciplinary actions that they could take within the facility. The people who work with them are people who work there because they know how to work with kids. A lot of them are trained very well in that area.

We were looking very seriously at a very successful program used in Manitoba. We are looking at that kind of a program. We are looking toward the future very optimistically. We would hope that we could be very successful in that program. I want everybody to know that. I do not want people to go out of here and say that the Minister said that if you do not behave yourself you are going to Willingdon. I want them to know that we are looking at better options. We have been looking at them for a long time. If they want me to say what they are trying to make me say, I am not going to do it.

We are going to be looking at options; we are going to be looking at programs; we are going to try to improve the system. You cannot do a heck of a lot when you have something like the assessment centre that has been there for a number of years. You could only do it if you have a good place to stay, good staff working there, good programs. That is why we have the 5030-5th Avenue group home. That is why we now have 501 Taylor, and that is why we are now building the facility to hold those youngsters who are sentenced to secure facilities.

We will be working with them. We will not be working against them.

Mrs. Firth: I wish the Minister would try to open herself up a little bit. I do not recall us ever standing up here and saying that we did not agree with the principle of working with these youths. That is why we want them kept here in the Yukon Territory.

I did not criticize the Minister by saying that she may be thinking about this and that it might be preferable for the youths to be housed in a secure facility here. I do not know if the Minister is even listening to me. I do not know if I am talking to myself or if the Minister is listening or reading or what she is doing. We are trying to participate in some constructive debate.

The Minister talks about disciplinary action and that it may be an incentive that if youths want to stay at home and stay in the facility in the Yukon, that it would be more beneficial to them if their behaviour warranted them being allowed to stay here. I do not think the public would disagree with that kind of thinking. If the Minister got up and said that she thought that it would be an added attraction to the youth to stay at home as opposed to having to go out to Willingdon, I do not think she would find a lot of people who would disagree with her.

» All we are trying to do is get the Minister to give us some indication of how she sees this facility working. She cannot get up

and say nothing and try to please everybody. She either takes a position, or she does not.

We are asking for \$1,639,000. We are asking for a million in O&M costs. Surely the Minister is prepared to stand up and tell the people of the Yukon what her position is on this facility. If she says something and people do not agree with it, well, people will not agree with it. She cannot stand up and go blathering on and on and on and never say anything. She has to take a position sometime. I do not think that she would find a lot of disagreement from this side on some of the positions she wants to take, but she has to express those positions.

She has also mentioned that there is some possibility that, in that disciplinary action, there could be isolation rooms. Perhaps young offenders whose behaviour is not consistent with the other young offenders in the facility would be isolated. That is a principle that other provinces are using or experimenting with. We all agree, I think, with the concept of young offenders being put into a secure facility, and once they are in that facility, we are all going to work in their best interests. We are simply trying to find out what the Minister's position is.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I think I have stated my position. I do not know what more I can do. I think that the Members on the other side of the House read *Hansard*. I really do not blame them for coming to this House and asking all of these questions, because I did not express myself very well in the House yesterday. There was some confusion with what I explained. I tried to straighten it out today, that we do not necessarily raise young offenders to adult court just to keep them in the Yukon. That is done sometimes, despite wherever they are going to go. That has been done for a number of years. It was done under the *Juvenile Delinquent Act*; it is now being done under the *Young Offenders Act*.

The Member was a little concerned about older offenders in the neighbourhood being a little bit overbearing and could possibly be dangerous. I gave an explanation as to what could happen in those circumstances, but I did not explain it right. I guess that is what is causing all the confusion here. My position is that I want to keep our young offenders in the Yukon. It is the position of all the communities we met with, whether it was secure or open. It is the position of that side of the House as well is that we want to keep young offenders in the Yukon. We do not want to send them outside of the Yukon anywhere. If there is any way we can keep from doing that, we will. We will build the young offenders' facility for secure custody. We will put the young offenders who are sentenced to secure custody in there.

If there are problems, there will be ways of dealing with those problems. We would hope that our plans, programs and our dreams and everything else will work. If they do not, then we are going to have to look at having options in place prior to that.

» **Mr. Phillips:** I do not disagree with the Minister when she says that may be a deterrent. It could possibly be a deterrent that they may send them outside if they misbehave. What we are talking about is young offenders who are sentenced in Yukon to secure custody facilities, regardless of the severity of their crime. Do they all stay here? Who evaluates the ones who go? It is certainly not done by the judge. It has to be done by someone else. Is it someone within that facility who sits down with this young offender and evaluates him or her and decides whether the young offender suits this facility, or has committed too serious a crime to be there and who may be too dangerous and have to be sent out.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: If the Member is talking about after they have been sentenced to open or secure custody, normally the youth workers who work with them would have to deal with that person at that time in whichever way they have within the department. If there came a time that they felt that the young offender was possibly too out of hand to keep in that facility, then there would be a possible chance they would be asked to have them contained in the Whitehorse Correctional Centre. That has happened in the past, or they could go out to Willingdon, but we would hope we would never have to use that. Maybe the Member across the floor is looking forward to something like that happening so he can get back to me and say, "Hey look, it is not working." That is his problem, not mine.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister is so paranoid it is terrible. It appears to me we are getting on the right track here. The Minister has said the young offender is sentenced to a secure custody facility. They all go to ours, and they stay in ours until such time as they have hung a licking on the guard or whatever the Minister said before, until they are impossible to keep in that facility. Is that what the Minister is saying? They all go to the Yukon facility, and none of them are sent outside unless they are elevated to the adult court.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister laughs hysterically. I do not think it is a funny matter. We, on this side, think that all young offenders, regardless of their crime, should be kept here if possible. We are spending \$1.6 million to ensure that. I want the Minister to tell us, because this has been her philosophy and this is what she has gone on this great crusade telling people this is what she is going to do, that she is going to keep these people here. This is a serious matter.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I was not laughing, I was groaning. I did not have any other choice but to groan. I have a hard time trying to put in my mind all of these hypothetical questions that are coming from the other side of the House. I have already explained what our intentions were. We will build a facility for secure custody. We will put our young offenders in there who are sentenced to secure custody. We will have better accommodations; we will have training programs; we will have youth workers working with these young people; and, we would hope that we will never, ever have to send any of our young offenders anywhere else. I do not want to stand in the House here and say that I am threatening to do anything else with them. I am being very optimistic about what our program is going to do. If they are trying to get me to say something in the House so they can go and splatter it all over the place, they are not going to get me to do that. I am not paranoid about what is going to happen. The paranoia, as I remember it, was around 501 Taylor and was not caused by us.

Mr. Phillips: I am going to go real slow. I am going to ask one question at a time, and I would hope that the Minister would listen so that the Minister is not confused by all these hypothetical questions.

We are building a \$1.6 million secure custody facility. I want to know who is going to go in it. I think that is a legitimate question. We are building the facility because the Minister said that we want to keep all of our young offenders at home. I want to hear from the Minister: when the young offenders are sentenced to secure custody facility, is it true that when they reach that facility they are assessed by people in that facility as to whether they stay there or are shipped out?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: When they are sentenced to secure facility in the Yukon, and when our secure facility is ready to be moved into, they will go into our secure facility.

Mr. Phillips: Will it be all young offenders who go to that facility, and who decides that?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The judge decides who goes to a secure facility and who goes to open custody.

Mr. Phillips: Who decides which young offenders who are sentenced to secure custody will not remain in the Yukon, and who decides in that facility?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We are once again looking at a hypothetical situation, and they are trying to get all kinds of answers from me that they would just love me to give. I had already told the Member that there could be a situation where one young offender decides to act up. That happens in all young offenders' facilities right across Canada, and if that young person decides to act up, if he starts to disrupt everyone else in the building, then they deal with him or her somehow. They will have options for that person. They will possibly have an isolation room where they can put him until he cools down or she cools down. There are a number of options that those people use that work there because they are training to do it. I would hope that we would never have to send our young offender anywhere else then where he or she is, and as was done before, when our facilities were not as adequate as we would hope them to be, some of those young offenders have had to go to the Whitehorse Correctional Centre. That is decided, I believe, by the people who work there.

Mrs. Firth: I guess the Minister made an interesting comment

when she talked about negativism, because when people are negative they get paranoid and they get defensive and all the other things that I see the Minister displaying. I am just asking the Minister to open up a bit and be positive about her portfolio and to be receptive and to be forthcoming and not to be defensive. We are not out here trying to attack the Minister and trying to get her to say things that we want to trick her into somehow.

That is the Minister expressing her paranoia, if she would just look at it for a minute. I am trying to find out who is going to have the decision making authority, and I am trying to have some constructive debate with the Minister. This is the question: we have followed the Minister when she says that the young offender sentenced to secure custody will go to the secure custody hearing in Whitehorse. We recognize there are various options that can be used: isolation rooms and talking to young people, and there are different approaches to take for expressions of aggressive behaviour that may be presented. What we would like to know is, recognizing that the Minister is saying that there are people who work with them and the assessment people will submit reports, who is going to make the final decision? Is that going to come to the Minister? Is she going to be informed there is a troublesome youth at the secure custody facility and is she going to say it is okay for the experts who are giving the advice to send a person to Willingdon? That is what we are looking for. Who is going to make that final decision, because the courts do not make it. If a youth has to go to Willingdon, or if it is determined that they need a more secure form of custody, who makes that final decision?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It always amuses me when I listen to the other Member who has just spoken; she will stand up here and analyze every situation. She talks about personalities changing; she talks about paranoia. I can see what she does as well. She has her way of doing things. She has her own style, such as we all do on this side of the House, and on that side. I have seen her do all sorts of things up here.

I do not think that I have not answered the questions that I have been asked. They are probably questions that the Members did not really want to hear, and they can find other questions. That is fine. They can sit there and roll their eyes and shake their heads and be as frustrated as I have become listening to their questions, as they are listening to my answers. We can sit here and follow this same line of debate for the next hour-and-a-half, and possibly never come out with anything that they want to hear, simply because they probably do not agree with it.

The Minister of Justice has offered to step in and clarify a few things, and I think I will let him. I do not have the final decision as to what happens to those kids. They do not come to me to make a final decision, to say what is going to happen. I do not make those kinds of decisions. I am not a judge. I do not know the circumstances, and I cannot make those decisions. Those are made by the people who know how to make them.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am intervening because I may be able to clarify the situation that actually occurs, because I have been a judge and have been involved. I have also been involved in other capacities.

The situation is that both sides are right. The paradox is explained this way. The legal authority under the Act to place a child who is sentenced to secure custody is with the government, not the courts. The Members opposite are right in that interpretation. I believe that is uncontroversial.

However, in practice, what actually happens is that these cases come to court with specific recommendations by the social workers involved or the youth workers involved. The submissions in court from the prosecutors and defense clearly identify the facilities and particular programs available at each facility. The sentences are made by the court in contemplation of those specific programs. It does occur that persons are sentenced to closed custody, and they come back to court when problems occur. It is frequently the case that additional court orders are made that contemplate the child being placed outside the Yukon. That is what the Minister is referring to.

So, practically speaking, the decisions are made in court. It is theoretically or legally possible that the government would not

follow the decision of the court; however, that would involve a breach of faith, in that the court is told about the various options and the various plans, and it would be unthinkable that the government would breach its submission to the court, or say it was planning one thing and do something entirely different.

³⁵ Practically speaking, the decisions are made primarily by the court.

Mrs. Firth: Do I understand the Minister to say, because he has said something different than what the Minister of Health and Human Resources was saying, that based on recommendations that come to the court from the social workers and the professional people who have been dealing with the young offender, the court will determine which facility the young offender will go to, whether it be Willingdon or the Yukon secure facility?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Practically speaking, yes. The submissions by the social workers are not always recommendations, they are in the sense of identifying options. They are frequently recommendations, but practically speaking, yes.

Mrs. Firth: I heard the Minister use the term recommendations. I was pretty sure he did, because I jotted it down. I still get the feeling that the court does not necessarily always identify whether the young offender goes to Willingdon or to a Yukon secure custody facility. Practically speaking, I think it would be the case in some instances where the court would say, "We sentence this youth to secure custody for a time of whatever," that may be all they say. I do not disagree with what the Minister is saying, that in that event the youth would go to the secure facility here in the Yukon. As a deterrent to uncomplimentary behaviour, sometimes a determination may have to be made by the professional people working with the youth that perhaps this is not the correct facility for the youth. We do not disagree with that. This government has made a decision that they are going to have this kind of secure facility, and we respect their right to do that.

I am simply trying to find out, if that is the case, and there is an instance that a decision has to be made that the youth, because of behavioural attitude, conflicts with the other young offenders or sets a bad example, has to be transferred to Willingdon, I understand from what the Minister is saying that it can be done without them having to go back to court. I see the Minister of Justice nodding his head. I want to know who is going to make that decision. To me, it is an important decision that everyone would be consulted about. Would those kinds of things be brought to the Minister's attention? I am not saying the Minister is going to decide and exercise some punishment, but would those kinds of things be brought to the Minister's attention, and who ultimately makes the decision? Is it a group or a body of people who make that decision?

³⁶ **Hon. Mrs. Joe:** I would like to thank the Minister of Justice for clarifying some of the things I probably could not explain as well as he could.

With respect to the question from the Member about who makes the decision to send a youngster either to the correctional centre here in Whitehorse or to Willingdon — if, for instance, that person was in open custody, he or she would probably have to go back to the courts to be sentenced to secure custody.

In the case of a person who is already sentenced to secure custody, there would be many options open to that person. Probably the last resort would be to be sent to the correctional centre or to Willingdon.

We are not looking very favourably at sending anybody else to Willingdon, nor are they looking very favourably at us sending any out. They are filled up already as it is. That would be done by the people from the youth services program. The people who administer that program would make a decision whether or not that person could do that, or they could very well end up in court again and possibly be asked to go outside for some kind of counselling and assessment, or whatever they decide to do with them. There may be some way of dealing with that individual through counselling and the person could come back. That final decision would be made by the administration of the youth services program.

Mrs. Firth: Would the administration bring it to the attention of the Minister, so that she was aware that this was happening, or would they have the authority to just go ahead and do it themselves?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Because the facility to house those youngsters sentenced to secure custody would be a new program, and it is our position that we keep all our youngsters here, I would make it very clear to them that they would have to consult me when they made that decision. It is my position that we keep all young people here.

I do not have the skills or the training that is required to make a decision, but I can sometimes sit down with the group and, together, we can come to some kind of decision. I have done that in other areas, as well.

I believe that we have those individuals in our department who can deal with those kind of youngsters. I would hope that we would never have to send any children out of the Yukon. We are going to do everything that we can so that that will not happen.

³⁷ **Mrs. Firth:** The Minister is in some way going to be held accountable or responsible for that decision, and I think that that may be something that the government may want to take a look at. I am not trying to trap the Minister. I am trying to bring something forward, something in a constructive manner. I am saying to the Minister that maybe you may want to have that looked at. That is the point that I was trying to get to. It ultimately is the Minister who is responsible and it is the government that has made the choice as to what kind of secure custody facility they want to have and, in making that choice, it adds other responsibilities. I am raising it as a concern on this side and we will see that if it does present some predicaments for the Minister I know she will, in consultation with her colleague the Minister of Justice, see what other provinces have done if that is the case. Manitoba is the province that they consulted with concerning these matters and I am sure they dealt with it in some way. I flag it as something that the Minister may want to be looking at later on.

To sum up this whole question, I think we have provided some constructive issues for the Minister, this one in particular. The Minister of Justice is looking very thoughtful, and I think he agrees with us that it may be of some issue for the government or some problem, and we have brought it forward to them. We do not wish any ill will on the Minister and we recognize the tremendous responsibilities that she does have, and we realize that she is prepared to take them on.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We will be building the facility, hopefully in the summer. We would hope to have it operating by early winter. We have a lot of work that we have to do in regard to putting together a program, and I do appreciate coming to this House and receiving all kinds of good suggestions and recommendations from the other side of the House. Any time they can come up with something that I think is valuable, I will certainly use it. We have a lot of work to do. We have a lot of consulting to do. I will work very closely with my department as I have in the past in regard to the Young Offenders Program and if the Member or Members on the other side of the House have some good constructive suggestions I will definitely take them into consideration and pass them on to the department. I will be happy to keep them up to date on what is happening, but I can only say right now that I hope that we never have to send a young offender outside, because that is not my intention.

³⁸ **Mr. Lang:** An observation has to be made that there are not a lot of Members in the House who experienced the situation at Wolf Creek, and the reasons for shutting down that particular institution. I recognize that federal laws are different from the territorial laws, but in view of the decision that the government has made with respect to this institution, obviously the whole question of what the institution is to do has come into question again. I think this is unfortunate.

The other element I want to put forward is that we, the taxpayers of the Yukon, had an institution at Wolf Creek where we had, at times, two or three young people in custody at great cost to the taxpayers of the territory. In view of the decision that has been taken, and the government has the right to make the decision, the government may well rue the day. The idea was to take care of our own and obviously that is not the case.

Mr. Phillips: As we all know, most of the young offenders do require some expert counselling and professional help. Is that help going to be available at this particular facility, or do we still have to

send the youths out for assessment and that type of thing?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We would look very favourably at that concept, but at this point in time we are using a couple of psychiatrists who come here. They do deal with our children; we will continue to do that. If we ever find that there is funding available, and somebody may have a program to offer us, we will certainly look at using that, but we do have a psychologist in the Yukon. We also use a couple of other psychiatrists from out of the territory who are very familiar with our children and the north.

Mr. Phillips: Do they come up on a scheduled basis every four or six months?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Yes. They come up on a scheduled basis and also if they are required at a certain time other than a scheduled time.

Mr. Phillips: They will come up for a specific case. If we have a young offender convicted today, where part of the sentence is to seek some assistance or guidance, would the young offender be sent out or would the psychiatrist come up?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Sometimes the assessment or counselling that is needed is more than what one resource person could do. In that case we would probably send the young offender out. If it was only the one person who was needed, we would bring that one person in; it would depend on the circumstances, but we do look favourably at that type of work with these young people.

Mr. Phillips: Will there be any other experts on staff at the facility, other than just security guards and administration? Will there be someone in the facility who will have some training or some expertise, so we do not have to call on outside help for every case?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We do have very qualified people on the staff already. We are always looking at those individuals who have had the kind of training in psychology and all sorts of other things that might be needed in dealing with these kids. Other than the youth care workers, we will be looking at teachers and recreation people, people to do training workshops and things like that. We do not specifically have any psychiatrist or psychologist on staff right now.

Chairman: We are on the Juvenile Justice Program, specifically the Young Offenders Facility. We are dealing with the information on page 53, Recoveries.

Mr. McLachlan: I have a question on Recoveries, but it is not related to Juvenile Justice Recoveries.

Chairman: Anything further on this program?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have another item for \$29,000 for equipment for the youth facility.

Juvenile Justice — Young Offenders Facility in the amount of \$1,610,000 agreed to

Chairman: We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The area of Health Services, the first item being the Health Care Hospital Services.

On Health Services

On Health Care, Hospital Services and Community Health

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am bringing back some information for the Member for Riverdale North. It is with respect to the Pelly Crossing health station. She wanted to know the location of it. It will be situated right across from the current National Health and Welfare trailer units. The style and finish will blend in with the school and the RCMP building.

With respect to the dollars that were for acquisition and renovation of an existing building, the dollars previously debated in last year's Capital Budget have lapsed, as the construction project was put on hold by joint agreement with YTG and National Health and Welfare.

The Member wanted to know what the funds for the extended health care facility covered. They cover the detail design and engineering, as well as site development, including installation of

necessary infrastructure, water, sewer, roads, heat, blinds, et cetera. Total project cost will not be finalized until completion of the functional program in March, 1987. The first phase construction of a 30-bed facility is expected to cost no more than \$3 million in total; however, the overall project calls for two subsequent phases up to 80 beds. The monies estimated in the 1987 Capital Mains include design costs and engineering costs for the full 80 beds.

Mrs. Firth: I do not have any further questions about the Pelly Crossing health centre, unless any of my colleagues do. I will let them ask, and then I will move on to the others.

Mr. McLachlan: Is there no recovery available when and if the building facilities presently being used as a health centre in Pelly are disposed of when the new units are built? What happens to them?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am informed that those buildings, or facilities, go to Crown assets, and they get recoveries from it.

Mr. McLachlan: The facility is totally owned by the federal government that presently exists in Pelly Crossing, or is the cost-sharing ratio applicable when we build a new facility? Is it applicable on the disposal of an existing facility?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The agreement is for us to get a percentage of the sale of that, and our percentage is 70 percent.

Health Care, Hospital Services and Community Health in the amount of \$1,556,000 agreed to
On Extended Health

Mrs. Firth: The Minister brought back information on three different projects. Perhaps we can go through it and then I am prepared to clear the item. I wanted to ask a few more questions about the Faro accommodations for nursing staff. The Minister told me that funds originally identified had lapsed. Is that correct? The Minister is nodding her head, indicating yes.

Were there no acquisitions made in Faro by the government for staff housing?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Not for any person years for this department.

Mrs. Firth: I am not talking about person years, I am talking about staff accommodation in Faro for the nursing staff and visiting medical/dental practitioners. The Minister is asking for \$227,000 in this budget and I had raised the \$1.5 million item. Was there any staff housing acquired for nursing staff in Faro up to this point? It was two years ago, I believe, when we were debating that in the fall Capital Budget.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am informed that we have never purchased any buildings until this time. The medical resources that are needed there right now are increasing because of the population.

Mrs. Firth: I believe the original money was identified for the construction of a facility and that was when we got into the debate about the possibility of purchasing houses instead of building a new facility in a town whose survival was being questioned. So there were two allotments of money identified, because I had raised with the Minister the \$1.5 million figure, and she had come back with another request. I am just trying to find out if anything was done with that money. Has it all lapsed? They have not built anything there. This is for the acquisition of accommodation. Perhaps the Minister could tell me what kind of accommodation it is going to be.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: As I mentioned before, the money has all lapsed for the plan that we had last year. The building we will be acquiring, I believe, is a multi-unit dwelling and there are five apartments included in it that can be used for accommodation. I will stand corrected if I am not right.

Mrs. Firth: Is that going to be a new construction or it is one that they are purchasing?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It is an existing building.

Mrs. Firth: Is this \$227,000 simply for the purchase or are there going to be any renovations required, or upgrading, or any equipment purchases, and so on?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It does include upgrading and renovations.

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister break it down for me then and tell me what is the cost for the facility itself and then what cost is going to be designated for renovation, and so on?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I do not have that information in front of me. There are some minor construction and renovations included in

another item under the total amount and that would come out of that, but I do not have a breakdown of that. If the Member does want a breakdown, I have no problem getting it and bringing it back tomorrow. I just do not have it.

Mrs. Firth: I just would like to know how much we are paying for that purchase. I think that is a valid question and the Minister said she would bring it back tomorrow, that is fine. I am prepared to clear the item and wait for the Minister's response tomorrow.

Mr. McLachlan: I have one small question in relation to the Faro Unit. Could the Minister who is bringing back information also state if it is a six-plex or five unit.

It seems it is six. The one that the nurses are presently using, I believe, was five, and that is why I asked the question. If it was six, that would be a better deal for \$227,000; if it is five, I was wondering if you were abandoning the existing one that the nurses have been in.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: The figure that I said was five, but I will check to let the Member know if that is the right number or if it is not.

Mrs. Firth: I want to ask some more about the costs of the Whitehorse General Hospital Replacement Project; I guess that is what the total project is going to be referred to from now on. The Minister gave us some more information and could not give us a total cost, but we discussed yesterday something within the vicinity of probably \$20 million dollars. Would that seem a reasonable figure for the total replacement cost for the extended care facility as well as the 80 bed hospital replacement?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am sorry — I do apologize — I cannot answer that question. I do not have the information at all.

Mrs. Firth: I would kind of like to have it because it is of interest to a lot of people. The first phases in the notes that the Minister gave me said that they are talking about the construction expecting to provide for 30 beds, and the Minister has mentioned 80 beds today. Does that include those 30, or is that in addition to? Is the Minister saying that it is going to be a facility with how many beds and it will cover the active nursing care within the hospital and also the extended care facility?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We do not have the kind of information that the Member wants on the hospital at this point in time. The information we were giving her prior to this was the information on the extended care that would be built along with the hospital. I am not sure at which point in time I can get that information, depending on how far along they are in the design phase.

Mrs. Firth: I want to make the point that the facility planning and design was \$1,834,000. I want to try to get some estimation of the total cost of the project. Could the Minister give it to me for the extended care facility, because there is a certain expectation out there that that facility is going to be built tomorrow, the way it has been announced. People are asking questions about it. Some people might think that this \$1.8 million would build a whole facility. That interpretation would not be unreasonable on behalf of some people in the public. I would just like to be able to clarify the issue when I am questioned about it.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We are expecting the design for the hospital at the end of March, I believe. That report will come back to us and give us a lot more information than we have right now. The information that I did give to the Member was with respect to the cost that we anticipated the extended care part of the hospital would be, and that was \$3 million. After that report comes back, I will be able to tell the Member a little more clearly about the cost.

Mrs. Firth: Is the report going to be available to us?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: It is a National Health and Welfare report. I do not see any reason why it should not be.

Mr. Phillips: Before we clear the whole item, I would like to ask the Minister a couple of questions with respect to Macaulay Lodge.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Yes.

Mr. Phillips: Could the Minister clarify whether, in this equipment purchase, they will be looking at such things as wheelchairs and that type of equipment?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Wheelchairs and stuff will be included under the Chronic Disease Program.

Mr. Phillips: Is that for people in Macaulay Lodge? I raise that

because I know there is a shortage of wheelchairs in Macaulay Lodge and that there is a need. I wonder if the government qualifies for the program.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Yes. The funding would cover replacement of items in accordance with one through five year replacement schedules, which is normal throughout the government on these kinds of buildings, and acquisition of necessary health care, recreational living equipment and furniture, including beds and mattresses, chesterfields, tables, chairs, major appliances, kitchen equipment, bedroom and dining furniture and recreational equipment. Wheelchairs would be included in that.

Mr. Phillips: Do they have a specified number? Is there a request now from Macaulay Lodge for more wheelchairs?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I really do not know, but if there is a requirement right now for wheelchairs at Macaulay Lodge we would certainly look at that requirement. If funding is there from this year's budget we would look at purchasing some if they were needed. I am not sure if they have asked us for any, but I can check into that.

Mr. Phillips: I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister. I hate to suggest to the Minister that she spend money, but I know that there are now widely used electric wheelchairs, or the three-wheel wheelchairs that allow the seniors to get out. It is quite an adventure for some of these seniors to get out and go up the street one or two blocks and come back again. Could the government look at possibly — not only for Macaulay Lodge but other seniors lodges — putting one of these machines at the lodge. There is now a Recreational and Occupational Therapist who can evaluate the seniors to see whether they are capable of using such a machine. I know some of them would use it and it does afford them a little more mobility, and that is extremely important to their independence and the life they have at Macaulay Lodge, or the Lodge at Dawson.

I understand that, Mr. Chairman, you cannot speak for your riding in the position you are in, but certainly we should make sure that if we are looking at something like this we should look at it for all the seniors lodges that have this type of care. The people in these lodges need a little more care and some of them cannot get up and just roll out of the building with just a regular wheelchair; they need an electric wheelchair because they are incapable of using a standard wheelchair. Maybe the government should look at purchasing one or two of these to allow the seniors a little more freedom and independence.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I would like to thank the Member for Whitehorse Riverdale North for an excellent suggestion. I have no problem going back to the department to see if there is funding available for such a thing. If funding is available and if these are needed, we can look at the possibility. I cannot make any kind of commitment right now except to say that I do agree with him that I think it is an excellent suggestion, and we will look at it.

*Health Services in the amount of \$3,450,000 agreed to
Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$5,996,000
agreed to*

Department of Justice

Chairman: We will begin with general debate on the Department of Justice, page 57.

Mr. Kimmerly: In the Capital, this department is very scant. It is a lower number than in other years. I can explain each individual item best under the lines. I have purposely and consciously been conservative about the items, especially in the correctional program.

Mr. Phillips: I am glad to see that the Minister is lean and mean in his department. We are prepared to go to the line-by-line items.

On Court Facility

On Court Facility Construction

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This requires some explanation, especially in light of the discussion we had last week about the construction of court facilities in rural Yukon. This is something different from that. It is planning, although it is called Court Facility Construction. It might better have been called planning.

The concept here is to follow what has already been done in British Columbia, at substantially greater expense to them. That is to plan for the facilities, in the general sense, in the long term. That is approximately to the year 2000 and possibly beyond.

The issues are very significant. They are primarily around the service that is available in the rural communities. We will be debating a motion about the availability of territorial agent services in the near future. This is a similar kind of planning activity. The planning involves the possibility of computerized access to such things as the Small Claims Court in the rural communities and the ability to file documents in the Territorial Court, physically, in the rural communities.

It involves a study of the population projections and the possibility of building courts or facilities in different places. It also involves what is occasionally a problem in the communities — that is the coordination of secure custody for remanded people and the facilities for handling the potentially dangerous people in the communities.

46 Facilities in Whitehorse are now very secure and would meet anybody's standards and would perhaps go beyond. There is still a potential problem in the communities if trials occur there. This is for long-term planning to address those questions about the facility for the courts, especially in rural Yukon.

Mr. Phillips: Why did the facilities study, which we just received in the House, not take that into account? It seems like we are going out again and doing another study on the need for court facilities, and we have just spent a few hours in the House here last week dealing with that very similar study.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The difference is that we initially tackled it on a two-pronged approach: a program to solve the problem in the short term, and a program to solve the problems and the potential problems in the long term. The study concerning the short term has already been done and was discussed last week. That is about essentially architecture, or essentially the buildings that the court uses in the communities in order to meet the present needs. These are things that we do not need a consultant's report to tell us we need, but we did need an architect's report to tell us how to fix the particular problem. That is done.

This planning is for the long term and is to enable us to project more accurately. One of the things that should occur is that we will be planning in the longer term and when we do budget for improvements, it will be a more exact estimate because we will be clear about what we need. Perhaps, more importantly for the future, we will not be doing all the communities in one year, as we are on the rural facilities, which is already voted in the Supp. We can plan to improve things, over time, a little bit each year. Those are the essential differences. We have already addressed the short-term needs, and this is a program for the long term.

This is already completed in the Province of British Columbia, and that will make our process substantially cheaper because we do not have to reinvent the wheel; however, we do give a better level of services in our smaller communities than they do in BC. We are planning to continue exactly that.

47 **Mr. Phillips:** I would like to suggest to the Minister that with all the studies we are doing that one is following the other doing similar-type things, and we could probably have built these facilities by the time we finish studying it to death. I go back to when I was in private enterprise; if I was going to do something I would not say, "what are my projections for today" and then commission a study and have somebody go out to all the communities in the Yukon and come back and tell me what is going to happen tomorrow. I would sort of combine both so I could get a clear picture of what we need today and what we will need tomorrow. We are again spending taxpayers money. We talked about the employment that has risen in the Yukon, and it is probably because we have thousands of these people running around studying every aspect of our lives.

We have a lot of people who work in this government who travel up and down the highways, people who are very competent and could probably tell you three-quarters of the things we are finding out in most of these studies. I wonder what some of these people are doing if we have everybody studying all aspects of Yukoners'

lives. Does the Minister see any potential of new court facilities in some of these communities right now?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: In the long term, yes. There is no immediate plan to build a courthouse anywhere else. That is the practical concern, but there may be plans to put a computer capability in Watson Lake or Dawson City so that the citizens of those communities can gain access to the court through telecommunications. There is no plan to build a new courthouse.

Mr. Phillips: What does the Minister mean by immediate future? Five or ten years? Does he have any idea at all of what we are looking at? I noticed that in one report we looked at quite a large undertaking in Pelly Crossing for a court facility. It was recommended in the first report. I would have thought when I read that that the projection was for the long term as opposed to the short term and that is where I see the two reports overlapping. I wonder why we did not combine them and get the best bang for our bucks.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I would certainly not anticipate building new buildings for five years or so.

Mrs. Firth: I have the same concern I had in the debate on Health and Human Resources regarding what we are doing, not just today for Yukoners, but for tomorrow when it comes to costs to maintain buildings. I do not claim to know a lot about the requirements or the needs within the justice system, but again I would expect that because our economic situation is better perhaps requirements within the justice system would be declining. My immediate response is that I would not see any necessity to build any new court facilities in any of the communities in the Yukon right now. Am I wrong in that? Is there disagreement with that within the Legislature? Do most Members feel that our requirements in the Yukon one day are going to be that we will need court facilities within the communities?

48 **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** There is no perceived need to build a courthouse in any particular community. There is one in Dawson City and in Watson Lake, but not the other communities. I do not foresee building a courthouse anywhere else in the immediate future. There is a concern to properly plan the facilities for the long term. I am specifically interested in the access to the courts by rural Yukoners. That aspect is extremely important. That is the aspect of the need that I will emphasize.

Mrs. Firth: I do not disagree with what the Minister has said; however, I want to present our concern. That is that one day Yukoners are going to have to look at paying the bills. I want to reassure the public that we are going to be able to afford the facilities that we are going to build for ourselves, and that there is some consideration being given to that when government is making plans and making futuristic plans.

We have facilities now that access those court facilities to the communities. They may not be the finest in the land, but they serve their purpose. We recognize the ability of Yukoners to adapt. We commend them for that. I hope it is not the government's intention to look at providing very sophisticated services within all of the Minister's departments to all of the communities. I include Whitehorse in this. Maybe we should look at some being in the communities and some not being in Whitehorse.

I am very concerned about whether the Yukon taxpayer, in the total context, could handle all the needs that are always being identified and all these services that people are always requesting.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I thank Mrs. Firth for that concern and recognize it as a very legitimate one. One of the things that we should be looking at is exactly what has been said on both sides, but more often from the Opposition. It is a concern about the continuing O&M costs of any particular building. I will direct by my words now, which are in *Hansard*, or will be, that one of the specific concerns of this study is to look at the continuing O&M costs.

One of the reasons why I am very much in favour of this expenditure is that it is my feeling that the Philipsen Building, as nice as it is, is overbuilt for Whitehorse. It was adapted, or modeled, on a courthouse in New Westminster, BC — or the court facilities are. The security arrangements there, in my judgment, are overbuilt for the Yukon. Some of the fixtures and the architecture is overbuilt. It is in order to avoid that in the future that we should be

planning, so that we plan for what is suitable here as opposed to copying someone else's facilities when a crisis comes and we absolutely need a new building.

“ The concern about O&M costs I endorse, and we will look at that.

Mrs. Firth: I appreciate the Minister's commitment to do that. I am not just concerned about the O&M costs; I am also concerned about the capital construction costs. I do not want the Yukon to be seen as somewhere in Canada where you can come and get rich quick and then leave. I believe that the native population has some very strong concerns about that, from any of the Indian people I have talked to about how Yukon can have the reputation of people coming here and building fancy buildings for us and bringing new ideas and leaving us with the burdens of the costs and then leaving the territory. So, it is not just the O&M; it is the capital costs, and I do not disagree with the comments the Minister has made about the Justice Building and someday we can sit down over a coffee and have quite a little chat about the Justice Building. I do not think there would be one businessman in town who would disagree with what the Minister has said. When you look at the quality and the standard of building that the private sector builds and private businessmen build, although they seem to meet all of the required federal and territorial building code standards, there is quite a difference in the appearance and style and quality and architectural design and landscape, and whatever, of the building. I just want to present it to the Minister as a concern of ours, and I know that we will be debating it further in the House. However, I appreciate his registering recognition of our concern.

Mr. Phillips: Just on the last item, are there plans in the works to extend the walkway to nowhere in the Philipson Building that sort of walks into a wall right now. It makes a lot of sense probably to open up that section so people could cross there and facilitate a little more efficiency in the building.

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: It is my hope that the various parts of the judicial system — being the lawyers, the Law Society the judges and most importantly, the public, and I would include the media — will in the years ahead communicate better with each other and act more as a unit. Although some segments of the system are insisting on substantial independence, some of that is, in my view, entirely unjustified; some of it is a hyper-legalistic approach.

⁵⁰ I am hoping that the simple issues like this one will be solved diplomatically over time. I am expecting that that will occur.

Mr. Phillips: Could the Minister repeat that answer? I am not certain if he said yes or no. Does the Minister believe that the two should join up? Is he pursuing the matter? Is he encouraging the two groups to get together so they can meet in the centre of the great hall, so to speak, or the walkway?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I am encouraging discussions to improve the flow of traffic in the building. I have not made a final decision, one way or the other.

Court Facility Construction in the amount of \$65,000 agreed to On Court, Administrative and Security Equipment

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: This is exclusively for recording equipment. It is to be supplied to Justices of the Peace to accommodate the requirements for court recording, especially for JPs. There is an additional requirement as a result of Bill C-18 in the federal Parliament, which is an amendment to the *Criminal Code*. This is for tape recorders.

Court, Administrative and Security Equipment in the amount of \$11,000 agreed to

Court Facilities in the amount of \$76,000 agreed to On Corrections Facilities

⁵¹ **Hon. Mr. Kimmerly:** This involves a conservative, or lean and mean, approach. This number is lower than for previous years. I will supply the list to the critic opposite, and he can photocopy it as he chooses.

Mr. McLachlan: In view of the recommendations in the Justice Review Committee that the so-called hotel on the hill be trimmed down, that no portion of the \$74,000 was going to beautifying or upgrading WCI and some of the things luxurious things that were criticized in the Justice Review Committee Report, could the Minister elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: The jail — let us call it a jail, even though it is commonly called the correctional centre — is not a hotel. I would welcome any Member to take a tour of that facility. It is a building that was built to accommodate 39 inmates. Last weekend, there were 105 there. It is substantially overcrowded. It is cement block construction. There is nothing elaborate about it. It is not a desirable place to be. It is not desired as a residence by those who are in there, I can assure you.

That label is most unfortunate. The overall direction of the government is to re-allocate away from services to convicted criminals and toward services to victims of crime and the prevention of crime, especially. That accounts for some of the lower numbers here. I would warn all Members that the inmate population is increasing at the jail, which was something I did not plan on in the last year or two. It has demonstrably increased. There is a need to look after people properly, especially with respect to such things as fire safety and the safety of the staff who work there.

⁵² **Mr. McLachlan:** The answers are good, as far as they go, but I get the impression that the Minister is hinting that it is just about three times the number it was built for, and we may soon be looking at an addition to the Whitehorse Correctional Institute if those numbers should continue to increase. Is that the view we may be looking at soon in the Minister's opinion?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: No. I have been advised about building a new jail at a very large price tag. The direction I have taken is to reduce the numbers, if at all possible, through three other programs. One is the Fine Option Program, which is now operating and operating well. Another is the Work Camp Option, which worked last year in the summer and will again next year. The third is the Community Release Centre, and an agreement is about to be signed with the Salvation Army about that.

Using the jail for people with, for example, assaultive and public danger crimes, and less for other types of crimes, it is possible to reduce the pressure of the population of the jail. I am attempting that.

The other alternative, that of building on to the jail, is very, very expensive indeed, and I wish, if at all possible, to avoid that expense for the taxpayer.

⁵³ **Mr. Phillips:** The Minister talked about the work camps being an alternative to the overcrowding in the jail. How well did the work camp at Haines Junction work last year, in the Minister's view?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: Very well. I have figures as to the hours of work performed in the community and the potential value to the community of that program. Considering the budget of the work camp and, if you calculate out of the number of inmates and the number of days, the cost per inmate day is very substantially less than the cost per inmate day at the jail. For those two reasons, I would suggest it was extremely successful.

Recidivism rates, which are good, concrete measures of success, are not available yet. We should be tracking all of that and may be able to report in subsequent years. It was an extremely successful experiment. It will be continued. This is not an experiment in the sense that it is something new. It is modeled on programs in the provinces, but it is something that we intend to expand, if at all possible. It depends on the number of suitable inmates. It is only the nonviolent inmates who are there, and the availability of work.

I am anticipating that the mobile camp will be re-established in Haines Junction over the summer, which has already been decided and, in the next year to go to Teslin, and in the year after that to go to Carmacks.

In the space of the next three years, we should be evaluating the possibility of continuing that kind of rotation, or expanding the program to be a 12-month program or building a facility in one of the communities. Those decisions are for the future, and will not be made in the next 12 months or so.

⁵⁴ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** I move that you report progress on Bill No. 7.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Porter: I move that the Speaker do now resume the

Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

May the House have a report from the Chairman of Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Webster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 7, *First Appropriation Act, 1987-88*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

Ms. Kassi: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Old Crow that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 pm tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled February 3, 1987:

87-02-3-101

Preliminary Feasibility Study of a Glue-Laminated Manufacturing Plant in the Yukon Territory (Penikett)

87-03-102

Study—"Yukon Based Furniture Manufacturing" (Penikett)

