

**Yukon Legislative Assembly  
Whitehorse, Yukon  
Thursday, April 25, 2013 — 1:00 p.m.**

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

*Prayers*

**Withdrawal of motions**

**Speaker:** The Chair wishes to inform the House of some changes that have been made to the Order Paper. The following motions have been removed from the Order Paper: Motion No. 360, standing in the name of the Member for Mayo-Tatchun, which is now outdated; Motion No. 422, standing in the name of the Member for Klondike, which is similar to Motion No. 372, which the House adopted, as amended, yesterday; Motions No. 274 and 419, both standing in the name of the Member for Copperbelt South, and Motion No. 424, standing in the name of the Hon. Premier, all of which are similar to Motion No. 423, which the House adopted yesterday. Also Motion No. 432, notice of which was given yesterday by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, was not placed on today's Notice Paper, as it is similar to Motion No. 372, which the House adopted, as amended, yesterday.

**DAILY ROUTINE**

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

**TRIBUTES**

**In recognition of the National Day of Mourning**

**Hon. Mr. Graham:** I rise today in recognition of the National Day of Mourning. The Day of Mourning will be held in this building on Sunday, April 28, and I ask that all Yukoners join me in attending this ceremony. Last year, the Yukon saw fewer workplace injuries and deaths than it did in 2011, but we shouldn't take much solace in that fact. On Sunday, we will remember one worker who died and another 1,049 Yukoners who were injured on the job in 2012 — that's far too many people.

Those injured or killed are our wives, our daughters and sisters; they are our husbands, brothers and sons; they are our friends, our colleagues, and even our neighbours. Some of those people will never heal. The simple act of going to work will have changed their life forever, and it will also have changed the lives of everyone around them.

This affects our community and it affects all of us. That's why it's important for us to gather in this building on Sunday for the National Day of Mourning. Here we will pay homage to all those who have died on the job in the Yukon and that number is more than 55 since 1984. We will also remember those injured on the job in the Yukon in 2012. But we must do more. As a society we must ask ourselves, "How many injured and killed are we willing to accept as the cost of doing business?"

There is, of course, only one acceptable answer and that's none. So on Sunday, let us stand together as a community and

recognize we must do better. As employers, supervisors and workers, we are responsible for ensuring our work sites are safe for everyone. We must make safety our first task on every job. We must strive to ensure no Yukoner loses their life in a workplace mishap in 2013 and beyond. There is no better way to honour those we have lost. I extend my condolences to the family of the deceased and my thoughts are with those 1,049 workers injured on the job last year. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. White:** I rise today on behalf of the Official Opposition to pay tribute to the National Day of Mourning for workers killed or injured on the job.

This will forever be a very personal tribute for me. I've claimed the Day of Mourning as my own, and I want to remind everyone of the human faces behind the tragedies that compelled us to mark April 28 as the National Day of Mourning.

No matter how many times I think I am over the shock of this day and that I've worked through it, I'm always surprised by how much it still stings. I will not apologize for the pauses and the tears.

April is a month of transition from winter into spring, from darkness into light, the migration of swans and the smells of spring — a month associated with renewals. For many, April is a joyful time. For me, April is a hard month. It's a hard month for thousands of other Canadians who live with the loss of a loved one taken long before their time in an instant they couldn't even begin to imagine or understand.

Since 1993, thirty-six workers in the Yukon left for work to never return home to their families. One worker did not return home to his family in 2012. On the days leading up to the 28<sup>th</sup> of April, I don't feel like myself. I feel like Eeyore from Winnie the Pooh. It's like I'm walking around with a dark cloud of sadness that is blocking out all the hope, the light and the changing season. These feelings sometimes catch me unaware; they sneak up when I am distracted and then the realization comes on slowly, like looking through a fog, and then I remember.

Today, looking outside, it's like Mother Nature is doing her best to share my melancholy with the territory. This is the time of year that we as Canadians and as a community join together to remember workers who were hurt or taken away from us while on the job. The fact that this celebration happens at all leaves a bitter taste in my mouth. Don't get me wrong, I'm grateful for the sense of community; I'm grateful for the thoughtful ceremony; I'm grateful to be standing here sharing memories I have; I'm grateful that my friends are remembered with floating black candles; I'm grateful that we take time out of our busy schedules to remember my friends and others who never made it home from work. But underneath all of that, it leaves me feeling angry, hurt, frustrated and furious — furious that in this day and age, that in this time of technology and knowledge, good people still continue to lose their lives every year while at work; frustrated that despite our best efforts, accidents still happen; worse yet that many of them are preventable tragedies.

Last year I asked you to visualize your morning routine. What do you do before you leave the house in the morning? What's important to you? Did you walk the dog? Spend time with the kids before racing them to the bus, or maybe you get to drop them off? Did you remember to kiss them, to tell them that you love them? Did you remember in the rush to tell them that you love them? Did you take a minute to stop and look at your partner? Did you let them know the importance of the role they play in your life? At any point in that routine, did you ever stop and wonder if this will be the last time you do this? Do you ever stop and think that this may be the last minute you see these faces that you love so much?

I don't want us to be living under a cloud of "what ifs" with fear of leaving the house. I hope you don't think these things every morning, and you shouldn't. No one should live with that threat of loss looming over their heads, but despite all advancements to make workplaces safer, this is still a sad reality. There is no guarantee that the one you love will make it home from work. That's why we have the Day of Mourning. We do this to remember those who didn't make it home.

I am reminded of that reality every day when I am at the government building. Every day I walk past a once-proud symbol of a promise that we have made to each other, a promise to keep each other safe, a promise that we will do better.

The memorial fountain lives most of its days on the lower level of the government building. It often sits in a pool of light. The five curved pillars naturally draw your eyes toward the skylights as if inviting you to pause and reflect. It sits there patiently waiting to be of service.

The first time I saw that fountain was at the ceremony in 2007. It was a proud, beautiful symbol of strength. I took comfort in this thing that looked so strong. I have since learned how delicate the fountain really is.

This symbol of comfort makes a yearly pilgrimage from the basement to the main floor, and it isn't without incident. It has suffered bumps, scratches, and scrapes. Every spring, an artist comes into the building and patiently and lovingly repairs it the best she can. The cracks get patched; the corners get replaced and camouflaged and painted where needed to hide the wear. What started out as a temporary symbol still remains. The first time I attended the ceremony for the Day of Mourning was a year to the day following my friend Jean-Francois's death in 2006. JF went out in style; the irony hasn't escaped me that he was killed by a mama grizzly with two cubs on the very day that commemorates workers injured or killed on the job while he was staking near Ross River.

I've never felt as helpless as I did that day sitting next to that fountain, trying to understand the senselessness of it — not understanding how a day like any other could go so terribly wrong. I wasn't able to look away from the floating candle, lost in memories of the friends I had lost. I took solace in the strength of that fountain. I've attended every ceremony but one since that day. I sent my parents in my place in 2009, when I was working at Yukon Zinc. I couldn't bear the thought that there wouldn't be anyone there for Jean-Francois. I snowshoed across Wolverine Lake and thought of my friend.

In 2010, the ceremony took on even more meaning — on October 19, 2009, Paul Wentzell parked his work truck in the tunnel of Yukon Zinc mine and he forgot to chock the wheels and the safety brake let go. I struggled to understand the senselessness of it all, not understanding how a day like any other could go so terribly wrong.

I wasn't able to look away from the floating, black candles, lost in the memories of both the friends I had lost. I looked to the fountain for strength.

In 2012, to my complete dismay, the ceremony again grew a meaning for me. Steve Cardiff was out visiting constituents on July 6, 2011. It was an ordinary day until his pickup crossed the line. I found myself again sitting at the ceremony, still trying to understand how a day like any other could go so terribly wrong, trying to understand how it was that three black candles held so much personal meaning for me, flooded with memories of my friends.

The tragic truth, I realized, is that more and more people are attending the ceremony. Now not only was I seeing familiar faces of those remembering past losses, but I was now seeing the new faces of recent tragedies. The sad truth is that, despite our best efforts, workers continue to have their lives cut short, leaving behind friends and family to mourn their loss.

Instead of seeing a strong, noble symbol of strength that I first experienced, they're left with a symbol that is a shadow of its former self. It's hard to look toward a battle-worn fountain for strength and solace. Then I think that maybe I should look at the wear and imperfections of the fountain as battle scars, showing us that the path to safety isn't easy. Maybe I should look at those imperfections as a reflection of the raw pain that we are feeling when we look toward it.

Maybe I should view the condition of the fountain as a concrete reminder that we need to work together to end a need for such symbols. I'm not pointing fingers; I don't care how we ended up where we are; I care about where we are going and how we will get there. We are all responsible. As a community, I know we can do better. I envision a permanent symbol that family and friends can visit at any time, a place for quiet reflection — maybe overlooking the river so that our minds can flow freely over memories; a physical reminder for the community to nurture a culture of safety; a reminder to be responsible for one another. I envision a symbol that shows how deeply we value safety and how much we miss those we lost.

The Day of Mourning is more than just a chance to gather together to commemorate our losses; it's more than a day of sorrow; it's a day when we as a community come together to recommit to nurturing a culture of safety, to pledge to look out for each other. The Day of Mourning isn't just about those that we've lost; it's about those who have been left behind.

Today I remember my friends and the tragedies that took them away. I wish I knew the story of every life lost so that I could share their memories here, so that their friends and family would know that we haven't forgotten. But more than anything, I wish that a workplace death would never ever happen again. I invite everyone to join us in remembering on Sunday, April 28 at 12:30 p.m.

**Mr. Silver:** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Liberal caucus and the Independent member to pay tribute to the National Day of Mourning, also known as Workers' Memorial Day.

April 28, 2013 is the 29<sup>th</sup> anniversary commemorating workers whose lives have been lost or who are injured or disabled on the job. We in Yukon join the rest of Canada and many countries around the world to honour the millions of lives that have been forever changed by workplace injuries. All workplace deaths or injuries are preventable. Safety on the job must be a priority for everyone and responsibility for safety belongs with each of us. It is up to both employers and employees to follow workplace safety procedures and to report any unsafe conditions immediately. By working together — then and only then can we hope not only to prevent and reduce, but to eliminate workplace deaths, injuries and diseases.

As mentioned previously, three Yukoners lost their lives in work-related accidents in 2012. To date this year, Yukon has reported 383 workplace injuries, and that is 383 injuries too many. Every day men and women are victims of unsafe workplaces. All workers have the right to work in a safe and healthy environment. Although we have made gains toward stronger health and safety regulations, workplace injuries and work-related illnesses are still far too common. We still have far too many lives that are unnecessarily lost or irrevocably affected by injuries because of workplace accidents or occupational diseases.

The Day of Mourning draws our attention to the need for safer workplaces. It sends a strong message about enforcing and following all health and safety laws and regulations that are in place and to renew our commitment to prevent further workplace deaths, injuries and diseases.

As we observe this day of mourning, we pause to reflect and honour all workers who have been injured or killed on the job, and we mourn with the families who are left behind. As we pay our respects, we must not allow our memories or the suffering of these workers to be forgotten. We remember the tragedies suffered and the triumphs achieved.

I would encourage Yukoners to show their support by joining the National Day of Mourning ceremonies being held on Sunday, April 28 at 12:30 p.m. here in the lobby of the YTG administration building.

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Hon. Mr. Graham:** It's my pleasure today to ask all members to welcome a visitor to our gallery — Vikki Quock-sister. I'm told by her staff that even though she is a full-time postal worker, she also works almost full time as president of the Yukon Federation of Labour. Welcome, Vikki. It's a pleasure to have you here.

*Applause*

**Ms. White:** I ask the House to join me in welcoming Jeff Sloychuk. He is the director of education and training for the Yukon Federation of Labour. He spends his days improving the working lives of Yukon workers and his Thursday nights entertaining them at Bailey's Pub & Grill's open microphone.

*Applause*

**Speaker:** Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

## TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** I have for tabling two letters: one is from me to the executive producer of the Discovery Channel with regard to the television show *Yukon Men* and the second is the response I received from that letter.

**Speaker:** Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Are there any notices of motion?

## NOTICES OF MOTION

**Ms. White:** I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to ensure that the development of the Yukon water strategy meets the objective in chapter 14 of the Yukon First Nation final agreements to "maintain the water of the Yukon in a natural condition while providing for its sustainable use."

**Ms. Stick:** I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to index the Yukon supplementary allowance to the consumer price index.

**Speaker:** Is there a statement by a minister?

## Speaker's statement

**Speaker:** Prior to proceeding with Question Period, the Chair will make a statement on language used during yesterday's proceedings.

Throughout this sitting, the Chair has given members considerable latitude in asking questions and providing responses in Question Period and participating in debates on bills and motions. For the most part, members have responsibly exercised their right to speak in this House. Some contributions to yesterday's proceedings, however, raise concerns.

As the Chair has previously informed members, one of the fundamental principles of parliamentary procedure is that members are to treat one another as honourable, no matter how strongly they disagree with one another about matters of public policy. Members are to show one another respect during proceedings, irrespective of personal opinions or feelings they may hold.

Yesterday, however, members on both sides of the House made comments that did not reflect well on themselves, on other members, or the Legislative Assembly as an institution. Upon reviewing the Blues, the Chair notes that one member accused another member of "fearmongering" and said that the member "should be ashamed of herself." Later in Question Period, the term "mudslinging" was also used. There were various statements by members, during Question Period and

during Orders of the Day, that directly or indirectly questioned whether another member was telling the truth. During the debate on Motion No. 372, we heard members use the words “silly” and “silliness” to describe the words or actions of other members.

The Chair would like to reiterate a point he has made before. Members are here to debate important issues — issues about which they and their constituents hold strong views. Strongly held views often lead to strongly worded statements. The rules of debate permit strongly worded statements. However, the rules do not permit statements that are insulting or disrespectful.

As I have said before, the Chair would prefer not to intervene in Question Period and debates. It would be preferable if members would restrain themselves during proceedings. Members have shown themselves capable of dealing with matters of great public importance by focusing on the issues and not resorting to insulting or disrespectful language. The Chair would urge members to continue to do so in the future. The Chair would like to thank all members for their attention.

We will now proceed with Question Period.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### Question re: Peel watershed land use plan

**Ms. Hanson:** We’ve all seen the Yukon Party government shift its response on the public’s involvement in the Peel land use planning process. Recently, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources made it clear that he ranks some opinions as being worth more than others. Now the Minister of Environment has moved the goalposts again. He said that although he wants to hear the views on the government’s options, simply supporting the Peel plan developed over the last six years with extensive consultation lacks the quality acceptable to this government.

When will the government stop playing with public process and just accept that there is overwhelming support for the Final Recommended *Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan* as written?

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** Thank you for the question. As we have said a number of times, with the public consultation on the Peel watershed land use planning process having concluded, we have received a significant amount of input. We received a number of views on both sides of the ledger. Some very strongly opinionated folks provided their input, and some provided other kinds of input.

At the beginning of the process, we asked Yukoners for thoughtful, constructive input, and in many cases, that’s exactly what we got. We’re going to take that information very seriously in our deliberations and, ultimately, we hope to achieve a land use plan that will provide special protection for key areas in the Peel region, while managing the intensity of use in others. As I’ve said before, we’re not done this process yet; we have yet to conclude the final round of specific First Nation consultation. That’s something that we hope to conclude as soon as possible. At the end of that process, we’re intending to come up with a land use plan that works for all Yukoners.

**Ms. Hanson:** Yukon First Nation governments are still waiting for that next step to happen. Meanwhile, CPAWS Yukon took the government up on its challenge when they challenged who was involved in the land use planning review and counted and categorized the thousands of public comments on the Peel land use plan. The results were what most observers had guessed: an overwhelming number of Yukoners who submitted comments want the *Final Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan* as written with no substitutes — 82 percent, and these are Yukoners. Frankly, the Yukon Party government is running out of ways to reinterpret this — to reinterpret the numbers, even. This Yukon Party government has done everything it can to rewrite the Peel land use plan to suit its interests.

When will this government stop trying to deny the support that Yukoners have for the recommended plan, a plan that was developed by the four affected Yukon First Nations and countless hundreds of other Yukoners?

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** Although I haven’t seen the recent work done by CPAWS, what I have seen from them primarily is, I believe, a pie chart and a stick-man drawing, so I won’t comment on the veracity or the methodology they used in that process.

But what we have said is that all the input we received is publicly available. We released a *What We Heard* document explaining the general themes of what we heard. And the member is correct — there are a number of people in the public who suggested that we should accept the final recommended plan, as presented by the Peel Watershed Planning Commission. We’ve been clear that’s not our preferred option and that was the reason we went through the public consultation as we did — to present a number of potential modifications to that plan, and that’s what we heard feedback on from a number of Yukoners.

We’re going to take all that input very seriously, and we’re going to consider it all in the process of our deliberations and our decision-making. Obviously, CPAWS is entitled to their opinion and their perspectives, and we’ll consider those as well. Obviously, there are some differences of opinion there, but at the end of the day, we’re going to try our best to come up with a land use plan that works for all Yukoners.

**Ms. Hanson:** Mr. Speaker, it’s unfortunate the minister just simply looks at the cartoon and didn’t click on it to actually see the press release and the detailed analysis completed by CPAWS — because this government has not done it.

I have to give this government credit where credit is due: this government has been tenacious in its refusal to listen to Yukoners. This Yukon Party government has shifted the goalpost so many times it’s hard to tell whose game they are playing.

One thing is clear: this government does not want to listen to views that are not their own. If you don’t agree with them, they ignore you, and then they move the goalpost.

This government is doing a disservice to land use planning, to the hard and fair work of hundreds of Yukoners, and to the idea of openness and accountability. My question is simple: When will this Yukon Party government stop trying to trans-

form the public's view into a mirror image of themselves and listen to Yukon people by implementing the fair and balanced *Final Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan*?

**Hon. Mr. Pasloski:** This government will continue to move forward with the position that we articulated — that I articulated, very clearly during one of the leadership debates that occurred in September 2011. I think it was the Environment debate, where we talked about moving forward with a plan of balance, where we can protect the environment and also respect all sectors of the economy. That is what I said during that debate; that has been our position ever since then.

We respect and we've moved forward with the consultative process. We're still in the process. It was one of the longest public consultations in Yukon government history. We're moving forward with the final phases of that with the four affected First Nations. We will continue to move forward to resolution. Quite frankly, we're doing what we said that we would do. As you can see from the numbers on that side of the House, the Yukon Party was elected by the people of Yukon to move forward.

#### **Question re: Workplace safety**

**Ms. White:** At the Day of Mourning ceremony on Sunday, I will be thinking of Steve Cardiff, someone who spent a lot of time in this Chamber and worked tirelessly to advance a culture of safety in the Yukon. I encourage everyone to attend if they can.

On this, the last Question Period before the Day of Mourning, I want to ask some workplace-safety related questions. On April 16 it was noted that in his report, the chief inspector of mines said a mine emergency response trailer was designed and ordered and was to be equipped and ready for June of 2012. The minister did not have details at that time about whether the trailer was fully operational and if it had been used, but committed to getting the information. Can the minister now provide details to this House about this extremely important piece of equipment in terms of mine safety?

**Hon. Mr. Graham:** I would like to thank the member opposite. It's not often I thank the members opposite for questions, but this is a very important one and I am happy to let her know that the Yukon Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board maintains mine rescue equipment and rapid-response capabilities to support the mutual aid agreements we have with all mine operators.

On October 18, 2010, the question was raised regarding misunderstandings about when the mine rescue station was closed when in fact all equipment housed in the mine rescue station is now part of our mobile mine rescue trailer, which also doubles as a quick-response unit.

The Yukon Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board is responsible for testing the knowledge of mine rescue staff and issuing mine rescue certificates; whereas mining companies are actually responsible for those responsibilities. The Yukon Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board does work with them, and the mine rescue trailer is now fully operational.

**Ms. White:** I thank the minister for his answer. On April 16, my colleague from Whitehorse Centre asked about

how safety rules are communicated to temporary foreign workers. We need to be aware that workers from other countries speak languages other than English and come from different workplace cultures.

Yukon's programs and materials need to be tailor-made to ensure safety and worker rights are communicated and understood and backed up.

The Department of Education's document, *Foreign Workers' Guide to Employment in Yukon*, contains information about workers' compensation and employment standards. This document is intended for workers who are here under the nominee program, temporary foreign workers and other new immigrants. This document was recently available at an Education open house. The copy of the document that we picked up said that minimum wage, as of April 1, 2011, was at \$9, which is out of date, of course, because the current rate is at \$10.54 an hour.

Will the minister commit to updating this guide with the current information to ensure that it is easily available in languages like Tagalog, Mandarin and French?

**Hon. Mr. Kent:** It's a pleasure to speak to the workplace safety aspects for temporary foreign workers. Working in partnership with Occupational Health and Safety staff, Yukon Education is working to ensure that good safety programs are in place at workplaces before applications under the Yukon temporary foreign worker program for those workplaces are approved. After applications have been approved, Yukon Education will continue to work in partnership with staff from the Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board to make sure that health and safety inspections of those workplaces continue to take place.

With respect to the specific question the member asked about the translation in the guide, I'll certainly work to get an answer back to her at a later time.

**Ms. White:** I thank the minister for the answer. The most important pieces of legislation to build a culture of safety are arguably the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* and the *Employment Standards Act*.

Currently, the Yukon permits workers to be terminated without cause or notice, as long as they have worked on a job for less than six months. This puts the territory at the bottom of the pack compared to other jurisdictions. No cause and no notice of termination is three months in Alberta, the N.W.T., Nunavut, and in Manitoba it is only 30 days. The Yukon Federation of Labour has raised this issue and says that the Yukon needs to narrow this probation period in the interest of worker safety. After all, a worker on the job for less than six months may fear raising a safety issue for fear of dismissal without cause or notice. Will the government amend the *Employment Standards Act* to address this issue in order to make the law fair and safer for new workers?

**Hon. Mr. Graham:** We're always concerned about worker safety here in the territory and, as part of our ongoing evaluation of all acts, we are in the process of looking at the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*. Whether or not the specific recommendation from the member opposite will be followed up with is another story, but I can guarantee you that it

will form part of our discussion and if it's adopted as a change, we'll bring it forward.

**Question re: Kluane tourism promotion**

**Mr. Silver:** I have a question for the government about Holland America's plans for the upcoming tourism season and beyond.

It is my understanding that the company plans to scale back or altogether cut bus tours that go through the Kluane region beginning next summer. This change of plans will have a dramatic effect on the economy of the Kluane region, particularly the communities of Haines Junction and also of Beaver Creek.

Is the government aware of these potential changes? And what information has the government received from Holland America directly about their plans for tours on the north Alaska Highway?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As a government, we cannot and will not comment or speculate on the operations of a private business until there has been a formal announcement by that business. What I can say, however, is the Department of Tourism and Culture and certainly all departments of the government have worked and we will continue to work hard to ensure that businesses have the opportunity to reach new and existing markets and to grow their customer base. We have seen good results over the years. Just last year alone, we saw a four-percent increase in the overall visitation to the Yukon, so unlike other jurisdictions, we are doing what we can and we are performing well.

**Mr. Silver:** I do have questions about those statistics as well, but that's for another date. The economic impact of the changes like this should not be underestimated. It means millions of dollars coming out of the north Alaska Highway economy. Another consequence of the change is the uncertain future of the Westmark Hotel in Beaver Creek. No tours may likely mean no hotel.

I've been given a couple of reasons for the changes from different people in Kluane. They range from the conditions of the highway to requests from Holland America clients for a different product to even just straightforward economics. They are not cutting back on the Yukon product, they're just redirecting it. Regardless of the reasons behind the cuts, they certainly will have a big impact on the Kluane region.

What plans is the government developing to address the effects in the Kluane region of this substantial reduction in tourist traffic?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** We on this side of the Legislative Assembly will not comment or speculate on the operations of a private sector business. We will leave that up to Holland America and any other business to articulate their operating plans for the upcoming season. We remain committed to working with companies such as Holland America and many others to continue to grow the tourism industry.

Over the past decade plus, we have invested and will continue to invest in tourism infrastructure, in product development, in visitor services, and many marketing programs that we have been able to expand by millions over the past number of years. Clearly, we are seeing the net benefits, because we are

seeing increased visitation to the Yukon, whether it's through air access or the rubber-tire market. We are committed to working in collaboration with industry to ensure that our approach to tourism is integrated and that it does result in net benefits to Yukoners.

**Mr. Silver:** I appreciate the minister's answer here. Mr. Speaker, last fall, the government signed a marketing agreement with Holland America. There was no mention of these changes at that time. There was also no mention of these changes when we debated the Tourism budget recently. The department entered into a three-year marketing project with Holland America at \$50,000 per year and I quote: "...to support joint efforts to promote cruise tour product, providing significant revenues and benefits to Yukon's tourism industry."

The government said, and I quote: "This three-year agreement will generate incremental new business for Yukon..."

It's clear now this expenditure will not be generating a lot of revenue for the Kluane region. I understand that Holland America's decision won't necessarily mean fewer visitors to the Yukon, but they are redirecting to different destinations.

Will the minister commit to additional marketing or infrastructure dollars for the Kluane region during this fall's budget to update and —

**Speaker:** Order please. The member's time has elapsed.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I find the comments interesting coming from the MLA for Klondike, particularly as he makes reference to tourism cooperative marketing agreements with companies such as Holland America. Of course, I certainly commend the Minister of Tourism and Culture and the good work of the Department of Tourism and Culture in terms of collaborating with industry.

To be sure, the tourism cooperative marketing fund, to which we have dedicated \$700,000 in this year's budget and have in the last number of years, is also toward facilitating those additional cooperative marketing agreements. It's unfortunate, however, that the Member for Klondike continues to vote against those expenditures. So unfortunately, the member opposite can say all he will in support of the tourism industry, but I would ask him to put his words into the vote.

**Question re: Trapping industry image and promotion**

**Mr. Elias:** Yukoners have worked so hard to ensure our territory is recognized around the world as a beautiful land filled with wonderful people. The few citizens who still maintain traplines take pride in their responsible approach to harvesting their fur. We don't club lynx to death when they're caught in a leg-hold trap. We don't shoot wolverines when they're caught in a leg-hold trap. We sure don't and we surely do not feed chinook salmon to our dog teams.

That's not our Yukon, but that's what is portrayed on the Discovery Channel program called *Yukon Men*. Yukon hunters and trappers consider this program's name as an outright case of identity theft. All the same, that's the type of trapping our children are seeing on TV.

Besides the letters he tabled today, how does the minister plan to counter this popular media representation of trapping in our territory?

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** Thanks to the member opposite for the question. I have to say that I do agree with him that some of the portrayals of trapping in the television show in question and the presentation of that as being in the Yukon is unfortunate. As he did mention and as I tabled earlier today, in October of last year I wrote a letter to the Discovery Channel raising concerns that the Yukon government had with that particular television show and some of the practices therein.

In that letter I noted that hunting and trapping in Yukon are well-regulated activities and both are important aspects of Yukon's unique quality of life, history, culture and traditional economy. As I noted in the letter, which members are free to read, of course some of the practices on that television show have the potential to damage both our tourism industry and our trapping industry in the territory. I did take the opportunity to raise that with the Discovery Channel and received somewhat of a response from the Discovery Channel. I, of course, will pursue this matter further, if possible, to determine what more we can do to ensure that what happens and what is portrayed on that television show aren't mistaken for what reality is in Yukon.

Of course their claim is that it is on the Yukon River in Alaska so it's acceptable for them to refer to it as *Yukon Men*; I took issue with that and asked them to change the name as well.

**Mr. Elias:** I also have some ideas. While trapping is allowed to languish as an industry, we can't allow it to die as a traditional stewardship skill, and it would be a sad day in the Yukon if we permitted one of the symbols represented on our coat of arms to disappear and to be only read about in story-books.

I have to believe eventually trapping will certainly rebound and become an essential driver in the Yukon's economy and as an experiential learning tool in our education system. So even if we don't foster trapping as an industry, we must maintain it as a traditional skill.

What is the minister doing at the very least to preserve trapping as a traditional, healthy-living skill, intrinsic to culture and long-term economy of the Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** I do agree with the member opposite that trapping is an important part of our history and culture, and that's why my department has taken a number of actions to support the industry.

Particularly, we deal with the industry association, the Yukon Trappers Association, to which we provide annual funding to the tune of, I believe, \$30,000 or \$35,000. In addition to supporting additional training and educational opportunities, we have hired a dedicated chief trapping instructor for six months in the territory; we've accessed training opportunities to support development of community-based trapper training instructors; we've reduced the length of trapper training courses and improved scheduling to facilitate attendance, and we are in the process of developing scheduled implementation this fall that will provide the ability for experienced and trained

trappers to challenge the Yukon trapping course. All of those things come in response to suggestions and recommendations made by the Fish and Wildlife Management Board, which, of course, has a key role to play in this as well.

So I'm always willing to hear from industry organizations and co-management boards, like the Fish and Wildlife Management Board, about what steps they think we can take to improve trapping in the territory and strengthen that industry and, as we can see, I've taken some steps already to date and fully intend to respond positively to any sort of acceptable recommendations we receive.

**Mr. Elias:** The status quo isn't good enough. Here's what the minister can do: he can partner with the Department of Education, lease some traplines around the territory, hire experienced trappers, and start a student trapping program, similar to the bison and moose hunts organized and sponsored by the Department of Education. The true value of trapping can only be realized by doing it, and not watching the illegal methods depicted on the Discovery Channel.

There are innumerable benefits to getting kids out on the land to develop the skill, as has been demonstrated in my own community's experiential learning program. Land and wildlife stewardship, healthy living and personal wellness, cultural and traditional values — this is a legacy that the minister could create and leave for the future, in addition to his special campground.

Will the minister seize this opportunity and provide financial support to a grassroots educational trapping program in our territory? Come on.

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** I appreciate the member opposite's passion for this issue, and I appreciate his support for the development of the new campground in the territory as well.

The Department of Environment is always willing to work with educational institutions or schools to provide trapping information for youth and to fit it into the curriculum in the territory. Environment Yukon regularly participates in outdoor programs, information and presentation requests from Yukon schools. We have a variety of educational resources about trapping and the biology and management of fur-bearers. These educational materials can be tailored to the school curriculum and are available for presentation upon request. There are a number of really great examples of where we have worked with individual schools to provide that kind of information, as he noted in his discussion of the school in his community. But there are also other methods — there is the bison hunt that he mentioned and other programs like that, which imbue some of Yukon's history into the curriculum.

Of course, it is important to not only facilitate the increased knowledge and understanding of trapping in the Yukon, but also foster a sense of history and culture in the territory's schools. So I can commit to continuing to work with the Minister of Education to ensure that Environment Yukon makes materials available to schools and that any schools that have interest in this kind of programming have it available from the department.

**Question re: Fort Selkirk withdrawal from resource development**

**Mr. Tredger:** Fort Selkirk is a living cultural heritage site and a special place for all who visit. Fort Selkirk is part of the Selkirk First Nation traditional territory and a place of historical and cultural celebration. It is also a place where Yukoners and tourists can look back into the past. Fort Selkirk was a major centre for trade and settlement in central Yukon. The Selkirk First Nation has requested that the government withdraw Fort Selkirk and the adjacent lands from resource development and thereby avoid potential land use conflicts.

Will the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources create a buffer zone by removing from the *Quartz Mining Act* and *Placer Mining Act* Fort Selkirk and the adjacent lands around this unique and important place?

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** Actually, with respect to the request the member is referring to, I don't believe we have received such correspondence from the Selkirk First Nation. If correspondence is on its way, I look forward to receiving it. I have not had any meetings with Chief McGinty or others about this, and I'm not aware of any formal approach that has been made on this topic. If the First Nation wishes to raise the topic with my colleagues and me, we would certainly hear their viewpoints before coming to any conclusion on that.

**Mr. Tredger:** Last summer during their community tour, this was raised with the Premier and he assured the Selkirk First Nation that he would get back to them. I'm disappointed by the minister's position. Fort Selkirk is a unique heritage site. It is co-owned and co-managed by the Yukon government and the Selkirk First Nation. The government and Selkirk First Nation have put resources into advertising and promoting tourism and the cultural values of Fort Selkirk. Why would the government not ensure that this important heritage site is not staked or disturbed by resource-extraction activities?

Again, I ask the minister: Will he not work with Selkirk First Nation to ensure that this historic site and the land adjacent are withdrawn from mining activities?

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** It would have been nice to see the member alter his script. I indicated in my first response that I haven't received, to the best of my knowledge, any formal correspondence from Selkirk First Nation on this, nor have I been approached by Chief McGinty or Selkirk First Nation about this. If they would like to raise this with me, either through letter or to talk about this, I would certainly be happy to hear their viewpoint and, as I indicated in my first response, my colleagues and I would hear their viewpoint and consider it before coming to a conclusion on it. So I'm not sure what the member doesn't like about government being prepared to sit down with the First Nation government and talk to them about their perspective before reaching a decision on that. I guess the member doesn't support collaboration with First Nation governments.

**Question re: Yukon hire program**

**Ms. Hanson:** You know, Mr. Speaker, local hire policies can build local capacity and community by keeping the benefits here in the Yukon. Yukon hire was a good public policy. In 2009, the Yukon Party Cabinet directed that the Public

Service Commission remove the standing Yukon hire directive that was to, and I quote: "ensure that hiring is at first limited to Yukon applicants."

My question: Why did the Yukon Party Cabinet direct the removal of the standing practice of Yukon hire?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I thank the member opposite for the question. As the member opposite just spoke to the issue, Yukon, like every other province and territory in this country, actually did adhere and signed on to the *Agreement on Internal Trade* and did in fact alter our policies. However, there are a number of policies that remain in place — when it comes to preferential hire, in terms of meeting our requirements under the final agreements with Yukon First Nations, and there are a number of other provisions that have been made available, despite having the *Agreement on Internal Trade*.

I certainly look forward to entertaining other questions from the member opposite.

**Ms. Hanson:** Of course, the NDP knows about the *Agreement on Internal Trade*; it's the government's job to be open and transparent about all the impacts of trade agreements on Yukon's economy. Also, measuring and evaluating the impacts of policy changes is a good management practice. The Public Service Commission's activity report from April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010 shows that in the first year after Cabinet directed the removal of Yukon hire, and I quote: "the number of outside hires increased by 68 percent in 2009-10, despite a decrease of 8 percent in the number of competitions posted."

Yukoners are interested in local jobs and the local hire policy was a great way to ensure that the benefits of Yukon economic activity do trickle down. Since the Yukon Party Cabinet directed the removal of the Yukon hire program in 2009, what has been the increase in the number of Outside hires and what has been the impact on Yukon hires?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Contrary to what the member opposite is referring to, in fact every province and every territory has signed on to the *Agreement on Internal Trade*. We have done so, and we have been able to maintain our provisions under the final agreements — for example, when it comes to preferential hire. We have also continued to promote hiring Yukon residents, in the meantime, and the manufacture and the use of Yukon goods and services by providing rebates to contractors working on eligible government contracts. Under that program alone, there has been over \$1 million. Just under that amount is allotted for direct rebates.

We continue to invest in the economy so we continue to see a growth in employment for Yukoners in the private sector and within the government. Certainly, we remain very committed to growing our public service and working with Yukon residents on training and opportunities for growth within the public service.

**Ms. Hanson:** The direction to remove Yukon hire affects more than the public services. It affects the private sector as well. When an extractive resource company is licensed to exploit Yukon's resources, that company pays some taxes and some royalties. Other economic benefits come from hiring local people who in turn live and spend in local communities. Yukoners can be hired to work at the site itself or to spinoff



jobs like trucking, et cetera. Yukon hire represents security for local workers. There is less and less security for Yukon workers. This government has stated its intention to restrict the number of temporary foreign workers on mine sites; indirectly, this may cause a company to seek local employees. In the end, it is good, secure jobs that make an economy robust. The minister says she is doing all of these things, but how does she know, since government stopped tracking outside hires and Yukon hires after 2010?

What mechanism is this government looking at to ensure local workers get maximum benefits from local economic activity? Is it considering incentives for companies? Are there any other examples?

**Hon. Mr. Pasloski:** Certainly, there are many examples of ways we have continued to try to ensure that local businesses have the best opportunity to be successful in an environment where we have signed on to an agreement on internal trade, as have all the provinces and territories. A good example of that would be the Building Canada fund that we've done over the last number of years. Some jurisdictions did large projects over a short period of time. We ensured that, by investing the money strategically over a larger period of time, we created an opportunity for more local businesses to be able to actively bid on smaller projects because of the capacity they have.

This government does support free trade agreements. It has now been over 25 years since the NAFTA was signed with the United States. The result of that for Canada has been the creation of millions of jobs for Canadians and for Americans as well. We know what the position is of the NDP. They are anti-trade. They have opposed every internal and external trade agreement that has existed, in both Yukon and Canada, since it was started. This government is not anti-trade. We want to see jobs and opportunities for Yukoners.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT BILLS

#### Bill No. 54: *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act* — Second Reading

**Clerk:** Second reading, Bill No. 54, standing in the name of the Hon. Ms. Taylor.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I move that Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be now read a second time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Minister of Community Services that Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be now read a second time.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I am pleased to introduce Bill No. 54, which provides amendments to the *Employment Standards Act* that will help parents of murdered or missing or critically ill children access to new federal benefits. The proposed bill supports this government's priority to provide support for families, including during times of particular stress and crisis.

It has been Yukon's consistent practice to ensure that our *Employment Standards Act* job protection provisions appropriately match benefit programs established by the Government of Canada.

Currently, Manitoba has passed new legislation mandating leave for these circumstances. The Province of Ontario has tabled similar legislation, and other provinces and territories are also considering amendments to accommodate these new federal benefits. The proposed changes to Yukon's *Employment Standards Act* are similar to other unpaid leave changes made already, such as the leave of absence for reserve forces, compassionate care leave, and the expanded definition of "family" for compassionate care leave.

On November 20, 2012, Canada's Parliament unanimously approved Bill C-44. This legislation enables the creation of a grant program under Canada's *Department of Social Development Act*, which provides support payments to employed parents of murdered or missing children who take time off work in order to deal with their loss.

This new federal program came into effect in January of this year.

Bill C-44 also amends Canada's *Employment Insurance Act* to provide benefits to employed parents who are caring for or supporting their critically ill children. The critically ill child provisions are expected to go into effect in June 2013 once Canada has completed the regulations.

The heartbreak of a critically ill child can be overwhelming and without doubt, at times such as these, a parent's focus is on looking after that child's needs. The amendments in this bill will enable an employed parent of a critically ill child to take a leave of absence without pay for up to 37 weeks in order to care for that child. Within that period, there will be a two-week waiting period for employment insurance benefits to be activated. If both parents take time from work, the maximum period of absence combined is 37 weeks, which is also consistent with the provisions of the federal *Employment Insurance Act*.

The loss of a child under any circumstances is a tragedy for a family and the community. When a child has disappeared or has died, the stress that the family must endure is inconceivable. This bill proposes that in these circumstances any person in a parenting role will be eligible for up to 35 weeks of unpaid leave. In this case, a weekly grant of \$350 in lieu of wages is available under the federal *Department of Social Development Act*. This leave of absence begins on the day on which the death or disappearance has occurred, as the case may be, and ends after 35 weeks.

Similar to previous provisions made for compassionate care, bereavement, reservist leave, maternity and parental leaves, these new forms of leave will, under our *Employment Standards Act*, provide the right to leave and job protection. Employees who take unpaid leave to access the federal programs must be reinstated in their former positions or be given a comparable position in the same location with the same wages and benefits. An employer may not dismiss or discipline the employee for taking leave and may not take the leave into account in any decision to promote or train the employee. Upon

their return to work, the employee will be entitled to pay and benefits at the same time as when the leave commenced and to any increases to pay and benefits to which they would have been entitled had the leave not been taken.

I believe these amendments to Yukon's *Employment Standards Act* will provide some peace of mind for parents who must take time from work to care for a critically ill child and for those who may have to endure the tragedy of a child who is missing or has died as a result of a crime. I am pleased that Yukon will be among the first jurisdictions in Canada to make these changes and provide job protection for parents who are going through a very difficult time. It will be one less thing for them to worry about.

I wish to thank the various department officials for their work in preparing this new legislation, which helps to meet Community Services' vision of vibrant, healthy and sustainable Yukon communities. I look forward to the ensuing debate from members opposite and I look forward to questions later on in Committee of the Whole.

**Ms. Stick:** I don't think anyone in this House would disagree with the member that the loss of a child, the disappearance of a child or a critically ill child is a stressful crisis for any family. I think the minister explained that very clearly, so I'm not going to go into that.

I do want to discuss this bill. When Bill C-44 was tabled in Parliament, the federal government also announced that it would provide an income support to parents of murdered or missing children whose death or disappearance was the result of a suspected *Criminal Code* offence.

To be eligible, the child's parents must take leave from their employment. That is great; it's a good thing. Today, what this bill talks about is amending our *Employment Standards Act*. If we look at Bill C-54, there is quite a bit of information in here that has been rolled out. I'm pleased the minister discussed Manitoba and Ontario, and I will come to what their legislation is that they have passed — or have tabled at this time — as well as Nova Scotia.

This Bill C-54 in fact does not bring Yukon legislation into line with Canada's *Labour Code*. There are glaring differences in what the federal legislation has now enacted and what's being proposed here. This government wasn't the first to propose amendments to the *Employment Standards Act*.

I've looked at Manitoba and they've passed their legislation. Ontario is currently in second reading. Nova Scotia is in second reading and has gone to a committee. I decided I would take Bill C-44, which has been passed, and compare it to this proposed legislation, which is labour code to labour code and what is being proposed in other provinces.

Under the federal labour standards, an employee has to have worked six consecutive months with one employer to be eligible. In our bill, Bill No. 54, we're asking that employees work 12 months continuously. Under the federal program, a parent of a critically ill child is granted 37 weeks' leave without pay — I'm not talking about EI here; I'm not talking about other programs; I'm just talking about leave without pay.

In our bill, Bill No. 54, we match that: 37 weeks. Leave related to the disappearance of a child — related to a criminal offence — under the federal bill, employees must work six consecutive months with one employer. Under our act to amend, it's 12 consecutive months.

If a child has disappeared, probably due to a criminal offence, parents are granted 52 weeks' leave without pay. Again, not linking this to EI, not linking this to other programs — 52 weeks' leave without pay. We've dropped from 37 weeks to 35. If parents should be in the unfortunate situation of having a child die as a result of a crime, they are expected to have worked six months under the federal act — 12 under Bill No. 54. Under the federal act, they're granted up to 104 weeks for the death of a child resulting from a crime. Bill No. 54, an *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, allows 35 weeks.

There is no comparison. These don't match.

The minister brought up other provinces so let's look at them. Manitoba — parents of critically ill children are entitled to 37 weeks' leave without pay and only have to have worked 30 days with one employer. Parents of children who have disappeared or had a child die due to a criminal act are entitled to 52 weeks for the disappearance of a child and up to 104 weeks for the death of a child due to a criminal act. That's Manitoba and it has passed.

Ontario — still in second reading — is more of the same, Mr. Speaker. An employee must have worked with one employer for six months — same as the federal. In the first instance, a parent is granted 37 weeks' leave for care of a critically ill child. Disappearance and death of a child due to a criminal act are rolled into one and the parents are entitled up to 104 weeks. I remind the Speaker — 35 in the Yukon.

Nova Scotia — not yet passed, but in second reading and again, the same: an employee, in this case, only has to work with an employer for three months, and in the instance of a parent caring for a critically ill child, leave is granted up to 37 weeks, same as ours. In the second instance, a parent of a child who has disappeared or has died due to a criminal act needs only to have worked three months and will be granted up to 104 weeks' leave without pay. What's being proposed here is not close to the federal legislation that was passed.

I find referrals to 35 weeks when I look at the bill when they're talking about EI benefits and the payments of those. We're not talking EI benefits; we're talking about a parent's ability to take leave from a job because their child is critically ill, has disappeared or has died due to a criminal act. 35 weeks — that's what we give them? It's not costing this government anything.

An employer would have to hire someone to replace them, yes, but we're talking about leave without pay. It doesn't cost the employer. They do need to ensure that that person has a spot back in their employment at the end of that time. Why? Why are we only going 35 weeks? To whom did we speak? Did we consult with the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce and ask them to go to their membership and ask businesses what they thought about this? No. Did we go to labour and talk to them? What did they think? No. I don't understand — why are we going in the opposite direction of everyone else? Why

the cold heart? Why grant 37 weeks for a critically ill child but, after that, 35 weeks max. No one else is proposing that; no one else is doing that. Why are we?

This isn't the middle of the pack — this is way at the back. I don't understand this, Mr. Speaker, and I'm hopeful.

What I'd like to hear from this government is amendments to at a minimum bring this in line with federal legislation. I'm not asking you to go to Nova Scotia, Ontario or Manitoba standards. Can we just bring it to the federal *Canada Labour Code*? That's fair.

I want to hear a commitment today that those numbers are changed. This is not fair. This isn't even reasonable. I hope to hear a commitment from this government that they will make these amendments. If not, we will bring forward amendments to these changes to make this a fair amendment to this act — a fair response to parents. We believe it's important to assist parents in times of significant stress. No one is going to argue that. Let's make sure that it's significant assistance. Thirty-five weeks — hardly fair.

Better yet, let's send this bill back and begin again. Let's talk to the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce; let's talk to labour; let's talk to businesses. It will not cost this government anything to do the right thing. It won't cost employers to go from 35 weeks to 52 or 54 or 104. These aren't simple changes to bring this in line; it doesn't bring it anywhere in line. We're way under on this one — way under — and I'm embarrassed. I think if this is passed — I don't know. I want to hear from this government that they will amend this or withdraw it and really make it fair and bring it up to the federal standards.

**Mr. Silver:** I would just like to say thank you to the member from the Official Opposition for bringing a collaborative model to this today and sharing information with the Liberal caucus. The amendments to the *Employment Standards Act* will help parents caring for a critically ill child or whose child is missing or has died due to a crime. The amendments will provide job protection for these parents when they take a leave of absence without pay, and access to new federal programs.

As a caucus, the Liberals are prepared to support the principle of this bill, but as mentioned by the critic from the New Democratic Party, we too have some serious concerns about the numbers that are part of this legislation. We agree with the NDP that this has to be at least taken up to the same standards as are set by the federal government. I understand that other provinces and territories are also working to bring forth legislation to implement these changes, and we will be asking more questions about the actual numbers as we get into Committee of the Whole.

**Speaker:** Does any other member wish to be heard?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I would like to thank the members opposite for their comments. I appreciate what has come forth and, to be sure, we will discuss this at greater length during Committee of the Whole.

You know, I'm not entirely sure what to make of the New Democratic Party, other than they will not be supporting this

bill, and that's truly unfortunate. Again, we are one of the first few jurisdictions in Canada to carry out this bill, which is really following Canada's *Helping Families in Need Act*, providing new benefits for parents in those times of crisis and in need.

I want to thank the officials of the Department of Community Services and the Department of Justice for crafting this bill. And just so that the members opposite do know — if I wasn't clear in my opening remarks — there was consultation undertaken, actually. Letters did go out and advertisements were taken out as well, but there were consultations, as I understand, not only with the public, but by way of advertising. Also, the groups that did receive letters would have been business groups, such as the chambers of commerce, tourism associations, labour groups, employer groups, First Nation governments and municipal governments as well.

Mr. Speaker, to be sure, there will be some debate in the Assembly and, of course, that is what this Assembly is all about, and we look forward to going line by line in speaking to the bill and hopefully providing some clarification at that time.

**Speaker:** Are you prepared for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Division.

#### Division

**Speaker:** Division has been called.

#### Bells

**Speaker:** Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

**Hon. Mr. Pasloski:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** Agree.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Graham:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Kent:** Agree.

**Ms. McLeod:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Istchenko:** Agree.

**Hon. Mr. Dixon:** Agree.

**Mr. Hassard:** Agree.

**Ms. Hanson:** Agree.

**Ms. Stick:** Agree.

**Ms. Moorcroft:** Agree.

**Ms. White:** Agree.

**Mr. Tredger:** Agree.

**Mr. Silver:** Agree.

**Mr. Elias:** Agree.

**Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, the results are 16 yeas, nil nays.

**Speaker:** The yeas have it. I declare the motion carried.

*Motion for second reading of Bill No. 54 agreed to*

#### **Bill No. 55: *International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Aircraft Equipment) Act* — Second Reading**

**Clerk:** Second reading, Bill No. 55, standing in the name of the Hon. Ms. Taylor.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I move that Bill No. 55, entitled *International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Aircraft Equipment) Act*, be now read a second time.

**Speaker:** It has been moved by the Minister of Community Services that Bill No. 55, entitled *International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Aircraft Equipment) Act*, be now read a second time.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I am pleased to introduce Bill No. 55, the *International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Aircraft Equipment) Act*. The *International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Aircraft Equipment) Act* is part of a worldwide initiative targeted at providing certainty for borrowers and lenders where aircraft are used as security for loans.

Historically, financing of airlines worldwide is considered a high-risk enterprise and this is partly because the aircraft that are security for the financing can, at any given time, be located in any part of the world, far from their home jurisdiction and its laws.

The bill tabled today in the Legislature will facilitate Yukon's participation in an international initiative that will standardize airline security interest rules worldwide and will lead to much more certainty in this complex area of finance.

The Government of Canada passed the federal *International Interests in Mobile Equipment Act* back in 2005. Amendments were made in December to implement the federal act, which is to be taking effect. In order for every territory and province to participate in this international initiative, each jurisdiction must enact similar legislation.

The significance of this bill is two-fold. Firstly, aircraft and their major components are often used as security by aviation companies when borrowing to acquire new equipment. With this act, Yukon aviation companies that have fixed-wing aircraft with a capacity of eight or more persons and helicopter companies operating machines with a capacity of five or more persons will be able to access financing at the best available terms and mitigate the risks that usually increase the cost of obtaining credit.

Secondly, we joined the worldwide *Cape Town Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment Protocol*, or "CTC" as it has come to be known, along with some 32 countries around the world. This protocol provides a clear set of rules to be followed for the documentation of lending agreements that involved aircraft and security and for priorities and process in the event of financial disputes involving aircraft. This act will also allow Yukon to participate in the international aircraft registry, based in Dublin, Ireland. The on-line registry system was established when the aircraft protocol to the Cape Town convention was ratified for the filing of interests in aircraft and aircraft engines. This registry operates in the same way that on-line vehicle registries do, allowing registrations to be entered and searched by criteria such as manufacturer, model and serial number. This registry is a valuable tool for financing companies and aviation companies as they sell and consider buying equipment. The registry reduces the risk associated with financing aircraft following greater certainty for creditors and manufacturers — the result being the ability to provide larger amounts of financing at a lower rate for companies in participating jurisdictions.

For Yukon's eligible fixed-wing airline and helicopter companies, this will provide the potential to decrease their operating costs and expand business. It will also allow local companies to search and determine ownership and any security interests of aircraft equipment they may be considering buying. They can register their own equipment to demonstrate the same.

This legislation will also benefit Outside airlines that service Yukon, as they will have the certainty of knowing that Yukon has signed on to the national protocol and that their aircraft, while landed here, are subject to a consistent international set of rules should a security interest need to be acted on. We know that this initiative has support in the local and national airline community where the margins of profitability can be fragile. Every opportunity to improve cost-effectiveness can have significant impacts on the bottom line.

What the *International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Aircraft Equipment) Act* means for Yukon is that our local companies will be able to secure their own assets, access reduced financing to replace or purchase new equipment, continue to support other industries, employ skilled workers and bring businesses and visitors to our territory.

**Ms. Moorcroft:** The Official Opposition supports this bill. I understand that the bill is based on the Cape Town Convention signed by Canada, and the bill has been recommended by the Uniform Law Commission. The Uniform Law Commission prepares uniform statutes in areas in which provincial and territorial laws would benefit from harmonization. At times, the federal government has related responsibilities and also participates in the discussions.

This bill allows the *Cape Town Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment Protocol* to apply in Yukon, which would create an international person/property registry for aircraft with fixed wings over eight passengers, helicopters over five passengers, and major aircraft parts. It is about greater transparency of ownership and helps to resolve disputes across nations around ownership, and it addresses the issues of high interest rates for financing of aircraft purchases. From the briefing and from the minister's introduction, I gather there has been a problem with Canadian banks lending for purchasing aircraft, and this is a hindrance to the domestic airline industry. I appreciate hearing from the minister details on the benefits to our own domestic airline industry in the Yukon and, either in her response or in Committee, I'd like to ask whether the minister can provide a common-language description of the clauses within the convention that Canada did not ratify — in other words, the exceptions that Canada may have to the *Cape Town Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment Protocol* on matters specific to aircraft equipment.

**Speaker:** Does any other member wish to be heard?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I'd like to thank the Official Opposition for their support of this bill. As I mentioned, it really enables our participation in the worldwide convention that will add some certainty to what has been coined as the complex

world of aircraft financing. We look forward to debate on line-by-line discussion in Committee of the Whole and taking further questions at that time.

*Motion for second reading of Bill No. 55 agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** 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 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*

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Chair (Ms. McLeod):** Order. Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 54, *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*. Do members wish to take a brief recess?

**All Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Chair:** Committee of the Whole will recess for 15 minutes.

*Recess*

**Chair:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order.

### Bill No. 54: *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*

**Chair:** The matter before Committee is Bill No. 54, *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Madam Chair, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill No. 54, *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*. As we just discussed here earlier this afternoon, when Government of Yukon has mandated leave for members of Canada's reserve forces and for compassionate care of a family member, we are also proposing adding unpaid leave for parents of murdered or missing children and for parents of critically ill children.

As I mentioned before, Canada's *Helping Families in Need Act* creates a number of new benefits under the legislation for parents facing the loss of a child who is missing or murdered and for those parents looking after a critically ill child. To ensure that parents who access these new benefits will not be subject to further distress due to loss of a job, the bill ensures job protection in very difficult circumstances.

Under the bill, as referenced earlier, parents of missing or murdered children will receive up to 35 weeks of unpaid leave. The parents will be eligible during that time period to receive a weekly payment from the federal government as established under the *Helping Families in Need Act*. In addition, parents who require leave to care for a critically ill child will receive up to 37 weeks of unpaid leave and will be eligible to receive weekly unemployment insurance payments from the federal government.

This bill also creates the option of responding to future federal initiatives via changes to our regulations, meaning that we can respond more quickly and more responsibly to federal initiatives as they occur.

I know there are a number of questions, and we will certainly get into it as we go through it line by line. Thank you.

**Ms. Stick:** I just wanted to respond to something the minister spoke of earlier, saying that she heard that the NDP would be opposing this bill. I would like to be clear on this — we are not happy with this bill the way it's written; we are not happy with the time given. But having said that, we will be proposing amendments to it in line-by-line debate. The reason we are doing that is, at a minimum — at a minimum — we want to bring it in line with the federal legislation. It does not meet what other provinces have passed, or are looking at, across Canada. We will propose these friendly amendments. If they are passed, that would be wonderful, and we will vote for the bill.

If they're not passed, we would not be happy. But we will vote for the bill — in favour, with sufferance — recognizing that this is better than nothing — as our labour standards exist now. So, yes, we will vote in favour, but with sufferance. I promise you that when the NDP becomes government, it will be changed, at a minimum, to match what the federal government has proposed or has passed.

But I'm hoping the Yukon Party will do the right thing and listen to our amendments, consider them carefully and pass them.

I do have one question to start with, and it's pretty basic: Why did we come up with the leave and eligibility provisions that are in this act? Why a year's employment with one employer? Why the drop from 37 weeks for a critically ill child to 35, and 35 for a missing child and for a child who has died because of criminal acts?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I'd like to thank the member opposite for her clarity. I do appreciate that. What I can say is that, when it comes to this particular bill and when we look at our own *Employment Standards Act* as it stands today, every jurisdiction varies across the country. To be clear, I'm not saying that the act is perfect as it is today, but what I am saying is that every jurisdiction in Canada determines its own *Employment Standards Act* or whatever they may call it in their own jurisdiction. In other words, every one is different. Leaves are different; overtime provisions are different. So it is very difficult to compare to other jurisdictions, in terms of individual leave provisions. It's really what you would call "the whole package".

We consulted on the federal benefit periods. We did not consult on the leave provisions. That is consistent with what this government and previous governments have also done when it comes to compassionate leave and reservist leave. While I do appreciate what the member opposite is saying, it is consistent with what has been taken in the past. We consulted again with the labour organizations, chambers of commerce, First Nation governments, and municipal governments on the benefit periods and not the leave periods. All of the responses supported those proposals, as was presented and as they were

consulted. Of course, that included the Confederation of Labour, municipal governments including Haines Junction, Faro and Mayo. The leave provisions in the bill match the times of the federal benefit period, so not the leave provisions in the *Canada Labour Code*. I had to go through this a number of times as well.

This is consistent with previous changes that we made to the *Employment Standards Act* related to other benefit periods. I'm pretty sure it was this Assembly that made some changes when it came to compassionate care leave. I know the previous mandate as well — the reservist leave, as I seem to recall. Needing to be employed for 12 months for this purpose, as is contained within the act, is consistent with maternity and parental leave, both of which are significant periods of leave. It's finding that balance.

I do appreciate what the member opposite has stated. What I can say is it would be difficult for us to entertain proposals on the fly, to not have had the opportunity to consult on what the member opposite is referring to on the leave, when we went to consult on the benefit periods.

Again I would remind the member opposite that Yukon is proceeding with some changes to provide that benefit to parents. We want those parents to take advantage of it if in fact there is a time of need.

I'm not saying that the door is closed, but there is certainly an opportunity to have that added discussion. But for the purpose of this legislation coming forward, it is really about the benefit and not the leave period — so just to provide that added clarity for the member opposite.

**Ms. Stick:** Yes, it is about the benefit to families; it's about the benefit to parents, so let's give them the benefit. Let's make it so that it matches the federal. As far as I can see from reading this bill, it's about leave; it's about 37 weeks; it's about 35 weeks; it's about how much you can take together when you split it as parents. It's all about leave. It's not about benefits.

It's about the ability to take leave without pay. That's what this amendment is about. It doesn't talk about benefits in here. This isn't about EI. It's not our legislation; it's federal.

I understand that provinces and territories do their own labour standards acts. I understand that. The minister introduced the fact that other provinces were enacting the same kind of legislation, so I looked at theirs. At a minimum, it matched the federal, and some went further. They went further. This does not. How do you compare 52 weeks to 35, or 104 weeks to 35? That's not right.

Great, we're going to look at the *Employment Standards Act*. I know there is a lot in there that needs fixing. Great, let's look at those things — but this is new. This is separate from what's in there now. These are clauses that we — what did they call it in the federal act? "Helping families in need" — that's what they called these amendments. And they did a lot more, because they went and looked at EI and they looked at the other grants that families can apply for. We are not offering those things. We are not offering money. We are giving parents the opportunity to not have to worry about going back to a job. We are not costing the government anything by enacting this. We are not costing businesses anything by enacting this.

Employers have to promise that if someone leaves for 52, 37 or 104 weeks, when that time is over, you can come back to your job, to your position or to the equivalent. We are not going to penalize people. It's not great if you are an employer and you have had someone there for 104 weeks and they might have to lay someone off, but I'm pretty sure if I hire someone to do that job, they are going to know about that. They are going to know about that possibility.

I don't agree with the minister that the door is kind of left open a little bit. Let's change it now; let's get it done. What are we waiting for?

I apologize that I did not get these amendments done until today, or that the research was just finished — when we looked at other provinces and when we looked at Bill C-44. We did our homework. We did our homework and we looked and compared and there is nothing wrong with this government saying, "Oh, you know what, maybe we should."

Let's be fair and reasonable. I'm not asking for the world. I'm asking them to just go to the federal level: six months' employment, 37 weeks if you have a critically ill child. Critically ill: work six consecutive months, 37 weeks' leave without pay. Disappearance of a child: six consecutive months working, 52 weeks' leave without pay. Death of a child — six months consecutive work — 104 weeks. Who is losing? Nobody is losing. If we go to 35, yes. Parents lose.

As I said, I will be bringing forward amendments line by line. If those are not passed, we will support this bill with deference because it's better than what we have now, which is nothing. We would not consider not supporting it. I think that's all I have to say, Madam Chair. Thank you.

**Chair:** Is there any further general debate?  
We will proceed then to line-by-line.

*On Clause 1*

**Ms. Stick:** Excuse me, Madam Chair. Yes, Madam Chair, under clause 1, I would like to move

THAT Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be amended in clause 3 at page 2 by replacing "12 months" —

**Chair:** Excuse me, Ms. Stick. If we want to move an amendment to clause 3, you must wait until we get to clause 3.

**Ms. Stick:** My apologies, Madam Chair. I just got a little excited.

**Chair:** We are looking at clause 1. Is there any debate?  
*Clause 1 agreed to*

*On Clause 2*

*Clause 2 agreed to*

*On Clause 3*

**Ms. Stick:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I apologize for my earlier mistake.

*Amendment proposed*

**Ms. Stick:** I move

THAT Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be amended in clause 3 at page 2 by replacing "12 months" with "6 months" in 60.02(2).

**Chair:** The amendment is in order. Does any member wish to speak to the amendment?

**Some Hon. Member:** (Inaudible)

**Ms. Stick:** I agree that a 15-minute break would be good. I could also, at this time, provide a copy of my other proposed amendment, so that if the government would like to look at that at the same time, I would be happy to do that.

**Chair:** Committee of the Whole will recess for 15 minutes now.

#### *Recess*

**Chair:** Order. Committee of Whole will now come to order to resume clause-by-clause debate of Bill No. 54, *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*.

It has been moved by Ms. Stick, the MLA for Riverdale South:

THAT Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be amended in clause 3 at page 2 by replacing “12 months” with “6 months” in 60.02(2).

**Ms. Stick:** This amendment would just bring in line the amount of time parents need to have been working from 12 months to 6 months and brings it in line with the *Canada Labour Code*. It’s a simple change and it’s the only one required in this section, as everything else would match the *Canada Labour Code*, including the 37 weeks leave without pay that is allowed under that.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I’d like to thank the member opposite for providing copies of the amendment in advance and I do appreciate the attention that the Official Opposition has put into these particular amendments. As I referenced —

**Chair:** We are speaking to the one amendment of clause 3.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Yes, I know. I am just providing context.

**Chair:** Thank you, carry on.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I just again wanted to go back to some of my earlier comments about how we will be unable to support this amendment. As I mentioned before, it’s really about providing that ability to access federal benefits and receiving the job protection as originally intended — those amendments coming forward. That is what we had consulted on with the stakeholders and that is what we are moving forward with, based on the feedback we received from the stakeholders.

Again, what I have committed to doing and what I will commit to do is follow up with the stakeholders by way of subsequent consultation on this and future changes that may be proposed as well. Based on that feedback, we can proceed accordingly, but to not proceed with consultation on these particular provisions is not being responsible.

It is something we would not care to proceed with.

**Ms. Stick:** I understand what the minister says about consultation and that letters have gone out. It impacts employers only in that it doesn’t impact employers. The only people this impacts are the parents and how long they have worked. In the *Canada Labour Code*, it says 6 months. That is how long they have to work to be eligible for the other benefits. This brings it into line with that. It doesn’t impact what happens to

employers or anyone else. This is just about them — a parent working six continuous months, to be eligible. So why are we making it 12? It is already six — six months, and they are eligible. That is what it says in Canadian law. So change it — make ours six to match. That’s all. It’s pretty simple, pretty straightforward.

**Chair:** Shall the amendment carry?

**Some Hon. Members:** Division.

#### **Count**

**Chair:** Count has been called for. Would the yeas stand, please? I’m sorry, in five minutes you can stand up.

#### *Bells*

**Chair:** Order please. Would those in favour of the amendment please stand.

#### *Members rise*

**Chair:** Would those opposed to the amendment please stand.

#### *Members rise*

**Chair:** The results are seven yea, eight nay. The amendment is defeated.

#### *Amendment to Bill No. 54 negatived*

**Chair:** We are carrying on with clause-by-clause examination.

#### *Clause 3 agreed to*

#### *On Clause 4*

**Ms. Stick:** I have an amendment to Bill No. 54.

#### *Amendment proposed*

**Ms. Stick:** I move that Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be amended in clause 4 at page 4 and 5 by replacing

- (1) “12 months” with “6 months” in 60.03(2);
- (2) “35 weeks” with “104 weeks” in 60.03(2);
- (3) “12 months” with “6 months” in 60.03(3);
- (4) “35 weeks” with “52 weeks” in 60.03(3);
- (5) “35 weeks” with “104 weeks” in 60.03(5)(b)(i);
- (6) “35 weeks” with “52 weeks” in 60.03(5)(b)(ii); and
- (7) “35 weeks” with “104 weeks” in 60.03(8).

**Chair:** Order please. This amendment is deemed to be in order.

It has been moved by Jan Stick, MLA for Riverdale South THAT Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be amended in clause 4 at page 4 and 5 by replacing:

- (1) “12 months” with “6 months” in 60.03(2);
- (2) “35 weeks” with “104 weeks” in 60.03(2);
- (3) “12 months” with “6 months” in 60.03(3);
- (4) “35 weeks” with “52 weeks” in 60.03(3);
- (5) “35 weeks” with “104 weeks” in 60.03(5)(b)(i);
- (6) “35 weeks” with “52 weeks” in 60.03(5)(b)(ii); and
- (7) “35 weeks” with “104 weeks” in 60.03(8).

**Ms. Stick:** At the risk of repeating myself, I will do it. This amendment, again, brings the Yukon up to what the federal government provides for workers under the *Canada Labour Code*. It brings us up — doesn't leave us at the bottom. It is more generous than the 35 weeks of leave without pay that the government is proposing here.

We think it makes sense to choose this target: *Canada Labour Code*. It's what other provinces and territories look at when designing their own labour law. It's pretty straightforward. I've said it earlier — what it does is that it provides parents with appropriate leave without pay. There is employment insurance and other programs they can apply to for funding. It gives them the time and space to begin to heal — just begin. That grief and pain will never go away. No amount of time will be enough. I know that. But it does give them space, and it does ensure that they have a job to go back to.

Imagine being faced with one of these situations and losing your job because you weren't at work — because your child has disappeared — and you're supposed to go to work and to show up and do your job? This gives people space. It gives them the support and the programs provide funding. It doesn't cost this government anything to do this. It's easy. It's straightforward. If we can't pass these amendments — if the government doesn't feel they can support them — then take it off the table. Pull it back. Fix it. Bring back something that we can support. Bring back something all of us can support — that employers, I am sure, would support, that parents would support, that businesses would support.

Make these amendments. Do it today; let's get this bill done. If we can't change these amendments, then take it off the table; fix it. Why do we have to be at the bottom? Can't we lead the way? Can't we at least be on par with other provinces and on par with the federal government? It's not a big ask. I don't know. It's not rocket science; it's pretty clear; it's pretty simple.

We were told these were easy amendments, these were slight, these would bring us in line with the federal government. Okay, but it wasn't quite that; it wasn't quite bringing us in line, so let's make sure it does. This is about parents. If you have to do consultation again or go to the right people and ask, do it. In the meantime, take this off the table then.

Again I'll say that if nothing changes and it's not taken off the table, we will support it because it's better than nothing, but it certainly is not a shining moment in what we could be offering parents. Thank you, Madam Chair.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Madam Chair, I guess I'm a bit perplexed about the NDP way of consultation and when we come to consultation, "I am sure" is just not going to cut it. When you are in government you are obligated to consult in a responsive and responsible manner and that is exactly what this government did. It went to consultation and I know the members opposite find that very laughable and very full of folly, but you know, when you sit on this side of the Assembly, you do have an obligation to go out and consult, issue letters and provide advertisements. That is in fact what this government did. It went to work and I'm very proud of the fact that the Yukon

government is actually one of the first jurisdictions to act on this bill.

I want to say that when we went out for consultation, we went out on consultation on the benefit, not the leave period, consistent with what this government and other governments have done over previous years — when it comes to compassionate leave, when it comes to reservist leave and other provisions that have also been made available.

Now, we did go out to consultation on the actual benefit and we did receive feedback. We received some feedback from a number of municipalities, from the Yukon Federation of Labour and others. You know, for us to just go at the flip of a pen, to go from 35 weeks to 104 weeks without actually taking the time to have a dialogue with the business community and, let's face it, this is about small- and medium-sized businesses. That is what this is about.

What I have committed to on the floor of the Assembly is that after this is all said and done — and by the way, we're not going to take it off the table, because we believe that Yukoners should access this benefit today, not tomorrow. Now, you're right, we will get this right and we're off on a right path forward. We're talking about benefits that aren't available in Alberta, they are not available in other jurisdictions. We are one of the three jurisdictions in this country to do this, so shame on the member opposite for making reference to not proceeding with this in a responsible manner.

I have to say again —

**Some Hon. Member:** (Inaudible)

#### Chair's statement

**Chair:** Order please. I am going to ask everyone to be respectful of the member speaking. Everyone will have their turn if they have something to say. Let's keep the tone of the conversation at a respectable level.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Thank you, Madam Chair. My apologies to the member opposite, but that is in fact what I have been hearing all day from the opposite bench.

I would like to say that we are proud of the bill going forward. I have committed to the members opposite that, following this bill, we will in fact go out for consultation to the stakeholders on the proposed amendments. Pending the actual outcome of the consultation, we will proceed and we will have that ability to proceed by way of regulation.

If we were to take the bill off the table, we don't have the time to go and discuss this and come back into the Legislature. We could wait until the fall and bring it forward, but then there are a number of months that are missing there that parents could actually miss out on benefits if so unfortunately they have to access these benefits.

I am not entirely sure how much clearer I can be. I am not saying I am opposed to these proposed changes. All I am saying is that we have the obligation to go out and actually have a discussion with the community — all stakeholders — municipalities, First Nation governments, labour groups and the business community.

We are very much committed to these provisions. We have made the commitment to having that additional dialogue. In the



meantime, these provisions are reflecting what the Government of Yukon did go out and consult on, and that is on the actual benefit itself.

**Ms. Hanson:** On the amendment — I am finding it quite perplexing. The minister keeps using interchangeably — using the language of “benefit”.

If the minister would look carefully at the legislative amendments that she has tabled here, the words are “entitled to a leave of absence.” If the minister is saying as she has said that they have consulted on benefits, that’s a red herring; that’s not the subject of discussion here.

My colleague has introduced amendments to the proposed amendment to this legislation with respect to the period of leave of absence from employment without pay. That’s the subject matter. It is not benefits. If you have consulted on benefits, great; I don’t know what benefits you’re talking about, but the issue here is leave of absence from employment without pay. What we’re talking about is the importance of ensuring that, at minimum, those parents and family members who have suffered from these, as a consequence of the stipulated provisions, have an opportunity to access a period of leave of absence from employment without pay for a period that at least matches what the federal code provides. We’re not talking about benefits, so I wish the minister could clarify.

I’m having a hard time fathoming how this government can assume, or basically say to Yukoners who might be in this God-awful situation — and it would be God-awful if anybody in this room or any family member or anybody in the Yukon has to endure the kind of circumstances that these provisions are intended to cover. Is the Yukon Party really saying that they think the federal provisions with respect to entitlement of leave of absence without pay are too generous for Yukoners who are suffering, potentially having to endure these same circumstances?

My colleague has already identified that this is not the first jurisdiction to be dealing with this. She said they have done no consultation on the leave of absence without pay. Why are we even bringing this forward? I think there’s confusion on the minister’s side with respect to the difference between that and benefits, which actually have a cost associated with them. We’re not asking anybody to pay here. If we’re talking about employment insurance, that’s something that each employee and employer pays into.

It’s not a government-controlled benefit. We are talking about — I will repeat this one more time — a leave of absence from employment without pay. We are asking that those leaves of absence without pay be for periods of time that merely mirror what the federal legislation provides. Is it too difficult for this Yukon Party government to at least mirror what the federal standard is? Why are we less generous? Or, why do we think that the circumstances and situations of individual families and parents would be anything different in this territory than it might be elsewhere? Is the suffering any less? I think not.

**Hon. Mr. Pasloski:** I think the only confusion here is occurring from the Leader of the New Democratic Party and her caucus. To stand up and say that there are no costs associated with increasing these leaves of absence really shows that

there is no understanding of the impacts that can occur to businesses. As we have seen many times, the NDP supports consultation some of the time.

We have come forward with making targeted amendments to this legislation based on the consultation that we did, creating the opportunity for Yukoners in a time of need to be able to receive a federal benefit that they have put forward for support of parents and guardians who are suffering from the loss of a murdered or missing child. Madam Chair, these sorts of changes that they have put forward in their amendment, as the minister has stated, are something we can certainly entertain — going out and receiving feedback, doing consultation — but this government will not be irresponsible and unilaterally impose changes in the legislation without going out and seeking input from all of those many small- to medium-sized Yukon businesses that will be impacted, and there will in fact be a cost associated to those businesses. The government would not be supporting these amendments.

**Ms. White:** I’m just going to put this out in terms of when I owned a coffee shop — so, when I was a small business owner.

As it reads right now, someone would have had to work for me for 12 months before they would qualify for the federal help, and then they could leave for 35 weeks. As we are amending it, we would like it to say six months.

**Some Hon. Member:** (Inaudible)

**Ms. White:** Thank you to the Minister of Environment. That’s awesome.

#### Chair’s statement

**Chair:** Order. I’ve asked the members to please respect the person speaking. I would like to hear what each and every one of you has to say on this topic. Thank you.

**Ms. White:** Thank you, Madam Chair. So when I owned a small business and if this were happening to an employee — if they had a child who went missing — 104 weeks is just over two years. There have been children missing for much longer than two years. It would mean that I would need to hire someone, and I would retrain them and they would work for me for those two years. That would not be a hardship for me. That would be something that I’d be willing to do. If I had the same employee and they needed the time — 52 weeks, which is a year and one month — 13 months — would not be a hardship for me to cover.

I think what we’re talking about is the opportunity for people to take the time to heal. In cases where the child is missing and not found dead at that point — we’re talking about enough time that if the parent needs to go and pursue lines of investigation; if they need to be available; if they aren’t able to be present, mentally and physically, at a job — it means they need more of a cushion to lean back on. It’s talking about time — the time that it takes to get over something like this, or to work through this, or to try to actually be able to function after. We’re talking about time. I don’t think that as a small business owner, I would resent giving someone that time that they needed.

So I'm interested in knowing what options were given when the consultation happened. I'm wondering if all the options were given — if this is what the federal government was doing and this is what we were proposing. How did we come up with these original numbers?

So what we're proposing is that we follow what the federal jurisdiction has stated — from six months to 104 weeks. I support these amendments.

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** I'd like to ask all members to join me in welcoming Ramesh Ferris to the gallery. He is, of course, no stranger to Yukoners for his advocacy of combating polio and his Cycle to Walk journey. I'd like to ask all members to join me in welcoming him today.

*Applause*

**Ms. Hanson:** I believe that Mr. Ferris is accompanied by a group of Rotarians from Uruguay, South America, so I would say *bienvenido* — I can't say it in Portuguese.

*Applause*

**Chair:** Is there any further debate on the amendment, please?

**Ms. Stick:** I just have a quick comment to make at the end of all of this. The minister was very clear that they went out to consultation with municipalities, with business, with First Nations on the benefits. They did not go out to consultation on the leave, but we'll pass these amendments and then they'll go out to consultation. Does that make sense? I don't think so. That's not consultation; that's presenting a done deal. "Here it is. We passed this." It's not the same. The benefits are the federal benefits. There is the program; there is the one where they get the benefits, where they're entitled to money and grants and support from the federal government. There it is; it's in the federal legislation.

So this is about leave without pay.

We're going to pass this and then we're going to go out to consultation? It makes no sense. We pass the act and then go out to consultation? That's what is being proposed? It doesn't make sense.

The other piece of this that I would like to say is that, yes, consultation is good. I know there are members across the way who think that this is going to be a real hardship for businesses. I know lots of business owners in the Yukon; I am one. There may be an unscrupulous employer out there — there may be, but I think you'd be pretty hard-pressed to find one who wouldn't support a family in that situation and support these amendments.

The Premier talked about the cost to the small business owner. Well, it's a cost every time somebody quits. We have to rehire and retrain. Yes, there is that cost; it's part of the cost of doing business. It's what we do. If a person has to take a year or two years off of their job because their child has died under criminal circumstances or is missing, yes, we then we hire somebody and we retrain.

If somebody got sick — it's not even in here, but there is an example. It's a cost of doing business. It's the way it is. So to suggest that we consult after — I mean, yes, go for it, but it doesn't make sense. That's not what this is about.

The federal benefits are there. Yes, Yukoners need to be eligible for those. It's great that they can apply. This is a good act if it would only come up to federal standards at a minimum. I would be happy with that; I would be thrilled if we could pass that today. Why do we have to be on the bottom of the pile on this one? We are not the third, we are the fourth jurisdiction to introduce this. Want some reading? Go and read what Manitoba passed already. Go see what Ontario has or what Nova Scotia is suggesting. It is more than what we are and, in some cases, more than what the feds are.

Let's just get the — I remembered my other thought: we can't make amendments to legislation in the Legislature. Somebody said that; somebody said this isn't the place. This is exactly the place. That's what debate is about; that's why we bring legislation to this Legislature because sometimes it's not right and sometimes we need to make amendments to legislation that is presented in this House. Does it happen often? Probably not with a majority government, but it does happen, and it should happen if it's the right thing. This is the right thing; this is not — this is just the right thing. Let's do it; let's do the right thing for parents in this territory. It's pretty straightforward. Thank you.

**Mr. Elias:** Just listening to the debate here and the topic on the sensitive issue with regard to these sections within the *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, surely the government, when they went out to consultation, took detailed and precise consultative notes on each section with regard to the factions of Yukoners that they did consult with. I think if the government was willing to table those on each section, which I'm sure that they have, it would give some members some comfort here to say that yes, we did meet with these factions of our Yukon society and here's what they said with regard to these sections. If the government has those, I think it would benefit all if they tabled them.

**Chair:** Is there any further debate on the amendment?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I don't want to be repetitive here again, but I do appreciate the comments from all members and I do respect what everyone has had to say here today, and I also respect what our government has done here to date on this particular bill. As I mentioned, it's all about providing assistance to families in need or crisis and that's why it's so important that we pass this bill, whether or not the members opposite support it or not.

I go back to how it was about matching the benefit period and not matching the *Canada Labour Code*. I go back to that.

When we went out for consultation, it was about specifically enabling the 35 weeks of benefits for a parent of a murdered or missing child and then also being able to access the benefit of the federal social development — or I should say the program that falls under the *Department of Social Development Act* that also provides that financial assistance. It also provides the benefit of having up to 37 weeks of benefits for a parent of

a critically ill child. It's about providing that benefit. I can't say that enough.

Passing this bill effectively means that employees can take leave to access the benefits. That's what we're committed to doing here. We've also committed to going out — based on the suggestions of the members opposite and we support those suggestions going forward — to have consultation on those specific provisions that the members opposite have made with respect to leave, something that was not consulted on before.

I do appreciate the comments that have been going around the Assembly here today, but we have committed to doing just that and we will do that. We look forward to the outcome of that and making changes based on the outcome of those consultations.

**Chair:** Is there any further debate on the amendment? Does the amendment carry?

**Some Hon. Members:** Division.

### Count

**Chair:** Count has been called.

### Bells

**Chair:** All those in favour of the amendment please rise.

*Members rise*

**Chair:** Would all those opposed to the amendment please rise?

*Members rise*

**Chair:** The results are seven yea, eight nay. The amendment is defeated.

*Amendment to Bill No. 54 negatived*

*Clause 4 agreed to*

*On Clause 5*

*Clause 5 agreed to*

*On Clause 6*

*Clause 6 agreed to*

*On Title*

*Title agreed to*

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I move that Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be reported without amendment.

**Chair:** It has been moved by Ms. Taylor that Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, be reported without amendment.

*Motion agreed to*

**Chair:** We are going to carry on with line-by-line debate in Bill No. 10, Vote 51, Community Services.

Committee of the Whole will recess for 15 minutes.

### Recess

**Chair:** Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

### Bill No. 10: *First Appropriation Act, 2013-14* — continued

**Chair:** We're resuming debate on Bill 10, Vote 51, in Community Services, page 6-9, Protective Services.

#### Department of Community Services — continued

##### *On Protective Services* — continued

##### *On Capital Expenditures* — continued

##### *On Fire Marshal — Fire Protection* — continued

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As I was saying, I believe it was the day before yesterday, these investments are really in support of our Fire Marshal's Office, in support of fire protection across the territory, which will have a direct benefit to municipal fire departments, as well as volunteer fire departments. As I mentioned, this line item pertains to a mobile fire training facility, which will be of great benefit to the territory. I understand it will be here later on this summer, and it will be travelling to all of the communities and will serve as a very hands-on tool and a safe mechanism for delivering firefighter training. Of course, it also provides dollars for ongoing fleet repair and certification of older equipment that we have.

Pursuant to Occupational Health and Safety standards, there are enhanced stringent requirements for turnout gear, for certification and for maintaining our fleet in each of our fire departments. This line item is really very much in support of those requirements going forward. That is reflective of this government's commitment to ensuring that our firefighters do have the proper equipment, that they have the training and that they have the infrastructure needed to do their job safely and effectively.

**Chair:** Is there any further debate on fire protection?

*Fire Marshal — Fire Protection in the amount of \$1,762,000 agreed to*

*On Fire Marshal — Prior Years' Projects*

*Fire Marshal — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Fire Management — Fire Management*

*Fire Management — Fire Management in the amount of \$815,000 agreed to*

*On Emergency Medical Services — Emergency Medical Services*

**Ms. Hanson:** Could we get an explanation of the increase there, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This \$572,000 is in support of continuation of supporting our emergency responders, in particular for rural operations equipment, including Whitehorse operations equipment. This is also in support of costs associated with purchasing two new ambulances and in support of integrated dispatch as well.

*Emergency Medical Services — Emergency Medical Services in the amount of \$572,000 agreed to*

*On Emergency Medical Services — Prior Years' Projects*

*Emergency Medical Services — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*Protective Services Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$6,830,000 agreed to*

*Protective Services Total Expenditures in the amount of \$33,318,000 agreed to*

*On Community Development*

*On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures*

*On Program Administration*

*Program Administration in the amount of \$653,000 agreed to*

*On Sport and Recreation*

**Mr. Silver:** Could I get a breakdown on that line item, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I'm very pleased to talk about sport and recreation.

This government has paid a lot of attention to this particular area. This line refers to \$623,000 for personnel — salaries, wages, benefits — and it also includes an additional \$248,000 in support of travel within the territory and Outside — honoraria, contract services, insurance, and the list goes on. We also have the remainder for transfer payments — so, just over \$2.6 million for transfer payments, again, in support of contributions to recreation sport groups, including the Volunteer Bureau, Yukon recreation groups, local authorities, sport governing bodies, Sport Yukon core funding, Special Olympics, Canada Senior Games, elite athlete coaching officials, Yukon Aboriginal Sport Circle and Sport for Life. It's also going toward support of Canada Summer Games, contribution to Team Yukon participation coming up in Quebec, as I seem to recall. It includes investments in Yukon's active living strategy and of course members may recall the announcement we made in collaboration with Health and Social Services in support of after-school programs to be made available throughout the territory and in support of enhancing participation in sport and recreation from the playground to the podium.

We're very pleased and proud to come through with Yukon's renewed active living strategy and in support of the principles of that strategy.

It also includes dollars for the bilateral agreement we have with the federal government, which we were pleased to announce at the Canada Games Centre for renewal of the three-year funding agreement in support of sporting events and recreation and other smaller contributions. It's very meaningful dollars and dollars that, by the way, are complemented with hundreds of hours of volunteer time.

*Sport and Recreation in the amount of \$3,491,000 agreed to*

*On Property Assessment and Taxation*

*Property Assessment and Taxation in the amount of \$4,464,000 agreed to*

*On Community Affairs*

*Community Affairs in the amount of \$24,904,000 agreed to*

*On Public Libraries*

*Public Libraries in the amount of \$2,001,000 agreed to*

*On Community Operations*

*Community Operations in the amount of \$5,346,000 agreed to*

*Community Development Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$40,859,000 agreed to*

*On Capital Expenditures*

*On Sport and Recreation — Recreation/Community Centres — Various*

**Ms. Hanson:** Could I get a breakdown there?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is just for some repairs to existing recreation facilities in unincorporated Yukon.

**Ms. Hanson:** Could I get which communities they are?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** It's 12 unincorporated communities. I don't have the complete list, but I'm sure I could send that information over to the member opposite.

**Ms. Hanson:** That would be appreciated. Thank you.

*Sport and Recreation — Recreation/Community Centres — Various in the amount of \$110,000 agreed to*

*On Sport and Recreation — Dawson City Recreation Centre*

**Mr. Silver:** Could I get a breakdown of that number, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As the MLA for Klondike is aware, these dollars are a continuation of the funding that was initially provided a number of years ago, in support of upgrades and repairs to the Dawson City recreation centre funding.

It was really at the request of the City of Dawson to carry forward with that agreement. The agreement was to expire, I believe, at the end of March and we were very pleased to be able to provide the additional dollars to that to carry out our commitment of the \$4-million contribution agreement.

In terms of a go-forward basis, as I mentioned the other day in Question Period, there is an oversight committee that is comprised of representatives from the Department of Community Services as well as the City of Dawson to come up with an annual workplan. I don't have that annual workplan before me, but it is just to prioritize what is to be done to the current facility. Unfortunately, I don't have that workplan in front of me.

**Chair:** Is there any further debate on the Dawson City recreation centre?

*Sport and Recreation — Dawson City Recreation Centre in the amount of \$500,000 agreed to*

*On Sport and Recreation — Ross River Recreation Centre*

**Mr. Silver:** Can I get a breakdown of that number as well, please? Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is for a new Ross River recreation centre, something that our government committed to and something that we are carrying forward with, and these dollars will continue this project to its completion by the end of the year, as I understand. The tender was awarded to Ketz Pacific Construction back in November. Since then, we have been doing finalizing on the design/build approach to this project. As I understand, as we stand here, that mobilization at the site is underway and in fact they will be taking down what is currently on the site and gearing up for the actual construction of the facility. This is something that has long been sought after by the community of Ross River since unfortunately it was burned to the ground, so this is going forward with that project.

*Sport and Recreation — Ross River Recreation Centre in the amount of \$6,000,000 agreed to*

*On Sport and Recreation — Prior Years' Projects*

*Sport and Recreation — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Property Assessment and Taxation — Rural Electrification and Telephone Program*

**Ms. Stick:** I wondered if I could have an explanation of why this number seems to just continually gradually decrease. What is the reason for that? Is it because there are fewer people applying for this or we're only bringing it up to this?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** In response to the member opposite, as I understand it, it is in direct response to demand.

*Property Assessment and Taxation — Rural Electrification and Telephone Program in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to*  
*On Property Assessment and Taxation — Domestic Well Program*

*Property Assessment and Taxation — Domestic Well Program in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to*

*On Public Libraries — Community Library Equipment*

**Ms. Hanson:** Could I get a breakdown as to the rationale for this amount? This is capital, so does this represent community library computers — PCs? And is there a decrease in the priority being placed on keeping those renewed?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** The line item for \$10,000 refers to equipment and furniture — couches, could be computers, et cetera. The decrease — I don't have an explanation for that decrease here, but one could assume that it is in direct relation to Whitehorse Public Library not needing as much investment as we have needed in previous years.

*Public Libraries — Community Library Equipment in the amount of \$10,000 agreed to*

*On Community Operations — Water and Sewer Mains*

*Community Operations — Water and Sewer Mains in the amount of \$75,000 agreed to*

*On Community Operations — Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade*

**Ms. White:** Can I get a breakdown on that number, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is really improvements to roads in various communities throughout the territory. That includes emergencies as they may arise over the course of the year, along with continual upgrades in unincorporated areas that may arise from time to time. This is in addition to the investments being made under Building Canada as well.

**Ms. White:** Last year, the minister said that Range Road, between the uphill from near Whistle Bend to the lights at Mountain View, would be getting repaired. Is that in that selection of the \$100,000? No? Okay.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** My apologies. No, it is not part of this particular line item. It would be under the Building Canada improvements.

*Community Operations — Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to*

*On Community Operations — Gas Tax Funded Projects*

**Ms. Hanson:** Could we get a breakdown, a list of the gas tax funded projects please? Or is that not available?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Madam Chair, I don't have that information available, but what I can say is that this funding has been utilized by municipalities and unincorporated communi-

ties. This particular line item is actually in support of unincorporated communities so this would be in addition to gas tax funding made available through First Nation governments and municipal governments as well. It's for a whole variety of different initiatives.

**Ms. Hanson:** Could I get an undertaking then, please, Madam Chair, to have a list provided through a legislative return or other means?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Yes, we'll endeavour to do that.

*Community Operations — Gas Tax Funded Projects in the amount of \$1,865,000 agreed to*

*On Community Operations — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Operations — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*Community Development Capital Expenditures in the amount \$10,060,000 agreed to*

*Community Development Total Expenditures in the amount of \$50,919,000 agreed to*

*On Consumer Services and Infrastructure Development*

**Chair:** Moving on to page 6-21, Consumer Services and Infrastructure Development. Is there any debate?

*On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures*

*On Program Administration*

*Program Administration in the amount of \$330,000 agreed to*

*On Board and Council*

*Board and Council in the amount of \$194,000 agreed to*

*On Consumer Services*

*Consumer Services in the amount of \$728,000 agreed to*

*On Corporate Affairs*

*Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$617,000 agreed to*

*On Building Safety*

**Ms. Hanson:** Could I get an explanation for this? It appears this is either flat-lined and so the actual descriptor — an explanation, please.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As I understand this, it is attributed to personnel changes and also, I believe, some fleet vehicle savings. That is offset to a degree by some fuel increases and long-term disability.

*Building Safety in the amount of \$1,389,000 agreed to*

*On Employment Standards and Residential Tenancy Office*

**Ms. White:** Can I please get a breakdown on this number?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This line item makes reference to the addition of the residential tenancy office, by and large, to the tune of about \$323,000. Of course, it is a key component of the act that was assented to here last December. As I mentioned earlier, we're taking the steps to get the office up and running. We do have a director who has been hired. One of his tasks will be to fully staff the office and to also proceed with draft regulations, as well as come up with public education materials and so forth — once those have been completed as well.

I have position reclassifications. We have long-term disability increases throughout the line item as well. Again, it includes the director and seven staff total under this particular line item and the associated travel and contracts and program materials in support of this office.

**Ms. White:** In the amount that the minister just spoke of, the \$320,000, can I get a more complete breakdown of what that is for the residential tenancy office?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** It's of course in support of public education materials.

It's in support of the director and it's also inclusive of other staff in support of the office, inclusive of a couple of officers to administer the act and also for administration support.

**Ms. White:** Can I get the number of FTEs there? Can I have a tentative opening date for that office, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As I just mentioned, I believe the opening of the office — we're just staffing it as we speak here right now. We have just hired a director and the director is to get the office up and running. That means hiring officers, and it also means coming up with education materials and working on the draft regulations to go out for consultation. There's a lot of work to be completed yet. We're hoping that by the fall — probably late fall — we'll have this office fully up and running. We look forward to the outcome of that work.

*Employment Standards and Residential Tenancy Office in the amount of \$958,000 agreed to*

*Consumer Services and Infrastructure Development Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$4,216,000 agreed to*

**On Capital Expenditures**

*On Community Infrastructure — Project Management*

*Community Infrastructure — Project Management in the amount of \$955,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Infrastructure Major Repairs and Improvements — Kwanlin Dun First Nation Site Soil Remediation*

*Community Infrastructure — Infrastructure Major Repairs and Improvements — Kwanlin Dun First Nation Site Soil Remediation in the amount of \$750,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Water and Sewer Mains — Kwanlin Dun First Nation Water and Sewer Installation*

**Ms. White:** Can we get the location where that work is happening, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Madam Chair, this is what we had talked about two days ago, but to go over that again, it is for soil remediation on their specific property along the Whitehorse waterfront.

It is a specific parcel of land. I think I quoted it the other day. I'm sure the member opposite could take a look at that reference. Of course, it also contains water and sewer installation as part of the YACA agreement with KDFN.

*Community Infrastructure — Water and Sewer Mains — Kwanlin Dun First Nation Water and Sewer Installation in the amount of \$650,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Water and Sewer Mains — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Water and Sewer Mains — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*Community Infrastructure — On Flood/Erosion Control*

**Ms. Hanson:** May I get a breakdown, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Well, this is funding of course in support of erosion control and funding to remediate some of the damage that has been caused in past flooding events in areas such as Upper Liard and Mayo in particular, and of course as well as to explore those long-term solutions as we talked about the other day in communities such as the community of Mayo. So there is work to be done on that front, but there are dollars in support of this initiative, which is to really support planning and long-term solutions as well.

*Community Infrastructure — Flood/Erosion Control in the amount of \$750,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade — Hamilton Boulevard*

**Ms. White:** Understanding that this is to rework the frost heave that has happened; can the minister tell us to date what amount has been spent on Hamilton Boulevard?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** I don't have the complete cost estimates for the repair, but there have been some temporary repairs until we actually are able to determine whether or not it is the final settlement of the particular road. As I mentioned the other day, it is to be attributed to an ice wedge that is situated underneath the roadbed that continues to create those bumps that we currently experience with the boulevard. Until such time as that is settled, then we will complete those repairs, but we continue to work with the City of Whitehorse on ongoing monitoring of the particular project itself.

*Community Infrastructure — Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade — Hamilton Boulevard in the amount of \$230,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects — Administration*

*Community Infrastructure — Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects — Administration in the amount of \$125,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Beaver Creek — Road Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Beaver Creek — Road Upgrades in the amount of \$692,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Burwash — Grave and Sedata Roads Improvements*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Burwash — Grave and Sedata Roads Improvements in the amount of \$1,046,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Burwash — Well Head Protection*

**Ms. White:** Can I get a breakdown on that number, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** Of course, we're working with the Kluane First Nation to look at the feasibility of a potential potable water source. Prior costs also include design, drilling of some test wells and looking at geothermal.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Burwash — Well Head Protection in the amount of \$836,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Carcross — Water Treatment System Upgrade*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Carcross — Water Treatment System Upgrade in the amount of \$140,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Carmacks — Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation Geothermal Energy Development*

**Ms. Hanson:** Madam Chair, could we just get a brief description here? Is this a feasibility study? Is this the planning stages? Is this a multi-year project? Whatever that might help to clarify.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** It is for developing a geo-exchange system for the community area.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Carmacks — Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation Geothermal Energy Development in the amount of \$250,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Dawson City — Sewage Treatment and District Heating*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Dawson City — Sewage Treatment and District Heating in the amount of \$5,525,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Dawson City — Water Study*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Dawson City — Water Study in the amount of \$75,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Dawson City — Rock Creek Water Supply Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Dawson City — Rock Creek Water Supply Upgrades in the amount of \$866,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Faro — Water and Sewer Pipe Replacement*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Faro — Water and Sewer Pipe Replacement in the amount of \$1,965,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Faro — Pumphouse*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Faro — Pumphouse in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Haines Junction — Water Reservoir and Pump System*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Haines Junction — Water Reservoir and Pump System in the amount of \$4,191,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Mayo — Water, Sewer and Road Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Mayo — Water, Sewer and Road Upgrades in the amount of \$2,675,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Mayo — New Community Well and Treatment*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Mayo — New Community Well and Treatment in the amount of \$531,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Old Crow — Road Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Old Crow — Road Upgrades in the amount of \$38,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Old Crow — Solid Waste Facility Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Old Crow — Solid Waste Facility Upgrades in the amount of \$19,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Old Crow — Water Supply Upgrade*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Old Crow — Water Supply Upgrade in the amount of \$225,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Pelly Crossing — Selkirk Public Works Shop*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Pelly Crossing — Selkirk Public Works Shop in the amount of \$1,200,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Pelly Crossing — Road Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Pelly Crossing — Road Upgrades in the amount of \$435,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Ross River — Arsenic Treatment and Systems Upgrade*

**Ms. White:** We've referred to it before in this House. Would the Building Canada fund be something that would be accessed to repair the sewage pit at one time? Would this be the right line for it at some future point?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As I said the other day, we are certainly working closely with the community, Ross River Dena Council, and the Government of Canada on a broad range of options to address waste water when it comes to the community of Ross River.

As the member opposite may know, Building Canada is winding down as it comes to completion next year in 2014. We will be working very closely with the federal government from here on out on a new iteration of the Building Canada program. Those details have yet to be forthcoming as of yet.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Ross River — Arsenic Treatment and Systems Upgrade in the amount of \$710,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Ross River — Public Works Building*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Ross River — Public Works Building in the amount of \$248,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Tagish — Taku Subdivision Fill Point*

**Ms. Stick:** Could we just get an explanation, please, of the Taku subdivision fill point?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is really to go toward the completion of a design and addressing the pumphouse and the fill point. This is something that has been sought after by the community for some time.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Tagish — Taku Subdivision Fill Point in the amount of \$846,000 cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Road and Drainage Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Road and Drainage Upgrades in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Arsenic Treatment*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Arsenic Treatment in the amount of \$336,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Wastewater System Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Wastewater System Upgrades in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Tlingit Council Road Upgrades*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Tlingit Council Road Upgrades in the amount of \$495,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Watson Lake — Water and Sewer Pipe Replacement and Wet Well*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Watson Lake — Water and Sewer Pipe Replacement and Wet Well in the amount of \$1,823,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Asphalt Overlay*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Asphalt Overlay in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Deep Creek Water Treatment Plant*

**Ms. Stick:** Is this a new water source or a new water plant that we're looking at for Deep Creek?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is going toward a new water treatment plant for the Deep Creek area and the Horse Creek community. I would be remiss if I didn't mention that.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Deep Creek Water Treatment Plant in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Mendenhall Community Water Supply*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Mendenhall Community Water Supply in the amount of \$1,000,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Hospital Road/Lewes Boulevard Upgrade*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Hospital Road/Lewes Boulevard Upgrade in the amount of \$275,000 cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Range Road Upgrade*

**Ms. White:** This was the spot I was looking for before. Can I please get a breakdown of where on Range Road that will be and anything else that might be relevant to that breakdown?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is actually in support of an agreement that we have in place with the City of Whitehorse, so as I understand, this project is really to go hand in hand with the upgrades that the City of Whitehorse is working on as well to upgrade Range Road in support of the new development. I do not have the particular area as to where that is, but I could endeavour to get that, but it is year one of a two-year contribution agreement with the City of Whitehorse.

**Ms. White:** I thank the minister for that answer and for endeavouring to get the information.

Does the minister know if this will include widening the road as well as repaving — something that is badly in need of repavement.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As one can appreciate, I don't have that level of detail right at my fingertips here — but again, working very closely with the City of Whitehorse to determine the actual scope of the project.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Range Road Upgrade in the amount of \$1,100,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Robert Campbell Bridge Widening*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Robert Campbell Bridge Widening in the amount of \$825,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Materials Recycle/Sorting Facility*

**Ms. Stick:** I understand that some of the facilities where they had compression — I don't know what you call them, but it's to compress cardboard and that — there were a number of issues at cold temperatures where they didn't work and they were less than adequate.

I just wondered if any of this money will be looking at replacing or repairing or making these pieces of equipment more efficient.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** The quick answer is no in response to the member opposite's earlier question. In fact, I'm pleased to report that all of those deficiencies have been resolved — of course, the ones that have been made reference to. Again, this



and further line items reflect the ongoing contributions of the Government of Yukon, in support of waste management improvements. Of course, that comes as a direct result of going to no-burn and enhancing our ability to divert waste from reaching our landfills in all of our communities.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Materials Recycle/Sorting Facility in the amount of \$760,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Transfer Stations, Recycle Depots, Composting/Chipping Equipment*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Transfer Stations, Recycle Depots, Composting/Chipping Equipment in the amount of \$944,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Solid Waste Management System*

**Ms. Stick:** Could I just get a breakdown of that, Madam Chair, please?

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is just ongoing upgrades to equipment and how we deliver transfer stations throughout the territory and also working with our community governments to help them with upgrades.

**Ms. Stick:** The minister across the way mentioned that this was ongoing, but if we look across, we see that there have been zero amounts allocated in previous years, so that's why I asked the question. This is a new line that has not received funding in the past.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This is really for upgrading equipment that we have in each of our respective sites across the territory and there are, I believe, just under 20 sites — and also working in collaboration with our community governments.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Solid Waste Management System in the amount of \$2,000,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Planning and Administration*

**Ms. Hanson:** I would like an explanation, a breakdown, of what this is because I've been looking as we've gone through all of the capital listings so far and I have not heard or seen anywhere where I can pin the repairs and upgrading to the Ross River bridge that the minister indicated in the House earlier this sitting would be undertaken and the work was either being planned — so I'm hoping that for this planning and administration line she will say to me that that is in fact what this is for, but it is in fact a significant increase, so I'd like to have the breakdown please, Madam Chair.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** As I mentioned in Question Period not long ago, we are looking at all the options in terms of replacement and what that may look like.

So while we don't have a finite number to be sure, we are going forward with a request to Building Canada in the last iteration of the annual capital plan going forward to the Government of Canada.

**Mr. Tredger:** Could I get a breakdown of the planning and administration line? I see that in the forecasted estimate there is quite a discrepancy — just an explanation there.

**Hon. Ms. Taylor:** This fund is for administration and also for scoping design of future projects, as well, on waste management initiatives. Also, of course, it is just a continuation of some of the work that we have been working on in previous recent years with community governments throughout the unincorporated communities as well.

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Planning and Administration in the amount of \$4,964,000 agreed to*

*On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Community Infrastructure — Prior Years' Projects*

*Community Infrastructure — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

*On Land Development — Land Assessment/Planning*

*Land Development — Land Assessment/Planning in the amount of \$700,000 agreed to*

*On Land Development — Industrial*

*Land Development — Industrial in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to*

*On Land Development — Residential*

*Land Development — Residential in the amount of \$29,890,000 agreed to*

*On Land Development — Prior Years' Projects*

*Land Development — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared*

**Consumer Services and Infrastructure Development Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$75,585,000 agreed to**

**Consumer Services and Infrastructure Development Total Expenditures in the amount of \$79,801,000 agreed to**

*On Revenues*

*Revenues cleared*

*On Government Transfers*

*Government Transfers cleared*

*On Changes in Tangible Capital Assets and Amortization*

*Changes in Tangible Capital Assets and Amortization cleared*

*On Restricted Funds*

*Restricted Funds cleared*

**Department of Community Services agreed to**

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** Madam Chair, I move that the Chair report progress on Bill No. 10.

**Chair:** It has been moved by Mr. Cathers that the Chair report progress on Bill No. 10.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Cathers:** Madam Chair, I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

**Chair:** It has been moved by Mr. Cathers 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 Chair of Committee of the Whole?

**Chair's report**

**Ms. McLeod:** Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 54, entitled *Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act*, and directed me to report the bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole has also considered Bill No. 10, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2013-14*, and directed me to report progress.

**Speaker:** You've heard the report from the Chair of Committee of the Whole.

Are you agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Speaker:** I declare the report carried.

As the hour is 5:30, this House stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m. Monday.

*The House adjourned at 5:31 p.m.*

**The following documents were filed April 25, 2013:**

33-1-52

"Yukon Men" television show: letter (dated October 4, 2012) to Bruce Glawson, Executive Producer, Discovery Channel Canada from Currie Dixon, Minister of Environment (Dixon)

33-1-53

"Yukon Men" television show: letter (dated October 29, 2012) to Currie Dixon, Minister of Environment, from Paul Lewis, President and General Manager, Discovery Networks (Dixon)