



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 249

1st Session

33rd Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, December 15, 2015 — 1:00 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable David Laxton

YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

SPEAKER — Hon. David Laxton, MLA, Porter Creek Centre

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Patti McLeod, MLA, Watson Lake

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME CONSTITUENCY PORTFOLIO

Hon. Darrell Pasloski	Mountainview	Premier Minister responsible for Finance; Executive Council Office
Hon. Elaine Taylor	Whitehorse West	Deputy Premier Minister responsible for Tourism and Culture; Women's Directorate; French Language Services Directorate
Hon. Brad Cathers	Lake Laberge	Minister responsible for Justice; Yukon Development Corporation/ Yukon Energy Corporation
Hon. Doug Graham	Porter Creek North	Minister responsible for Education
Hon. Scott Kent	Riverdale North	Minister responsible for Energy, Mines and Resources; Highways and Public Works
Hon. Currie Dixon	Copperbelt North	Minister responsible for Community Services; Public Service Commission
Hon. Wade Istchenko	Kluane	Minister responsible for Environment
Hon. Mike Nixon	Porter Creek South	Minister responsible for Health and Social Services; Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board
Hon. Stacey Hassard	Pelly-Nisutlin	Minister responsible for Economic Development; Yukon Housing Corporation; Yukon Liquor Corporation

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

Yukon Party

Darius Elias	Government House Leader Vuntut Gwitchin
Hon. David Laxton	Porter Creek Centre
Patti McLeod	Watson Lake

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Elizabeth Hanson	Leader of the Official Opposition Whitehorse Centre
Jan Stick	Official Opposition House Leader Riverdale South
Kevin Barr	Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes
Lois Moorcroft	Copperbelt South
Jim Tredger	Mayo-Tatchun
Kate White	Takhini-Kopper King

Liberal Party

Sandy Silver	Leader of the Third Party Klondike
---------------------	---------------------------------------

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Floyd McCormick
Deputy Clerk	Linda Kolody
Clerk of Committees	Allison Lloyd
Sergeant-at-Arms	Rudy Couture
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	Doris McLean
Hansard Administrator	Deana Lemke

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Tuesday, December 15, 2015 — 1:00 p.m.**

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: We will now proceed with the Order Paper.
Tributes.
Introduction of visitors.
Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Ms. Stick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have for tabling the document from August 2015 called, Human Rights and Poverty Reduction Strategies by Canada Without Poverty.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I was fixated on the Grinch over there.

I have for tabling the Yukon Heritage Resources Board annual report for 2014-15. I also have for tabling the Yukon Geographical Place Names Board annual report for 2014-15 as well as the Yukon Arts Centre Corporation financial statements.

Speaker: Are there any reports of committees?
Petitions.

PETITIONS

Petition No. 23 – response

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to respond to Petition No. 23 of the First Session of the 33rd Legislative Assembly that was tabled in this House on December 9, 2015. I would like to begin by thanking all of those members of the public who signed the petition and the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes for tabling it.

The topic of this petition was very similar to the topic of a motion brought forward on opposition business day last Wednesday — that being the proposed establishment of National Aboriginal Day as a territorial statutory holiday. I should note that, after amendment, that motion passed this House unanimously.

In response to this petition, I would like to reiterate some of what I said last Wednesday. National Aboriginal Day is a Canada-wide event that recognizes and celebrates the unique heritage, diverse cultures, languages and outstanding achievements of aboriginal people across Canada. The Government of Yukon certainly supports this recognition and celebration and supports the activities and events surrounding National Aboriginal Day in Yukon that focus on the contributions, culture and languages of Yukon First Nations.

We do this particularly on June 21 every year, but those sentiments underpin much of what we do throughout the entire year. While we are interested in continuing this

conversation about the proposed establishment of National Aboriginal Day as a statutory holiday, there is more work that needs to be done.

As supported in last week's motion, we believe that consultation with Yukon First Nations, as well as affected stakeholders, such as employers and employees, is warranted. It will be these groups whose livelihoods are affected by this decision and it is only fair that they be consulted in the decision-making process. The Yukon government will move forward with such consultations in the new year.

I would like to again thank the members of the public who voiced their support for this petition and look forward to their continued participation, as we see this conversation continue.

Speaker: Are there any petitions to be presented?
Are there any bills to be introduced?
Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to ensure that trials of methods to enhance lake trout populations:

- (1) are in compliance with current departmental policies; and
- (2) fully engage Department of Environment fisheries staff.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to adopt universal design standards appropriate for Yukon campgrounds, conduct accessibility audits and build accessible campsites and facilities as part of planned upgrades to Wolf Creek, Marsh Lake, Teslin and Conrad campgrounds before the 2016 summer season.

Mr. Tredger: I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to publicly release the regulatory amendments it proposes to zone areas to regulate GMOs as a discretionary use, if farmers and citizens within that area decide that is how they want to proceed.

Mr. Silver: I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to do a better job working with municipal governments instead of criticizing them from the sidelines through social media when a decision is made that it does not like.

Speaker: Is there a statement by a minister?
This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Economic outlook

Ms. Moorcroft: Mr. Speaker, the Premier used to stand in this House and speak about the Yukon's enviable position in Canada when it came to our economic performance. Now, as the Yukon enters a third consecutive year of economic decline, his silence is deafening.

Yukon's real GDP is expected to fall six percent this year despite record levels of federal transfers to the territory. This government has overseen a steep drop in Yukon's mining investment and the closure of two out of three operating mines in Yukon, yet the Premier keeps deflecting responsibility, pointing to commodity prices. What he fails to explain is why only Yukon has seen two, and soon three, years of economic decline.

Mr. Speaker, when will the Premier stand up and take responsibility for Yukon's poor economic performance?

Hon. Mr. Hassard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course as I have said in this House on numerous occasions, it is no secret that the Yukon is experiencing challenging times economically. Of course, this is due in particular to the global downturn in the mineral markets. We know that, Mr. Speaker. Because of that, this government has continued to make investments — investments in infrastructure; investments in education; and investments through Energy, Mines and Resources in mine licensing improvements.

This government continuously works on ways so that when the world markets turn around, the Yukon will be in a great place.

We do this work so that the people of the Yukon can continue to enjoy the prosperity that they have.

Ms. Moorcroft: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has let Yukon down when it comes to providing leadership in tough economic times. The Premier keeps talking about a record capital budget to stimulate growth during the downtime, but what he fails to acknowledge is that when local businesses don't get contracts, Yukoners lose out.

The facts show that the government's big capital budgets aren't having the effect they intend. Take the business incentive program. Although last year's capital budget was nearly 40-percent larger than it was in 2007, the benefits provided through BIP were half of the value provided then. This lack of support for local businesses contributes to making Yukon the only jurisdiction in Canada posting two years of economic decline.

Mr. Speaker, can the government explain why the business incentive program is only being used half as much as it was seven years ago?

Hon. Mr. Kent: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll respond on some of the local contracting opportunities that we've seen over the past number of years.

I've said before during this current Sitting — and it's worth repeating — that 14 of the last 15 major capital projects delivered through Highways and Public Works have been delivered by local general contractors. The 15th of course is F.H. Collins, and that project was valued at approximately \$34 million; 75 percent of the labour on that project was delivered

by Yukoners; and we had a number of Yukon subcontractors work on that project as well.

Mr. Speaker, in the 2015-16 fiscal year, there are 22 major work projects being delivered by Highways and Public Works' Property Management. Many of those are delivered as well by local companies. One only needs to look at some of the bids that have closed recently — the Salvation Army being delivered by a local company; Carcross fire hall being delivered by a local company when it gets underway next year; the St. Elias Residence — a YACA agreement with the Kwanlin Dün First Nation — being delivered by a local company.

So, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the facts presented by the New Democrats when it comes to local opportunities with respect to our projects are incorrect.

Ms. Moorcroft: Mr. Speaker, the government talks a big game about supporting local business, but their words don't reflect the reality on the ground. Contrary to what they assert, this government is doing a poor job to support Yukon businesses and they fail to enforce Yukon's labour standards. The private sector is frustrated. This is not surprising, considering this government's unilateral choice to remove local benefit provisions from our procurement directive in 2013 and their decision not to speak up for Yukon businesses, as the *Agreement on Internal Trade* is being reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, when will this government recognize the value and benefit of Yukon businesses and take meaningful steps to support them by implementing local procurement benefits like the ones they removed in 2013?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Mr. Speaker, certainly this government — as we pause on the last day of this session — reflects on what we've accomplished. Certainly as we look at our platform, Mr. Speaker, we see that we have delivered on almost all of those commitments; either they have been completed or are ongoing.

We have short-term priorities, such as investing in infrastructure; improving our permitting and licensing processes; improving our quality of life by investing in recreational facilities; and we are focused on First Nation partnerships. But also, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that has long-term vision, unlike the parties on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, where we continue to say that we feel that this territory should become a net contributor to this country; that we have a plan for education and for our youth; and we have a plan for abundant renewable energy for this territory.

We're also doing things such as — 13 times since the Yukon Party came in to power, we have opened up the *Income Tax Act* — 13 times, Mr. Speaker — to provide relief for Yukoners and Yukon businesses.

Question re: Food security

Mr. Tredger: Food security is when people have physical and economic access to enough safe and nutritious food to support an active and healthy life.

In 2012, Yukon had the third-highest rate of food insecurity in the country. In 2015, Whitehorse has the fastest growing food prices in the country, but there is good news.

More and more farmers are growing nutritious food in Yukon. This government's draft local food strategy outlines many ways to address food insecurity, including a farmers market coupon program for low-income people.

Will this government support a farmers market coupon program in communities across this territory?

Hon. Mr. Kent: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite is correct. We have developed a draft Yukon local food strategy. I was able to speak to some of the commitments at the North of 60 agriculture banquet that was held recently here in Whitehorse. There are a number of objectives for this policy, including creating initiatives that enhance competition, resiliency and responsiveness in the agri-food sector; developing a framework that offers local food producers opportunity and profit; promote local food so that it is conspicuous and widely available in our retail stores; and inform consumers about the value of supporting a local food system.

I'm very proud of the work that our government and previous Yukon Party governments have done with respect to enhancing opportunities in the agricultural sector. One only needs to look at the community markets that the member opposite referenced. We have had support for farmers markets all across the Yukon, as well as the Fireweed Community Market that's located here in Whitehorse.

I look forward to being able to present the final local food strategy to colleagues and we'll look forward to some exciting initiatives that emerge from that strategy.

Mr. Tredger: Yukon farmers grow Yukon's local food. Government can help the local food industry by supporting a reliable customer base for fresh local produce. The government has said it would investigate the merits of introducing a local food act, but even without changing legislation, Yukon's local food procurement policy can include schools, hospitals, correctional centres and other facilities.

Mr. Speaker, will the government implement local food procurement policies for institutions like hospitals, continuing care facilities and the correctional centres as a way of supporting Yukon's local food production and to provide Yukoners with healthy food?

Hon. Mr. Kent: That is one of the considerations of the local food strategy — using local foods and offering procurement opportunities, not only for our institutions but for restaurants and hotels and those in the accommodations and hospitality sector.

One only needs to look at the recent success of the tourism opportunities with respect to food. I know that both of those culinary tourism events that have been hosted and partly funded by the Tourism and Culture department have been tremendous successes in exposing Yukoners and Yukon businesses to the opportunities of local farms. I have had the opportunity to visit a couple of local farmers within the last couple of years and have been very impressed by what they're able to offer.

So again, back to the question asked by the member opposite, procurement by government is something that will be included for discussion in the local food strategy.

Mr. Tredger: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. According to Canada Without Poverty, two out of every five northern households are food insecure. One part of the explanation is that the further food travels, the more it costs. The Heart and Stroke Foundation's report card about access to healthy food shows a basket of food that costs \$191 in Whitehorse, costs \$295 in Dawson. Milk that was \$4.69 in Whitehorse was over \$7 in Dawson, but Mr. Speaker, a bottle of beer costs the same in Dawson City as it does in Whitehorse. In effect, the Yukon government subsidizes the transportation of alcohol up the highway, but not food.

Mr. Speaker, what is the government doing to ensure equitable and affordable access to healthy food in communities outside Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Kent: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, there have been a number of initiatives and changes brought about by this government over the past four years with respect to food security. Of course there was the *Donation of Food Act* that was introduced by the previous Minister of Health and Social Services. I think it was actually in response to an idea by the Member for Takhini-Kopper King — an excellent example of cooperation across the floor in this House that has led to a positive result.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Yukon local food strategy, there have been a number of consultations that have taken place. We've talked to the agricultural community, First Nations and the public on a series of initiatives that will lead toward our objectives. Some initiatives are expected to be inexpensive, with significant potential, while others will require an investment to increase production. We're looking forward to a final strategy that will augment some of the existing policies and programs that we have, including the Yukon government agricultural policy, the multi-year development plan and the Growing Forward 2 program.

So Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of exciting things underway with respect to agriculture and local food development. I'm excited to continue that good work on behalf of Yukoners and make sure that we can enjoy as much local food on our tables, whether it's at home or in the restaurants, as we possibly can.

Question re: Dawson City daycare

Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Services. About a year ago, I asked a previous Minister of Health and Social Services about the status of the Little Blue Daycare in Dawson City. It currently is housed in an older building and the daycare desperately needs a new home. They submitted a proposal to the minister's department over a year ago to replace the building. At that time, the minister called it an exciting report. Mr. Speaker, a year later — and we're still waiting for a response.

Will this government be funding this worthwhile project so that it can get off the ground?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the Department of Health and Social Services and this government recognize that there are unique needs for some rural centres and we're always exploring a level of funding and service model for our rural childcare services, as the member opposite had indicated.

As I understand it, the Dawson Society for Children and Families operates the Little Blue Early Child Care and Learning Centre. This centre is currently licensed for 20 spaces, and has been licensed since 1980. As I understand it, in early October 2014, the centre submitted a consultant's report, entitled *Situation Report and Recommendations for the Little Blue Early Care and Learning Centre* to the Child Care Services unit. The department has on a number of occasions met with the centre program director and the board of directors to discuss that specific report, to discuss any proposed changes and to discuss potential funding alterations. Health and Social Services has provided approximately \$50,000 in funding for this organization to address the necessary capital improvements as a one-time only, exceptional funding opportunity. We continue to work with the organization on an ongoing basis and look forward to those discussions.

Mr. Silver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are definitely happy with some renovations. I mean, we have water coming through the outlets right now and a roof that needs to be repaired. These are temporary solutions. Before this session started, the Premier said that there wasn't much left to do on the government's mandate. We heard that again today. He said the government has accomplished what has it set out to do and should be congratulated on a job well done. Yet here is another example of something that is left to be done.

Since I was elected in 2011, I have been urging the government to help provide a new, safe building for the Little Blue Daycare to occupy. In four years, there has been no action taken. This government has one more budget to deliver, and it will come in the spring. Will there be \$1 million in there to build a new home for the Dawson daycare — yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated for the member opposite in my first response, the Department of Health and Social Services, as well as this Yukon Party government, recognizes that there are some unique needs for childcare providers in a number of the communities. I also indicated that the department has, and continues to, meet with the Dawson Society for Children and Families, which operates the Little Blue Early Child Care and Learning Centre in Dawson City, which has in fact been in operation since 1980, as I indicated. We will continue to have those discussions with the daycare provider and with the director, as we have been doing. We have provided them with funding to make some alterations in their current space, and we look forward to those discussions and that relationship on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Silver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Dawson daycare has done what they are supposed to do. They have jumped over all of the hurdles. They have developed a responsible plan to proceed with the new building. The former

minister received the report a year ago and said it was — and I quote: "...an excellent report and we look forward to proceeding with it as quickly as possible." A year later, the government is still dragging its heels and the daycare is still waiting for an answer.

A Liberal government would fund this facility. When will the government be making a decision on this request, or should it be added to the ever-growing list of projects the next Yukon government is going to have to address?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course this government will continue to engage with the community of Dawson City.

This gives me an opportunity to talk about some of the recent things that we have done in health care here in the territory: the opening of Canada's first MRI earlier this year; of course the construction of the two regional hospitals that both parties were vehemently opposed to in both Dawson City and Watson Lake; and the tremendous increases that we have for home care. We are going to be opening McDonald Lodge very soon in the members opposite's riding.

We'll also be opening very soon the Oblate house as a temporary long-term care facility to take some of the burden of patients who are waiting for long-term care who are now currently in the hospital. We also expanded the women's shelter in the MLA for Dawson's riding and we will begin construction early next year on a beautiful 150-bed long-term care facility, Mr. Speaker, that the doctors and the nurses all say is desperately needed and we know that both the NDP and the Liberals would cancel that project.

Question re: First Nations/government relations

Mr. Barr: Mr. Speaker, since the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's recommendations on residential schools this summer, this government has taken some positive steps to make reconciliation a reality in Yukon.

On the day that the TRC's full report is released, I would ask them to commit to go a little further. Part of reconciliation is building respectful government-to-government relations. This year, after amendments were tabled to the *Yukon Oil and Gas Act* and Yukon First Nations felt they weren't adequately consulted, thankfully the Yukon government went back to the drawing board.

Mr. Speaker, what concrete steps will this government take to ensure that adequate consultation with First Nation governments happens from the get-go before bills are tabled in this House?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course the record shows that the passing of the amendments to the *Yukon Oil and Gas Act* was unanimous in this House, Mr. Speaker — just last week.

Of course this government continues to respect and live up to our commitments when it comes to the final agreements, and that is what has happened in this territory. What we have here is indeed unique in this country and probably the world, Mr. Speaker, and it's an opportunity for us to be leaders — and that's exactly what we're doing.

The TRC is a very prime example of that work. Upon the recommendations — the calls to action — I tasked our deputy ministers to come forward and provide a report that would be the basis of looking at what we've done already to meet up to those calls to action. But then we also reached out to First Nation leadership and, in fact, I've met a couple times, Mr. Speaker, with First Nation leadership on the TRC.

We are committed to working together to finding a path forward. Again, we believe that Yukon is certainly the place in the country to lead on things, such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission calls to action. This is a report that is very important. I know the final report was put forward today and we look forward to engaging with First Nations and with municipalities and all Yukoners.

Mr. Barr: Mr. Speaker, reconciliation is about healing and building mutually respectful relationships, but it is not just an abstract thought. Our actions give these ideas of reconciliation life.

In May of 2014, this House unanimously supported a Yukon NDP motion to endorse Canada's statement of support on the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. The declaration sets out the principles of partnership and mutual respect that should guide the relationship between governments and First Nations. The declaration would provide an excellent framework for this government to implement the commitments they made regarding reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, has this government considered adopting the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* as Yukon's framework for reconciliation?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course there was unanimous support of a motion in this House earlier that supported Canada's statement on the United Nations declaration.

Here in Yukon — as I just mentioned in my first response — we have been the leaders when it comes to self-government and final agreements. We believe that those final agreements and those self-government agreements are the path to reconciliation. We have 11 of 14 First Nations that have signed final and self-government agreements. We continue to work on implementation and evolving Yukon as to what modern Yukon is as a result of those agreements.

We continue to work with the three First Nations that have not signed and, in doing so, we're working collaboratively with them to reach reconciliation agreements with those First Nations. We will endeavour to work together not only to benefit First Nations and those communities, but indeed to then therefore benefit all Yukoners.

Mr. Barr: Just last week this House unanimously voted to support another NDP motion to consider making National Aboriginal Day a statutory holiday. We should all be proud that every member in this House stood up to support the motion. Making National Aboriginal Day a statutory holiday for everyone would give life to the idea that reconciliation isn't just for First Nation people but a common goal for all Yukoners. Celebrating Yukon's first National Aboriginal Day as a statutory holiday the same year as the Truth and

Reconciliation Commission's final report was released would show that reconciliation is happening and it needs to be fostered and embraced.

Upon hearing the minister's response to the petition today, the previous question written is not really necessary. However, I would say that I'm thankful for the consultation to move forward this year. Can we expect to have —

Speaker: Order, please. The member's time — order.

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: I believe that we heard a response to the petition from the Minister of Community Services this very day. As well, of course, such endeavours require the consultation. I always chuckle at the fact that the NDP demands consultation when it chooses and then sometimes think we should just ram things through without any consultation.

We believe that the people who are affected by such a change should have their voices heard, and that's exactly what this government will do.

We're very proud that this government introduced a residential school curriculum this year. It has been piloted for a couple of years, and now we have rolled that out. Of course, the changes that we made to the *Child and Family Services Act* back in 2010 are certainly resulting in us leading in that area in Canada as well — having other jurisdictions look at what we're doing.

The work of the minister responsible for the Women's Directorate, along with aboriginal women's leaders and Chief Doris Bill — and I think Chief Carl Sidney as well — they have been doing tremendous work. There was a family gathering that was held just last weekend. We prepare for another regional roundtable that will occur in February. These are important issues for Yukoners and this government is focused on those important issues.

Question re: Residential Landlord and Tenant Act

Ms. White: I have an example of Yukon Party leadership at its best. The Yukon Party government's overhaul of the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* comes into force in the new year. While this may seem like a Christmas miracle for many renters and landlords, it's a lump of coal for social assistance recipients housed in long-stay hotel rooms by the government. That is because long-stay hotel residents with less than six months' residence aren't covered by the act.

They have to rely on the *Hotels and Tourist Establishments Act*, which only requires hotel operators to — and I'm quoting: "... take all reasonable precautions to ensure the safety of their guests and their guests' property."

Mr. Speaker, since this law is a tourism and cultural law, can the Minister of Tourism and Culture explain what her department does to ensure that long-stay hotel residents on social assistance have the same access to safe housing as everyone else?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: This is a policy issue that we have debated a number of times in this House and I'm pleased to stand and reply again.

When we developed the regulations for the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act*, there was a decision that had to be

made about what the appropriate threshold is at which time an individual staying in a hotel makes the transition from a guest-hotel relationship to a landlord-tenant relationship. We picked the date of six months. We realize that there are opposing views on that. The NDP has suggested that there should be no date like that. We don't agree and we don't think many in the tourism industry would agree either.

That being said, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that there are different views on this, but we had decided to go with the six-month threshold. That's one that I will stand up and defend. I believe it is the correct path and it finds a balance between the numerous interests that need to be considered in this case.

While I appreciate the member opposite's concern and passion on this issue, it's an issue where we disagree and I do believe that the six-month threshold is an appropriate one.

Ms. White: If the Community Services minister continues to be so eager to discuss these long-stay hotel residents, perhaps he will consider excluding them from the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act*.

Long-stay hotel residents who are routinely evicted, year after year, to make room during the tourist season are being told by this government that they don't matter.

The *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* lays out the process for health and safety disputes, among many other important tools that manage the landlord-tenant relationship, and long-stay hotel residents are being specifically excluded.

Mr. Speaker, when these tenants who are ignored by the government and lost in the grey areas of their legislation need help over the holidays, they can't go to the Residential Tenancies Office. So where are they supposed to go? Should they go to the tourism information office for help?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After a resident of a hotel has been staying in that facility for more than six months, they enter into a residential landlord-tenant relationship as per the act. At that point, they can exercise all of the powers and responsibilities outlined in the act and the regulations. At that point, they could also enter into a tenancy agreement; they can also access the services and supports available at the Residential Tenancies Office.

I realize that the member is uncomfortable with the six-month threshold and thinks that is an incorrect policy decision and that's an issue where we will continue to disagree.

A decision had to be made about what time the appropriate threshold is — we chose six months. I know the members think it should be less. Others in the community think it should be more. But I will respectfully disagree with the member opposite and suggest that we have achieved the adequate balance with this particular threshold.

Ms. White: This government continues to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to house social assistance clients in long-stay hotels. My question to the Minister of Community Services: Which government department is the overseer of the safety of these clients in long-stay hotels?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: The general safety for any building in the territory is covered by the *Building Standards Act* and of course the regulations pursuant to that, and if any individuals

believe that there is a breach in any public building for environmental safety, they can bring it up with the Department of Community Services building inspections.

As well, there are, of course, a number of other protections in place throughout the territory, including now — with the imposition of the new *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* — a whole stream of new opportunities, resources and tools for those landlords and tenants throughout the territory. There is also, of course, now for the first time going to be minimum rental standards in place throughout this territory, which did not previously exist.

All of these new resources and tools are going to be in place with the coming into force of the new *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act*. We're very proud of that act and the regulations pursuant to that act and we're very excited to see the operations of the new Residential Tenancies Office, which will be a new resource for all Yukoners who have an interest in finding information or an alternative dispute resolution process with regard to disputes between landlords and tenants in the territory.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Elias: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 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): I will now call Committee of the Whole to order.

The matter before the Committee is Vote 51, Department of Community Services, in Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: We will take a 15-minute break.

Recess

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

Bill No. 20: *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Vote 51, Department of Community Services, in Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*.

Department of Community Services — continued

Chair: We left off discussing the Capital lines.

On Capital — continued**On Community Development — continued**

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Ross River — Suspension Bridge — continued

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Ross River — Suspension Bridge in the amount of \$91,000 agreed to

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Tagish — Taku Subdivision Fill Point in the amount of \$387,000 agreed to

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Tlingit Council Road Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of \$400,000 cleared

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Wastewater System Upgrades in the amount of \$8,000 agreed to

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Road Upgrades

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Road Upgrades in the amount of \$2,242,000 agreed to

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Teslin — Arsenic Treatment in the amount of \$21,000 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 \$429,000 agreed to

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Deep Creek Water Treatment Plant underexpenditure in the amount of \$498,000 cleared

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 \$219,000 agreed to

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Range Road Upgrade in the amount of \$318,000 agreed to

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Marwell Water and Sewer Upgrades

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Marwell Water and Sewer Upgrades in the amount of \$337,000 agreed to

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Ibex Water Upgrades

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Whitehorse (and area) — Ibex Water Upgrades in the amount of \$33,000 agreed to

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Solid Waste Management System in the amount of \$200,000 agreed

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Local Road Upgrades

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Local Road Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of \$189,000 cleared

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

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Planning and Administration in the amount of \$297,000 agreed to

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Water Systems Upgrades

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Water Systems Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of \$639,000 cleared

On Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Wastewater Systems Upgrades

Community Infrastructure — Building Canada Fund — Territory-Wide — Wastewater Systems Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of \$2,000,000 cleared

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 \$755,000 agreed to

On Corporate Policy and Consumer Affairs

On Property Assessment and Taxation — Domestic Well Program

Hon. Mr. Dixon: I appreciate members' indulgence to provide an update on this particular line. I wanted to explain this because it is indicative of the success that we've had with the expansion of the domestic water well program into the municipalities.

As members know, the domestic water well program is, and has been, a highly successful program available to rural Yukon property owners. The program helps property owners drill for a new water well, or make improvements to an existing well for domestic use, through access to low-interest loans that can be paid back over a maximum period of 15

years. Property owners within municipal boundaries have in the past expressed interest in similar type programming and, as such, legislative changes occurred in the fall of last year to provide a means for the Yukon government, with the assistance of municipalities, to offer the program within municipal boundaries.

Earlier this year, at the AYC conference in Haines Junction, I had the opportunity to sign an agreement with each municipality to work with them on the provision of this in each municipality. Of the 29 municipal projects currently underway, 26 are within Whitehorse with one project each in Faro, Haines Junction and Carmacks.

I did want to provide an update. On this particular line, what you see is a transfer of \$150,000 from the domestic well program to the municipal well program. When we initially budgeted this at both \$800,000 and \$400,000 respectively, we indicated to our municipal colleagues that, if it was necessary to reallocate those funds, we would do so, and that's what we've done here. The reason we've had to do that is because the municipal side has been so successful in implementing this new program.

To give members some perspective on this, in 2014-15 — the last year the project was operated only in non-municipal areas — we had a total of 16 projects underway. This year, since April 1, 2015, in our current year, we have 45 projects underway, so we've seen a considerable increase in the uptake of this program as a result of its expansion to municipalities. As I indicated, of the 45 — 29 of the projects are within municipal boundaries in the communities that I listed — 29 are in municipalities and 16 are rural.

The total value of projects in 2014-15 last year was just over \$300,000 and now, as you see, the program is much more subscribed to than it was previously. So I did want to take the opportunity to update members on that particular line and provide an explanation as to why that \$150,000 was being shifted from one program to another and that is, of course, as I indicated, because of the great success we've had in implementing this new program within municipal boundaries.

With that, Madam Chair, I'll conclude those remarks.

Property Assessment and Taxation — Domestic Well Program underexpenditure in the amount of \$150,000 cleared
On Property Assessment and Taxation — Municipal Well Program

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I just wanted to briefly rise and thank the Minister of Community Services and all of the staff of Community Services who have worked on the expansion of the rural well program into municipal areas. This is something that has been — for my constituents in Hidden Valley and MacPherson, as well as others within Whitehorse and other municipalities — a subject of great interest to see this very effective program that began only outside of municipalities extended within municipalities. I appreciate the fact that this has now been achieved and I have heard very positive feedback from constituents of mine within Whitehorse city limits, who have been able to access the program as a result of the expansion or are looking at doing so next year.

I would like to thank the Minister of Community Services for his work on this and also thank officials in the department — particularly the deputy minister Paul Moore, former deputy minister Kelvin Leary, now retired assistant deputy minister Charlene Beauchemin, and Kelly Eby — for their many hours of work respectively on extending this important program.

Property Assessment and Taxation — Municipal Well Program in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to

On Total of Other Capital

Total of Other Capital in the amount of nil cleared

Total Capital Expenditures underexpenditure in the amount of \$4,304,000 agreed to

Total Expenditures in the amount of \$1,426,000 agreed to

Department of Community Services agreed to

Chair: Vote 51 has cleared Committee.

We are going to move on to Vote 52, Department of Environment.

Committee of the Whole will recess for just five minutes.

Recess

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

The matter before the Committee is Vote 52, Department of Environment, in Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*.

Department of Environment — continued

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Madam Chair, before we get started, I want to introduce my Deputy Minister, Joe MacGillivray, here to assist me today. He's also one of the experts in the Department of Environment, as was my ADM that I had here yesterday. I'm not sure if there's a "site-specific" like I said in Hansard — I think they're still trying to deal with how to write that out.

I do want to continue just a little bit. I want a correction for the House, but I want to talk a little bit about our campgrounds, Madam Chair. As we move forward, going forward — Yukon Parks includes universal design as a core lens for designing construction and maintaining campgrounds and this does include such things as minimizing the slope on the approach to facilities — the standard is two percent; avoiding any lifts or obstructions that interfere with people's movement; using ground materials such as cement, wood chips or stone dust that would allow people to get in and out of vehicles more easily and this has to do with accessibility.

Yukon Parks is currently looking at a redesign of our existing barrier-free outhouses to further enhance their accessibility. At Wolf Creek, Yukon Parks is introducing a designated parking area and a barrier-free outhouse beside the trailhead.

Several potential trails have been assessed to determine if they could be made accessible for people with disabilities. Yukon Parks is currently exploring partnerships and funding

to create accessible trails at Wolf Creek and Pine Lake campgrounds for 2017.

Yesterday in the House, when the Member for Takhini-Kopper King asked me if the Minister of Environment could please confirm that there will be no long-term leases for RVs in Yukon parks for the 2016 camping season, I said in the House, “Absolutely, I can confirm that there will be no long-term leases in our campgrounds.” I want to correct that and say absolutely I can confirm that there will be no long-term leases in our campgrounds in 2016. What I wanted to get across is that as we work with our local First Nations and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to look at, for example, increasing the supply of well-maintained Yukon government campsites, attracting Yukon campers to some of our under-utilized campgrounds might be an option moving in the future, but that isn’t an option right now for the 2016 season.

That was just an update I wanted to get across to the member opposite. I do also want to thank the department for bringing this to my attention, and I look forward to sitting down and answering some more questions.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for his opening statement and I welcome the official to the Legislative Assembly. I am really happy to hear what the minister just said about using the universal design theories for campground design into the future.

I had the good fortune today of running into an advocate from the disability community who talked about the really fantastic steps he sees happening within the Department of Environment, especially around campground accessibility. He had nothing but incredibly positive things to say about the staff from Yukon Parks. He just talked about how he felt that for the first time in a really long time that the community had been invited into a conversation and the department was going to go forward together to try to make these changes. There was a lot of really positive things and feedback there. I want to make sure the Parks staff hear that and also that the minister hears that as well.

The one thing in our discussion, when we talked about accessible campsites — we talked about outhouses and cook shacks and those things — and when I asked, “Well, are there any accessible campsites that you know of in Yukon?” He said, “No, not yet.”

My question for the minister is: Is the Department of Environment, or Yukon Parks specifically, working to try to make sure that there are accessible campsites in Conrad as it is being constructed? Does he see more accessible campsites being made available in Yukon? Can we expect any of those to be open for the 2016 camping season?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I believe that yesterday in the House I had said that I would commit to getting back to the member opposite with all the campgrounds and the ones that are accessible. I am not sure of the number in Conrad that are accessible, but I will commit to the member opposite — like I said yesterday in the House, as we move forward, we spoke to the fact of looking at accessibility when it comes to any of the

infrastructure as we grow our campgrounds, whether it’s infill or building new campgrounds.

Ms. White: I don’t want to focus too long on this, because I appreciate that the minister is answering in a positive fashion.

The one point that was made is that, sometimes when they’re viewed as accessible to able-bodied people without disabilities, they actually truly aren’t that accessible for people who need to be able to roll right up to the outhouse or right up to the camp shelter. Those are all super-big issues, so it’s about making sure that we take that into account.

I maintain that I did not realize how challenging it was to use a wheelchair until I pushed around my 70-something year-old friend in a wheelchair and I was worried that I was going to dump her out downtown.

I take things for granted because I’m able to walk between point A and point B. We talked about accessibility in the motion last Wednesday, and riding a bike with a friend who is a paraplegic becomes a much different situation because it’s about being able to access trails in spots that make sense for him.

It’s just about taking that into account when we look at the future of campgrounds and making sure that we’re using a lens that reflects the reality of someone with those mobility challenges.

One more thing is that there is hope that there will be campsites that are truly accessible, so that a family with children or one of the parents in a wheelchair can access those so that they’re looking forward to camping, and the question was: Will they be able to do it in 2016?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: For the member opposite, I committed to get back to the member opposite with those sites, but we’re shooting for the brochure to be ready by 2016. So it’s identified.

But one of things that we are doing — and I don’t think I brought it up yesterday during debate — is the fact that we’ve gone cross-jurisdictional — across Canada — and looked at established standards for what other jurisdictions do for accessibility, so we’re working with other jurisdictions and looking at what they have as we move forward. That’s where some of our ideas come from on next steps when it comes to accessibility in the campgrounds.

Universal access is not always 100-percent accessible at every site, but we are looking — and, like I said, I’ll get back to the member opposite. One of the things in the discussions that we’ve had is that we want to make sure it’s still a camping experience. If we have to use different materials that are a little bit harder and more packed for the wheelchair, like the member opposite asked for — I don’t think we’re looking to pave everything and take away from that kind of Yukon wilderness experience either.

We’re looking for solutions as we move forward that can keep it as good — I think my fellow colleague, the Minister of Health and Social Services, spoke to it when we debated the motion. He talked a little bit about some of the people with accessibility issues still wanting that natural nature experience.

So we're going to work in that as we move forward and I hope to endeavour to have the map out a little bit better. I was looking last night a little bit at some of the mapping systems that some of the other departments have and looking at how much better it's going to be when you go to look at the campgrounds and have those sites identified for Yukoners. It will help a lot with them when they decide where they want to go camping.

Ms. White: Thank you, Madam Chair. And just to clarify the minister's statement there — I have never once suggested that things need to be paved. I do appreciate the wilderness experience and that it's important to note that the disability community isn't saying that they don't want the wilderness experience; they're just saying they'd like to have the chance to participate in the wilderness experience. How we choose to move forward, I hope we involve that community in the conversation.

Yesterday, we were talking about the 22 new infill sites and we were talking about the campground in Conrad and just the challenges of how we're going to make sure that the level of service is the same. I have some questions around that, because I'm seeking some clarity. More campsites obviously are going to mean more work for departmental staff. Then there was one time last week where the minister referred to staff in Yukon parks as campground cops. Then I was trying to figure out what a campground cop would be and what that would mean.

Can the minister clarify for me and for other people who are listening the difference between campground attendants and park officers?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I thank the member opposite for the question. "Campground cops" is a little bit hard to understand.

We have the staff that maintain and do the maintenance and clean the stalls and clean the campgrounds. Then we have our campground enforcement people, who are under the *Parks and Land Certainty Act* that they have enforcement abilities. They're the ones who go around at night and make sure that there's law and order in the campground, for lack of better words. Those are park officers — that's what they're called. Then the other ones are called campground attendants — so park officers and campground attendants.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for bringing the differences in those two roles and responsibilities forward.

Part of the reason why I think the conversation is relevant now, because we've talked about these infill sites, we've talked about the opening of a new campground and Agay Mene is on its way and things.

Yesterday, I asked the question about staffing and the response was that the minister didn't have the exact number of maintenance staff, but the department was looking into it. The minister couldn't tell me how many more full-time equivalents would be needed — whether it would be a 0.3, a 0.5, a 0.6 or a 0.9. But in looking at this and just having the definition cleared up between campground attendants and park officers, my question is: Are we only looking at adding campground attendants or are we looking at also increasing

the number of park officers with that increase in spots? One can only imagine the increase in numbers in campgrounds closest to Whitehorse.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: When it comes to the increase in the park attendants, the park officers or the campground attendants — that is going to roll out in next year's budget — the budget isn't complete yet, but there are some asks in there. I think I spoke to it yesterday. I'm not sure, we haven't nailed it down yet, but there are some asks for additional resources and we do understand that in the department. With the increased use of our campgrounds, we're going to need increased maintenance and increased park officer presence, so that will come out in next year's budget.

Ms. White: I appreciate the answer, understanding that next year's budget is in the next year — but the question I'm trying to ask, is if the minister plans on asking for an increase in the budget to make sure that the increase to staffing levels are reflective of the increase of camping spots — making sure that there is not just an increase in campground attendants, but there is also the increase in park officers because when we look at map and there are 52 — and they are spread far and wide in some cases — to understand if there is only a handful of people doing those jobs, then there is risk that is incurred when we keep them on the road, driving between point A and point B for long periods of time.

My question is: Are there intentions of the department to make sure that the staffing levels reflect the increase that we're expecting in Yukon campgrounds for next summer?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I spoke a little bit about it yesterday. When we budgeted for the Conrad campground, we budgeted for the resources and the need for an attendant position there and also a park officer present, understanding that Yukon is pretty big and we have a lot of long distances to travel. I had the opportunity actually to go out with park officers in my riding and saw what they dealt with on a day-to-day thing. If there is a little bit of infill in a campground — a few more stalls — they are there anyway, so that is not going to be as big of a deal as the amount of time maybe for cleaning the campground. We do take into consideration that there is going to be a need for more resources as we develop and grow any of our campgrounds.

Ms. White: I also appreciate that answer. Is there the intention of looking to have both campground attendants and park officer number increases for next season?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Like I said before, that is still in the budget process and we haven't finalized the budgets yet. We totally understand in the department that there is an ask for additional resources and we know that with the increase in our campgrounds, there is going to be a need for resources — but I can't speak to the exact amount because I don't have numbers.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that answer. I'm not ever sure if this comes back to the minister or not, but on more than one occasion within department briefings, I often say: "I wonder what the Department of Environment could do with a much bigger budget." One day I'll look forward to that

happening and seeing what they can do when we are able to fund all the projects that we think are valuable.

Yesterday, just before we ended, we were talking about both the Klaza caribou herd, then the Hart caribou herd and then the Porcupine caribou herd. The last question I asked the minister was about whether or not there was any intent or willingness of the government to revisit the 1985 *Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement*.

In the answer — and I am quoting back from Hansard yesterday — and I quote: “We’re not at the stage of opening anything or doing anything. I think we’re just working with our existing partners when it comes to the Porcupine caribou herd.” Can I just get the minister’s confirmation as to whether or not there is an intent or willingness on behalf of the Government of Yukon to revisit the 1985 *Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement*? Was that a yes or no answer?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: No, not at this time. We are continuing to work with the board and all the members of the board on issues related to the Porcupine caribou herd.

Ms. White: Yesterday, I was mentioning that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is under pressure from the United States’ side of the border at the very least. I was citing that there was a website that looks very much like it could be a protection website, but it is actually about opening it up for oil and gas development. There are concerns about the safety and security of the calving grounds and how they are under risk on the other side of the border. I realize that the minister can’t tell me what the United States is planning on doing on their side. My question is: What, if any, discussions has the Minister of Environment had with his federal counterparts regarding protecting the calving grounds of the Porcupine caribou herd?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The Fortymile caribou herd, the Porcupine caribou herd and the Nelchina caribou herd are all herds that are actually doing quite well. They are growing. I spoke yesterday about just having had a briefing on this. In the briefing, one of the things that struck me as being really good was the partnerships that we have and the work that we do with our partners in Alaska on census counting, collaring and studying. We are doing a better job. We have a map that shows the better job we are doing with the new innovations, with satellites, GPS, collaring and stuff like that.

We are going to continue to work with them. I think the Lieutenant Governor from Alaska is here with the salmon subcommittee talking about fish. I have had the opportunity to some of the board members and ask them — at any given time, as the Minister of Environment, I have told the salmon subcommittee or the Yukon River Salmon Commission or the board that if there is an opportunity for me to support them in their endeavours by writing a letter to a federal minister or to our fellow jurisdictions, I sure will. We will continue to work with our partners on that.

Ms. White: I can’t remember if it was sometime this year or last year we learned that the Yukon government employs a lobbyist in Washington to lobby for the Shakwak project, so that they are there talking to the people they need to talk to about making sure that the Yukon government — or the Canadian government and then, in turn, the Yukon

government — gets adequate funding to maintain the Shakwak or to continue on that highway construction project.

Has there ever been thought about using a similar resource to lobby for the protection of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The Yukon government has provided ongoing funding to the Vuntut Gwitchin, and they’re there in Washington on behalf of issues that they relate to within their traditional territory, so that’s how the government moved forward with that.

Ms. White: I have questions now in regard to a letter that I wrote the minister last summer regarding the Yukon Water Board and the conflict of interest rules.

In the letter, I wrote about a deputy minister who served with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources from 2012 to 2014 and who was appointed to the Yukon Development Corporation in 2014. After advocating on behalf of the Yukon Development Corporation for projects that would need water licences to move forward, this same individual was then appointed to the Yukon Water Board. It turns out that I wasn’t the only one to write a letter to the minister about the conflict of interest. The chair of the Water Board had raised the matter as well.

It’s really fortunate that the government has access to legal opinions, because the Department of Justice found that the individual — and I quote: “... would not be able to take part in any way in any matters involving YG as a party...” It did turn out that there was a conflict of interest — and it’s important, because we can talk about actual conflicts of interest or perceived conflicts of interest, and in this case it was identified.

I’m going to refer to a press release from December 8, 2015. It says: “Government of Yukon appoints new chair of Yukon Water Board.” I’m not sure if the minister wants to pull this up or not. So this is a press release from December 8, 2015, and I have questions about appointments and conflicts of interest, or perceived conflicts of interest. I have questions as to whether or not there may be another one in this situation.

As of March 2015, the person mentioned in this press release was a member of the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board, and very recently that position has become vacant. On December 8, she was appointed as chair of the Yukon Water Board, effective December 11. Under section 8(3) of the Yukon’s *Waters Act*, it’s about the establishment of the Yukon Water Board, and it says — and I’m quoting from the *Waters Act* — “The Minister shall designate two members of the Board to be chairperson and vice-chairperson, respectively.”

So Madam Chair, I’m just looking for clarification. Under my understanding, the law says that the person needs to be a member of the Yukon Water Board to be appointed chair or vice-chair, so can the Minister of Environment explain how someone who is not a member of the Yukon Water Board was appointed as chair?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The Water Board follows under ECO and the Minister of ECO is responsible for that, so I

don't want to comment on this. That would be a better question asked under ECO.

Ms. White: Is the minister responsible for the Yukon *Waters Act*?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The Yukon legislation is under the Minister of ECO.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that. I guess I'm going to flag that I will be sending a letter to the department or whichever minister is responsible, raising concerns about conflict of interest — similar to what I did earlier this year. I will look forward to answers that way.

I have a question about environmental liabilities in remediation and the reduction of the \$887,000, as it was found in the supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I'm sorry, but could the member opposite ask the question again?

Ms. White: I apologize to the minister. I've been told in Hansard that they sometimes have to turn down the speed. I was asking about the reduction of \$887,000 in the Environmental Liabilities and Remediation line item.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I've been told the same thing. Nice to see a grin on your face — the member opposite there.

Anyway, the revote is for the Site Assessment and Remediation unit — SARU — to complete the following projects: the Swift River highway maintenance camp, to complete the assessment work; the Old Crow sites, to continue data collection at the nursing station, airport and maintenance site; site assessment remediation unit — SARU — matrix upgrade projects and Yukon government properties list project to assist SARU in identifying potential contaminated sites. Remediation expenditures — the Marwell tar pit remediation deferred a portion of the work due to delays in the regulatory process — quantitative human health and ecological risk assessment and the Yukon environmental socio-economic screening and approval projects permitting and procurement process — to note, the \$1.55-million recoverable from Canada will still be received in 2015-16, as per the agreement.

Ms. White: Early in this Sitting, when asked about the increase in the environmental liabilities under the Department of Highways and Public Works, the Minister of Environment said that was the cost of doing business; that when they do work, it goes kind of hand-in-hand that there were going to be concerns. Can the minister talk about, I guess, the policies within the department of making sure that the cost of doing business is indeed not environmental liabilities?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Madam Chair, just to clarify: When I said that, I was speaking to the past practices of long before today.

Ms. White: I appreciate that clarification. We have talked a lot of different times about the importance of having easily understandable information available online in an accessible way. There was a time I was looking to figure out the hazardous sites in Yukon. On the website, it gives a number to call — which, as it turns out, I'm not supposed to call the numbers; I'm supposed to talk with the minister.

Then, the minister at the time was really generous and read off all 94 sites in the House, which was super helpful.

My question is — we have the waters page and we have the campground maps: Has there ever been a thought about creating a spill map or an environmental liability map, where you could pull up a map and see the different spill sites identified in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: That hasn't been a topic of conversation with me, but I'll go back to the department and check with them. With the new technologies and information, as we spoke to, when it comes to campgrounds, there might be something that the department has in the hoppers that they're working on. I'll get back to the member opposite. I'll look into it.

Ms. White: Thank you. I would like to move on to the climate change action plan progress report of 2015. I would like to know the minister's thoughts on climate change and the Yukon government's role. So far, the targets that we have set are solely for Yukon government and they haven't been set out on a wider net than that. I was wondering if the minister could talk a bit about why the intent has been so focused on solely Yukon government, as opposed to the territory as a whole.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: That's why, in our *Climate Change Action Plan*, we've targeted within government the sectors on one hand. Then, broad-based, we have made four sectors, because the four sectors are the ones that would, I believe, contribute to climate change the most.

To add to that, I have been doing a lot of reading and research and I know that just about everybody is back from COP21 — from the event — and I've had a debriefing from the department. I have a phone call this week with our federal minister. I am very happy to see some of the progress. We had the opportunity to go over there, and the Premier had the opportunity to speak to some of the challenges that we have and to a lot of the adaptation and mitigation that we have done.

The next steps, moving forward, the federal minister has put a pretty good timeline down of 90 days where she would like to work with the provinces and territories to commit to setting a strategy. We are looking forward, up here in the Yukon, to working with the federal government and our fellow provinces and territories to develop a strategy. Keeping it in context, the northern territories are a little bit different. We are based heavily on transportation to get products and services to the north. I think there was a question in the House today about food security and the cost of getting food up here.

I was excited to see that what came out of Paris was a pretty big fund for developing countries to help deal with the issues related to climate change. I am sure hoping that, within our own country, there is a fund that is put forward because, you know, we already pay for it up here. I think I spoke in the House about the melting permafrost on the Shakwak. That is just one good example of the effects of climate change that we see.

I am looking forward to using the knowledge that we have. We are doing a better job of collecting data now, as we

move forward and work toward the effects of climate change. We are not a big emitter here in the Yukon, but we sure do want to make sure that there is funding available for what we do so that we can help address some of the issues — from the federal government — when it comes to climate change, and also that we can move forward with some of the challenges that we have and still lead the Yukon's action in response to climate change.

I hope that sort of answers that for the member opposite. I am looking forward to the next 90 days.

Ms. White: A number of years ago, I took a course up at the college. It was a one-day course called “Climate change for decision-makers”. It was taught by Alison Perrin and it was looking at the responsibility of people in positions to make decisions as to whether you choose to mitigate situations or whether you choose to adapt to them. Highways and Public Works, Department of Environment — everyone within a department has to look at whether or not they are going to try to prevent the changes of climate change or whether they are just going to adapt to those changes.

When we talk about the meeting in 90 days and knowing that world leaders have signed on to the COP21 agreement, which talks about 1.5 degrees, before this meeting, the world was talking about two degrees and how that was where we had to draw the line. We have realized already that, if the planet continues on the course that we are, we are really looking at four to five degrees and that is going to be disastrous for a great many people around the world.

So the number that was decided upon was 1.5 degrees. That's a hard target, right? There are no easy things about that.

I read an article recently that compared that target to bringing down the global temperature to running a marathon. It's not just a slow jog; it's a flat-out sprint. To reach that 1.5 that we've talked about is going to require hard targets, so in 90 days whether it's the minister or the Premier who goes to these talks with their counterparts across Canada, will Yukon be taking a hard target to reduce our emissions to this meeting?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to say in the House here that the greenhouse gas emissions in the Yukon — we do account for less than one percent of Canada's overall emissions. Canada's emissions represent 1.6 percent of the world's emissions. I wanted to get that across because the member opposite is completely correct that there are things we can do, such as: accelerating the replacement of old vehicles with more fuel-efficient ones, which is going to help with climate change; our partnership with the City of Whitehorse on a ride-share program; reintroducing the use of hydrogenation during the low-use periods in our government buildings; and then some of the programs that we have moving forward for doing a better job of insulating.

On the other hand, we just have to adapt to the melting permafrost. There is no option for us. We can't turn something down or turn it off in the Yukon to help the permafrost from melting. That has to do with greater global emissions that we

have no control over. I spoke to the Premier earlier today about this and we're looking forward to meeting with our federal counterparts, to having that broad-based discussion and to looking at options as we move forward.

The member opposite is correct — and 90 days is a pretty good timeline and I think it's a good timeline because then we can get those discussions out and everybody can, for lack of better words, put their cards on the table and we'll have to address some of the challenges we have and some of the ways that we can help, and so will other provinces and other territories.

I think we'll know more — I'm not going to prejudge or say what I think is going to come of it. I'm just looking forward to working with all the partners in Canada as we move forward.

Ms. White: It's an interesting point that the minister just made and I'm going to ask a question — or maybe add to that and then ask the question.

So the minister has just said that we have to deal with the effects of climate change because of other people in the world and their pollution and their pollution generation, but there are two sides to that coin — which is that we can say that we're less than one percent of Canada's entire greenhouse gas emissions. Does the minister then accept too that our decisions that we make here within the territory affect people globally as well? So we're affected by their emissions, but does the minister recognize that we also affect, say, Indonesia, by the choices that we make. The planet is circular, so what we emit here goes into the atmosphere and it affects other sides of the planet. Does the minister agree that it's two sides of the same coin?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I think if we want to look at the magnitude of it, anything that we can do to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the Yukon is a good thing and that's why — I can't count the times I've said this — we have a climate change action plan and that's why we look at reducing our greenhouse gas emissions; why we do better monitoring, gather better data, use newer technologies; and work with the building sector, the transportation sector, the electrical sector and the industrial operation sector.

I understand right now that oil is really low, so it's not that expensive to buy oil right now. Any industry always looks for an opportunity to save money — whether it's cleaner energy or whether it's insulating your home better — and that is what this government is committed to doing, working with all four industries with better options and to do a better job when it comes to greenhouse gas emissions.

I look forward to our Climate Change Secretariat and the hard work that they are going to do on this file moving forward. We have an energy strategy that, I believe, is about to come out, so I look forward to seeing the Yukon — which has been talking about climate change since 2009; had that discussion; had a line item in our budgets that we vote for all the time. I could say that the members opposite continue to not vote for it, but I think it is important —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Oh, I did? Anyway, I just want to bring it across that we are doing a good job here in the Yukon and I am continuing and am quite happy to move forward and continue on doing a good job when it comes to climate change in the Yukon.

Ms. White: There are many things in the government's budget that I will never vote for, so I guess that is just the way it's going to go.

There always seems to be — when we have this conversation — it's always about what others should be doing, as opposed to what we should be doing internally. So there is a small village in Japan called Gamakatsu — and I'm sure I pronounced that wrong. In 2010, they recognized that — where they lived and how it was remote, if they didn't do something about their garbage problem that they were going to be overrun with garbage. In five years, they have become a jurisdiction that produces no trash. They separate and they compost. Everything they have there they recycle. The point of this is that it wasn't easy — it was about changing habits. It's not saying that I expect to be told that you have to change your personal habits to have a better effect on the planet — it's not an easy solution. It's not easy.

The question becomes: Do we do the hard work now and try to slow down the process with everybody else in the developed world who is making hard decisions about how they're going to move forward, or do we throw up our hands and say: Okay, well, we live in a jurisdiction that is going to be hard hit because our permafrost is melting and those carbon traps are melting? Or do we look at it in a way and say: Okay, it's not going to be easy, but we're actually going to make decisions and we're going to hit targets — we're going to have a lofty target and we're going to try to hit that?

My question again, is: Will we be taking a hard target to these national meetings when Canada sits down around a table and says, this is what we're going to do to meet our obligation under the COP21 agreement that says, as a planet, we're trying to bring down the warming temperature 1.5 degrees?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Like I said earlier, we are going to work with our federal counterparts. I'm not going to predetermine what will come. Instead of committing to an arbitrary territorial target based on estimated projections, the Yukon government — like I said earlier — worked with four key players and technical experts. That's why we have some sector-specific targets in key Yukon sectors — those four sectors I spoke about.

In the building sector, for example — by 2020, it says to reduce the emission intensity of existing residential, commercial and institutional buildings across the Yukon by five percent. I think you see that with some of the new programs that we have and some of the new building code requirements. In transportation, the target is to reduce emissions from Yukon government light vehicles by five percent from 2012 levels. In the electricity sector, reduce the emission intensity of on-grid diesel power generation by 20 percent. In industrial operations — establish reporting protocols for stationary facilities emitting over 2.5 kilotonnes.

We will reduce the electrical energy intensity of industrial operations, including mines, by 15 percent from 2012.

We have targets, but I am not going to predetermine what — we are all partners in this. We have many provinces, three territories and the federal government that are going to sit down and have this discussion about climate change. I look forward to the discussion.

Ms. Moorcroft: I would like to come back to just one question. We had a full debate one afternoon on the motion to make campgrounds accessible and the government amended that motion to indicate that they would support the Yukon government continuing to make campgrounds accessible. My colleague, the Member for Takhini-Kopper King, asked the minister a number of questions earlier this afternoon, but there is still an outstanding question, so I am going to try once again to see if I can get an answer to the question.

Let me first say that I am very encouraged by the fact that the government has adopted the universal design standard for campgrounds. That is the gold standard. No matter how high they set their standard, however, if they fail to meet that standard, it will go over like a lead balloon.

The question that I want the minister to address is one that we discussed last Wednesday afternoon during motion debate. It is one that I sent to the minister in writing and he indicated that he would get back to us on it. That is the question of whether the Yukon government will make a firm commitment that they will have accessible campsites for the next camping season. In this supplementary budget, there is a \$522,000 allocation that has been removed from the Atlin Lake campground. The government is unable to proceed with the Atlin Lake campground because of legal challenges with the Taku River Tlingit First Nation. The government has taken that \$522,000 and put it into capital development in Parks to upgrade the Wolf Creek, Marsh Lake and Teslin campgrounds. Since the government made that announcement, we have been asking on this side of the House for the government to make a commitment that they would ensure that there were at least a couple of accessible campsites at those three campgrounds that are going to be upgraded in the coming year. We would like to see the minister make a commitment that there will be accessible campsites in the coming season resulting from the expenditures in upgrading Wolf Creek, Marsh Lake and Teslin campgrounds. Can the minister make that commitment please?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: At the new Conrad campground — expected to open in the spring of 2016 — universal design is being addressed in several ways. Two designated universally acceptable campsites will include accessible parking, picnic tables and camping areas. New barrier-free outhouses are spaced throughout the campground. Designated parking is located near facilities, such as the kitchen shelter and playground area and the design and construction of the new children's playground is planned for 2016 and includes an accessible area or a structure and a permanent accessible wildlife-viewing spotting scope is also planned for installation.

To the rest of it, I committed to the member opposite to getting back to her and I will in due course.

Ms. Moorcroft: I thank the minister for reading into the record the information about the Conrad campground being accessible when it opens. That's great. That's not the question that I asked the minister to answer. The minister is once again saying that he would get back to us. We have given the minister notice of the question. The government has put funds in the Environment supplementary budget that could be used to make accessible campsites when they do the upgrades at Wolf Creek, Marsh Lake and Teslin. The minister has indicated that they have accessible camping facilities at the Conrad, so it would seem they should know how to do it and they should know how much it costs.

Why can't the minister make the simple commitment that the government will be adding accessible campsites when they upgrade the campgrounds next year in Wolf Creek, Marsh Lake and Teslin?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: As I said in the House before, when we're doing upgrades to existing campgrounds — that is why we amended the motion to include all campgrounds — we will use the principles of universal design; that they should be incorporated where practical or possible so that people with disabilities could participate in the same programs and activities as those without disabilities.

I haven't seen the plan. There is a plan and we're moving forward with it. I have committed to hopefully by spring having the online map with the sites that are identified and I also committed to the member opposite — this will be the second time in the line of questioning — that I will get back to the member opposite on that.

Ms. Moorcroft: The minister would be unable to put information on the map to say that campsites are accessible if campsites are not accessible.

As the Member for Takhini-Kopper King mentioned earlier this afternoon, we have spoken to people in the Yukon who are part of the abilities community and who have been to the campgrounds around the Yukon. What they tell us is that while there have been some accessible outhouses, there are no accessible campsites.

I can see the minister is not going to answer the question no matter how many times I pose it, but I do want to make a representation that the government has identified funds for upgrading three campgrounds that are the heaviest used in close proximity to Whitehorse. During that upgrade, I would implore the government to use its new gold standard of a universal design approach and to ensure that there will be at least two accessible campsites and cook shelters as well as other accessible facilities as part of the upgrades.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I thank the member opposite for that.

Mr. Silver: Thank you to the representative from the department today for his time and also to the minister for answering our questions here today.

I did want to start off with just an observation. I got back from COP21. It was a wonderful opportunity to meet with several Premiers and others, but more importantly, I met with

a lot of ministers of Environment, from Nova Scotia to Manitoba, and of course the federal minister as well. It does beg the question — and I'm not sure if this was something that has been asked of the minister yet or not, but I'm sure it would be something that he would like to address. Why is it that the Yukon Party did not include the Minister of Environment in our trip over to Paris?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Early in the conversation, Madam Chair, COP21 was going to be a huge issue. There were going to be some major conversations. It was going to be a big deal and I guess that is the reason why we sent a robust group, including the member opposite and the Leader of the Official Opposition.

I had a chance to chat with the Grand Chief at lunch today and she told me about how overwhelming it was and how far it was to walk to go to some of the booths. Because we're in the Legislative Sitting, it was important that we not send the complete government. For us, it was important to have someone here and we believe it was really important that our Premier — because we do see the effects of climate change a lot more in the north — and to — I've said it in the House before — tell the Yukon story, so we had the Premier and we had members of the opposition — non-partisan — to tell the story of the Yukon.

I thank the member opposite for the question.

Mr. Silver: I do appreciate the answer. It was definitely a concern for the Government of Nova Scotia. I was talking to the MLA for the Antigonish region, who was their acting Minister of Environment and — very similar concerns. They also are in the Legislative session right now for the fall. He did go, but as the member pointed out, they didn't send such a robust group as well. It definitely was a question that begged to be asked, so I appreciate the minister's response.

We did talk a bit at length with the Member for Takhini-Kopper King and I just want to make sure that this question was asked. We spoke about how government has set the targets for its internal operations — cap GHG emissions at the levels of emissions for 2010 — we discussed that; reduce the GHG emissions by 20 percent below the cap by 2015; and work toward becoming carbon-neutral by 2020. I'm not sure though if the minister actually committed to whether or not he felt that we're on target to meeting those targets. Maybe he did, but once again, if he could reiterate for those three specific targets, does the minister believe that we will be meeting those targets in those timeframes?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: There is a two-year time lag for the numbers on that, so for the member opposite, I think the targets that we set are good targets. I believe that from just looking at what we have seen in our data, but there is a two-year lag in our data. I think that we're moving that way and I think it's a good thing. I look forward to the data as it comes every year.

To expand a little bit on that, I do look forward to having that conversation here within the next 90 days, as I mentioned to the Member for Takhini-Kopper King, my critic for Environment. Working with the provinces and territories, I had the opportunity to sit with the federal ministers. I haven't

met with the new federal minister, but I had the chance to sit with the Environment ministers earlier last year before COP21. We actually came up with a climate change committee within the Environment ministers. It's an important thing for Canada; it's an important thing especially for the north — we brought our northern perspective to that.

I look forward to the next steps while we move forward with a strategy that Canada's going to set out, and that we'll be a partner on.

Mr. Silver: Minister McKenna is a force to be reckoned with, for sure — Minister of Environment and Climate Change — new title. I look forward to those meetings as well, on a local basis.

If there's a two-year lag behind the data, we'll ask the question: Adding two to each of these dates, does the minister believe that his government is on target to meet 20 percent below the cap by two years plus 2015, so 2017? Does he also believe this in working toward being carbon-neutral by two years plus 2020, which would be 2022?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I do believe we're making great progress. That's why, in the latest update to the action plan, there are 28 new actions. I'm really looking forward — and I think I said this earlier — to looking at what comes out of the next 90 days. I understand there's a pretty robust commitment from many countries to help developing countries with funding for issues related to climate change, so I'm hoping we see the same sort of thing, and I'm hoping that in the conversations the member opposite may have with some of his colleagues, that's what gets brought across to them.

As I said earlier, when it comes to permafrost, it doesn't matter what we do, we're still going to see the effects of permafrost and the ice is still going to melt. There's going to be money needed, whether it's in the Dawson area — the whole City of Dawson, the member's riding — underneath it is permafrost. There are always going to be issues related to that and it's always going to cost money, so I'm hoping that, as we work with our partners, this is also addressed, so there's an opportunity for us to mitigate and adapt as we move forward.

Mr. Silver: There's definitely a need for us to be extremely concerned. We live in an area where we hear the conversation about two degrees above pre-industrial levels, and we hear now that the new target is 1.5 degrees. We live in an area that has already seen these increases over the last 10, 20, 30 and 40 years.

When the minister speaks about the federal counterparts coming to the Yukon and the 90 days' plan moving forward, now that Canada — to quote the new Prime Minister — is back, again, with all due respect, that doesn't have a lot to do with a commitment that was made already in the Yukon from this government to set certain targets — right? With those certain targets, we don't have to wait for Ottawa to tell us what we learned in Paris to move forward on the commitments that we've already made.

Does the minister believe that we're on track to meet our own emission targets that have been set locally, based upon local knowledge? I can ask two questions in a row here. These

are also the government's targets: *Yukon Solid Waste Action Plan* — is the minister satisfied with the progress of the solid waste action plan? Will the government meet any of its targets here that were part of that plan as well?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I thank the member opposite for his question. Although there is always more work to do, I tabled the new 2015 climate change action plan progress report that details significant progress made to date and identifies new actions. I believe there are 28 new actions. Significantly, the progress report provides an update on some of the existing commitments, reports on actions taken beyond the original commitments, and details the new actions that support existing goals.

I believe we are making progress. Like I said before, I'm looking forward to working with my provincial and territorial counterparts and the federal government as we move forward when it comes to talking about actions on climate change.

Mr. Silver: Actions beyond initial commitments sound great. It really does. It's still not whether or not the minister is confident in the fact of whether or not we are going to meet these targets. I will move on. I don't know if not committing to a "yes" means a "no", but I guess the record stands as it stands as far as whether or not the minister is confident in being able to hit these ambitious targets.

Again, with the *Yukon Solid Waste Action Plan* — in his last response, the minister did not mention the *Yukon Solid Waste Action Plan* and whether or not he believes his government will meet any of these targets that are part of that plan, but I will move on.

I would like to talk about bison up in the minister's area — the Aishihik bison population. As we know, Madam Chair, and as the minister obviously knows, this has continued to grow over the last few years. Last year, the hunting season was extended to allow for greater numbers to be taken. As of April, the population was still expected to be around 1,300 — 300 more than the management calls for. Will any additional action be taken this year to attempt to meet the management targets?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: In accordance with the 2012 bison management plan, hunting is the primary method used to manage the Aishihik bison population. Last winter, 180 bison were harvested from this population — essentially, sort of stabilizing the herd growth last year. New this year, the winter season now extends from November 1 through to March 31, adding six weeks of harvest opportunities for hunters. Bison hunters are still encouraged to harvest the cow bison to better balance the ratio of males and females in this herd.

We continue to monitor the distribution of bison and will continue to produce the maps of key bison concentrations to assist hunters in planning their hunting trips. Starting in 2016, special guiding permits will be available for bison.

The other thing I just wanted to add to this Madam Chair is that there are — the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board has some recommendations that are on the table right now that they're looking at and assessing right now, but that

would be something that would probably come in the 2017 season.

Mr. Silver: Madam Chair, if the minister can comment on the solid waste action plan targets?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The solid waste action plan falls under Community Services, so that would be a better question to ask to the Minister of Community Services.

Mr. Silver: Okay. I guess I am going to have to wait until the spring session for that one.

It would be interesting to know what the Minister of Environment has to say about the solid waste action plan, as it does deal with recycling and it does deal with everybody doing their part, but okay, I will move on.

I'm going to move on to the Ddhaw Ghro Habitat Protection Area plan. Madam Chair, on May 13, 2013, I tabled a motion — Motion No. 474 — urging the Government of Yukon to quickly explain why the recommended Ddhaw Ghro Habitat Protection Area plan submitted to the Government of Yukon in June 2006 for final ratification had not yet been signed. In December 2013, the minister reported that it had not been signed off due to — and I quote: "... issues in years past with regard to fire protection within that particular protected area." At that time, the minister indicated that those issues had been worked out. The department website however still has this listed as an in-progress management plan. So Madam Chair, where are we with this habitat protection area plan and has it been signed off?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The Ddhaw Ghro area has long been recognized for its importance culturally and for its ecological values. The habitat protection area was committed to by the First Nation of Na Cho Nyäk Dun, Selkirk First Nation and the Yukon government under chapter 10 of the final agreements. This new habitat protection area, which is approximately 1,600 square kilometres in size, will be managed under the *Wildlife Act* and in accordance with an approved management plan. The management plan is close to being finalized, but work continues between the parties on finding mutually agreeable approaches — like the member opposite spoke to — on fire management and also on motorized access.

While planning continues, the area is effectively protected in the interim through withdrawals from exploration and development of the oil, gas and coal, placer mining and quartz mining; and pre-existing rights, claims and dispositions within the boundary were not affected.

So it's a work in progress. We're close. I'll update members when it's finalized.

Mr. Silver: It sounds like that's the same briefing note that we got the last time we asked this question. It's still in progress and they're still close, yet this habitat protection area plan has not been signed off.

I am going to move on to the Marwell tar pits. Can the minister provide an update on the tar pits? What work has been done this year since we last asked about it?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The cleanup of the Marwell tar pits is a multi-year project. It is co-funded with an agreement with the Government of Canada. The phase 1 assessment

activities are now complete, and the project is moving into the phase 2 of remediation. I might add that my deputy minister and I actually had an opportunity to go with staff and see the site ourselves, and it is overwhelming.

A request for proposals to procure remediation construction will be developed this fall, 2015, and it is anticipated that the contract will be awarded in early 2016 to begin the remedial construction work on this site. I might add that regular project updates are communicated to the affected First Nations — the Ta'an Kwäch'än Council and the Kwanlin Dün First Nation — as well as the affected individuals and businesses in the area. The overall budget for this project is \$6.8 million. The Yukon government's share of this cost is \$2.04 million, which is largely sourced from our northern strategy fund. That is the update.

Mr. Silver: Just to clarify, in that briefing note there was a confirmation of something being finished by the fall of 2015. We are past the fall of 2015. It sounded like we looked toward this being accomplished. Was it actually accomplished?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: No, the request for proposals was for the fall, then the contract would be awarded in 2016 and the work would be done.

Mr. Silver: Did the request go out? Is that already done for the fall of 2015?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Yes, I believe it has.

Mr. Silver: Thanks for the clarification. I have a question that might be more suited for line-by-line debate, but I will try it now. Of course, it would be fine if it is not answered right now. The Watson Lake district office — what was the original budget for this building and the final costs?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I don't have the overall total, but in the supplementaries, the \$157,000 is a carry-forward of the funds to demolish the old building and re-fence the lot, so that is what that extra money is for.

Mr. Silver: I'm curious, Madam Chair, in the Premier's mandate letter to the ministers, the one to the Minister of Environment mentioned "participate and contribute" to the mine licensing improvement initiative. If the minister could maybe expand on what his department doing to contribute to this process?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: We're leading a cooperative effort with assessors, regulators, First Nations and industry to improve the timelines, the clarity, the transparency and the effectiveness of the mine licensing system. This work will establish common standards, specify processes, and clarify the roles of the regulatory agencies so as to provide certainty for companies who want to do business in Yukon.

We're also engaging with the First Nations to discuss how they want to be involved in the decisions regarding mining activity and how they derive benefits from mining. The proposed changes in no way lessen, of course, our environmental protection or oversight of the mining activity, but instead improve the regulatory system's ability to ensure environmental standards are met. We have established a working group with the First Nations to develop an agenda for

this initiative, as well as other mining-related issues that are of concern.

A cleaner and simpler process will mean that the mining-related licences will be easier to assess, interpret and enforce and more time could be spent on carrying out mining operations, ensuring licensing conditions are respected and protecting our lands and our water. So that's our role.

Mr. Silver: Thank you, Madam Chair and I appreciate that from the minister. Just back to the district office, I was wondering if the minister could provide a written response on the cost of the Watson Lake building and — I'll leave it at that.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Yes, I'll get back to the member opposite with that.

Mr. Silver: I'm going to move on to some outfitting questions here. I know that this has already been brought up — it was brought up in Question Period I believe and also on the floor for this department.

Madam Chair, just to recap, there is currently a proposal put forward by the government to place five — I believe it was five; others have said four, but I believe it was five — of the remaining game management subzones — the GMS. Those are: 713, 717, 720, 724 and 726 in game management zone 7 east on permit for Dall sheep hunting. We've had a long discussion as to why the government is doing this and moving in this direction. The minister has said before that we're just looking into it. It seems like it has gone a little bit further than just looking into it. He can confirm or deny whether or not this is the intent of the government and that they're moving through the process now. I'm concerned that new restrictions — well, they're going to be putting in place a lot of restrictions on Yukon resident hunters, simply because of the reintroduction of outfitting in that area.

I guess the question that hasn't really been asked yet, or addressed, is: During the public consultations, did the minister feel that Yukoners were supporting this change in direction — or this potential change in direction — that Yukon government is considering? Also, when will a decision be made on this proposal?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I just want to clarify this — and I think I clarified it yesterday with the question — but this new concession that everybody — it's an old concession. It was just issued a permit, so this has been a concession, like many of the outfitting concessions, that has been around for tens of years — some of them for a hundred years.

The proposed regulation change aims to manage harvest of the sheep. The member is correct: there are five of the zones in the popular and accessible hunting area in southern Yukon. The Department of Environment has worked with the outfitter to establish quotas for moose and sheep for most of the outfitter area. A combination of resident sheep permits and establishing government outfitter quotas for this area will help manage a sustainable sheep population.

The proposed regulation change is in process right now, mandated under the *Umbrella Final Agreement* with the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board, so I'm not going to comment on what I think is going to come out of it,

because I strongly believe in the process; I believe in the *Umbrella Final Agreement* and chapter 16, which comes to fish and wildlife, and chapter 17, which comes to forestry. I believe in the resources councils; I believe in the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board and those processes.

The great thing about that is that they do very good consultation. They talk to Yukoners; they talk to the outfitters; they talk to everybody. They hold public meetings. As the Yukon grows, we're going to see issues that pop up, so I'm going to let that process continue on and I'm going to look forward to the recommendations that come back from the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board, and then there will be some comments on that after from the minister.

Mr. Silver: That's great. I'm glad that the minister respects the process, as he should, but that's not the question. The question was: What is the minister hearing? I can tell him that what I'm hearing is that this is not necessarily the way to go.

I'm not asking the minister to comment on anything else past what he's hearing. We know that the minister is an avid hunter. I like to go out hunting myself. We have lots of friends who hunt. I mean, it's a Yukon tradition. We're wondering what he's hearing. Is it matching up with the proposed changes?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: The Department of Environment is also, as the member opposite knows, responsible for conservation. When there is an area that's being hit hard, there are some processes in place. In the guidelines to establish outfitter quotas — the Member for Takhini-Kopper King and I had this conversation yesterday — “Notwithstanding the conditions stated above, if a sheep permit area is established for resident hunters, all outfitters who harvest sheep in that permit area should be placed on sheep quotas for that specific area.”

This is a tool. This is one of the tools that we use within the department. We have this guideline and we have the process set out under the *Umbrella Final Agreement*. I, myself, enjoy the outdoors and am an avid hunter, but the responsibility of the minister within the Department of Environment also is for conservation. If there is an area that has low populations, and we need to look at putting in a permit hunt or the outfitter needs to be on quotas, that is what the department does. We rely on the expert advice of our biologists and we rely on the regulation change proposal that is set out under the *Umbrella Final Agreement* to go out and consult completely with all Yukoners. They do a wonderful job of that.

This is just one regulation change proposal. We see them every two years — different regulation change proposals. I think the end results of those regulation change proposals are quite successful. I think most Yukoners are happy.

Mr. Silver: Again, we are not hearing what the minister is hearing from the hunting community. This isn't necessarily a knock against one set of folks who go into the wilderness for hunting compared to another. It's not. In talking to a lot of my friends who are hunters and talking about the outfitters who are from the local community — Dawson has outfitters who

are born and raised and who live in the community and they are excellent stewards, the ones we know who live in this town. Absolutely, conservation is a huge issue for them. It's their livelihood. Of course, it's going to be. That is not the question.

The question is: What is the minister hearing from the hunting community on these proposals? I am just suggesting that, hopefully, from the communications that he is receiving from local hunters, they will find a better way to manage our populations, or at least listen through that negotiation process.

I am happy to hear the minister believes in the UFA and the process of negotiations that happen on a bi-yearly basis on these particular files. This one is an interesting issue. I am going to go on to the NorthCurl Outfitters.

As the minister knows, in August 2014, a BC outfitter took clients on a sheep hunt near Primrose Mountain and ended up shooting two sheep in the wrong hunting zone. A BC man who works in the Yukon as an outfitter was fined \$11,500 for violations of the Territory's *Wildlife Act* as a result. I have a couple of questions on that.

Typically, outfitters charge tens of thousands of dollars to take non-residents on hunting trips and are paid a certain amount by their clients for each of the animals they do kill. I am sure the minister is well aware of this incident. Can the minister tell Yukoners whether or not the sheep were forfeited as a result of the conviction? Was the outfitter allowed to keep the money that he was paid by his client?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I will have to confirm for the member opposite — I know that this issue went through the courts. I am not exactly sure, and I don't want to state something that could be not correct in the House here today. I will get back to the member opposite on that.

But I do want to take a little bit of issue with the member opposite when he asked me the first question, or his response and my response: What does the Minister of Environment think? What are Yukon hunters saying? What are outfitters saying? What are people saying to the minister?

When the minister hears from organizations or meets with organizations, and there's a regulation change proposal, I'm not going to pre-empt the process by commenting on it. I pass on that information — all that information that's gathered through the community meetings, through the hard work from the department on providing the numbers or the data that's required. I'm not going to step up. If the member opposite wants to pre-empt and decide what he thinks should come out of it — I'm going to let the Fish and Wildlife Management Board — they do a great job, and I'm going to let the process work itself through that process. I do want to say on the floor of the House today to Yukoners that I believe in this process and that's why I'm not commenting on what I think or what hunters are telling me, because I want to hear and I want to see how the process comes out; I think that's good governance.

Mr. Silver: I honestly believe the minister's heart is in the right place on this; I do. I know that he's an avid hunter and that he respects wilderness and respects management practices — absolutely. We'll leave it at that. I just really hope

that what he does here comes to some form of fruition through this process, because my phone is ringing off the hook on this particular issue; I'm sure his is as well. It's worth debate in this Legislative Assembly.

Back to the court case — there has to be a policy here. Is there a policy that the department can talk to me about? You know, not to compare oranges to apples, but a great example in Nova Scotia: if you're caught poaching lobster, you lose the car that you drove there with and any gear that you used. There's set legislation and everybody knows it in managing that part of their industry. Listen — that industry in Nova Scotia is sustainable and it's sustainable with the management practices and the fines that are associated with it.

So can the minister comment on — maybe in this particular case, sure. If it's a court case he doesn't want to talk about, I can respect that. But again, if the fine is \$5,000 per sheep and if that's a standard fine, and then another — I think it's like \$1,500 for administrative or something else — totalling \$11,500, and if you're getting thousands of dollars for the hunt — tens of thousands of dollars for the hunt — does the fine outweigh the crime in this case?

So I guess specifically, if he can talk about this particular case: Was the customer allowed to keep the sheep or was it forfeited? Was the outfitter allowed to keep the money that he was paid by his client? Again, in this case, mistaken areas and all that stuff aside, he was found guilty.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: We'll confirm it, but I don't believe that he got to keep the sheep.

Each court case is different and we rely on the courts. This is how it works and I think it's the same thing across Canada. There are some rules and regulations but, when it goes to court, sometimes the heaviest fine isn't implemented — it's the lower fine, and you've seen it in many of the acts and regulations that we have here.

I can confirm to the member opposite, but that's something that went forward to the courts and the judge of the day might have made a different decision. I'll confirm with the member opposite. I'll get that information for him and I'll get back to him.

Mr. Silver: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to the department official for his time here today and for the minister for answering these questions.

Just on that last point, we know that the court has given a specific fine. Are there government fines for these types of actions or does it have to go to the court? As I said, in Nova Scotia, the regulations are clear; the fines are clear. You can challenge those, yet it's still a clear amount.

If the minister wants to get back to me with a written return on that, that's fine.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I will get back to the member opposite in a written return. That's a little grey area for me. I'm not sure, so I'll get back to him.

Ms. White: Just to follow up on some stuff that we talked about earlier in this legislative Sitting in Question Period, there was one unanimous feeling at the Fish and Wildlife Management Board meeting, which is that the biggest risk to sheep right now is unfettered ORV access. That

was an interesting one because, in a meeting that lasted four and a half hours, the common ground was the concern raised over access by off-road vehicles.

We know that we've made legislative changes here to be able to identify areas for protection — both environmentally sensitive areas and things like that. I guess my question is: as the minister thought about approaching the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and actually designating some of those areas as being off-limits to ORVs to help sheep populations or ones that have been recognized as being environmentally sensitive?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: That may just be one of the recommendations that come from the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board.

We recognize that there are specific places and areas in Yukon that are particularly sensitive to damage from off-road vehicles, and that is why we need a way to target specific areas where it is appropriate to restrict ORV use and limit the growth of new trails.

I think I've said this in the House before. That's what was contemplated when we made changes to the *Territorial Lands (Yukon) Act* last year and what we're anticipating is a process to identify these areas and put it into place for these types of protections. To do that, we think the model used for the creation of changes of hunting and fishing regulations that involves First Nations, renewable resources councils, the Fish and Wildlife Management Board and Yukoners is a possible solution. We've sought input from these groups and that's why we did extend the consultation, so we look forward to seeing what comes out of that.

It is important that we continue to work with our renewable resources councils and others to develop this process that will allow us to target specific areas that are in need of protection, but also so we can treat all Yukoners fairly.

Ms. White: In those changes to the lands act, it was discussed that it was going to be based on a complaint process as opposed to a pre-emptive — looking at an area that was at risk, and then moving toward that protection.

I know that the previous Minister of Environment and previous Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources were approached by a group with concerns and they highlighted environmentally sensitive areas that were at risk of damage due to ORVs. At that point in time, they thought that the conversations with the government departments went really well and they were actually hoping for interim protection in the high-risk season.

It's the area around Trout Lake actually, and so the question is — different Minister of Environment than previous, but: Have those steps been taken? Are we looking at actually seeing the protection in the risky seasons for that area that was brought to government as being environmentally at risk due to ORVs?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I'm not going to comment too much on the *Territorial Lands (Yukon) Act*, as that doesn't fall within my department. I know the Department of Environment commented on that part of it, but it falls under

EMR. That's just one of the tools, as is the rate change proposal — and I believe in the Pilot Mountain area, we went to a permit in that area.

We look forward to seeing what comes from the recommendations that are in front of the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board right now, and we'll move forward with actions and rate change, and the requests that come from them.

Mr. Tredger: I have just one quick question. I was at the EMR library, and they have a very extensive aerial photograph collection. I'm wondering if the Department of Environment has done any aerial photographs of presumably sensitive areas to see and determine the amount of encroachment and habitat fragmentation by off-road vehicle use. I think it's important that we establish a baseline that will guide us in the future, as we go forward.

I know I've talked to a number of friends who are pilots, and have talked to different people who have been flying over the area, and they have said that the encroachment and the fragmentation are visible and they are growing each year in a marked way. I'm wondering if the Department of Environment has conducted any aerial surveys so we get some baseline data, whether they have started to analyze the encroachment and to look for ways to protect some of the very sensitive areas, especially those above the treeline.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: To answer the member opposite, our focus in the Department of Environment is our wildlife inventory and the habitat. I think we spoke a little bit about it yesterday, when we talked about the Klaza caribou herd. That was an example of us looking at the habitat, looking at the food and then looking at the population, and that's why you'll see in our budget every year that there's a good number of dollars set aside for gathering that information, so we have a good wildlife inventory and that we have some ideas about habitat.

Then, as I said earlier today, if there is an issue — a specific area that's an issue — that's why we see these regulation change proposals moving forward, whether we move to a permit hunt or whether we deal with it through the *Territorial Lands (Yukon) Act*, when it comes to ATVs, once we get that thing finished.

There are many tools in the toolbox, but we're focused on conservation. It's really important for us to have that data, to have the numbers on the sheep, the caribou, the moose — the animals that everyone loves to hunt, but the animals that everyone loves to take photos of. I think the members opposite have brought up wildlife viewing, and that's also key for the Yukon.

It's a balance, but I'm confident in the department. We do a great job when it comes to gathering that information, and we have very reliable and good data when it comes to our wildlife populations and habitat.

Mr. Tredger: So there have been no aerial surveys done and no mapping of the area at all over the last five years?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: To answer the member opposite, I believe there have been some — probably not as much as the

focus that we have put on surveying for population and habitat.

I think I answered this earlier in the House that, when it comes to the Porcupine caribou herd, there was a lot of aerial photography of the area there — the habitat, access areas and stuff like that. So we do gather some of that information, but our main focus is on the actual populations and habitat.

Ms. White: Just to follow up on the same train of thought, I appreciate the department or the minister saying that the department's concern is around the actual animals themselves, but if habitat fragmentation continues at the rate that it has, and we're not mapping it and we're not paying attention to how it's happening — the reason why both outfitters and resident hunters agreed that the biggest threat to the sheep population was the use of ORVs was because those populations are being pushed farther and farther away from what was their habitat because of the fragmentation that's occurring.

Is habitat like health? So intact space is important for wildlife species. Is habitat fragmentation not a concern of the Department of Environment?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I want to thank my deputy for this information. It is a concern for us and we do comment on it when it comes to YESAB applications. The same thing would go forward with the rate proposal process. When we provide information for the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board, they have those tools and that information also to look at when they make their decisions.

Ms. White: I appreciate the answer from the minister.

In his role as the Minister of Environment — to me that seems like that is the figurehead; the steward of the environment of Yukon. In his role as that steward, is he able to have conversations, for example, with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and advocate for the protection of wildlife habitat to slow down that fragmentation? Is the Minister of Environment able to champion the stewardship of the Yukon environment from the fragmentation that is happening due to ORV use in our wild spaces?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: In part, that is why we'll see legislation put forward. There will be regulations in a different department from mine put forward. So we communicate all the time.

Mr. Elias: Can the minister give an update to the House on the progression of the Bell River, Summit Lake and Whitefish wetlands protected area that was agreed to in the 2009 north Yukon land use plan? This scheduled protected area is — the original boundary set was 1,525 square kilometres of north Yukon. I have been there several times myself over the course of my life. It's really very rich with Dall sheep, moose, caribou, bears and anadromous and catadromous fish populations.

Can the minister give the House an update on where the planning is at? Who is on the planning team? Have final boundaries for the area been set? What type and level of protection is each area going to have — whether it's going to be a habitat protection area or whether it's going to be a

special management area? If the minister can give an update to the House on that, that would be great.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Establishing habitat protection areas is one way that we can preserve habitat, practice conservation and safeguard traditional First Nation harvesting practices. The Yukon government recognizes its obligations under the final agreements and is making progress on management planning on several of these habitat protection areas.

When it comes to the Summit Lake and Bell River territorial park — agreement on the park boundaries was reached by the Yukon government and Vuntut Gwitchin government in December 2014, I believe. Management planning was initiated in the spring of 2015.

This park was identified in, of course, the *North Yukon Regional Land Use Plan*. So this park is established in the *North Yukon Regional Land Use Plan*. The plan specified that further boundary refinement and delineation will be required for this protection area. In 2014, the Department of EMR and the Department of Environment reached consensus on the proposed boundary. The boundary proposed was endorsed by the Vuntut Gwitchin government in December 2014. So a park management planning working group was established in 2015. We're looking forward to seeing the completion of this.

Mr. Elias: I thank the minister and all the department officials for working toward the successful conclusion of this initiative. Can the minister elaborate on which organizations are on the local planning team — whether it's North Yukon Renewable Resources Council, members of the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, members of his department — or he mentioned the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources? Then I'll ask my final question.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: It comes out of our parks planning portion of the department. I don't have the exact answer for the member opposite. So I'll have to get back to the member opposite. I can find that out for him.

Mr. Elias: Okay. Thank you. Something that is near and dear to my constituents with regard to the planning of this new protection area is about water — local water monitoring — just because of the Whitefish wetlands and the way that the headwaters come out of the mountains into the Bell and Eagle rivers.

Something of interest to my constituents is having some type of water-monitoring effort among the partners, whether it is communities or school organizations working toward helping to implement this, or whether it is governments by themselves or governments and industry, or whatever. My constituents consider a water-monitoring concept as an important part of the management planning within this new protected area. Does the minister have any thoughts on that?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: I do thank the member opposite for the question. I had the opportunity to meet with one of the locals and had this conversation with the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin. I explained to him that we have a water strategy and we have an action plan and progress to date was adding 1,500 hydrometric and four water-quality monitoring stations and upgrading 23 of our hydrometric stations with real-time

satellite telemetry. I just had the opportunity to speak with my deputy minister earlier today about making sure that we look into that and make sure that if that is required, that they are looking at monitoring the water there, that we put a station in there. He can pass that on to the member who we met with and let him know that there is progress on that and we will be putting in a water monitoring station there to collect data.

Chair: Does any other member wish to speak in general debate? Prior to going to line-by-line debate, would members like to take a break?

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Chair: Prior to taking a break, we're going to go into line-by-line debate.

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 52, Department of Environment, cleared or carried, as required.

Unanimous consent re deeming all lines in Vote 52, Department of Environment, cleared or carried

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 52, Department of Environment, cleared or carried, as required. Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures underexpenditure in the amount of \$68,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$620,000 agreed to

Total Expenditures in the amount of \$552,000 agreed to Department of Environment agreed to

Chair: We will be going to Vote 22.

Would members like a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

The matter before the Committee is general debate on Vote 22, Yukon Development Corporation, in Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*.

Yukon Development Corporation

Hon. Mr. Cathers: Madam Chair, this is typically an annual appearance by Yukon Development Corporation in the House with witnesses in Committee. Usually we don't get to debating the vote in budgetary debate, since the corporations are both corporations of the Yukon government that are managed by governing boards, though the appropriations for YDC must be approved within the Legislative Assembly.

I would like to thank the chair of the Yukon Development Corporation Board of Directors, Joanne Fairlie, for joining me here this afternoon, along with the president and chief executive officer of the Yukon Development Corporation, Justin Ferbey. I would like to thank them for making time in their busy schedules for the second day in row to appear in the Assembly — yesterday to answer questions directly and today to provide me with support, as we deal with what is in fact only a \$372,000 item in the budget related to the revotes of contracts for consultants that were doing the next generation hydro work, pursuant to the planning directive by Yukon government and the work plan that has been approved by the Yukon Development Corporation Board of Directors.

I would like to also thank all of the members of both boards of Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation for the excellent work they do within their respective areas of responsibility. The Yukon Energy Corporation, as members are likely aware, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Yukon Development Corporation. It is itself a regulated utility and, for portions of its work, including, and especially, anything that it seeks to recover through electrical rates, it is subject to review by its regulator, the Yukon Utilities Board.

That is also one of the reasons for the fact — as some members have asked questions about previously in the House — why the Yukon Energy Corporation is doing a 20-year resource plan, while the Yukon Development Corporation works on the longer term. That is because of the fact that Yukon Energy Corporation has an obligation to present the Yukon Utilities Board — its regulator — with ongoing resource plans for the 20-year period.

Secondly, it is because, when planning work is being done of a longer term nature, it is structurally more appropriate to have the Yukon Development Corporation do that longer term work within its area of responsibility. That is why the next generation hydro work is being led and managed by Yukon Development Corporation and its board of directors — and most especially by Joanne Fairlie, the chair.

I would like to thank her for her many hours — and now several years — of work in that capacity, for the excellent work she has done of strengthening the governance and the corporate accountability structure within those corporations. That has begun with, and included in large part, responding to recommendations and issues that the Auditor General has identified in the past, including in the area of the reason — as some members have been confused or unclear about — for the complete separation of the membership of the two boards.

That is something that responds to recommendations that the Auditor General of Canada made to the Yukon government in its report regarding the Energy Solutions Centre. Some of the issues identified by the Auditor General included the issue of overlapping positions between the Yukon Development Corporation and its subsidiary at the time, which was the Energy Solutions Centre, and encouraged the government to pay attention to that in corporate governance. As well, we have paid close attention to recommendations and issues that have come from the Auditor

General of Canada in subsequent reports regarding the government's financial structure. The excellent work that has been done to strengthen and clarify the structure of both corporations and their respective mandates in areas of responsibility has been in large part prompted by that. I would like to again commend Joanne for her work in that area and also acknowledge the work of the former, but now retired, president and chief executive officer of Yukon Development Corporation and one-time deputy minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Greg Komaromi, for the excellent work that he did on the governance structure. I would like to thank and acknowledge as well the work of assistant deputy minister, Shirley Abercrombie, and the Department of Finance, as well as the officials from Justice, including Lawrence Purdy, who were all part of strengthening the governance structure in response to issues identified by the Auditor General.

I would like to as well, in talking about next generation hydro, briefly refer to and provide the members with some context that they may not have been aware of, especially if they were unable to attend the recent technical workshop hosted by Yukon Development Corporation. I should again note that, in planning within Yukon Energy Corporation and Yukon Development Corporation, we are making a sincere effort — and the boards and staff are making a sincere effort — to provide information to Yukoners so that everyone can make informed decisions about our energy choices. There are no perfect choices to meet Yukon's future energy needs. All of the choices and all of the options have their own costs and their own impacts. We believe that it's important to provide Yukoners with that information and do our planning, in large part, in public; to make the public aware of what the boards and, ultimately, Yukon government are considering and assessing in the options that are presented to them so that they have a better understanding of why, when Yukon Energy Corporation goes forward to its regulator, the Yukon Utilities Board, with an application for a specific project — they have an understanding of how the Yukon Energy Corporation came to the point of making a decision to recommend that project and to apply to the Yukon Utilities Board for permission to construct it.

To just briefly reference some of the comments and questions when witnesses appeared before the House yesterday afternoon, one of the things that I think at least one member of the House was not understanding was the reference around ministerial approval of the policies and projects with significant financial and operational impacts, which is intended to provide the board discretion with what matters achieve that threshold and not be overly prescriptive, but to ensure that if there are projects that, for example, may require or seek Yukon government support to avoid the entire cost of those projects going into the rate base, that structure of the reference and protocol is intended to ensure that, prior to getting to the stage where a project is well-advanced, government is well-aware of the potential cost of a project and aware that a request will be made, as it was with the construction of the LNG facility, for government assistance to avoid all of the cost going into the rate base.

Similarly with the federal contribution and a portion of the territorial contribution to the construction of the Mayo B project — those contributions, because they were made by government to the corporation — those amounts did not have to be passed on to ratepayers. The reason for that is, of course, that anything that goes into the rate base and is approved by the Yukon Utilities Board is a cost that ultimately is borne by the ratepayer. So these types of investments are consistent with, in our view, the principle of past investments by the federal government through the former NCPC — the Northern Canada Power Commission — structure and, through those investments, allow infrastructure needs to be addressed, while not making the citizens of the area immediately pay the costs on their bills.

Speaking specifically to the Yukon Development Corporation, as you may know, Madam Chair, the Yukon government asked Yukon Development Corporation to investigate possible hydro solutions to meet the territory's needs 20 to 50 years from now. Over 99 percent of our current electrical generation comes from hydroelectricity. To maintain this level of supply for future generations, we believe that an important part of that was to look for new hydro options and to consider them, while again noting, as I've mentioned previously in the House, that Yukon Energy Corporation in particular is considering a full suite of potential energy options, including solar, wind, pump storage, and also both fossil fuels and smaller scale hydro to meet the needs within its 20-year resource plan. They will be ultimately making their recommendations and requests to the Yukon Utilities Board when they present that resource plan.

Similarly, the Yukon Development Corporation has — although focusing on its work of doing planning for a potential larger scale hydro project to meet the needs 20 to 50 years from now — also provided comparative options to those who attended workshops, including the most recent technical workshops, which provided four basic options for people to consider and understand the potential costs and footprints of various solutions.

Access to clean, affordable electricity is an important part of the daily lives of Yukoners in all sectors of the economy and to Yukon's future economy growth. It is important to all customers — whether they be residential consumers; whether they use it for home heating, commercial purposes or for government use.

This is why we have asked Yukon Development Corporation to do the planning work to look for a next generation hydro project that addresses Yukon's future energy needs and economic growth and provides an opportunity to partner with First Nations.

Yukon First Nations are an integral part of Yukon's development. The Yukon government currently enjoys successful partnerships with First Nations on energy projects, including partnerships with the Kluane First Nation on a wind project, with Kwanlin Dün for Yukon Energy Corporation's recent liquefied natural gas facility, with Na Cho Nyäk Dun on Mayo B and with Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in on the Mayo-Dawson transmission line project.

Through the next generation hydro project, the Yukon government hopes to have a partnership with one or more First Nations and we want to work together to help make choices that benefit our respective citizens and future generations of Yukoners.

The next generation hydro project is an important component of the Yukon government's planning work to address the future energy needs of future generations of Yukoners. Although the next generation hydro project focuses on the longer term needs, the shorter term needs still need to be addressed.

Yukon Energy Corporation recently started the process of updating its 20-year resource plan and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources recently released the independent power production policy to complement the microgeneration program, which allows people to produce renewable energy and sell it to the grid. I would note that that is through changes — that microgeneration program is assisted as well by changes that the Yukon government made to the rural electrification program through Bill No. 80, which also created the framework and the legislative authority to expand the rural domestic well drilling program into municipalities.

That change that was made to the rural electrification program allowed people who are on the grid to borrow money under the rural electrification program for the addition of home renewable energy projects. Previously, if someone was off the grid, they could receive money under rural electrification for a home-based renewable energy project to meet their energy needs. If they were connecting to the grid, they could receive money to connect to the grid, but once they were connected — it was an either/or situation — they did not have the opportunity to both finance renewable energy and connect to the grid. This has allowed — again subject to the cap that is within rural electrification on the maximum amount of property value that can be borrowed under the program — people who are on the grid to choose to put in a solar energy system, a wind energy system or a small-scale hydro system and sell that energy to the grid at a slight premium.

That is again a change and an enhancement from what had previously been proposed by people, including members opposite, which was a net metering program that would simply provide kilowatt-hour credit per kilowatt hour, meaning that for energy that was produced that would then be offset against energy that was consumed. Our program has provided a slight incentive, and that amounts to roughly six or six and a half cents. I should note as well that the microgeneration program was deliberately set up as a pilot project for two primary reasons.

One is to evaluate whether that structure should be reassessed and changed in some way, recognizing this is the first time in Yukon history that such a program has existed. Secondly, although ultimately those costs are expected to be part of what goes into the rate base and the cost of Yukon Energy Corporation, for Yukon Energy Corporation to have made an application to the Yukon Utilities Board to pay the cost of a microgeneration program would have cost more than

the estimated cost over the next two years of funding the program. So for the first two years of that program, it is being funded by the Energy Solutions Centre within the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

In 2009, the government produced the *Energy Strategy for Yukon*, which identifies priority actions for renewable energy and electricity. As a colleague of mine mentioned earlier in the House, I would just like to clarify that a progress report on the energy strategy is about to be released. We are not currently creating a new energy strategy.

The priority actions included increasing the renewable energy supply in Yukon by 20 percent by 2020 and supporting strategic investments in infrastructure to increase the supply of electricity from renewable sources. We have already met and exceeded the 20-percent renewable energy supply target through the additions of turbines at both Mayo B and the Aishihik facility with the third turbine. The Mayo B project added 10 megawatts to the existing hydro facility in Mayo, and the Aishihik third turbine added seven megawatts to the existing Aishihik hydro facility.

These are examples of some of the investments government has made in creating new renewable energy supplies for the Yukon. But we have not stopped at meeting that 20-percent target that we set out to achieve five years from now. Despite the fact that we have already more than completed that target, we are continuing to look for opportunities to invest in hydroelectric projects. The boards and staff of both Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation are doing their due diligence in doing planning work, identifying potential options, comparing the costs of those options and, ultimately, coming up with projects that are robust and are known investments in energy.

I should note that an example of how not to do green energy policy is seen through Ontario's *Green Energy Act* and the strong criticisms made by Ontario's Auditor General in her recent report on the electrical system, which found that not only did it cost consumers \$37 billion more than the market price for electricity — again, that is \$37 billion with a "b" — over an eight-year period, that in fact the costs of solar and other renewable energy in Ontario was significantly higher than what consumers paid for energy from similar sources in the United States.

We are attempting to ensure that we learn from mistakes of other jurisdictions, and that is why the boards and staff are doing their good work and their due diligence on behalf of all Yukoners.

Mr. Tredger: I too welcome the officials from the Yukon Development Corporation back to the House.

It is an exciting time to be dealing with energy in the world today, in light of COP21 and the world's commitment to go to a fossil-fuel-free world as quickly as possible. It's a challenging time too because we as a society have developed a dependence on fossil fuels, but it's exciting because in our universities, in our businesses, in our homes, in our corporations, we as humans are pulling together to find a new way to create and store energy. So we task our corporations — the Yukon Development Corporation and the Yukon Energy

Corporation — with a big challenge, but we can be cutting edge.

I remember when we first got our windmills. I had come from Alberta and saw the two windmills up on Haeckel Hill. I thought — wow. Now we see windmills around the world. We see them in Alberta. We are cutting edge. We have the technology. We have the people. We have the Yukon Research Centre and the northern climate innovation. We have engineers in our community. We are talking about things that, five years ago, I didn't know much about, if anything. I knew a bit about wind and solar, but I'm learning about — and when I say "I", I should include everyone, because we're all part of that learning curve. We are learning about geothermal and electrical thermal storage. We are learning about wood gasification. We're learning about new storage options. Investors are starting to jump into the renewable energy field. We're following people like Elon Musk and Tesla Motors, or SolarCity — which wants to put a solar panel on every house in America — and it's one of the fastest growing companies in the world.

Through the Yukon Development Corporation and the Yukon Energy Corporation and the Yukon Energy Solutions Centre, we have that opportunity, so I thank the people who are working in those corporations and the Energy Solutions Centre for helping us get off fossil fuels, which we must, as soon as possible.

It seems that the way forward is a suite of different ways. As the minister said, we can't rely on a centralized system, but the way of the future seems to be a decentralized, nimble system that can take advantage of technology, that can move forward, that can change the way we look at storage — pumped hydro, lithium-ion batteries, power packs in our homes — the options are there, and it is exciting.

One of the ways that the minister may be able to help move us that way is the Yukon Utilities Board does not have the authority now to include the true cost of carbon, or the environmental costs, in determining the viability of projects. My question for the minister is: Will he consider going to Cabinet to issue a directive to the Yukon Utilities Board that, in the future, they consider the full environmental costs of a project when they're determining the cost and the viability of a project?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I thank the member for the question. I would note again that, as we are looking at the energy picture for Yukon and energy options, we are comparing the various sources. It would be premature at this point to talk about issuing directives to the Yukon Utilities Board regarding green projects and how to compare them to other projects.

I would note to the member that consideration is being given by the respective boards of Yukon Energy Corporation and Yukon Development Corporation, as well as by Yukon government, on how to move forward, assess projects and give recognition to the fact that Yukoners do want to see renewable energy options and may be willing to consider paying a little more for new sources of power from renewable

sources versus the option of adding new fossil fuel generation to the system.

There will be very thoughtful consideration given by all on whether to do that and, if so, how to do it. From my standpoint, personally, I think in principle that most Yukoners are likely amenable to the concept of considering paying a little more for new energy supply in the future if that is from a renewable and green source versus a fossil fuel source that may be a purely cheaper option. We need to look at this very carefully and in an informed manner.

Without the intention of being too critical of the Government of Ontario — recognizing that they presumably had good intentions in their *Green Energy Act* — we need to also be mindful of what the Auditor General of Ontario found regarding the effects of that. Most importantly, the issue with that is not just the fact that the Auditor General of Ontario found that consumers in that province paid \$37 billion more than market price for electricity over the past eight years and will pay another \$133 billion — again, billion with a "b" — extra by 2032 as a result of haphazard planning in their process.

I'm just going to quote a few key excerpts for members, so that the member will understand why we are being cautious in looking at options and why — when I will stand here and emphasize from my perspective as minister responsible for Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation — as we make these decisions — I think that it's vitally important that the boards of Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation, the Yukon Utilities Board — for any projects submitted to it — and the Yukon public as well be fully informed and understand the costs of any of the choices we make and, if there is a decision to pay more for greener sources, that this be done on the basis of understanding the costs, rather than coming from a starting point of saying, I like the idea of energy option A or B.

Again, the costs there include as well — the electricity planning process — again, I'm quoting from an article in the *Globe and Mail* in comments quoted by the Auditor General of Ontario, Ms. Lysyk. "We found the electricity power planning process had essentially broken down over the past decade." The Auditor General of Ontario also went on to note that, as a result, electricity prices for consumers in small business — this is in Ontario — jumped by 70 percent. Those fees amounted to \$37 billion between 2006 and 2014 and are projected at \$133 billion from 2015 to 2032.

As I noted in my introductory remarks, this is not just because of the types of renewable energy projects the Province of Ontario went to, but that in fact, according to the findings of their Auditor General, compared to US prices, the cost of wind power in Ontario is double and solar power is more than triple. The 2010 *Green Energy Act*, Ms. Lysyk said, failed to take advantage of low electricity prices and instead mandated higher prices for wind and solar power companies than they received previously.

That also is, by way of explanation, why in our microgeneration policy we deliberately made it a modest incentive, why the number that was chosen ultimately by the

Yukon government was reflective of what the Yukon Utilities Board had determined was the avoided cost of diesel power production. Again, through setting that up as a pilot project, it is very specifically and deliberately intended to give us the room for revising that number, including potentially making it more attractive. We were very mindful of not wanting to make the mistakes that Ontario notably, but also some other jurisdictions have made — with presumably the very best of intentions — moving toward incentives for renewable energy projects without fully understanding their long-term implications.

Again, in noting those implications and the criticisms, those are criticisms of the Ontario Auditor General, not of myself — but it is important that we look at both the successes and the failures of other jurisdictions when we are doing our planning and our policy work.

Madam Chair, I ran out of time to mention in my introductory remarks that, through the workshops that have been offered by Yukon Development Corporation, the hope is that it will help all of us — both levels of government, Yukon government, First Nation governments, as well as, to a lesser extent, municipal leaders — understand the options and the costs of various solutions, but it is also hoped that it will provide Yukoners the opportunity to be as involved as they wish to be in understanding what is being considered by the boards of Yukon Energy Corporation and Yukon Development Corporation, as well as by government, and why decisions may ultimately be made. It also provides opportunities for them to provide input and their perspective at that point.

So the workshops are intended to help people understand not only potential hydroelectric projects and better understand the size, cost and potential socio-economic and environmental effects, but also to help everyone have a good understanding of the impacts and trade-offs of alternative supply options, such as wind, solar, small hydro and thermal, and what options are being looked at to meet long-term energy needs.

The Yukon government looks forward to continued conversations with First Nation governments and all Yukoners on matters relating to energy, including the first phase of work on next generation hydro. We are committed to achieving meaningful partnerships with First Nations as we continue to discuss the research and planning results and also help deepen our understanding of the respective communities' interests and concerns.

The next generation hydro project is an initiative that is a priority for the Yukon government and a potential solution to meeting future needs. As I have mentioned before in the House, it is our hope that, by providing everyone with the information to make informed decisions and by considering the input from all and working collaboratively, that we will be able to find a path forward to meet the Yukon's energy needs and chart a course that future generations of Yukoners will look to and see as sound decisions by the Yukon government and by First Nation governments and by the boards respectively of Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation.

We hope that future generations of Yukoners will look back and see the decisions we make now and in the future as sound decisions that provide for the needs of future generations of Yukoners in a responsible manner, just as we have greatly benefited from the vision of past governments and the investments in hydroelectric projects that we all enjoy today, including the energy provided by the Whitehorse dam facility, the Aishihik dam facility and by the Mayo facility.

I should also note, as I referred to the — though I am paraphrasing — remarks that Mr. Ferbey made yesterday in appearing as a witness, and noting comparatively the size of the project when it's compared to the size of the existing Whitehorse dam, the range of some of the projects being considered is not dissimilar in terms of total output.

So again, the next generation hydro initiative is a priority for government. I would also like to note that, because of the structure of the boards and the directive they were given, until the board of Yukon Development Corporation has had an opportunity to review the recommendation made by a consultant and make a recommendation to government, we're not really in a position to make a lot of announcements about next steps and don't want to get into a lot of speculation about what Cabinet will do at that stage, out of respect for the process and the authority of the board of the Yukon Development Corporation to make its recommendations to us before we go too far in jumping to conclusions.

I hope that will provide answers and clarification to some who have not clearly understood why, when we've talked about First Nation partnerships and heard specific concerns about why certain projects are still within the range of those being considered by Yukon Development Corporation — that, in fact, is because of the nature of the directive and the nature of the process. I can assure those, including the Selkirk First Nation and Chief McGinty, who I had the opportunity to meet — along with the chair of Yukon Development Corporation board, Joanne Fairlie, earlier this year — that we certainly very much appreciate their perspective and heard their concerns loud and clear. As Chief McGinty rightly noted in commenting to the *Whitehorse Star* earlier, he understands that there will be a report by Yukon Development Corporation early in the new year. At that point, we will be in a position to talk about next stages of the projects and which projects will continue to be considered at that stage.

Again, I want to emphasize that we are placing a strong emphasis on seeking First Nation partnerships and agreements to do further work on planning within their traditional territories. It is our sincere hope that any project that results from next generation hydro planning will be an opportunity for partnerships with First Nations, and First Nations will be active, engaged financial partners in that enterprise.

There is much work that we can do, including developing partnerships with potentially affected First Nations. The planning initiative is all about giving the Yukon government, First Nation governments, Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon citizens the information we all need to make informed decisions together about Yukon's energy future. It is

our hope that we will be able to find a path that benefits future generations of Yukoners.

I should note as well, in providing a little more information to members about the next generation hydro work, that in comparing some of the options that they refer to, what I found to be a very helpful way of simplifying and explaining some of the options and scenarios that are being considered by Yukon Development Corporation is the next generation hydro workshop number 3 participant package — if members have not received copies of that, it can be made available. It provides good comparisons of some of the options being considered on pages 14, 15, 16 and 17 of that report. There are comparisons that note some of the scenarios being considered. They provide comparisons of each potential generation source. It does include looking at resources, including wind, wind plus battery storage, solar, next generation hydro, run-of-river hydro, small hydro with pump storage, pump storage hydro and natural gas — all for comparative costs. The scenarios that were provided by the Yukon Development Corporation and its consultant for next generation hydro include scenario number 1, the natural gas overview, which compared the options of existing hydro and natural gas.

Scenario 2 was the next generation hydro overview, which compared a scenario which includes options including existing hydro and next generation hydro.

In scenario 3, it looked at smaller scale renewables with battery storage. In that scenario, which is found on page 16 of the workshop handout, it looked at options including the use of course of existing hydro, the use of wind, the use of solar, small hydro and natural gas.

Scenario 4, which was entitled renewables with pump storage, included a scenario looking at options including existing hydro, wind, solar, small hydro, pump storage and natural gas. Again, as noted in comparing the energy scenarios in the table on page 17 of the document, it determined that, comparing smaller scale hydro with a next generation style project, that in fact the scenario 3 renewables and scenario 4 renewables with pumped storage would in fact likely impact significantly more hectares than a single project. As I believe either the chair or president and CEO referred to yesterday in the House, in fact based on the work done to date, it would appear that a smaller scale hydro option would in fact result in more rivers being affected as well.

Again, what I would encourage members and in fact all Yukoners to do is to take a look at the information that has been developed, become aware of the technical work done to date and provide their input as well through this planning exercise, so that the consultant —

Chair: Order, please.

Termination of Sitting as per Standing Order 76(1)

Chair: The time has reached 5:00 p.m. on this, the 29th sitting day of the 2015 Fall Sitting.

Standing Order 76(1) states: “On the sitting day that the Assembly has reached the maximum number of sitting days allocated for that Sitting pursuant to Standing Order 75, the

Chair of the Committee of the Whole, if the Assembly is in Committee of the Whole at the time, shall interrupt proceedings at 5:00 p.m. and, with respect to each Government Bill before Committee that the Government House Leader directs to be called, shall:

“(a) put the question on any amendment then before the Committee;

“(b) put the question, without debate or amendment, on a motion moved by a Minister that the bill, including all clauses, schedules, title and preamble, be deemed to be read and carried;

“(c) put the question on a motion moved by a Minister that the bill be reported to the Assembly; and

“(d) when all bills have been dealt with, recall the Speaker to the Chair to report on the proceedings of the Committee.”

It is the duty of the Chair to now conduct the business of Committee of the Whole in the manner directed by Standing Order 76(1). The Chair would now ask the Government House Leader to indicate whether Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, and Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, the only government bills now before Committee of the Whole, should be called.

Mr. Elias: Madam Chair, the government directs that Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15* and Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be called at this time.

Bill No. 19: *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15* — continued

Chair: The Committee will now deal with Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*. The Chair will now recognize Mr. Pasloski, as the sponsor of Bill No. 19, for the purpose of moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 76(1)(b).

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Madam Chair, I move that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, be deemed to be read and carried.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Pasloski that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, be deemed to be read and carried. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of nil agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$3,000 agreed to

Total Expenditures in the amount of \$3,000 agreed to

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to

Schedules A and B agreed to

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Madam Chair, I move that you report Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Pasloski that Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, be reported without amendment. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 20: Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16 — continued

Chair: The Committee will now deal with Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*. The Chair will now recognize Mr. Pasloski, as the sponsor of Bill No. 20, for the purpose of moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 76(1)(b).

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Madam Chair, I move that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be deemed to be read and carried.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Pasloski that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be deemed to be read and carried. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$20,147,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$23,436,000 agreed to

Total Expenditures in the amount of \$43,583,000 agreed to

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to

Schedules A and B agreed to

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Madam Chair, I move that you report Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Pasloski that Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be reported without amendment. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Chair: As all government bills identified by the Government House Leader have now been decided upon, it is my duty to rise and report to the House.

Speaker resumes the Chair

Termination of Sitting as per Standing Order 76(2)

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. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, and directed me to report the bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole has also considered Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, and directed me to report the bill without amendment.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

Standing Order 76(2)(d) states, "On the sitting day that the Assembly has reached the maximum number of sitting days allocated for that Sitting pursuant to Standing Order 75, the Speaker of the Assembly, when recalled to the Chair after the House has been in the Committee of the Whole, shall:

"(d) with respect to each Government Bill standing on the Order Paper for Third Reading and designated to be called by the Government House Leader,

"(i) receive a motion for Third Reading and passage of the bill, and

"(ii) put the question, without debate or amendment, on that motion."

I shall, therefore, ask the Government House Leader to indicate whether Bill No. 19 and Bill No. 20, the only government bills now standing at third reading, should be called.

Mr. Elias: Mr. Speaker, the government directs that Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, and Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be called for third reading at this time.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 19: Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15 — Third Reading

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Pasloski.

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Premier that Bill No. 19, entitled *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15*, be now read a third time and do pass. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 19 agreed to

Speaker: I declare the motion carried and that Bill No. 19 has passed this House.

Bill No. 20: Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16 — Third Reading

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Pasloski.

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Premier that Bill No. 20, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16*, be now read a third time and do pass. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Agree.

Mr. Elias: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Kent: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Hassard: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Agree.

Ms. McLeod: Agree.

Ms. Stick: Disagree.

Ms. Moorcroft: Disagree.

Ms. White: Disagree.

Mr. Tredger: Disagree.

Mr. Barr: Disagree.

Mr. Silver: Disagree.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 11 yeas, six nays.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 20 agreed to

Speaker: The yeas have it. I declare the motion carried and that Bill No. 20 has passed this House.

We are now prepared to receive the Commissioner of Yukon, in his capacity as Lieutenant Governor, to grant assent to bills that have passed this House.

Commissioner Phillips enters the Chamber, announced by the Sergeant-at-Arms

ASSENT TO BILLS

Commissioner: Please be seated.

Speaker: Mr. Commissioner, the Assembly has, at its present session, passed certain bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the Assembly, I respectfully request your assent.

Clerk: *Fourth Appropriation Act, 2014-15; Second Appropriation Act, 2015-16.*

Commissioner: I hereby assent to the bills as enumerated by the Clerk.

Before I leave today, I have to tell you that you had me a little worried. We were called to be here at 3:00 p.m. today and you continued your debate, and I had visions and

nightmares of going back to the early 1980s when we actually started a debate one day at 1:30 p.m. and ended at 6:00 a.m. the next morning. It was a very, very long day, so I was worried that you were forgetting about the guillotine clause and you were going to carry on until all hours of the morning.

I know that Christmas is coming and people are getting ready to enjoy the season, so I want to thank all of the members of the Legislative Assembly for the dedication to your roles in the betterment of the Yukon.

I have sat in this Legislature, as many of you know, for many years, and I know that it isn't just you who do this work — it's your staff, it's the people in the various departments, and I want to thank all of them for all their hard work over the past few years.

The other thing I want to mention while I'm here today is that you're not the only ones who do great things for people in the Yukon. Every year we have the nominations for the Commissioner's Award in the territory, and I'm pleased to tell you today that recent nominees have been selected for the Commissioner's Public Service Volunteer Award. There is Gary Bailey for his dedication to the youth in the Kwanlin Dün community, and he will be receiving the Commissioner's Award this year; William Curtis, for his years of dedicated service to the biathlon group — he is involved in that; Kevin Murphy is going to receive his Commissioner's Award for service with Table Tennis Yukon and all the work he's done with those young individuals there; and, of course, someone we all know well, Jim Robb, will receive an award for his dedication to Yukoners and his support of tourism, culture and the arts in the territory.

Laurie Henderson is also going to be receiving a Commissioner's Awards for her dedication and her hard work to get Mount Sima up and running over the past few years. Also nominated this year is a bravery award for a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Constable Jérôme Lacasse. Jérôme will be receiving his bravery award for saving a woman's life in the Yukon River, where he had to jump in and pull her out of the river. It was very cold water, I believe, in the fall or the winter that year.

Many of these people will be receiving their awards at the Commissioner's New Year's Levee this year. The levee is going to be at the Westmark Whitehorse on January 1, of course, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. I invite all of you to join me at that event in ringing in the New Year. I am also going to have a fairly large selection of youth performers at the levee again this year. I encourage you to come out and see that.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the participation as well of the leaders of the Government of Yukon and the opposition for their efforts and the work that they have done at the United Nations Climate Change Conference. It's something that, as a grandparent and as a parent, is extremely important to all of us in Canada and all of us in the world. I want to thank you and all of the Yukon participants who went to that event and participated in reaching an agreement at that event.

As you depart your offices here today, I want to wish all of you a very Merry Christmas, a healthy and happy New Year, and a safe and healthy New Year.

Thank you very much.

Commissioner leaves the Chamber

Speaker: I will now call the House to order. Please be seated.

As the House has reached the maximum number of days permitted for this Fall Sitting and the House has completed consideration of the designated legislation, it is the duty of the Chair to declare that this House now stands adjourned.

Merry Christmas. Happy New Year. God Save the Queen.

The House adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

The following sessional papers were tabled December 15, 2015:

33-1-192

Yukon Heritage Resources Board Annual Report — April 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015 (Taylor)

33-1-193

Yukon Arts Centre Corporation Financial Statements For the year ended March 31, 2014 (Taylor)

The following document was filed December 15, 2015:

33-1-123

Yukon Geographical Place Names Board 2014-15 Annual Report (Taylor)