



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 72

3rd Session

34th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, December 2, 2020 — 1:00 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Nils Clarke

YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

2020 Fall Sitting

SPEAKER — Hon. Nils Clarke, MLA, Riverdale North
DEPUTY SPEAKER and CHAIR OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Don Hutton, MLA, Mayo-Tatchun
DEPUTY CHAIR OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Ted Adel, MLA, Copperbelt North

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Sandy Silver	Klondike	Premier Minister of the Executive Council Office; Finance
Hon. Ranj Pillai	Porter Creek South	Deputy Premier Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources; Economic Development; Minister responsible for the Yukon Development Corporation and the Yukon Energy Corporation
Hon. Tracy-Anne McPhee	Riverdale South	Government House Leader Minister of Education; Justice
Hon. John Streicker	Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes	Minister of Community Services; Minister responsible for the French Language Services Directorate; Yukon Liquor Corporation and the Yukon Lottery Commission
Hon. Pauline Frost	Vuntut Gwitchin	Minister of Health and Social Services; Environment; Minister responsible for the Yukon Housing Corporation
Hon. Richard Mostyn	Whitehorse West	Minister of Highways and Public Works; the Public Service Commission
Hon. Jeanie McLean	Mountainview	Minister of Tourism and Culture; Minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board; Women's Directorate

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

Yukon Liberal Party

Ted Adel	Copperbelt North
Paolo Gallina	Porter Creek Centre
Don Hutton	Mayo-Tatchun

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Yukon Party

Stacey Hassard	Leader of the Official Opposition Pelly-Nisutlin	Scott Kent	Official Opposition House Leader Copperbelt South
Brad Cathers	Lake Laberge	Patti McLeod	Watson Lake
Wade Istchenko	Kluane	Geraldine Van Bibber	Porter Creek North

THIRD PARTY

New Democratic Party

Kate White	Leader of the Third Party Third Party House Leader Takhini-Kopper King
Liz Hanson	Whitehorse Centre

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Dan Cable
Deputy Clerk	Linda Kolody
Clerk of Committees	Allison Lloyd
Sergeant-at-Arms	Karina Watson
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	Joseph Mewett
Hansard Administrator	Deana Lemke

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, December 2, 2020 — 1:00 p.m.**

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

Prayers

Withdrawal of motions

Speaker: Motion No. 356, notice of which was given yesterday by the Leader of the Third Party, was not placed on today's Notice Paper as the actions requested in the motion have been taken in whole or in part.

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Introduction of visitors.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Istchenko: Today in the gallery, for the tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Lions Club, from the Grey Mountain Lions Club, we have Gary Doering. He is the Zone 7 chair for all six Canadian clubs. We have Gord Sutton here, who is the treasurer, and is also with Grey Mountain. He's busy right now collecting money in the raffle that they are doing for the pickup truck. It is also a real pleasure to have Helen Blattner here today. She is our vice district governor for 49B, soon to be district governor of all 49B. Also listening on the radio today are many club members from around the Yukon. Please welcome them all today.

Applause

Speaker: Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In recognition of World AIDS Day

Hon. Ms. Frost: I would like to thank the incredible work of the department. I would like to also just acknowledge that, in prepping for World AIDS Day and the tribute, the great work of all Yukoners as we look at World AIDS Day. I am presenting today on behalf of the Yukon Liberal government.

Yesterday marked the start of Aboriginal AIDS Awareness Week in Canada. As we all know, the global HIV epidemic is not over. According to estimates from the Public Health Agency of Canada, there were more than 63,000 Canadians living with HIV at the end of 2016.

We also know that the number of people living with HIV in Canada is increasing and that 14 percent of people living with HIV are unaware that they are infected. This epidemic is also concentrated in specific populations across Canada. About 11 percent of HIV-positive people are indigenous people, although they only represent about five percent of the population. Numbers like these remind us that we need to contribute and continue our efforts to increase awareness and knowledge about HIV and AIDS. We also need to continue to

focus on prevention and education programs, particularly in indigenous communities across the country.

This year, it is especially important that we remember the ongoing global impact of HIV. This is because the HIV epidemic may be accelerating due to the COVID-19 pandemic. People living with HIV may also have an increased risk of poor outcomes when infected with COVID-19. For this reason, the World Health Organization is calling on everyone to rally for global solidarity to maintain essential HIV services during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Today, as the Health and Social Services minister, I call on all Yukoners to challenge HIV stigma and discrimination, which we know still persists in our communities. By showing respect and compassion for those living with HIV, we can improve outcomes and reduce the number of new infections.

In closing today, I would like to recognize one of our important community partners, Blood Ties Four Directions. This organization has been providing HIV education and support since its founding in 1993.

On behalf of myself and my Liberal colleagues, I would like to thank all current and past Blood Ties members, staff, directors, and volunteers for their hard work and dedication to eliminating barriers and helping people live with dignity.

We also would like to thank all our front-line health care workers in Yukon who bravely and selflessly continue to deliver services to HIV and COVID-19 patients and clients and use this opportunity to educate Yukoners to be respectful and kind to one another during this very difficult time.

Applause

Ms. Hanson: On behalf of the Yukon NDP and the Yukon Party, I join in marking World AIDS Day, which has been observed on December 1 since 1988, when World AIDS Day was designated as the first ever international day for global health. World AIDS Day is a reminder that, while we are trying to contain the COVID-19 pandemic, the world is still in the midst of multiple pandemics, including malaria and TB. Of these pandemics, AIDS has, over the past 40 years, killed over 33 million people. It is important to maintain our support for communities and countries who, with resilience and innovation, try to maintain their efforts to address HIV/AIDS.

As the World Health Organization says, this is vital because, while we focus on fighting this new pandemic, we must not drop our guard on a twin pandemic that has been with us for 40 years and is far from over.

Despite significant efforts, progress around the world in scaling up HIV services was already stalling before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. That slowing down of progress means the world will be missing the 90-90-90 internationally agreed upon targets for 2020. Those targets had been to ensure that 90 percent of people living with HIV are aware of their status, that 90 percent of those diagnosed with HIV are receiving treatment, and that 90 percent of those people receiving treatment have received viral suppression.

The COVID-19 pandemic has made access to HIV prevention, testing, treatment, and care more difficult. Now more than ever, we need to support the work of local grassroots

organizations here in Yukon, like Blood Ties Four Directions and those working globally to meet these needs. The work of our public health professionals in “normal times” is challenging. COVID has introduced layers of complexity.

As we celebrate the news today of Britain’s approval of a COVID-19 vaccine, a couple of thoughts come to mind about how we here in Yukon and as part of a world community respond. We hear much talk — worry, really — about our access to the COVID-19 vaccine, and yet, 40 years on, there is still no vaccine for AIDS.

Although there have been effective anti-retroviral medications for HIV for 25 years, the majority of the 33 million people so far killed by AIDS had yet to die when those drugs first arrived. Think about that. Annual AIDS deaths continued to go up for a decade, and close to a million people — mostly non-white people — die every year of AIDS.

The statistics show clear racial and economic barriers to life-saving treatments for AIDS. We know that anti-retroviral therapy taken by people who are living with HIV and the drugs that people who are HIV-negative can take as a form of pre-exposure prophylaxis — PrEP — share an important property with vaccines: They curb transmission.

This Legislative Assembly agreed in April 2019 to make PrEP available for free to qualified individuals in Yukon. We have it within our power to contribute to the UN’s sustainable development goal of ending AIDS as a public health threat by 2030 by acting now on a commitment made by all members of this Assembly.

Applause

In recognition of Lions Clubs International

Mr. Istchenko: I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition, the Liberal Party, and the New Democratic Party to pay tribute to the Lions Club as they celebrate 100 years of Lions in Canada. On June 7, 1917, Lions Clubs International was born in Chicago in the United States. The name “Lions” stands for liberty, intelligence, and our nation’s safety, but this group stands for much more: fraternity, good fellowship, strength of character, and purpose. In 2017, it marked the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International, and this year, 2020, marks 100 years of Lions in Canada — the largest humanitarian service organization in Canada and in the world.

The Lions global expansion began in 1920 with the chartering of the border city Lions Club in Windsor, Ontario. There are currently 1,600 clubs in Canada, with over 37,000 members. The Lions Club is a network of individual clubs, united in helping others and improving their community.

Becoming a Lions Club member gives you the opportunity to volunteer locally in your community, make new friends and professional connections, lead projects, and make your community a better place to live — and you have fun doing it, Mr. Speaker.

I will always remember one thing in the Lions Club code of ethics: Always, always bear in mind my obligations as a citizen to my country, my territory, and my community and to

give them my unswerving loyalty in word, act, and deed so to give freely of my time, labour, and means.

The Lion’s Club motto, chosen by way of a contest in 1955 and won by a Canadian Lions member, is “We serve”. This motto sums up the life work of members around the world. The first Lions Club in the Yukon was the Whitehorse Lions Club, chartered in 1951, but over the years, we have seen them expand throughout the territory. The St. Elias Lions Club in Haines Junction, which I am a proud member of, was chartered in 1964. The Lake Laberge Lions Club was chartered in 1969. The Grey Mountain Lions Club was chartered in 1979, and the Fireweed Lions Club was chartered in 1993. Last but not least, the Dease Lake Lions Club was chartered in 1994. These are the active clubs in the Yukon and northern BC today.

In the past, we had clubs in other communities: Watson Lake; Beaver Creek; Northway; Destruction Bay, which was Mount Logan; Mayo; Elsa-Keno, the Mount Haldane Lions; Faro; and the Nisutlin Bay Lions in Teslin.

As I spoke to earlier, when the Whitehorse club — which began in 1951, joining District 49 — later came to sponsor my club, the St. Elias, and many others throughout the Yukon, the Lions Club grew to such a great membership in District 49 that we had to split into two districts, 49A and 49B. I am very proud to say that my club has the largest membership in both of the districts.

You might wonder what we do in our communities and how we give back. Well, there are some of you who will remember the first original swimming pool here in Whitehorse. It was called the Lions pool. It was a highlight for me when I had a chance to go there as a kid coming in from the communities. The Whitehorse Lions Club Internet and TV Auction, the Fireweed Lions Bosses’ Christmas Bash party for small business, the great Mountain Lions vehicle raffle, which I spoke about earlier in the introductions, the Lake Laberge Lions trade show, and the St. Elias Lions Club memorial spring poker run. So, the Lions are responsible for numerous outdoor rinks and playgrounds. The skateboard park in Riverdale was initiated by a local Lions member who saw the need for our youth and worked in the City of Whitehorse to make it happen. We also sponsor many non-profit organizations, groups, and individuals through funding, bursaries, volunteering time, and many more things — the list goes on. When the St. Elias club was chartered in 1964, their first order of business was building a fence at the cemetery. Ironically, that is one of the last things that we were doing last year — still renovating that fence.

It has been a tough year for Lions Clubs here in the Yukon and in Canada because of the pandemic. Many events have been cancelled, which hits organizations hard as events are our main fundraiser. Part of being a Lion is meeting, getting together as a group, and working on projects giving back to our communities. So, Mr. Speaker, I can guarantee you that, when things get back to normal, the Lions Clubs will be back eager and strong, ready to serve our communities.

Again, I want to thank those who came for the tribute today, those who are listening, and congratulations to Lions Clubs in Canada on 100 years of service to your communities.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Mr. Hutton: I have for tabling three documents: the Yukon Bureau of Statistics police-reported crime statistics in Yukon for 2017; the Yukon Bureau of Statistics police-reported crime statistics in Yukon for 2018; and finally, the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction fall 2017 Canadian drug summary report on alcohol.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I have for tabling today a legislative return based on debate yesterday during Committee of the Whole regarding correspondence between the government and the opposition parties over the spring and summer.

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

Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

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

THAT this House congratulates the newly elected chief of the Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation Nicole Tom, Deputy Chief Zachery Cochrane, Wolf councillors Tanya Silverfox and Calvin Charlie, Crow councillors Chantelle Blackjack and Toni Blanchard, and elders councillor Shirley Bellmore.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon, under the authority of the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*, to declare a rent-increase moratorium until July 1, 2021.

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

THAT it is the opinion of this House that the current state of emergency, established under the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* and expiring on December 8, 2020, should be extended.

Speaker: Are there any further notices of motions?

Is there a statement by a minister?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mount Sima snow-making and electrical infrastructure upgrade

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, don't let the rain fool you; it's winter here in the Yukon, and there is an exciting

project happening at the Mount Sima ski hill. Our government, in partnership with the Government of Canada, is investing in Mount Sima's snow-making and electrical infrastructure to help move the ski hill away from its reliance on diesel and support the ski hill's transition to greener energy.

Our \$1.4-million contribution toward this \$5-million project will help to improve Mount Sima's snow-making capabilities in order to make them greener, more efficient, and more reliable for the operational team at the hill. Currently, snow-making at Mount Sima is powered by diesel. The ski hill hauls diesel generators around the mountain to fuel snow-making cannons. With the improvements from this project, Mount Sima's snow-making will be connected to our local power grid so that the hill no longer has to rely on diesel generators for snow-making.

The project will also upgrade the snow-making pumphouse by connecting it to the power grid and will run power up the hill. Not only will this electricity source increase the hill's capacity for snow-making, it will also create new possibilities for LED lights along Dan's Descent. This means that the alpine terrain, Big Air, and base park area can be lit up if necessary, which will extend training hours and allow opportunities for extended events during our dark winters.

To both mitigate and adapt to climate change, we believe that it is important to transition to greener sources of power as much as possible. Mr. Speaker, our government has always been committed to projects that promote greener energy and build healthy communities.

In addition to supporting this project, we are also supporting a variety of projects around the territory that are helping us to save power and move toward more renewable energy. For example, we are upgrading public works buildings in municipalities across the territory with green energy retrofits to help reduce energy consumption. Building a green economy, reducing our reliance on fossil fuels, and building healthy, active communities are cornerstones of our commitment to Yukoners.

We know that our community needs healthy, active, and safe ways to be outdoors more than ever. These improvements to Mount Sima support that. Whether it is through early season training for high-performance athletes or kids camps, or whether it's ski and snowboard coaching or mountain biking in the summer, Mount Sima adds vibrancy to our outdoor community. We are pleased to help the hill improve so that it can continue to be a place where people can be active, have fun, and be outdoors safely.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that some work on this project is already underway. We will continue working through next summer with the goal of being done in time for next year's winter season. I am looking forward to seeing the results and learning about what other opportunities these improvements will bring.

Mr. Cathers: I'm pleased to respond to this ministerial statement. It is, of course, a re-announcement of a press release from last month.

We support Mount Sima and investment in that pillar of the community. As you will recall, the Yukon Party, when in government, supported the Friends of Mount Sima Society when the ski hill was at risk of shutting down, and that, as well as the work of the volunteers and donors, was key to its continued success. It is important to ensure that this valued resource to our community is able to continue to provide services to Yukoners of all ages.

However, when this project was announced, it did raise a number of questions from Yukoners. This is evident if you go to CBC Yukon's Facebook post about the announcement where there are close to 100 comments questioning the Liberal government's claims that this will significantly contribute to action against climate change. The news release claims that this investment of \$5 million will help to electrify the hill and essentially reduce the hill's reliance on diesel. The minister again highlighted that in his comments today by claiming that this will reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, but, Mr. Speaker, this investment does not reduce the Yukon's reliance on fossil fuels or diesel.

The Liberal government has, every year, continued to expand its use of rented, dirty diesel generators. Increasingly under the Liberals, our electricity is dependent on diesel. Spending \$5 million to electrify Mount Sima sounds like an excellent way to address climate change until you realize that the electricity is increasingly produced by rented diesel generators. We also know that the Liberal plan to rent dirty diesel generators is expected to go on for a decade. In contrast, when we were in government, we met our commitment to increase the renewable energy supply by 20 percent a year ahead of schedule, but the Liberals have gone in the other direction with record increases in diesel fuel usage.

The Liberal government recently submitted a rate application from Yukon Energy to the Utilities Board asking to increase power bills for Yukoners by 11.5 percent. According to that rate application, the government is projecting that the total amount of diesel generation will increase by over 400 percent in just three years under the Liberals. In the YEC rate application, there is \$7.1 million associated with the Liberal plan to rent diesel generators.

So, if the minister could, in his response, tell us how much the Yukon's emissions will be reduced as a result of the investment mentioned in his ministerial statement, that would be helpful.

Let's be clear: We do not dispute the need to improve and make investments in infrastructure at Mount Sima. In fact, we support those efforts as being good for the ski hill. The improvements of lighting will help the hill provide increased services, and we do support that. If snow-making equipment tools and other infrastructure are in need of investment, we think that has merit as well. But the government's portrayal of this as a major action in the fight against climate change raises many questions, and the minister's suggestion that this investment will substantially reduce reliance on diesel and help to reduce our emissions is suspect and worthy of scrutiny.

Ms. White: I, like many, have had a long relationship with Mount Sima. I started hiking the mountain to snowboard when it was first being cleared, prior to the installation of their very first chairlift. I remember the trailers that served as the first day lodge. I worked as a lift operator, back in the exciting days of the double-chair, and I think the first and only time I ever spoke at a Whitehorse City Council meeting was about the fate of the mountain when I was in my early 20s.

I have been a season pass holder every year that I've lived in the Yukon since the mountain opened, and I have been riding at Mount Sima for more than half my life.

In 2013, when Mount Sima's future was shaky, the NDP tabled a motion that urged the Government of Yukon to work with the City of Whitehorse and other levels of government and the Great Northern Ski Society to facilitate a long-term and sustainable solution for funding the Mount Sima recreation area. We have come a very long way since those shaky days.

Mount Sima has improved the infrastructure with a high-speed quad chair. They have cut new runs and continue to work on existing terrain. Mount Sima has placed itself on the map with its creative and innovative ideas. They believe and embody the "If you build it, they will come" mentality. They built an alpine ski jump training facility, and ski jumpers came. They built a world-class jump park, and national snowboard and national ski teams came. They build a world-class big air jump and a triple line, and professional skiers and snowboarders came. They invited para teams, and they came. And then they made snow for early season training camps, and those teams came in spades.

None of this speaks of the work that has been done to utilize the off-season. They build mountain bike trails, and guess what? They came and continue to come, just like all the others who have been invited to the mountain. This reinvention of a community asset has taken dozens of folks years and years to do. Board members past and present, employees past and present, all deserve our enthusiastic high-fives for the hard work.

Sam Oetli is now Mount Sima's general manager, but he has been kicking around the mountain for such a long time that I can't remember a time when he wasn't there, and he had this to say about the announcement — and I quote: "After years of hard work and advocating to all levels of government, Mt. Sima will be moving away from diesel for all our snowmaking and going onto the grid. This is a major leap forward for our facility and will cut our snowmaking greenhouse emissions by 90%. The project will upgrade all our equipment, twinning of our pump system, and lights on our main areas of play. Mt. Sima will cement itself as a national training center for athletes and insure our community will have a feasible, green and amazing facility well into the future." I couldn't agree more. Mount Sima really is the little hill that can.

So, this season, when you're up at the mountain and see a Sima team member, please give them a COVID-friendly high-five, because they are all giving it 110 percent.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I would like to begin by saying that it was great to learn that the Leader of the Third Party was a

“lifty”. I echo her remarks to give a shout-out to all of the staff up on the hill and the board, over the years — the board members who have done so much work to turn the hill around. It is a much more sustainable hill now because of many of the things that we’re talking about. This move — not only does it reduce diesel use, but it will also open up the nighttime. I think that there is a real opportunity here for the hill.

The Member for Lake Laberge was asking me to give information about greenhouse gas emissions reduced. What I can say today is that the general manager of the hill, Mr. Sam Oettli, estimates that they use about 110,000 litres of diesel a year. He estimates that 90 percent of that will be reduced through this electrification — that is 99,000 litres of diesel. I will work out, for the Member for Lake Laberge, what that difference is in greenhouse gas emissions — happy to do that.

Diesel generators for Yukon Energy for backup and peaks totally makes sense because we are an islanded grid. Investing in a whole new diesel plant for the future — sunk costs — or even just moving toward fossil fuels generally — that is not a smart move. The whole of the world is moving away from that, Mr. Speaker. I just saw a report today about the progress toward Paris, around investment in fossil fuels. We actually need to turn in the other direction. We need to move away from investing in fossil fuels.

So, I am happy to work out the greenhouse gas emissions saved and happy for Sima, because this is a sustainable solution that will serve the whole of the territory.

Speaker: This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: COVID-19 vaccine

Ms. McLeod: Based on initial projections reported on publicly by national media, if distributed on a per capita basis, Yukon would likely see only 3,300 doses of the COVID-19 vaccine in the first quarter of next year. While we know that it is our hope that we get more than that per capita, it is prudent to plan for that eventuality. If distributed on a per capita basis, there will not be enough for every member of high-risk groups in the territory to be vaccinated in the first quarter of next year.

Can the Minister of Health and Social Services tell us which group will be at the front of the line?

Hon. Mr. Silver: What I can tell folks in the Legislative Assembly is that the COVID vaccine will absolutely be the next big shift in the responsibility of the pandemic, as we undertake the most complicated immunization program ever delivered in Canada.

I can also share that we will be working very closely with our federal, provincial, and territorial counterparts on the vaccine planning. Canada has confirmed that there will be enough vaccines for all Canadians over the coming year. As we approach an initial vaccine rollout, I appreciate that there will be different perspectives as to how to move forward. It is important that we continue to work together to keep Yukoners safe and to ensure that the most accurate information from public health officials is shared to members of our community.

This work is quickly evolving. These initiatives and others, as they develop — we will update Yukoners on the work in progress.

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Manitoba referred to the issues related to deciding who gets the vaccine first as — and I quote: “... lifeboat time”. His analogy was that there is a limited amount of vaccines or “lifeboats” and governments need to decide who gets on them. Canada’s chief public health officer, Dr. Theresa Tam, stated yesterday that the decision as to who gets first access will ultimately lie with the provinces and territories themselves.

Can the Minister of Health and Social Services provide specifics on how the government will determine who is high priority for the initial vaccine distribution?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, planning for the COVID vaccine is well underway. We have teams working on the distribution and storage concerns. We have teams working very closely with the federal government. Obviously, there are specific details that still have to be finalized. This means that the plan has to be fluid to reflect the realities in different parts of the country. We do have to look at vaccine options here in Yukon. I want to stress that our federal counterparts are an important part of this conversation when we speak about fair and equitable access to the vaccine, including key populations who are high risk, such as long-term care residents, elder populations, auto-immunocompromised individuals, health care workers, and indigenous and remote northern communities.

Today, in fact, we have our DM meeting with the DMs of health from across the country. In the next couple of days, I will be meeting with the ministers. I have northern ministers’ meetings as well. I know that the Premier is also meeting with his federal counterparts across the country, so we are working together very closely on this to align with Yukon’s needs.

Ms. McLeod: The federal government is purchasing 26 ultra-cold temperature freezers for storage of vaccines. How many of these are coming to Yukon?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly coordinating with our federal counterparts. Here in the Yukon, we are looking very closely and working very closely with our chief medical officer of health and we are working with Community Services. I know just recently that the Minister of Community Services met with Brigadier-General Carpentier from a joint task force north on capacity for distribution. On behalf of the federal government, they have acquired low-temperature freezers. We have a process in place to acquire that for the Yukon. We have acquired transportation freezers to ensure and enable vaccines to get to our Yukon communities. We have structured a process and we’re doing that in collaboration with our partners, with the federal government. We’re doing that in collaboration between Health and Social Services, Community Services, and under the advice and direction of our chief medical officer of health and the experts who are there to provide guidance for us.

We know, just as a way forward, that we have experts within Health who are there to provide the vaccines and I want

to just acknowledge that. The services will be delivered to Yukoners.

Question re: COVID-19 pandemic business relief funding

Mr. Istchenko: Yesterday, we discussed the relief funding for bars and restaurants. As discussed, the government arbitrarily set the eligibility threshold to be that the business must demonstrate that 60 percent of their revenue came from tourism visitation.

Can the Minister of Tourism and Culture explain how a bar or restaurant is supposed to demonstrate that 60 percent of their business came from tourism last year?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Thank you for the question. I want to just say that we're really proud that we were able to get those next programs out the door that are supplementary programs to the Yukon business relief program that are specific to tourism businesses. I'm also really happy to be working with the Tourism Industry Association of Yukon.

The 60-percent threshold was based on an adjusted threshold that was established for the Elevate program, which is a program specifically designed with the Yukon University and other partners to help tourism businesses.

By reducing that 60-percent threshold, we were able to open the doors a bit more for bars and restaurants. I want to also let Yukoners know that all Yukon businesses have been supported through the entire pandemic through the Yukon business relief program, which was conducted and delivered by the Department of Economic Development, and also the program that was run through CanNor. All of these programs have remained in place. The new program that we announced this week is another supplementary program.

Mr. Istchenko: As discussed, according to yukon.ca, the eligibility criteria for this relief funding for bars and restaurants states that a business must demonstrate that they attributed at least 60 percent of their 2019 revenue to tourism visitation. I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but the last time that I went to a bar or restaurant, they didn't ask me if I was a tourist. So, bars and restaurants are suffering for a whole lot of other reasons, in addition to the lack of tourism.

Can the minister explain why she is making bars and restaurants jump through the extra hoops to get this funding?

Hon. Ms. McLean: We're not asking anyone to jump through hoops. These new programs that we developed for tourism non-accommodation businesses are for tourism non-accommodation businesses. We do have to have some measures in place to ensure that these programs are going to the businesses that have maxed out the eligibility and that are tourism-related businesses. Those that, through the Yukon business survey in 2019, have shown up to 60 percent of their attributable revenue to tourism will be eligible, so there are absolute measures in place.

Our Department of Tourism and Culture — and I know that Economic Development will be working as well to ensure that businesses that qualify get this help.

There are a number of other programs in place. This is for tourism non-accommodation businesses that have maxed out

their eligibility under the federal program and the Yukon program.

I look forward to further questions.

Mr. Istchenko: We understand the programs. It is just that this policy doesn't make sense for bars and restaurants. They are suffering for a whole lot of other reasons than just a lack of tourism. They have done their part to protect their community by adhering to public health guidelines, but this has come at a cost, and now it is time for the government to do its part.

Will the minister just agree to get rid of that 60-percent threshold so that this program will truly help bars and restaurants?

Hon. Ms. McLean: I have spoke a lot about the business relief programs that have been available to Yukoners through the entire pandemic. Again, I just want to reiterate our desire to support our businesses so that they are able to be here when visitation is again safe to happen in our territory. We will continue to work with our partners to identify the programs that are responsive to our businesses' needs. We know that the tourism sector is the first hit, the hardest hit, and will have the longest recovery.

We will continue to work with them. These programs that we announced this week are very specific to tourism-related businesses. Right now, the business relief program — almost all of the businesses that are being supported are tourism-related businesses.

So, we are working very, very closely. These are supplementary programs for those that are maxing out of existing business relief programs and that have a potential of loss. We will help them to meet the needs that they have. We are here to work with all Yukon businesses and in support of tourism.

Question re: Paid sick leave rebate program

Ms. Hanson: Yesterday, the chief medical officer of health said that, if employees can work from home, they should endeavour to do so, indicating that many recent COVID cases have arisen through transmission in the workplace. The chief medical officer also said that, even if you have mild COVID symptoms, with the exception of a runny nose, you should not go to work.

At the same time, the Premier touted the paid sick leave rebate that is available to employers to cover the cost of providing that sick leave. It sounds good, Mr. Speaker, but the program as it is currently structured is unnecessarily restrictive. Employers can only apply once per employee, so if employees stayed home at the outset of the pandemic for three days and later on needed to stay home for another five days, that employee would only receive the paid sick leave once.

Given the current restrictions placed on the government's paid sick leave program, does the Premier really believe that a person with any of the symptoms listed by the chief medical officer of health is going to stay home and risk losing pay?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I am happy to talk about our COVID response on the floor of the Legislature this afternoon. It is a very important subject for all of our citizens, Mr. Speaker.

I want to start this afternoon in my response to this question by going back in history a little bit. On March 18, 2020, the Government of Yukon issued a human resource work-from-home directive intended to get as many employees as possible — taking into account operational requirements — working from home. This was done to limit the density of workers in our workplace to stem the spread of this disease throughout our civil service and hopefully blunt the spread of the coronavirus in the territory. We did this immediately and got almost 50 percent of the civil service working from home.

We are facing a second wave right now. Yesterday, the chief medical officer of health issued a recommendation that, where possible, without affecting service delivery, workers should work, where possible, from home. We fully support that. I will be happy to talk about this issue far more this afternoon.

Ms. Hanson: It's cool that the Public Service Commissioner is answering a question that I asked the other day. I was actually asking the question about the private sector paid sick leave rebate program that the Premier was talking about yesterday.

Despite the sick leave description that indicates that it is available for 14 days, the way that this government has rolled it out means that, for a program that is supposed to be there to support workers who do not receive sick pay, the current restrictions are not helpful. In fact, they might actually discourage workers from staying home when they should.

If a worker has a mild cough or any other symptom and gets a COVID test, they are told to stay home until the results come in. With a wait time of four to six days, a person could miss five days of work before receiving a negative result. With a one-time-only reimbursement per employee, there is no future paid sick leave as this pandemic wears on.

Has the Premier directed that the paid sick leave program be adjusted to reflect the real needs and the everyday evolving nature of the pandemic?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: A little bit of background quickly on the program — in response to the economic impacts of COVID-19 on Yukon businesses and individuals and to encourage compliance with the health guidelines, the Government of Yukon launched the paid sick leave rebate program on March 26.

From March to November, just to give a sense of how long it has been used — going back to November 25 — we have allocated \$331,850 in funding and have approved 84 employers. There were some good questions from the Member for Whitehorse Centre during budget debate. As I remember and reflect on it, I think that there were about 150 people who actually used it out of those 84 employers. A very valid question was asked: What are we going to do to ensure that individuals who have used this program still have the opportunity if they have to go back and be tested again?

During that exchange, we reflected upon the fact that the Canada recovery sickness benefit can actually be stacked on top of the program that we're doing. You can have the territorial program and then, of course, you have the federal program. At this point, we believe that, between the stackable nature of both

programs, we'll actually be able to cover the needs of Yukon employees in the private sector.

Ms. Hanson: I kind of believe in truth in advertising, so if I think that there's a program that's available for 14 days of sick leave and I can only access it once — and because the epidemic evolves over time — if I take some time at the beginning and then I get sick as this pandemic evolves, I can't access any of the remaining 14 days that one would think would be banked.

What the chief medical officer said yesterday is that, really, the only reason to have any symptoms and to remain working is a runny nose. For anything else, you need to stay home. The way that the government has designed their paid sick leave rebate program makes it very difficult — it makes it impossible — for a worker who is displaying COVID-like symptoms to stay home without fear of losing pay.

Why will the government not adjust its paid sick leave rebate program?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: With the program as it's laid out for Yukoners, we have the ability to stack two programs now that are there. We have that opportunity to stack those programs so people can use them. I think that we have to commend the public servants who helped to build this sick leave program. We have a federal government that essentially used this as a template for their program. I really commend the individuals who have worked on it.

What we've also done as a government and as a department — the three key pieces are to monitor, adapt, and respond. That's what we'll continue to do. We're monitoring, and now we have this stackable program. If we have to adapt, we will adapt, and, of course, then we'll respond. We have done that all along — just as we've seen the minister of tourism come in today and add these supplementary programs onto things we have done.

I think that we have done a good job of ensuring that we shore up the supports that are there. If there are changes that need to be made, we'll monitor, adapt, and respond.

Question re: Government network services outage

Mr. Cathers: As we all know, the pandemic has changed the way that government conducts its business, as more public service employees are working from home. Yesterday, the chief medical officer of health encouraged even more people to work from home, if possible. However, at the same time, the Yukon government network went down for a couple of hours. This means that many employees who hooked up to the network, including those working from home, were affected by this loss. They couldn't access e-mail, they couldn't access their shared folders, and they couldn't print.

With more public servants working from home, how will the government ensure that the computer network does not crash?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: As we heard yesterday, the computer crash didn't only affect employees who were working from home, but it also affected the opposition and, actually, all of the government. This was an issue with a server — our servers up on the road — that had an issue with a power shutdown. We're

exploring, and we take it very seriously. This is something that we take very seriously. We want to make sure that we know what is happening, so we're doing an investigation to make sure that this doesn't happen again and that the redundancies that we have built into the system kick in when these types of things happen.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know that when the chief medical officer has recommended that we all take best efforts to get as many employees home as we possibly can to blunt the spread of this virus through Yukon society — this is a very important initiative for this government. We have to look at the public health implications all the time to make sure that our public is kept safe in the face of this COVID-19 pandemic. That is the focus that this government has had since day one, and we will continue to keep the focus — the eye on the ball — and in this case, it's public health and safety.

Mr. Cathers: I do have to remind the minister that he and his colleagues have had four years in office. This is not the first time that the government network has gone down in the building, as there was a similar instance a couple of weeks ago. These outages, especially yesterday, also meant that yukon.ca was offline for a portion of the day, which during the pandemic, is a crucial source of information, according to the Premier, and the one he typically points Yukoners to consult.

What contingency or backup plans are in place to ensure that yukon.ca does not go down when the main government network does?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I am happy to talk about our record on modernization and improvement of the digital tools that we have at our disposal. This has been a focus of ours from day one, and it is certainly something that is near and dear to my heart. We have a redundant fibre that we have started construction on just this year, going up the Dempster, to make sure that our Internet is robust in the territory. We have taken huge steps to make sure that we have more online services to service our Yukon public. We have made sure that we have more digital services for our public.

Yes — the member opposite is absolutely correct. Yesterday, we had a power shutdown at one of our server sites in the territory — our second site up on the highway. It did shut down the Internet to our government computers for about three hours. I have asked for — and the ICT branch within Highways and Public Works is doing a full investigation to find out the source of the shutdown and to make sure that our redundancies are bolstered so that this doesn't happen again.

We have to make sure that our public service has access to the Internet, and we will continue those efforts.

Mr. Cathers: Well, the minister told us that improving the reliability of the network has been a focus of his since day one. That is not something to brag about, considering how often the network goes down.

We also understand that there has been trouble over the past few weeks with the Hospital Corporation's computer network. The service has been slow, and e-mails have been touch and go. This is concerning, as computers have quickly become a critical part of health care. With more people working from home, we need to ensure stable access for health care staff.

What is the government doing to improve the hospital's network to minimize disruptions and ensure that it is capable of handling more people working from home?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: The date was early in March — I guess it was at the height of the pandemic. The Department of Highways and Public Works and the ICT branch within that department reallocated its server structure and got enough server capacity to have every single civil servant working from home. We got 50 percent of the civil service out of their offices and still managed to get some national-calibre services and supports to our Yukon citizens throughout this pandemic.

This government has a very solid record of providing the tools to the civil service to act and operate within this digital economy, and I will absolutely go to the mat defending the actions of our civil service during this pandemic to get the supports and the services that Yukoners need and that their colleagues within the civil service need. They have performed a heck of a lot of exemplary work to make sure that this society operates in a diffused way throughout this pandemic.

I am happy to talk about this all afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: ATAC Resources tote road project

Mr. Kent: Concerns continue to be raised by those in the mining industry about the Liberal decision to deny permits for the ATAC tote road. The project received a favourable environmental assessment recommendation from YESAB in 2017. In 2018, the minister tied the decision document to a sub-regional land use plan for the Beaver River watershed, adding two more years to the process. When the company first entered the assessment process in 2016, this new process was on no one's radar, so this amounts to the Liberals changing the rules of the game midstream. The minister said that this was a new way of doing business and it was how business gets done. For an industry that relies on certainty, this sends a very troubling message to companies and investors looking to do business in the Yukon.

How can other companies active in the Yukon be assured that the minister won't just change the rules of the game on them as well?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Again, going back to the decision that was made by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, we have a decision that was based on two really key points. The first was that the company did not demonstrate sufficiently in its application the significant adverse environmental and socio-economic effects identified in the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board evaluation and that they would be properly mitigated. The second part is that the First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun identified a number of significant adverse impacts that may occur on its treaty rights, including impacts on hunting, fishing, trapping, and its use of the area for traditional pursuits if the project was to proceed at this time. The Government of Yukon agreed with these concerns and determined that the application did not appropriately or sufficiently indicate how these impacts would be mitigated. So, again, that speaks to that.

I think that we are very supportive of a sustainable industry here in the Yukon that, when it is done, takes into consideration

all aspects of our Yukon communities. I believe that we have systems in place here in Yukon that provide a solid approach to making sure that good projects move forward.

Mr. Kent: The Beaver River sub-regional land use plan was to be completed in March 2020. We're nine months past that deadline. This morning, yukon.ca says — and I quote: "The planning committee is currently gathering information about the planning area." That certainly doesn't give us any indication of when this plan will be complete. As there are a number of other claimholders in this region that are active now, does the land use plan have to be completed before they can advance their projects? If so, when will it be done?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I can speak to the question concerning the Beaver River land use plan. According to the latest statistics — I think that, since September 22, 2020, the planning committee has held seven online stakeholder engagement sessions to gather feedback on the work completed to date. I know that the parties recently approved a revised work plan and timeline due to COVID-19 delays. I think that anyone who travelled in and around the Mayo area was aware that there were grave concerns in the community by many about COVID-19, and there was definitely a reduction in face-to-face activity in that community since last March.

Again, we still see — includes the following deliverables by winter of 2020: a recommended land use plan; a fish and wildlife harvest regime; and a fish and wildlife monitoring and adaptive management plan.

We are still working in consultation. I believe that the next meeting of the senior liaison team is set for December of this year.

As to the second part of the question, I can't speak to hypotheticals. In a broad sense, what the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources does is that they take each application as it comes, and each one is a unique circumstance.

Mr. Kent: So, this plan was supposed to be done in March 2020, before the pandemic even hit the Yukon. We have been hearing from other companies since this decision was made that they will soon be reaching out to potential investors, looking to raise funds to support their projects in the Yukon. They are looking to the Liberal government for clarity on how to get new infrastructure, like tote roads, permitted in the Yukon. ATAC, in their Monday news release, questioned whether the Yukon was actually open for business under the Liberals, and others are wondering the same.

For the minister's reference, their exact quote in that news release was — and I quote: "If this road can't be permitted following a positive environmental and socio-economic assessment decision and years of governmental encouragement to invest in the project, then you have to wonder if Yukon is in fact open for business."

I'll ask again: What assurances can the minister give to the mining industry that they won't endure the same treatment as ATAC did, where the rules are changed at the eleventh hour?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: It's always a difficult debate. Part of the statement that was made by the company also alluded to taking potentially a legal path. Of course, that confines the

debate here in the House when you're in government and those overtures are made.

What we've continued to do here is work with companies — a lot of conversations over the last number of days — the same supports that I've offered in my role previously to sit and answer questions from investors, the same way that we have done over the last number of years or to speak with company CEOs. I have felt that our conversations over the last few days with different mining leaders have been positive. I think that we're looking at a very positive exploration season next year based on our meetings that we've seen to date.

This application was submitted to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Each and every day, the question has been asked. I have identified the fact that there have been areas within the application that I believe the technical teams felt did not quite mitigate the items that were there. A lack of understanding from the Whitehorse Centre — a decision made by the technical team within and then moved up.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: Order, please.

The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 237 — *adjourned debate*

Clerk: Motion No. 237, standing in the name of Mr. Gallina; adjourned debate, Mr. Gallina.

Speaker: Member for Porter Creek Centre, you still have unlimited time.

Mr. Gallina: To recap where I had left off in previous debate on private members' day. I see private members' days as an opportunity to bring forward important topics for debate — in this case, *Our Clean Future* — to help constituents understand what the strategy means to them. It is also an opportunity for other members to offer their insights on this strategy and to share what they agree with, what they disagree with, and where improvements could be made.

I have spoken about what is contained in this strategy — specifically, the four goals that the strategy outlines that will help us achieve Yukon's vision for a clean future. There are targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. By 2030, we will reduce Yukon's total greenhouse emissions from transportation, heating, electrical generation, other commercial industrial activities, waste and other areas so that our emissions in these areas are 30 percent lower than they were in 2010.

We are ensuring that Yukoners have access to reliable, affordable, and renewable energy with targets for Yukon's main electrical grid to see 97 percent of electricity to come from renewable sources by 2030. For communities not connected to the main electricity grid, we plan to reduce diesel fuel for electricity generation by 30 percent by 2030 compared

to 2010. In transportation and heating, by 2030, we will meet 50 percent of our heating needs with renewable energy sources.

The necessity to adapt to climate change is not an option, in my opinion. By taking action to adapt to the climate change that we are already experiencing — and those changes yet to come — the strategy identifies ways that Yukoners will become highly resilient to the impacts of climate change by 2030.

As well, Mr. Speaker, this strategy addresses the need to build a green economy by helping Yukon businesses plan and benefit from the transformation to a green economy. There will be support for innovative ideas and the knowledge economy, and it will be easier for businesses, entrepreneurs, and communities to access funding for green projects throughout the Yukon.

I know that there is a lot to unpack when you begin to address the priorities in this strategy, and I know that my colleagues will share more specifics when they address this Assembly later today in debate.

This strategy will only be successful if there is community leadership and successful partnerships. The objectives set out within the strategy were identified as priorities for Yukon by the Government of Yukon, participating Yukon First Nations, transboundary indigenous groups, Yukon municipalities, the youth of this territory, Yukon individuals, and key stakeholders in a variety of businesses and non-profit organizations.

We will not meet the ambitious targets set forth in the strategy if there isn't collaboration and buy-in from all of these groups. When I look at how Yukoners engage in development of this strategy, we see a formidable commitment to take significant climate actions and position ourselves to benefit from the green economy.

Mr. Speaker, the commitment to the input of this strategy — a strategy that Yukoners see themselves in — is evident in the “what we heard” document released in May of 2019. Throughout October, November, and December of 2018, there was a comprehensive engagement process that Yukoners participated in. There were public meetings in 14 communities, with 287 participants from Yukon and transboundary indigenous groups. There were youth-specific events, with 44 youth participating from five communities. An online survey received 481 responses. Of those responses, 13 percent were identified as members of Yukon First Nations or transboundary indigenous groups. There were over 80 stakeholder groups that sent letters to Yukon government and 25 stakeholder one-on-one meetings that included businesses, non-profits, and individuals.

Mr. Speaker, Yukoners wanted to see an integrated strategy, one that prioritized the areas of affordable and reliable energy. They wanted to see reduced greenhouse gas emissions. They wanted to see increased resilience to the impacts of climate change and a strategy that created jobs and economic opportunities. We see the priorities of Yukoners reflected here in this strategy — an alignment to the four main categories that I spoke about earlier. This is the testament that Yukoners have been heard and that this government takes their input seriously.

Mr. Speaker, the final points that I will reiterate before handing it over to others today are about the action this

government took in addressing recommendations from the Auditor General of Canada in their 2017 report delivered to the members of this Assembly, simply titled *Climate Change in Yukon*. As I have mentioned previously, this was an effort by the Auditor General of Canada, along with all other provinces and territories throughout Canada, to identify how jurisdictions were preparing for and adapting to climate change.

The Auditor General made four recommendations. They were: to create a territory-wide risk assessment to help prioritize commitments and manage the impacts of climate change; that the departments of Environment, Energy, Mines and Resources, Highways and Public Works, and Community Services develop climate commitments that are time-bound and costed and that the commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions should indicate the level of reduction; that the Climate Change Secretariat should publicly report in a consistent manner on the progress made on all commitments and expenditures associated with meeting these commitments; and finally, that the departments of Environment, Energy, Mines and Resources, Highways and Public Works, and Community Services should complete their work and carry out concrete action in a timely manner to adapt to climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I'll note that the reason why the Auditor General of Canada made these specific recommendations was because, in the documentation that they were working with to assess Yukon's action against climate change, these were the areas that had not been addressed sufficiently by the government of the day.

The Auditor General was working from Yukon Party action plans and status reports from 2006 to 2011. Through this Liberal government, the departments of Environment, Energy, Mines and Resources, Highways and Public Works, and Community Services have all publicly agreed to the recommendations made in the 2017 Auditor General's report to address climate change. We see today — with the *Our Clean Future* strategy and the actions taken by government departments — that the recommendations made by the Auditor General have been taken seriously and have been acted upon.

A territory-wide risk assessment has been completed and it was done in collaboration with participating Yukon First Nations, transboundary indigenous groups, Yukon municipalities, youth of the territory, individual stakeholders, and a variety of businesses and non-profit organizations.

We see commitments that are time-bound, with targets set from today to 2030. These plans are costed and have reporting mechanisms in place, as departments throughout government have identified ways to support the *Our Clean Future* strategy and take action to mitigate against climate change. Finally, target levels have been identified for the reduction in greenhouse gases. The strategy identifies a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 that are 30 percent lower than they were in 2010.

In closing, this is a strategy made by Yukoners for Yukoners. It does encompass a whole-of-government approach to address and mitigate climate change. Finally, it actions on all of the recommendations made by the Auditor General of Canada in the 2017 report on climate change in Yukon.

I look forward to hearing from other members of the Assembly today on this very important topic which impacts all Yukoners.

Mr. Cathers: I'm pleased to rise today in speaking to this motion. Ultimately, I want to begin by noting that we support the basic objectives of reducing pollution — including CO₂ emissions — as well as the objective of increasing renewable energy.

There are parts of this strategy released by the government that we do agree with, including that we're pleased to see the continuation of some of the successful programs that were launched during our time in government, including the good energy program and the microgeneration program.

We do have many questions about this strategy. That includes the fact that this is another case of this Liberal government making commitments that sound nice but not identifying the true costs and not really having a realistic plan to actually implement the grand commitment.

We do have many questions about this strategy, including the real costs and what other pollution will result from implementing some of the grand commitments in it. I do have to note that, as I have touched on earlier during debate, while government is dealing with making grand promises, they are neglecting some of the basics that are necessary if we're serious about reducing our territory's dependence on goods shipped from Outside, increasing agricultural production, and so on.

That includes the ongoing problem — that began in late summer and that this government has still failed to take effective action on — of the loss of commercial garbage service for farms and other businesses as well as residential users in the Whitehorse periphery, including in my riding of Lake Laberge. That is something that is very important to the success of our territory's food industry — the ability to have access to affordable and predictable disposal options for waste.

In the absence of that, what we risk seeing is that, while the government has not acknowledged the costs that are being incurred in other areas if illegal dumping or increased pollution occurs, those are costs that are actually happening here in the territory. Just like in that particular area, with the strategy itself, I have questions about where their commitments may sound nice but will in fact result in increased costs — such as the fact that, in this government's plan to significantly increase the use of electricity under their strategy, at the moment, their plan for producing that electricity involves renting diesel generators and burning diesel fuel. While the announcement may sound green — much like with the ministerial statement earlier today about Mount Sima — the truth may be different from the announcement.

So, returning again to the issue of commercial garbage service for farms, I again have to emphasize to the Minister of Community Services and to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that, if this government is actually serious about supporting the growth of our agricultural sector, they need to address the basics — including working with the City of Whitehorse to come up with a deal that actually provides predictable rates and affordable rates for commercial garbage

service contractors to once again resume providing that service to farmers and to other businesses, as well as to residents in the area.

In a similar area, we have seen that part of this problem is related to the government's imposition of tipping fees. Again, we see this government, unfortunately, making an ideologically based commitment without actually understanding — or acknowledging, it seems — the true costs of that commitment, which include illegal dumping.

One of the things that I am going to highlight in my response is that we agree that reducing pollution is important, but CO₂ emissions are not the only pollution that government needs to be cognizant of and not the only one that they need to take steps on — along with society as a whole — to see a reduction in the pollution that occurs. For example, in the commitments that the government has made regarding its desire to see an increase in electrical vehicles, they have failed to address the issues and the questions of the life-cycle costs of those vehicles, including what they cost to produce — both in terms of the mineral resources and plastics that go into those vehicles — and what happens at the end of life, at the other end of the train, as far as the disposal of that vehicle, the battery within it, and so on.

The life-cycle costs with anything — not just electric vehicles — are far more important than the sales pitch. The sales pitch can sound good, but to sign on to the Liberals' current plan without more information would be akin to walking into a car dealership, looking at a vehicle that is shiny, reading the sticker on the window, hearing a good sales pitch from the salesman, and then signing a contract without reading the fine print. The details are very important, and that includes the life-cycle costs as well as the increases to emissions which will occur under the government's current plans to produce the electricity that is required to meet the ambitious targets set out in the strategy.

Again, I want to emphasize the fact that, when it comes down to the basic objectives, we agree that there is a need to reduce pollution, including CO₂ emissions. We agree that there is a need to take action in response to climate change. In fact, it was a Yukon Party government that came up with the first climate change action plan, as well as the energy strategy launched in 2009 that included a commitment to increasing renewable energy production here in Yukon.

I have to remind this Liberal government that they are talking a very good line when it comes to becoming greener, but when one looks at the actual situation on the electrical grid, if we compare this government's aspirational targets set out in their new plan, we see the government hoping to hit a target of 93-percent renewable energy production. Well, in fact, I would remind the Liberal government that, before their recent actions led to the substantially increased use of diesel fuel to power our electrical grid, if one looks at the Yukon Energy Corporation annual report from 2016 — and I am referring to page 6 of that report, which I can table if members would like me to, but they should also find a copy of it still online on the Legislative Assembly website. According to page 6 of the *Yukon Energy 2016 Annual Report*, in that year — and I quote: "More than

98 percent renewable in 2016 — keeping the Yukon clean and green”. It shows that 98.37 percent of electricity supply came from hydro production in 2016. The Member for Porter Creek Centre and his colleagues, I hope, will understand why I find their goal of hitting 93 percent rather underwhelming. It is still more than five points higher in terms of diesel use to produce the energy than it stood at when the Yukon Party was in office.

It is also notable that, in this so-called strategy that the government has presented, the mining targets are not set.

The emissions targets for the mining industry, according to page 13 of the government’s document, which they call *Our Clean Future* — and I quote: “We will work with industry to set a target for greenhouse gas emissions from placer and quartz mining by the end of 2022 that will see Yukon mines produce fewer emissions of greenhouse gases across their lifecycle for every kilogram or kilotonne of material produced.”

It also says — and I quote: “This intensity-based target will encourage industry to look for innovative ways to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions from mining, regardless of how many or few mines are in operation at any time.

“Reaching these targets by 2030 will put Yukon on the path to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 for our entire economy.”

So, we see there that this area is under the target set — and again, I will quote briefly from the government’s so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy: “By 2030, we will reduce Yukon’s total greenhouse emissions from transportation, heating, electricity generation, other commercial and industrial activities, waste and other areas so that our emissions in these areas are 30 per cent lower than they were in 2010.”

So, again, it is interesting that they chose the 2010 number, and that is in part because they don’t like to compare it to the last year of the Yukon Party government in 2016, because, in fact, the Liberal government has significantly increased the use of diesel fuel to produce electricity. In contrast, we set out a goal in the 2009 energy strategy, which I announced as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources at the time. In 2009, we set out a target of increasing the Yukon’s renewable energy supply by 20 percent by 2020, which, as members will know, is this year. So, 11 years ago, we set out the goal of increasing the Yukon’s production of renewable energy by 20 percent by 2020. In fact, we not only met that goal, but we met it years ahead of schedule.

I am going to quote briefly from a Yukon government news release from August 28, 2013 — “Government of Yukon on track to exceed renewable energy targets”.

“A progress report on the implementation of the 2009 *Energy Strategy for Yukon* has determined that the Government of Yukon is on track to surpass its target of increasing Yukon’s renewable energy supply by 20 per cent by 2020.

“‘The Government of Yukon is making excellent progress on achieving its energy efficiency targets and continues to take steps to reduce energy consumption, costs and emissions within Yukon,’ Energy, Mines and Resources Minister...” — and the name of the Member for Copperbelt South — “... said. ‘Increased energy efficiency is the best response to high energy

prices and environmental concerns and will assist us in meeting our future energy needs.’

“Released in 2009, the energy strategy reflects the government’s vision to improve energy efficiency and conservation, produce more renewable energy, meet electricity needs, responsibly develop oil and gas, and make good energy choices. The 2012 Progress Report provides an update on these priorities which are being researched, explored and developed by the Government of Yukon and its partners within the Government of Canada and the private sector.

“Highlighting that the vast majority of electricity generation in the territory comes from renewable sources, the report states that in 2012, 95 per cent of electricity demand was met by renewable energy and nearly 20 per cent of heating demand was met by renewable wood-based heating. Per capita, this is greater than any other jurisdiction in Canada.

“Additionally, the Aishihik third turbine and Mayo B projects have increased Yukon Energy Corporation’s renewable generation capacity by 22 per cent, already exceeding the territory’s target of increasing renewable energy by 20 per cent by 2020.”

That’s the extent that I will quote from that press release, which, for Hansard, is from August 28, 2013, on the government website.

I’ll close my comments on that by noting that this press releases recognizes that, at that point in time, of the energy that was on the territorial grid, 95 percent of that electricity demand was from renewable energy. In fact, once the Mayo B project and the Aishihik third turbine were fully commissioned, we saw the territory get — according to Yukon Energy’s report in 2016 — to the point where 98.3 percent of our electricity was being produced by renewable sources. Again, in contrast, this Liberal government’s goal of hitting 93 percent is rather underwhelming.

The fact is that we have seen this government go down in approach. After spending a substantial amount of money on planning to build a 20-megawatt diesel or LNG facility, the government then has tried desperately to pretend that their project, which was consulted on in this mandate, actually wasn’t theirs after all. They chose to go down the road of — instead of buying diesel generators, they decided to rent them. We know that this is already resulting in \$7.1 million in costs that they’re planning on passing on directly to ratepayers, and according to their estimates for usage this year and in previous years, we’ve seen the government telling us that the cost of their rental diesels is roughly \$13.5 million.

The Liberal government continues to exist in a state of denial. We unfortunately are seeing the same thing with this strategy.

I want to talk about the mining intensity targets some more. In the government’s so-called *Our Clean Future* — which might better be titled “their not-so-clean future” — according to page 16: “From 2009 to 2017 — the period of time for which we have reliable greenhouse gas emissions data for Yukon — emissions from placer and quartz mining have varied from year-to-year depending on the amount of mining activity in the territory. These annual fluctuations can be seen in Yukon’s total

greenhouse gas emissions as well, which is the direct outcome of increases or decreases to mining emissions as well as the indirect impact that mining activity has on overall economic activity in the territory. Overall, mining emissions have ranged from 10 to 15 per cent of Yukon's total emissions over this period."

The strategy further goes on to say: "The year-to-year variability of Yukon's mining emissions makes it difficult to set a maximum level of greenhouse gas emissions from mining to be reached by a certain date. If mining activity were to decrease, total mining emissions could reach the target without requiring any improvements to how mines operate. If mining activity were to increase, the target could become unachievable.

"Unlike an absolute greenhouse gas reduction target, an intensity-based target that establishes a desired level of greenhouse gas emissions per unit of material produced will encourage operational efficiencies regardless of how many or how few mines are in operation at any one time.

"In addition, establishing a tailored approach for mining emissions eliminates the possibility for a substantial change in mining activity to skew our efforts to reduce emissions from other parts of Yukon's economy. For example, if mining emissions were part of the Yukon-wide greenhouse gas reduction target, a significant decrease in mining activity could help us to reach the 2030 target without needing to make as many improvements to our transportation and heating systems."

It is interesting here that we see, on the next page, that it says, "The Government of Yukon will work with industry to set the mining intensity target, or targets, for placer and quartz mining by 2022."

Part of the challenge here is that — while that is, according to the government's report, 10 to 15 percent of the overall picture in terms of carbon emissions — they are planning to set it by the end of 2022. As we know, this will be after the next territorial election. They are leaving it to the next government to actually deal with this issue while pretending that they have set out a realistic plan for reducing emissions. In fact, they are leaving a major sector — one of the Yukon's largest industries — not dealt with.

I am going to refer to a document — the government has, right now, a request for proposals issued by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in November 2020, which, of course, is just last month. The title of the RFP is: "Request for Proposals: Development of intensity-based greenhouse gas reduction targets for Yukon's mining industry". Also on this page of the request for proposals, for which I will just ask staff to ensure that a copy is provided to Hansard for their reference, it says, "The Yukon government is seeking an experienced and well qualified consultant resource to assist in the development of one or more intensity-based greenhouse gas reduction targets for Yukon's mining industry, and in the identification of tools and measures that may be necessary to successfully reach the target(s) by 2030."

The document itself, in going through this request for proposals, describes some of the terms of the contract early on. It talks about the application of the Yukon business incentive

policy rebates, acceptance of minor and non-material defects in the proposal, and the government's right to make changes to contract terms — all of which raise some other questions, but I will leave those for the moment.

In flipping through this request for proposals, we run into some interesting elements within it. Ultimately, my key point in reading this is that this is a big part — if the government is actually planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we need to understand what the plan is.

It needs to be a realistic plan that includes having an understanding of the costs and its impacts on industry as well as on the public. In the absence of that, it's a nice idea, but it isn't a realistic strategy.

On page 16 of the RFP, it notes: "While this greenhouse gas reduction target will ensure we see a decrease in emissions from transportation, heating and other areas, we also need a plan to address greenhouse gas emissions from mining, which were 10 per cent of Yukon's total emissions in 2017."

Let me read that sentence again: "... we also need a plan to address greenhouse gas emissions from mining..."

The government has themselves acknowledged in their own contract that they don't actually have a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from mining. I'm going to move on to quote further from this. "Consequently, the Yukon government has committed to work with industry to set targets for greenhouse gas emissions from both placer and quartz mining by the end of 2022 that will see Yukon mines produce fewer emissions of greenhouse gases across their lifecycle per unit of material produced."

While we do support the concept of taking an intensity-based approach to emissions from the mining sector, the details of this matter — because, otherwise, we're being asked to sign onto a blank cheque, where the government wants our support for their so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy, but key details have yet to be worked out, and we don't know what that means or what the impact would be on Yukoners.

I'm going to quote further from the RFP where it talks about the description and scope of work. "The Yukon government is seeking an experienced and well qualified consultant resource to assist in the development of one or more intensity-based greenhouse gas..." — reductions — "... for Yukon's mining industry, and in the identification of tools and measures that may be necessary to successfully reach the target(s) by 2030."

It sets out a 10-year plan. I point to the fact that, for a key sector of the Yukon economy — in fact, one of the largest sectors of the Yukon economy, the largest private sector part of the Yukon economy — the government, in setting out a 10-year plan, is planning to wait until two years into that time period before they even get their act together and figure out what the plan actually means for our placer miners and hard rock mines. That means that, while this document sounds nice at first blush, it just simply leaves so many questions that have yet to be answered that government just didn't get the work done on.

It talks about, in this RFP, the total available budget for completion of phase 1 is \$50,000. It raises the question: What's

phase 2? If phase 1 is the focus of that RFP, what is the second phase of the work?

Under requirements, it notes: “The mining intensity targets that are established must: encompass greenhouse gas emissions and production from both placer and quartz mines; encompass greenhouse gas emissions across the entire mining lifecycle from development through to closure and remediation; be set at a level that will be achievable by 2030 while also being ambitious...” and it goes on.

My primary point in identifying this is that this is a very aspirational strategy, but major details have yet to be figured out. It isn't really a plan for addressing either energy or climate change. Again, I do want to acknowledge that there are parts of it that we agree with. We are happy, for example, to see the continuation of the microgeneration program that we implemented. We know that there have been concerns with it, including the fact that the Liberal government capped the program to limit the amount per household that could be produced. We still have yet to hear an explanation of why they did that. Was it because it was an initiative started under a Yukon Party government that was proving to be too successful and the government didn't want to see it achieve greater success because it was someone else's strategy? Is that the reason why they capped the amount under the microgeneration program? Because we have yet to hear a better explanation.

By the government's own admission — somewhere in my stack of papers here — I'm going to reference a legislative return tabled by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in March of last year, 2019, regarding energy supply and demand. That is currently on the Legislative Assembly website. I believe it was tabled on March 18, 2019 — though the document itself, on the page signed by the minister, says March 19 and it also says March 12, but the stamp says March 18. So, it is a little bit unclear when it was tabled, but I think that would have been on March 18, 2019.

As a side note, I have to point out that it's somewhat similar to problems that we recently saw on yukon.ca where it listed three different ages for children for whom the mask-use requirement is mandatory. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit of a sloppy approach unfortunately here.

So, in referring to this legislative return — again, tabled by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and this Liberal government — it noted that, as of January 2019 of last year — it talks about the success of renewable energy generation. Again, in this document tabled by the minister himself, it says — and I quote: “The Government of Yukon is achieving and surpassing expectations on implementing various initiatives and ideas related to energy generation and reducing energy use in the Yukon. We have adopted a multi-faceted approach by promoting renewable energy generation, managing electricity and utilities, promoting energy efficiency initiatives, supporting research and training, and demonstrating leadership in the energy sector.”

It then goes on to talk about — again, I'll quote: “The Government of Yukon's popular micro-generation policy has led to Yukon experiencing high adoption rates for small-scale energy-generation projects. As a result, we have witnessed

major growth and development in locally-sourced renewable energy and a significant boom in our local solar energy industry since the policy was implemented. As of January 2019, there are 218 different micro-generators using mostly solar energy to generate 2,309 megawatt-hours of new electricity annually.”

I'm pointing out that it's not just us saying that the microgeneration program that the Yukon government developed and implemented during our time in government was successful. In fact, the current Liberal minister acknowledged it himself. I would just like to acknowledge as well that, without the work of Yukon government staff as well as the Yukon private sector, the policy we put in place would not have been successful.

But in working with them, the development of the policy and its implementation have been very successful. In the words of the minister, signed off on a legislative return last year, it says — quote: “As a result, we have witnessed major growth and development in locally-sourced renewable energy and a significant boom in our local solar energy industry since the policy was implemented.” The minister also goes on to say in the legislative return: “The high number of solar energy generating systems has established Yukon as one of the nation's leaders in adopting renewable energy.”

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to reference a little later here in this document — I know that there was something else I wanted to draw members' attention to in this here — but I would note that the success of the good energy program that I announced in 2009 has been continued since. We were pleased to see that in this report as well as the continuation of microgeneration. Again, we do have that rather large question of why the government capped the microgeneration program and whether it was simply because they would rather develop alternative arrangements that they could put their own brand on and that they wouldn't have to give credit to the previous government for implementing. If that's the case, I would encourage them to revisit that and have the policy reflect the actual needs of the territory instead of just political vanity.

Returning to the legislative return on retrofit incentives signed by the minister — again, I would note that they were initiatives developed under the previous Yukon Party government — quote: “Our Good Energy program offers a full suite of incentives to homeowners to improve their homes' energy efficiency. Homeowners can start with renovations to improve air tightness and increase insulation levels in their existing residences and get a Good Energy rebate. One of our Good Energy rebates incentivizes switching to energy efficient home heating from renewable sources such as biomass or air source heat pumps. Uptake over the last four years has been consistently high, with 1,408 retrofits completed, largely focused on improving window quality in homes. Collectively, existing homes have saved enough energy to power approximately 205 non-electrically-heated homes for one year. Energy retrofit programs deliver measurable benefits to participants. They relieve pressure on our energy-generation needs, reduce collective greenhouse gas emissions and create green jobs that stimulate the economy.”

Here is another good one — again, I am quoting from page 8 of the legislative return signed off by the current Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources himself — on page 8 — quote: “Yukoners can take smaller actions to make their homes more energy efficient. Our Good Energy incentives program plays a significant role in encouraging Yukoners to purchase energy efficient appliances and reduce residential electrical loads.

“The statistics for the Good Energy program show that lowering energy use is important to Yukon residents. Over the last decade, Yukoners who have received Good Energy rebates have saved over \$9.7 million in energy costs and prevented 40,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions. The energy efficiency incentives are making a significant impact. We have collectively saved enough energy to power over 2,400 non-electrically heated homes for one year. The high participation rates prove that the Government of Yukon’s energy efficiency initiatives are successfully encouraging Yukon residents and local businesses to conserve and reduce their energy use and save money. Building on those successes, we are currently working across departments and with the Government of Canada to expand our existing programs to deliver energy efficiency solutions on a larger scale.”

Again, I want to just repeat part of what was said in the document signed by the minister himself and tabled in this Assembly: “The statistics for the Good Energy program show that lowering energy use is important to Yukon residents. Over the last decade, Yukoners who have received Good Energy rebates have saved over \$9.7 million in energy costs and prevented 40,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions. The energy efficiency incentives are making a significant impact. We have collectively saved enough energy to power over 2,400 non-electrically heated homes for one year.”

We are pleased to see the government continuing those programs. We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is always room for improvement. While we do appreciate some of the actions that are outlined in this strategy, as I mentioned, there are many questions that have yet to be answered about the true impact of this report.

This Liberal government has a practice of making grand, uncosted promises. This includes the fact that we are already in a situation where — due to the government’s choice to spend a substantial amount of money planning to add a 20-megawatt diesel or LNG facility and then flipflopping and deciding to rent instead of own — they not only wasted millions of dollars on planning, but they have spent — according to their own documents, they are already spending roughly \$13.5 million to date in renting those diesel generators and burning diesel fuel. The government still has yet to tell us what this will cost going forward.

I am going to just briefly refer here to one of the other documents I have — which, again, is a somewhat ironically named “strategy”, much like our so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy — their draft 10-year renewable electricity plan that they released to stakeholders in July 2020. In looking at the plan, we see that despite calling it “renewable”, there is a lot of diesel usage in that strategy.

It comes down to what we might refer to — for lack of a better term — as the “truth in advertising” question. Much like the ministerial statement earlier today, we saw the government claiming that, by investing in Mount Sima and moving it off diesel, that would simply be using green energy. Well, in fact — based on the actual numbers regarding the load for the last several years and the fact that, under this Liberal government, Yukon Energy has been directed to rent 17 portable diesels for this winter alone — if winter consumption is already requiring burning LNG at max capacity and is using rental diesels, then moving a major customer such as Mount Sima onto the Yukon Energy grid will, of course, lower Mount Sima’s own use of diesel fuel and lower the cost for that NGO — and that is a good thing.

However, when government pretends that, overall, it is a major action on climate change, that is simply not factually correct. That is misleading. It is effectively a shell game where the use by a sport facility of diesel generators drops but, because the grid is already burning beyond our hydro capacity, for every kilowatt hour that it consumes energy, there is still going to be diesel or LNG being burned to produce that power.

The minister today, in responding to my response, suggested that he do the math on how many litres of fuel Mount Sima is currently burning and tell us what the overall emissions reduction is, but that is a completely misleading comparison, because the real question is: How much diesel fuel will still be required to produce that power?

Overall, as I indicated earlier, we do think that the investment is a good thing for Mount Sima and we believe that it is partly a positive news story. But the government is deliberately exaggerating just how positive it is and it is deliberately exaggerating and misrepresenting —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Minister of Community Services, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite just described comments or remarks of mine as being misleading and then just referred to them as deliberately misleading. I think that is contravening Standing Order 19(h).

Speaker’s ruling

Speaker: I don’t think that I need to hear from the Member for Lake Laberge right now. In my view, what he said was that the government was deliberately exaggerating, which I think is permissible in debate with competing narratives.

The Member for Lake Laberge, please.

Mr. Cathers: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So, I just want to note that, again — much as with the re-announcement today about Mount Sima — when it comes down to the government’s so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy, the real question is not about what the headline says, but what the actual impacts are on the territory. What are the real costs? What are the real emissions?

With some of the government's moves, for example, to electric vehicles, it raises the real question of whether, overall, we're seeing a net decrease in diesel fuel use, or whether in fact we're simply seeing it reallocated so that, instead of a citizen burning it themselves in their vehicle, in fact, it may be being burned by Yukon Energy and passed on to all ratepayers.

Another problem with that — and another reason that government can argue that they still believe that approach is the right one — but if thousands of people are buying new cars with a government rebate and then the cost of powering those cars — with increased diesel fuel use to create the electricity — is being passed on to every ratepayer, that is also — when it leads to an increase in rates, such as the 11.5-percent increase that the government is currently planning to impose on Yukoners, as seen in Yukon Energy's recent application to the Utilities Board — when those rates increase — if that application is approved — and when the power rates recently increased, it's every Yukoner who pays those costs, and that includes those who can least afford to pay their power bill.

So, it can end up being, in effect, a tax on poor people, and it is potentially going down the same road as Ontario went down, under the Liberals, where we saw them succeed in creating a new term in Canadian debate of "energy poverty" which didn't previously exist in this country. "Energy poverty" was the term coined for the situation faced by Ontario citizens who, as a result of that Liberal government's failed green energy policy, saw a massive increase in their electricity rates, to the point where some people were having to choose between putting food on the table, paying their mortgage, or paying their power bill. Ultimately, that is why, at the start, it's important that everyone understand what the real cost will be, both in terms of the financial costs and other pollution, whether it be increased emissions to power government-owned — or, I should say, Yukon Energy-owned — diesel generators or whether it's related to increased transportation costs or increased pollution, such as that caused by the government's tipping fees that they have imposed this summer.

When somebody is burying their garbage on their property or burning it on their land or dumping it down a side road, that's increased pollution. It might not be the intent of the government's tipping fee strategy — it isn't the intent, of course — but if those are the actual unintended consequences of your policy, it's simply living in a state of denial to profess to believe that those increased pollution costs haven't occurred.

Just briefly on that, I would note that, as a result of the government's increased tipping fees that have been imposed in areas including the Deep Creek solid waste facility this year, I have received more complaints about people burning garbage on their property than I have — easily — in the previous 10 years combined. I do believe that this was not the intent of the government's tipping fees, but the fact that it is happening is something that needs to be acknowledged, just as with the illegal dumping that goes on and the costs that we have seen as well.

Just analyzing and comparing how, with the government's current strategy that we are debating here this afternoon — comparing to their actions to date, we have seen the situation,

of course, that they talk a good game on green energy, but in fact, they are quietly renting 17 diesel generators and planning to rent diesel generators for another decade to meet our power needs. They are talking about increasing the production of renewable energy, but in fact, they are aiming for a legislated goal of hitting 93 percent of our electricity being produced from renewable sources, when the previous government — in 2016, we saw that the total number — according to Yukon Energy's own report, 98.3 percent of our electricity was coming from renewable sources.

So, they are going in the wrong direction while pretending that they are getting greener.

Jumping back to the draft 10-year renewable energy electricity plan that Yukon Energy shared with stakeholders in July 2020 — and again, touching on the fact that, as I noted, the title and the content are two different things — as we see in this strategy, it is called a "renewable strategy", but if we look, we see not only the increased use of diesel fuel, but increased diesel fuel prompted directly by the actions listed in the government's so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy.

I am going to refer to page 11 of this one that has an updated peak forecast and electrification actions, et cetera. According to page 11 of Yukon Energy's draft plan, released in July of this year — this page shows the updates from the base case for power consumption that was outlined in the 2016 integrated resource plan — or IRP, as it is called on this graph. It shows the number for the 2019 base case with and without the updated 2020 peak. We see that the updated peak forecast on here outlined in Yukon Energy's plan shows the consumption from electric vehicles estimated at 11 megawatts — 11 megawatts to power the electric vehicles. Now, the plan doesn't include developing enough hydro to meet that demand, so where is the electricity coming from? Based on the plans that the government has currently released, it's coming from burning diesel.

Smart heating is estimated to show a four-megawatt increase in electrification and electrification actions are shown as an additional three megawatts. So, we see that it appears that — according to the numbers presented on page 11 of Yukon Energy's own draft plan — there is an 18-megawatt impact associated with implementing the government's so-called *Our Clean Future* document.

It isn't the increased use of electricity that is the problem but how they are producing it. On the one hand, we expect to see a situation where, if the Liberal government were re-elected — which we don't expect based on what we hear from Yukon citizens — based on their plans, if everything goes their way, they would like to be using 18 megawatts' worth of increased power directly in association with *Our Clean Future*, as shown in Yukon Energy's documents. Their plan for meeting that increased 18-megawatt load appears to be largely dependent on diesel.

When the Minister of Community Services, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Minister of Environment, or the Premier rise in speaking to this motion, I would like to them to answer this simple question: What's the bill for that 18 megawatts? How much is that 18 megawatts in increased

demand associated with their so-called *Our Clean Future* document? What is the total impact of emissions? What are the total estimated fuel costs associated with producing that power? The power has to come from somewhere, and their current plan has a lot of diesel in it.

Moving on to the next area here, I want to talk briefly again about electricity. It's interesting that, on page 18 of their so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy, it says — under “Ensuring reliable, affordable and renewable energy” on page 18 of that document — “Electricity”: “In Yukon, historically we have met over 90 per cent of our electricity needs each year with clean, renewable power because of our large supply of hydroelectricity. As Yukon's economy and communities grow, and as Yukoners increasingly invest in electric vehicles and electric heating technologies, demand for electricity will grow.”

It is a brief acknowledgement, with no details in this strategy, of the fact that electric vehicles and electric heating will increase the demand for electricity. It's also notable that there is obviously a political decision made to be selective of the history that they refer to when it says: “In Yukon, historically we have met over 90 per cent of our electricity needs ... with clean, renewable power...” In fact, as I outlined earlier and as shown in the *Yukon Energy 2016 Annual Report*, in that year, the electricity demand was met primarily with hydroelectricity, and in fact, 98.3 percent of our electricity that year was produced with renewable energy — not 90 percent — 98.3 percent.

I would also remind the members — I know they especially like to desperately try to paint themselves as being greener than the Yukon Party. In fact, their fossil fuel emissions record, in comparison to our increase in renewable energy and the result of programs that we implemented — such as the microgeneration program — that have helped Yukoners themselves produce renewable energy — we are very happy to stack our record up in comparison to theirs.

Part of our record includes the fact that we connected the grids. Previously, the Whitehorse-Aishihik-Faro grid was not connected to the grid from Mayo and Dawson. As a result of connecting them, it allows improvements in stability as well as the ability to use electricity from the Mayo dam on the rest of the grid to make use of that energy more efficiently as a result — and, of course, vice versa — and to allow the use of energy from Aishihik during the winter in other Yukon communities. It, of course, resulted in the community of Pelly Crossing coming off of reliance on diesel to being able to depend on the electricity grid, like many other Yukon communities. Those are all things that we are proud to have done and that we think are good steps taken to make the Yukon a little bit greener — but also, we do so.

This is a key factor which the current Liberal government does not appear to share our views on. Everything that we did to improve energy efficiency, to add renewable electrical supply, to connect the grids, and so on was also done with costs in mind — what I have referred to, for lack of a better term, as “considering the two greens”. We need to look at making something greener, but we also need to make sure that it is

affordable. It is important that any plan — any strategy before government is making a decision to take major action — be thought through. Part of thinking it through — a very key part of thinking it through — is understanding whether you can do it. Part of understanding whether you can do it includes understanding what it will cost, and if you don't know what it will cost, then you don't really know if you can do it. That applies to any of these major commitments that we have seen made by the government. We know how they have taken what I previously characterized as their “ready, fire, aim” approach to planning, which we have seen in a case of their decision to shove aside the Salvation Army and take over the Whitehorse Emergency Shelter without having a plan to operate it, without knowing the costs, and, bizarrely, without even going to their own Management Board for approval first.

We know that, to date, the costs of running it are \$4.8 million that they have admitted to, which, of course, is well over double the cost on that facility —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Deputy Speaker (Hutton): The Minister of Economic Development, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I just want to refer to Standing Order 19(b), which speaks to matters other than the question or discussion, motion, or mandate. We have now veered down the road of the emergency shelter. I don't think that really pertains to this particular conversation.

Deputy Speaker: Member for Lake Laberge, on the point of order.

Mr. Cathers: I think the minister may not have been listening to me. I believe it was very direct and relevant. I was comparing the government's approach in committing to adopt this strategy to their decision to act the way they did on the Whitehorse Emergency Shelter and the fact that neither one of these was costed out before they made the decision. I think it's very relevant to the debate.

Deputy Speaker's ruling

Deputy Speaker: I do tend to agree with the Member for Lake Laberge. There's a thread of relevance here.

Carry on.

Mr. Cathers: My fundamental point in making that comparison is that there's a pattern, and the problem with that pattern is that not only is it not properly being forthcoming with Yukoners about the costs of doing something before the government makes the commitment to do it and says they're going to get it done, but it also leads — if you make a major commitment without understanding if you can do it and commit to going down that road — and actually do go down that road — we see that cost overages happen all the time. I expect that the same thing would happen with the so-called *Our Clean Future* report as happened with the Whitehorse Emergency Shelter, where government makes the decision to do it, does it, and then costs keep ballooning out of control.

We know that, with just one facility, the costs have more than doubled. The government won't tell us what the total bill is for that facility, but we know that it has gone from \$2.1 million for the Salvation Army to \$4.8 million that the government has admitted to — and more that we believe they've moved between programs.

In the case of their so-called *Our Clean Future* approach, one of the pieces of very direct relevance is that the 18 megawatts of increased electrical demand associated with this document in which Yukon Energy Corporation estimates — so these are not my estimates; these are the estimates in Yukon Energy Corporation's draft 10-year plan that they shared with stakeholders this summer. According to the chart on page 11, the cost of the electrification actions of the smart heating and the electric vehicles — when you add up the three megawatts for the first one, the 11 megawatts for the electric vehicles, and the four megawatts for the smart heating — again, these are Yukon Energy's estimates — that total adds up to 18 megawatts.

One thing that the government has not answered in their *Our Clean Future — A Yukon strategy for climate change, energy, and a green economy* is what the cost is of increasing electrical production by 18 megawatts to meet those actions and how that electricity will be provided. Again, it certainly appears, based on what we see Yukon Energy providing, that the 18 megawatts is going to include the government's diesels. A plan to keep leasing diesel generators is a very expensive approach to dealing with the situation. It is, in my view, largely living in a state of denial and pretending that you're not investing in diesel long term, so renting instead.

I would also raise the question — when the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources — who is also the Minister responsible for Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation — stands to speak to this motion, I would ask him to tell this House whether, in fact, the reason that they are going with the short-term leasing of the diesel generators rather than a long-term lease is to avoid having to go to the Yukon Utilities Board with the proposal of long-term leasing of diesel generators. That is certainly how it appears to me. Due to technicalities in the process, it appears that, if they have a contract of less than a year for renting those generators, they can avoid taking the project to the Yukon Utilities Board and having them review it. I suspect that the Yukon Utilities Board would look at a proposal to rent diesel generators for a decade and laugh it out of the hearing as being a high-cost option that is not in the best interests of ratepayers.

A simple question for the minister: Does structuring the rental contract in that way avoid them having to take the project to the Utilities Board for approval, as we believe it does? Is that the reason government has chosen to go with rentals shorter than a year instead of a 10-year rental contract for a diesel generator, which would be far cheaper than renting it every year and paying the mobilization and demobilization costs?

We should note, in terms of our energy security, that we know that Yukon Energy has concerns about the ability to keep renting diesel generators because that's a pretty small market in North America and the certainty of being able to continue

renting generators every year is uncertain. As well, we know there have been problems in previous years. I don't know the status as far as this year goes, with the condition that those generators have been in when they got them, because much as with a rental car, there is the risk that a rental generator has been treated roughly by its previous users and, when you get it, it may not quite be in the condition you would like it to be in.

It does seem, to me, to be a risky and an expensive approach to providing backup and it also seems to be one that is largely based, it appears, on bypassing the Yukon Utilities Board and avoiding triggering the *Public Utilities Act* provisions that are intended really to keep Yukon Energy and the other utility accountable to the public and to ratepayers. But if government is helping to deliberately bypass that, then those costs can be hidden.

When I touched on the reduction targets, I made mention of the modelling that they've used as well, I think, but it does — again, the variation in the greenhouse gas reduction modelling that they talk about on page 14 of the strategy: “Based on modelling, we anticipate that Yukon's emissions, excluding mining emissions, could increase to 678 kilotonnes in 2030 if we do not take action. As a result, to meet our 30 percent greenhouse gas reduction target by 2030, we estimate that we need to reduce our emissions by 263 kilotonnes. However, forecasting what Yukon's greenhouse gas emissions could be in 2030 is very challenging. Future emissions depend on several factors, including population growth, the economy, and the success of the actions in this strategy, all of which are hard to predict. This makes it very important to track actual greenhouse gas emissions on a regular basis and be flexible and adaptive in our efforts.”

The strategy — we note that, in the fine print, it raises questions about how effective the strategy will be in doing it, noting — quote: “... all of which are hard to predict.”

I would just like to move on to another specific area related to that — or a few other specific areas related to their plan. As I mentioned, it talks about electric vehicles. On page 5, I believe it is, of the strategy — at least, according to the page number that I have here, it talks about what you can do.

“Our Clean Future also creates many opportunities for individuals, businesses and organizations to take part in reducing emissions, enhancing energy security, making Yukon more resilient, and building a green economy through financial support, information and advice. Here are some actions you can take as an individual or business to help Yukon achieve our 2030 goals.”

The strategy talks about — quote: “Make your next vehicle electric with the help of up to \$5,000 from the Government of Yukon for eligible zero-emission vehicles. Or, purchase an e-bike to make active transportation easier. Check out the Good Energy suite of clean transportation rebates.”

As a side note, I note that, below that, when you talk about the total number of actions the government states, they kind of inflate those figures by including things such as this one: “Walk, ride your bike or take public transportation to work, even just 1 day a week.” That is advice that can help, but suggesting that people ride their bike or walk or take a bus is

not exactly a government action, nor is it profoundly new advice. Yukoners are aware of steps that they can take to reduce their own emissions by reducing the use of vehicles.

Another thing I should note in talking about the electric vehicles — when we look at the 11-megawatt increase that Yukon Energy appears to be estimating to meet the government's plan for electric vehicles — and I would note that the electric vehicle number here — I am just trying to find the page here — the Government of Yukon actions and key actions on page 8 of their strategy — one of their key government actions for transportation is — and I quote: “Get 4,800 zero-emission vehicles on the road by 2030. We will do this by working with local vehicle dealerships and manufacturers to establish a system to meet targets for zero-emission vehicle sales, providing rebates and investing in charging stations.”

Next, it says: “Ensure at least 50% of all new light-duty cars purchased each year by the Government of Yukon are zero-emission vehicles.”

There are a number of questions associated with this. The first one, as the minister will know, is: Where is the power coming from? According to Yukon Energy, it appears to be an 11-megawatt increase, and it looks like they are relying on diesel to meet that.

They talk about ensuring that 50 percent of the light-duty cars purchased by the Government of Yukon each year are zero-emission vehicles. That raises to me a question about the usage. If those vehicles are being used as part of the government fleet, it raises the question of how long the charge lasts in those vehicles. For instance, can a Yukon government employee who has been assigned a zero-emission vehicle from the fleet take that vehicle and drive to Dawson City or Watson Lake without having to stop to charge it? If they do have to stop to charge it, there are a number of questions. Is the infrastructure there? If it is not there, what will it cost to install it? That is not always a simple thing, depending on the availability of the infrastructure that is in place in communities, and it may require additional upgrades before they can simply put in a charging station. There might be other costs associated with taking the energy off the grid and stepping down from the line.

So, there's a question of what those costs are for infrastructure but also if there is lost time from a government employee having to sit, waiting along the way to charge the vehicle. What is the estimated loss of efficiency to government? I have heard it suggested to me by people in the private sector who know more about the range of electric vehicles than I do — the suggestion that perhaps the government, for those types of things, would be better off looking at hybrid vehicles instead of purely electric.

With a hybrid car, if you run out of power in the battery, you can go to the energy produced by the gasoline or diesel engine and continue going instead of sitting off the highway waiting for your vehicle to charge. There are questions, of course, about zero-emission vehicles and the decline in efficiency — at least from some of those vehicles — when operating in colder temperatures and, if there is a reduction in range, what the impact of that is. When those vehicles have to

stop to charge during our coldest times of the year, that is the same time of year when we have the highest power demand already and, at that time, we are already needing to dip into diesel and LNG to meet that electrical demand.

Here is another question related to the batteries. Some of the contents of those batteries in electric vehicles are toxic. What is the disposal plan? What is the recycling plan? How much of those elements will be reused and how much will simply be disposed of? If they are likely to be disposed of, either through government planning for that happening — or perhaps failing to come up with a plan at all — that is a potential problem. There is also the potential problem of, if people have to pay for disposal, people simply choosing to illegally dump vehicles.

We know that this has already been a problem with the government's increased tipping fees — the number of abandoned vehicles along roadsides. There was one in my riding abandoned across the road from the Deep Creek dump. There was another one that was beside the Mayo Road — or north Klondike Highway, if members prefer, but most of us out that way call it the “Mayo Road”. There was another one that was abandoned there that I, in fact, reported to the RCMP thinking that it might have been a stolen vehicle. In fact, after they investigated it, they determined it was just an abandoned vehicle. People are already dumping vehicles to avoid tipping fees. What happens if they do that with electric cars?

Another question — and I thank my colleague for passing it on to me — is a question about the grids in our communities and our subdivisions and whether they have a high enough capacity for people to put chargers in their homes for their vehicles and whether those homes have enough capacity in their breaker panels.

The aspirational targets are a lot easier to commit to than figuring out how it's going to work. As the Premier himself used to like to say when in opposition, the devil is in the details. Well, unfortunately, the lesson that he seemed to take from his own rhetoric in opposition was that this government is almost allergic to providing details or working them out. We are often left with very reasonable questions not being answered. The tendency, of course, of the government in Question Period is to revert to the closest script in their book rather than actually providing us with an answer to the question. Again, as my colleague, the Member for Kluane, passed on to me, there are questions about the capacities of parts of the grid to serve electric cars. What's the cost of upgrading it?

For example, looking at the community of Whistle Bend, when Whistle Bend was put in — as the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of Community Services will probably require — there was a requirement for a substation upgrade at the time. The cost of that was in the millions of dollars. That was because the existing substations had previously, with most subdivisions, not needed expanded capacity to provide the load, but Whistle Bend was a step beyond it, and so it required millions of dollars in infrastructure to be able to meet the needs of the homes there.

If those homes also start adding electric cars onto their total consumption, what's the impact of that? How many of the 11

megawatts that Yukon Energy says that they think the government's electric vehicle plan will add in demand to the grid — how much of that 11 megawatts will end up in Whistle Bend? How much will be in Copper Ridge? What's the impact on the infrastructure there?

In communities such as Haines Junction, Carmacks, or Watson Lake, if the government is successful in achieving their aspirational targets of adding 4,800 zero-emission vehicles on the roads by 2030, how many of those vehicles are likely to be in each community? Has the government even done the basic work of figuring out what grid infrastructure upgrades would be required so that you don't end up with a situation where you've succeeded in convincing 4,800 Yukoners to buy a zero-emission vehicle and they have hooked them up, but the grid simply can't keep up with the demand and keeps crashing? We have already seen an increase in the unreliability of the grid under this government. If they don't have a plan that has worked out the logistics, it leaves us wondering what those impacts will be.

As I mentioned, it also raises questions. I would encourage the government to actually get up and respond to this point. What are the life-cycle costs of those 4,800 zero-emission vehicles estimated to be? Those include minerals such as rare earth minerals that often are coming from Third World countries. The impacts of mining those metals — or metals from here that are shipped overseas to China or elsewhere as part of the manufacturing process and then getting shipped back here — the life-cycle costs of manufacturing those cars and the batteries and then disposing of them need to be considered.

Lest the ministers try to portray it as us simply not being willing to consider electric vehicles, we are not saying that increasing the number of electric vehicles is necessarily a bad thing. What I'm saying is that we need to understand — and a responsible government would already understand — what the costs of that plan are before making that grand aspirational commitment. That has to include the life-cycle pollution costs associated with building those new vehicles. It also necessarily has to include the consideration of comparing that to what would happen if, instead of just going to zero-emission vehicles, they use hybrids — or simply through improvements in the technology of vehicles burning fossil fuels.

I will just briefly illustrate some of the changes that I, as a consumer and owner of vehicles, have experienced myself — and my own observations in the last couple of decades of what I've seen with the truck that I drive compared to the one that I used to drive and the snow machine I have compared to the one I used to have. That includes that the Ford F150 that I currently have is the same basic model as the one that I had that was a decade older. I have observed that, in that time, the engine got a bit smaller and the total horsepower was increased substantially. Driving the same way, basically, as I did with the one I had before, I notice that I personally get about two miles per gallon better fuel efficiency than I used to get.

In the case of the Polaris snow machine that I have compared to the first one that I had — which was the first one that I purchased personally, in 1999 — I've noticed that it does about four miles per gallon better than the old one used to.

While I'm not suggesting that electric vehicles aren't part of the equation, improvements by manufacturers which have been occurring in fuel efficiency should also be considered, especially in comparison to the question about the total life-cycle pollution costs of electric vehicles.

The government's plan for 4,800 zero-emission vehicles sounds nice at first blush, but when you ask the questions that they haven't provided the answers to yet — what does that mean if vehicles are being disposed of that are currently in use? What's the impact on our dumps? What's the pollution associated with that due to illegal dumping? What is the cost of manufacturing those 4,800 vehicles and shipping them to the Yukon? How much diesel fuel will be burned to produce the electricity for those vehicles? What will be done with the vehicle, including the battery and other toxic parts, at the end of life? The questions are so large that they do overwhelm the commitment itself.

Fundamentally, my point is that, even before the Liberal government decides that they should lock in these actions, they should figure out what those commitments mean — what the total pollution costs are, what the total costs of diesel use are, and how much that will cost ratepayers. It may — if they had actually costed out their plan, in my view — result in a situation where, instead of committing to 4,800 zero-emission vehicles, they may choose to simply improve the fuel efficiency of parts of the government fleet or purchase hybrids instead of zero-emission vehicles for a portion of that — and so on.

Another element that is talked about here in the government's strategy is a commitment to replacing 1,300 residential fossil-fuel heating systems with smart electric heating systems by 2030. Now, as you recall, Mr. Speaker, that is the number in there that — when we look in Yukon Energy's document, Yukon Energy has an estimate that this commitment will result in four megawatts of increased demand. Again, for the record and for Hansard, that is on page 11 of the draft 10-year renewable electricity plan — if we haven't already provided a copy, we can certainly do that.

Again, there's a cost to that four megawatts in addition to the rebates for replacing fossil-fuel heating systems. Again, there are the questions. What is the cost of the power? How much diesel is being burned to do that?

Part of the reason why the government has already seen itself in a situation where it has twice — twice, Mr. Speaker — gone for a rate increase through its government-owned corporation, Yukon Energy, is because of the substantial growth of demand for residential heating for electricity. Adding 1,300 homes on there is going to have a cost associated with it, but in the government document, we see the commitment, but they don't tell us the cost.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, as shown on page 10 and elsewhere throughout the document, key Government of Yukon actions include — and I quote: "... require at least 93 per cent of the electricity generated on the Yukon Integrated System to come from renewable sources, calculated as a long-term rolling average."

Again, as I mentioned, I'm going to continue to be very underwhelmed by that commitment, considering that when this

government took office, 98.3 percent of our electricity was produced by renewable sources, but through the hard work of this Liberal government, they have been renting more diesels than anyone before, and they have increased our diesel use to produce energy at quite an impressive rate. When they face an election at the end, one of the notable things in this government's record is how they promised to be a green government when they convinced Yukoners to vote for them, but in fact, they went from 98.3 percent of our electricity being produced through renewable sources to getting to the stage where they're committing to — aspirationally — reaching 93 percent and, in their documents, citing a rate of only 90 percent being produced by renewable energy.

The commitment also related to that is one of their key government actions of creating a clean energy act by 2023 that legislates our greenhouse gas reduction targets and our commitments to energy efficiency and demand-side management.

The legislation — it just sounds like they were desperate for something to announce in that area — in fact, because of government action or inaction, is one of the most significant things leading to the increased diesel use from producing renewable energy. Creating legislation — when the Liberal government itself bears a lot of the responsibility for the increased use of fossil fuel emissions — that is binding on government is really a questionable use of time and energy because there are other ways to achieve those goals without spending time drafting legislation related to it.

Again, we do acknowledge that there are some good things outlined in this document, but questions remain associated with the cost of it. Before going on to list some of them, I want to talk about the government's record to date and what the impacts of their plans are, as shown in the application of the government corporation, Yukon Energy, to the Yukon Utilities Board for a rate increase that was filed just last month.

They can't try to pretend that we're just pulling these numbers out of the air. We're pulling them from a corporation that reports to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources from their application to the regulator, the Yukon Utilities Board, talking about their predicted revenue shortfall.

I am going to quote from page 2 of their general rate application just filed. On page 2, it says, under "Factors Driving the 2021 Revenue Shortfall" — and I quote: "A rate increase is required for the 2021 test year to recover a \$10.971 million revenue shortfall driven by increased costs and changing load profiles. The Application documents the full range of load profile and cost changes. As reviewed in tab 1, the following key factors are driving most of the 2021 rate increase..." I remind — the government has a direct connection to their energy plan, because one of their actions in government is filing a rate increase, which they have tried to blame on someone else when it, in fact, is picking up the cost of their own programs and their own mistakes.

Again, returning to the document — and I quote: "As reviewed in tab 1, the following key factors are driving most of the 2021 rate increase:

"Capital Costs (37.8% of revenue shortfall): Aging infrastructure drives investments in sustaining capital and growth in peak and energy loads drive investments in new supply. These capital cost increases impact the 2021 GRA revenue shortfall through increases for depreciation/amortization, long term debt costs and equity return.

"Energy & Peak Load Changes (8.4% of revenue shortfall): Dependable capacity requirements caused by peak load growth for non-industrial sales drives diesel rental costs that account for \$3.8 million (34.9%) of the 2021 GRA revenue shortfall."

I am just going to step aside from that for a moment. This is according to the government-owned corporation, Yukon Energy, that says in their application that 34.9 percent of their revenue shortfall is related to diesel rental costs. So, the diesel rental costs that are reflected in this rate increase application are 34.9 percent of their revenue shortfall and a total of \$3.8 million just in the 2021 rate increase.

Returning to the document: "Higher overall loads provide increased revenues at existing rates (\$14.4 million) that reduce the 2021 revenue shortfall by \$2.9 million after considering load-related cost impacts of \$10.8 million for increased long-term average thermal generation fuel cost requirements at 2018 GRA fuel prices (to address increased energy generation) and \$0.7 million..."

Again, the fuel cost requirements that we are looking at here — the load-related cost impacts, as cited in this document, of \$10.8 million for — and I quote: "... increased long-term average thermal generation fuel cost requirements..." So, that is the \$3.8 million that I mentioned for diesel rental costs and \$10 million related to the cost of increasingly depending on either diesel or LNG to provide baseload. This is on page 3 of Yukon Energy's general rate application.

So, there is \$3.8 million associated with running the diesels, \$10.8 million associated with increased use of diesel and LNG, and ultimately, the government — despite having a substantial chunk of their total rate increase for consumers being due to this approach — is planning, with their so-called *Our Clean Future* document, to go down a road where they are going to continue to rent diesel and burn even more diesel fuel to meet their increased energy demand. Yukon Energy's estimates of the cost of this document seem to be an 18-megawatt impact on increased demand.

A simple question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is: What is the cost of renting 18 megawatts of diesel capacity, and what is the cost of running those diesels?

I am going to go back to the document itself here. Fuel price changes relate to 19.4 percent of the revenue shortfall. Higher fuel prices account for \$2.1 million of the 2021 GRA revenue shortfall.

We see as well in this application — "Other non-fuel O&M increases relate to labour (\$1.4 million) and non-labour (\$1.7 million) factors."

Other cost changes include: depreciation rate changes, a \$0.6-million increase; reserve for injuries and damages, RFID,

updates, a \$0.4-million increase; and the new independent power production, IPP, costs of \$0.3 million.

Stepping aside from that, it's notable that, with the new independent power production projects that the government is bringing online, the cost of that is being passed on directly to consumers. This is in contrast to a previous ruling by the Yukon Utilities Board, which we know that the government didn't like, which said that government should pay for the cost of demand-side management programs rather than making ratepayers pay those costs. We know that the Liberals didn't like that. They have set themselves down a course to ensure that all those costs are passed on directly to consumers rather than being covered by government. While I don't disagree with ratepayers paying a portion of the costs associated with various initiatives, there is a point where we, in the past, have chosen to have government fund some of those programs, such as the good energy program, simply to avoid passing them on to ratepayers and having an impact on rate that includes affecting those who are least able to afford those electricity rates.

It's interesting as well that, in connection with the government's actual actions in 2021 on energy as shown in this general rate application, other costs that they've tried to disavow responsibility for include: new supply major projects, which has a \$26.9-million net rate base impact — \$26.9 million, according to supporting documents contained within the general rate application. I'm citing from tab 1, and it appears to be page 1 of that. That includes uprates to two of the turbines at the Whitehorse facility, WH1 and WH4. I don't disagree with those uprates, but in layman's terms, that's replacing some of the technology that is there to create increased efficiency. I don't disagree with the principle of doing that, but the government should be more up front about the fact that it has made that decision and those costs are being passed on to ratepayers.

Other costs that they notably didn't really ever talk about very much — I don't think there was a press release when the current Liberal government decided to add a third LNG engine at the Whitehorse facility, as they did. According to this document — surprise, surprise — "... completion of LNG Third Engine (\$8.3 million)..."

Associated with their added fossil fuel capacity on the system and reflected in their current rate increase application, it includes \$8.3 million in costs directly due to the LNG third engine, and that's just capital costs; that's not the O&M.

We also see again, turning to the next tab, the fact that the diesel rental costs account for \$3.8 million.

Turning to the next page here is yet another spot where we see the diesel costs reflected in the table outlining their total revenue shortfall of \$10.9 million. It notes — surprise, surprise — that the diesel rental cost is shown as \$3.8 million and change, and the long-term average thermal cost is showing as \$10.7 million. All of these are reflected in the rate increase.

Ultimately, with the government's so-called *Our Clean Future* document, as well as with their rate increase and all aspects related to governance, one of the things we're calling for is — tell Yukoners the facts. Don't hide them. Don't pretend that your actions are greener than they are. Tell people the costs.

With *Our Clean Future*, what it should outline is clarity on the financial costs of its implementation and the pollution costs of its implementation.

If the government genuinely believes that it is better to move to electric vehicles and electric homes than to burn home heating fuel or wood in those homes — and instead of using vehicles that are burning diesel or gasoline — then tell Yukoners what the costs are associated with meeting the electrical demand. Don't hide those costs. Don't pretend they don't exist. Don't go back to the same kind of shell game that we saw in the ministerial statement around Mount Sima in which they cite the numbers that Mount Sima is saving in terms of its diesel usage, pretending that it is the net impact in reduced fossil fuel consumption, because that is not factually true.

If you still believe that helping an NGO save costs for a sports facility, reducing their need to run generators, et cetera is a worthy initiative, that's fine, but tell people what the true costs are. Don't cite one tiny portion of the picture, ignore the associated cost increases in other areas, and pretend that Mount Sima's reduction in diesel fuel usage is the territory's net result associated with moving them onto the grid, because that is simply not true. It's a false comparison, and it's one that is deliberately misleading to Yukoners for those who choose to make it.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker's statement

Speaker: Yes, the Member for Lake Laberge will refrain from using those two words together. He knows that quite well.

Mr. Cathers: I will respect your ruling. I will say that it's misleading to make that comparison and leave it at that.

I want to talk about some other elements contained within the so-called *Our Clean Future* strategy here. As I mentioned, we are pleased to see the continuation of good energy work and pleased to see the continuation of microgeneration and the references in terms of energy production on page 5 — that you can get a rebate when you install a renewable energy system in your home, then generate electricity, and sell what you don't use back to the utility through the microgeneration program. That has been successful.

As I cited, we implemented it; we're pleased that the government has continued it. Their own legislative return tabled by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources demonstrates the success of that in terms of both the reduced use of fossil fuels and the emissions reduction, as well as what has happened for Yukoners who have signed on through those programs.

As I noted, we do have the question of why the government chose to cap that program, and I have heard a question, as well, from Yukoners: Why isn't government looking at a change to the rates as diesel fuel prices go up, considering that the initial rates for the microgeneration program we set were based on the estimated avoided cost of diesel consumption? Since the cost of diesel is going up, is the government going to look at adjusting those rates to reflect the current cost and potentially increase what homeowners receive from providing that power?

Will they look at removing that cap, which is limiting the ability of Yukoners themselves to contribute to the renewable energy grid?

Moving on to the next page of the government's strategy, a number of the actions that are being talked about — most of them are good actions. To call some of them part of their energy and climate change strategy is a bit of a reach when, for example, under "People and the Environment", one of the goals that they are adding to their list of action items under the strategy for climate change, energy, and a green economy is talking about responsible hunting. Now, of course, we support responsible hunting, but as part of their climate change and energy strategy, to suggest that telling people to take an introduction to safe and responsible hunting practices — including hunter ethics, essential gear, firearms safety, and field dressing methods — as part of their climate change or energy actions is a bit of a reach. Suggesting that telling people to read *Hunt wisely* is one of their climate change or renewable energy actions, again, is a bit of a stretch, Mr. Speaker. Suggesting that registering for the Yukon hunter education course is part of their climate change action and energy strategy is, again, a bit of a reach. It is not that I disagree with those actions, but to put them under the banner that they are putting them and to add them to their list of action items is really reaching for it.

It also talks about — just in the introduction to this document — firesmarting. Again, I agree with that, but whether firesmarting is an action related to climate change or energy is a bit of a reach, Mr. Speaker. While firesmarting is arguably a mitigation action related to climate change, it's not a fundamentally new one, and certainly telling people to do it themselves is not new at all.

The document also talks about "Support and sustain Yukon agriculture for both businesses and local families in our communities by purchasing local products and services." As I mentioned previously in the House — but it deserves to be touched on again: If government is serious about supporting the growth of our agriculture sector, they need to take action to get rid of the things that the government has done that are making life tougher for farmers and market gardeners. Those include the fact that the carbon tax has been imposed on farmers and market gardeners and it is increasing their costs, but they can't get a rebate for many of those costs. As we know based on previous debate here in this Assembly with the Premier, when someone goes to buy fencing supplies or food for their livestock, they're paying a carbon tax on that product, but they can't get it back. They can apply for an exemption from the federal government for their own fuel, but they can't get back those indirect costs that some other businesses can get. It is adding to their capital costs and adding to the cost of feeding their animals. The Liberal government's response to this to date has been to stick their heads in the sand and pretend it's not happening. It is happening, and it's increasing the cost to Yukoners.

As well, related to the Liberal carbon tax, the cost of heating a barn facility with propane is something that Yukon farmers, including my constituents, are paying increased costs for, but they can't get them back. So, the government policy is

making farming more expensive. If you're serious, as part of your commitments contained in this strategy — if you're actually serious about supporting Yukon agriculture, then take it seriously, and get rid of the costs that are government-created and being imposed on Yukon farmers.

As members will recall, I have reminded the Liberal government that, through a change in the Premier's own Department of Finance on how they are interpreting the fuel oil tax rebates under the government's legislation, they have reduced the rebates that they are providing to Yukon farmers, including my constituents. It's through a change in policy that, in my view, is actually clearly contrary to the intent of the act to exempt farmers from paying a tax on their off-road fuel use associated with farming activities in the Yukon.

At risk of causing the minister frustration again, their lack of action in getting a realistic, workable deal with the City of Whitehorse that results in resumed commercial garbage service at affordable and predictable rates to Yukon farmers and other businesses affected by it is a new cost of business that occurred this year. If they are serious about their commitment in this strategy to support and sustain Yukon agriculture, then take it seriously. Reach a workable deal with the city that results in this service being restored, because as a result of this — the end effect of that — which is that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources suggested I should just talk to the Minister of Community Services and the Minister of Community Services and which seems to just point to the city and say it's their responsibility — is that ultimately, as a result of the lack of effective action by this government in response to a problem that occurred under their watch, it has created a situation where farmers on the Hot Springs Road are expected to potentially take their own garbage to Deep Creek, which is a 40-mile drive, to drop off their garbage, instead of a situation where they could do as they did for years, which is pay a commercial garbage hauler to take it into the city landfill. Ultimately, the government then takes the garbage from the Deep Creek transfer station and hauls it to the city landfill anyway. It is a logically inconsistent outcome, so my message to this Liberal government is: If you are supporting Yukon agriculture, take the problem seriously and fix it.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move on to a few other areas. There are again some good steps contained within this plan. I am pleased to see the government continue to support community energy projects. I do have some questions about the overall costs of those in some cases.

I'm also pleased to see: "Expand monitoring of concentrations of particulate matter in the air from biomass burning and forest fires to all Yukon communities..." But again, I do have to point out that, when government policies such as the tipping fees and the loss of commercial garbage service result in people burning more of their own garbage at home, it's actually creating a situation that the Yukon Party took action to end — that being smoke from known toxic products being in the air as a result of burning. It was previously Yukon government dumps that used to burn that waste, but if people are resorting to burning their own garbage to avoid the government's tipping fees, it doesn't really matter whether that

toxic smoke is coming from a Yukon government dump or whether it's coming from somebody's property. If it is circulating in our communities and affecting the air quality where Yukoners live, it doesn't matter who produced it — it's a problem.

Just as with the overall plan here, ultimately, we believe that government needs to be realistic about everything that's included within it. They need to better explain the costs; they need to actually know the cost before proceeding. That includes the financial costs and the increased pollution in other areas, whether that be through increased use of diesel to produce electricity or due to unintended consequences associated with the strategy.

We do not disagree with the overall objectives and the four goals that they have outlined on page 10 of reducing Yukon's greenhouse gas emissions. We do not disagree with ensuring Yukoners have access to reliable, affordable, and renewable energy. We do not disagree with the commitment to adapt to the impacts of climate change or the commitment to build a green economy, but ultimately, it's important that there be a realistic understanding of what that all means and all the costs associated with those commitments.

It is somewhat ironic, considering the approach we have seen from other Liberal governments, such as in Ontario, that the reference to building a green economy, on page 4 — they used a dollar sign above a leaf as their icon. That's somewhat humorous, considering the debacles we have seen, such as in Ontario under the McGuinty government and the Wynne Liberal government, where the high costs of green energy resulted in massive power rate increases affecting Ontario citizens.

In contrast, when we were developing the microgeneration program, we deliberately looked at every Canadian jurisdiction and American jurisdictions.

I would like to thank the staff who helped with that work, both in the analysis and the policy development. We deliberately chose a different approach that was based on encouraging the production of green energy, but also doing so in a way that was affordable — and that we had a good understanding of what the potential costs could be as well as the ability — if it grew at a rate faster than we expected — to adjust the size of the program in future years so that we never got into the situation that we have seen — with the Liberal government — such as the one in Ontario get into — where costs have ballooned as a result of their green intentions that have not been backed up with a well-thought-out plan.

I want to emphasize the fact, again, that we support reducing Yukon's greenhouse gas emissions; we support ensuring that Yukoners have access to reliable, affordable, and renewable energy; we support adapting to the impacts of climate change; we support building a green economy. But it is fundamentally important that, before we launch down the road of any specific commitment — especially grandiose ones — that the Yukon government have a good understanding of what it actually costs and that they be transparent with not only the Legislative Assembly, but with Yukon citizens about what those costs are and that they allow citizens to make their own

decisions about the appropriateness of those specific commitments, based on a good understanding of the expected implications of those actions — especially the expected costs — because I think it is fair to say, as I wrap up my remarks, that Yukoners do want to see us take action in response to climate change, including reducing our own emissions, but they also don't want to see a big increase in power rates.

They want government to be environmentally responsible; they also want government to be fiscally responsible, and fundamentally, they want government to be open and transparent with citizens about what the true expected costs are that are associated with any major initiative it implements. They don't want to see a government either knowing the costs and not disclosing them or launching into a big commitment without actually understanding what it is going to take to deliver on it and seeing a situation where, due to “back of the napkin” planning, government gets into a situation where ratepayers or taxpayers — who are usually the same people — are paying the bills for a lack of transparency by government or a lack of good planning by government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in wrapping up my remarks, we want to see action taken, including those four goals. We believe that Yukoners want to see it as well. But what we want to see — and I believe that almost every Yukoner shares that view — they want to see government be environmentally responsible. They also want government to be financially responsible and transparent with the public about the costs of its initiatives.

Mr. Adel: I rise today to speak to Motion No. 237, that this House supports meeting or exceeding the targets laid out in *Our Clean Future* — including the greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy targets.

Today, over 90 percent of Yukoners' electrical generation comes from renewable resources. That's something that we can be proud of. However, only 26 percent of heat energy is generated from renewables. A large portion of Yukoners still rely on hydrocarbon-based energy to keep their homes and families warm in Yukon.

Our Clean Future strategy looks to support local and community-based renewable energy projects, combined with upgrades to the electrical grid and energy storage, to make the best use of our sizeable renewable resources.

Maximizing efficiency will allow us to continue to heat and power our lives with clean energy, even as demand increases and we shift to more electrically focused transportation and heating in the Yukon.

Mr. Speaker, local and community-based renewable energy projects will create jobs and stimulate a green economy across the Yukon. The success of the strategy requires us to foster new partnerships, share information, and collaborate with all governments, First Nations, organizations, businesses, and individuals. We require the collective effort of everyone to ensure that the Yukon has a sustainable and green future.

The goal of this strategy of government is to reduce Yukon's total greenhouse gas emissions by 30 percent by the year 2030. That's an attainable goal. It's no easy task, and it will require extensive modernization to our heating systems and

road transportation — which together contribute 75 percent of Yukon's total greenhouse gas emissions. It will also require significant diversified investment in more renewable electricity generation, creating local jobs and economic opportunities for all Yukoners.

Reaching this target is important, as it will inspire others by demonstrating that a remote northern jurisdiction can achieve a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

Several lessons have been learned since the last time greenhouse gas reduction targets were set for the Yukon. In the 2012 climate change action plan progress report, 12 independent targets were set for a variety of sectors across the territory. While the targets related to greenhouse gas emissions from buildings' electricity generation were met, the other targets were not or could not be reported on due to a lack of available data.

Since that time, we have made improvements to how we gather and report greenhouse gas data. We know where the contribution of greenhouse gases is coming from in our territory: 54 percent of Yukon greenhouse gas emissions come from road transport; 21 percent from heating; 10 percent from mining; seven percent from aviation; three percent of GHGs are from electrical generation; one percent from industrial and commercial; and four percent from other sources.

It's important to understand which sectors of our economy and community are contributing what percent of greenhouse gas emissions, otherwise, our ability to tackle this problem may not be functionally adequate. We're now setting targets that we know that we can track through available data.

We will also conduct modelling work to help us set greenhouse gas reduction targets that are both ambitious and achievable. To reach 30 percent greenhouse gas reduction by 2030, we estimate a necessary reduction of 263 kilotonnes. For context, a typical passenger vehicle emits about 4.6 metric tons of CO₂ per year. Currently, almost all the energy we use to meet transportation needs comes from fossil fuels. As a result, transportation by road and air is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the Yukon contributing 61 percent of the territory's total emissions.

Close to 90 percent of transportation emissions come from road transportation, with a relatively equal split between personal vehicles, commercial, and industrial vehicles, including those that transport food, fuel, and other products. One of the ways that this strategy intends to meet these reduced greenhouse gas targets is through incentivized electric vehicle sales. Rebates for electric vehicles are available for Yukoners right now. Whether you're purchasing an electric bicycle for personal transportation or an electric SUV to move your family about, rebates are available to make access to these new forms of transportation more affordable for Yukoners. We recognize that, by increasing the representation of electric vehicles on Yukon roads, we will also be increasing demand-side energy.

The *Our Clean Future* strategy coincides beautifully with the 10-year renewable energy plan previously announced. Collectively, they work together to ensure that the Yukon has a larger capacity for renewable energy generation to support increased green energy technologies and to sustain our growing

population while ensuring that we work toward a cleaner future for all.

It would be a moot point to flood the roads with electric vehicles if we continue charging them using diesel generators because you can't be green on just one side of the equation — it has to be both. Ensuring affordable, reliable, and renewable energy for Yukon remains a priority.

In Yukon historically, 90 percent of our electric needs annually are met with clean, renewable power because of our large supply of hydroelectricity across the territory. As the Yukon's economy and communities continue to grow and as Yukoners increasingly invest in electric vehicles and electric heating technologies, the demand for electricity will go up. That goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, but all but four of our Yukon communities are connected to the same electrical transmission network. Most of the generation and high-voltage transmission of electricity on the main grid is managed by the Yukon Energy Corporation, while most distribution is the responsibility of ATCO Electric Yukon. The four communities that are not connected to the main electrical grid — Beaver Creek, Burwash Landing, Destruction Bay, Watson Lake — oh, it's five, Mr. Speaker — and Old Crow — are served by four microgrids that have been primarily powered by diesel generators operated by ATCO Electric Yukon.

With our target for Yukon's main electricity grid, we will aspire to see 97 percent of the total electrical consumption coming from renewable resources. Mr. Speaker, this includes electricity used by the mining industry, which is also connected to our grid. For the communities that are not connected to the main electrical grid, we will reduce the diesel use for electricity generation by 30 percent by 2030 compared to 2010 by introducing new, innovative, and creative energy solutions to meet the unique challenges and needs of these communities. This is already happening, Mr. Speaker, with solar arrays being powered up in several of our communities.

To meet the Yukon's electrical targets, we need to invest in more electrical generation capacity. Options can range from wind and solar to hydroelectricity projects to a combination of these or other renewable energy sources. For the main Yukon grid, the Government of Yukon will set a minimum regulatory requirement for the Yukon Energy Corporation to generate at least 93 percent of electricity from renewable sources on average. It will then be up to the Yukon Energy Corporation to determine the best way to meet or exceed this target.

For off-grid communities, the government will continue to work in partnership with Yukon First Nations, communities, and ATCO Electric Yukon to establish community-based renewable electrical projects in order to reduce diesel use for electricity generation by 30 percent by 2030.

Efforts to substitute some of the diesel that continues to be used for electrical generation with clean diesel alternatives — like biodiesel and renewable diesel — will help us reduce our total greenhouse gas emissions even further. These are not "pie in the sky" ideas; they are achievable and necessary to ensure a healthy life and future for all Yukoners for many years to come.

I hope that you will join me in supporting this incredibly bold and important strategy. It sets the tone for what we can

expect from our governments moving forward and how they manage the difficult challenges of meeting the demands of Yukoners, while also striking a balance with our equally important environment.

Mr. Speaker, people and the environment are not mutually exclusive. While the Earth could certainly thrive without us, we could not survive without her.

We must take the necessary steps to ensure that our environments are being respected and that our resources are being used responsibly.

Mr. Kent: I appreciate the motion brought forward today by the Member for Porter Creek Centre, and I thank my colleagues — the Member for Lake Laberge, as well as the Member for Copperbelt North — for their comments here this afternoon.

I wanted to focus in on a few aspects of the document that we're discussing here today. I would note that my colleague, the Member for Lake Laberge, did a good job of giving a good overview and talking about some of the concerns that he has — and some of the shared concerns that we have — with respect to the situation that we find ourselves in.

The first thing I wanted to talk about is Yukon Energy and the hydro and renewable energy targets that are set. Then I want to talk a little bit about the mining targets and hopefully get one of the ministers who will perhaps get up after me from across the way to expand on what we can expect. It's a fairly vague reference to the intensity targets for mining at this point. Then I wanted to talk a little bit about some of the key performance indicators and the measuring of our progress.

I'm not going to move it yet, Mr. Speaker, but I do have an amendment that I will move to this motion prior to my time elapsing here today.

So, first of all, talking about the total amount of energy supplied by renewable sources — so where we're at right now — for reference, I'm looking at page 18 of the 2019 annual report. It says there that "Running a hydro operation means we need a steady and reliable supply of water. We had enough in 2018 to generate 92% of the electricity needed in Yukon. Liquefied natural gas and diesel generators made up the other eight%".

Then, if you fast forward to 2019 — "Because Yukoners need electricity even when Mother Nature changes things up, we were required to use more LNG and diesel than normal in 2019. Hydroelectricity accounted for 84% of our total energy supply in 2019, with LNG at 15% and diesel 1%."

So, I'm curious as to how the targets that the Member for Copperbelt North mentioned with respect to renewable energy will be met, given that we are currently at 84 percent. Obviously, other factors have come into consideration since these numbers — the Eagle Gold mine that is run by Victoria Gold is on the grid and it has flashed up since some of these numbers have been accounted for, and we're expecting Alexco to go back into production and add further strain to the grid here — which is good news, obviously, from a mining perspective. We're pleased that they're opening and that they're on the grid.

But, again, they will put strain on these numbers of what we're able to generate from hydroelectricity.

So, I'm anxious to hear — hopefully — from one of the ministers across the way — if they get an opportunity to speak — what they're thinking about how we're going to meet these targets that they've set for themselves as far as generating electricity from renewable sources. We have a number of diesel generators rented and deployed — not only in Whitehorse but also deployed in Faro this year — the parking lot over by the Whitehorse Rapids facility is jammed up with diesels and diesel tanks. I'm not sure what it looks like in Faro, but I'm assuming that the yard up there would be the same. We're quite concerned with the trajectory that this government is following when it comes to supplementing our power needs through rented diesel generators.

I am interested to hear from ministers on how they plan to meet these targets while renting diesel generators for the next decade here in the territory.

I do also want to speak briefly to the mining side of things. We are pleased that the document set intensity targets for the placer and quartz mining industry. A quote that I wanted to take out of the document that jumped out at me is on page 13 of *Our Clean Future* — it is just at the bottom right — and I quote: "Mining plays a central role in the transition to a green economy. Minerals are vital to low carbon technologies — from batteries to wind turbines, solar panels and electric vehicles. Meeting an emissions intensity target will help Yukon's mining industry sustainably produce the materials needed for the global green economy."

When you look at the targets that are set, it does mention that mining was 10 percent of Yukon's total emissions in 2017. I think that is obviously a low number. Eagle Gold hadn't opened by 2017, now we have Alexco ramping up again, and then we are going to have off-grid mines like Kudz Ze Kayah and hopefully Coffee come on board before 2030. Again, I am interested in how those greenhouse gas emissions produced by those mines that are off-grid will be generating their own power. Obviously, there is machinery on-site, and there are transportation greenhouse gas emissions associated with these projects as well. I am looking forward to hearing from ministers opposite on what exactly they are planning when it comes to ensuring that mining can continue to play an important role as one of the cornerstone private sector industries here in the territory. Let's say that these targets will be established by 2022, so we will look forward to holding the government — well, I guess there will be an election before then, so we'll have to see what happens in the election before those targets are set, but I am curious as to what kind of activity the government is looking to undertake in 2021, prior to the election, with respect to setting these intensity targets for the mining industry.

I do want to talk now about measuring the progress when it comes to this document. I'm going to jump to page 66 in the document, which is the page that talks about the key progress indicators. It says at the top, under "Measuring our progress": "The Government of Yukon will publicly report each year on the implementation ... The annual progress reports will include..." — status, key indicators of progress, the latest 2030

greenhouse gas emissions forecast for Yukon, and any modifications to the actions in *Our Clean Future*.

I just want to walk through some of these KPIs here and hopefully get a better sense when other members speak on exactly what they mean and some of the baseline data — if there is baseline data for them — and what we're looking to accomplish for milestones as we move throughout the next decade.

The first goal is to reduce Yukon's greenhouse gas emissions. There are two indicators: "Greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, heating, electricity generation, other commercial and industrial activities, waste and other areas." It is looking at a 30-percent reduction by 2030 compared to 2010. I'm hoping to get a little bit more detail around how that will be achieved.

The second indicator under that goal is: "Greenhouse gas emissions intensity of mining." Then, again, we won't even be setting the targets until 2022, so I'm curious what that means, as far as the remaining eight years, with respect to reaching our goal by 2030.

The next goal is to: "Ensure Yukoners have access to reliable, affordable and renewable energy." An indicator is the percentage of the electricity that we use on the main grid that is generated from renewable sources calculated as a long-term rolling average — the target being a long-term rolling average of 97 percent by 2030.

As I mentioned earlier in my comments, in 2019, Yukon Energy said that we only generated 84 percent of our total energy supply from hydroelectricity; the rest was from thermal, LNG, and diesel generation. That's a fairly large leap, especially with Victoria Gold's ramping up to full production and Alexco coming back online.

The next one is: "Litres of fossil fuels used to generate electricity in off-grid communities". It says a 30-percent reduction by 2030 compared to 2010. I know that some of the communities, like Old Crow and others, are working on renewable projects. I'm interested to hear more if members opposite have time to expand on that as far as what else we can expect in the next 10 years from those off-grid communities.

The percentage of energy used for heating that is from renewable sources — they want to see 50 percent of that energy produced by 2030. I'm curious where we are today with respect to that. Perhaps it's in the document, and if it is, I apologize. I'll take another look through, but I'm curious to see where we're going to be with that. A lot of that would perhaps be biomass heating. One of the challenges there right now is that there are only limited areas in the territory where we can get fuel wood and one of those limited areas is actually in British Columbia. Northern British Columbia is talking to one of the MLA for Watson Lake's constituents when we visited a fuel-wood operator here in Whitehorse a number of weeks ago. He was hauling wood as far north as Dawson City from northern British Columbia. We need to identify fuel-wood sources that are accessible and closer to where the markets are and close to all the communities. I know that the Member for Klwane also has constituents who are quite active on the fuel wood and the

biomass side of things — supplying firewood to Yukoners who choose that as a heating option.

Greenhouse gas emissions from road transportation see a 30-percent reduction by 2030 compared to 2010. Obviously, there are small passenger vehicles that would be part of this, but another part is the truck transport industry. When it comes to the mining intensity, I'm curious if the trucks that supply or haul ore from the mines to the different ports — well, obviously with the silver mine and any base metal mines that come on board — and if that will be carved out of that or if that transportation piece will be part of the mining intensity targets or if it's included in this particular target.

Another goal is to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The indicator is a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators that will reflect Yukon's resilience to climate change. The target is to be highly climate resilient by 2030.

Another goal is to build a green economy and the indicator is greenhouse gas emissions per person and per unit of real GDP. The target is a decrease from 2020 to 2030. If there are some metrics around that, I would be interested in seeing those as well.

On that next page, page 67, it goes through a number of areas — transportation, homes and buildings, energy production, communities, people in the environment, innovation, and leadership. Under leadership, the indicator is the number of Yukon government staff who have completed climate change training. I am curious if the minister can expand on that and what type of training that will be for public servants in the Government of Yukon and where it will be offered. Is it something that will be done through Yukon University? If there is some more information on that, I would be interested in hearing it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I only have 20 minutes to respond here today, so I'm not going to get a chance to go through these other indicators under the areas that I have talked about here. I am hoping that ministers provide some additional answers on exactly where we are with these measurements, the milestones to get us to 2030, and the goals that are set under this particular plan and these particular measurements.

As I mentioned off the top, I am going to propose an amendment to this motion. I do have copies for everyone.

Amendment proposed

Mr. Kent: I move:

THAT Motion No. 237 be amended by:

(1) deleting the phrase "supports meeting or exceeding" and inserting in its place the phrase "urges the Government of Yukon to meet or exceed"; and

(2) deleting the word "including" and inserting in its place "and provide progress reports to the Yukon Legislative Assembly twice annually on the status of".

I do have a signed copy and I have copies for all members.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, as has been our practice during the COVID provisions, if we could be given a small adjournment to allow members to review the proposed amendment, that would be appreciated.

Speaker's statement

Speaker: Thank you. As I have been told by the wise Clerks-at-the-Table, adjournments are — back in my legal career, I think that you would adjourn matters and come back. I think that, if you adjourn matters here, we're done. So, I think it's a recess.

Do members wish to recess for 10 minutes?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: In order to comply with COVID-19 distancing requirements in order to allow MLAs to meet to discuss the amendment, the House will recess for 10 minutes.

Recess

Speaker: I have had an opportunity to review the proposed amendment with the Clerks-at-the-Table and can advise that it is procedurally in order. Therefore, it is moved by the Member for Copperbelt South:

THAT Motion No. 237 be amended by:

(1) deleting the phrase “supports meeting or exceeding” and inserting in its place the phrase “urges the Government of Yukon to meet or exceed”; and

(2) deleting the word “including” and inserting in its place “and provide progress reports to the Yukon Legislative Assembly twice annually on the status of”.

I think that, as a result, the proposed amended motion would read:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to meet or exceed the targets laid out in *Our Clean Future — A Yukon strategy for climate change, energy and a green economy* and provide biannual progress reports to the Yukon Legislative Assembly on the status of the greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy targets.

The Member for Copperbelt South, on the proposed amendment, you have three minutes and 19 seconds.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you reading out what the motion as amended would read. Again, I thank the Member for Porter Creek Centre for bringing this motion forward, but I feel that what the amendment I am proposing here today will accomplish is to strengthen the accountability of the motion by “urging the Government of Yukon to meet or exceed”, rather than “supports meeting or exceeding” because, as an Assembly, that is where we have the most power, I would suggest, as far as urging the Government of Yukon to be accountable. The second part of the motion is to “provide progress reports to the Yukon Legislative Assembly twice annually on the status of”.

As I mentioned during my initial remarks, I know that the report contemplates an annual report, but we feel that having these reports to the Legislative Assembly done twice a year will help us track how we are meeting the goals. I did go through a number of the key progress indicators that are laid out in the document and there are some there that are very measurable. I think it would be important for us to have a handle on those and I don't think that it is too onerous to report on the status twice a year. There are seasonal differences as far as the amount of

greenhouse gas emissions from electricity generation, for instance.

Obviously, we hope that the renewable sources take up more in the summer and the thermal backup and load generation is more geared toward the winter months. But again, as the climate changes and as we work our way through to these goals set for 2030, I don't think that it's onerous for the government to report to the Legislative Assembly twice a year.

With that, I'll conclude my remarks and hope that I get to hear members' thoughts on my proposed amendment and that ultimately members of the Legislature will support this amendment to Motion No. 237.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I am happy to rise today to speak to the amendment on this motion. I look forward to getting back to the main motion as well.

Let me start — just very quickly, Mr. Speaker — 99,000 litres of diesel reduction from Mount Sima equals 265 tonnes of carbon dioxide reduced. But — as the Member for Lake Laberge pointed out — if you're using the grid, it's not all 100-percent renewable. I looked over October and November — which is when the snow was generated for this past year — and it was 94-percent renewable. If we drop six percent off of that, then we would get 250 tonnes of CO₂ which are saved through Mount Sima.

The amendment that's proposed by the Member for Copperbelt South has a couple of points that I'm going to speak to. The first one is around how often we get that accountability. I'll note, for example, that when the past government put out its second progress report on climate change on their strategy — which I think was in 2015 — I would have to look back for sure, but there's always this lag between emissions and when they're reported. If I think of that document when I reviewed it — I think that the emissions they reported on were for 2012. There is often a couple-year lag in emissions.

When the Member for Copperbelt South just noted that it shouldn't be “too onerous” — it has not been the practice of governments to be able to get greenhouse gas emissions turned around very fast in the past. I think it should be faster — I think that is fair to say. But to try to suggest every six months — the accounting processes aren't in place that quickly.

My recollection — when we were looking at past emissions and working through those past climate change strategies with the then-Yukon government, the fastest way we found to track emissions was through the Department of Finance, because we could understand, just by fuel taxes, where fuel was being spent, and thus you could account pretty quickly for emissions.

As I try to talk to this amendment, I'm going to take us back a little bit. It's actually, today, exactly 15 years ago, that the then-Environment minister, Premier Fentie, was at the Montréal United Nations meetings on climate change. I was part of the Canadian delegation and part of the Yukon delegation, and there was a strong focus on the north, because we understood — well, we have understood for some time — but we shared with the rest of the world, at that point, how

important Canada's north was, because climate change was impacting us disproportionately. It was so much faster here.

I remember Premier Fentie coming, and we explained to him the reality of the situation. At that time, of course, we didn't have a strategy yet here in the Yukon. We didn't have any targets.

From that, I remember Premier Fentie signing onto the Montréal declaration. I was really happy, because after many years of trying to impress upon the government here how important this issue was, we finally had some movement. Call that 15 years ago — it was the end of 2005, maybe coming back in 2006 — it was a mere three years to get to the first Yukon government strategy in 2009. That is my recollection.

When that strategy came forward, there were some targets, but let me explain what happened at that time. At that point, we were using the Kyoto Protocol, and the Yukon stood up and said, "We have met our emissions targets." I looked around, and I said, "What have we actually done?" They said, "Look, here were our emissions back when the baseline was set, and here are our emissions today."

What had happened was that Faro had closed. Suddenly, we had this great reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and the government took credit for that as though they had done something. We all understood that this wasn't actually something that had happened. It was not intentional to reduce emissions, and you really don't want to tie your emissions reductions to seeing your economy go down, right? That's not a good choice.

We could see at that point that there were some challenges. I worked with the government over the intervening years. I was the manager of the Northern Climate Exchange at the college, which worked on public education and information on climate change mitigation and adaptation. I tried to help them understand where this challenge was. I said to them, "Look, you have some individual actions in your strategy, but you're not even looking at where the biggest emissions are." They said, "Well, where are the biggest emissions?" I said, "Transportation." They hadn't even measured it. They said, "We don't know what we can do about transportation." This was much as I heard the Member for Lake Laberge talk about it — "Well, what if the vehicles don't work in the north?" and "What are we going to do with the batteries? How are we going to deal with them? Where are they going to come from?"

I would just like to let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I just saw a report today that, as of the third quarter of 2020, Norway is currently at 60 percent of vehicle sales being electric vehicles, with 20 percent being plug-in hybrids, and the other 20 percent are fossil-fuel vehicles, including standard hybrids. That is 60 percent. That is a northern country. They are dealing with it. They have it dialed in. So, I think that it is possible for us. Of course, we have different distances between communities — as the Member for Lake Laberge noted — and, yes, there are some things to overcome, but, man, we have to get there.

So, when I looked at the 2009 strategy that was put forward by then-Premier Fentie, I pointed out to them that they didn't have any actions dealing with transportation. They said, "Well,

we don't know what to do about transportation." I said, "Why don't you measure it? One of the first actions should be just to measure it."

Three years later, their first report came out on a sort of redo of the strategy. They had measured it and figured out that roughly half of our emissions come from transportation. I pointed out to them, "Well, that's great, but now you need to do something about that" — to which they said, "Well, we can't do anything about transportation." I said, "Yes, we can" — and I mentioned one great action that was mentioned earlier today in the Legislature, which is around — well, I will leave that action for a second.

Let me go back to what they were going to do on transportation. I said, "You need to do something on transportation. You can't just say there is 50 percent and leave it hanging." They said, "Well, what could we possibly do?" I said, "Well, at least investigate what to do. Put that as your action." So, they agreed and put that as their action. I think that would have been in the 2012 update.

Let me turn to what the best action is. The best action for transportation is to develop the local economy because then you don't have to ship as much stuff up the highway. If you're thinking about where that is best suited, there are two places. One is energy itself — the more you can create local energy, the less you have to transport it up here. The other one is, of course, food. So, the more we can build local agriculture here, the less we're dependent on transportation and the better off we are. That is why I believe that it's good to have local agriculture in this strategy that we have in front of us. In talking with our local agriculture folks, we've doubled it and redoubled it and we will need to do that again.

When the 2015 update came out, which listed the 2012 emissions — by the way, the problem was that the government started saying, "Hey — yeah, we're reducing our emissions." I heard them say that again in the 2016 budget speech. "We've reduced our emissions." I said to the folks who work on climate change, "Which one of these actions reduced those emissions?" "Well, none of them." I said, "So, where did the emissions reduce?" I already knew the answer — and, of course, the answer was that mining was tanking. Well look, if we're going to sit there and rely on mining tanking as our strategy — man, that's not a smart strategy. This is the problem with all of these climate plans — that if you're not careful, you can hide whether something is happening or not because the emissions get measured and it takes a little while to come in — and it also matters when you change governments.

So, what was the main purpose of this motion before this amendment came in? It was around saying, "Hey, can we all agree in this Legislature that we need to have at least these targets or better?" It's not to say that — I listened for two hours or so, I think, as the Member for Lake Laberge talked about the shortcomings of this strategy. Okay, but the motion in front of us — and now not the amendment, but the purpose of the motion was to say, "Hey, whichever government you are, come forward with your individual steps about how you wish to achieve this — but can we agree as a Legislature and as a

territory that we all want to work to achieve these goals or better?”

Now, as I look at the amendment, I think that's lost. The reason is because — and I'm just looking at the wording of the amendment — it's that the Government of the Yukon meet or exceed the targets. I just want to say that the purpose of the original motion was that we all agree, as legislators, that we should do at least this much or more — albeit that many people here would bring different elements to that strategy.

I'm not against progress reports; I'm not against accountability. Twice annually, I have noted, is tricky to be sure — but okay, that's fine. You update it as you can and you bring it forward as fast as you can. I think it is important that we keep informing this House and the public of progress. That is important, but we should not tie it to these actions. It should be about achieving targets, and every government that comes from here forward in time should meet those or should exceed those. That's the whole point.

That's why, as a matter of fact, the notion of bringing in legislation — our federal government is talking about it. In Denmark, I have seen that they brought forward great legislation, and the purpose of that legislation — and the same purpose that we're talking about here with legislation — is: How do we make sure, as governments moving forward over time, that we don't keep sort of pointing fingers one way or the other and that we all work together to achieve this? Because I think that we can agree that we need to move from a fossil fuel-based economy to a renewable and sustainable energy economy. It's the smart thing to do; it's the right thing to do.

Okay, I'll make one other note around the whole mining kind of analogy. I remember when the past government asked me and several other people to be part of a panel to work on setting targets and how to set them for their then-strategies. The challenge was always mining, because you couldn't predict — if mines came on, they would be a big energy use; if they came off, they would be a big energy use. You didn't want to set it up today or in the future — and I argued this hard — you didn't want to set it up that, if mines shut down, the government could claim that they were reducing emissions. That should not be allowed, and that's why we went for intensity targets. That's the main reason.

The second most important reason is because the life cycle of a mine is what you have to measure. It's not the setting up and just the closing of the mine; it's the decommissioning of the mine as well, and we have a doozie in front of us with the Faro mine site.

It's the federal government that will take the lead on reclaiming that and dealing with that legacy. Of course, now, when we look back, we wish that things had been done differently. Man, I hope that we as a government — and any future government — whenever there is a mine — works more closely to make sure that they're not creating some future environmental liability. But here it is — we have Faro. We need to clean it up. It's important. I am using the grand “we” in that sentence, Mr. Speaker.

I noticed an article in the paper some months ago talking about the emissions around cleaning up the Faro mine. When

we talk about intensity-based targets for mines, we don't want to get into a situation where we would say, “Hey, we're not going to clean up a mine because we don't want to break our emissions targets.” We certainly would never want that. We certainly would want to do both — clean up those mine sites and meet the targets. So that's why — with mining in the Yukon, it really is a very cyclical thing, so you would go with intensity-based targets.

What I think the original motion was talking about — which the amendment has lost, for me — is that — what I thought the Member for Porter Creek Centre was asking was if all legislators of all parties can agree — whether or not they agree on this plan and how to achieve it — on the targets so that we can all work to achieve those no matter who is elected into this House.

I think that it is critical that we do a life-cycle analysis. I think that it is critical that we look at the economy, the environment, and the social/cultural at the same time. I think that the individual pieces of the amendment, as they are brought forward, are not wrong. We should have progress reports as often as possible to keep that accountability up.

What I see as different through this amendment is whether or not everyone here is agreeing that we should achieve these targets together. Just in my experience, I have seen too many times where governments have passed the buck on this issue and it has not been dealt with.

It has been kicked down the way too many times, and we're way overdue on moving forward on this strongly and significantly. In the plan itself, I remember when we did the accounting of whether we thought that we could get there from both a cost perspective and a target perspective — and bringing forward those numbers — the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources bringing forward their teams to talk about how to achieve this. They said, “This is how much we think we can get with these strategies” — and we said to stretch it. Stretch it, because we have to be aspirational as a territory. There's a phrase that the Premier has used: “We have to be on the right side of history.” We need to move this and more.

When I listened to the Member for Lake Laberge talk about how he disagrees with this one, this one, and this one out of the package, I thought, “Great. If you do get elected, I hope you will bring something else, but at least let's achieve this together.”

Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for the amendment. I think that the original motion is stronger because it's about: Can we all do this together?

Ms. Hanson: The motion that was presented earlier today — the NDP was prepared to support it. We have a number of comments about that motion, and I'll make a couple of them in the context of replying to the proposed amendment from the Member for Copperbelt South.

I have to point out to the minister — and I appreciate his passion, his enthusiasm, and his expertise in this area. I would also point out to him that, just as he was at the Montréal climate change conference, the now-Premier and I and the then-Premier

attended the Paris climate change conference. It was in Paris that the international community agreed to set the *Paris Agreement* targets, which were to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, not by using 2010 as the base year, but 2005.

So, yes, the minister has said quite passionately that we shouldn't allow governments to skate and get away from being held accountable — not on our watch, because it's too hard. Quite frankly, we agreed to use 2005. That's the *Paris Agreement* Article 4.4. I can remember sitting and watching in these late-night sessions as those things were being discussed. I thought it was being taken seriously.

I thought that the amendment that was being put forward today does something that government is very rarely comfortable with, which is moving from the passive to the active voice. What it is doing is urging the Government of Yukon to meet or exceed, and it helps to fulfill what the minister just described as the challenge that he, as an expert in this area, faced trying to advise successive governments — particularly one government that was in power for that period of time — to actually do something, or to skate around — to use language. Quite frankly, for a government that likes to stand every day and make statements — being held accountable by actually having to make objective, evidence-based reports to the Legislative Assembly — not press releases, but reports. I think that when the Auditor General's Commissioner for the Environment and Sustainable Development was to next look at the Yukon in the context of the federal-provincial-territorial reports on the environment, it would have a very different take on it if there was that kind of accountability evinced by this territorial government, supported by all Members of the Legislative Assembly.

So, quite frankly, there is nothing substantively wrong with the wording of the motion as it was, but I do believe that actually holding government — whether it is this government or my leader's government or whichever. I have been around too long. We have been talking about this, as the minister talked about — Rio, Kyoto, you name it. We are past all that kind of rhetoric.

If the government doesn't want to have that active approach to it, so be it. Take the passive approach, and just watch it sort of slide again. Maybe by the next time we talk about the next clean energy strategy, the baseline will have moved to — I don't know — 2020 from 2005, from 1992 to 2005, to 2000 and where — where do you want to go? At what point is it not tolerable? I think that we have passed that. I heard the minister say that.

If you want to be aspirational and if you want to be on the right side of history, hold yourselves to account. Let us work together to hold ourselves to account.

Hon. Ms. Frost: With respect to the proposed amendment, I'm pleased to rise today. I really would like to acknowledge the Member for Porter Creek Centre for the motion as laid out in *Our Clean Future*, including the targets for greenhouse gas emissions focusing on the vision for Yukon. I would like to take a moment to speak a bit about *Our Clean Future*.

Certainly, on this side of the House, we're very proud of the *Our Clean Future* initiative. The 131 recommendations came directly from Yukoners — input from Yukoners with their vision to a better future.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Ms. Frost: Well, apparently, the Member for Whitehorse Centre has more to say, but she has had her opportunity, and we will talk a little bit about this ambitious plan. The active approach to look into the future and the plan to meet the targets as defined — I know we have our climate change strategy department, our experts, who will work toward addressing the recommendations.

We've received significant feedback from Yukoners during the public engagement. People responded specifically — we've heard. The member opposite has made note that, historically, we've gone through many exercises and had lots of participation from members of this Legislative Assembly who perhaps have never brought a plan of this magnitude forward with specific targets.

Instead of tearing the plan apart and suggesting that we want to bring it into the Legislative Assembly twice a year so it could be scrutinized — now the government will publicly report each year on the implementation of *Our Clean Future*. We will include the status of each action in the strategy and data on several key indicators, and we will progress toward each of the targets in *Our Clean Future* in these annual reports. The reports will help us to assess what is working, identify improvements, and look toward new opportunities as part of the adaptive management approach going forward. We certainly want to look at the targets.

We know, as long-time Yukoners, for the record, that this strategy is more important now for Yukon than ever before. It's important because of what we are seeing at this very moment here in the Yukon, with the impacts and effects of climate change.

The Member for Lake Laberge droned on and on about garbage burning and how perhaps people will throw things in the river. That analogy and suggestion is so far back — that we have to educate Yukoners and work together to look at reduction of waste, reduction of using plastic bottles that come in here every day — perhaps Styrofoam cups that people bring in here — that's not acceptable when we talk about *Our Clean Future*. It's very important because climate change is happening in Yukon — faster across the north. We know that.

What is the purpose of this amendment? We want to talk about perhaps looking at the main motion and what it was intended to do. The north is experiencing changes before our very eyes. Looking at customary and contemporary practices, looking at what observations are happening on the land with science, making adaptations and measures that address the changes to climate and how we interact with the climate, the collective knowledge, experience, and actions taken with *Our Clean Future* — that was done collaboratively with Yukoners — and establishing a voice for youth as a new venture forward for this government that perhaps wasn't even contemplated historically.

We are proud to have developed this strategy in collaboration with Yukon First Nations, our transboundary indigenous groups, and our municipalities. The Member for Lake Laberge went on about facilities. Well, we are working with our municipalities. We are helping to look at waste and waste reduction. We have put significant resources into energy incentives.

Heating accounts for 21 percent of Yukon's total greenhouse gas emissions. To help to reduce our heating demand, we have to look at expanding energy retrofit incentives, which means good energy rebates. It means that we need to make our buildings energy efficient. We need to modernize, catch up, and keep up. We have resources in our communities — buildings and facilities that are 50 years old. We have put resources in there.

I am not certain exactly who, but one of the members opposite was talking about targets. How do we hit the targets? How do we measure? What are the measurables?

We have identified in the plan — in terms of reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, we know that the project that went forward in my own little community — 189,000 gallons of diesel fuel will be reduced from the grid once that comes online. That's the type of initiatives that we need to look at — small, little communities doing their part to make a difference — measurable outcomes, measurable opportunities to make a difference.

I don't need to go on about our plan that commits to an intensity-based target for the mining industry. My colleague, who is the resident expert, at least in our caucus — members opposite may not agree with that, but in my opinion, he has a wealth of experience and he has been doing this his whole life. This is his career, and we rely on that expertise in terms of historical knowledge and capturing that, articulating that, and helping us to better understand — looking at the initiatives going forward and measurables. How do we work toward a measurable outcome?

Would it make a difference for us to report twice a year here and put that kind of pressure on the department to generate — to report back to the Legislative Assembly — when we very clearly indicated in the plan that we would report on an annual basis to Yukoners?

We would work with Yukoners; we would help Yukoners; we would put investment into alternatives for Yukoners. We are proud to have developed this strategy in collaboration with our partners.

The final strategy that was developed incorporated feedback from all sectors of our society. Because of this collaborative process, the strategy outlines Yukon-wide priorities and ensures that we are all working together to make meaningful changes. Yukoners want us to take action — they want us to take action now. The majority of Yukon First Nations and municipalities have had conversations around the climate change emergency. Some have put in place measures and resolutions that trigger for themselves their own targets. My community has initiated a climate change strategy with a target of 2030 and a vision to reach that target and do every part that they can. It's the same thing with the Kluane First Nation.

We know the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin's community is doing the same thing with their biomass projects.

So we have been listening. Our clean strategy, which includes 121 recommendations, will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Yukon. It will help us adapt to the effects of climate change, enhance energy security, support Yukon businesses and individuals to participate in a green economy, rather than focusing on, "What does agriculture have to do with our green economy? What do hunting and fishing have to do with our green economy?" We want sustainability. We want access to those resources seven generations from now. If we don't deal with that now, we will see detrimental impacts and effects on the animals.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, there was a national debate and a discussion around this phenomenon that we're seeing and the effects that it would have on the Porcupine caribou herd — the fact that it's raining right now in the middle of their wintering grounds indicates that perhaps they won't get access to the very essential nutrients that they need to survive. We've seen the decline historically from impacts and effects like this. So that's why it's important that we look at food adaptations and food security in the north — alternatives. It's not so much about how we adapt as human beings but how we adapt as communities to address — it's up to us to take action.

The four goals that support healthy people, communities, and ecosystems in our territory clearly lay out the actions and the deliverables and the vision that has been put forward for us — the vision of our communities. By reducing greenhouse gas emissions and building a green economy that protects and restores the natural environment, we will uphold our joint responsibilities as stewards of the land while supporting sustainable economic well-being for future generations. It's about the cycle of life; it's about the cycle of the economy.

Yes, of course, we want to address — and a member addressed this earlier — seasonal changes, impacts, and effects. How do you measure that? That's the objective of this clean strategy. We are seeing changes before our eyes. We see things happening. Of course, we want to measure the changes and the impacts and the cumulative effects that happen. That will be done with the Climate Change Secretariat; it will be done with our partners.

Our actions will support Yukoners to continue to practise their traditional activities without being threatened by climate change. That's important when we speak about adaptation. It's important that we take into consideration a vision that sees from two eyes — one from a traditional, one from customary; one from contemporary, which addresses science. It's important as we look at legislative changes as we go forward.

This will support the whole approach to dealing with the spiritual, mental, and physical being of our very nations.

Speaker: Order, please.

The time being 5:30 p.m., this House now stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m. tomorrow.

Debate on Motion No. 237, and the amendment, accordingly adjourned

The House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

**The following legislative return was tabled
December 2, 2020:**

34-3-48

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Mr. Hassard related to general debate on Vote 51, Community Services, in Bill No. 205, *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21* — correspondence (Streicker)