



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 76

3rd Session

34th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, December 8, 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
Tuesday, December 8, 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: The chair wishes to inform the House of a matter regarding the Notice Paper. Motion No. 371, notice of which was given yesterday by the Member for Copperbelt South, and Motion No. 372, notice of which was given yesterday by the Member for Lake Laberge, were not placed on today's Notice Paper, as the motions were not in order, as they seek an explanation on a matter.

The members may refer to my ruling of October 28, 2020, for further reasoning regarding these motions.

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Introduction of visitors.
Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In recognition of International Day of Persons with Disabilities

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Yukon Liberal government to pay tribute to International Day of Persons with Disabilities.

Held each year on December 3, this international day of observance was first proclaimed by the United Nations in 1992. Its purpose is to promote the rights and well-being of people with disabilities and to increase awareness of people with disabilities in every aspect of political, social, economic, and cultural life.

Each year, the UN declares a different theme for this day. This year, the theme is "Building back better: toward a disability-inclusive, accessible and sustainable post COVID-19 world". What does "disability inclusive" mean in this context? To quote the US Centers for Disease Control: "Disability inclusion means understanding the relationship between the way people function and how they participate in society, and making sure everybody has the same opportunities to participate in every aspect of life to the best of their abilities and desires."

Even under normal circumstances, we know that people with disabilities are less likely to have equal access to health care, employment, adequate housing, and education. They are also likely to have fewer opportunities to participate as fully equal members of their communities and societies. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 crisis is widening this divide.

There are more than one billion people with disabilities in the world today, and sadly, they are among the hardest hit by the pandemic in terms of fatalities. As the United Nations notes,

if the world's COVID-19 response and recovery was designed to reach the furthest behind first, our post-pandemic world would be a better place for everybody. We would be better able to respond to challenges like the one we're facing today.

Here in Canada, the federal Liberal government recently announced plans to bring forward a disability-inclusion plan which is designed to address the social infrastructure gaps that have been worsened by the pandemic. Our Yukon Liberal government applauds this plan. It consists of a guaranteed income supplement, a new employment strategy, and a streamlined eligibility process for federal programs and benefits.

This plan will help to ensure that Canadians with disabilities, who account for about 22 percent of our population, are not left behind in times of crises.

Here in Yukon, we are fortunate to have a number of amazing and caring NGOs that support and serve people with disabilities. These include: Options for Independence; Inclusion Yukon; Teegatha'Oh Zheh, Child Development Centre, Challenge Disability Resource Group; LDAY centre for learning; and Autism Yukon Society. All of these groups provide support to individuals and their families and are key partners in improving health outcomes and enhancing quality of life. I thank all of these groups for the work they do to break down barriers and to open doors for the people they serve.

I would also like to thank the staff at the disability services unit in the Department of Health and Social Services. The dedicated and hard-working team at this office provide support and services to about 350 Yukoners, 175 of whom are children. Today, I call on all Yukoners to celebrate the accomplishments of people with disabilities and to work together to build a post-COVID future that is more inclusive of everyone.

Mahsi' cho; thank you.

Applause

Ms. McLeod: I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to recognize the International Day of Persons with Disabilities which takes place each year on December 3.

"Disability" by definition is: "A physical, mental, cognitive, or developmental condition that impairs, interferes with, or limits a person's ability to engage in certain tasks or actions or participate in typical daily activities and interactions." As you can see, this definition covers a very broad range of impairments. Disability affects more than one billion people worldwide — about 15 percent of the world population — and yet people have not fully caught on to the importance of addressing some critical barriers faced by those with disabilities.

The theme for 2020 is "Not all disabilities are visible." This is important for us to remember, Mr. Speaker. Equally important to remember is that public judgment is one of the biggest challenges persons with disabilities face every day. By ensuring that all community members remember that disabilities take many forms, we can reach a point where compassion replaces obtrusiveness.

We are fortunate here in the Yukon to have so many professionals, organizations, and volunteer groups to not only work with and support those with disabilities and their families, but also to advocate for them in incredible ways. They work to help eliminate the challenges faced daily by individuals with those disabilities and also to highlight the diverse talents of all community members.

Thank you to all those who work to spread awareness of disabilities both visible and invisible and for the work that you do in support of people facing those challenges. Thank you to those who do their part by working to remove barriers and to create a more accessible community for all.

Applause

Ms. Hanson: On behalf of the Yukon NDP, I join in recognizing December 3 as the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. Now more than ever, the imperative for legislators to move from words to action to address the real, daily, lived experience of people with disabilities has been exposed as the impact of COVID-19 becomes daily more apparent.

We all know too well that legislators at all levels are more than competent at finding eloquent words to talk about issues as though the expression of abstract thoughts is enough. For example, Canada signed onto the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* in 2006. As a nation, we joined in pledging to deliver on the UN's sustainable development goal of leaving no one behind. The federal government took until 2019 to pass *An Act to ensure a barrier-free Canada*, the *Accessible Canada Act*.

In Yukon, the government has been silent on its intentions to pass mirror legislation. This is important not only because the federal law only covers aspects of life under federal jurisdiction, like banking, telecommunications, and transportation that crosses provincial and territorial borders. But it is important because, in the absence of territorial legislation respecting disability rights, Yukoners are told, "Well, there is the *Human Rights Act*, which prohibits discriminating against people because of disabilities." Mr. Speaker, in 2020, surely we are beyond the point of expecting the one in five fellow Yukoners living with a disability to rely on having to file a complaint after they experience a situation where their rights have been violated.

As disability activists have pointed out, human rights acts, and the Charter just say "Don't discriminate." That doesn't tell you how to design your school or your hospital or how to operate your doctor's office. Housing, health, education, and employment are areas of concern for people with disabilities when it comes to accessibility.

Provincial governments in Ontario, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia have enacted disability rights legislation. BC concluded extensive public consultation on legislation to mirror the federal act.

2020 is supposed to be about taking action to create a disability-inclusive and accessible community. It is past time to move past talking about how accessible we want the Yukon to be. It is time to set standards for businesses, non-profits,

education- and health-related institutions, and the public sector on how to be accessible to people with a wide range of disabilities. Maybe then we can say that we have delivered on our commitment, realizing that the rights of persons with disabilities is not only a matter of justice, but that it is an investment in a common future for us all.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I have for tabling a legislative return responding to a question from the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin on October 20 during Committee of the Whole.

I also have for tabling two annual reports for 2019-20: one from the Yukon Teachers Labour Relations Board, and one from the Yukon Public Service Labour Relations Board.

Hon. Ms. Frost: I have for tabling a legislative return in response to questions on November 24, 2020, from the Member for Kluane regarding outfitters' quotas.

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

Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions to be presented?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Mr. Istchenko: I rise in the House today to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House congratulates the Kluane Lake Research Station on the establishment of an off-grid, hydroponic food-production facility that will provide Yukon communities access to a variety of freshly grown produce all year-round.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to recognize the importance of making spirometry tests available in the Yukon again, especially during a pandemic, due to the fragile health of many patients in need by immediately taking action to restore this health service.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to acknowledge period poverty experienced by women and girls in the Yukon by providing menstrual-care products free of charge.

Speaker: Are there any further notices of motions?
Is there a statement by a minister?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Yukon Days**

Hon. Mr. Silver: This week, our government is proud to continue with the tradition of engaging with federal ministers alongside Yukon First Nation leadership through what is now a virtual Yukon Days. The majority of these meetings are taking place this week. Yukon Days is an annual event where we meet with members of the federal Cabinet to discuss issues that matter to most Yukoners.

Since 2016, our government has implemented a collaborative approach to Yukon Days where we have worked with Yukon First Nations' national chief and the Council of Yukon First Nations to share priorities with the federal government through trilateral meetings. Our voices are made stronger when we can all speak together.

As the COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated, governments are at their most effective when they are collaborative, coordinated, and working on a common goal. Over the course of the past four years, our joint approach has yielded important investments for our territory — for example, the \$26 million that we received for the Yukon University science centre last year. It has also ensured that federal ministers understand the unique land claim and self-government context in Yukon.

This year, we have shifted, obviously, to a more virtual model to allow us to continue this important dialogue while still following the “safe six” guidelines.

While Yukon Days looks different than it did in the past, I'm very pleased that we are having productive conversations with federal ministers on a number of important issues. We are discussing resources to support community safety plans, investments in First Nation housing, the delivery of health services to Yukon First Nation people, and promoting the sustainable management of Yukon River salmon.

Yukon is known across the country as a leader in reconciliation. These meetings have given us a chance to profile the extraordinary and innovative work underway by Yukon First Nations, such as the Kwanlin Dün First Nation community safety officer program and proposed made-in-Yukon solutions for challenges that we are facing together.

I want to thank the Yukon First Nation chiefs for their participation in these meetings with members of Cabinet and me. I'm looking forward to continuing to engage with the federal government in partnership with Yukon First Nations.

Mr. Hassard: I appreciate the opportunity to respond to this ministerial statement today. I would like to begin by thanking the Premier for this update on what we believe is an important annual event for the entire Yukon. We're happy to hear that the government has found a way to hold this event virtually in these challenging times, and we certainly look forward to an update when the event is concluded and all of the meetings are finished.

Thanks again to the Premier for this update.

Ms. White: When I start, I wonder if this is the first-ever ministerial statement about a Zoom meeting anywhere that

ministerial statements are made. While there is no doubt that it is important to have conversations with federal ministers, I am not sure that this ministerial statement really provides any new information to Yukoners. We hope that the Premier will elaborate in his responses on what ministers his government plans to meet with and how these meetings will concretely improve the lives of Yukoners.

We are happy that Yukon First Nation leaders have a seat at the table, and we salute their leadership and vision when it comes to reconciliation and intergovernmental relationships, as well as issues like health care, housing, resource management, and much more.

I will point out that a positive aspect of this year's virtual meetings is that it shows that business can be conducted remotely. This saves the government money and reduces emissions, which is critical if we believe that the climate emergency that we declared just over a year ago is more than just words.

I look forward to the day when Yukoners who live in the communities are given the same flexibility to work remotely so that they can live in their communities while working for YG. The pandemic has shown us that work can be successfully completed remotely, whether it is public servants working from a home here in Whitehorse or in the communities where they live. If the Premier can have productive meetings with his federal counterparts over Zoom, I have no doubt that, with a bit of creativity, we can decentralize government and allow Yukoners to live in their communities while working for Yukon government.

Hon. Mr. Silver: Thanks to the members opposite for their comments. I think that it is extremely important to stand in the Legislative Assembly during a ministerial statement to express to Yukoners who may not know that these conversations are continuing to happen. Every year since we've been in government, our Yukon Days have been trilateral. In the past, the First Nation components of Yukon Days were more of a cultural significance after the meetings were done. What we have instilled in this Yukon government are trilateral conversations with federal ministers, the chiefs and councils, and our ministers. Again, the good news from those previous meetings was a coordinated effort in Ottawa.

We have heard from many different ministers on how thankful they are to be able to speak to First Nation leadership and the Yukon government at the same time about joint priorities. They are happy to also see a five-year capital plan that reflects the unique communities so that they can have a view to the five-year future in the Yukon and priority capital projects for First Nation governments and ours as well.

I think it is extremely important that Yukoners know that these meetings are extremely important to us and that they are ongoing. I want to thank the folks who have dealt with the logistics of these meetings.

It's a herculean task, as you can imagine, to get everybody into and out of the Zoom conversations — federal ministers heading into Question Period — those types of things, but again, the work of all of the public servants in all of the

governments — whether it be in the Teslin Tlingit Council or Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in or our government or the federal government — shows how important this is to all levels of government that these conversations continue.

It really does help complement the Yukon Forum, which we are preparing for this week. The Yukon Forum — more of a conversation bilaterally on things such as off-road vehicle regulations or the *Putting People First* plan or the missing and murdered indigenous women and girls and two-spirited individuals.

On a federal basis, we have communicated with the opposition on what the conversations are, the topics are, at Yukon Days — not to be confused with Yukon Forum — but I think that it is an extremely important time to make sure that folks know that, despite the pandemic, Yukon's voice is being heard in Ottawa.

Speaker: This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: *Civil Emergency Measures Act* implementation review

Mr. Hassard: So, when this session began, the Liberal government proposed a select committee of the Legislature to review the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* and its use throughout this pandemic. At the time, we argued that it was inappropriate for the Minister of Community Services, who has administered the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*, to sit on this committee to review his own actions.

This morning we received an internal Cabinet e-mail that shows that the Minister of Community Services has been actively orchestrating the Liberals' entire strategy to manipulate the process and the outcomes. The minister himself is preparing quotes, helping to write speeches, and orchestrating the Liberals' entire strategy — all with the ultimate goal of getting himself on this committee to review his own actions.

How can the Liberals continue to pretend that this process isn't a sham, all designed for the Liberals to write their own report card?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, it is correct. I did put forward a motion to establish a select committee of all parties to work on the legislation. I heard from the members opposite that they wanted to change the legislation. In fact, they tabled some amendments to it in a bill. We haven't debated that yet, but, yes, I continue to work on that motion — it is my motion.

I am, of course, responsible for the emergency. I am, of course, working with communities to talk to them about the emergency. I am, of course, listening to concerns from Yukoners. I am, of course, working with members on this side of the Legislature around debate in this Legislature — yes, absolutely. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I brought with me that correspondence, which I inadvertently sent to the members opposite — no big deal. I am happy to even table it.

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, this internal Liberal strategy e-mail demonstrates clearly that the minister himself is orchestrating this whole thing just to get himself on the

committee so that he can influence the committee's outcomes. He desperately wants to be on this committee and to review the job that he has done implementing the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*. He has written content for speeches, pulled quotes for his colleagues to use, and charted out exactly how his colleagues should argue that he himself is the best person to review his own work. If his manipulation of the debate of this motion is any indication of how he would behave on the committee itself, it is clear that this entire process is bogus and that we are right to oppose his participation in this.

Will the minister admit that he has been manipulating the process with regard to this motion and its outcomes with the obvious end goal of inserting himself on this committee?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, what I will also do is share the correspondence with the media so that everybody can see that correspondence. Yes, absolutely, Mr. Speaker, I was reading Hansard from the past around debates on select committees. Yes, I am doing my work around preparing for a motion that I have put on the floor here that I think is important to debate. Yes, I absolutely think that it is an important motion.

When you read through it, you will see that I even say in there that it is not so important whether it is me who is the person on the committee. What is so important is that Yukoners have an opportunity to talk to a select committee about what they would like to see as differences.

I did look back through past debate in this House, and I did share that with colleagues. I think that I will share it with the public as well so that they can see that debate all the way through. I'm happy to do so.

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Party has consistently made the case that the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* should be amended to allow for democratic oversight and legislative scrutiny. We have been critical of the Liberal government for their unwillingness to call back the Legislature throughout the summer and for the passage of dozens of ministerial orders. Now the Liberals are saying that they will review the act but that they want total control of the process so the Minister of Community Services can review his own conduct and write his own report card. Now these internal Liberal strategy documents show that the Liberals and the minister are manipulating the process so that they can rig the outcome.

It's obvious to everyone outside of the Liberal Cabinet Office that this doesn't make sense, so will the Liberals agree to scrap this flawed process and start working with the opposition parties in good faith to review the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*?

Hon. Mr. Silver: What we have is a debate about a motion to talk about the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*. In that debate, what the opposition is not talking about is equal representation: one member from the Yukon Party, one member from the NDP, and one member from this caucus. But that's not good enough for the Yukon Party. They don't want specific people; if the particular minister is wrong for them, then they're just not going to show up.

It's so interesting — as the Member for Whitehorse Centre speaks off-mic as she often does and doesn't listen to the

answer — filibustering our motion, also standing on points of order to not amend, standing on points of order to not even be able to have this conversation in the Legislative Assembly, and then amendment after amendment, but all summer long saying that they want a select committee. I guess if the opposition cannot control the narrative, they are not interested in the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*.

On our part of the Legislative Assembly, we believe it's very fair to have one member from each of the parties. The Yukon NDP can pick their member, the Yukon Party can pick their member, but I guess the Yukon Party doesn't allow us to have representation that we think is extremely important on there, especially when you have an individual who has forensic knowledge not only of the act itself, but how it has been used in the last nine months.

Question re: *Civil Emergency Measures Act* implementation review

Mr. Cathers: The internal Liberal Cabinet Office e-mails that we received this morning outline the Liberals' legislative strategy. In those e-mails, the government minister outlines the Liberals' strategy planning, speaking notes, and ultimately the government's end goal to manipulate the outcomes regarding the proposed review of the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*.

What is particularly startling about these e-mails is that included on the list of people the Liberal minister addressed these partisan strategies to is the Member for Riverdale North who also happens to be the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Can the Minister of Community Services tell us why he appears to be coordinating the Liberals' legislative agenda strategy and partisan objectives for the Legislature with the Member for Riverdale North?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I was going to stand on a point of personal privilege regardless. I'm happy to do it right now in Question Period. I sent out an e-mail to MLAs — to colleagues. It turns out that the list has you in that list. An e-mail earlier talking about looking at past Hansard was sent to you. I'm sorry that I sent it to you, Mr. Speaker. That was not my intention, but you will also notice next to it that it's also sent to me; I sent it to myself. Why did I do that? Because it was a list of MLAs. It's just that the list had us on it. There was no intention of sharing it with you. Again, my apologies.

What I will do is table that one piece of e-mail that I inadvertently sent to one of the staffers with the Yukon Party. After I did that, I turned around and sent it to the staff of the NDP, because I thought, well, if I've sent it there, let me send it in both directions. I will send it as well to the media. I will put it out there on my social media. People can see that I've been researching Hansard to look at select committees so that, when we debate select committees here in this House on my motion, there is some good information that we can talk about.

Mr. Cathers: Mr. Speaker, I do have to point out that the e-mail was sent over a month ago. For the minister to now be apologizing is a little bit rich, since it has become public.

These questions are directly related to internal government strategy documents created and sent by the Minister of Community Services as he attempts to manipulate the process with respect to the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* review and his own conduct during the pandemic.

In 2017, following a question about the Member for Riverdale North's attendance at partisan events, the then-Clerk of the Assembly issued a statement to media outlining the role of the Speaker. In that statement, the Clerk said — and I quote: "In a Westminster parliamentary system ... the Speaker of a legislative assembly must be neutral and non-partisan when presiding over the proceedings of the legislative assembly. The Speaker is also expected to restrict his or her political activity outside the House in order to preserve the neutrality and non-partisan nature of the position."

Can the minister tell us how he could possibly believe that it is appropriate for the Liberals to include the Member for Riverdale North in e-mails about the development of partisan strategies for the Legislative Assembly?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it is appropriate for me to send something to you. I did it by mistake. I apologized to this House. It's one of those things when you press "send" on an e-mail and sometimes there is autofill and other things.

What I will say to this House is that I have had no response from you on that. So, you did your job. I am the one who made the mistake. Again, I apologize to this House. I have one e-mail that was sent this morning in error to a staffer from the Yukon Party. That is the challenge here. I took the decision to share it then with the staff of the NDP. I am taking the decision to share that with the public and media. Please — I encourage everyone to please have a look. All it is, is me going through past Hansards and talking about past select committees. By the way, six of the seven past select committees have ministers on them. There has never been any debate in this Legislature about whether or not a minister should sit on them from any party in this House. Now it is an issue — okay, fine, let's have the debate.

Mr. Cathers: Well, it's a fairly desperate attempt by the minister. He knows that, like the Public Accounts, the principle is that ministers don't review their own work, but the minister is trying to issue his own report card.

The 2017 statement by the Clerk of the Assembly also notes that — and I quote: "The Speaker will not, under normal circumstances, attend caucus meetings when the House is in session or in the two weeks prior to the reconvening of the Assembly."

Can the minister explain why the Liberal government was appearing to coordinate House strategy for the government's legislative agenda by directly involving the Speaker and why he has only made this public once he got caught?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Mr. Speaker, I am finding this line of questioning very interesting. Apparently, nobody on the other side of this Legislative Assembly has ever sent an e-mail in error. Apparently, the explanation given by the minister is not satisfactory, but most important, in relation to the last question, is the fact that the member opposite has clearly not

read the motion that is before the Legislative Assembly, has been debated, and is the subject of the particular e-mail, because it clearly says that the select committee — special committee — would “... consider and identify options for modernizing the Civil Emergency Measures Act, and make recommendations on possible amendments to the Civil Emergency Measures Act.” There is another bit of information there about how that would happen. Those are not report cards; it is not about looking back; it is about looking forward and speaking to Yukoners about what they think this piece of legislation could and should do for them.

Perhaps he could read the motion.

Question re: Hemodialysis services in Yukon

Ms. White: A year ago today, my friend Terry came home to die. He said he would rather die with friends around him than live alone in Vancouver, dependent on hemodialysis not available to him in Yukon. He died just after the new year.

My question is: What has this government done, since Terry’s death, to address the needs of Yukoners who require hemodialysis that is not provided in Yukon?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, of course, our sincere condolences to the family. We take into consideration every death that happens as a serious lesson learned and we always look for improvements, as we just recently rolled out the *Putting People First* report. The objective, Mr. Speaker, was to look at preventive measures, to look at collaborative care, and to work with our partners on best practices.

We certainly don’t want to focus on acute care. We want to focus on prevention and we want to focus on the best possible models that we can bring here to the Yukon.

We have been working with British Columbia’s renal agency to improve services available in the territory for Yukoners with kidney disease. This early intervention and support delay the progress of the disease and supports home dialysis therapies to keep Yukoners in the territory.

We are taking into consideration and looking at best practices and we’re doing that with the experts who focus on the supports needed for hemodialysis and different aspects.

I would be happy to respond to further questions.

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, after Terry’s death and the publicity surrounding it, I received many e-mails and letters from folks who were shocked by Terry’s needless death, but also concern for their own future health care needs. Some individuals were already experiencing the impacts of kidney disease.

This government was willing enough to cover over \$450,000 for Terry’s care while he was in a Vancouver hospital. The government indicated then that there were not the numbers in Yukon to justify offering hemodialysis to Yukoners. Mr. Speaker, his family doesn’t want condolences. They want others to have access to hemodialysis in Yukon.

Can the minister tell this House what the magic number would be in order to offer hemodialysis in Yukon rather than sending Yukoners permanently away?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, again, I’ll reiterate that BC supports Yukoners who need dialysis or transplants. Their

guidelines do not recommend developing a hemodialysis centre here in Yukon. These guidelines are rooted in evidence, experience, and research developed by BC Renal agency to ensure equitable and logical distribution of high-quality kidney care and services as a guide for best practices. It would be fair to say that this work that we are doing with our partners in British Columbia has been slowed as a result of COVID. The work will continue as we look at the future.

I certainly want to acknowledge that we have had a number of patients in the same situation. We take every one of them very seriously. Acting on many other initiatives that have had a direct impact on chronic kidney disease, we are working on recommendations to improve travel and we’re working on recommendations to support the patients to access services in British Columbia and that is something that we historically have done. Are we looking for improvements? Most certainly we are — from the experiences that we have learned from.

Ms. White: I am not sure that I would cheer about the answer, because I believe that it is the government’s responsibility to Yukon citizens and not British Columbia’s. We know that Yukoners have had to make this choice in the past, they are making it now, and they will continue to have to make this impossible choice: move permanently away from jobs, homes, friends, and family to receive hemodialysis, or remain here to die.

In the Northwest Territories, there are two communities where hemodialysis is available for 23 people in total. One is Yellowknife, and the other is Hay River. Hay River, with a population of just under 4,000 people — one-tenth of the population of Yukon — now has four hemodialysis machines. There are two NWT communities where individuals can remain in their community and get access to the health care that they deserve. Yukoners do not have the same access to health care.

How does the minister explain that the Northwest Territories has enough patients to justify not one but two communities with hemodialysis support while Yukon patients have to relocate south?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, acknowledging what is happening in the Northwest Territories and the focus on in-centre hemodialysis treatment while the Yukon focuses on more of an independent model and we work with our BC partners — just as a note for the record, the individual the member opposite is speaking of would have had to go to BC for services because that is where we rely on supports.

With respect to proactive and preventive care, which is really important in this conversation, it is delaying the progression of kidney disease. For this, we have initiated the find-a-doctor app; we supported Yukoners; we have allowed for funding and constant glucose monitoring for diabetes patients. We have currently 53 patients with chronic kidney disease who require no dialysis and seven patients who require dialysis. Those seven patients are treated out of BC, and we fund and support those patients. We will continue to do so.

I wanted to just again say that Yukon does not take this lightly. We are taking every experience as we look at putting people first and as we look at a collaborative model and a preventive model.

Question re: ATAC Resources tote road project

Mr. Kent: The decision by the Liberal government to deny permits for the ATAC road continues to receive negative feedback from mining companies and the investment community. Companies are saying that they don't know what to tell their shareholders and potential investors about this decision and how it will affect their projects.

In a *North of 60 Mining News* article from December 4, the CEO of ATAC is quoted as saying: "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."

The Liberals boasted about the new requirement for sub-regional land use plans to be completed before projects can be approved as their new way of doing business. Are the Liberals considering this new way of doing business for any other projects in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the member opposite. Once again, part of the work that I've been doing over the last number of weeks is continuing to communicate with the financial sector across the country. What we've seen in many cases is the analysts who do that work and then provide insight and advisement to the financial firms have done a lot of deep diving. They have taken a look at the recommendations that were put out by the environmental assessment. They've also taken a look at the information that has been provided by the Yukon government. I think what they've done has given an opportunity to contemplate on what the recommendations were and the decisions by the Yukon government. I think there is a lot of work being done just to understand this. I think that's important.

We spoke last week about some of the reasons behind denying the road based on the application. Over and above that, I think it's important that we still touch upon the fact that we have a very vibrant industry. Environmental assessment structure is very important when you look at the ESG financing. Even this week, discussions with other financial institutions about the importance of how they're going to look at it — and we see the other territories — Northwest Territories and Nunavut — position themselves in the same way.

Mr. Kent: The question that I asked is: Will this sub-regional planning be considered for other projects in the territory?

But on Yukon.ca this morning, the Beaver River land use planning documents still include work on a road access management plan. It's scheduled to be completed in March 2021. This update was submitted in November before the minister pulled the rug out from underneath ATAC Resources by denying the permits.

Since the road permits have been denied, has the minister instructed the committee to stop work on this road access management plan?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Again, to answer the first question — and I apologize if it wasn't answered in full at this particular time. We have had some First Nations reach out to us. That has been the only discussion on sub-regional planning. There have

been some First Nations that have asked us to look at that. We have not, as the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources or with the Department of Environment, dealt with any conversations, but there have been conversations that have been led by First Nations on that particular topic.

Again, concerning this particular process, we are going to undertake the work that we have looked at doing with Na-Cho Nyäk Dun. We spoke about this at length in budget debate under Energy, Mines and Resources, and we talked about the timeline that is there and the work plan. I explicitly shared the fact that December 14 is the next date of our senior liaison committee. From that, we continue to do that work and there are some key pieces around sub-regional planning that have to be done around wildlife management and others. That is the work that is being done between the two governments, and we will continue to do that work.

My colleague, as well, wanted me to touch upon the fact that ESG, for those who don't know, is an acronym that really focuses on environmental, social, and governance. Those are some of the key things that you need for investment these days.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, as we have said before, the Liberals have changed the rules of the game on the ATAC project at half-time. They introduced sub-regional land use planning as part of the process after the project received a favourable environmental assessment. What normally would have been a decision on this project in perhaps the summer or fall of 2018 has now dragged on into late 2020, with no end in sight. Jurisdictions needs stability and certainty with their permitting processes in order to attract investment.

Although the minister doesn't seem overly concerned with what this decision means to mining in the territory, what is his message to investors about his new way of doing business?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, I think that our message to the overall investment community is: First and foremost, some of the challenges that we found coming into office were that there was a tremendous amount of legal cases going on and there was real instability concerning the fact that folks were pretty worried about the government-to-government relationships. That is something that we have put a lot of work into through our MOU with 11 First Nations. That, of course, then led to the work that we do on all those sub-tables. Then, of course, over and above that, is the mineral development strategy, which I think is a very important undertaking — something the previous government tried to get off the runway, didn't quite happen, and crashed. Again, for us, we have that work underway.

I think that when you take a look at that work and then some real optimism going into this year where a lot of capital has been raised, it looks like we are going to have a very, very strong exploration season. Of course, we have those three mines now, up and running, and more in the pipeline.

I think that we can really take a look at this one particular case where an application was denied, but if you take a look at the entire picture, what we're seeing is folks working in mines and mines actually being built and going into production. That is really not what we were previously seeing. When you take a look at year over year, our exploration numbers are quite

strong. There have been some anomalies, but the finance folks said, “Listen, make sure you get mines open.” That’s not what was happening in the past.

Question re: COVID-19 pandemic public health measures for hospitality industry

Mr. Istchenko: Starting yesterday, the government is requiring that bars and restaurants take contact information for guests. Did the government consult with the Yukon Information and Privacy Commissioner about the planning and implementation of this policy?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I will start with the responses.

I did put the question to my folks about a privacy impact assessment. I am sorry, but I don’t have the answer in front of me, but I know that when the chief medical officer of health let us know that his office believed that this was important to keep up safety, we agreed that it should come forward quickly. My understanding is that bars and restaurants are to keep this list. It is not a list that’s shared with us unless there is a case. Then it is much like flights where there is a manifest, so we have a way to contact people.

I will get the specific answer for the member opposite, but we let bars and restaurants know that, as of December 2 and as of yesterday, this started to happen where people are signing in. I know this because I went out last night and checked it out. I saw that it was at work. I will get a specific answer for the member opposite, but it’s just to say that the whole point of this is to make sure that we can follow up with people and protect their safety.

Mr. Istchenko: Mr. Speaker, protecting the privacy of Yukoners is extremely important. Businesses are being instructed by the government to collect and retain personal information. We understand the public health purposes of this as it relates to contact tracing, but we also need to ensure that we are protecting privacy. While the minister is off finding out whether or not he consulted with the Yukon Information and Privacy Commissioner about the planning and implementation of policy, can he also find out what other measures — maybe in the House today he can answer this — his government has put into place to protect the privacy of Yukoners?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question around the Privacy Commissioner, I would like to note that, given that the information collected is collected by the respective bar or restaurant, this information is held for 30 days and then is destroyed. We did not consult with the Privacy Commissioner because this is not the government collecting the information.

As we continue to adapt and respond to COVID-19, we are identifying new ways to keep our communities safe, and Yukoners need to know that. The objective here is so that we can do contact tracing and prevent Yukoners from essentially coming into contact — if they have come into contact, we have a means in which to quickly correspond with them, and that is as advised by the communicable disease centre under the direction of our chief medical officer of health. Businesses, including bars and restaurants, were required to submit their operational plans prior to reopening to ensure the health and

safety of staff and customers. These plans were approved by the Health Emergency Operations Centre and follow the guidelines of the chief medical officer of health.

I would like to just say that Yukoners should feel safe in knowing that we are following protocols to do the necessary contact tracing when appropriate.

Mr. Istchenko: I am not sure if the minister heard the question, but I was asking about what other measures the government is putting in place to protect the privacy of Yukoners. Both ministers weren’t sure if they had consulted with Yukon’s Privacy Commissioner about the implementation of the policy.

I am going to switch gears a little bit with respect to the enforcement end of it. If an individual refuses to provide this information, what is the responsibility of the bar or restaurant? Are they required to deny service?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to talk this afternoon about the actions that this government is taking to provide more information to our citizens and also to better protect their privacy.

We undertook a debate about two years ago here in the House about our new *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. We undertook to rewrite that act and make sure that the privacy of our citizens is better protected. We consulted with the Information and Privacy Commissioner in the drafting of that piece of legislation. I can say to the members opposite that the regulations that will bring that act into force are currently on their way to Cabinet. I know that when that act is finally brought into service, it will provide much more robust privacy for our citizens interacting with government and much clearer rules around the provision of information. Once again, we know how important that is for Yukoners. I know that when this act is brought into force in a few months, it will certainly do a much better job protecting the privacy of our citizens as they react and interact with our government. Those rules will be a lot clearer as well.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

Notice of opposition private members’ business

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the item standing in the name of the Third Party to be called on Wednesday, December 9, 2020. It is Motion No. 358, standing in the name of the Member for Takhini-Kopper King.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, in order to continue debate on government business as we approach the end of the current Fall Sitting, the Official Opposition will not be calling any private members’ business for tomorrow.

Speaker: We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 212, amendment to — *adjourned debate*

Clerk: Motion No. 212, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Streicker, resuming debate on the amendment proposed by Ms. Hanson; adjourned debate, Mr. Cathers.

Mr. Cathers: Mr. Speaker, in resuming debate again on this motion and the amendment to it, I would like to again recap the fact that, throughout this year, the Yukon Party has focused on bringing forward constructive solutions, including proposals to work together on all-party committees related to multiple aspects of the pandemic. As well, last week, as the Official Opposition critic for democratic institutions, I tabled proposed changes to the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* which would provide the Legislative Assembly with oversight and control over the extension of the state of emergency and require that any regulations and ministerial orders be subject to a mandatory review by the Legislative Assembly or committee of the Assembly within 45 days of being issued and empower committees of the Legislative Assembly to conduct public hearings on regulations and ministerial orders under the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*.

In saying that, as well, we agree that there are likely additional changes that are required to the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* and we would be happy to participate in a committee, but we are making it clear that we believe the highest priority changes would be to improve democratic oversight and provide the ability that has been missing throughout the government's management of the pandemic for the public to be involved in matters including the imposition of ministerial orders that are affecting the lives of 40,000 Yukoners, Mr. Speaker.

We believe, fundamentally, that even if an order has to be made in a hurry, that there needs to be, at the very least, an after-the-fact check with Yukoners asking questions as simple as: What's working? What isn't? How can we do better?

Now, in speaking to this proposed amendment, I would note that, with the proposed committee, a key question all members should consider is this one: Why should Yukon citizens have confidence in a committee reviewing the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* and the work that it will do?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals insist on having the Minister of Community Services on the committee as proposed by the minister, the fact is that Yukoners have every reason to question the government's sincerity because of that conflict of interest of the minister continuing to manage aspects of the pandemic under the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* while being asked to participate in a review of that legislation.

We can safely assume that the number one thing Yukoners will want to talk about is how the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* has been used throughout the pandemic, including the use of ministerial orders issued by the Minister of Community Services. That will be at the heart of the discussion about what changes should be made to that legislation that would affect the future. People whose lives are being affected right now are

going to want to talk about that. I believe that they have every right to talk about that.

I want to also, in speaking to this amendment to the motion, remind all members of the Yukon Party Official Opposition's position. We are happy to participate in an all-party committee reviewing the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*. If the Liberals reconsider their position and agree to have one of the Liberal private members on the committee of the Minister of Community Services, we will happily support the passage of this motion. If they refuse, we continue to have concerns that the committee's credibility will be tarnished by the Minister of Community Services sitting on it while he is still responsible for issuing orders related to the pandemic because of the declaration of a state of emergency.

What the Liberals have appeared not to get — or are perhaps willfully ignoring — is that just as with the principle that's applied when Public Accounts committees do reviews of the government action, the long-standing principle has been that ministers, if they are sitting on that committee, recuse themselves from any discussions related to a department that they're currently the minister responsible for or that they were the minister responsible for during a period covered by the review. In the absence of that, unfortunately, there is not the necessary public appearance of impartiality. The process appears biased and it will have the appearance, if the government proceeds with having the Minister of Community Services on the committee, that the government has perhaps already decided what the outcomes will be.

This has also been added to throughout the year. The government has had a perfect record of shooting down every single proposal that we have made regarding working with them in all-party committees or the proposals that we have made to amend their motions, such as their motion regarding the civil emergency when they shot down three amendments proposed by the Yukon Party and one proposed by the NDP and a previous amendment that we proposed to this very motion that we are discussing. The government — the Liberal government — has shown an indication that they are not willing to take suggestions from everyone else, and it does leave us questioning — especially if the Minister of Community Services sits on the committee — why we should believe that this committee will be any different. If this process is simply one where the government has already decided what the outcome will be, then it will not have the credibility it should have, if it is actually going to listen to Yukoners — give Yukoners the confidence to come forward to the committee and actually recommend the solutions that should occur, in terms of proposed changes to this committee.

I should also note that we are concerned that officials from the Department of Community Services and other departments who are called to testify will be afraid to share their opinions frankly with the committee, since the Minister of Community Services would be sitting on it. We are concerned that the minister will fundamentally be in a conflict by continuing to issue ministerial orders while effectively reviewing his own performance.

That process risks making a mockery of parliamentary tradition and propriety and our democratic solutions. There is a very simple solution: The government can simply agree to allow one of the Liberal backbenchers to sit on the committee and to work on behalf of Yukoners, including their constituents.

It is ridiculous to pretend that this committee's work is only about the future. People who are being affected by the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* today will want to talk about those effects when they talk about what they think should be changed. I would certainly hope that this isn't a case — we are getting the impression that the Premier doesn't really have confidence in the ability of the Liberal private members, and I would encourage them to in fact allow those members to participate in the committee and do good work alongside members of the Official Opposition and the Third Party of listening to Yukoners and suggesting changes.

While we are critical of parts of the government's response that we disagree with, including the original proposed structure of this motion, we have consistently throughout the pandemic not just identified the areas where we criticized the government, but brought forward — time after time after time — constructive proposals for what could be done better. That includes the legislation that I mentioned that I tabled on behalf of our caucus and the proposals that we made during discussion of the civil state of emergency where we proposed that any future extensions of the current state of emergency being debated should be debated in the Legislative Assembly prior to their implementation.

We proposed that the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments convene to review, call witnesses, and study all ministerial orders and orders-in-council issued during the state of emergency. We proposed as well that all Members of the Legislative Assembly should be provided with the same information that informs the Yukon government's decision on whether to implement and extend the state of emergency. In addition to that, the Third Party made a proposal that we supported. I will note as well that the Third Party, the NDP, did support the amendments that we proposed, and we thank them for that.

Ultimately, the pandemic should be an opportunity to work together for the betterment of all Yukoners. Unfortunately, we hear the government members occasionally using phrases that suggest that we are all on team Yukon or that they are interested in working together, but their actions do not live up to those claims. It has not increased our confidence in a committee with the minister sitting on it when we see, as we did earlier today, the e-mail that the minister claims to have accidentally sent to people — including the Member for Riverdale North — which appeared to me to be instructing MLAs to do things, including to cast aspersions on Yukon Party MLAs during discussions regarding the review of the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*. It appeared as well to be instructing them on what they should say and why they should be arguing for the Minister of Community Services himself to sit on that committee. It does not increase our confidence in a process in which we were already questioning the sincerity of the government when the minister sends e-mails that have the appearance of him playing the role

of a puppet master in trying to orchestrate the outcome that he wants.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to, as I mentioned, the proposals that we have made regarding democratic oversight and information sharing, we have, throughout this year, as you will recall, since the beginning of the pandemic — we in fact began early in the month of March — we proposed an all-party committee where all MLAs would have the opportunity to work together, dealing with the territory's response to the pandemic. The government refused to consider it. We again, throughout the months since then — on several other occasions — made other proposals regarding working together to deal with aspects of the pandemic.

Those suggestions were again rebuffed by the Liberal government. We are certainly getting a strong sense that the government is not actually interested in working with the Official Opposition or the Third Party and that they simply want the appearance of working together, but on terms that they themselves have dictated.

Frankly, especially if the Minister of Community Services is the government's member on this committee, as they proposed in their original motion, it leaves us questioning their interest in actually taking any suggestions or any constructive proposals from other members of the committee. If we're simply going to see an exercise in window dressing and a sham process, that really is not a good use of the time of members of the Assembly. It's not a good use of taxpayers' resources, and frankly, Yukoners deserve better from the government.

What Yukoners do deserve are changes to the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* that improve democratic oversight and accountability. As noted, we have identified those that we see as high-priority changes. So, in contrast to the government's approach, we are clearly outlining a vision for improving oversight by the Legislative Assembly — oversight of ministerial orders and, most importantly, inclusion of the public in reviewing the rules that are being issued that are affecting their lives.

Ultimately, a pandemic is not an excuse to avoid democracy. It is not an excuse to avoid public consultation. Fundamentally, every single one of us has an obligation to represent our constituents and people throughout the territory.

The people throughout the territory do want to be involved in the decisions that are affecting their lives. In my view, they have every right to be involved.

Ms. White: I thank my colleagues for what they've said so far in this debate.

One thing that I just want to bring forward is that I would guess, especially based on what the minister has said himself, that the Minister of Community Services is incredibly busy right now. As we've heard, we're in month nine of a pandemic and he is in charge of the CEMA legislation. I know, sitting on other committees, that often they are reorganized around the availability of ministers who are busy right now, which I appreciate.

But if we're going to talk about the importance of changing or opening up this legislation and taking a look at what needs

to be done, one would expect that it is going to require a certain amount of time. The timeline that it has been set for is for the summer of 2021, I believe.

The amendment that my colleague for Whitehorse Centre has proposed is bringing in the Minister of Community Services as an expert witness. It would allow him to share what he has learned in the nine months — since this has been ongoing. What it would also do is free up the committee to continue to meet as required and not be beholden to the busiest person possibly who would be on that committee. I think it's reasonable. I don't think that it weakens the motion; I see it only as a strength.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I am very pleased to hear the Member for Lake Laberge say that the public should be involved in a conversation regarding future CEMA legislation and that Yukoners need to be heard, because he has introduced a bill here in this Legislative Assembly to amend that legislation without any of that being done. I am certainly happy that this has changed.

I can appreciate that the amendment is an attempt to structure the special committee from a selection of our talented and dedicated private members, but the motion brought in as Motion No. 212 indicates that one MLA from the Official Opposition and from the Third Party would join the Minister of Community Services on a special committee for the purposes of considering and identifying the options for modernizing the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* and that the committee would make recommendations on possible amendments to the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*.

They would be empowered, Mr. Speaker, to hold public hearings and to call for persons, papers, and records. They would be required to report to this Legislative Assembly on its findings and recommendations by August 31, 2021. They would be supported by the Clerk. Equal representation from the three parties represented here in the territorial Legislative Assembly — no chair yet chosen that would be appropriate for the committee to do this. I also note that equitable, fair representation is what is proposed here in Motion No. 212. Parties would choose their own participants.

I am puzzled, frankly, as to why there is such vehement opposition to the Minister for Community Services being the selected person on behalf of the Yukon Liberal Party. All parties should get to choose who they want to send to do this work on their behalf.

They are required, as I've noted, to consider and identify options for modernizing the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* legislation. They are required to work together on behalf of Yukoners.

When this motion was brought forward, it was carefully considered. Research was done when contemplating a special committee —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Member for Whitehorse Centre, on a point of order.

Ms. Hanson: In the interest of facilitating this conversation, I stand on Standing Order 19(b). The member opposite is speaking to matters other than the proposed amendment to the motion, which has only two key matters. It doesn't speak to the whole construct, the history, or anything else of the motion that was put forward by the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes.

I fail to see how this is speaking to the amendment as proposed.

Speaker: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: On the point of order on Standing Order 19(b), I would say that this is a difference of opinion between members. I see that my colleague is again just building some context in order to properly debate this particular topic.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: Just a few sentences before the point of order was raised, the Government House Leader was talking about the composition of the proposed select committee and how each party would have their respective choices. That does relate to the amendment as well.

I will continue to listen to the Government House Leader. I would remind all members in the debate that we are governed by Standing Order 35(b), which says: "When taking part in a debate on an amendment to a motion: ... (b) a member, other than the mover, shall confine debate to the subject of the amendment."

There is obviously some latitude provided by the Chair to all members during amendment debate. But, like I said, I'll listen. I'm listening.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it is necessary for — certainly, I am well-aware of the rules mentioned by the member opposite and carefully structured my comments to respond to the amendment — the amendment which asks for a person named in the motion to be removed — and I am going to speak to why that person was intentionally selected. I think that is exactly what the amendment is.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: The Member for Lake Laberge, on a point of order.

Point of order

Mr. Cathers: It seems like the Government House Leader is debating your ruling and attempting to intervene on the point of order that was just made after the fact. I thought that was not procedurally in order.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: Certainly, no member should be debating with the Chair, the Chair of Committee of the Whole, or the Deputy Chair of Committee of the Whole on rulings. So, there is an element of that — but the Government House Leader can continue, because she appears to be on topic right now with respect to the amendment.

Government House Leader, please.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was simply directing my comments at you, as I am required to do — and rightly so.

Research was done when contemplating this special committee and how it should be structured. Research led us to believe that this motion would be supported and that the special committee could be perhaps even at work by now. Research involved looking at former special committees or select committees, as we on in this particular side of the Legislative Assembly have not had — with the exception of the Premier — any experience with that.

Since 2000, some seven committees of this nature have been struck in this Legislative Assembly: one in 2007 on anti-smoking, one in 2008 on human rights, one in 2009 on the *Legislative Renewal Act*, another in 2009 on the *Landlord and Tenant Act*, in 2009 on the Safe Operation and Use of Off-road Vehicles —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: The Government House Leader has the floor, Member for Whitehorse Centre.

Point of order

Speaker: Member for Whitehorse Centre, on a point of order.

Ms. Hanson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just clarifying that, in fact, those are not select committees; those were special — this is a special committee, not a select committee. All of what has been cited by the member are select committees, so she is incorrectly attributing what kind of committee they were.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: Well, that is not open to the Member for Whitehorse Centre. As we all know, during the course of the four years of debate in the 34th Legislative Assembly, it is about competing narratives, and when people have the floor to provide their competing narratives, that is when they will do so. It is not tenable for members to sit and provide their competing narratives from their chairs. So, that's not on.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: The Member for Whitehorse Centre will stop her comments.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: The Member for Whitehorse Centre will cease her comments for now. Thank you.

The Government House Leader, please.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Six out of seven of those committees had a minister on the committee, so the objection that the minister should not be now on this committee rings hollow and certainly does not follow the precedent or the practice that has been set by this Legislative Assembly. The Member for Lake Laberge himself was on a select committee when he was a minister; as well, the current Leader of the Yukon Party conservatives was on a committee when he was a minister.

I will speak in a moment about the then-Minister of Justice, Ms. Marian Horne, when she was appointed to a committee regarding future legislation of the *Human Rights Act* and the Human Rights Commission.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition, on a point of order.

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, I would call the minister on Standing Order 19(c) — needless repetition. These arguments are the same as the ones that were made in the e-mail written by the Minister of Community Services that he tabled here this morning. She appears to just be reading those notes back into the record.

Speaker: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: On Standing Order 19(c), I believe that the interpretation of that particular point of order is repetition, if anything, that would have happened here within the House during this debate. I believe that the member opposite is referring to a document that, again, has not been recited here in the House. I believe that would be an incorrect point of order.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition does not have a point of order at this time. I have learned from the former Clerk of the Legislative Assembly that, even within debate on motions, if certain representations have been made at second reading, they can be made again in Committee of the Whole and they can be made again at third reading.

So, the repetition rule does not apply. In any event, we haven't had this repetition that I can recall on the record in Hansard with respect to this motion.

The Government House Leader, please.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I think that the point here is that, in previous committees of this Legislative Assembly, in six out of seven in the last 20 years, ministers were on that committee. Parties were allowed to choose who they wanted to be on that committee. I would like to draw a parallel with one particular situation and focus on one such precedent, because it is almost a direct parallel to the particular matter that is before us — to the motion and to the amendment to the motion to remove the Minister of Community Services.

Back in August of 2008, a select committee on human rights was formed with three members — one from each party — including the Minister of Justice. To be clear, the Minister of Justice is responsible for the issues of human rights, and the Human Rights Commission appointments and other work falls under the authority of the Minister of Justice here in the territory. On that motion, there were three speakers — one from the then-governing party, one from the opposition, and, in fact, the minister herself spoke to the motion. Government members spoke for some 20 minutes. The Yukon Liberal member spoke for some 20 minutes and the Yukon NDP did not speak on that motion at all. After the three members spoke — some 40

minutes of debate — the motion passed, with the responsible minister as a member of the three-person committee. There were no amendments, no one spoke against the motion, and there was no recorded vote.

The Yukon Party member at the time — the Member for Klondike — and the mover of the motion went on to say — and I quote: “We want this legislation to reflect the values of all parties...”

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition, on a point of order.

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, I would have to call the minister on Standing Order 19(b), because it doesn't appear to me that she's speaking to the amendment at all at this point in time.

Speaker: If the Leader of the Official Opposition is referring specifically to the amendment, then as I've stated before, we're likely governed more by Standing Order 35(b), I suppose, because that seems to be the Standing Order that is specific to amendments. In any event, I take your point.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Just on the point of order, Mr. Speaker — on Standing Order 19(b), I think that it's a delicate situation. Based on what has been past practice — at least, even in this particular part of the Sitting, listening to debate by some members — quite robust debate by certain individuals. It seems that a lot of context is being built in those debates. I think that it would be in contravention of how we've looked at things to date — even since early October — if we were to believe that this was veering away from the type of debates that we've had since starting a couple of months ago.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: I think that the main issue is still the Government House Leader's contributions to this debate — as to why the words “the Hon. Minister of Community Services” should or ought to or ought not to be deleted. I'm listening, but I think that this is still the subject matter of her contribution so far.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I'll start again with a quote from the then-Yukon Party member when debating that motion that I've just described — and I quote: “We want this legislation to reflect the values of all parties, and most of all, all Yukon citizens.

“When this work is done, involving all stakeholders, we will have a piece of legislation that all parties can support and be proud of, and I look forward to the support of all members for this motion.”

The then-minister went on to note that they would be holding public hearings and that Yukoners would be given an opportunity to speak on the very important issue that was before them. As I've noted, that motion passed with very few comments and little debate, and it was one in which the minister

directly responsible for that area of the law and that area of legislation was on that committee.

It seemed like a good idea at the time. There were no — certainly not that I'm aware of — difficulties with that process.

The Minister of Community Services — this amendment suggests that this person be removed — the wording “be removed” from this motion — and, in fact, be replaced with a selection of the private members. Each of the parties of this House has the opportunity in participating in this process, Mr. Speaker, of choosing who they want to send to do this work. I think that's fair. I think that's equitable. I don't truly understand the objection, other than perhaps some personal situations — but I don't think that's an appropriate conversation to have here. Each of the parties should be able to choose who they wish to do this important work.

I can tell you that the Minister of Community Services is not terribly keen on having been chosen with respect to this motion coming forward. But what is incredibly important is that Yukoners know why he was chosen. It is important that we have a select committee that listens to Yukoners about what they would like to see in our emergency legislation. The minister brings expertise, experience, opportunities in professional work — he comes with an open mind. He has an extraordinary —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

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

Mr. Cathers: It appears to me that, pursuant to Standing Order 35(b), the minister is not confining debate to the subject of the amendment. She is, however, quoting from the instruction e-mail sent out from the Minister of Community Services to the Liberal members.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: So, I'm listening, and it seems like we're still on the topic of why — the Government House Leader, the member who currently has the floor, is taking the position as to whether clause 1 of the amendment to Motion No. 212 — the Hon. Minister of Community Services, as I cannot name that person in the House — whether those words or that person ought to or ought not to be deleted. I believe that the member is still within that subject matter.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: In case the members opposite didn't hear, I was extolling the virtues — exactly, that's what I was doing — of the Minister of Community Services and why he has been chosen by our government to do this work on behalf of Yukoners.

He has expertise. He has experience. He is a professional. He comes with an open mind. He has an extraordinary work ethic, and he is the one person, frankly, who knows more about this process and the legislation than probably anyone in this Legislative Assembly. Again, I go back to the opportunity for each of the other parties to choose whoever they want to send to do this work, and why they should want to choose who we want to send to do this work is a strange situation for me.

I mean, earlier, we heard the Member for Lake Laberge indicating that Yukoners would want expertise and that they would want the best possible result. He also indicated that he was concerned that somehow this work would not be properly done — that we were casting aspersions on them. I actually think that it is exactly the opposite, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Lake Laberge is indicating what they have concerns about because, in fact, they are interested in picking the person who we would be able to choose to do this work. I'm not sure why they would. They should pick their own person; the NDP should pick their own person. The three people should come together and do the work.

One of the criticisms, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Community Services for being on this committee — I guess there was also a criticism earlier that I forgot regarding electoral reform — was that he had previously expressed an opinion on some aspects of those issues. In this case — in this amendment and in this motion — we have the Official Opposition, the conservative Yukon Party, having tabled a bill to amend this legislation.

As I've mentioned earlier, it is appropriate that they are now saying that they want to hear from Yukoners, but that's not what they've done here. They've tabled a bill in this Legislative Assembly to change the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*. They are clearly proposing that the —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

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

Mr. Cathers: Pursuant to Standing Order 35(b), the minister is taking a lot of latitude, and it's also bizarre that she's portraying a bill that seeks public consultation as one that is somehow excluding the public. But the minister is well off the track of the amendment to the motion tabled by the Third Party. She has had a lot of latitude this afternoon.

Speaker: The Government House Leader, on the point of order.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I would say, of course, that it is not a point of order. I certainly understand that the members opposite disagree with what I am saying — and they are entitled to do that, but I am also entitled to say it during my submissions to you on an amendment to a motion that is on the floor of this House.

Speaker: The Member for Whitehorse Centre, on the point of order.

Ms. Hanson: I will try again with Standing Order 19(b). The minister may be speaking to an amendment but not to the amendment that is before us today. There were previous amendments made by the Yukon Party. That is not the amendment. The amendment that was put forward by me is not what is being spoken to by the member opposite at the moment.

Speaker: I think we're almost done here, but the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Just a quick question, Mr. Speaker, on the process —

Speaker: On the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Yes, on the point of order — based on the practice of the House, we have sat here over and over again, and during that, what we have seen is a tremendous amount of latitude. What we have seen from our colleagues is not being in a situation — there — that will probably quiet things down.

What we have seen in the past is real latitude and a cordial response from this side of the House on letting individuals continue to go on and not having three, four, five, or six points of orders.

I guess that, if the rules are changing, the rules will change.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: Yes, I think that I have heard a fair bit of debate on the submissions on the points of order from all members, but my memory is fading now.

What I will say is that what I was hearing from the Government House Leader was her commenting on some of the comments made by the Member for Lake Laberge in his comments on this amendment, and obviously there is some latitude to respond. However, I will continue to listen. I would certainly remind all members that the comments should be confined to the subject matter of the proposed amendment, if at all possible.

Government House Leader, please.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to the bill introduced by the Yukon Party to amend the *Civil Emergency Measures Act*, I say again that this is the first time we have heard today that they are interested in hearing from Yukoners. Hopefully, they will agree to participate in a committee struck for that purpose.

We clearly are intending to hear from Yukoners. The member opposite had criticized that intention clearly during his submissions on this amendment. We didn't really see how that was appropriate, but nonetheless, it is appropriate to engage Yukoners in this process and to hear from them moving forward. I have made the point clearly that the intention of the motion — in fact, the stated words of the motion don't have anything to do with the report card. They don't have anything to do with looking back. They don't have anything to do with anything except engaging Yukoners on how we could get the best possible law going forward. They will, of course, have great opinions, ideas, and comments on that. This is the work that needs to be done. That is how we are proposing to do this work: a three-person committee. Each party gets to pick the person that they choose to send and do this work and that group of individuals will choose who will be their chair.

Our focus as a government, Mr. Speaker, and as a Legislative Assembly should be how we can best support Yukoners through this pandemic and focus on the health and safety of Yukoners. I am submitting to us all that we move forward together to listen to Yukoners through this committee, that we hear what they think, and that we serve them well about what we have learned and what we can do better in the future.

I certainly appreciate that there are other opinions. The three parties should and could come together by individually choosing who they want to do this work. The motion was clear.

There was no intention to hide who it was we were choosing. We clearly put thought and research and intention into this motion and have brought it to the floor of this Legislative Assembly. We truly hope that the other parties will support it. We will not be supporting the amendment.

Speaker: Are you prepared for the question on the proposed amendment to Motion No. 212?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Disagree.

Hon. Ms. Frost: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Disagree.

Mr. Adel: Disagree.

Mr. Hutton: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Disagree.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Disagree.

Mr. Gallina: Disagree.

Mr. Hassard: Agree.

Mr. Kent: Agree.

Mr. Cathers: Agree.

Mr. Istchenko: Agree.

Ms. McLeod: Agree.

Ms. White: Agree.

Ms. Hanson: Agree.

Paired: Hon. Ms. McLean and Ms. Van Bibber

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are seven yea, eight nay.

Speaker: The nays have it. I declare the amendment defeated.

Amendment to Motion No. 212 negatived

Speaker: Is there any further debate on the main motion?

Ms. White: Now, speaking to this sadly unamended motion, a lot of the thoughts that I have are the same — mainly that the Minister responsible for the CEMA legislation has put himself down on the committee. We have concerns that this will hold up the process, for a whole bunch of different reasons.

I think there are so many reasons why the Minister responsible for Community Services would be an excellent witness, including the fact that, for the last nine months, he has been immersed in this legislation and because he is so close and because he is so involved. We also know that we are still currently in a pandemic. We have just extended the state of emergency. This one goes until March; we might have to extend it past that. Knowing that — this special committee that is being proposed by government is scheduled to report at the end of August 2021.

You know, having witnessed, for example, the Select Committee Regarding the Risks and Benefits of Hydraulic

Fracturing, I can say that was a blistering schedule, watching from the outside, and there was no way that it would have been able to complete that work in that short a time, especially nine months into what it is looking at, which is the state of emergency.

I have concerns, because if an election was to happen before the committee reports, then the committee would be dissolved and the work done by the committee would be lost. We have heard how important it is that the committee hear from Yukoners about their concerns, their thoughts, and suggestions — whether they were good or bad — or what worked and what didn't, and all that collection of information would be lost, and that is of concern.

You know, we in the NDP caucus had said — when we were talking about land use planning, when we were going through the whole Peel debacle — how could you ask people to participate freely? How could you ask people to participate when they don't believe in the land use planning process anymore because of what happened there? Here is an example of government getting ready to set up a committee that it is going to be asking for people's information and going out and asking for input — and to know that this could be lost if an election was called before is worrisome.

So, before we engage in a committee like this and put the time and energy into this work — because we believe that it needs both lots of time and energy — we need to know that the government is serious and that they won't throw out the work of this committee just because they have the ability to call an election. Because again, we know that, in our current system, the ruling party has the ability to call an election.

So, I have one question for the minister — or any minister for that matter, if anyone else chooses to get up to speak — and I'm looking for a direct answer, because one thing that we've come to understand during this pandemic is that people need certainty. They are looking for certainty. They're looking for the ability to plan.

So, if we go forward with this motion and this committee is struck, does that mean that this government is committing not to call an election until this committee has completed its work in August 2021?

Mr. Hassard: I rise briefly today to share my objection to this motion.

Mr. Speaker, we've made our position on this motion abundantly clear. From the outset, we've indicated that the process that the Liberals are proposing is certainly flawed. In fact, we believe that it's nothing more than a sham being rigged by the Premier and the Liberal Cabinet.

We all agree that CEMA needs to be amended. We've proposed numerous areas where we want to see a legislative change. But inserting the minister who is responsible for implementing the CEMA into a committee designed to review how CEMA has worked clearly, Mr. Speaker, puts the minister in a conflict.

Now, we recognize that the Minister of Community Services will have some significant input into this process. As the Member for Takhini-Kopper King has just said, it would be

very important to have the Minister of Community Services testify before the committee — and probably even be the first and number one witness. But to have him as one of the three members of the committee — it really makes this process flawed.

Our position in this respect was really only confirmed when we received the internal e-mails this morning from the minister showing that the whole thing was being orchestrated by him — the Minister of Community Services. He is manipulating the process, the debate, and ultimately the outcome of all of this from beginning to end, Mr. Speaker.

Now, it's quite clear that the minister's and this government's intentions are not in good faith. The minister wants to be on this committee. Even though the Minister of Justice insists that he doesn't, it is pretty clear that he does. He has written the speeches and he has done the research to give to his colleagues so that they have the material that they need to support his position. He even says that he is going to slip them quotes and speeches to reference. It is pretty clear that this minister has everything nicely and neatly lined up. They know that they have a majority. They know that they can force this motion through, as they have in the past.

But one thing that was surprising about the e-mails that we received this morning was who was and wasn't included on the e-mails. It is pretty clear whose input the minister wanted and whose he did not and who was actually in the loop about the plans and who was not. Over the past few months in the Legislature and throughout the summer, we have come forward with numerous proposals for multi-party work related to this pandemic. We have even proposed a select committee of our own. We have proposed motions. We have put forward friendly amendments to Liberal motions. We even proposed motions that specifically state our support for the Liberal government's position.

It was just last week that we offered a motion that would strengthen the Liberals' position regarding the per capita allocation of vaccines for COVID-19. Each and every time that the opposition or the Third Party have proposed anything at all, the Liberal government has used its majority to shoot it down. I wasn't entirely surprised that the Liberal government used their majority to vote down the amendment that we just voted on — the proposed amendment that was proposed by the Third Party. It certainly fits with the government's perfect record of voting against every single motion, amendment, or proposal that either of the opposition parties has proposed. It certainly fits with the government's perfect record of voting against every single motion, amendment, or proposal that either of the opposition parties has proposed since the spring. We know that they are going to use their majority again today. I would be very surprised if they don't ram this through, just as they continue to show the way they have done things.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is unless one of their non-government members stands up and refuses to continue to be part of this flawed process and biased process.

I will remind all members that it is the job of non-government MLAs, whether they are on this side of the House or that side of the House, to hold the government to account.

That is what we were all elected by our constituents and communities to do. That is how our system is supposed to work. The executive branch is accountable to the legislative branch.

So, do members of this House really think that the way to objectively and impartially review how the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* is working is to have the minister whose job has been to implement the *Civil Emergency Measures Act* sit on the committee? It is simply impossible for an objective, non-biased review from this minister — especially while the state of emergency is still ongoing and that same minister is still currently exercising powers under this exact act.

Do members of this House think that the minister can look back at his actions over the past nine months and be critical and objective about them? Is it in the best interests of Yukoners and Yukon communities for the minister to be thrown into such a conflicted position? Is it in the best interests of Yukoners and Yukon communities to have the minister diverting his attention to be on this committee when he should be focused on the emergency and protecting our communities?

We know that he is just working with what he has got and that he will have useful input, but that input — as I have said before and as the Member for Takhini-Kopper King has said — should come as a witness to the committee, not as a voting member.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's quite clear that we will be voting against this motion and the flawed process that it represents. The evidence to date suggests that, in its current design, it's nothing more than a sham and the results are being orchestrated.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will ask all members to remember one thing when they are voting, and that is to do the right thing for Yukoners and Yukon communities.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I have some brief comments, but based on some of the discussion that has happened here today, I think it's important to note that what is now being described as a "flawed process" by the Yukon Party opposition is the process that they used six out of seven times in the last 20 years or so. They used a few of those six out of seven — they weren't always in government.

The precedent of this Legislative Assembly, as I said, was researched in determining how to best set up this process. We indicated that the research brought forward that kind of information, certainly, by way of knowing that this had been done on many occasions before — many of the members sitting opposite were, in fact, ministers who headed up committees like this.

On the questions about the integrity of the Minister of Community Services and his abilities to do this work, I feel extremely strongly that he is the one person who can bring an objective eye to this role because he has the expertise. He has also been accused of being in a conflict of interest. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. There is no conflict of interest here. There is no personal gain. He is doing the work on behalf of Yukoners that he has had to do every day and night, seven days a week, since March and will continue to do on their behalf.

Yukoners will want to have —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: The Government House Leader has the floor.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Yukoners will want to have expertise, Mr. Speaker, to get the best possible result. The vehement opposition to this particular person — that the opposition party should be able to choose who we would send to do this work — but the structure of the committee is that each party would choose who they wish to send. All are entitled to do so in a free and democratic society. Individuals are, of course, open to having their own opinions. There have been some opinions cast about from a —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Member for Lake Laberge, on a point of order.

Mr. Cathers: This appears to be needless repetition by the minister. We've heard this speech from her before when she was speaking to the amendment and straying to cover topics that really were not related to the amendment.

Speaker: The Government House Leader, on the point of order.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I'm assuming that the member opposite wasn't listening. I hadn't spoken before about conflict of interest, about opinions, about the things that I had been speaking about. Nonetheless, I am now speaking to the main motion. I am almost finished with my remarks, but clearly they are not being welcomed.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: There has been an element of repetition, but I think that, speaking on the main motion, there is certainly some latitude. The main motion contains a lot more subject material than the amendment, so the Government House Leader can continue and I'll certainly continue to listen closely.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Lastly, I'm concerned with the criticism from the Yukon Party that we somehow don't want to work with the other parties — actually, maybe it is from both parties. Clearly, in my view, it's the Yukon Party that doesn't want to work with us. There are some real questions about why they would object so vehemently to the Minister of Community Services being on this committee. I have heard their submissions and their debate. We will no doubt agree to disagree. In my submission to this Legislative Assembly, I ask that we strike the committee, that we get to work on behalf of Yukoners, and that we listen to them so that we ultimately have a strong piece of legislation that will take us into the future.

Speaker: Is there further debate on Motion No. 212?
If the member now speaks, he will close debate.
Does any other member wish to be heard?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: First of all, I want to start by acknowledging some things that I think are positive out of this process. What I understand from all parties is that everyone here believes that there are ways to improve this act.

Second of all, what I hear is that a select committee — or a way to listen to Yukoners — is important — a special committee. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say just a few things, and I recognize that members of the opposition have expressed concern that my party has asked me to be the person to come forward. I was the one who suggested that we go for a select committee, and I brought forward the motion; thus, my name is there. I will just read, for a moment, from my e-mail that I sent this morning to the Chief of Staff for the Yukon Party. I didn't mean to, but I did, and after I did that, I thought, "Well, okay, let me share it with the Chief of Staff of the NDP as well." Then I suggested to our team that we send it out to the media so that everyone can see it.

I will now quote from it: "The other thing I ask that you emphasize is about me on the committee." Sorry, Mr. Speaker — just for context — this is me writing to the Minister of Justice, who I knew would be speaking to the amendment. "The other thing I ask that you emphasize is about me on the committee. Explain that when the amendment(s) came forward, I expressed that I would be happy to step down, that the more important thing is that we have a select committee to listen to Yukoners about what they would like to see for our emergency legislation."

So, that is what the members opposite are talking about as me "orchestrating things". What I was doing was what I believe is my job — is to go off and research the motion, to research Hansard to look at what has happened here in past legislatures. I have not viewed this as a review of what has been happening. I think that is a critical thing to happen — a review of that. I think that something like Public Accounts is a great way to do that. I think that there are many ways that I think that it is important to hear from Yukoners about their concerns about how we have navigated through this pandemic.

Trust me, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is fair to say that there will be things that could have done better. I can't imagine anyone navigating through something this new and challenging without making some missteps. One of mine — again, I sincerely apologize for it — was to send an e-mail with that research work to the Liberal MLAs and miss that I was sending it to you. That was not — pardon me, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: You're addressing the Chair. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Pardon me. Mr. Speaker, I sent that to you. That was a mistake, and I apologize to you and to all members of the Legislature for that.

I also was attempting to send something to my colleague, the Member for Copperbelt North, whose first name happens to be the same first name as the chief of staff for the Yukon Party. I sent it in the wrong direction. All right. I don't believe that there is anything in there that is incorrect. I went off and researched how committees have been struck here in the past. I looked to try to see those instances. But was I trying to make this about me? No. Again, I encourage everyone to read it. I am not worried that I was doing that work. I think that work is only appropriate. In fact, I hope everyone does it.

What I do think is important here is that we find a way to look at this act. I think that all members of the Legislature have

good ideas. So, my suggestion was that we put together a special committee and that we make it two opposition members and one from the government side to show or provide that opportunity so that it is not purely the government side and that we could think about this from a longer perspective — over time, what would serve Yukoners best? I have pointed out in this House that there are other things that I think are missing. It isn't just about whether there is the opportunity for all MLAs to vote on the extension of this state of emergency. I think that there are many other things that are worthy of improving upon with this piece of legislation. During Committee of the Whole, I made comments here about that.

The Leader of the Third Party asked a question — she raised a valid concern. We don't know when the next election is. I've heard the Premier say that, right now, the focus is on this pandemic — okay. So, I don't know when that election is, but I think that is a valid point. I think the way to do it is, once the committee does come together — and I still hope ardently that the Official Opposition will be an active participant on that committee — that what happens is we talk about how to make sure that we can get interim findings or something tabled so that nothing is lost.

So, Mr. Speaker —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker: Yes, the Minister of Community Services has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Thank you. So, I think there are many ways in which we can make sure that the information is not lost and I think that it will be a valuable process regardless.

What I've heard from the members opposite is that they want to see some changes to this act, that they want to contribute, that they want to help serve Yukoners, and that they want to bring forward their ideas. Even though they disagree with my participation on this particular committee, their concern seems to be that I'm the minister responsible.

In history, we see that this was never a concern previously. Okay. We keep saying, "Let's do this. Let's look at the act. Let's find other ways to do a review." So, I don't know which way the parties will vote today. I will note for all members of the Legislature — in fact, I will table — again, I've been looking at how many times we vote in this Legislature and I have counted up — not counting yesterday, but to date, we have 223 votes in this Legislature. Of those 223 votes, 117 — 52 percent — have been unanimous. I will note that one quarter of the time —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Member for Lake Laberge, on a point of order.

Mr. Cathers: The minister seems to be talking to something other than the question under discussion. Also, his time would be much better spent managing the pandemic than counting votes or the number of words in Hansard.

Speaker: Government House Leader, on the point of order.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: The Leader of the Official Opposition opened this door when he spoke about how certain votes were always challenged by the government. He opened the door when he spoke about the way in which parties have voted. I think that it is appropriate that the member speaking is able to respond in that way.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: During the course of the debate of Motion No. 212, there certainly have been contributions by members about the narrative that there has been a lack of cooperation by the government side or a lack of support. I have certainly heard that both today and when we started with this in early October.

So, yes, there certainly is some latitude and some ability for the Minister of Community Services to provide his narrative on that topic.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: As I was saying, so far, I have recorded 223 recorded votes in this Legislature. Of those recorded votes, 117 of them have been unanimous; 55 of them — roughly one-quarter — have been the government voting on its own; 44 — roughly one-fifth — have been the Yukon Party voting on its own — not that different. I will happily go back and find —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition, on a point of order.

Mr. Hassard: I would call a point of order on Standing Order 19(e) on the minister — "reflects upon any vote of the Assembly unless it is that member's intention to move that it be rescinded".

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: I will return to the House with more fulsome and complete reasons, if needed. Certainly, with respect to the House, for the member, it is certainly open to the members to reflect that certain votes took place.

Like I said, I will review Hansard. I will speak to the Clerks-at-the-Table on this topic, but the fact that votes took place is not, in my view, running afoul of Standing Order 19(e). The reflection is looking at it from a substantive or qualitative — such as "I have an opinion that the House ought not to have taken that approach on that vote." That is offside of Standing Order 19(e).

Like I said, I will likely come back and provide a more detailed statement on that topic, but the very fact that certain votes have occurred, in my view on the fly, does not run afoul of Standing Order 19(e).

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Finally, with respect to the history of support — or lack of support — I will go back and find amendments that have been brought forward by the members opposite that we have supported. I do all of this — I measure these things. I have said that previously. The members opposite

seem to be concerned that I am looking back through Hansard and looking at things. It just makes me want to do it more.

I am happy to table all of that. If the members find some time that I am shirking my duties as a minister — or on this select committee or in any other role — please, by all means, feel free to bring that criticism to me. I am happy to receive it. I feel that there is a process here in this Legislature and outside of this Legislature where members opposite provide criticism that helps improve the work overall. I think that this is the point. I hope that I have been open to that criticism. I actually have had some of that conversation with my wife — about whether or not I am open to criticism and whether I am serving Yukoners well in that regard. Maybe I can be criticized about how I'm receiving criticism — fair enough.

The most important thing that I started off with — out of my own remarks, which I emailed all over the place this morning — is that on December 8 —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The one that I'm referring to, Mr. Speaker, is the e-mail from this morning —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Speaker's statement

Speaker: We are not having a conversation here.

Standing Order 17 — as we know, every contribution that a member makes is through the Chair.

I am listening to the Minister of Community Services. He is closing debate on Motion No. 212. We are not having a conversation between the members.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, I will redouble my efforts to focus solely on the conversation that I am having with you and the remarks that I am making to you.

This morning I sent an e-mail around in all sorts of directions. In that e-mail, I emphasized that the most important thing is that we get an opportunity to strike a committee that will listen to Yukoners. That is the most important thing.

I appreciate that members opposite have expressed concern about my involvement on that committee. However, what I hope that we do is get to the committee so that we can hear from Yukoners, because that is the most important thing.

Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Frost: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Agree.

Mr. Adel: Agree.

Mr. Hutton: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Agree.

Mr. Gallina: Agree.

Mr. Hassard: Disagree.

Mr. Kent: Disagree.

Mr. Cathers: Disagree.

Mr. Istchenko: Disagree.

Ms. McLeod: Disagree.

Ms. White: Disagree.

Ms. Hanson: Disagree.

Paired: Hon. Ms. McLean and Ms. Van Bibber

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are eight yea, seven nay.

Speaker: The yeas have it. I declare the motion carried.
Motion No. 212 agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair (Mr. Hutton): Order, please.

The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 55, Department Highways and Public Works, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

Bill No. 205 — *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 55, Department of Highways and Public Works, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*.

Is there any further general debate?

Mr. Mostyn has 15 minutes and 36 seconds.

Department of Highways and Public Works — continued

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I won't take that long. I want to thank my officials for once again showing up to support me as I answer questions on this supplementary budget. Again, we have a total of about \$30 million worth of items on our books for this discussion — roughly just a little over \$20 million for capital, which is a decrease; and we have about \$11.5 million in O&M spending. I am more than happy to talk about those numbers which are the subject of this debate this afternoon.

I am also — in the spirit of openness, transparency, and democracy — willing to answer questions on any other matters that the members opposite may wish to ask.

I know that yesterday, my good friend, the Member for Whitehorse Centre, had expressed that she had more questions, and so I did ask that I have my officials come back today to answer the questions that she had remaining. So, I am more than happy to open the floor to those questions.

Ms. Hanson: I thank the officials for being here today with the minister. When we left off, the minister was being very happy about the question I had asked him with respect to brushing. I just want to get three points of clarification from the minister with respect to that. So, the minister had said that the government now uses five categories for brushing, so I would appreciate it if he could elaborate on what those five categories are and how they accommodate the differences in, say, communities that are adjacent to the various highways or roadways in the territory.

So, for example, the accommodation that is made for a community like the residential neighbourhoods along Fox Lake — where we and you, Mr. Chair, and I have for many, many years seen the transformation of the north Klondike Highway — it's not configured as it was 40 years ago. People's residences have been built up over those many years and may or may not — maybe even inadvertently — be closer to the right-of-way than they thought they were. What does that do to affect the quality of life and also the tourism values of places like that? I raise that in the context of trying to understand whether or not these standards are intended to be standard or if they accommodate — as we've seen across Canada with the Trans-Canada Highway and others — the changes to roadways — with the Trans-Canada, again — if you, as I have as a child, have driven across this country in the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, 2000s, 2010s, and 2020s, you have seen the changes and some of the ways the road has morphed, but the accommodation has been made over time for communities and nearby residences so that their quality of life is not affected.

I am interested in that — and related to that brushing, the total budget of the 2019-20 — the total expended — and then the 2020-21 budget and expenditures to date for brushing.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: First, I would like to correct the Member for Whitehorse Centre. As I said yesterday, they are not five categories of brushing; they are five categories of highways. Those five categories of highways are determined by socio-economic factors, traffic volumes, tourism impacts, and economic impacts. All those criteria went into the designations of our highways. There are now five classifications of highways in the territory, and each one of those have levels of service that we will assign to those highways. So, they're not brushing categories.

The five categories of highways will — some of the things that we will look at, as far as maintaining, will be lines — how often we paint the lines on the road. We will look at safety features — i.e. barriers that we put along certain categories of highways and which categories of highway get those safety features implemented first. Brushing is another criterion that we will work into which category of highway gets brushed

more often — and wider or less wide. Also, lane delineation — things such as reflectors — which category of highway will get reflectors and where they'll get them.

As I said in my opening, the current issues that we have in the supplementary budget are about \$11.5 million in O&M spending and about \$20 million in capital spending that we're discussing today. I will endeavour to get the member opposite the numbers for the brushing contract for 2019-20 and 2020-21.

The last question that the Member for Whitehorse Centre was asking this afternoon had to do with the accommodations that we're going to make for communities. So, when we were brushing along certain communities — in Crag Lake recently and other places — we actually — I know that my colleague, the MLA for the area, and I went out to Crag Lake and met with residents. I actually had a measuring tape that we used — the two of us — and bushwhacked through the highway right-of-way to actually delineate the amount of space between the highway centre line, the side of the highway, and the residences. We then went back to the department and spoke to them, and in the end, the engineers went out and took a look at the roads and started to change or at least reduce, in some cases, the recommended brushing width from 20 metres to 15 metres from the centre line.

Where the posted speed limit is above 50 kilometres an hour, the minimum brushing zone requirement remains at 7.5 metres from the shoulder and brushing should remain at 10 metres.

So, we are looking at traffic safety. We are also looking at the condition of the road, the slope of the road, the slope of the road away from the shoulder — and the slope up from the shoulder will also inform the decisions that our engineers make. We have actually started to look at how we have dealt with some of these areas. That has become part of the common approach that we're having, and we will apply the same principles — as I have spoken to the departmental officials. The accommodations that we have made in places such as Tagish will now become the norm as we move up the highway and run into other areas where people's homes, businesses, and cottages are affected.

I have rough numbers, Mr. Chair. Since 2019, \$6.5 million has been allocated to the program. We have brushed more than 750 kilometres along Yukon highways, 5.5 kilometres of new barriers have been installed, and approximately 2,000 kilometres of highway lines have been painted. We are moving toward a total of 5,000 kilometres as the goal, and we are well on our way to accomplishing that goal.

Ms. Hanson: I surely hope that the residents in other areas of the Yukon don't have to rely upon having to prevail upon ministers — or sitting Cabinet ministers who serve as the MLAs for the region — to have to come out and tape measure to prove that it is important that their private properties and their businesses be protected.

I have a couple of questions with respect to the HPW role, as the government owner of properties and leaser of properties. The minister — in responding to the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin, I believe, in commenting about Macaulay Lodge — said that it was not fit for renovation.

My question is: What are the current O&M costs of maintaining that building, as it has been, for the last number of years, vacant with lights on?

The second part of the Macaulay Lodge question is: Did Highways and Public Works — or did the Department of Justice consult with Highways and Public Works with a view to using it as an alternative to the ARC? The Minister of Highways and Public Works will recall that, as a result of the widening of the highway and other reasons, the Salvation Army withdrew from providing that service to the Yukon, and alternatives needed to be found. One of the questions that I have is: What whole-of-government conversations occurred to look at the possibility — at least on a temporary basis — of using that currently lit — and apparently heated, because it doesn't look like there are pipes freezing or running out — facility for the transition services for people? They are men, in this case. One of the criteria that Justice had told was that they wanted to be on a bus route and close to community services, so a normalized lifestyle. Those are two aspects of the question with respect to Macaulay Lodge.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: As I told the Leader of the Official Opposition during Question Period, I believe, we completed a building condition assessment and feasibility study report on Macaulay Lodge in May 2020. That report considered renovating and repurposing Macaulay Lodge as housing or office mixed-use space. That report indicates that repurposing Macaulay Lodge to housing or office mixed-use space is not financially viable. As a result, we did not consider Macaulay Lodge as a site for the ARC.

If we're going to house people from the justice community in a new place, we're not going to do it in a building that is in that state. Fixing it up — the cost estimate to renovate the facility into housing is approximately \$15 million, which includes \$1 million worth of hazardous material remediation. Of course, once you start doing a renovation in a building such as that and start to encounter these hazardous materials, it could become even worse. So, no, we did not consider putting the ARC in that building.

I can tell the member opposite — because my colleague, the Minister of Community Services, and I, on another one of our outings, did actually tour Macaulay Lodge, checking it out for potential use during the Arctic Winter Games. I can report that the interior of the building is really in very, very poor shape. I'm going by memory, but I believe that one of the shower facilities in there was not even operational. There is a lot of work that needs to be done to that building. It really is not in very good shape, and Highways and Public Works came to that conclusion as well after a full review of the study.

Now, the member opposite has asked me for the O&M costs for that building. I'm going to get that information. It's not part of the supplementary budget, but I will endeavour to get the member opposite an answer to that question. I had hoped it would come in while I was speaking, but it has not yet. When I get that answer, I will certainly relay it to the member opposite.

Ms. Hanson: I appreciate the undertaking by the minister to relay that information.

On a related matter, can the minister provide an update on the status of the former women's correctional facility located adjacent to the Whitehorse Correctional Centre that was designed to have bedrooms rather than cells and that has been sitting vacant? It was used by Teegatha'Oh Zheh for housing disabled adults. Can the Minister of Highways and Public Works please tell us what the current status of that building is? Similarly, what is the cost of keeping it empty?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: My officials have informed me that the status of Takhini Haven is still an ongoing discussion between Health and Social Services and Justice. I can tell the member opposite that the facility is part of the upgrade we are running as the new wood boiler expansion at the jail and part of the district heating system we are putting in place there. Takhini Haven will be benefitting from that upgrade that was funded in part by us and the federal government.

As far as the final use of that building, I believe that those discussions are ongoing between Health and Social Services and Justice.

Ms. Hanson: I thank the minister for that. I am assuming by the minister's response that, in fact, there has been an inspection and that he can dispel the rumours on the street that the building has been condemned. That would be very helpful to have clarified.

Can the minister provide us with an update on the status of the amendments to the *Motor Vehicles Act*? It has been well over a year. We recall that there were over 300 issues identified with respect to the *Motor Vehicles Act*. We have heard many, many times from this minister about the imperative of getting this new act to improve public safety and make laws easier to enforce. It needs to be updated, so we have been waiting to hear when that would be happening. That is probably the second last question that I have.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I thank the member opposite for the question this afternoon about the *Motor Vehicles Act* rewrite. As members in this House are well aware, the *Motor Vehicles Act* has not been significantly updated since it was first implemented in 1977.

Rewriting this piece of legislation is necessary to improve safety for all road users on Yukon highways. This new legislation will allow us to address long-standing issues with the existing act. It is a large and complex piece of legislation. It touches on a wide range of issues important to Yukoners. I have no doubt that all members of this House have heard many, many complaints about traffic in the territory.

I believe that rewriting this piece of legislation is a foundational piece that will address many, many of the concerns we hear about on an if not daily, then weekly basis. We hear about noise of vehicles, the speeding, the intoxicated people driving impaired, and distracted driving. Of course, there are concerns and issues — and not concerns so much as — well, speeding — I mean, all of these things can be addressed with a new piece of legislation.

We've spoken and I think we agree that this work is vital for the territory. I know the police officers who I have spoken to — from Beaver Creek to Watson Lake and points in between — are very, very glad that we are actually taking on this task

because they say that enforcing the existing act is a nightmare. I know that judges have said the same thing.

It's an important piece of work. The work to rewrite the act is underway — well underway. Public engagements have taken place in 2019, with more than 2,800 responses provided by the public. I have just recently issued a letter to First Nation leaders and leaders of municipalities asking for more feedback. We're committed to working with our stakeholders — including municipalities and First Nation governments — to update this important legislation and make our roads safer.

In the letter that we have just sent out to First Nation leaders and communities, we have indicated that we are working very hard to fuse both the introduction of the legislation and the regulations together.

I know that is an issue that the member opposite — even as late as last week — was talking about — that we should endeavour to get the legislation and regulations together. Our Justice minister and I agree that this is something that — we have seen the lag between the ATIPP act passing and the regulations coming into play. We really want to bring those two things together. It is an issue that the member opposite has raised. I fully agree with her that it is frustrating to have these really progressive, solid pieces of legislation be passed by this House and then have a lag with the implementation. We are going to bring the *Motor Vehicles Act* and the regulations together, and we hope to have all of that work done — I believe the deadline I said in the letter was 2023.

Ms. Hanson: I am not sure — that is quite an underwhelming response — a five-year process to get amendments to legislation — “a vital piece of legislation”, as I just heard the minister say — that is pretty sad. I fully anticipate — I'm reacting because I anticipated that the minister was going to tell us that this legislation would be brought forward in the spring, so I guess I'm disappointed.

On a happier note, Mr. Chair — we raised many, many times concerns about the safety in Hillcrest — my old stomping grounds — for the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists crossing. We heard that it wasn't possible to make it safer because there wasn't anybody to fix the lights there. They are all wrapped in dark plastic. Now, according to the Hillcrest community page, the comment — a bit cheeky — but it was that they guessed they didn't need Outside electricians after all, because now we have at least flashing lights, so motorists should be aware that there may be stoplights soon.

Can the minister inform this House as to when that next step will happen — when it goes from flashing to actually operating?

Part of the issue that we keep raising is really around pedestrian and bicyclist safety. We know that we have an active transportation network that has been slowly built up in this community which encourages people to walk and to bicycle to work for fun and to get around the city. In some places — actually, it's the municipal government that has done this, but hopefully the territorial government can do it — but there are means to facilitate or assist bicyclists to cross without having to dismount, go through the snow, climb over the snow, and get to the button to push it. Apparently, at Robert Service Way,

there is a simple modification to the crossing that allows the bicyclist to not have to do all of that.

Has that been considered for the Hillcrest crossing for the Alaska Highway — something that is similar to what is available, in use, and appreciated by the cycling community at Robert Service Way?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: First of all, I would like to correct the Member for Whitehorse Centre again, because she said in her response to the *Motor Vehicles Act* — a long time to amend the act. It's not an amendment. I want to make sure that the record is clear. It's not an amendment to the existing act. It's actually a full rewrite of the legislation. It's not an amendment. It is a full rewrite of the *Motor Vehicles Act*, and it takes time.

We could actually present the legislation sooner, but we feel that, to the member opposite's point, fusing something as complicated as the *Motor Vehicles Act* with the regulations that play such an integral role in the enforcement and giving life to the legislation — that we bring them forward together. It usually takes about two years to draft the regulations on such a complicated bill.

I will note for the member opposite that — I believe it was Nova Scotia or New Brunswick — one of the Maritime provinces just recently rewrote its *Motor Vehicles Act* and took 10 years to rewrite that piece of legislation.

Our piece of legislation could be done a lot sooner, but I think that taking the time and care to actually bring the regulations and that piece of legislation together is well worth the wait.

I share the Member for Whitehorse Centre's frustration and disappointment that it's taking this long, but having worked with Justice, Highways and Public Works, and the drafters, I am confident that they are working as fast as they can to bring this forward. I have the utmost confidence in that team to deliver this work. If they say that it's taking until 2023 to bring the regulations and the legislation together, then I am confident that this is how long it will take. I have no doubt that they are working as hard and as fast as they can to deliver this piece of legislation because it is so important.

I will also note for the record that it was the Member for Whitehorse Centre who referred to the community of Hillcrest as “cheeky” — read the post from the residents of Hillcrest as “cheeky”. Yes, the light is flashing. It is flashing because we want to make sure that the lights are powered up and working before we actually bring the programmer up from down south, as required to bring it from a flashing light with no programming behind it to an actual working light on our highway.

That individual — as I said in the House in Question Period a few days ago, the Department of Highways and Public Works is working with the company to bring their technician up to program those lights. They have been talking with that company and the individual. They have come up with a plan to ensure that the individual can come up and work safely in our community, while meeting the self-isolation rules. That individual, as I understand it, is scheduled to fly up here tonight. I am hopeful that the programming of this light will be done by the end of the week. It is late, yes, but the bubble burst,

Mr. Chair, as we all know, and that forced some changes in plans and some trepidation with the company down south.

We have worked with that company and we have alleviated the concerns. I believe that the individual is scheduled to arrive here tonight, so I'm very happy to have that news for the House this afternoon. I fully expect that, if he does get on the plane and he does get here, then we should have that light functioning hopefully this week. So, there's that.

As for the cycling, as a cyclist who uses that stretch of road and who does cross at Hillcrest to come into work, when I have been cycling — and admittedly, the last month, it has been so busy that I haven't been able to get on my bike, and I have a flat currently, so that is inhibiting my biking to work. But when I fix the flat and when I get back on my bicycle — if we continue to have these nice snowy conditions and don't get a melt — and I hope to do that fairly soon — I will be crossing at Hillcrest as well, and I will certainly take a look at how it is to cross that highway.

Personally, my officials don't have the specifics about the Robert Service Way crossing, but I will endeavour to get that answer to the member opposite.

Ms. Hanson: I did say that it was one last one, but there is another one. Well, you know, time gives a different perspective, so if the minister, the Member for Whitehorse West, is lucky, in 2023, he will be sitting on this side of the House asking questions of the minister with respect to the new *Motor Vehicles Act*. Perspective is everything, actually.

One of the things that I just wanted to ask the minister to follow up on — we have had a number of conversations with respect to — according to Transport Canada and Nav Canada — the imminent cuts that are being proposed across seven airports, including Whitehorse. Today the Premier spoke about the great opportunity that is available to Yukon government and Yukon First Nation leadership because of the Yukon Days meetings, where I understand that federal Cabinet ministers, territorial Cabinet ministers, and First Nation leadership partake in meetings — as the Premier outlined this afternoon. That relates to a letter that the minister got today — along with federal ministers, as well as the Premier and the Yukon Senator, who I mentioned last week had raised this issue in the Senate transportation committee. It seems to me that this would be a matter that the proposed Nav Canada cuts at the Erik Nielsen Whitehorse International Airport, as the heading of this letter — given that this is a unified voice speaking to our federal government with Yukon Cabinet ministers and Yukon First Nation leaders meeting with their federal counterparts — the Tourism Industry Association of Yukon asked today that those cuts not occur.

They state that, with more than 400 tourism businesses — and I would note that includes Yukon First Nation tourism businesses — and 4,000 tourism employees in the Yukon, at five percent of our GDP, Yukon is the second highest in the country — and talks about the aviation sector as an essential element in the Yukon's economy.

Can the minister confirm whether or not Yukon Days meetings have — whether he, in that forum, has raised with the Transport minister, the Hon. Marc Garneau, this issue? As we

know, it's not up to Nav Canada. Nav Canada has been seeking for the federal government to assist this private sector entity. We heard last week, from the transportation committee of the Senate, that the Transport department officials at that Senate committee told our Yukon senator that the \$116-million request was not on.

Was this raised, or is it going to be raised? It's only Tuesday, so Yukon Days, I would gather — the minister can clarify this — will go on throughout the week. What advocacy has been used at this unique opportunity — a joint voice coming from Yukon First Nation leadership and the Yukon government — to raise the concerns that have been raised across the sectors, across this community, and across the territory about any proposed cuts that would impact the safety and integrity of our Whitehorse airport?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Once again, I am going to take a moment to correct the member opposite for Whitehorse Centre. The Member for Whitehorse Centre keeps talking about cuts. So far, I have not even heard officially from Nav Canada that they are going to cut anything. They are currently doing a review. The review is going to take a number of months — a long time, relatively speaking — several months. They are going to be talking to various jurisdictions across the country. Nav Canada itself is an autonomous business run to provide services to the aviation sector. It is independent of Ottawa, and it is undertaking this review itself as many aviation businesses across Canada during the pandemic have suffered grievous financial losses.

The cuts the member opposite is talking about are still hypothetical. They're doing a review. There are reaching out to the communities across Canada — there are several — and we are one of them. We will see what they have to say about that review.

I have been endeavouring to reach out to Nav Canada and the president, whom I have spoken to and will continue to speak to. I've heard just this week that they are trying as well to arrange a meeting with me. When I speak with Nav Canada officials, I will certainly make my concerns with any reduction in services to Whitehorse International Airport known.

I appreciated the letter from the Tourism Industry Association of Yukon today. I did speak with them about this issue last week in a Zoom call with the executive director and president of TIAY. We had a discussion about their thoughts and my thoughts about the review that Nav Canada is currently undertaking.

I have, as well, regular correspondence — as this government does — with our colleagues in Ottawa. The Minister of Transport is aware of our concerns with reductions in service at Nav Canada. I will continue to work very closely with my colleagues in Ottawa. I know that the Premier has also spoken about this subject with his counterparts in Ottawa — the Deputy Prime Minister, perhaps the Prime Minister whom he has been talking to very closely, and certainly other officials.

We are on this file. We know how important it is to the Tourism Industry Association of Yukon that we retain service here in Whitehorse. We are in conversations with our airlines here, including Air North, and with TIA. This week we will be

talking with Nav Canada — or in the near future we will be talking with Nav Canada when we can arrange that meeting.

My position, as I've said, is that I do not support cuts to our service levels here in Whitehorse with Nav Canada, but I am going to be talking with the officials with that institution in the very near future. I will learn more about what they're proposing and what the scope of their plans are in light of the pandemic.

So that's what I have to say about Nav Canada and its service levels this afternoon.

Ms. Hanson: Unfortunately, the question wasn't about Nav Canada. It was about whether or not at the Yukon Days meetings occurring this week — whether the minister and his colleagues, including the Premier, who indicated that this was a significant opportunity to meet with federal counterparts via Zoom, were going to use that opportunity to raise this issue with the minister responsible for Transport Canada, since they are the ones who would be looking at possibly trying to address this in the spring budget or before. Given the consequences and impact on Yukon's economy — particularly the tourism sector, which affects both First Nation and non-First Nation governments and their citizens with, as I said, 4,000 employees and five percent of the GDP. It is a simple question: Is the agenda for Yukon Days this week inclusive of a conversation about this important issue to the whole of Yukon? Can the minister simply tell us whether or not it is on the agenda?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Nav Canada is an independent agency that makes its own decisions. I will be speaking with officials from Nav Canada in the near future.

We have been speaking with our federal counterparts on support for the aviation industry. The federal government has been very supportive of our aviation industry in the territory and across the north. I am very glad and grateful for the federal support that we have received and that all of the territories have received to keep our northern aviation industry flying. That connection — from Whitehorse to Vancouver, but more importantly, Whitehorse to Old Crow to Dawson and to Mayo — is essential to this territory. The federal government recognizes that and is moving to support that.

Nav Canada is having a review. The member opposite is characterizing that as cuts to Whitehorse. That is a hypothetical, Mr. Chair. We don't know the extent of the moves that Nav Canada is going to make. Until I know what Nav Canada is proposing, I am not going to presume to know what they are asking or what they are going to do.

I have stated publicly that I support our tourism industry in the territory as a whole and that I am not supportive of service reductions in Whitehorse — cuts, perhaps — that would hurt our aviation sector. I am going to be working with Nav Canada and relaying to them that I am not in favour of any moves that would impact our tourism sector, that would prohibit players such as Condor coming to Whitehorse, or that would impact our safety — the safety of our aviation sector.

So, until I know what Nav Canada is proposing, I am not going to start hounding Ottawa for resources when we do not know the extent to which we are going to need them. Ottawa is aware, and we are working — and the Premier, my colleagues

on this side of the House, and I are very clear that we want to make sure that our aviation sector remains whole and healthy — as healthy as possible to get to the other side of this pandemic.

As far as Yukon Days goes, I know that the agenda has been set. I am not scheduled to talk to Minister Garneau. That does not mean to say that I have not spoken to Minister Garneau and that I will not in the future. They are aware of our concerns surrounding Nav Canada. They are aware of our support for the aviation industry. They are aware of TIAY's support for the aviation industry. We are working with our players in Ottawa, at several levels. We are working at the official level, and we are going to work very hard to guarantee and to safeguard our aviation industry into the future.

Mr. Hassard: I thank the officials for coming back today one more time. I just had a couple of questions regarding highway reconstruction and widening in the Porter Creek area. I know that, here in the Legislature, we have asked many times about turning lanes in front of Super A, in particular, and lights, et cetera, so I am just curious if there is anything in the works in regard to upgrades through that Porter Creek section.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: We have just announced recently that we are going to public consultation for two residents of Porter Creek to ask them their thoughts on the highway running in front of their neighbourhoods.

Mr. Hassard: Would the minister be able to provide this House with an update on the particular sections in that area that they will be looking at and consulting on?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: The member opposite will find information regarding that public consultation on yukon.ca, but to save him the web search, it's Azure to Centennial.

Mr. Hassard: Rather than going by the street names, could the minister provide us with an idea — is that from the south entrance into Porter Creek to the north entrance into MacDonald Road? How much of that stretch in there — maybe the minister can correct me on my geography. Is Azure part of the road into Crestview?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I will again save the member opposite a Google map search. I did it just while he was asking the question. It is actually from Goodman's Appliance Services and Repair right down — just north of Trails North. It looks like the first access coming into Crestview as you are coming north on the highway back to Centennial — so, north back.

Mr. Hassard: I thank the officials for being here. I think the minister actually meant Goody's Gas, but that is beside the point. I appreciate that information. Thank you.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Vote 55, Department of Highways and Public Works?

Seeing none, we will proceed to line-by-line debate in Vote 55.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

On COVID-19 Response

COVID-19 Response in the amount of \$10,396,000 agreed to

On Corporate Services Reduction

Corporation Services Reduction underexpenditure in the amount of \$324,000 cleared

*On Information and Communications Technology
Information and Communications Technology in the
amount of \$324,000 agreed to*

On Transportation

Mr. Hassard: Can we get a breakdown on that amount, please?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I would be happy this afternoon to give a breakdown on that \$1,029,000. If the member opposite will oblige me, I will continue to seek that information.

I will say that, when it comes to information communications, it is a very important matter for us to discuss. I can say that it's part of our efforts to make it easier for the public and businesses to access government services online. Last year, in 2019-20, the government spent over \$10 million on information technology projects, of which \$3.8 million went to local companies. This year, we budgeted \$14.5 million on information technology projects, including \$2.5 million to the Department of Health and Social Services for the 1Health project and an additional \$4 million for new IT projects in other departments.

These projects include everything from enhancing IT to expanding mobile radio systems to providing internal business solutions and web-based services for citizens. Our government continuously seeks ways to provide best value for money for taxpayers. We are evaluating solutions to enhance our phone system for flexible work arrangements, as well as a video conferencing presentation sharing capability. We have started to upgrade boardrooms and meeting rooms in strategic locations to facilitate video conferencing, thus reducing personal travel and associated costs. That, of course, is very important as we move through this pandemic that we find ourselves in and have to make allowances for people working from home who cannot come into the office for various reasons.

As members opposite can hear this afternoon, our investments in information and communications technology are very important as part of improving the way that we operate and turn this, as I say, 19th century institution into a 21st century, data-driven institution. It is vital.

We are looking here to see if we can get some detail for the members opposite on the \$1 million. We are certainly going to continue to look at this.

The fact is that we've seen a woeful negligence, perhaps, in the investments in our data and communications technology for many, many years. We really do have to do a better job, and that's what we have striven to do over the four years of our mandate.

The members opposite will note that we launched an open data portal in June 2019. This tool makes government information available to be freely accessed, used, and shared by anyone, anywhere.

Of course, as we've spoken to the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin over the last little while, we've also spent some considerable time and effort improving the Bids and Tenders system so that our contracting community can actually bid on jobs remotely from Dawson City and not have to pick up paper-based documents. The advantage of that, Mr. Chair, is that the contractors, when they fill in those documents, can actually be

told when and if they have made a mistake. It actually improves the success rate by which our contractors can bid on their jobs.

I will happily answer any other questions that the member opposite may have.

Chair: We are on the item Transportation for \$1,029,000 in the operation and maintenance vote.

Is there any further debate?

Transportation in the amount of \$1,029,000 agreed to

On Total of Other Operation and Maintenance

Total of Other Operation and Maintenance in the amount of nil cleared

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$11,425,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

On Information and Communications Technology

On Corporate Information Technology Equipment and Systems

Total Corporate Information Technology Equipment and Systems underexpenditure in the amount of \$2,500,000 cleared

On Property Management

On Dempster Fibre Project

Dempster Fibre Project underexpenditure in the amount of \$19,500,000 cleared

On Total of Other Capital

Total of Other Capital in the amount of nil cleared

Total Capital Expenditures underexpenditure in the amount of \$22,000,000 agreed to

Total Expenditures underexpenditure of \$10,575,000 agreed to

Department of Highways and Public Works agreed to

Chair: The matter now before the Committee now is general debate on Vote 27, French Language Services Directorate, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Committee of the Whole will recess for 10 minutes.

Recess

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

The matter before the Committee is Vote 27, French Language Services Directorate, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*.

Is there any general debate?

French Language Services Directorate

Hon. Mr. Streicker: To begin with, I would like to welcome Monsieur André Bourcier, who is the director of the French Language Services Directorate. Je vous présente Monsieur André Bourcier, le directeur des services en français.

I just want to mention two things in opening remarks, Mr. Chair. The first one is that the budget itself is for \$400,000, which really is about the sponsorship of the Ministerial Conference on the Canadian Francophonie. That is the group

that manages the federal-provincial-territorial table on French language ministers. We are hosting it. Most of this money is going to be recovered. Only a small amount is really coming from the Yukon government itself, but the \$400,000 is the amount in the budget.

The other thing that I would like to do is to just say thank you very much to all of the folks who have been doing all the translations during the pandemic. It has been quite a remarkable job that they've done to try to keep the francophone community informed and up to date with all things to do with the pandemic. In fact, I would just acknowledge Mr. Bourcier has been doing his role during the livestreams to make sure that, if there is a need for translation, it happens during the livestream.

I am happy to answer any questions for the French Language Services Directorate today on these matters or other.

Ms. McLeod: I want to thank the official for joining us here today in the Legislature. I thank the minister for his information on the expenditure under the supplementary budget. I do not have any questions today for the French Language Services Directorate.

Ms. White: Merci Monsieur le président. Bienvenue au directeur des services en français, pour sa première visite aussi à l'Assemblée. Malheureusement, il n'y a pas grand chose à dire aujourd'hui, alors je n'ai pas beaucoup de questions.

There is so little to talk about in the \$400,000 line item. I was going through the significant budget at the beginning of the year but, in all honesty, we have had such leaps and bounds in French Language Services from the very first time. I called the very first official back in Highways and Public Works — say that all we see is steady growth, and it is, of course, through the direction of both the minister and the director. It is not a very exciting first time in the Assembly for the director of the French Language Services, but it is meaningful. I also just really want to highlight the importance of having the translation services on demand, essentially, for the livestreaming. We saw in very quick succession the adaptability of government departments. We asked for the American Sign Language interpreter, and she arrived. We asked for French language, and they arrived.

It means that what we are seeing in those updates is that we are reaching out to as much of the community as we can. So, thank you, of course, to the director who gets us that service during those live briefings, and I thank the minister for the work. I appreciate that, as he got busier, he said that he had to drop his French classes, and I appreciate that. It has been an interesting time in learning a second language and practising a second language with all that additional stress. It's one thing that you can put down and pick up later on. Merci beaucoup d'être venu, et un grand merci à la Direction des services en français. C'est important. On voit un grand changement dans cette direction depuis quelques années, alors c'est quelque chose que j'apprécie, mais je n'ai pas de questions aujourd'hui.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Vote 27, French Language Services Directorate, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*?

Seeing none, we will proceed to line-by-line debate.

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all

lines in Vote 27, French Language Services Directorate, cleared or carried, as required.

Unanimous consent re deeming all lines in Vote 27, French Language Services Directorate, cleared or carried

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 27, French Languages Services Directorate, cleared or carried, as required.

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of nil agreed to

Total Expenditures in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to French Language Services Directorate agreed to

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I just would like to say thank you to Mr. Bourcier. Bienvenue pour la première fois ici.

I thank him for his first time here and thank the members opposite for their comments.

Chair: The matter now before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 53, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Committee of the Whole will recess for five minutes. Mr. Adel, please.

Mr. Adel: EMR officials have gone home for the day. The minister is happy to come down to answer questions for the short period that is left in the Committee, so when we come back in five minutes, just so the House knows, that is the situation that we're in.

Chair: Would members like to have the minister all on his own for a few minutes?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: We will recess for five minutes and give the minister time to show up.

Recess

Chair: Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 53, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, in Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*.

Is there any further general debate?

Mr. Pillai, you have 18 minutes and 36 seconds.

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources — continued

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I know that the member opposite had a number of areas that he touched on as we were concluding. I know that we have limited time. I'll leave it to the member opposite — maybe we'll go through something. I know that there are some areas of forestry and smaller pieces. We will probably be back again together, but we can have an opportunity to clear some of that. I'll just cede the floor and try to get through some of the questions from the member opposite.

Mr. Kent: I appreciate that from the minister. A quick question coming out of Question Period today. I know that I had asked about additional sub-regional plans that were being contemplated. I don't have the Blues with me, but I believe the minister said that he is working on additional sub-regional land use plans. I'm curious if he could tell us how many and where those are located.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I appreciate the opportunity to clarify, and hopefully it will be reflected in the Blues — the comments that I made in response. We have had at least one First Nation request to have a discussion with us about sub-regional planning. There has been an ask. We have not received anything formally.

At this point, the only plan that we're working on is with Na-Cho Nyäk Dun. I spoke a bit about that today — that we're still committed to that work, and we continue to follow on the revised work plan. But no other sub-regional plans have been undertaken.

There have been some overtures from at least one leader with council, but again, we haven't received — normally what would happen is that we would receive some sort of a formal correspondence or there would be another discussion. There hasn't been, but it seems that there was some interest in the concept. Maybe that First Nation will undertake a discussion with Na-Cho Nyäk Dun to do their own due diligence; I am not sure.

Again, I think that where that question was going today during Question Period was: Would this affect other projects that are underway? The answer is no, because we haven't undertaken that.

All of the folks who are currently inside that area — and that was asked of me today — as we're communicating to folks who reach out to us and who are in that sub-regional area now — they are still, in some cases, applying for renewals to their permits or continuing to do the exploration work that they're undertaking. We have communicated to them that, again, it's the same process that it would have been whether we were doing that planning or not.

Mr. Kent: I am going to just jump over to forestry issues for the balance of our time here this afternoon. I just wanted to ask the minister a couple of things.

Going over the Yukon Liberal Party platform from 2016, there were a couple of items dedicated to forestry in there. The first was developing opportunities for forestry companies to create fuel for biomass heating projects. I am just curious about the fuel wood and the opportunities.

I know that I have said in the past that, even with the firewood contract for the campgrounds in the Dawson area, some of that fuel wood was being hauled out of northern British Columbia just down the Stewart-Cassiar Highway, south of Junction 37. The second commitment that they made was targeting investment to boost small-scale softwood lumber opportunities, including a forestry plan for southeast Yukon. I know that this was asked of the minister in Question Period — about the southeast Yukon forestry plan — so I'm interested in an update on that. Exactly what investment has been targeted to boost small-scale softwood lumber opportunities?

The minister and I have both been in conversations with the small mill operator in the Whitehorse area. He is having some difficulty getting access to timber, so I'm interested in any updates that the minister has with respect to that and then any other fuel-wood opportunities that they are looking at for biomass heating projects — potential firewood or fuel-wood opportunities closer to communities throughout the territory.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I will start with the quicker answers. First of all, with southeast Yukon, I think that it has just been in the last two weeks that I sent a letter to Chief Charlie. We have been ready to engage on a transfer payment agreement that would offset some of the costs and capacity that would be needed by the Liard First Nation to work with us on that plan. Previously, the funds were in place and we were ready to do that work. I guess that maybe other priorities had come up — by the First Nation. Certainly, with the previous administration there, we did have some discussions a bit about biomass. We did talk pretty thoroughly about biomass as well as opportunities.

There was some pretty big impact from fire on the Robert Campbell Highway a number of years back. I know that the LFN had reached out.

Part of what we communicated at that time was that we really wanted to get to the table to get this management plan in place. We're ready and willing, and I've sent a letter off just reaching out to say that, if there is more information needed or another discussion that has to happen — but we want to be doing that work.

On the biomass side of things, it's really three departments. We've tried to work with the Yukon Wood Products Association and others to have those discussions. Of course, Community Services — what we saw was some of the work that was done this year around Mary Lake. I will say to the member opposite that I might not get to the softwood discussion today, but I appreciate the good work being done in the sense that the member opposite connected one of the cutters with somebody who had just won a tender on some of that firesmarting, and so it has been good. There has been an opportunity there to access some needed fibre and then, at the same time, we're working between Community Services and the Forestry branch in Energy, Mines and Resources to look ahead to be able to provide folks with forward-looking opportunities on fibre.

Biomass is between three departments. So, Community Services' role is to identify areas for firesmarting, and a lot of that work has been done just south of the city, understanding

that some of our biggest areas of threat are there. As well, Highways and Public Works — I'm not sure. I might have missed it during debate, but they are leading that work on installing the actual furnaces that are needed to be able to use that wood. It's all part, really, of an ability to maximize the use of some of that fibre that's being cut through fire mitigation, then having that ancillary use, and putting it into our system and pivoting over to that.

I see now that we're in a position where we're installing — or identifying and moving to install — some of these furnaces. Again, we felt that some of these areas — I'll call them "cut blocks" — have been a real opportunity for people who want to look to get into biomass.

Also, in the Haines Junction area, another area that had a bit of a fire threat previous to that — and another area — and we're working with a number of First Nations. The Forest Management branch and Wildland Fire Management are working together to create more fire-resilient communities through their participation in planning, contracting, and permitting for fuel-abatement activities. The materials harvest for fuel abatement can provide opportunities for biomass industry development, and contracts offered through the Wildland Fire Management fuel-abatement program can provide harvesting and clearing opportunities for a variety of forest industry operators.

To aid in the coordination of the development of the biomass industry, the departments of Community Services and Energy, Mines and Resources have initiated an interdepartmental working group on fuel abatement, biomass, and climate change implementation. The working group will also provide support for implementing *Our Clean Future — A Yukon strategy for climate change, energy and a green economy*. This is very key to that.

There is a lot to discuss, and hopefully we will have a chance to continue on the biomass. We have also had some significant situations occur through Mother Nature. We had a really serious blow-down between Lake Laberge that stretches all the way to Kusawa — so a lot of mature trees knocked down. The Forest Management branch and Community Services right now have been very quick to identify what that means. We know that there could be a fire threat in the summertime — and at the same time, what is the best way for us to get in there and maximize the use of that fibre that has fallen? That is work that is underway, and I will report back when we have a chance.

Seeing the time, Mr. Chair, I move that you report progress.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Pillai that the Chair report progress.

Motion agreed to

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

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Streicker that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

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

Chair's report

Mr. Hutton: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 205, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21*, and directed me to report progress.

Speaker: You have heard the report from the Chair of Committee of the Whole.

Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Acting Government House Leader that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

The following sessional papers were tabled December 8, 2020:

34-3-59

Yukon Teachers Labour Relations Board Annual Report 2019-2020 (Mostyn)

34-3-60

Yukon Public Service Labour Relations Board Annual Report 2019-2020 (Mostyn)

The following legislative returns were tabled December 8, 2020:

34-3-53

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Mr. Hassard related to general debate on Vote 55, Highways and Public Works, in Bill No. 204, *Fourth Appropriation Act 2019-20* — Old Territorial Administration Building in Dawson City (Mostyn)

34-3-54

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Mr. Istchenko related to general debate on Vote 52, Environment, in Bill No. 205, *Second Appropriation Act 2020-21* — outfitter harvest quotas 2020-21 (Frost)