

Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Thursday, May 20, 2010 — 1:00 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In recognition of National Road Safety Week

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House, I rise today to pay tribute to National Road Safety Week. This year, National Road Safety Week runs from May 18 to 24. Every May, Mr. Speaker, Canadians recognize the need to educate drivers on the importance of road safety. There are approximately 3,000 fatalities and almost 200,000 injuries on Canadian roads every year. Of these statistics, 40 percent are teen drivers who are just learning the rules of the road. Road crashes are the leading cause of death for people under 40 years old.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we as a society work together to educate people about the need to follow the rules of the road, drive to road conditions and be aware when they are behind the wheel.

National Road Safety Week concludes with the Victoria Day long weekend, and we will see an increase of traffic on all Yukon roads. In the past, the increased traffic has resulted in more crashes on the highway, as many take to the roads to begin the summer season. Let's take the opportunity this year to remind people to take extra precautions when travelling all roads and highways.

For 2010, always remember to: (1) buckle up — use your seat belt and child seat correctly; (2) slow down, obey posted speed limits and drive according to the road conditions; (3) drive sober — sober includes being free of drugs, alcohol and, of course, distractions; (4) make driving your only priority when behind the wheel. Eighty percent of accidents and crashes are caused by human error, including distractions.

Highways and Public Works continues to work with the RCMP to promote safe driving behaviours and to increase the awareness of safe driving practices and habits.

This upcoming summer season, Yukon's carrier compliance section will continue to conduct commercial vehicle inspections to ensure commercial drivers and vehicles are safe and in good mechanical condition. In previous years, more than 3,700 periodic vehicle inspections and 1,500 commercial vehicle inspections were completed annually.

In conjunction with National Road Safety Week, the RCMP will be conducting random checkpoints to ensure safety is being practised by all our travellers. Child car seats are an important factor when considering safe transportation.

Highways and Public Works will continue to work with parents to ensure that their children are properly harnessed in their seats. For the third year in a row, our department continues to provide incentives to parents to have their children's car seats inspected.

This program offers a free inspection of the car seat whereupon the child's name is entered into a draw for a \$500 Registered Education Savings Plan bond. I would urge all Yukoners to evaluate their driving habits and ensure they are following the rules of the road, ensuring they are not driving impaired in any manner. Remember that driving is a privilege, not a right, and road safety is everyone's responsibility.

Speaker: Any further tributes?
 Introduction of visitors.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: It's my pleasure today to welcome a group-study exchange delegation from Estonia and Finland. Mr. Mike Kenny of the Whitehorse Rotary Club is working with them. Rob Christie is from the Midnight Sun Rotary Club, and the youngster on the end is Con Lattin from the Rendezvous Rotary Club.

I ask the House to join me in welcoming from Finland, Ms. Minna Leino, Virpi Katajala, and Sade Kahra.

From Estonia, there is Sirje Nilson, and the guy with the biggest smile in the whole group there is Peeter Hagen. I think I'm missing one, unfortunately, so my apologies to our guests from Estonia and Finland.

I ask all members of the House to join us in welcoming them.

Applause

Mr. Mitchell: I would just like to add that also with the group is the Rev. David Pritchard from Whitehorse and one of the Rotary Club members. We will welcome them as well.

Applause

Mr. Hardy: I would never miss this opportunity; I would like to welcome especially the people from Estonia. My son had the honour and privilege to live in Estonia for approximately four months many years ago on a Canada World Youth exchange and he went back there again last year because he had such a fabulous experience and loved the people there, so welcome to the Yukon.

Speaker: Is there any further introduction of visitors?
 Returns or documents for tabling.

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Edzerza: I have for tabling the Yukon state of environment interim report for 2007.

Hon. Ms. Horne: I have for tabling the 2007-08 crime prevention and victim services trust fund annual report.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: For tabling today is the Yukon Housing Corporation annual report for 2007-08.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I have for tabling to you, the Speaker of the Assembly, a letter that, after due deliberation by the government caucus, designates our Minister of Environment to serve on the Select Committee on the Safe Operation and Use of Off-road Vehicles established by Motion No. 834.

Speaker: Are there further documents for tabling? Are there reports of committees?

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Mitchell: I have for tabling the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Speaker: Are there any other further reports of committees?
Petitions.

PETITIONS

Petition No. 12 — response

Hon. Ms. Horne: I would like to begin by thanking each Yukoner who took the time to share with us their concerns regarding Bill No. 82.

The consultation on corrections identified a desire to address drug dealers and bootleggers. Let me quote a couple of the comments: “Bootlegging and drugs in the community are problems.” Another comment: “The drug dealers and bootleggers will always make money off of this need.”

One of the factors that make crime attractive for social predators is the ability to make a quick dollar. The goal then was to find ways so that crime doesn’t pay. On December 16, 2009, the Assembly directed the government to bring forward civil forfeiture legislation by way of a unanimous motion in this House. I appreciate the members of the Liberal Party, the Official Opposition and especially the members for Vuntut Gwitchin and Porter Creek South for speaking in favour of this motion that resulted in Bill No. 82.

Given that the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin outlined how civil forfeiture works in his speech on December 16, and that the Member for Porter Creek South encouraged us to get on with bringing this bill forward, we felt that the Liberal members in the Assembly supported this legislation. Unfortunately, the Liberal members changed their position on the bill several times.

I would like to thank the NDP and the Independent Member for their feedback and recommendations on amendments they would like to see.

On April 28, the Yukon Legislative Assembly unanimously passed Motion No. 1031, which reads as follows:

THAT this House urges the Yukon government to delay debate on Bill No. 82, *Civil Forfeiture Act*, until a further sitting, to allow sufficient time to have meaningful public consultation on its implications for Yukoners.

Consequently, Bill No. 82 will not be passed into law. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Petition No. 13 — received

Clerk: Mr. Speaker and honourable members of the Assembly, I have had the honour to review a petition, being

Petition No. 13 of the First Session of the 32nd Legislative Assembly, as presented by the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin on May 19, 2010. The petition presented by the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin appears in two versions. The differences between the two versions are minor and both versions meet the requirements as to form of the Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

However, the version that contains the phrase “the undersigned ask the Yukon Legislative Assembly to urge the Government of Yukon” is more procedurally precise and this is the version of the petition to which the government should respond.

Speaker: Petition No. 13 is accordingly deemed to be read and received.

Are there any petitions to be presented?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Any notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Cardiff: I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Yukon government to make best efforts in appointments to the Yukon Human Rights panel of adjudicators to be consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of the residents of Yukon as stated in section 2 of the *Human Rights Act*.

I also give notice of the following motion:

THAT it is the opinion of this House that the Yukon energy strategy and action plan, in order to guide the government’s role in the energy sector, should:

- (1) be in place for the long term;
- (2) be renewed every five years;
- (3) be based on solid research and thoughtful policies, plans and priorities;
- (4) benefit from public participation;
- (5) support conservation; and
- (6) recognize and respond to climate change factors.

I also give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to schedule capital projects in Dawson City during the present construction period and in the future, with the objectives of:

- (1) avoiding shortages of local labour; and
- (2) maximizing local economic benefits.

I also give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Minister of Community Services to study the factors behind the pricing of gasoline, diesel and heating fuel in all Yukon communities, and establish measures to protect consumers from unfair pricing.

Mr. Hardy: I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to strengthen important elements of the common public interest in water by urging the Government of Canada to include in Bill C-26, *An Act to amend the International Boundary Waters*

Treaty Act and the International River Improvements Act, the development of a comprehensive national water policy that:

- (1) bans all bulk water exports;
- (2) excludes water from the North American Free Trade Agreement; and
- (3) recognizes water as a public trust.

I also give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to work with municipal councils, local advisory councils, non-government organizations and rural Yukoners to expand public transit and shuttle bus services between rural Yukon and Whitehorse by establishing a transit pilot project between Dawson City and Whitehorse, in order to:

- (1) reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and
- (2) increase social inclusion through the provision of transit opportunities to Yukoners who do not own vehicles.

Speaker: Are there any further notices of motion?
Is there a statement by a minister?
This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Yukon Energy Corporation/ATCO

Mr. McRobb: It is the ultimate day of this spring sitting and perhaps the final opportunity to question this Premier on his secret plan to sell out Yukon's energy future to a private company from Alberta. His involvement in this attempted sell-off is well-documented and is a matter of public record. The Premier and his colleagues, however, remain in hard denial about those events and continue to go to great lengths to sweep this whole scandal under the carpet. Where is the accountability to the public? How will the public ever know the true extent of involvement by the Premier and his colleagues? Will the Premier now do the right thing and call for a public inquiry into these secret negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Contrary to the Liberal Member for Kluane's opinion, all evidence and the public record show that the member is incorrect. In fact, there has been a process that has even gone through the Public Accounts Committee and it is pretty clear — and the member should know this if he has reviewed the acts, regulations and the orders in council.

The member should be very clear on the matter, that it is a matter of government policy. If the member is clear on that matter, he would understand full well that his assertions are indeed incorrect.

Mr. McRobb: Well, what is this Premier afraid of? What is he running and hiding from? We may never find out, if this government is allowed to sweep this matter under the carpet and hide behind officials. I'll remind the Premier: in a public inquiry, the burden for officials to toe the line would be lifted. Each and every official would be testifying under oath, and hence, free from political pressure — perceived or real — which could compromise their employment with this government.

This government should stop hiding behind officials, and instead, give them the protection they deserve to speak out in

the public interest. Will the Premier now do the right thing and call for a public inquiry into these secret negotiations?

Speaker's statement

Speaker: Before the Hon. Premier answers, Member for Kluane, we had this discussion previously. Accusing the government of hiding behind public officials is fine; that's your prerogative. However, when you start mentioning having officials "toe the line," that means the officials are, in fact, in the wrong. They're not here to defend themselves and it's not part of the political process. Please keep that in mind, Member for Kluane.

Hon. Premier, you have the floor.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Liberal Member for Kluane that his call for a public inquiry would put people under oath, including possibly himself. The fact of the matter is, the government has actually followed its energy strategy, has been building partnerships and, most recently, the Yukon Utilities Board has given the green light for a major investment in infrastructure for our Energy Corporation here in the territory, dramatically increasing its assets — not selling them. The partnership included a \$71-million investment from Canada. Those are the facts. That's what's happening in the Yukon.

The Member for Kluane, the Liberal member, continues to sweep a dusty cloud of incorrect information.

Mr. McRobb: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's no wonder that Yukoners so badly want a government they can trust, because they are not getting it under this Yukon Party regime.

Mr. Speaker, as we wrap up the final day of this session, Yukoners are being reminded of where this tired government stands on being open and accountable. The public knows it doesn't have the whole story on this scandal.

Half the Yukon Energy Corporation Board resigned. The Premier's ex-right-hand man resigned and this government's popularity took a nose dive when these negotiations were publicly exposed. The issue has caused lots of infighting within the Yukon Party that is still ongoing. It is about integrity.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: On the point of order.

Hon. Ms. Horne: The Liberal Member for Kluane is, under 19(h), uttering a deliberate falsehood.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: From the Chair's perspective, there is no point of order. It is simply a dispute among members. Member for Kluane, you still have the floor.

Mr. McRobb: It is about integrity. Let's clear the air and be truly open and accountable. Will the Premier now do the right thing and call for a public inquiry into these secret negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is about integrity. As I stated earlier, in response to the Liberal member's questions, the member should be fully aware of all the

acts, regulations and the orders-in-council and policy, by the way, as his colleagues from the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General are fully aware of those policy matters. That is where the integrity issue comes into play. If the member would be explaining the facts to the Yukon public, the member would explain that by policy you can't sell all, or substantially all, of the Energy Corporation's assets without board approval.

So I think the member's point is quite moot. How can you have negotiations for something that you can't sell in the first place without board approval? One can only wonder what the member is referring to regarding the resignations of certain board members. A lot of other board members stayed and did their job because they knew that was a matter of policy. I would refer the member to Order-in-Council 1993/108 that refutes any and all things this Liberal member has been saying.

Question re: Environment portfolio

Mr. Fairclough: The Peel watershed is one of the most important environmental issues in Yukon today and the Minister of Environment refuses to answer even the most basic questions on the issue. After all the bold statements he made from the opposite side of the House, he finally got what he wanted — to be the Minister of Environment.

As the Minister of Environment, his lone voice could make a difference, but what has he done? He sits back and lets other members speak for him on environmental issues. When is the Minister of Environment going to find his voice again and use it to advocate for the environment?

Hon. Mr. Edzerza: I don't know how much plainer I as a minister could be to this Member for Mayo-Tatchun with regard to this issue. The member knows full well that the *Umbrella Final Agreement* must be followed throughout this process. The member knows that. That is all I have to say for now, thank you.

Mr. Fairclough: In other words, the minister is still silent, Mr. Speaker. We're looking for results and we're not seeing any. The Minister of Environment stated on the opening day of this session, "As the minister and as a human being, I am committed to the environment." He wanted to protect McIntyre Creek before he was a minister, and now that he's a minister that has all changed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the minister changed his mind so often that we don't know what he really wants any more.

The Minister of Environment has done a lot of talking and now he's been given the chance to act on his words but nothing has happened and the minister has gone back on his words. When will we see some results from the Minister of Environment? Results, Mr. Speaker, that is what we're missing.

Hon. Mr. Edzerza: The Member for Mayo-Tatchun must be asleep at his job if he doesn't realize all of the things that have been accomplished through Environment. I mean, one of the most important things with regard to the Porcupine caribou herd, for example, has been put in place — a process to start protecting the Porcupine caribou herd.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous things within the Environment portfolio that have been accomplished. For example, I, as the minister, have only been here for three plus months. The

state of the environment report has been tabled today — something the Member for Mayo-Tatchun never even tabled when he was an Environment minister.

Mr. Fairclough: Perhaps the minister doesn't understand the process for that, Mr. Speaker. The minister has made it impossible for us to have any confidence in him any more. When he actually speaks out for environment issues, it's to announce that he has changed his mind again. When the minister is asked to live up to his commitments and responsibilities — and we've seen it in this House — he has gone silent. The Minister of Environment has changed his position and his party so often that it's difficult to understand what he now stands for, if anything at all.

The Minister of Environment has been given the perfect opportunity to use his voice and make a difference but he won't. Does the minister have to lose his Environment portfolio before he will advocate for the Environment portfolio again?

Hon. Mr. Edzerza: I guess it's maybe time to put on record a few things that the Environment department has accomplished. Let's start with the climate change strategy and action plan. That particular issue covers enhancement of knowledge and understanding of climate change, adaptation to climate change, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and leading Yukon action in response to climate change. Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Climate Change Research Centre of Excellence has been established. The Porcupine caribou herd interim measures are in place and now has advanced into a document that has, to date, been signed by seven of the eight parties, and the federal government is committed to signing it.

The site assessment and remediation unit, the territorial parks special management areas — special management areas like Tombstone, Old Crow Flats and others that are being worked on — there's the Lhutsaw wetlands habitat, the Fishing Branch. We are going to establish a Yukon wilderness preserve. Mr. Speaker, this party has done a lot with environment and will continue to do so.

Question re: Waters Act

Mr. Cardiff: The Yukon Minerals Advisory Board — largely a group of corporate mining executives based in Vancouver — is responsible for advising the government on policy direction around mining and economic development. We've seen the government snap to attention when this corporate interest group makes recommendations. Take the issue of independent power production, or IPPs. The board said there should be private ownership of water and private expansion in electrical generation. The government launched their IPP consultation and policy development.

We always seem to find curious statements in the annual reports of the Yukon Minerals Advisory Board. Here's one from the 2009 report: The board is calling for "surgical amendments to the *Waters Act*."

Is the government considering following the recommendation to make surgical amendments to the *Waters Act*?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: For the member from the Third Party's benefit, all should respect advisory boards, no matter what constituency, industry or group they represent, as the government does. However, on the issue of the *Waters Act* it-

self, I think the member knows that the devolution transfer agreement requires us to follow a process.

First, we have the mirror federal statutes, one of them being the *Northern Inland Waters Act*, and we are obligated over time to continue that process and actually develop successor legislation.

I hope that helps the member in clearing up the issue about an advisory group offering their opinion and view about the government having to follow what it's obligated to follow.

Mr. Cardiff: The government has had seven years to work on successor legislation, but we haven't heard anything about it. Here's another whopper from the Yukon Minerals Advisory Board's 2009 annual report. It surrounds land use planning, which they call a significant concern about the recommended Peel watershed regional land use plan. The board strongly recommends the government significantly amend the plan or reject it. Is the government considering following the recommendation to significantly amend or reject the Peel watershed plan?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: This government certainly works with a wide variety of organizations throughout the territory, whether it be the Yukon Conservation Society, organizations such as Yukon Minerals Advisory Board, or a wide variety of others. We even listen to the suggestions from the opposition, who have encouraged us to look at things like net metering and independent power production. On this issue, I thank the member opposite for the question. Just to update him, the Government of Yukon is currently working with the First Nations affected in the Peel watershed area. There was a memorandum of understanding signed on this process, and we will continue to work forward, collaboratively toward a plan that incorporates a variety of land use activities within the Peel watershed and addresses the interests of the parties in a balanced manner.

Mr. Cardiff: Here is another doozy. In the 2008 annual report, the board said that a major disincentive to private investment in hydro-electric power projects was that businesses have to go through the full YESAA review and obtain a water licence before obtaining the rights to use water for power generation. They want private interests to be able to secure rights before going through an environmental process — something this government is familiar with. Is the government considering following the recommendation that private interests are able to circumvent YESAB and the Water Board?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, let me point out that circumventing the law is akin to breaking the law and that is something that is inappropriate and does not happen here, at least under the Yukon Party government watch. I know the formal Liberal government allowed the City of Dawson to contravene the law and go over its debt limit. Let me also point out a recent example of the processes we follow.

The Yukon Energy Corporation has gone before YESAB for the Mayo B project, has gone before the Yukon Utilities Board. These are clear demonstrations of how the Yukon Party government follows those obligations, those duly regulated processes that come from law. So to the member's question, we would follow the process.

Question re: Public consultation

Mr. Hardy: I rise today to dispense with a little of the doom-and-gloom that we often have in here and to remind people of the achievements that we bring in when we do work together, such as on the *Landlord and Tenant Act* consultation, the social inclusion summit, the *Solid Waste Action Plan*, formation of a credit union committee, consultations on legislative renewal, consultations of civil forfeiture and consultations on the use of ATVs.

I want to set the stage for our return to the Legislative Assembly in the fall. After all, it's silly to forever be calling for an election — an election, of course, that will one day come; there's no doubt about that. But there is a lot of work still to be done.

I'm looking for time frames from the Premier so that people can get a sense of the work that will continue on the issues that we care deeply about and have agreed to.

My question is this: when will the public consultation on civil forfeiture begin? When will the first meeting for the credit union committee be called? When will the first ATV meeting be held? When will the consultation on legislative renewable begin?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't share more the views and the opinions of the member of the Third Party. A great deal has been accomplished by this Assembly over the last many years. I think the evidence is clearly demonstrated throughout the Yukon in what is happening in today's territory. As far as these timelines, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member of the Third Party. I can't give him exact timelines here on the floor. These timelines would be dealt with by those designates from each party who are charged with the responsibility of being involved in these committees. I would point out that we will try to conclude these very important initiatives on behalf of the Yukon public as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. Hardy: Just for a point of information for the Premier: all our names are in and we're waiting for the government to name theirs.

New Democrats have always stood for social justice, for equality, for compassion and for democracy, even when our numbers are small. Tommy Douglas said, and I am paraphrasing it: It is not always about quantity but quality. Our mission is to be voices for the people, to democratize and humanize our government and our society.

Now, we're very proud that this House voted unanimously to support taking our *Legislative Renewal Act* to the people. It's extremely important that we look at the rules of this House and improve them, to give the people greater access and make us more accountable to them. We've raised other issues of democracy and we hope that, in the fall, we can have a productive discussion that leads to real change.

Will the government join with us in strengthening democracy in the Yukon through working on electoral reform and on improving the *Municipal Act* so Yukoners can exercise their right to organize a referendum?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: In the context of working with our fellow members, our colleagues here in the Assembly, I can only point to the many examples of how we've been able to do

that as elected members of this Assembly. As far as the two areas that the member specifically pointed to, I would remind him that we are proceeding with these other matters as far as the Legislative Assembly has directed that we do. Today I tabled the designate for the select committee that will be dealing with the use of off-road vehicles, and we will continue to do that as we go forward. Again, our purpose here is to endeavour, to the extent possible, to conclude these processes on behalf of the Yukon public as quickly as is possible.

Mr. Hardy: As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the NDP is never short on ideas, and we are willing to make those ideas a reality.

Now, NDPers believe deeply that it's a privilege to serve the people. They put their trust in us and we must serve them to the best of our abilities. We serve the people but we also must take direction from the people. The strength of our territory is our people. They are the ones who care for our children, who build the roads, who treat the sick. We have a long way to go to make government truly reflective of people's values, wishes and concerns. We are Yukoners; we are 34,000 people, and we can choose a better path. Democracy means that people are at the heart of decisions that affect them.

When it comes to the big financial questions, however — to budgeting \$1 billion — there doesn't seem to be that much democracy. I have asked this in the past and I will ask this again of a government of any day: strike an advisory council that is made up of First Nations, opposition leaders, NGOs, business and labour, to develop the budget that reflects the values of the people of the territory.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what the Yukon Party government does. That's why we engage with the business community; that's why we engage with First Nations governments; that's why we go out on fall community tours; that's why we engage with non-governmental organizations. It is about the people.

Mr. Speaker, and that is why we've invested, this year, another \$1,075,000,000 based on that input we've received from all those Yukoners. Mr. Speaker, that is a significant investment in 34,000 people. We are investing in Yukoners, as we've been doing over the last years and we intend to do more. Mr. Speaker, I think we're in agreement. The issue now is continuing to do the hard work.

Question re: Election call

Mr. Mitchell: I have a question for the leader of this tired government. It all comes down to trust, integrity and accountability. After almost eight years the public no longer trusts this government. After eight years they are all in it together. The entire caucus backed the Premier's plan to privatize Yukon's energy future. When the Premier invested \$36 million in ABCP in contravention of the *Financial Administration Act*, he did it with the backing of every member of the government caucus. When we debated a motion of non-confidence in this government, every member on that side of the House stood and backed this Premier. They are all in it together. From Beaver Creek to Watson Lake to Old Crow, we are hearing the same question: when can Yukoners expect an election call from this Premier?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I hate to shatter the Leader of the Liberal Party's day, but the rest of the Yukon Party government and I are not tired at all. In fact we are quite anxious to continue to do the work — the good work — that we do on behalf of the Yukon public. Speaking of tired, Mr. Speaker, we have been listening to the same old, tired positioning by the Liberals of this House. It continues to demonstrate that there is no plan or vision for this territory. That's a really serious problem, because to have trust in any political entity, you must demonstrate to the public what it is you do, so this same old, tired approach by the Liberal Party can be likened to someone standing on a board and getting a hernia trying to lift it.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, Mr. Speaker, this Premier has little impact on my day, but an awful lot of Yukoners are sorely disappointed in what they are hearing. This Premier doesn't want to face the public. This tired government doesn't want to be accountable for its actions. It prefers to hide behind officials. The Premier has a standard message that he repeats time and time again. Everyone else is wrong. It's much easier than taking responsibility for one's actions.

It is this government that invested \$36 million and can't get it back. It is this government that has blocked a public inquiry into secret negotiations to privatize our energy future. It is this government that ran a deficit last year and won't admit it. It is this government that is spending more than it will take in this year and won't admit it. Yukoners want an opportunity to vote for a government they can trust. When can Yukoners expect an election call from this Premier?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it the Leader of the Liberal Party's assertion that the Liberal Party would be that choice that Yukoners would make, I would caution the member to not get too far ahead of himself. Mr. Speaker, the member's points about fiscal matters and any other matter, quite frankly, aren't substantiated by fact. We are very proud of our fiscal record. The record shows clearly that the Yukon Territory is ranked along with Alberta as the only two jurisdictions that are not in net debt. In fact, with a \$1,075,000,000 budget, we still have a savings account, Mr. Speaker, and a lot more work ahead of us. If the members had taken any time to actually delve into policy, instead of all the other issues that they were trying to create, the members would have noticed a five-year capital plan, or capital fiscal framework.

They would have noticed that capital plan that shows projects and investment going forward. I think the members opposite recognize that this is not a government that's tired. This is not a government that's void of a plan and vision. It is evidenced clearly by all the facts and the deliverables that this government has brought to the territory and Yukoners know that.

Question re: Fiscal management

Mr. Mitchell: This Yukon Party government has overstayed its welcome. They are tired, they are fumbling, they are failing and Yukoners are ready to show them the door. Fewer people than ever say that they will support the Yukon Party and it is easy to see why. They are spending Yukoners into the poorhouse. They delivered a deficit last year and they've already spent the surplus this year. More than that,

they've racked up almost \$200 million in long-term debt to fund projects that will probably go overbudget. The public knows the Premier is writing cheques he can't afford to cash. When will the Premier accept the facts and call an election?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, Mr. Speaker, first off, when it comes to trust and integrity, the Yukon Party government was elected to serve this territory for five years. We have every intention of doing that. Furthermore, as far as the financial points the member has brought up — no, this government did not allow communities like Dawson to go over their debt limit and be in contravention of the act itself.

No, we did not break the bank, empty it of one thin dime and have to borrow money to pay employees' wages. We did not do that. No, Mr. Speaker, when we came into office, we fixed all that.

So today, the Yukon government — the territory — has a net financial resource position. We have a savings account. Furthermore, we have literally \$100 million plus in our bank account. That's far and above what the Liberals were able to produce in the shortest lived majority government in the history of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, the Premier can't govern because he is too busy trying to get his own house in order. He was caught unawares when his right-hand man deserted him to sit as an Independent. The Premier managed to recruit a replacement to shore up his majority, but there weren't many applicants and the new hire hasn't delivered much.

The government can't even manage to appoint chairs for committees that were set up six months ago because the Yukon Party is in survival mode. It's over, Mr. Speaker, and everyone knows it.

When will the Premier call an election?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's far from over because what the Leader of the Liberal Party fails to recognize is that we're only just a little over a month into a fiscal year — \$1,075,000,000 of investment in Yukoners in infrastructure, health care, education, social programming, arts and culture and film and sound.

Lots is happening in this territory, Mr. Speaker — the direct result of the hard, tireless work that this government continues to do. As far as the member's call for an election, no, we're not calling an election any time soon, Mr. Speaker. There is no reason to. The territory is in far too good shape, and I think the Liberal Party is desperate. They are scrambling. Talk about having a house out of order — they don't have a plan, they don't have a vision. They don't even know how to get themselves across the street.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier says they are only a month into the fiscal year. He has already managed to over-commit the small surplus he projected.

Mr. Speaker, this may be the last question the Premier ever fields in this House, and it is going to be a familiar one. The list of failures is long: overbudget hospitals, ballooning debt, political interference, irate phone calls to officials, privatization of Yukon Energy, consecutive deficits, poor bookkeeping and rebukes from the Auditor General, inaction on the Peel, inaction on committees, inaction on anything other than clinging to

power. This Yukon Party government has had its day and now it is over.

Will the Premier acknowledge this government's failure and do what the public wants: call an election?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: If that's the last question we hear from the Leader of the Liberal Party, this would be a godsend to the Yukon public, because every statement the member has just made cannot be backed up with any evidence whatsoever. In fact, it's the Liberal leader and his party who have broken a contract with Yukoners.

It is all about integrity and honesty. The members opposite and their leader — they'll all in it together — should get on the floor of this Legislature, correct the public record. It'll take them months.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of personal privilege

Speaker: On a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Hardy: Often, Mr. Speaker, the media can be quite hard on members in the Legislative Assembly. At times that makes me a little uncomfortable, though that's their right and I would never openly criticize some of the reporting that happens. So excuse me up there in the gallery.

However, I felt they were a little unfair, specifically to a friend of mine in the Legislative Assembly, the Member for Porter Creek North, I believe it is. He was criticized for his eyes being closed.

So what I have here for the member opposite is a pair of glasses to ensure that there are no more doubts that his eyes are always open and he sees clearly through all the deep, thought-provoking and scintillating debate in Committee of the Whole. With your indulgence, I would like to give him a pair of glasses that has a clear view for him.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair (Mr. Nordick): Order please. Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with Vote 2, Executive Council Office.

Do members wish a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

Bill No. 20 — First Appropriation Act, 2010-11 — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*.

Point of personal privilege

Chair: Mr. Hardy, on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Hardy: I just want to make it very clear to people, just in case there any misunderstanding in my comments made on my last point of privilege a few minutes ago with regard to the member opposite from Porter Creek North. This was meant in a manner of deep fondness for the member. He and I have had a very good relationship over the many years that we've sat in this Legislative Assembly. My comments were meant, in a sense, to recognize the fact that, at times, the things that are reported about people within the Legislative Assembly — all members in here — that are covered in newspapers need to be called into question.

From my perspective, they can be considered cruel and they can be very insensitive to the disabilities people have. My attempt was to point that out in a lighthearted manner, and I hope I have not offended my friend, the member opposite. I want to make it very clear that if I have, I do apologize. However, I do also want to make sure that the message is very clear that there are people who do have disabilities and we must recognize and respect those disabilities and allow the person to do the job they do, in the best manner they can, and respect that as well.

Chair: Committee of the Whole will now continue with Vote 2, the Executive Council Office. Hon. Premier, you have about five and a half minutes left.

Executive Council Office — continued

Hon. Mr. Fentie: We left off yesterday basically just going over, in general terms, a number of the areas of the Executive Council Office. I hope that provides some assistance to the members opposite as we continue our debate on this department, and I will now turn the matter over to the opposition members.

Mr. Mitchell: Over the past couple of days, we've had some good debate and we've clarified some issues regarding where we're at with the land claims process with the final three First Nations. We have had some answers — where we're at is that there is no mandate from Canada, but at least the Premier has indicated that the government continues, and will continue, to try to encourage the Prime Minister and the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs to consider re-establishing a mandate and that we also await the First Nations' desire to re-establish negotiations.

We have found out that 12 of 14 First Nations have complied with the requirement to do their reporting on the northern housing trust money and that two have not. We have clarified

that the decisions of the Water Board, being an independent quasi-judicial body, cannot be overturned by the minister. The minister has to sign what is presented and there is no other process despite some of the public comments that have been made by third parties as to what they might want to see happen, and that's worth establishing. We have learned some information.

I have more questions, Mr. Chair, but I think we have achieved some information in this debate. I appreciate that we have had some constructive debate when the opportunity was there. I just want to again thank the officials for the job they do and the information they provide, which is of benefit to all Yukoners, and again, for having provided us with meaningful information at the briefing.

One last thing I would request is when we might expect an update on the ministerial travel, because the time period that was provided — I don't have that, well, I do have it in front of me if I dig it out — but I believe the information provided was a comparison of several years that went from April 1. But last year it went — did it go to February 9? It was less than a full year and we're not sure, for example, if that included the travel to attend the Olympics or what might be left out, and we would like to see that information. If the minister will commit to providing that at the earliest opportunity in written form, not three days before the next sitting — as soon as it truly is available — we would appreciate that. With that, we know the Third Party members have significant questions that they would like to ask and we would want to provide that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I'll table an updated information item on the issue of ministerial travel.

Mr. Cardiff: I'm pleased to be here today. I'd like to welcome the officials here today who are providing assistance to the minister and the Legislative Assembly, to provide answers to the questions we have coming from the NDP caucus.

I'd like to go back a day or two, to a conversation I had with the minister responsible for the Women's Directorate, when I asked questions of the minister. In the Women's Directorate, one of the objectives is for the government to support Yukon's commitment to the economic, legal and social equality of women. I asked the minister responsible for the Women's Directorate how they measure or how they evaluate whether or not they're meeting those objectives within each of those areas — those being economic, legal and with regard to the social equality of women.

The minister informed us that there are no measuring tools, there are no statistics. Given that the minister responsible for the Executive Council Office has the responsibility for the stats branch, the minister's words, I believe, were, "There is no program to collect that information."

So I would like to ask the minister responsible for Executive Council Office and the Statistics branch why that is. It seems to me that any department has goals and objectives, and there should be measurable outcomes that we are trying to track to ensure that the desired outcomes of the products of those departments are — how do we know whether or not they're achieving as a government what they set out to do?

I think that's important. It's important to us on this side to know that if the government has goals and objectives around important issues, like social equality, legal equality and the economic equality of women in our society, that we should be able to somehow evaluate what it is that we're doing. In this case, I believe it's with \$1.7 million in that department, which I believe is — I think my words were “a pittance in a billion-dollar budget.”

We could be spending more, Mr. Chair, to address some of these issues. I know that it is a multi-department approach. The Premier will get up and say there is lots going on in other departments to promote the social equality of women and the economic equality of women and the legal equality of women.

The minister responsible for the Women's Directorate cited a litany of problems that we have in our society — statistics that say we're not doing enough. What we need are statistics that prove that the objectives are being met. I was told in no uncertain terms that there is no program to collect those statistics. I think that, with any organization, it is important that if you are trying to achieve something and you're spending public money on it, you want to ensure that somehow you can evaluate what it is that you're doing and go back to the public, explain to the Members of the Legislative Assembly that this is what is actually happening, and, yes, we are meeting those objectives. I was told there was no program to collect those statistics. So, as the minister responsible for the Bureau of Statistics, I'd like the minister to stand up and tell me why.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I guess there are a number of ways to look at the member's issue and question. First off, if you look at the budget, there are a significant number of examples of how the statistics are actually measurement tools. Then if you look at what the member pointed to, as far as, for example, violence against women, I think now the statistics that we are aware of today demonstrate that that particular measurement is working because more and more people are coming forward, which may not have been the case in the past.

There's another large grouping of areas the member is referring to. Of course, in the Bureau of Statistics, we continually work on improving on what exists and adding more as we can, so it's an evolving process. Then we also have to deal with Stats Canada and how all those statistics fit and are measured and the list goes on.

If the member is referring to us not having anything to measure the results of what we are doing, I beg to differ. I think the Statistics branch has a litany of examples of how measurements take place.

As I said, we keep evolving, we keep improving, we build on, but we also have to understand statistics in some cases. Sometimes, like the census that we experience in the Yukon, every time we do an undercount — and in the last one I think there was an excess of 1,000 Yukoners who were missed — we have to be very careful that when we do gather statistical information, we are relatively sure and confident that we are dealing with correct information. I'll go back to the example of the undercount. We've proven through that process — the gathering of statistics there — that that's not always the case.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, I would encourage the minister responsible for the statistics branch to share that information so the minister responsible for the Women's Directorate has the appropriate tools to measure the outcomes of the department for which she is responsible. I think this is very important. I appreciate the work that the Bureau of Statistics does. I appreciate the minister responsible for providing me with the statistics I requested earlier in this sitting.

I have another question related to the statistics branch today. As was mentioned earlier in this sitting by the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin, the government is sending around a survey related to the Yukon health care insurance plan. It's an update. It does say if you do not sign and return this card, your health care could be cancelled. I think many Yukoners find that offensive.

As well, on the reverse side of the page — I would like to know what the minister thinks about whether or not this is an optional section. It says, “The following questions are for statistical purposes only.”

“Is the health care insurance subscriber listed above,” it says, “status First Nations, non-status First Nations, Métis, Inuit, white, other.” And I'd just like to know — in my understanding, “white” is not a race.

If you look at the statistics branch — and I did look at the statistics branch a few evenings ago, looking for statistics about the makeup of our population as was reflected in some of our comments the other day. In the statistics that are presented, when they talk about origin or race, they don't refer to people as being “white.” There are persons of British origin, persons of North American origin, persons of different origins, but to the best of my knowledge — I just think it is inappropriate and I would be interested in the minister's interpretation of that.

I think there's another word — it could be “Caucasian” — of European ancestry or North American ancestry — but I just find, in my mind and in the minds of people I talk to, that it's inappropriate and we need to come up with a better definition for this section of the form and any other forms that are asking for this optional information.

Could the minister respond to that and give me his opinion or thoughts on that, and whether or not that could be addressed?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: On the first point, I think it's critical that we update our data, our statistics with respect to valid health care cards throughout the Yukon. It's very important we do that.

Regarding the issue of, if you don't fill out the form, you could lose your eligibility for health care, I guess the only way I can put that is “six of one and a half dozen of the other” because if you don't fill it out, the chances are you might not get a health care card, I would assume. That would then cause you difficulties should you have to access the health care system. If there's another way to do that — I suppose there could have been — and we'll certainly bring your issue forward.

As far as the optional section, I think the emphasis has to be that it's optional. I couldn't tell the member of the Third Party why that was put in there. If I tried to, I would only be

speculating. I'm sure the members opposite will agree that the government side never does speculate.

Therefore, we will bring the member's concern forward. The member is correct. In other examples, "Caucasian" is a term used, so I can't speak to that particular issue, Mr. Chair, with any degree of fact or detail, because I don't have any. Therefore, we will bring the concern forward and try to determine exactly how this was put in and why and so on.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister, because I know some in the public who have received this form offence. They don't think it's appropriate. These are well-educated people who have experience in dealing with matters such as this. I think it's important that we listen to those people with the experience and understanding of these types of issues.

I'd like to ask the minister if he could bring us up to date on the nine-year review of the land claim agreements. It's my understanding that the new funding agreements have not yet been reached. I'd like to know why it's taking as long as it's taking, what bottlenecks or hurdles need to be jumped, and what the government is doing to try to assist in expediting those negotiations, what positions the Yukon government is taking, and whether or not it agrees with positions that are being put forward by those self-governing First Nations.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: The first point we have to be clear on is that this process is a bilateral process between the federal government and the seven self-governing First Nations. Once we understand that point, then we can clearly understand or see that the Yukon government's role here is very limited. However, we did assist in the process; we did assist going through the nine-year review. We were a participant in that. We did assist in going through a gross expenditure base exercise, just for more information that can be input into the review process itself.

We did attend Ottawa and met with a number of ministers, along with chiefs of self-governing First Nations in the Yukon, to support the fact that the treaties in the Yukon are very important treaties; they are unique in the country. Implemented properly, they demonstrate a model for how we address what is unfinished business, to a large degree, across Canada, but a model to be sure.

So we did a lot of work in the process to get us to where we're at, which, today, again, is bilateral between Canada and the self-governing First Nations.

A mandate was provided — the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and its minister — and has been pursued by the department. Of course, once they get to that certain juncture, it must be then provided to federal Finance or the Treasury Board and, at this juncture, all available information to date, which is updated information, is that they have the elements of a new agreement on the table and the parties — especially the First Nations — are reviewing that. Beyond that — I would not want to go any further because, again, it would be speculative and we don't want to do that. We must leave the process where it should be, and it's now a matter of determining, from the First Nation perspective, if they want to proceed to the next step. On the federal government side, what has been presented is the result of the process — a long one

too, by the way — and the mandate and the necessary work and sanctioning that they require in their overall system. It's near completion, and we'll see what the outcomes are.

Mr. Cardiff: Just a short follow-up question for the minister on this subject: does the minister have any idea how close, if they're providing assistance? While I realize it is an agreement between the federal government and self-governing First Nations, if we're providing assistance as a government to try to assist the process back up to self-governing First Nations as Yukon citizens here in the territory — which is our job, as a government, to back up what it is that our citizens are trying to negotiate — does he have any idea how close we are?

Obviously if you're not in the room, it's difficult, but the minister is a lot closer to the matter than members on this side of the House, and I think it would be helpful if we knew whether we're months away, weeks away, or years away from the completion of this process.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: First, we have assisted, as I pointed out, all through the process. Secondly, the government supports the proper, appropriate implementation of the treaties. It also includes the matter of net benefit to Yukon. If you extrapolate the proper, appropriate implementation of the treaties, that includes self-government, that includes the financial transfer agreement to ensure it's properly resourced.

At this stage of the game, it's actually at the decision point on whether to accept or not accept. We can't speak for First Nation governments on that matter and, once again, it is a process that's bilateral in nature. I could assume, though, given the juncture that the process is at on the nine-year review and the new FTA, it is at that point where a decision will have to be made soon.

There is an extension of the existing agreement until March 31, 2011. That would speak to the possibility of what time frame we're dealing with here.

Mr. Cardiff: I would like to go back to another question I asked in another department. I asked the Minister of Community Services about a letter that I sent last fall to the Yukon director of the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs. It was a letter of support for proposals that the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs made to the federal Department of Finance that would provide a \$3,000 income tax deduction for volunteer firefighters who have performed at least 200 hours of service in the taxation year. It would also provide a \$500 tax credit to employers for each employee who was actively serving as volunteer firefighter or officer.

The concept behind this is to provide incentives, and this is about recruitment and retention, and it's about employers supporting their employees in participating in the safety of our communities. It's so that employers receive some sort of a benefit because their employees are often going at a moment's notice. Nobody knows when a fire is going to strike. So they're called away from work and, in some instances, in many communities, not only are they firefighters, they're emergency medical responders, so they're responding to traffic accidents or other accidents.

It provides that income tax deduction for the firefighter who has performed that service, because they're out of pocket

for costs, they're missing employment, wear and tear on their vehicles, and they're providing vehicles and equipment and donations.

I know that in the community of Mount Lorne, there are many who are giving of their time and their own personal property to assist in providing these services to our community.

I think it's a good measure, but the Minister of Community Services said that it wasn't in his purview — that it was something that he needed to talk about and that it came under inter-governmental affairs, I believe, is what he said.

I'm going to send this letter that I sent to the Yukon Director of the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs over to the minister, and I'd like to ask him whether or not he'd consider writing a letter of support as well.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I'd appreciate seeing the letter from the Member for Mount Lorne, and we would certainly work positively with our volunteer firefighters and EMS workers in the communities. Anything we can do to lessen the financial burden on those individuals is a benefit to all Yukoners.

I'll take the letter under advisement, and I certainly will be working with those individuals to see what benefit we could get working with our partner, the federal government, on a tax benefit to those volunteers.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, I copied the minister on the letter. I believe the date on the letter is November 16, 2009. Just the other day, when we were debating Community Services, the Minister of Community Services said it was a matter of taxation and he booted it over to the Minister of — I thought it was Executive Council Office, because he thought it was intergovernmental affairs, but it could be Finance. What I'm looking for is the commitment from the Premier now to write a letter of support on this issue.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I'm not sure that we are able to do that on the floor of the House at this moment. We're talking about issues of income tax deduction and tax credits that require some work.

As far as intergovernmental, yes, I guess it would be because we would also have to coordinate anything of this nature with the federal government. It's a process that sometimes can be lengthy. So before I can answer, yes, we would write a letter of support on the matter, we would have to — at least, the Department of Finance — look at this a little more thoroughly before we make any determination like that.

I can't give the member a response in the affirmative or the negative at this time until that type of due diligence is being done, so we understand exactly what it is that we can do, if anything.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Chair, under intergovernmental affairs, there was a meeting of the northern premiers here just last week. We'd like to know what discussions this government has had with regard to how this minister has been advocating for greater care, regulation, monitoring, planning for cleanup in the Arctic, to avoid a situation like is now occurring in the Gulf of Mexico. We'd like to know what discussions have gone on, on this file with the governments of the Northwest Territories and Nunavut. Is there a pan-northern position with Alaska? There is a lot of talk in Alaska about offshore oil development, as well

as with the Government of Canada, as they have a role to play in this.

There is lobbying going on with regard to whether or not the requirement for relief wells should be required. There's a lobby going on by the oil industry to strike that requirement. We've seen what happened in the Gulf of Mexico and the length of time it takes to drill a relief well and the impacts there are incredible. We're talking about the degradation of the environment, the great effects on the economy and the way of life of many people.

The Arctic is a fragile place — not that the Gulf of Mexico isn't, I'm sure — but it is a fragile place and it's something we need to preserve for all mankind, if we're going to have this type of activity.

I'd like to know what discussions took place with the other premiers with regard to this issue and what position they're taking with the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Of course, we're all well aware of the disaster unfolding in the Gulf of Mexico and it is really quite shocking. As far as this issue as it relates to the northern Premiers, it finds its way into a number of areas that we are working on because it becomes part of a number of different initiatives, but essentially the discussion was centered with the permanent participants of the Arctic Council. This was included. Of course, it's important to have all the Arctic regions involved in this too. That's not the only thing that was discussed, by the way. It included language, other environmental issues, healthy sustainable communities — so it's a broad-ranging set of initiatives that we continue to work on. The new thing is that we will be, on an ongoing basis, working with the Arctic Council and, as we stated in general terms, that is to be better able to influence the federal government's foreign and domestic policy.

As far as drilling offshore in the Beaufort Sea, for example, the Yukon has devolved from Canada oil and gas resources and, in that devolution process, we have a memorandum of understanding that we must follow, so that allows us that link to be able to provide input. We know there are international disputes about boundaries and, of course, that includes laying claim to resources below the sea bed.

Also at this time, the National Energy Board is reviewing these very matters. So we certainly support that review, Mr. Chair. In light of all that is transpiring in the Gulf of Mexico, this is a positive step being taken by the National Energy Board, which actually is the government agency that deals with this in most cases.

Of course, there are other departments and agencies that would also be involved, should something happen, but as far as regulatory issues and the actual activity in the Beaufort Sea, it's the National Energy Board.

There are other areas that we discussed — renewable energy inventory, which we are working on; the northern climate change adaptation strategy, which is part of our input on the national level; water stewardship so that northerners are firmly plugged in to the stewardship and the management of water in the north; tourism and marketing — building on the Canada Winter Games and the Olympic Games of 2010; on healthy

sustainable communities; a focus on housing; infrastructure; even telecommunications in regard to weather data with the PolarSat initiative from the Canadian Space Agency.

We have continued our work on health care funding and discussions on the northern university and northern research; and I touched on the fact that we are now going to regularly engage with the permanent participants of the Arctic Council.

Mr. Cardiff: The minister is quite right when it comes to the involvement of the Arctic Council. I think it is very important because I believe that, with what we're seeing happening with climate change and the fact that the amount of ice in the Arctic is getting to be less and less every year, the potential for a large-scale oil spill to affect many more countries than just Canada becomes more and more possible as the sea ice begins to disappear. It could have a very devastating impact. We need to have a strong voice, because what we're seeing with climate change now is having a huge impact on the people who live in the north and have lived in the north for millennia. We need to ensure that we do all we can to preserve the way of life, as much as we can, and to not destroy the natural food sources and the environment.

The minister also touched on some of the other issues. I'm pleased to hear that the water stewardship was discussed. I have a question around that.

It says in the communiqué that came out that the premiers recognized that northern watersheds contain ecosystems that have local, regional, national and global value. That's a pretty broad statement. It says that the ecosystems must remain healthy and diverse since they are fundamental to northern communities and economies, as well as being globally significant. They are globally significant for a variety of reasons because they maintain the ecosystem. It says that the premiers directed their environment ministers to continue efforts to ensure that regional and national initiatives address issues, such as climate change and water efficiency, and help ensure safe and secure water supplies for all Canadians.

There is currently in the House of Commons — although I understand that they're on a break right now, but I believe they're returning next week — a bill before Parliament, called Bill C-26, *An Act to amend the International Boundary Waters Treaty Act and the International River Improvements Act*. It has come to my attention that there is some concern that the legislation narrows the definition of "bulk water removals" to exclude water in manufactured products.

Canada needs to have, we believe, a national water policy that bans all bulk water exports and excludes water from free trade agreements, like the North American Free Trade Agreement. It recognizes that the water within our boundaries belongs to the public. It has a global value. Well, the global value is about preserving our ecosystems and our climate patterns; it's not about selling out our water.

The free trade agreements — there is a possibility that if one of the provinces did not adhere to a federal law, and they extended the notion of water as a commodity — this has been talked about. I know it has been talked about in British Columbia. It has been talked about, I believe, in Newfoundland.

I am pleased that water was on the front page of the communiqué. It is a good thing that we're having those discussions. We need to ensure that safe, secure water supply for all Canadians. We don't want to make the public interest subservient to the commercial interests in this. I raised some of this earlier in Question Period around the right to water and whether or not there are any plans to make changes to the *Yukon Waters Act* around hydro generation. But, by extension, if you've got the right to use the water, do you have the right to bottle it and export it? It has to be done within reason. We don't want to be exporting water. It will worsen climate change, and it will lead to increasing shortages of water within our own territory and country.

The other thing about Bill C-26 is that it does not apply to water resources in the north, which have been the subject of the most recent proposals by some commercial interests when it comes to bulk water. What they say they're doing is trying to protect the interest of Canadians and the right to water. We don't believe it's going far enough — but then, on top of it all, the legislation that's supposed to protect northerners and their right to water doesn't apparently even apply here.

I would be interested to know whether or not those formed part of the discussions with the premiers and the Arctic Council.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: By virtue of the fact that this is part of our ongoing agenda as northern premiers, I think that speaks volumes to what exactly we are intending to do. Now, is this about selling water? Is that the purpose of our efforts? No, not at all. The real purpose — of course, fundamental — is that we have input to the national government on what it is they do. But it is also important to recognize there are interjurisdictional issues on this matter. I will give you an example: British Columbia's project, the Site C hydro project, will in all likelihood have a major impact on the Northwest Territories river system, the Mackenzie River, because the Peace River runs into the Athabasca and the Athabasca runs into the Mackenzie. That is another point to be made.

Thirdly, are we doing things with our *Waters Act* that allow ownership of water? Absolutely not. In fact, the only thing we'll do with our *Waters Act*, going forward — at least the priority issue is going to be successor legislation and that is part of what we must do. Water is vital and very valuable to life. That has to be part of the equation as we go forward.

Can we use water, for example, in the Yukon to produce such things as electricity? Yes, we can. We can do so in a way that has much less of an impact on the environment, for example. It replaces fossil fuels and so on. None of these things, as far as selling water and bulk water sales and all that stuff — that's not what we envision here whatsoever. What we are trying to do, at least now, is make sure we have meaningful input on the national agenda.

We also want to make sure that what we have — because it is cross-jurisdictional for us, all things considered — one major water drainage is international in nature and the other goes into our sister territory. These are important factors in why we must work together. There are other instruments here — the Yukon River salmon treaty; there are all kinds of other

instruments that come into force and effect, but I can assure the member that we're not rushing headlong into selling water in any shape that the member alludes to, as far as mass export of Yukon's water supply.

Mr. Cardiff: I appreciate the Premier's position on this. The message that I'm asking the Premier to take, which I hope the other premiers are advocating for, is to ensure that the federal government does an adequate job of not allowing bulk water exports. The reason for that is because, under the free trade agreements, once it begins — once you turn the tap on, you can't turn it off. Once you start providing that service or that product, or you enter into an agreement, it becomes a standard practice and you can't go back on it without paying a penalty. We could end up in a situation where, in order to meet the needs of another country, our own citizens may have to go without.

Water is a precious commodity, and I'm not saying we shouldn't share it in times of need. That would be the last thing that I would be suggesting, but what I want to ensure is that it doesn't become a commodity that's traded on a bulk basis. It's about taking that message to the Prime Minister and to the federal government and saying that it is not acceptable to the people of the north and especially here in the Yukon, because that's the jurisdiction that this Premier represents. That's what we're asking of him today in his role as Premier and minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs. Will the minister, when he travels to Ottawa and lobbies with the northern premiers, make a strong case against allowing this so it doesn't become something that we have no control over at some point in the future?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Essentially, Mr. Chair, the reason we are taking this pan-northern approach is to address the issues that are, first and foremost, critical to northerners, but it is much more than the issue of commodity bulk water sales. I pointed to an example that is immediate. Cross-jurisdictional issues with British Columbia's project have a major negative impact on the Northwest Territories' Mackenzie River system. We have lots to do, and the messages will be firm. It will be in the best interests of northerners.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Chair, I appreciate the Premier's response. Having lived in British Columbia, I appreciate and understand that. I have lived through some of that. There are waters in B.C. that cross international boundaries as well. The one that comes to mind is the Columbia River. There were lots of disputes. In those instances it was Canada that was affecting the water flow into the United States.

I understand what the minister is saying, but what I was hoping to hear is — I guess the simple way to put this is — will the minister take a stand on bulk water exports?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Chair, I think I've been very clear here. The best interests of northerners are our priority, but there are a number of challenges in this area. Our pan-northern approach is to ensure that we have meaningful input to the federal government. I have not received any evidence whatsoever that the federal government by next week will be selling in bulk volume water from the Yukon, N.W.T. or Nunavut, or any other place.

There are already many international treaties in place that address — especially between Canada and the U.S. — water issues and challenges and disputes, and the list goes on and on, whether it be B.C. and the United States, Manitoba and the United States. There are a myriad of issues here. So once again, we will be very forceful regarding what's in the best interests of northerners on all matters that have an effect on northern peoples, our environment, our communities, and our future.

Mr. Cardiff: It just takes one person or one jurisdiction or one company to — I see the Premier is indicating, I believe, that he would like to take a short recess. I would be agreeable to that.

Chair: Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

Chair: Order please. Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with Vote 2, Executive Council Office.

Mr. Cardiff: When we left off, we were talking about water and bulk water exports. I have a few other questions for the minister about water inspections. I would like to go back to that because I believe water is something that is very important to Yukoners.

Currently, inspections and compliance under the *Waters Act* are handled by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Department of Environment. Sometimes there is some concern about the arm's-length relationship between permitting and examining compliance.

This has caused some concern among members of the public who are concerned that if you are permitting a project and you are also overseeing and ensuring compliance, there may be the need for another body or another department to look at that.

I'm going to just toss out a couple of ideas here and I'd like to hear the minister's take on these ideas. The first one is whether or not the minister or the government sees any value in transferring the responsibility for all water inspections and all monitoring to the Water Board. Also, what does the minister think about expanding the composition of the Water Board to actually have inspectors sit on the Water Board?

I'd like to know whether or not — this is another idea — there could be amendments to the legislation or the regulations concerning the *Waters Act* that might actually improve compliance. These could be things like creating regulations so there could actually be ticketing, like a summary conviction, for compliance and enforcement. It would be a tool that water inspectors could use to gain compliance without going through a formal legal process where charges are actually laid under the act. They could just ticket violators under the act.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I'd like to thank the members opposite for enabling the Premier to take an extended break so that he would be able to collaborate with the Yukon media at this time. Unfortunately, he's still doing business with the me-

dia at this time. I will do my best in his stead. I will refrain, however — I'll just put this on the record, categorically, that I am in a conflict when it comes to speaking about the Water Board. I have spoken to that in the past as well. I will defer any questions in that regard to perhaps the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

The member opposite made reference to water inspections. I know that an issue was raised — I think it was last fall — by the Member for Mayo Tatchun, if I'm not mistaken.

It was with regard to a memorandum of understanding or agreement that was struck between the two departments of Environment and Energy, Mines and Resources. That was something that was struck a couple of years ago — if not three years ago — under the previous ministers responsible. It was a means of being able to delegate authority to inspectors within Energy, Mines and Resources. That was just for the inspection, as I understand, for the one particular project underway at that time.

That's not to say that any of those authorities or powers under the *Waters Act*, when it comes to water inspection, are to be diminished, because it has been transferred or delegated to inspectors in another department. They are still subject to the oversight. Environment, I know, is very much engaged with ongoing discussions and ensuring that inspections are conducted in accordance with the act itself. I know the agreement was in the spirit of integrating our resource management.

It was an actual area that the respective departments have been moving upon. I believe it has been duly noted in previous reviews undertaken in the past. So it's something that the two departments have worked to the best of their ability to address — to be able to integrate services provided by the Government of Yukon.

So I do know that that agreement is still in place as I understand and it's still just pertinent to that one particular project. All other projects, however, when it comes to inspections in this regard, continue to be conducted by the Department of Environment. I know the Department of Environment has done a very good job in terms of providing the technical expertise and providing that oversight to other respective departments who require that expertise.

I know that the Department of Environment not long ago had actually created a Water Resources branch to reflect the importance of water management for the Government of Yukon since devolution. There have been a number of changes that have been made in the Department of Environment to reflect that importance and also the evolving role of water management as well.

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Mr. Chair, perhaps I can add a little bit more to this debate, even though we're not quite into Energy, Mines and Resources yet. Yes, Mr. Chair, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has a broad range of responsibility. Part of it is promotion of certain industry activities, whether it be energy, forestry, agriculture, or mining, but we also do play a very important regulatory role.

One of the things we have been working on in recent years is an integrated resource management approach. Wherever we can, it really makes more sense to have one person carry out three different tests, rather than have three different people go

out into the field and each carry out one test. This is a matter of practicality, prudence and support for industry and, at the same time, recognizing the professionalism and the professional standards of our people who do the testing work.

In fact, I would trust the qualifications, the character and the nature of the people doing this testing, whether they were in the Energy, Mines and Resources department or Environment, or in any other. I think the placement in any department does not have any bearing on the professionalism of those individuals carrying out tests.

I would take it as a slight to suggest that those people involved in ensuring that the testing is done are doing any less of a job because they're in a specific department. I trust that wasn't the intention of the question here.

We did have the issue of whether or not water-quality testing would be transferred to the Water Board. It's a question of the jurisdiction of government, the area of responsibility, and also the purpose of the Water Board. The Water Board is a lay board that has a regulatory responsibility; however, they're not in the active day-to-day operations of conducting these tests. We do have the people with the skills and background throughout the Government of Yukon and, as I said, we have made a conscious effort to work toward integrating our resource management and taking steps to ensure that high standards are met and that they are done in an efficient manner.

Really, if we can send one person in a white hardhat and a pickup truck out to do a test, that makes much more sense than sending out three individuals in three different pickup trucks to go and do three different tests. This is one way we are ensuring the high standards are being met, and that we're doing that in a prudent manner. I do appreciate the question, but I can certainly vouch for the competency and the professionalism of the individuals who are involved in doing the test, and assure members opposite that they are not moved from their responsible position or role into doing anything inappropriate because of the relationship with other individuals in a department. I hope that clears things up for the member opposite.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, there were a couple of questions in there. Basically, what I asked was whether or not the minister saw any value in transferring water inspections and monitoring to the Water Board. Included in that would be expanding the composition of the board in order to have inspectors sit on the board itself, so there would be an arm's-length monitoring of compliance with the *Waters Act*.

The other question I asked that I didn't hear an answer to was whether or not — as an idea — there could be amendments to the *Waters Act* or the regulations. The idea would be to create regulations for ticketing, so it would be like a summary conviction as opposed to laying formal charges under the act. For minor violations of the *Waters Act*, there could actually be this tool that inspectors could use where, in order to ensure compliance and enforcement, they could issue a ticket that would need to be paid within a certain time frame, as opposed to going through the formalities of laying charges and using the legal system. I don't know if the minister can provide an answer to that as well.

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Mr. Chair, the Member for Mount Lorne is proposing some interesting ideas. I am not saying that they are not without merit; however, they are a very substantive change. The Water Board is a regulatory board and not a primarily an inspection or enforcement type of board. The legislation that creates the Water Board is very specific about the representation of that board. It is made up of, for lack of a better term, a collection of lay people with a broad cross-section of the Yukon represented on that board. They do have technical advisors. However, what the member is suggesting is a significant change from its original intent and its original role. The member is also aware that this is one of the pieces of legislation that is affected by the devolution transfer agreement and that there are specific processes for the creation of successor legislation.

It is a fairly extensive process to go through. The ideas that he has put forward about fines instead of other penalties are something that may be worth further consideration and some thought. But I do again want to assure for the member opposite that the government is very confident in the efforts of our water-quality testers now. We certainly believe in their professional integrity. We have recognized their credentials and their experience in this matter. We certainly stand behind and support those Government of Yukon employees who undertake this type of water-quality testing.

There are penalties under other legislation. This isn't an issue that is done in isolation. There are other aspects that regulate many of the activities. Specifically, I'm thinking of placer quartz mining licences that may be in place that would also have enforcement or regulatory control over some of these areas.

I just want to make the member aware that we appreciate his constructive criticism. It is good to hear ideas put forward on the floor of the Legislative Assembly, ways of addressing situations better, of improving the efficiency, improving the standards of it, and doing so in a proactive manner. That type of debate is very constructive.

I do want to make him aware, though, of the challenges of changing the legislation to accommodate what he's looking for. I will certainly raise his issues or his thoughts with the folks in my department and give them some consideration.

Mr. Cardiff: As my colleague, the Member for Whitehorse West, pointed out earlier today in Question Period, that's what we're trying to do. That's why I presented it as ideas that could be considered. We're aware, as was pointed out by the Premier in Question Period in responding to my questions earlier today, it is something for which we are required to have successor legislation. Actually, most of us were all new members in this Legislative Assembly then, when the legislation came forward and the devolution transfer agreement came into effect.

We passed all kinds of legislation in this House about water and resources in the territory, as the government became responsible for it.

One of the requirements of that — my understanding — was to develop successor legislation that not only mirrors what the federal legislation was, but more effectively reflects the

wishes of Yukoners. That's why we're trying to present this now, so that when the government does go through the process of developing successor legislation, some of these ideas could be incorporated into that, if at all possible.

So while we've got a stand-in for the Water Board questions, I'm going to pose one more.

There was a recent Water Board decision to deny a water licence for the Carmacks Copper mine and it has led the company to suggest that the Yukon — it was basically Western Copper's vice-president of community affairs who said this: "Well, I don't think this is the end of the story. The company is disappointed, especially considering that the project was approved by YESAB. So we are concerned that the decision is not consistent with what prior decisions have been made on the project."

What the company is suggesting is that there is some inconsistency with the regulatory process. There are some questions about whether or not the environmental assessment board did a thorough analysis. There are some questions about whether or not the Water Board operated outside its mandate. If there are problems associated with the regulatory process and it is hindering — well, it could do a number of things. Number one, if the environmental assessment process isn't thorough enough, we could be endangering the environment and the water and the fish and the land and the air.

On the other side of the equation, if projects that should be approved aren't being approved, that has an economic impact. I've got questions around this as well, a little later, for the minister in regard to how we measure that. So the questions around this are whether or not the minister agrees with the company's position. Did the Water Board operate outside its mandate? Was the YESAA process thorough enough? If needed, will the government be bringing forth changes to the *Waters Act* or some regulations to ensure that this regulatory dispute doesn't continue and doesn't happen again?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Chair, I think we have to recognize the exact situation. The Yukon has a single assessment process. That is what we commonly call YESAA. That is a big asset for the Yukon Territory — that single assessment process — and dozens upon dozens upon dozens of projects have already gone through that assessment process and have been approved since it was implemented.

Secondly, I would venture to guess that we're probably in the neighbourhood of 1,000 projects assessed by YESAB. Of course, these are of great benefit to the Yukon public, and that benefit comes in many, many forms.

As far as the regulatory side of issues in the Yukon, we have law. Law includes the *Waters Act*, which gives rise to and mandates the Yukon Water Board. This is a quasi-judicial independent board that conducts hearings and reviews of applications put before it for water licences that are specific to the use of water and/or the discharge of water.

Again, there is a litany of examples of hearings and reviews that have gone before the Water Board and projects have been approved to the benefit of Yukoners today and, in many cases, long into the future.

There are going to be examples of issues, such as the one the member speaks of. First off, we must respect the independence of the process and continue to work on the situation, because what we ultimately want to create here is an ongoing, continued interest and investment in the Yukon Territory. For example, if we were to look at other denied water licence applications — there are others, so if any attempt is made to portray this as a departure from that independent process and the law that we must follow, that would be incorrect. We have to, again, respect that fact.

The one thing that will change the scenario over time is the fact that we have an obligation to develop and implement successor legislation vis-à-vis devolution and the agreement the Yukon signed on to some years ago, which we implemented in April 2003. At this time, we are not advancing successor legislation, in terms of the *Waters Act* — that's yet to come — but we did have to mirror, in this territory, the federal statutes so we're actually dealing with federal law.

Mr. Cardiff: The minister didn't necessarily answer all the questions. There's some concern about whether or not the Water Board operated outside its mandate, is my understanding.

With regard to successor legislation, maybe the minister can tell us what the schedule is for successor legislation. I know we recently passed a new, made-in-Yukon forestry act, which was a piece of successor legislation. There are a number of other pieces of legislation, as well, that require some work on the part of the government with regard to developing that successor legislation.

Can the minister tell us about whether or not the Water Board did operate outside its mandate? That seems to be the position the company is taking. Can the minister give us a schedule of when some of this successor legislation will be on the government's agenda?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Chair, the mandate of the Water Board is defined by the act itself. Certainly I, as minister, or anybody on the government side is going to interpret that. There are other processes for that. That said, as far as a schedule for successor legislation, all these things must be done on an ongoing basis in due course.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, seeing the time, we'll leave it at that and we'll move on to another subject. The minister either doesn't want to tell us or he doesn't know what the schedule is for developing the government's agenda when it comes to developing successor legislation. There has been a review of the YESAB process.

Some things have been identified, and I'm not going to go through a whole list of them, but one that has come to light recently is that there is a provision in the *Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Act* in section 122(g) that allows the Government of Canada, following consultation with the Yukon government and First Nations, to establish a funding program to facilitate the participation of specified classes, persons or groups in their review of projects. It is my understanding that this hasn't happened yet, but it is possible. The concept is that this was provided for under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. Seeing as how YESAA is kind of a mirror of that

act — that was the way it was explained to us; that's what the government is telling us — it's about creating a fund that would allow for citizen participation in the process.

When you go through a process like what I was talking about in my previous question, there are large multinational companies in some instances that have substantial resources that they can afford to spend to go through the environmental process and provide technical information and scientific information to support what it is that they're doing.

The most recent case that was before the Water Board — a substantial amount of money was expended by a self-governing First Nation in order to hire the technical expertise and help to present their side with the scientific data and the technical arguments that they made. Now, there are groups and there are individuals who want to play a role in this process. But they don't have the resources that large multinational companies may have in order to participate in what is supposed to be a public process that involves all Yukoners. So there is a provision within the act.

Maybe the minister can tell us whether or not regulations have been established to allow a fund to be created to fund the participation of groups or individuals in project reviews that are required under YESAA legislation.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: In listening to the member of the Third Party, we have to be careful we don't confuse the *Waters Act* and YESAA; we have to be careful we don't confuse YESAA being a mirror of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. YESAA is a creature legislation developed federally that was spawned through the treaties, so they are distinctly different.

Furthermore, as far as available funding, each First Nation receives \$100,000 from Canada. The Yukon receives a small amount, about \$196,000, from Canada and, because this is a federal statute and any amendments or processes regarding it would rest with the House of Commons, any intervenor requirements, should they want to ask for them, would go back to the federal government itself.

Mr. Cardiff: Can the minister tell us whether or not regulations have been established that allow the participation of groups or individuals, whether or not — we'll take First Nation governments out of the equation — \$100,000, I believe — and I'm assuming that's annually. I see a nod of the head. \$100,000 doesn't go a long way, as we saw in a recent regulatory process, albeit not a YESAB process, where a quarter of a million dollars was spent on one project review in order to get the technical information and expertise to argue or present the other side of the story. The minister is saying there's \$100,000 a year for each First Nation, \$196,000 for the Yukon government to intervene in some of these affairs or to participate in these project reviews under the *Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act*.

What I heard the minister say was that other intervenors have to go to Ottawa. Shouldn't there be a way for this government — for the Yukon Party government — to help facilitate individuals and groups of people with accessing that money if it is available. First of all, does the minister know whether the regulations have been established with Canada,

this government and the First Nations governments to fund the participation of other groups or individuals? How do people access that money? While he is on his feet, can he tell us what this government spent their \$196,000 on?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Chair, I am not even sure what the member is alluding to. First off, again, we're getting back and forth about cost to do with the Water Board hearings and YESAA assessments. Let me go over this again. The monies the Yukon government receives is not for intervenor status; it is for the work we must do in our areas of responsibility in regard to YESAA.

As far as regulations, there is a massive regulatory package that goes with the act; it is substantial. Furthermore, again, it's federal legislation. So outside of the \$100,000 per year each First Nation receives from Canada specific to YESAA, there are millions more being received through the financial transfer agreement. So, you know, if we're going to get into this discussion, we're going to have to get all matters on the table.

As far as intervenors, this is federal legislation and it would be back to Canada. We do our job, First Nations do their job and Canada does its job.

Mr. Cardiff: I can see we're not going to get much in the way of answers. I think it's unfortunate. I think that it's important that groups of individuals, whether it's the Friends of McIntyre Creek or the Yukon Conservation Society, Ducks Unlimited or whether it's a community association or a municipality — that if they need to participate in a regulatory process, take the Water Board out of it, because the question isn't about the Water Board.

We finished with the Water Board awhile ago. I was using that example as what participating in a regulatory process could cost. There are obviously some stumbling blocks and there's no plan to assist Yukoners to participate in a democratic process, which is what we were talking about — my colleague again today in Question Period was talking about how we involve Yukoners in democratic processes about things that affect them. This is important to Yukoners, no matter which community they live in. There are lots of projects that are being promoted and reviewed and Yukoners want an opportunity to participate in that and sometimes, depending on the size of the project and the size of the proponent and the resources that they have available, it's hard to compete and get your point of view across.

It's unfortunate that the government doesn't want to go to bat for those people and ensure that they have an opportunity to participate in the democratic process.

I'm going to move on to another area, as I alluded to earlier, when we were talking about a couple of other issues — measuring the success of what it is we do. The New Democrats raise this issue on — I wouldn't say a regular basis, but we've raised it before and we feel it's a good idea. We want to address the issue of using the gross domestic product and the inadequacy of some of those statistical measuring tools for assessing the progress of our territory.

I'm going to quote a few paragraphs here. The reason we believe the gross domestic product isn't an adequate measuring

tool is because it doesn't count some of our greatest sources of wealth — unpaid household labour being one of them.

Volunteerism — now there's one where I believe the Yukon would do well if we were actually using a genuine progress index, because Yukoners are known for their volunteerism. A clean environment is another example, and it's something we currently have and it would be a good reason — if we wanted to use a genuine progress index — to protect our environment even more. The problem with the gross domestic product is that it doesn't distinguish between those good things and the bad ones. It counts the depletion of our natural wealth and the environmental degradation actually as an economic gain. It's like the more trees we fall, the more fish we catch, the more ore we mine, the more fossil fuels we burn, the more greenhouse gases we emit, the more the gross domestic product increases. That's how we're measuring our progress in Canada and in the Yukon.

It only reports how much income we produce but it doesn't report how that income is distributed. You need to measure that. The gross domestic product can increase even while those less advantaged — basically the poor get poorer and the gap between the rich and the poor actually grows. Now, the genuine progress index is more of a commonsense accounting. It counts beneficial activities as positive and damaging activities as negative. The minister should be able to relate to this. It is kind of like the full actuarial accounting thing where you are balancing the positives and accounting for the liabilities.

It is a little more sophisticated but it is more accurate guidance for the citizens and the policy-makers and it allows us to evaluate the activities of our government, of our industry and our society. That way we can change what it is we're doing. We can change our behaviour.

I don't want to get into a great discussion about this because I realize our time is short here, but I would like to just highlight that in Nova Scotia, they're using a genuine progress index. Some of the components they use are time use. It's the value of civic and voluntary work. It's the value of unpaid housework and childcare. It's the value of how much leisure time people in our society have. It also accounts for paid work hours. It looks at living standards. It looks at income, but not just at how much individuals make; it looks at how that income is distributed among our citizens. It looks at financial security. It looks at the debts and the assets. It looks at the economic security of our citizens.

When you look at natural capital, it looks at things like the soils and the agriculture, the forests, the fisheries, the marine resources, the energy, the air and the water.

It looks at them in both a positive way and — this is the full accrual accounting version of it, for me — it looks at the positives, but it also looks at the negatives. We need those liabilities and we need to account for those liabilities when we're measuring our progress as a society. It looks at the human impact on the environment, so that can be solid waste. To the government's credit, with some urging, we have a solid-waste strategy. That could be something that would be a positive in a genuine-progress-index look at how we view our progress as a society, as opposed to the gross domestic product.

It looks at ecological footprints; it looks at greenhouse gas emissions; it looks at transportation, it looks at the human and social capital — something that I hear the Premier and some of the ministers talk about, it looks at the health of the population, it looks at the cost of crime and it looks at a measurement of how we educate our citizens.

There are some pluses for the Yukon and there are also some minuses, obviously, as well. We have work to do in that area.

The question for the minister is whether or not, as an alternative to the gross domestic product — and I'm not suggesting that we scrap the gross domestic product. What I'm asking is, how about we have a look at doing an alternative as well, so we have another measuring tool to judge how the government is doing and to look at how we're progressing as a society.

Would the minister have the Bureau of Statistics look at developing a Yukon genuine progress index?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: The member opposite touches on a few interesting points, but there are some problems with the argument, as well as some good points. It has been an interesting exercise over the last few weeks to have statistics coming out that we really don't seem to be able to make any sense of.

Statistics Canada for instance, comes out with something that says that unemployment is up dramatically. We find out, of course, that they rotate communities and one of the communities they rotated into is primarily a retirement community. So unemployment is, of course, going to go up with that. But the interesting thing is that in one Statistics Canada report, as an example of how we run into these problems, said that the unemployment went up because of the loss of 600 public sector jobs. Well, first of all I am suspicious. If we lost 600 public sector jobs, we'd be hearing about it. In fact, we can't seem to find what they are doing. I am looking at another document on the Statistics Canada website that says that the Public Service expanded. Well, how can we expand while we lose 600 jobs in that sector? So those are completely against each other and from the same agency.

We have had cases, for instance, with numbers of jobs where certain categories, for instance, women in certain sectors have been unable to be reported because anything less than 200 — as an example in one case that sticks in mind — can't be reported because it could breach confidentiality. So again, how do you create statistics when you can't even report on some parts of it?

The one thing that Statistics Canada does mention, however, is that one of the reasons our GDP went up — and I'll get to that in a second — was because of transmission lines and work on the electrical power generation. It's all for green hydro. We don't produce cars, we don't do a lot of things. It's not a manufacturing jurisdiction.

So, consequently, a lot of what we have is very, very difficult to compare to other jurisdictions. When you look at — and again, I'm going to Statistics Canada's website — decreases in mining, oil and gas exploration — well, at least on the mining exploration isn't our problem this year. Again, manufacturing outweighing the increases in engineering construction in gov-

ernment-related industries — and that's a comment on the Atlantic provinces.

In central Canada, again, transportation equipment manufacturing, including aerospace — again, that's not something that relates to here, or electrical power engineering construction. Well, we do have that, with Mayo B, so that's at least somewhat comparable.

But it's interesting, when you do look at the GDP, it's a measure — and the member opposite is correct in some respects that it's only one of many measures.

But when you look at this for instance, I think it's pretty well known that the recession hit virtually every area of Canada from coast to coast to coast last year, except for two small economies — Prince Edward Island and the Yukon. Both places saw gross domestic product actually expand — 0.6 in Prince Edward Island, but the Yukon went up 1.4 percent. Now to put that into perspective, Canada as a country went down 2.9 percent. So actually, we have come 4.3 percent above average, which puts us, using this measure, as the very best in Canada. We're very proud of that, and there are so many factors involved in that and so many people and groups that could take control or possession and credit for that thing.

So many people will really speculate that for a large degree, we've escaped the recession or at least we've escaped a lot of the aspects of it. It's interesting again coming from Stats Canada who claims our unemployment rate went up and then they praise us for having the best GDP in Canada. It's not the only measure and the member opposite is quite aware of that.

Comparing smaller economies, which P.E.I. and Yukon would certainly be, a single big project can boost or depress GDP numbers. Larger economies can be misleading and it's difficult to quantify — it really is — by that measure exactly which product or territory was hit the hardest.

In terms of what actually gets into people's pockets, I forget off the top of my head now whether the Yukon is the second or third, but it's either the second or third highest per capita income in Canada. That's pretty darn good, actually. Yes, there are some challenges and increases in cost of living here but, in general, I've never found it to be excessive. People I've tried to recruit to come up ask first of all about the cost of living or the cost of housing. It's possibly high, if you're from Red Deer; if you're from downtown Vancouver, extremely low.

It's all relative and the quality of life is certainly a big factor. Canadians in general look at the environment and look at all of these things with great interest, and that's as it should be. When you look at the Yukon as a jurisdiction, we're far and above everyone else. We live in a jurisdiction where consultation and concern for the environment is, if it's not the best in Canada, it's certainly pretty darn close.

We are 10 times the national average on a per-capita basis for spending for sports, recreation and culture — 10 times the national average. That is just amazing, Mr. Chair. What is amazing, too, is the fact that statistics like one in 1,000 in Yukon have cut a successful CD. Translate that to a larger jurisdiction and realize how outrageous that number really is. Quality of life is a huge thing here but the member is correct

that looking at it simply in terms of GDP — for instance, in Newfoundland, the economy shrank 10.2 percent as various projects wrapped up. There was a decrease in oil extraction and metal ore mining operations; there was a strike there. Nunavut's economy contracted 10.6 percent. The national economy declined 2.9. In the Yukon, we actually had the highest increase in Canada of 4.3. So we do have to look at various factors, but that is why we have our own Statistics branch within Executive Council Office. That is why we have economics and financial analysts and economic analysts within the Department of Economic Development.

They are constantly looking at this and constantly reporting to us on how well we're doing, or occasionally on how poorly we're doing in other areas and how we can improve. We will continue to look at all ways of reporting and, as the member suggests, I'm sure our staff is listening very carefully to this and we'll take these comments under advisement.

Mr. Cardiff: We were trying to present the good idea and I'm glad that it is recognized that it's a good idea. It's unfortunate that the minister chose to not stand up and answer the question for something that he's responsible for.

I just have a couple more questions and then it's my understanding that we will probably be going through the lines of this department prior to 5:00 if we can do that. I'm just going to have a couple more questions, but I'd like to take the opportunity now to thank everyone for a great sitting.

I feel we have accomplished some things. I'd just like to wish everyone who works for government and who is listening to the radio, all the Hansard staff for the work that they do, and all the staff in the legislative offices, the assistants — the people who answer the phones and do the casework — all that work is greatly appreciated. I hope that everybody appreciates the little break that we're going to get, although I know that there is going to be committee work, and that will mean some extra work for some of us, including those in the Legislative Assembly office who provide an incredible amount of support to all the members of this Legislative Assembly, and we've added a little bit to their plate — but we certainly appreciate the work that they do. So, I'd just like to wish you all a great summer. I'd like to ask a couple of final questions.

I'd like to ask a couple of final questions. Executive Council Office — the minister has responsibility for spending in the Youth Directorate. I know some increased funding was announced to youth-focused, non-government organizations. What I'd like to know is whether or not that is just annual funding for one year. Is there a multi-year agreement, or is it to be granted in perpetuity on an ongoing basis, to maybe be renegotiated to a higher level at some point in the future?

The other question I have is one that I hope, when we come back in the fall, I don't have to ask again. We've been asking this question for far too long, and that is what progress has been made toward the provision for a permanent youth shelter in our community?

I know other Members of the Legislative Assembly have interacted with young people on the street. Several years ago, I spent some time talking to youth outside the federal building late at night; going to Tim Horton's, buying coffee, buying hot

chocolate, and speaking with them. It seems that the government came up with some temporary solutions that aren't adequate. The government needs to take this seriously. I appreciate the increased funding to these youth-focused non-government organizations, but we need to do more. We need to find a permanent solution to assist young people in that transition from when they can't be at home so that they're not on the street, so that they're not couch-surfing, so that they're not trading their bodies for a place to sleep.

I would like to hear the minister stand up and tell me that they are actually going to do something about this before we've got children and young people dying on our streets, because eventually that is what is going to happen. We have seen it in the past and it is going to happen again, because they don't have a safe place to go. It needs to provide a transition to a better life and that is what an emergency youth shelter is designed to do. It is to give them a place to go and to give them some help so that they can move forward with their lives. It is just about providing them assistance at that critical point where they are really vulnerable. I hope the minister will stand up. I will appreciate hearing about the funding that has been provided. I certainly hope that I don't have to ask this question about youth shelters again in the fall.

Chair: Order please. Committee of the Whole will recess momentarily.

Recess

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

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I, too, would like to extend our thanks and gratitude to all the departments and individuals who have supported our respective offices throughout the budget sitting and with legislation, and to the Legislative Assembly, Hansard office and so forth.

Much work has been accomplished — the largest budget ever in Yukon's history; legislation has been brought forward by the respective ministers; constructive criticism has been brought forward and the need to take a look at improving pieces of legislation.

When the member opposite makes reference to committee work, this is another form of legislative renewal and our government has been very proud to work with the opposition on a number of pieces of legislation and matters of policy over the years — off-road vehicles, the very fact that the Premier tabled a letter earlier today designating the Minister of Environment to sit on the committee to take a look at the safe use of off-road vehicles. That indeed will be a very busy time for those members who will represent their respective parties on that particular committee. The *Landlord and Tenant Act* is another example. I know our standing committee on appointments is due for another meeting fairly soon as well for outstanding appointments later on in the summer. These are all but a number of examples of work that is conducted by the Legislative Assembly on an ongoing basis. I think the more work that we do, the more that it lends to the very importance of seeing additional work in this regard.

The member opposite made reference to youth funding. In this year's budget, I'm very pleased to be able to report, as the member opposite knows full well, that the announcement was made earlier this year to enhance the level of funding available to youth organizations in the Yukon.

To the member opposite's question, in terms of multi-year funding arrangements with groups, yes, indeed. There has been a commitment put forth by the Government of Yukon for multi-year funding agreements — so, in this particular case, three-year funding agreements.

We know how very important having secure, stable funding available is. Of course, that is always subject to legislative approval year in and year out, but we did put forth the commitment to not only enhance the funding, but to also provide multi-year funding by way of three-year agreements.

So, again, these commitments will enable the organizations to conduct their business, to continue to offer the valuable programming that they have offered and will continue to offer in all of our territory. I've been very pleased to be able to serve in a government that is very supportive of youth and ensuring that funding is made available for youth programming — for youth and delivered by youth.

It certainly is very similar to what we have done in the Women's Directorate by providing secure multi-year funding, in terms of providing ongoing funding to women's organizations. We were able to not only enhance a level of funding, but we were able to extend or expand the number of groups receiving funding over the years. In this particular case, however, under the Youth Directorate we are providing annual contributions totalling over \$900,000 to youth-serving organizations.

There is approximately \$220,000 to each of the following: Bringing Youth Toward Equality, Youth of Today Society and the Boys and Girls Club of Whitehorse.

There is also an additional \$200,000 for communities across the territory in support of winter youth activities and that has been a program in the running for some time as well.

There is also an additional \$102,000 to numerous community organizations across the territory for youth opportunities through the youth investment fund.

There were also dollars available to I'AFY for youth programming in this regard.

So this in total represents an increase of about \$330,000, commencing in 2010-11 with the delivery of this budget. Again, we know there was a demonstrated need that was brought forward by youth organizations, such as the Boys and Girls Club. With this additional funding, we will be able to provide that ongoing, secure and stable funding they are so very deserving of.

Mr. Chair, I know how hard each of these organizations works. These organizations also receive funding through a number of other funding mechanisms. The Boys and Girls Club, for example, receive funds from the arts fund to help organize, in collaboration with an organization out of British Columbia, to put on a circus for youth. It was very well-received. It was an amazing turnout of individuals in support of this particular event. But it's just one of many, many events that have been hosted by youth over the years.

In terms of the youth investment fund, as I made reference to, this has also provided a number of projects delivered by youth and promoted by youth under 19 years of age. This is more or less for short-term projects for youth, as I mentioned earlier: winter youth activities program provides funding for approximately all the Yukon communities — and I believe there are 17 of them including Kwanlin Dun First Nation — offering activities, training employment for youth and so forth.

Each of these eligible communities has received up to about \$10,000 per year. Again, the remainder of the budget is used for the program coordinator position that also helps administer this particular program. Hopefully that is quite clear for the member opposite.

In terms of the questions of housing needs of youth, this government has made great strides in terms of being able to enhance the delivery of affordable housing for a number of various groups over the years.

One such example is that there has been a lot of discussion and debate in this particular Assembly about the lone-parent family-focused housing initiative that is going up as we speak in the community of Riverdale. This is an example of providing long-term, secure housing — not just emergency housing but long-term. It was something that we, in working with the Women's Directorate and Yukon Housing Corporation, deemed as the number one priority in terms of providing housing to those in need — that is, those who were deemed to not be able to find adequate housing, to be able to meet that particular need. We went to work with a number of the clients who were on the waiting list and other stakeholder groups, including many of the women's organizations, to determine what the housing initiative would look like, how many housing units that would be. Now, here we are today, being able to help construct units primarily for lone parents — of which the lion's share, unfortunately, happens to be comprised of women and children.

We have also provided dollars for other affordable housing initiatives for seniors and elders, as we made reference to. There are a number of different housing initiatives going up in the communities, whether we look to Watson Lake — I saw tremendous progress on that one particular initiative alone. I know that will be very well-received in the community, but we are also delivering it in other communities — Haines Junction being one of them, where we were able to expand the housing initiative that we were able to construct through Yukon Housing Corporation not long ago. I could speak at great length about all the different initiatives, but in terms of being able to address poverty, we are looking at the root causes of crime, looking at the root causes of poverty in our territory. One of the greatest ways — or deterrents — of addressing issues such as this is by looking at housing — whether it is emergency or, more importantly, long-term housing.

There has been a lot of discussion through the anti-poverty discussions we have had over the years but, more importantly, the social inclusion strategy — the wellness strategy — that came forward in this Legislature not long ago and there has been a great need identified within that particular venue, as well, to address affordable housing for all different client groups, including youth.

Termination of sitting as per Standing Order 76(1)

Chair: Order please.

The time has reached 5:00 p.m. on this the 32nd day of the 2010 spring sitting. Standing Order 76(1) states: "On the sitting day that the Assembly has reached the maximum number of sitting days allocated for that Sitting pursuant to Standing Order 75, the Chair of Committee of the Whole, if the Assembly is in Committee of the Whole at the time, shall interrupt proceedings at 5:00 p.m. and, with respect to each Government Bill before Committee that the Government House Leader directs to be called, shall:

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

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

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

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

It is the duty of the Chair to now conduct the business of Committee of the Whole in the manner directed by Standing Order 76(1).

The Chair would now ask the Government House Leader to indicate the government bills now before Committee of the Whole, which should be called.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: The government directs that Bill No. 18, Bill No. 20 and Bill No. 84 be called at this time.

Chair: The Committee will now deal with Bill No. 18, *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*.

Bill No. 18 — Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10 — continued

Chair: The Chair will now recognize Mr. Fentie as the sponsor of Bill No. 18 for the purpose of moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 76(1)(b).

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I move that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 18, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, be deemed to be read and carried.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Fentie that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 18, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, be deemed to be read and carried. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$16,392,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$24,169,000 agreed to

Clause 1 and 2 agreed to

Schedules A, B and C agreed to

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I move that you report Bill No. 18, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Fentie that Bill No. 18, *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, be reported without amendment. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Chair: The Committee will now deal with Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*.

Bill No. 20 — First Appropriation Act, 2010-11 — continued

Chair: The Chair will now recognize Mr. Fentie as the sponsor of Bill No. 20 for the purpose of moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 76(1)(b).

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Chair, I move that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, be deemed to be read and carried.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Fentie that all clauses, schedules and the title of Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, be deemed to be read and carried. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$811,886,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$263,516,000 agreed to

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to

Schedules A, B and C agreed to

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Chair, I move that Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, be reported without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Fentie that Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, be reported without amendment. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Chair: The Committee will now deal with Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*.

Bill No. 84 — Labour Mobility Amendments Act

Chair: The Chair will now recognize Mr. Lang as the sponsor of Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*, for the purpose of moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 76(1)(b).

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that all clauses and the title of Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*, be deemed to be read and carried.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Lang that all clauses and the title of Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amend-*

ments Act, be deemed to be read and carried. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Clauses 1 to 18 agreed to

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*, be reported without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Lang that Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*, be reported without amendment. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Motion agreed to

Chair: As all government bills remaining in Committee of the Whole have now been decided upon, it is my duty to rise and report to the House.

Speaker resumes the Chair

Termination of sitting as per Standing Order 76(2)

Speaker: I will now call the House to order. May the House have a report from the Chair of Committee of the Whole?

Chair's report

Mr. Nordick: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 18, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, and directed me to report it without amendment.

Committee of the Whole has also considered Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, and directed me to report it without amendment.

Finally, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 84, *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*, and has directed me to report it without amendment.

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

All Hon. Members: Agree.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

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

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

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

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

I shall, therefore, ask the Government House Leader to identify which of the bills now standing at third reading that the government wishes to be called.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the government directs that Bill No. 18, Bill No. 20, Bill No. 81, Bill No. 84 and Bill No. 85 be called for third reading at this time.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 18: Third Reading

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Fentie.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I move that Bill No. 18, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Premier that Bill No. 18, entitled *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10*, be now read a third time and do pass.

As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall put the question. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Hart: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Horne: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Edzerza: Agree.

Mr. Nordick: Agree.

Mr. Mitchell: Disagree.

Mr. McRobb: Disagree.

Mr. Elias: Disagree.

Mr. Fairclough: Disagree.

Mr. Inverarity: Disagree.

Mr. Cardiff: Disagree.

Mr. Cathers: Agree.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 10 yea, six nay.

Speaker: The yeas have it.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 18 agreed to

Speaker: I declare the motion carried and that Bill No. 18 has passed this House.

Bill No. 20: Third Reading

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

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I move that Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Hon. Premier that Bill No. 20, entitled *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, be now read a third time and do pass.

As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Hart: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Horne: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Edzerza: Agree.

Mr. Nordick: Agree.

Mr. Mitchell: Disagree.

Mr. McRobb: Disagree.

Mr. Elias: Disagree.

Mr. Fairclough: Disagree.

Mr. Inverarity: Disagree.

Mr. Cardiff: Disagree.

Mr. Cathers: Agree.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 10 yea, six nay.

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

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 20 agreed to

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

Bill No. 81: Third Reading

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 81, standing in the name of Hon. Ms. Horne.

Hon. Ms. Horne: I move that Bill No. 81, entitled *Victims of Crime Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 81, entitled *Victims of Crime Act*, be now read a third time and do pass.

As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 81 agreed to

Speaker: I declare the motion carried and that Bill No. 81 has passed this House.

Bill No. 84: Third Reading

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 84, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Bill No. 84, entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act* be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Community Services that Bill No. 84 entitled *Labour Mobility Amendments Act* be now read a third time and do pass. As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 84 agreed to

Speaker: I declare the motion carried and that Bill No. 84 has passed this House.

Bill No. 85: Third Reading

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 85, entitled *Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 2010*, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Lang.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I move that Bill No. 85, entitled *Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 2010*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Community Services that Bill No. 85, entitled *Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 2010*, be now read a third time and do pass.

As no debate or amendment is permitted, I shall now put the question. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 85 agreed to

Speaker: I declare the motion carried and that Bill No. 85 has passed this House.

We are now prepared to receive the Commissioner, in her capacity as Lieutenant Governor, to grant assent to the bills which have passed this House.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Commissioner: Please be seated.

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

Clerk: *Third Appropriation Act, 2009-10, First Appropriation Act, 2010-11, Victims of Crime Act, Labour Mobility Amendments Act, Act to Amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 2010.*

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

Please bear with me for a few minutes. As I do at the end of each session, I will say a few words to finish your spring sitting.

I cannot say it often enough. Thank you for all your work in the Legislative Assembly and for giving of yourself to public life. Whether you are an MLA or support staff, everyone plays such an important role. It is shaping up to be an exciting, busy summer for me, as usual, with graduations, the Yukon's 112th birthday and a variety of local events to attend. I am sure I will see some of you as you continue your work as members in your ridings.

Summer is a great season for Yukoners as we shake off our winter chill and set out for the lakes and rivers throughout the territory. Camping and fishing — it all sounds so great to me, and relaxing. So make sure you take some time so that you take care of yourselves.

I wish you and your families a wonderful summer. Thank you.

Commissioner leaves the Chamber

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

As the House has reached the maximum number of days permitted for this spring sitting, as established pursuant to Standing Order 75, and has completed consideration of the designated legislation, it is the duty of the Chair to declare that this House now stands adjourned.

Members, please enjoy your summer.

The House adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled May 20, 2010:

10-1-168

Yukon State of the Environment Interim Report: Environmental Indicators from 2007 (Edzerza)

10-1-169

Crime Prevention and Victim Services Trust Fund 2007/2008 Annual Report (Horne)

10-1-170

Yukon Housing Corporation Annual Report for the year ended March 31, 2008 (Kenyon)

10-1-171

Select Committee on the Safe Operation and Use of Off-road Vehicles, membership of: letter (dated May 20, 2010) from Premier Fentie to Speaker Staffen advising that the Hon. John Edzerza, would be the Government Caucus Member (Fentie)

10-1-172

Public Accounts, Standing Committee on: Fourth Report (dated May 20, 2010) (Mitchell)

The following document was filed May 20, 2010:

10-1-155

Ministerial Travel 2009-10 (Fentie)