

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Monday, October 25, 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 will proceed at this time with the Order Paper.

- Tributes.
- Introduction of visitors.
- Returns or documents for tabling.
- Reports of committees.
- Are there any petitions?
- Are there any bills to be introduced?
- Are there any notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to develop a homeless shelter in downtown Whitehorse.

I also give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to continue its initiatives to revitalize the City of Whitehorse's downtown core.

Speaker: Are there any further notices of motion? Hearing none, is there a statement by a minister? This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Whitehorse Centre by-election

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, it is a basic democratic principle that citizens get to elect their own representatives, and they get to make that choice free from political interference. Unfortunately, the Premier and his Yukon Party colleagues have chosen to disregard this basic democratic principle.

Just last Friday, the Premier said he was still deliberating the time and political implications of calling a by-election. Whitehorse Centre residents have been without representation for almost three months. The Premier has refused all calls for a by-election that would let them choose their MLA. Instead, his party sent out a questionnaire to downtown residents.

Does the Premier think that a survey constitutes representation for downtown residents?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Liberal leader would recognize that parties do engage with the citizenry from time to time. Surveys are but one mechanism through which that can be done. But let us reflect somewhat on the representation that the government has provided for the citizens of Whitehorse Centre.

SCAN legislation was no small feat, Mr. Speaker. It was very important for the downtown residents. The eight-member street crime unit was another initiative led by this government and the Minister of Justice. It is an issue of crime on the streets in the downtown core, which is being addressed by this government. Habitat for Humanity — we all know what 810 Wheeler Street was about for years. Through this government's efforts, and its representation of the citizens of Whitehorse Centre riding, Habitat for Humanity has replaced a drug house at 810 Wheeler Street. These are just some examples of solid representation by the Yukon Party government and its team — initiatives that the Liberals voted against.

Mr. Mitchell: It's nice to have lists. Perhaps the Premier should put this on his shopping list: an election for a downtown MLA. Now, downtown residents expect to have an MLA in this House representing their interests. They expect to have the same democratic rights as every other Yukoner. Instead, they got a flyer advertising the Yukon Party and a questionnaire asking if there are any issues they want to raise with the government. Representation doesn't come through a Yukon Party survey. Representation is a Whitehorse Centre MLA sitting in this House every day advocating for downtown constituents. Does the Premier think downtown residents want a survey, or does he think they want an MLA?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, I think the downtown residents are deliberating thoroughly on the matter given the opposition that the Liberals have presented to the residents of the Whitehorse Centre riding and all the good initiatives that have been taking place in the downtown riding.

Let's look at another example — the replacement of Alexander Street residence for seniors. This is an initiative that the government went forward with on behalf of the Whitehorse Centre riding. Once again, the Liberals opposed it. They voted against that investment. The Liberals can't have it both ways. If you oppose good things for the citizens of Whitehorse Centre, you're hardly a good representative.

Mr. Mitchell: I'll make it easy for the Premier. If he thinks that voting non-confidence in this government is against the interests of downtown residents, we're going to continue to vote that way.

The Premier doesn't think that Whitehorse Centre residents need an MLA in this House to represent their interests. If he did, he would have called a by-election by now. He has stated in the media that the riding, and I quote: "will be represented very well by the government." Well, downtown residents don't want to be represented by the government. They want to choose their own representative from whatever party they chose to vote for. The Premier thinks a survey counts as democratic representation. The people who are actually living in Whitehorse Centre think that's a poor substitute. When will the Premier finally let downtown residents have an MLA in this House? Will he call a by-election?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: The statements by the Liberal leader about representation are merely an opinion of the Liberal leader.

Representation comes in many ways. For the Liberal leader to suggest that a party survey is now the sole and only

democratic mechanism that is representing the citizens of Whitehorse Centre is simply not the case and the member knows it.

These are statements in this House that are basic, empty criticism and serve no purpose, not only for the citizens of Whitehorse Centre, but they serve no purpose for this Assembly or Yukoners in general.

Let's look at another example: multi-millions of dollars invested in revitalizing the downtown core, including the waterfront. The Liberals opposed that. They voted against every dollar of that investment, Mr. Speaker. That revitalization of the Whitehorse waterfront and the downtown core is definitely essential to the riding of Whitehorse Centre and its citizens.

Question re: Land development

Mr. McRobb: The Yukon Party's 2006 election platform promised to ensure there is a constant two-year supply of residential lots in the Whitehorse area. However, Yukoners know all too well this is another promise this Yukon Party government has failed to live up to. Land availability was a hot issue a few years ago, and the minister at the time said he would be looking after it. Well, Mr. Speaker, he has looked after the problem all right, because it's now bigger than ever.

Last week's land lottery in Takhini produced some interesting results — 199 buyers for only 42 lots. Demand outpaced supply nearly five-fold. Unfortunately, it appears this problem will only get worse.

Can the Energy, Mines and Resources minister tell us how many new lots are scheduled for release in 2011?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Indeed, this government is taking strong steps to address this issue. Previous initiatives by previous governments encouraged people to pack up the U-Haul and leave the territory. Instead, with the Yukon Party in power, that certainly has been turned around. We're seeing growth — an increase in the population not only here in Whitehorse, but also in other Yukon communities. That's also something the members opposite should remember — that there are other communities outside of Whitehorse.

The Government of Yukon entered into an arrangement with the City of Whitehorse a number of years ago about planning and protocols for development within municipal boundaries. We're pleased to see some of the recent announcements of projects, including the Ingram subdivision and the additional project that the city launched last week. As well, we're well on our way into the design of Whistle Bend and expect that that will see additionally hundreds of lots available for a growing need here in Whitehorse.

We're working with the city, following their lead, seeing a mix of types of housing, whether it's single-family homes, duplexes or multi-family homes. We're working to ensure there's a variety of different housing options for Yukoners and people in Whitehorse.

Mr. McRobb: This government still points the finger at the previous government, even though it has been in power for eight years now — shame on them. There will be zero lots developed next year. That's what the minister didn't want us to know. Not only is the situation bad now, it's only going to get

worse because this government failed to ensure there is a constant two-year supply of residential lots in the Whitehorse area.

The insufficient supply of residential lots for development has impeded Yukoners' ability to acquire land on which to build their homes and will continue to do so for years. Not only will there be no new lots in 2011, the next new lots expected to be available in late 2012 will miss the building season for that year.

Can the minister explain why people wanting to start building homes on the next lots to be developed must wait until the building season in the year 2013?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: We just saw the land lottery for Ingram subdivision.

This had about 40 residential lots. It had room for 72 town homes, nine multi-family units and a number of duplexes. There are still some of those lots left, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there was a significant demand for the City of Whitehorse's land lottery that was held last week, and we continue to have an inventory of lots that will be back up for sale in another lottery in the very near future. We will continue with that with our partner in this process, the City of Whitehorse, and with Yukon First Nations, who are also developing land, available either for residential or recreational purposes.

We are continuing to work to address this need, not only here in the City of Whitehorse, but also in the growing communities throughout Yukon.

Mr. McRobb: Still no answer from the minister, Mr. Speaker. It is painfully obvious that this government has only two types of lots — under-supplied or overpriced. This is simply too little too late for many people who have already been waiting years to have the opportunity to buy a new lot in the city. The high demand for lots isn't new. It was an issue years ago, and one can only assume that's why it made its way into this government's 2006 election platform.

The number of applicants in the most recent lottery was almost five times the number of lots available. This shows us how much demand is out there.

Does this minister find it reasonable to expect Yukoners in need of land to wait nearly three more years to have the opportunity just to apply on a lottery for lots? Is that what he thinks?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Party government certainly recognizes that we're seeing growth, not only here in Whitehorse, but in other Yukon communities. We're seeing a renewed faith and optimism in the economy. We're seeing growth in the economy. We're seeing incredible private sector investment. We have also got — it has just been announced — two major condo developments in the planning and development stages on the Whitehorse waterfront. Certainly the private sector is making their investment into providing additional housing opportunities for Yukoners — let alone the hundreds of units that the Yukon Housing Corporation has provided, or has provided assistance on.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to work with the City of Whitehorse. We have lots available in the Ingram subdivision. We're also working on the Whistle Bend subdivision with the City of Whitehorse. Once it is fully developed, we will

then have opportunities for even more people to live and enjoy the quality of life that we all enjoy here in the Yukon Territory.

Question re: Municipal sustainability review

Mr. Cardiff: Last Friday, mayors and municipal councils from across the Yukon gathered in Whitehorse for the official launch of the Our Towns, Our Future review which will look into financial management and funding issues for municipalities. The minister responsible for the *Municipal Act* said this review would: “get to the heart of long-term municipal sustainability in the Yukon.” He goes on to say: “I would consider this to be one of the most important initiatives in recent years for municipalities.”

Will the minister outline how Yukon citizens will be allowed to participate in this review?

Hon. Mr. Lang: In addressing the member opposite, certainly the committee that has been set up with territorial government representation and the Association of Yukon Communities representation will be going around our municipalities and not only meeting with the municipalities, but meeting with the public. There is going to be a public component to the consultation. That will start on the first of November, and I look forward to the results of that consultation.

Mr. Cardiff: What the minister is saying is that, yet again, this government mostly consults with municipal politicians and consults but not necessarily with the people. That’s sadly par for the course with this government. When the *Municipal Act* was last reviewed in 2008, citizens were essentially cut out of the process, and the end result was a limited discussion about issues like four-year terms, and the more fundamental issues about municipal democracy were avoided.

Now the minister launches another review process which will look for innovative and cost-effective ways to support strong and sustainable municipalities, focused on things like infrastructure and funding. There are clearly other issues with the *Municipal Act* that are not exclusively of a financial nature.

When will this government start a dialogue with the public on the long-term sustainability of not just the financing of municipal governments, but the sustainability of our local democracy and citizen participation?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That’s what we’re going to do. We’re going out to talk to our municipalities. We’re going to work with the municipalities, the general public. We’re also going to meet with First Nations. We’re going to do a whole review here in the next six weeks and that will be part of it.

There will be consultation with the general public. There’s more to it than finances. It has to do with the sustainability of our municipalities. I look forward to the results and to the new year, where we can address some of these issues.

Mr. Cardiff: Maybe the minister would like to send over the terms of reference for the review. The preamble of the *Municipal Act* says that Yukon municipal governments are created by the Government of Yukon and are responsible and accountable to the citizens they serve and to the Government of Yukon and that public participation is fundamental to local good government.

One way our act creates accountability and participation is through the public vote section, which spells out the rights of

citizens to organize a referendum on any matter within the jurisdiction of the council, but the *City of Whitehorse v. Darragh* and the B.C. Court of Appeal basically struck down this right in that ruling that anything within the city’s official community plan is not subject to a referendum. This ruling is a major alteration of the intent of the legislation, which was to provide mechanisms for citizens to challenge the decisions of municipal government.

What is the minister’s plan to ensure that the public vote section of the *Municipal Act* meets the needs it was originally intended for?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The decision by the Supreme Court is a decision made by one of the highest courts in the land, so I’m not going to debate that on the floor here this afternoon.

This is exactly why we’re going out into the communities, into the municipalities, and also talking to the general population — or the community members and certainly looking at all aspects of municipal government in our communities. It’s not all about the resources that the community has at hand to manage its issues. It’s many, many other issues. That’s exactly why this was triggered: to get to the bottom of some of these questions.

I was at the meetings on Friday. This plan was well-received by the municipalities, and I look forward to the results of the meetings as they unfold. It has to do with all aspects of municipal governance and also meeting with the general public to see what input they can have. Everybody has an opportunity to have a discussion here over the next period of time.

Question re: Takhini Hot Springs Road improvements

Mr. Cathers: In 2009 the Department of Highways and Public Works presented the functional plan for upgrading the Hot Springs Road to the public. The functional plan includes the improvements my constituents have been asking for — widening the roads to create cyclist lanes, improving the trail on the north side of the road for multiple user groups and creating a trail on the south side for non-motorized users, including joggers, horse riders and skiers. The road service has deteriorated significantly in the past couple of years and it’s becoming an increasing concern for my constituents.

Earlier this year, the minister told me a small amount of engineering work still had to be done for this project. Will he please tell me whether that engineering work has been completed now and, if not, when he expects it will be completed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The member opposite is correct — the functional plan has been completed, and the update on the design work is ongoing. It is not finished yet, so it’s in process as we speak.

Mr. Cathers: My constituents are eager to see the Hot Springs Road upgraded and repaved soon, and also want to know if any changes have been made to the planned improvements. When the engineering is done, will the Department of Highways and Public Works be making that information available to the public? Will there be any processes, such as open houses, to seek public input on any options or changes? Is the minister able to indicate when that will happen and when he expects the engineering work to be completed?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I can't answer the question on the timelines of the design work, because that's an internal thing that's going on within the department. Certainly, I could get back to the member opposite on that. The public part of it — I'm not quite sure how that will unfold, but it is work in progress at the moment and the timelines are such that that work would be done over this winter.

Mr. Cathers: I thank the minister for that answer and I would appreciate if he would follow up in letter form with me when he has that information.

The Hot Springs Road surface is at the end of its expected lifespan and it needs to be repaved soon. The planned project — the widening and creation of cyclist lanes, et cetera — are all very important to my constituents, but the most common question is when will the road be fixed?

Widening and repaving the road is a priority that is very high on the list for my constituents. Will the minister please assure me that it is still a high priority for the Yukon government? And is he able to tell me when Highways and Public Works hopes to begin work on the ground to widen and repave the Hot Springs Road?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, all our roads are high priority to this government. We put the resources where the department sees the biggest benefits. But as far as what is going to be in next year's budget, the member opposite would have to wait until that budget is read in the House here. The design work and the functional plans have taken a period of time over the last four or five years, so we look forward to moving ahead on this project as quickly as we can, but as Minister of Highways, I cannot tell him the timelines here in the House today.

Question re: *Civil Forfeiture Act*

Mr. Inverarity: I have a question for the Justice minister regarding the status of the *Civil Forfeiture Act*. Last spring, during the public rallies outside this Legislature, and the healthy debate here inside, we actually achieved the consensus on a workable solution to our concerns with this bill.

The Justice minister defended this legislation at the time, calling it something that would be very good for Yukoners. We did not disagree with this part of the debate. We voiced our concerns about the lack of public consultation. The minister commented last Thursday during general debate that public consultation has not been scheduled. My question is, why has it not been?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I reiterate to the member opposite that this government remains committed to giving law enforcement the tools it needs to combat illegal activity in our communities. We are committed to ensuring the public confidence is strong in our police force and in this government. We have accomplished a great deal through our initiatives that we have put in place already to improve the justice system. A strong justice system reflects a healthy and peaceful Yukon, and that is what we have. As to the timing of the public consultation on legislation, the government has not and does not contemplate at this time scheduling the consultation; it remains tabled.

Mr. Inverarity: That's not what the minister said last spring. I am asking the Justice minister to work with us on this.

The minister clearly supports civil forfeiture legislation in the Yukon.

We agree that criminals should not be free to prosper from crime. The minister indicated last spring and as recently as last week that this legislation would be an important addition to fighting crime in the Yukon's toolkit.

This is an opportunity for us to work cooperatively on behalf of Yukoners. Will the minister please schedule something sooner and tell us when exactly this legislation will be coming forward?

Hon. Ms. Horne: Talk about flip-flops. Last spring we were criticized for bringing it to the floor of this House. I reiterate that we, at this time, have no intention of taking this bill out for consultation. We have several issues that are important to the public that are now out for consultation. I do thank the member of the Third Party for coming forward with his useful suggestions to this act.

Mr. Inverarity: Public consultation, Mr. Speaker — public consultation. How many times do we have to say it? We have been very clear about this issue. The *Civil Forfeiture Act* is well-intended. There are lots of Yukoners who have something to say about it. Public consultation is critical, especially for this legislation. We brought forward our recommendations; we asked the minister to work with us on behalf of all Yukoners, and the minister said yes. The concerns we have, have been raised and dealt with.

Last spring the minister made a commitment to do this. Is the Justice minister saying that public consultation will not be done before the election?

Hon. Ms. Horne: Perhaps the suggestions from the member opposite and Liberal Party are lost in space, because we certainly didn't get any useful suggestion — actually, no suggestions at all. Again, I thank the member from the Third Party for bringing forward his useful suggestions. This is not going out for consultation at this time; it remains tabled.

Question re: *Substance abuse*

Mr. Inverarity: Last week during general debate, I asked the Justice minister about the extent of the drug trade in the Yukon. The minister responded that she did not know the dollar value, but agreed that it was a huge problem. Yukoners are concerned about this problem — that this problem is growing. It surprised me to find out that the minister isn't more informed about the scope of what we are dealing with, with the illegal drug industry. Has the minister taken the time to get briefed on the extent of the illegal drug trade in Yukon and what is the estimated value of this illegal industry?

Hon. Ms. Horne: What the Yukon public is interested in is substance abuse. Alcohol continues to be the largest driver of crime in Yukon. We have taken many steps to deal with this problem.

We are expanding the street crime reduction team. We are continuing funding for SCAN. We are investing in land-based treatment centres; \$100 million in affordable housing; investment in education; a land-based healing program within KDFN; and we're consulting with other First Nations as to the viability of treatment on their lands. Drug prevention programs in our schools; land-based healing programs; investments in

NGOs with multi-year funding; Kaushee's Place; Help and Hope for Families Society in Watson Lake; the Dawson City Women's Shelter; Outreach van; investment in early learning; investment in community justice initiatives — I could go on here all afternoon with what we're doing about substance abuse in Yukon.

Mr. Inverarity: The minister can't even tell us how big the problem is and she has lots of solutions — which is nice to hear; however, Yukoners want to know that their communities are safe. We know that the RCMP is doing its best to keep Yukon free of illegal drugs. The minister has mentioned all the programs to support these efforts, but that's not what I'm asking about. The minister should become more informed about who else is working to stem the flow of illegal drugs in the Yukon. There are other government and non-government agencies that might be able to offer valuable insights in this regard.

Has the minister explored partnering with other groups, in addition to the RCMP on this issue? I know she has mentioned a few, but there are some that she has missed.

Hon. Ms. Horne: I reiterate that 80 percent of the driver of crime in Yukon is alcohol. According to our records, seven to eight percent is related to drugs. Again, these issues we brought forward — the recommendations we have put into place in Yukon were voted down by the members opposite. This is flip-flopping at its best and the Liberals do it best.

Mr. Inverarity: I don't think that even deserves a response, Mr. Speaker.

It's about the youth. They are our most vulnerable in society. If illegal drugs are made accessible to one child within the school, then the whole school is exposed.

We know that this is a very real issue and Yukoners are worried about it too. What is the Justice minister specifically doing to prevent the sale of illegal drugs in Yukon schools?

Hon. Ms. Horne: Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that we have the drug dogs in our schools. We have the early education program. We have the street crime reduction team and the results of that are very favourable. Our citizens are very pleased with the street crime reduction team.

We have SCAN; we have results back from the citizens on that. They're very happy with the results.

What more can I say? We are criticized for consulting; we are criticized for not consulting. We are taking care of Yukoners.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: Prior to ending Question Period, the Chair will rule on a point of order raised last Thursday by the minister responsible for the Yukon Housing Corporation.

At the time the Member for Kluane posed a series of questions to the minister regarding government accountability. During the course of his final supplementary question, the Member for Kluane said, "The minister should be mindful of the oath of office he swore in this Assembly."

At that point, the minister rose on a point of order and said, "The member opposite is saying that someone abrogated an oath." The Leader of the Official Opposition intervened on the point of order and said the Member for Kluane "did not accuse

the minister of abrogating of his oath. He reminded him of his oath..."

The Chair concurs. There is no point of order. However, the Chair would ask all members to remember that personal comments they make in the preamble to their question or response may lead to disorder even where the words themselves are not disorderly.

In closing, the Chair would like to remind all members of the words of one of the prayers we use to open our proceedings: "May the deliberations in this House be characterized by temperance, understanding and reason. And may we, the elected members of this House, serve all Yukon citizens with dignity and honour."

I would ask that all members keep those words in mind and act in accordance with them as we conduct proceedings in this House.

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce two citizens of Whitehorse who are in the visitors gallery today. They seek to represent downtown residents on this side of the bar: Ms. Liz Hanson and Mr. Kirk Cameron.

Applause

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): I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. The matter before Committee is Bill No. 22, *Second Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with general debate on Vote 8, Department of Justice.

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. 22 — *Second Appropriation Act, 2010-11* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 22, *Second Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with general debate on Vote 8, Department of Justice.

Department of Justice — continued

Mr. Cardiff: I'd just like to pick up where we left off on Thursday afternoon. We were having a good conversation about the correctional facility and what services will be available there.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the minister, the deputy minister and the officials within the Department of Justice, as well as the officials within Highways and Public Works, Property Management Agency, for the opportunity to tour through the facility on Friday morning and get a feel for what the facility is going to look like, what the programs and services will be and what type of facility will be available for those unfortunate individuals who are involved with our justice system.

That said, where we left off on Thursday was a question about what services will actually be available. It was briefly mentioned during the tour on Friday that there was an area that would be made available for Health and Social Services programming. The thrust of my question on Thursday, just to refresh the minister's memory, was that I think it would be beneficial if there were spaces made available to departments like Health and Social Services to deliver their programming, as well as space made available for non-governmental organizations, such as the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Society Yukon, Elizabeth Fry Society, Second Opinion Society and Alcoholics Anonymous, where they can have resources made available to those organizations, so that they can better deliver the programming in partnership with the corrections department and provide those services to inmates that truly assist with healing and rehabilitation of the inmates.

It could be a common space that some of the community resources could work from. I believe that, in the true spirit of partnership — which is what the government talks about — this would be beneficial. Can the minister tell us what types of spaces will be made available to these organizations and possibly to the Department of Health and Social Services or other departments that may have a role to play in the rehabilitation and provision of services to inmates at the new correctional facility?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I would also like to comment on our tour on Friday of the new Correctional Centre facility. It was very, very impressive. I'm sure everyone who came on the tour was very impressed with the new facility. The design and the purpose are very well planned. It will serve us well into the future in Yukon. I'm glad the member from the Third Party could come.

As to the questions, I will answer them; I hope I will answer them all. I will begin with the women's annex after it's no longer required.

The space now occupied and used as the women's annex will be the responsibility of Health and Social Services, and they are working on a plan of how to best utilize that space. We are also in consultation with them on using the annex to support our Community Wellness Court clients. The final plan will need to be in place after the new Correctional Centre is occupied. After the commissioning of the new Correctional Centre building is complete and the annex is officially handed over to

Health and Social Services, we will then establish what they will be used for.

As to the question about whether other public groups can use the facility and book space at the annex and at the new Whitehorse Correctional Centre, the department is currently working on a policy that will allow the use of these spaces for public groups. We will certainly work with NGOs such as FASSY, Elizabeth Fry Society, Alcoholics Anonymous, and other groups to work in partnership with the Justice department to provide services that work toward healing and addressing the needs of offenders and their rehabilitation back into the communities. We can look at the healing room, common space, classrooms, interview rooms and medical services.

Regarding the question about what will happen to the old Whitehorse Correctional Centre, there is money in the original project budget to demolish the old Whitehorse Correctional Centre. Highways and Public Works will do a feasibility study for the repurposing of this building. At this time, the old Whitehorse Correctional Centre is not being demolished and we will see what the plans are for the future use of this facility, but there will be no programming in this building or anyone living in that building.

As to the programming at the new Whitehorse Correctional Centre, there will be many spaces available at the new centre for a variety of purposes. There is a multi-purpose gathering area in the centre of the new institution, which we toured on Friday, and it was a very impressive area — a lot of natural light — and it had an unusual design, which was petals on a flower — a crocus. It was very impressive and I think it will do well for us.

Adjacent to this multi-purpose area are the food storage and food preparation areas, so that the food can be prepared right beside an activity taking place, such as a solstice gathering.

The elders office and lounge area are in the same program block. These rooms will be used by the elders as a place to work and meet. There will be the spirituality room right across from the gathering space. As I said, it's shaped like a crocus with a lot of natural light. We were going to go with a circular shaped room, but the elders opted for the crocus shape. A variety of programming can happen in the non-denominational spirituality room.

Medical and dental rooms will be in the medical area. There will be a nursing station set up with a secure medical records storage, a treatment room equivalent to a standard doctor's office, a dental clinic space equivalent to a standard dentist's office and two rooms for doctor consultations.

There will also be program space adjacent to the living units, such as the case management office and program room on each living unit floor. Other program space, such as classrooms and hobby craft, will also be adjacent to the living units.

I believe that answers the questions that were asked.

Mr. Cardiff: I'd like to thank the minister for those answers. She indicated the department was working on a policy for making space available to the non-governmental organizations that are providing services. I would ask that, when that policy work is completed and there is a policy in place, she

provide it to other Members of the Legislative Assembly, or at least the Justice critics for the Third Party and the Official Opposition, so we can have a look at it and gain an understanding of how that's going to work in the future.

Still on the correctional facility: I asked a question a couple of weeks ago about something I believe will possibly affect the operation of the new correctional facility — or the existing correctional facility, until the new facility is open. That is the federal legislation around the *Truth in Sentencing Act*. What we're hearing is that — the idea behind the *Truth in Sentencing Act* is that it reduces credit for inmates while they're in remand. The theory behind that — and the Minister of Justice touched on this last week in answering some of the questions that I had around programming being made available to prisoners in remand. She assured me that as long as there were no security risks — that there was an assessment done and there were no security risks — that prisoners, those who are awaiting trial and were in remand, could access that programming. That's a good thing.

The justification for the time credited in remand on the sentencing used to be because programming wasn't available.

As long as the programming is available, maybe there isn't that much of an argument to be made, but I would still like to say that the way that the act works — my understanding of it — is that this is going to affect those who can least afford it. It's going to be really tough on poor people, people who are less able to advocate for themselves, or cannot afford to pay bail. These would be basically the poor or the working poor, people who have low literacy skills, many of them being First Nation.

What the minister said is a little confusing. Her response was: "Our remand times in the north are historically higher than the rest of Canada." That could be borne out in the Justice facts, where it says that in 2008, the length of sentences ranges from five days to 609 days. The average remand stay was 38 days, with the range being from one day to 396 days.

It shows that — I believe, anyhow — if the average stay in remand was 38 days, but it was in a range of one to 396 days — the other reason for having one and a half times or two times the credit for the time spent in remand taken off of your sentence is that oftentimes it is because the courts are backed up. So it's through no fault of their own that they're spending this time in remand. If that's the cases, if the justice system wasn't plugged up, these cases could be dealt with more expeditiously. What the minister said is that our remand times in the north are historically higher than the rest of Canada.

The new legislation will gradually reduce the amount of time inmates spend in our corrections system, but that's not necessarily the case. What it's saying is that instead of getting one-and-a-half times credit, or two times credit, for time spent in remand, they're actually going to have to serve their full term in the correctional facility. So they'll actually be in the correctional facility for a longer period of time.

I don't understand the minister's reasoning on that. I also asked questions about what financial impacts the new law would have at the new correctional facility — or at the current one, for that matter. It was the Commissioner of the Correc-

tional Service of Canada who said they're going to need about \$2 billion to deal with the increase in prisoners due to this new legislation — basically the law-and-order agenda. The Commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada, Don Head, said the crime legislation will need an extra 4,500 people in federal prisons across the country over the next three years.

I'm wondering what impact this is actually going to have on our correctional system here in Yukon and how the minister intends to fund that. Will there be additional funds coming from the federal government? And at the next meeting of the federal, provincial and territorial justice ministers, will the minister ask them to review the effects that this law is having on the poor, the working poor, people with low literacy skills and on the First Nations population of the territory and our country?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I will repeat the information I gave on Thursday. Bill C-25, the *Truth in Sentencing Act*, came into force on February 22, 2010, and it limits how much value courts can assign to pre-trial custody. It is just what it says it is — it's the *Truth in Sentencing Act*. Under the new legislation, the courtroom practice will be to give straight time or one-to-one credit for time spent in remand — i.e. truth in sentencing. The existing Whitehorse Correctional Centre and the new Whitehorse Correctional Centre presently under construction are both able to handle the gradual increase of sentenced inmates. We're comfortable with the size of the new facility and it should serve our needs for the next 30 to 40 years. There is capacity of 166, which is double-bunking. This includes approximately 15 women and also special needs clients.

The new legislation will gradually reduce the amount of inmates serving remand time. I'll elaborate on that a little more here later on.

Having inmates under sentence as opposed to remand status means that inmates have more flexibility to take programming and take part in work programs. This is what is different with our remand inmates at the Correctional Centre; they do have the ability to take any programming that is available to them. But of course, they have to agree to take and want to take the programming. We are aware that there is a disproportionate number of First Nation offenders within the system and we have taken steps to address this issue, most notably with the *Corrections Act, 2009* and in the creation of programs that are directed to First Nations.

The inmates who have been remanded into custody do have the advantage of taking the programming in the same manner as the sentenced inmates, but the sentenced inmates are given priority. The remand inmates are often in custody for such brief periods of time that it does not allow them to attend programming. The difference between inmates remanded into custody as opposed to inmates who are sentenced, is that they are innocent in the eyes of the law, and therefore cannot be compelled to take the programming.

I can assure the member opposite that the remand time was identified by federal, provincial, and territorial ministers of justice at the FPT meeting. FPT ministers worked with the federal government to address the issue. The FPT ministers are also working with the federal government to address the impact of the various pieces of *Criminal Code* amendments. Our cur-

rent projections indicate that the current building will address our needs.

The statistics provided were from last year, 2009, with the federal government, and they were proclaimed in 2010. We don't have any new statistics as to how many are using bail. We do have an inmate work program, which is really working quite successfully, and the inmates at the Whitehorse Correctional Centre have work programs that are required under the new *Corrections Act, 2009*. They are provided to inmates for a number of reasons. Work programs allow inmates to learn important skills and gain experiences that may increase the likelihood of employment upon release.

The work programs also contribute to a good work ethic, building self-esteem, self-discipline and make productive use of their time during their stay at the Whitehorse Correctional Centre. The Whitehorse Correctional Centre and the inmate work program have assisted a number of community projects over the last year. For example, inmates have worked on the Habitat for Humanity triplex housing project, Phoenix Rising. The triplex was built on the same site where the very well-known 810 Wheeler Street drug house used to be, which was demolished.

Inmates on the crew, under the supervision of work crew supervisors, donated in excess of 1,000 hours to this project. The tasks ranged from cleaning up the property, drywalling, building porches, plumbing activities, insulating the crawlspace and painting. The future tasks will include the installation of siding.

We've assisted the Youth of Today Society to renovate Angel's Nest — that was 300 donated hours; cleaning up of Kishwoot Island and Bert Law Park; we helped the Klondike Snowmobile Association clear brush on the trails in the Whitehorse area; we helped with the renovations of the Mae Bachur Animal Shelter — the work crew installed proper dog runs and secured the cat pen.

The president of the Humane Society Yukon sent a written thank you stating that, without the help of the work crew, the work would not have been done. The president also commented on the much-needed renovations, reducing the workload of shelter staff and enhancing the lives of their animals.

Any materials needed for the work projects are normally purchased by the sponsoring agency. The costs associated with equipment, inmate pay and work crew supervisor salaries are included in the budget for the Whitehorse Correctional Centre.

In September 2010, Whitehorse Correctional Centre purchased a van to transport the work crew and equipment, at a cost of \$31,000. The work crew, in the last year, has provided hundreds of hours of free labour to worthy projects in the community, and these certainly will continue.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for her answers. It is a little different from what she had previously said, because she just finished saying, not too long ago — I'll wait and let the Premier brief the minister and the officials.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Cardiff: Well, if she's not listening to me, why should I ask the question?

The minister, on one hand, said that it would reduce the number of inmates in the system and the amount of time they spend in our correctional system. She then indicated that they would be in there, so I'm not sure which is right.

The bill basically ended the practice of giving convicted criminals double credit for time spent in custody awaiting trial. There are a number of reasons for that — some of it is overcrowding, which may be the case now, but with the new facility that probably won't be the case — we hope.

There is also the issue about whether or not inmates are eligible to receive programming. The minister's quite right — individuals have to be willing and accepting of that programming in order to receive it. So, I talked about what the — I just lost my place here. I just need to find my spot here again. I shuffled some paper, and I've misplaced that one — oh, it was the Commissioner, Correctional Service of Canada, Don Head.

Mr. Chair, the parliamentary budget officer in Ottawa, Kevin Page, put a price tag on the truth in sentencing law. While this is looking at it from a federal perspective, this is what Mr. Page had to say: "In 2009-10, corrections in Canada cost \$4.4 billion. By 2016, they're projecting that it will cost \$9.5 billion." That's an additional \$1 billion a year over five years, Mr. Chair.

Some of the additional costs will be in new facility construction. We won't be faced with that here, because we are already doing that, after taking a long time to do it — but finally we're there and it's a good thing.

By limiting the credit that a judge can allow for time served, it is going to add about 159 days to inmates' average sentences — this is federally — and bring their average time in federal custody to 722 days from 563.

It also says that the number of inmates in federal prisons at any one time will increase to about 17,000 inmates from about 13,300 — an additional almost 4,200 inmates, so additional cells we won't need. But what he also looks at — this is the parliamentary budget officer — is that provinces and territories carry the weight of the corrections service system in Canada. So the impact on provinces and territories is going to be where it's felt the most and, when you start calculating the figures and the total cost, it is going to be substantial. What I am asking the minister — when we toured the facility on Friday, it didn't appear that there was a — we're going to move the people from the existing facility to the new facility and we're making improvement in staffing by the sounds of it — is what I understood from the director of corrections — that there were more full-time corrections officers and there was a complement of auxiliary on-calls that can be called in, because you have to backfill every position.

You can't leave a position empty for a shift because you need those people there 24/7. We're not sure what the additional costs of running the facility are, because it's a larger facility with more room for more inmates. But we don't know — or we don't seem to have a cost of what the possible impact of this new federal law will be on the operation of the facility. It's pretty clear to me that inmates will be there for a longer period of time and that there may in fact be more inmates — an in-

crease in the number of inmates staying in the correctional facility.

Could the minister enlighten us: are they studying this issue? Are they trying to do some projections about what the impacts might be?

I don't believe she answered the question about whether or not she would take forward to her federal, provincial and territorial counterparts the idea of a review to see just what kind of an impact this is having on those persons with low literacy skills, poor people with an inability to make bail, and the First Nation community as well.

Hon. Ms. Horne: First of all, I'd just like to give an overview. A robust, sophisticated and balanced justice system is one of the most important building blocks for any society, and we in the Yukon have completely redeveloped the way we do corrections. The old model was to warehouse offenders. Our model focuses on protecting society and an offender accountability. We have a new corrections philosophy; a new *Corrections Act, 2009*; a new correctional and treatment centre.

Again, the number one driver of crime in Yukon is substance abuse. We have implemented the *Yukon Substance Abuse Action Plan*; we have more treatment programs and options; we have more education and prevention programs; we have enforcement, like SCAN and the street crime work. In partnership with First Nations, we've developed a land-based treatment option. We recognize the challenges and are responding to the needs of people with FASD. We are addressing violence in the home by promoting equality.

To directly respond to the member opposite, it's my understanding that the judiciary in the territory customarily gave 1.5:1 to one credit, even prior to the new legislation. This means the new pact of the legislation will be less marked in Yukon than in other jurisdictions. In addition, the new legislation came into effect in May. We will monitor the legislation and we will make adjustments accordingly.

Yes, I'll agree that the impact of the new legislation will be greater for the federal government than for us here in the Yukon Territory, or in the three northern territories. So, from a territorial perspective, we are quite comfortable that citizens will have a greater confidence in our justice system, and our new Correctional Centre will be able to address the number of offenders from the time it opens, and for the next 40 years.

During our tour, we explained the supervision model. The staffing model for the new Correctional Centre is currently under development, and the need for new staff has not yet been confirmed. The issue of staffing for the new centre is still under analysis. The analysis will include examination of the legislative requirements under the new *Corrections Act, 2009*, the new federal legislation, and commitments made for correctional redevelopment. The analysis will include security requirements at the new facility, programming requirements under the new *Corrections Act, 2009*, and the correctional redevelopment strategic plan. The direct supervision model has an officer stationed in the living unit itself. As we saw during our tour, they will be right within the pod. This allows the officer continual contact with the inmates and the ability to address

any and all concerns immediately, and this provides a safer environment for inmates and staff of the centre.

Supervision of inmates at the centre must incorporate knowledgeable, respectful and effective communication, support, intervention and direction. Preparatory training for this model has included First Nations culture, special inmate groups, risk assessment, post-traumatic stress and mental disorders, motivational interviewing skills and policy application. As a component of the corrections redevelopment, the department has completed the implementation phase of direct living unit supervision in four units, including the women's annex. Staff members supervise, interact and manage clients directly in these four units. All staff participate in a comprehensive training program to be more proficient in using interpersonal skills to accomplish daily objectives and maintain control using the least restrictive means available. Part of the training was emergency extraction. This provides staff with an alternative avenue should safety be at risk. Direct supervision training is part of the correctional officer basic training for future hires.

In 2010-11, curriculum development and delivery of enhanced direct supervision training will be provided for staff. The training will provide staff with skills and knowledge to be proactive in the case management process and day-to-day decision-making for supervising the unit. This training will also provide supervisors with enhanced skills, knowledge, confidence, accountability and supervision and support for correctional officers working in the direct supervision model.

Managers and supervisors will continue to directly monitor the progress of staff and inmates in the direct staff units in order to make any necessary adjustments and to ensure the concepts, training guidelines and policies are implemented in a consistent manner.

The presence of managers and supervisors will provide the necessary support for both staff and inmates and will allow immediate avenues of communication and feedback. This is further developed through current supervisory leadership, skill development training and mentorship programming. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Cardiff: I don't know that the minister and I are necessarily going to see eye to eye on this matter. I agree that Yukon citizens need to have confidence in the justice system and the correctional system. I think that is an important piece of the equation, and I think we are making progress with things like land-based treatment. We're making progress by having a new, more modern facility where we can more efficiently monitor the activities of inmates where they are safe — both the inmates and the staff. I think it's important that the staff feel secure in the job they are doing. I think that is a very important piece of this equation, and I was pretty confident, in looking at the design of the new facility and the way it was explained, that the safety of the staff will be improved.

It will provide for more interaction of the staff with the inmates with regard to programming and will allow them to move a little bit more freely within the areas that are available to them, and at the same time, provide the staff with the ability to separate and segregate those inmates who may have issues

with other inmates, so that the inmates are safe and the staff can be safe as well.

I don't want to spend a lot of time disagreeing with the minister about what the possible impacts of that legislation, C-25, might be, so I'd like to ask her a question about recidivism — repeat offenders and types of programming. Are we seeing an increase in recidivism? The statistics that were provided from between — they were kind of lumped together in the Justice facts 2003-08. It showed that 20 percent were likely to reoffend in that period. It showed 20 percent were likely to reoffend twice. Twenty-two percent were likely to reoffend between three and nine times; and two percent, 10 or more times.

I'm wondering whether or not that represents an increase or if there is a decrease in recidivism. The facts that are provided are basically over that five-year period, but that doesn't tell us whether or not there is more recidivism or whether there is less recidivism. Could she provide some information in that regard?

Hon. Ms. Horne: There are no real reliable recidivism measures. Our facts booklet is designed to give a raw number. This does not address the seriousness of the offence. We are working nationally on a recidivism measure, but this work is not yet complete.

I'll just add here that an important addition and tool to assist in decreasing the recidivism rate in Yukon is our attendance centre, or the Community Wellness Court attendance centre. I briefly went over that with the member opposite on Friday. The attendance centre will provide wrap-around services for clients of the Community Wellness Court, as well as ongoing support and after-care when they have completed Community Wellness Court.

The opening of the attendance centre will complete the vision of providing Community Wellness Court clients — those with substance abuse, mental health problems, FASD or cognitive impairments — the resources they need to successfully complete their wellness journey. The attendance centre will also serve as a check-in centre for low-risk offenders on probation, and bail clients.

The attendance centre will provide programs and services that will address a variety of clients' needs, such as counselling and group programs that address their criminal behaviour, as well as providing assistance with other aspects of their wellness journey, such as employment readiness, life skills, educational upgrading, recreational and healthy living, budgeting and money management, responsible tenancy, and other programs that will be coming up.

The attendance centre, I am happy to say, will be open 12 hours per day, seven days a week. Through extended hours of operation, programs and services will be offered during the day, in the evening, and on weekends to enhance access to clients and offer support during periods of time when they are more at risk. The attendance centre will begin operation in late November 2010. The attendance centre is being funded through the existing budget of the Community Wellness Court will be based in downtown Whitehorse where it is more accessible to more clients.

Within our new *Corrections Act, 2009*, as you can see, we're not sitting still; we are still actively developing programming and support for our clients who go through our justice system. As to our numbers here, a more reliable way to look at crime is the crime severity index. Regular crime statistics only look at gross numbers; the crime severity index looks at how severe a crime is. Either measure shows a long-term trend toward lower crime rates.

Mr. Cardiff: I believe the minister did mention the attendance centre when she was answering questions from the Member for Porter Creek South and I do recall that. What she's saying is when they get the attendance centre in place, what I'm hearing — and that it is going to be in downtown Whitehorse — does she have a time frame? I think it's a good idea. It sounds like it's a good idea to provide services to clients of the court system and the Community Wellness Court. I'd like to know what the time frame is for its establishment. Is this going to be a new building that the Department of Justice is building, or is it going to be housed in an existing structure? What is the proposed location for it? Would it also be available to individuals who are on probation? It would make sense to me that maybe some of the individuals on probation might benefit from accessing some of those services, like employment skills, life skills training and others that the minister mentioned with regard to the attendance centre. If the minister could provide some further detail on that, it would be much appreciated.

Hon. Ms. Horne: Yes, this will be available for individuals on probation. As I said earlier, we hope to have this up and running by the end of November. When we do have the details on the building's location — we will certainly send both critics for the opposition an invitation to the opening. But we are still working on the final details for the building, and we will let you know as soon as they are established.

Mr. Cardiff: You would think that if it's going to be available at the end of November, we'd have an idea of the location. If there's a reason why we can't get the location, then I guess we'll have to wait until the end of November to find out where it's going to be located. I'm assuming it's going to be in an existing facility, as we probably won't be building a new one before the end of November. I know I asked some questions regarding addictions treatment and I did, during the tour, see the area that was intended for inmates needing mental health treatment, and it was a secure area.

I just wanted to clarify — what I understood last week is that if there were male and female inmates, both requiring mental health treatment in the correctional facility, they would be in separate units. I believe it was on the top level in the men's area where they were going to have the mental health treatment housed, close to the main control area. Can she confirm the female inmates would actually be housed in the female section, if they required mental health treatment?

What is the maximum number of rooms available for those suffering from mental illness, in need of treatment?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I can confirm that we have separate mental health facilities for male and female, and they will be separated, and they are on the third floor. The exact number of

cells — we do not have those details as yet, but we will be issuing those as they become available.

Mr. Cardiff: I thought that was known, but I'll look forward to receiving that information from the minister.

I guess the other thing is that these two kind of tie together — how the mental health services will be staffed. Is there a person — a psychologist or psychiatrist — dedicated to provide mental health services to inmates?

The other question I have is, if there's an inmate who has been in the facility who is on remand and they're found not criminally responsible because of mental health issues, what's going to happen to that individual? In the past, I believe we've seen persons who have had mental health issues, who have been involved in with corrections, but then have been found innocent or not criminally responsible, basically, who have been housed at the correctional facility.

I'm just wondering, is that going to continue to be a practice where it's two separate institutions — there is the correctional institution and there is the mental health institution — or will they be transferred to secure facilities at Whitehorse General Hospital if they're found not criminally responsible? How is that going to work?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I can tell you what we're doing currently and the services that are available currently to offenders with mental health issues at WCC.

Whitehorse Correctional Centre has the ability to manage inmates with mental health issues within its mental health room. This room is capable of holding three inmates in a bright spacious area. A local psychiatrist attends weekly to treat male and female inmates referred by the physician. A nursing manager with expertise in mental health provides services to inmates and there's clinical supervision by two registered nurses. In addition, the department employs a master's level forensic clinician who attends the centre to assess and treat mental health clients.

In sentencing, the judge can recommend that accused persons avail themselves of mental health services during their period of confinement. A judge may not order someone to receive mental health treatment, and inmates have the right to refuse treatment. Psychiatric care is considered medical treatment. Mental health services are available to all inmates at Whitehorse Correctional Centre and clients of offender supervision and services. Community Health and Correctional Services continue to contract with the local psychiatrists to provide comprehensive psychiatric services to inmates and clients who are referred.

In the 2007-08 fiscal year, \$129,700 was expended on psychiatric services for Whitehorse Correctional Centre and offender supervision and services. In the 2008-09 fiscal year, \$158,200 was expended on psychiatric services for Whitehorse Correctional Centre. In 2009-10, \$108,094 was expended. Yukon Review Board clients, like any other individual at Whitehorse Correctional Centre, have access to all services, programs and recreational opportunities available.

Whitehorse Correctional Centre has dedicated staff. The Yukon Review Board hears all matters where a court has found that an accused person is unfit to stand trial, or that they are not

criminally responsible by means of a mental disorder. Once an accused is deemed not criminally responsible because of mental disorder, they are usually referred to the Yukon Review Board for a disposition. The Yukon Review Board has 45 days from the date of the finding of "not criminally responsible" to convene a hearing. In the interim, individuals who are found not criminally responsible may be remanded to Whitehorse Correctional Centre or released to the community on conditions while awaiting their disposition.

A disposition can include an absolute discharge, conditional disposition where individuals reside in the community under conditions, or a hospital order in Whitehorse or outside the Yukon Territory. Whitehorse General Hospital and the Whitehorse Correctional Centre are designated hospitals in the Yukon.

The Whitehorse Correctional Centre was designated a hospital by a ministerial order. With respect to the mental health services in the new building, as I indicated previously, we are now in the process of examining our staffing model, including the need for mental health clinicians, but I did say what we had in place, and I'm sure it will be very close to that in the new facility.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for the information provided. One of things she said is that right now they have one room available for three inmates. That's in the current facility, I'm assuming. I'm wondering how they go about segregating male and female clients or inmates in need of mental health services if there is only one room that can handle three inmates. How do they currently do that?

Hon. Ms. Horne: This is an issue that is problematic. Often, if we have a male and a female, we move one into the dorm to keep them separated. We do work within the limitations of the current building and it has worked satisfactorily, but we work with it on each issue as they arise. So far, we haven't had that much of a problem with it and we do work around it.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for that answer and trust that efforts are being made. It's about the security and the safety of both the inmates and the staff. I know that we're going to be looking forward to the improvements that will be made available in the new facility shortly.

I'd like to ask the minister some questions about the common client project. She has mentioned that before and the idea is along the same lines as the document that was put out a number of years ago. I believe it was called *Working Without Boundaries*, and it's about integrating services of many or differing departments — two or three departments, four departments — whatever the need may be. In this specific instance, it's looking at common clients in, I believe, Justice, Health and Social Services — for health needs — or education needs, so it would be the Department of Education.

I'm just wondering if she could give us a little bit of an update on the integrated service that is being provided. Could she tell us how well it's working, what they're doing to address privacy concerns when information is transferred from department to department, so that it doesn't negatively impact on individuals? Is there any research involved in the effectiveness

of this project? Are any of the recommendations in the *Working Without Boundaries* paper — I believe it was 2004 — being integrated into the common client project?

Hon. Ms. Horne: It is the common client project or *Working Without Boundaries*. This is a very important project to the departments that are involved and to all Yukoners. A workshop in the common client research project was held April 3, 2009 with Dr. Julian Somers, Ph.D. Dr. Somers is an associate professor at Simon Fraser University and a director with the Centre for Applied Research in Mental Health and Addiction. Over 60 participants attended from Health and Social Services, Education, Justice and the Women's Directorate, including senior management and direct program managers, plus members of the common client working group. The main objectives of the workshop were to engage with representatives of Yukon government departments in support of integrated service and policy planning concerning people who are jointly served by the departments of Justice, Health and Social Services, and Education, and to identify practical options to integrate relevant information regarding publicly supported service or a common client registry.

Based on feedback and learning at this initial workshop, we have embarked on an interdepartmental research project that will inform policy responses to the needs of our common clients to better coordinate the government response to their needs. The common client research project will start with a cohort of Justice clients and expand outwards across departments, with a focus on the family, as well as on the individual. The objectives of the research project are to build a picture of who the common clients are and how many there are and to undertake an analysis to inform more effective and efficient service delivery.

Improvements have already been made in several areas where coordination is required. The new *Corrections Act, 2009* establishes requirements for a more integrated approach to management of offenders with other service providers, including First Nation governments.

Internally, better communication is being worked on, on a continual basis, to improve responses to our common clients. There is still more work to be done, and further quantifying the needs of our clients will allow for stronger response over time.

A steering committee comprised of representatives from the departments of Education, Justice, Health and Social Services, Yukon Housing Corporation and the Women's Directorate have been tasked to work on a research project regarding common clients, to help identify the scope of the services they access.

Common clients are persons who, at various periods in their lives, receive an array of government services from more than one department at the same time. The services accessed by common clients are in the areas of Justice, Education, and Health and Social Services. In addition, many common clients are women and they face particular issues and barriers that may differ greatly from those of male common clients.

The *Working Without Boundaries* report was developed by officials from the departments of Health and Social Services, Justice and Education, together with a senior officials steering

committee. The report was completed in 2004, and there were a number of major recommendations. The document and approach is informing the work on the common client project.

The approach is to begin with the selection of a Justice cohort, consisting of individuals with the most admissions to custody and probation over the last five years, and then to extract all electronic data available on those individuals and depersonalize it, rendering only a research ID for data-matching purposes.

Then, with the assistance of the Yukon Bureau of Statistics, this data will be linked to data from other departments. This methodology addresses privacy concerns; however, further precautions are taken by doing the analysis within the Yukon Bureau of Statistics, as they have a mandate to undertake this kind of research via the *Statistics Act*.

In instances where electronic data is not available, some file reviews may be undertaken to fill information gaps. This will also be conducted under the auspices of the Yukon Bureau of Statistics. Once all data is matched, an analysis will be undertaken of the common clients' access and utilization of services with a view to working collectively and more efficiently to meet their needs. This work will be completed in the fiscal year 2010-11. The amount of supplementary budget is \$61,000 for contracting a researcher on behalf of the departments involved in the common client project. This \$61,000 is recoverable from Public Safety Canada.

The research and presentation, as well as the workshop itself, costs approximately \$7,000. Public Safety Canada has agreed to contribute \$61,000 in 2010-11 toward the completion of the research component. The Yukon government will contribute \$46,000 through in-kind donations of staff time, data and systems support, and a direct financial contribution of \$5,000 toward the project. With respect to privacy concerns, the information shared is deemed for consistent purposes and is only shared to the extent necessary to ensure collaboration. Full file sharing is not required. We always keep in mind our duties to the ATIPP act when sharing files for common purposes.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for that answer. The minister talked about completion of the research component.

I know there is money in the supplementary budget for this. Is that going to be the end of the research component? I would like to know when she expects the research component to be finished and what comes after that? What does she envision coming after the research is done? What are they going to do with that research?

I think I understand a lot about what it is that is intended, but I'm asking how they are going to roll that out and what the time frame is for the rollout of what they learn and the services that can be expected to be provided.

Hon. Ms. Horne: Yes, we do have \$60,000 in this supplementary budget. This will complete the research component by the end of this fiscal year.

The officials will then review the results in order to determine how Yukoners use government services and begin to develop and better coordinate the delivery of services to individuals who need them most and when they need them most.

Mr. Cardiff: Is this something that is going to become part of the culture of the departments? I certainly think that it should be.

I'm just wondering whether or not there's — as part of a continuation, so to speak, of the research — some sort of monitoring of the effectiveness of the delivery of those services. I understand what the intent is — to do the research, to understand how we can better serve clients of those three departments and to look for ways to better serve them — but then when we're doing that is there going to be some measuring tool to measure how we're doing? It's kind of like a continual improvement exercise, in my mind. I guess the other question about it is whether or not there's going to be someone in the Department of Justice or another department, or one person in each department, who is going to take on that task of monitoring the effectiveness of the measures that we take as a result of what it is we have learned through the research.

Hon. Ms. Horne: I'm pleased to advise that there is a commitment among the departments of Justice, Education, Health and Social Services and the Women's Directorate to provide more coordinated services to Yukoners. The first step is to determine the magnitude of the issue. This is what we are doing now in our research. The next step will be to develop a more coordinated intervention strategy and we will ultimately evaluate the impact of the strategy on Yukoners. Needs have been developed in the interdepartmental working group, so this work will continue.

Mr. Cardiff: I'd like to thank the minister for that answer. I'd like to move on to another area.

I'm not about to prejudge what the outcome of the leasing review is going to be, but I'd like to say that I certainly appreciated being able to attend the two meetings that were held in Whitehorse and to listen to some of the concerns that citizens were raising. I believe that the exercise of going out and talking to people about the services that they receive from the RCMP is valuable and it's an education for all those involved, including myself, to hear what it is that people are saying. It varies. I may get into asking the minister some more specific questions, but what I'd like to know is whether or not the minister is in receipt of any preliminary findings and if there are any interim measures that either have been put in place or are intended to be put in place to address some of the concerns that have been raised by members of the public.

I'd also like to know whether or not — it's my understanding that there are discussions underway between the government and the RCMP with regard to the renewal of the police service agreement which expires in 2012. I'm wondering whether or not any of the information that has been gathered in the police review is influencing how those negotiations are being conducted.

Hon. Ms. Horne: To respond to the member opposite, no, I have not received any preliminary findings.

As I understand, the RCMP has made a number of policy changes that have already taken place over the past several months, particularly with respect to housing prisoners. We had originally set a deadline for September 15 for the policing review and the report to come to the minister.

The co-chairs and the advisory committee for the review of Yukon's police force requested an extension of the deadline to submit their final report. The co-chairs made this request in order to allow more time to meet with citizens. The response from Yukon citizens was higher than we had anticipated, so we needed the extra time to fully review and analyze the input received to date and allow coordination with the taskforce on acutely intoxicated persons. We are very aware of the level of public interest that the review has generated and of the importance of giving Yukon citizens the chance to contribute. We are pleased that the Yukon citizens have responded to this review.

In response to this extension request, our government extended the deadline for submission of the report to December 31, 2010.

The co-chairs and the advisory committee for the review of Yukon's police force have been meeting with Yukoners since the beginning of May 2010. Yukon citizens have responded to the review by participating in dialogue sessions throughout the Yukon and in various formats. They have attended public meetings, provided written comments and met directly with the advisory committee members.

The co-chairs and advisory committee have participated in over 50 meetings and have heard from hundreds of Yukoners. Some of the common themes that have emerged include: citizens want their RCMP members to be a part of the community; increase in First Nation involvement with the RCMP; improve the RCMP's response to vulnerable people; concerns about RCMP response to domestic violence and sexual assault; ensure RCMP members have the knowledge, skills and attributes required for police in the north; greater community input into RCMP priority setting and communications; and concerns about how the RCMP complaints process and internal disciplinary process work.

On the Yukon government website for Justice is a complete listing of meetings to date. Submissions were received from organizations such as Second Opinion Society, Bringing Youth Towards Equality, the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Society Yukon, Yukon Humans Rights Commission, and other information related to this review. The review is not complete, but costs to date are approximately \$220,000. A part of these costs is to enable selected non-governmental organizations to participate. For example, funding was provided to FASSY. This approach was taken because a contribution to FASSY clients was important to gather, and it is the professionals and families who support FASD who are in the best position to gather their contribution to the review. I think that covers the questions I had on the review.

On the new *Territorial Police Service Agreement*, the current 20-year police service agreement will expire on March 31, 2012. The Department of Justice represents the Yukon on the contract advisory committee and is working closely with our provincial and territorial partners to negotiate the best possible agreement with Canada and the RCMP.

The focus of provinces and territories and the renewal of the police service agreement is on ensuring greater accountability, containing the costs of policing, and defining a new relationship with the RCMP. Over the last two years, much work

has been done at the provincial and territorial level to clarify issues and address concerns related to the policing service agreement while moving toward consensus on what is needed in a new agreement. The provinces and territories are seeking a new police service agreement that ensures the RCMP will be more accountable to the jurisdictions in which they operate, through greater responsiveness to territorial legislation, a modernized complaint system and regular reviews of the agreement. In terms of the cost within the agreement, the provinces and territories are seeking increased financial predictability and transparency, and a clearer definition and justification of costs included in the agreement.

The provinces and territories are also seeking a new relationship with the RCMP and a commitment that jurisdictions will have a greater say in the decisions that affect the quality and cost of policing. Our officials work closely with other provinces and territories where the RCMP provides police services to ensure that a new agreement includes only those costs that should be incurred as part of territorial policing. We will strive to contain costs to the greatest extent possible with any new agreement that we have in Yukon.

Mr. Cardiff: I've got a few more questions with regard to the police service agreement.

I think that it is important that the agreement include measures to improve local accountability — not just within the Yukon, but I'm talking about local accountability within communities, so that there's more interaction between communities and the police force in a community, because it is about establishing the priorities of the community as well. I think if we can get to that place where there are good relationships, there is a free flow of information and an exchange of information and priorities, that relationship can be strengthened.

It's my understanding that within the agreement, the minister has the ability to set priorities and goals for the RCMP and the delivery of that policing service that we receive here in the Yukon — that the minister has the ability to dialogue, if you will, with the chief superintendent on a continual basis to update the chief superintendent on the goals and priorities that the government has — and as well for the chief superintendent to inform the minister and the government on what it is achieving and how that relationship with communities is going and provide an update on current issues within Yukon with respect to policing. I think that would lead to better accountability.

I'm wondering if there's something within the police service agreement that enshrines that relationship and flow of information between the minister and the chief superintendent. The minister talked about the current agreement being a 20-year agreement — what is the term for the new police service agreement that would be taking effect April 1, 2012?

Hon. Ms. Horne: This is a new 20-year agreement. The last agreement was for 20 years, and this is a new 20-year agreement. With respect to the *Territorial Police Service Agreement*, this is an agreement among the federal, provincial, and territorial governments. For the most part, the agreement is a financial document. It describes who pays for what with respect to policing, for example, who pays for building new detachments, who pays for training police dogs, who pays for

training at Depot. We are quite comfortable that the new agreement will permit Yukon to address the concerns raised by Yukoners in the review ongoing right now.

Indeed, the RCMP itself has recognized the need to be more accountable to provinces and territories. This was the main message that the Brown Task Force brought forward: the issue of accountability at the territorial level and at the community level is the cornerstone of high-quality policing services.

The RCMP is undergoing a transformation, both nationally and in Yukon, while dialogue and planning continues. The RCMP does recognize that it can act to bring about some positive changes without delay. Initiatives are underway to fulfill the vision of the RCMP as an adaptive, accountable, trusted organization that meets the needs of the communities and First Nation governments.

These initiatives include new policy, which formalizes the practice adopted in M Division in 2009, requiring the use of non-RCMP investigators whenever possible to investigate death, serious injuries and criminal or sensitive matters involving members of the RCMP.

The federal government has proposed new legislation to improve the public complaint process and to provide the independent commission for public complaints with greater investigative powers. New supervisory positions now exist within Yukon's M Division to ensure the policies, the code of conduct and the mission, vision and values of the RCMP are respected and that training is timely and appropriate. Transformational change is critically important for the RCMP to ensure high levels of public trust and confidence and for the RCMP to be responsive and effective in the delivery of its policing mandate.

The co-chairs look forward to the Yukon government, the RCMP, First Nation leadership, municipalities and other groups and institutions working together to develop training, orientation and planning processes that are critical to the success of this process, which involves the review and to have more say locally.

There is still much work to be done, however. Over the course of the next few weeks, the co-chairs and advisory committee will complete their discussions with citizens, and I do look forward to receiving their final report at the end of December. The recommendations in the report will help shape policing in the territory for many, many years to come. It is the intention of the review team that the report reflects the concerns that have been expressed throughout the process and that the recommendations lead to a renewed relationship with the RCMP. Our goal is to ensure that all citizens receive high quality policing services and that the RCMP is acknowledged and respected for its contribution to our public safety.

Just some of the issues that have come up in our review — I'll just quickly go over the main themes. I think one of the big issues for northern policing is we have so many small rural communities, and this is general in the three northern territories.

It involves serving isolated communities in the Yukon. There are challenges there that are related to small communities: the harsh climate and limited access to the communities, especially during the winter months. I take into account Bur-

wash Landing and the problems we had in getting policing there — Yukon's geography and its small and dispersed population, and the self-government status of First Nation communities. These create unique policing opportunities not evident in other parts of Canada.

The police officers in our small rural communities are called upon to provide a wide range of services that require a variety of skills and attributes. They hold a position in their community that requires them to have training and skills that reflect the needs of those small isolated communities. These requirements often give rise to stress and strain on individuals and their families — balancing operational requirements. These are conditions that are really unique to the north.

Through our citizen feedback, as I say, we've received a very varied array of complaints, as well as praise for the RCMP. The review team supported the First Nation leaders, the agencies and groups that deal directly with individuals who are likely to come in contact with the law and to gather their input. We have received formal written submissions, and these NGOs have met with their clients and prepared written submissions. The themes were also varied.

As I said earlier, we have received common themes: the role of M Division and the community; increasing the First Nation involvement with M Division; improving the response to vulnerable people; and responding to domestic violence and sexual assault. Domestic violence is an issue that is very common to the north and we need those individuals trained to do the job, to be able to respond to the calls and the complaints from members of the community. We have to ensure that M Division is equipped for policing responsibilities in Yukon and for Yukon requirements.

We need greater community input into M Division priorities and communications and response to their concerns about accountability in respect to the roles of M Division in the communities. Citizens want their members to be part of the community, to understand and respect the local First Nation culture and to take active part in community events. There is a clear desire on the part of the citizens and of the RCMP to build stronger, more positive relations in order to prevent crime from occurring. Many citizens also suggested that the members need to spend more time in their community in order to build and sustain strong relationships within the community. This means they would see if they could spend longer periods in the community — more than the two years, which is the current norm.

Increasing First Nation involvement with M Division — this means that the First Nations have a desire for more involvement with M Division and how it provides policing services within their communities. The First Nation leaders spoke about the importance of having their citizens directly involved in delivering police services, either as participants or in some other related capacity.

The First Nation leaders have said that they would like structures put in place to maintain relationships of mutual respect over time, rather than rebuilding these relationships every few years. The review team has heard that First Nation people do not want to lose the opportunity to create a harmonious and safe way of life for their families, especially for the youth. Re-

garding improving the response to vulnerable people, community residents, First Nation leaders, Yukon government officials and the RCMP members whom the review team spoke to recognize that longer and more in-depth training, a closer and more coordinated relationship with partner agencies, and a community policing model that results in a higher quality of response, and improved prisoner care, supervision, and treatment is required.

Responding to domestic violence and sexual assault — many women expressed concerns as to how the RCMP responds to domestic violence and sexual assaults. Aboriginal women identified a deep and historical mistrust of police as a compounding factor in their experience of victimization. The review team heard about the power imbalances inherent in domestic violence and sexual assault crimes, and the necessity for police understanding of these dynamics.

Ensuring M Division members are equipped for policing responsibilities in Yukon — it was noted that it is critical that police officers transferred into the territory are carefully selected, have a solid understanding of the unique social and cultural heritage of Yukon, as well as of the specific community in which they serve, and that they may require additional training to prepare for service in the north. It was also noted that community leaders and governments should have an important role in selecting commanders who will lead detachments and in welcoming members and assisting them and their families to integrate into each community in Yukon.

Regarding the greater community input into M Division priorities and communications, the municipal representatives, First Nation leaders and citizens requested more involvement in establishing priorities at the territorial and detachment level. Systems need to be put into place that provide for citizens, municipal representatives and First Nation leaders to work closely with RCMP leadership to establish policing priorities for communities that reflect the community. Changes need to be made to ensure citizens and governments have a meaningful voice in setting policing priorities, that they actively participate with the police in priority-setting and that there is an accountability process to report on progress made toward achieving these priorities.

There were concerns about accountability. The review team has noted there is a great deal of confusion and, ultimately, dissatisfaction about the operation of the RCMP complaints process, as well as how the RCMP internal disciplinary process works. In addition, citizens and RCMP members raised serious concerns with police investigating police.

The common element that ran through the discussions to date with citizens, and which is present in all the themes, is trust. Some citizens of the territory have lost confidence in the RCMP to uphold the core values. The co-chairs believe that raising the public's confidence in the RCMP is absolutely essential to ensure that citizens of the territory receive high-quality policing services.

The process to regain trust will take time and effort on the part of government and citizens alike.

If we remain committed to building and continuing to find ways for honest and open dialogue, we can move toward a

stronger, healthier and more positive working relationship between citizens and the police. We will work toward a new relationship with the RCMP. Although we first put this out for completion September 15, as you can see, the work is ongoing. It has been more than we expected in the public input and we are getting the results we expected. This process will do more for the RCMP, working with our citizens and for public confidence in the future, and will only be a win-win situation.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for her comments again. I recognize some of this may have been covered. I know there was some repetition, but we can all be guilty of that. I think that it's important that we ensure that the discussion that we have here is thorough.

First of all, I would like to say that I very much appreciate the work that the co-chairs and the steering committee, which are representative of the broader community, are bringing to the table. The work that's being done and the extension of the time frame — I think that the extension of the time frame is valuable, given the seriousness of the subject matter. From what I've been hearing at the meetings I've attended and from individuals who are in contact with my office or talking to me on the street or in meeting rooms, they certainly appreciate the opportunities that have been provided.

Yes, there is a mistrust out there. There's a mistrust by some individuals in the community in the police and the policing service. In some respects, there's a mistrust of the process — of the policing review. It takes time for people to come to a place where they can see something positive happening. So I think that there is room for continual improvement here.

This isn't going to be the be-all, end-all, when we get the report that'll fix everything. That's why I have been asking questions as well about the police service agreement. Certainly, the concerns about the trust that women place in the RCMP when it comes to investigating domestic violence and sexual assaults — I asked the minister a question before about dual charging, and I asked the chief superintendent some of those same questions, and I think it's something that we have to take seriously. We have to ensure that the concerns of women who have been sexually assaulted or been victims of domestic violence aren't minimized by those who are investigating them, or by the court system, or we're never going to solve the problem.

It involves education of the police force; it involves education of Justice officials and Crown prosecutors in how to ensure that these things are dealt with in the most sensitive and effective way — sensitive to the needs of the victim, certainly, and that their concerns and the issue is taken seriously and not minimized, not trivialized. Otherwise, these problems are not going to be dealt with. They're going to continue to remain hidden away.

When the minister talks about carefully selecting new police officers to come to the territory, I think things like that need to be taken into consideration — that they have a good understanding and sensitivity to those types of issues.

As the minister has said, and we've talked about this issue — we debated a motion here in the Legislature about the Sisters in Spirit campaign and the prevalence of domestic violence and violence against women and how much more prevalent it is

here in the territory. I'm not going to go cite statistics because that would definitely be repetitive. The minister has already cited those statistics; other members of the Legislature have cited those statistics, so this should be a focus for this minister in the policing review. She recognizes how important and when it comes to that additional training. The minister talked about the fact that this is a federal, provincial, territorial financial agreement that lays out who pays for what. If the territorial government has to pay more money for that additional training, then I believe that it's a worthwhile investment. It would be a service to our community. It would be a service to our mothers. It would be a service to our wives, our sisters and our daughters and our granddaughters to ensure that we end that cycle of violence.

That's where, I believe, there should be a strong focus because it's an issue in every community in this territory. It requires a strong response from the RCMP and it requires a strong response from our justice system. It also requires education of the public about why this is unacceptable. That's the responsibility, in my mind, of the Department of Justice. It's their responsibility to provide that education. The Minister of Education needs to, as well, take up on the minister's lead. We all need to lead by example in our communities. We need to lead by example in our school system and teach our children that's not right.

I would like to know whether the minister will take those concerns seriously in the policing review, whether primary aggressor training is on the list, and whether or not these kinds of issues will be addressed in the selection of new members coming in. I appreciate the fact that communities should have a role in selecting the commanding officers or chief superintendents that are coming to the territory. It is about a new relationship, as the minister said. Some of what we're hearing in the policing review is somewhat difficult to hear, because it's never easy to hear criticism, but some positive comments about policing in the Yukon have come out of the review. I did hear people making positive statements about the police at some of the meetings.

But we need to respond to the concerns, and we need to build on those positive things.

I'd like to leave the minister with an idea I've put forward before. I'm still expecting a response on the training and selection of members, especially training around how to deal with sexualized assault and domestic violence and the sensitivity around that. The other issue I'd like the minister to think about before we take a break is whether or not there would be any consideration given to a citizens board or a commission.

This is something I've raised before with previous ministers of justice — to provide that new relationship. This is about citizen involvement in our policing system. I recognize that the minister has a relationship and a responsibility, but if there were a citizens board or a citizens commission that could communicate the priorities of the community and provide some form of feedback or evaluation on the services that were being provided by the policing services back to both the RCMP and the minister. Then we could truly have that continual improve-

ment. I am going to leave that with the minister and would like to hear her response, more than likely after the break.

Chair: Order please. Committee of the Whole will now 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. 22, *Second Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with general debate on Vote 8, Department of Justice.

Hon. Ms. Horne: The citizens and the RCMP have expressed a genuine commitment to improving the quality of policing service in the territory and, as I said earlier, the level of public interest in the policing review has exceeded our expectations. I'm so very glad that we found it prudent to extend the deadline for the submission of the review's report to my office. I agree with the member opposite that this process has been helpful for Yukoners. The process has allowed citizens to come together and be able to voice difficult, sometimes very personal issues that are extremely important to them, to the review board. I want to assure you that, as Minister of Justice and minister responsible for the Women's Directorate, I am deeply concerned about trust. The confidence that women have in the RCMP is critical.

I have spoken, and do speak to the commanding officer of M Division regularly, and have spoken to Commissioner Elliott and Deputy Commissioner Bass of Ottawa regarding women's issues and their concerns. We have heard the issues raised by the public in the policing review, which sound very close to the concerns brought forward by the member opposite. I do not want to prejudge the recommendations of the review, but from the documents on the review's website, it is clear that the review team has also heard the concerns of women.

So I look forward to hearing what the review recommends for how best to address the concerns of women in its summary, and this is an issue that I will be looking at very closely.

I can tell you that right now with the primary aggressor charges, I am aware that violence against women, including intimate partner violence, is often related to gender inequality. While both men and women report experiencing violence in relationships, research shows that women are more likely to experience serious physical injuries and that women are more likely to fear for their lives and experience emotional consequences of abuse.

Primary aggressor policies direct law enforcement agencies and prosecutors to investigate and determine the most significant aggressor when they are called to a domestic dispute. These policies provide guidance and factors to consider in investigations and prosecutions, including taking into account the dynamics of family violence, prior history of violence and the difference between offensive and defensive injuries.

The RCMP has both national and divisional policies regarding violence in relationships. In responding to calls for service, the RCMP are always balancing concerns about safety for all involved, with concerns about gender inequality and the circumstances leading up to the incident that resulted in the call for service.

In my capacity as Minister of Justice, every year I set priorities for policing in the territory and communicate those to the RCMP's M Division. A common thread in those priorities has been to work to increase the communication and coordination of services to victims of crime. The RCMP, in turn, has been very responsive to this priority, and we continue to discuss ways of improving our levels of service to victims of crime.

I can assure you that the RCMP views domestic violence very seriously and continues to work in collaboration with many others toward providing a safe environment for families.

We have heard that there continues to be concerns in some sectors about how the justice system responds to domestic violence matters, and we are committed to working with all partners in the justice system to develop ways to respond to and prevent domestic violence. As part of the RCMP's basic training at Depot, members receive training on how to respond effectively to domestic violence. This specialized training continues once they arrive at M Division, with more focused training in areas such as the Yukon *Family Violence Prevention Act*. In addition, there is ongoing and regular in-service training, education and communication between Justice staff and the front-line RCMP members regarding domestic violence, victimization and ways of responding to situations where there is a high risk of violence.

The courts require that police have reasonable and probable grounds before charges can be laid against an individual.

The RCMP does not lay charges against any individual, male or female, without reasonable and probable grounds. The RCMP also participates in the Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court and the Community Wellness Court steering committees. Our experience is that the RCMP is very responsive to incidents of domestic violence and has demonstrated support for victims through referrals to the Victim Services unit.

The RCMP reviewed the statistics and in 2009, there were 153 domestic violence files. Of these 153 files, in six cases both parties were arrested for assault during the initial investigation. Of these six cases, dual charges proceeded to court in only three cases. In 2009, two percent of all domestic violence files in Yukon resulted in dual charges proceeding to court, so, as you can see, the RCMP do take this issue very seriously and they're very careful in laying charges. If there's doubt, if they're not sure, they do lay the dual charges.

Mr. Cardiff: The minister answered some of the questions. I would agree that it's something we need to take very seriously, especially given the difficulty and the courage with which those women share their stories and their concerns about how they've been treated during the investigation of domestic violence or sexual assaults and the concerns they have about how that has been undertaken. It takes a lot of courage. I don't think that we would have those individuals coming forward if there weren't legitimate concerns there.

I understand that the minister takes this as seriously as I do. I think that it is important.

When it comes to additional training, I think it might be beneficial to find a way to involve some of those front-line

workers in communicating the seriousness of how these investigations are conducted, to communicate the damage that it does when victims' concerns are minimized and how that breeds the mistrust in the system that leads to the continuation of that cycle of violence. Women aren't as likely to come forward if they don't see results coming out of the complaints that are being raised. If the complaints are minimized and there's no action, then nothing is done about it and the cycle will continue. Men get the wrong message that this can continue, that they're not going to be punished, and women and children live in fear. I don't think that should continue.

So when it comes to that additional training, I understand there is training at the depot in Saskatchewan — it is my understanding and I heard this comment a couple of times at the first meeting that I attended. While it may be intensive, it's a short time frame, and I realize that there is ongoing training all the time, but maybe we need to look at the level of training. That might be more of a national issue with the RCMP with the training that's provided there. Maybe there could be more training over a longer period of time. I understand that it's kind of like a — it's not an apprenticeship, but that they serve a — I'm not sure what the term is, but when they go out after receiving their training and they're under supervision, and the training actually continues. When it comes to that additional training, the local training, I think that involving some of the front-line workers who deal with victims of sexual assault and domestic violence, communicating to those officers who are receiving the training, the seriousness of this issue, it might have a bit more of an impact.

The minister also indicated that she communicates annually the policing priorities to the chief superintendent and I would submit that, in the interest of accountability and transparency, just like there are letters of expectation with Crown corporations, that this document be tabled in the Legislature as well. I'd be interested in hearing the minister's views on that if that would be possible — if she could table her communications with the chief superintendent regarding the minister's priorities for policing in the Yukon.

I know I'm kind of rolling these questions up. At the rate we're going, we're probably going to end up going to the end of the day on this because I do have one other area that I would like to explore. The minister didn't respond to the request or the idea of a citizens board or commission to communicate policing priorities to the policing authority and to actually provide feedback and evaluation of the policing services that are provided.

That would be like a broad citizen-based board that could report to the chief superintendent and the minister. I'd be interested in the spirit of that new relationship, and I'd be interested in her views on that, as well.

Hon. Ms. Horne: I do agree that the front-line workers who deal directly with the issues of the victims of domestic violence could provide meaningful insights that would help police officers and others learn more about the social context of domestic assault.

With respect to the training, I know that the review committee has concerns about the nature of the training that RCMP

officers receive. I do look forward to the recommendations in the report when they do come. I will not make comments on what that report will contain.

With respect to our discussions on establishing police priorities, these have been made public on a number of occasions. Yes, this is something that I can bring forward in the future. Some of the discussions I have are verbal and not by letter; they are actual meetings and we don't take minutes at those meetings.

Our *Yukon Victims of Crime Strategy* supports the development of ways to integrate responses for victims, offenders, families and communities.

I may ramble on here — not “ramble” on — but my descriptions are longer, because some of these people are not aware of all this, so I'm taking this opportunity to explain in detail what we're doing

To integrate responses for victims, offenders, families and communities — currently, this is what we are doing in this area: Victims services staff participates in monitoring of safety with respect to victims in both the Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court and the Community Wellness Court. The Department of Justice has successfully operated the Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court since March 2001. The Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court is a therapeutic court that supports offenders and the victims to make the necessary changes in their lives so that they lower the risk to reoffend. The Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court continues to operate in Whitehorse, as well as in Watson Lake. The Department of Justice works with offenders both individually and in groups. There are counselling sessions at the Whitehorse Correctional Centre and in the community by delivering the spousal abuse treatment program for men and the women and anger and the violence prevention program for women. Victim Services staff participates in integrated offender management case conferences to ensure the victim's voice is represented in case planning.

Victim Services staff liaise with community justice staff and committees to explore interest in reconciliation initiatives, and Victim Services will offer a group for women with partners in the Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court defender programming, as well as a group for children whose parents are involved in the Domestic Violence Treatment Option Court in the 2010-11 fiscal year. With respect to a police commission, or advisory board, I understand that the review committee has heard this suggestion from a number of different groups. Again, I will wait to hear from the review committee, and respond to their recommendations accordingly.

Mr. Cardiff: So, I can understand the minister doesn't want to prejudice the outcome of the review or any of the recommendations, so she doesn't have an opinion basically about a citizens board or commission to communicate priorities. It's just one idea. I know I've put that forward before.

I mean, I would hope that the minister has a point of view on that idea and would consider it at some point in the future, because I think it is a way that we can improve that relationship. There was one other thing that came up at the last meeting that I'd just like to bring to the minister's attention. It might not

form part of the agreement, but it could be a priority in the provision of policing services. That would be the provision of French language services being available to the RCMP, because oftentimes both in the case of the victim or the offender, the inability to communicate in their first language leads to ineffective gathering of evidence and ineffective understanding of the situation.

There were a couple of instances cited. It's because the victim and the offender don't necessarily have the same understanding of the terminology that's used by the investigating officers. The investigating officers might not be able to communicate effectively with them. I know that it might not just be our other official language, which is French, where this occurs. I'm just wondering whether or not the minister could communicate that concern when she speaks with the chief superintendent and maybe work with the Department of Justice, the French Language Services Directorate and some of the other communities in Whitehorse where there are issues about communication, so that some sort of translation services could be made available when the RCMP are responding to calls they receive involving individuals whose first language isn't English. Could the minister do that?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I agree that this is a concern that was raised by citizens. It is not only French. It could be a First Nation language. It is my understanding that the commanding officer responded to this concern that was raised by a citizen. I can certainly raise this again with him at our next meeting.

Mr. Cardiff: I appreciate that. I certainly recognize that it was raised in the context of the French community. I recognize there are issues around First Nation languages and newcomers to our territory where this is going to be more of an issue.

I'm sure that in other jurisdictions — in cities where there are larger immigrant populations — there are ways to address this issue and that we can probably learn from some of them as well.

I would like to ask one more question before I move on. I would like to go back to the corrections piece for a minute. I don't have the exact terminology, but in the new *Corrections Act, 2009*, I believe there was the provision for an independent civilian inspection service or board — it's a citizens board. The minister can supply me with the correct terminology for that because I don't have the *Corrections Act, 2009* in front of me.

I'd like to know whether the minister can tell us whether or not that board or committee is in place, how many members are on it, whether the names of those members are public and where we could find them, and whether or not any matters regarding correctional services have come before them.

Hon. Ms. Horne: The name of it is the "community advisory board," and it is contained in the new *Corrections Act, 2009* and regulations. The act and regulations contain sections governing collaboration with First Nations and NGOs; provisions for First Nation and culturally relevant programming; a provision to create a new position of director of inspections and standards to address discipline and complaints; innovative, alternative measures to deal with inmate discipline; a new pro-

gram integration section; provisions for the creation of a community advisory board and a new process for earned remission.

It's important to note that this community advisory board does not hear cases concerning discipline or personnel issues. They deal with policy only. It is important that our government get this board up and running as soon as possible. The board members have now been appointed and the first orientation meeting will take place later in November. Right now, we're just formalizing the appointment process. We're establishing the board's rules and procedures and the orientation still has to take place. As I said, the orientation will take place within the next month and the regular meetings will follow thereafter.

Mr. Cardiff: I appreciate the minister's response on that, and the update on where we're at with that. I'm glad to hear that the members have been appointed, that there will be an orientation and we're moving in the right direction. Is there a director of inspections currently? Can the minister tell us who that is and whether or not there have been any inspections? Can she also tell us: is the director of inspections a government employee or are they independent of government? What exactly is their mandate?

Hon. Ms. Horne: We do have an investigations and standards office. The investigation and standards office provides independent oversight of the corrections system by responding to inmate complaints, appeals of inmate discipline, and by conducting investigations and inspections as required.

Staff has delivered training sessions to ensure all corrections staff and hearing adjudicators understand the mandate of the investigations and standards office and the principles of fairness and natural justice involved in administering the *Corrections Act, 2009*. The investigations and standards office commenced work with the proclamation of the new *Corrections Act, 2009*, on January 11, 2010. The investigation and standards office received 33 complaints, 10 inquiries and 14 disciplinary appeals from inmate during its first nine months of operation. After reviewing disciplinary appeals, the office confirmed six cases, overturned six cases in favour of the inmate, amended a disposition and ordered one new hearing. The office was able to resolve all substantiated complaints brought to its attention by inmates. Over 90 percent of recommendations from the investigations and standards office to corrections management were implemented.

The amount of the supplementary budget for 2010-11 is \$43,000 to meet staff training needs for the new office. The O&M budget for the investigation and standards office for the 2010-11 fiscal year is \$228,808.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for that information and the statistics in that regard. I would be interested to know if the investigations and standards office would be issuing a report on their activities.

Hon. Ms. Horne: It is in the act that they report to the deputy minister.

Mr. Cardiff: Is that report available to the public? I can understand the need for protecting the information of the individuals. We on this side of the House and others in the public with an interest in this area would be interested in the nature of the complaints and the remedies, not so much the individu-

als. I'm not interested in knowing which individuals laid complaints against which individuals. It's more a sharing of the information around the nature of the complaint, the remedies that have been proposed, the actions that have been taken and the improvements that have been made in the correctional service.

Hon. Ms. Horne: This office is less than a year old. As I said, it commenced in January 2010. It will be directed to the deputy minister's office and, most likely, this report will be posted on the website. So I would check for the report shortly after the new fiscal year commences.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for that answer and we'll watch for that on the Department of Justice website. It may, in future, even form part of the annual Department of Justice facts document.

I'd like to ask the minister some questions about the human rights modernization project. We had the select committee go out a number of years ago — I believe in 2008 — and conduct a fairly extensive consultation with Yukoners and it brought forward a lot of recommendations, some which were acted on and some of which were going to come at a further date. I know I asked the minister a question about this in the spring and she assured me that phase 2 was going to be going forward and that there were a number of issues that were going to be dealt with.

Unfortunately, we didn't get to carry that conversation, so I would like to carry on that conversation now. I would like to know, first of all, why only some of the recommendations from the select committee report are being included in phase 2; namely, the recommendations around structure, roles and responsibility, and processes, and why the recommendations on scope and coverage of issues have been left on the back burner.

Hon. Ms. Horne: As the member opposite will recall, phase 1 of the modernization of the legislation amending the *Human Rights Act* in regulations to give effect to those recommendations that were relatively discreet and which did not require complex drafting was completed on December 10, 2009, when the amendments and the regulations were proclaimed.

With the proclamation of Bill No. 71 on International Human Rights Day, December 10, 2009, and the passage of revised regulations after consultation with the Human Rights Commission, phase 1 of modernizing the *Human Rights Act* is complete. Eight of the 25 recommendations have been addressed.

The resulting amendments are aimed at improving and simplifying the complaints process, modernizing the language and clarifying some roles and responsibilities. The remaining 17 recommendations fall into two major categories: (1) improving the complaints process; or (2) reviewing and updating the scope and/or coverage.

There are some additional recommendations focused on the process or aimed at the actual drafting of the legislation.

The Department of Justice recently completed a targeted consultation on part 1 of phase 2, focusing on roles and responsibilities, accountability, appeal processes, tribunal qualifications and human rights education. Reviewing, updating, scope

and coverage will take place during part 2 of phase 2 of the human rights system modernization project.

To facilitate the targeted consultation, we published a discussion paper which provided information and raised important questions in respect of each of the five areas that part 1 of phase 2 focuses on and established a website for the human rights system modernization project. The website sets out the history of the modernization project, contains relevant links and features expert articles that Yukon commissioned to provide information to stakeholders and the general public.

The Department of Justice placed ads calling for submissions and sent specific invitations to all of the stakeholders who had first appeared before the select committee in 2008 and to each Yukon First Nation and municipality. Consultation meetings on part 1 of phase 2 began at the end of August and ran throughout October. The cut-off date for written submissions was October 8, 2010.

Throughout September, the human rights system modernization team met with representatives of the following: the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce, the Yukon Hospital Corporation, the Yukon Human Rights Commission, the Victoria Faulkner Women's Centre, the Yukon Council on the Status of Women and the Ta'an Kwäch'an Council.

In addition, there were written submissions from two individuals. Written submissions were received from the Yukon Human Rights Commission, Yukon Public Service Alliance of Canada equity-seeking committee, Yukon College, Public Service Commission, the Yukon Council on the Status of Women, and the panel of adjudicators established under the Yukon *Human Rights Act*.

A report on *What We Heard* will be completed by October 31, and a subsequent report with recommendations will be submitted to me by December 31, 2010.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for the answer to the question; however, she didn't really tell me why the other issues — the recommendations on the scope and coverage — still aren't being dealt with.

There are a number of questions around this process. Number one, can the minister tell us which groups were involved in the development of the discussion paper?

Hon. Ms. Horne: It was drafted by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Cardiff: So the department didn't discuss this discussion paper with the Human Rights Commission or the panel of adjudicators, who would have some expertise in this area, given their input into the original consultation? I would have thought they would have had something to contribute to the discussion on these issues.

The other thing, I guess, is that the minister used the term "targeted consultation," and I have heard from people how well they thought the select committee process went. The minister didn't talk about any public meetings around this issue. I know that I would have appreciated being able to attend a public meeting to hear what the public was saying on this important issue. I recall that the meeting we held in Whitehorse was certainly well-attended and provided a lot of input into the recommendations that we as members of the select committee

made to the Legislative Assembly. But there was no public meeting on this issue. It appears that no input was put into the discussion paper on how to frame some of these issues using the expertise that we have available, both at the commission and at the appeal tribunal levels, as well as other organizations, which I'm sure could have provided some assistance.

There's also the time frame for some of the consultations that select committees have in the Legislative Assembly. We have select committees on the *Landlord and Tenant Act*, which has been active for almost a full year now, and the off-road vehicles. Both of those select committees were created a little less than a year ago. We have the whistle-blower committee, which has been active for three and a half years.

As far as time frames go, I don't have the letter in front of me, but I believe it was in August and the time frame seems a little short to allow for public input on this.

The minister mentioned there will be a "what we heard" document available toward the end of October — I believe that's what she said.

I am wondering whether or not she can make that document available to Members of the Legislative Assembly and the public. And can she tell us why they chose to just go with a targeted consultation, as opposed to a public consultation? Because I seem to recall hearing when we were on our community tour from a number of individuals that they would like to be further consulted on any other proposed changes to the legislation.

Hon. Ms. Horne: We did not consult on the creation of the discussion papers, as it is process-bound. The department took their cue from the select committee's report and framed the issues accordingly from that report. The report will be available mid-November and will be on the Department of Justice website. The Department of Justice produced the discussion paper on the issues that were raised by the select committee's recommendations and established a website on the modernization project and commissioned expert papers on human rights, which are available on the website.

The discussion paper has been widely distributed to organizations and individuals who made submissions to the select committee or who have an interest in the area of human rights. Their input has been solicited. In addition, there have been public advertisements about the modernization project. The discussion paper, the website and these ads have solicited much public input.

Mr. Cardiff: Can the minister tell us how many individual — I don't need to know what the names are; however, it sounded to me like the submissions were going to be posted on the website, so I might be able to find them there in the future, but I didn't see any there recently. How many submissions from individual citizens did the project receive?

Hon. Ms. Horne: We do not have that information at this time. The department is running the targeted consultation and that information, what we heard, will be on the website.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, the deadline was October 8; I thought the minister would have had that information. I have a number of questions around this review. The minister didn't answer the question about the timelines either: why they chose

to go with what I would consider reasonably short timelines on this consultation. I received the discussion paper in August and the deadline, I believe, was October 8 and it just seems to me that that's a fairly short time frame.

I commend the chambers of commerce, the Victoria Faulkner Women's Centre, the Human Rights Commission and the tribunal, the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the Public Service Commission for reacting in a timely manner. I'm sure it kind of put the squeeze on their manpower and their resources to come up with the necessary research on some of these issues in a short time frame. I would like to know why the minister chose to go with a short time frame.

The other thing is that the minister didn't answer the question about the lack of public meetings. I think that was one of the strengths of the select committee — the ability for citizens to come out and voice their concerns, as we found out in the police review and with some other consultations that have gone on. There are some in our society who don't necessarily possess the literacy skills to provide a written submission to the minister on this.

I'm wondering if there were opportunities for individuals in the public to make verbal presentations to the group conducting this consultation on the discussion paper?

Hon. Ms. Horne: We did have great participation from the groups that participated. They understood the need to move forward on this very important issue. We're working with groups to address their concerns. At the end of the day, because of the importance of this issue, we wanted to expedite the process.

There were opportunities for individuals to phone in their recommendations to us and perhaps a public meeting is something that will come forward in the report on December 31.

Mr. Cardiff: I'll be interested to see the *What We Heard* document just how much input there will be. I'm pleased that there was as much input as the minister indicates by groups — civil society groups, First Nation governments and community groups. I think that that's important.

I thought that some of the recommendations that were in the document that we put forward as a select committee were pretty clear — but take recommendation 16.

It's a recommendation that that funding of the Yukon Human Rights Commission and the Yukon Human Rights panel of adjudicators be removed from the Department of Justice. I thought that was a pretty clear recommendation. The minister has decided to go out and consult on that recommendation. I would argue that the — when you read the discussion document, the discussion document is actually making the argument against the select committee's recommendation. When it says that most human rights commissions and tribunals are funded through the relevant Department of Justice or Attorney General as are other administrative bodies, it's making the argument that the funding should stay within the Department of Justice. That's the way that I read the discussion document. I was a little taken aback by that because I thought that that was a pretty clear recommendation.

We could get into the reasons for that, and the quick reason for it is that if the Department of Justice is funding the

Human Rights Commission — there are a number of instances whereby in a small jurisdiction like this we're all just a little bit closer, so there is that perceived perception of conflict. Where the problem arises is that there will be times where there could be a complaint where the commission is mediating or working with a person who has a complaint that may be going before the appeal tribunal — where the complaint is against the government — and the respondent is the Government of Yukon. Therefore, Department of Justice staff members are likely to be involved as respondents in the case. So they're not only respondents in the case of a complaint, but they're also the funding agency for both the commission and the appeal tribunal.

Whether or not there is any real conflict of interest, there's a perceived conflict of interest there in the public's mind. There are other independent quasi-judicial bodies that are dealt with in that report to the Legislative Assembly, and their funding is approved by the Members' Services Board and voted by the Legislative Assembly. It's in the vote authority of the Legislative Assembly. Two examples would be the Ombudsman and Information and Privacy Commissioner, and the child advocate. It would just make sense to me that, if we could remove that perceived conflict of interest — and I thought we had agreed on that among the members of the select committee, but now to put it back out and, when I read the discussion paper, argue against it, and provide the arguments against what it was that we recommended, I don't see the point in that. Could the minister tell us why she did that?

Hon. Ms. Horne: I am familiar with recommendation 16 and it calls on the government to remove the funding for the Human Rights Commission and panel of adjudication from the Department of Justice. This issue is being discussed in the context of the current consultations. Public media statements by the Human Rights Commission imply that the Department of Justice is in a conflict of interest as it represents the Yukon government as employer in human rights complaints, while also serving as the funding authority for the Human Rights Commission and the panel of adjudicators. It is the norm in Canada for the government to fund human rights commissions through their Department of Justice or Attorney General. Ten out of 14, including Yukon, do so. Three governments fund their commission through a different government department and the Northwest Territories commission receives funding directly from the Legislature.

Given the interest to examine funding, we are open to looking at the issue. I would ask the member opposite to bring his views forward to the review team.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, you know, the question for the minister is about the select committee, of which the minister was a member, made a recommendation to remove it from the Department of Justice. I think the only thing that was up for discussion was where it should be located, but when I read this discussion paper — theme 4, funding and financial accountability — the recommendation is there, but then most of the arguments are against removing it from the Department of Justice.

Unfortunately, the way that I perceive it, and the way that members of the public who have talked to me about this per-

ceive it, is that if the perception of conflict of interest wasn't there before, it certainly is now. That causes me great concern.

I'm not questioning the members of the commission or the staff of the commission or the members of the tribunal, but it's the public perception that somehow the Department of Justice feels that it needs to exercise its authority and control over the budgetary requirement of the commission. The commission and the appeal tribunal have to go to the Department of Justice to say, "This is what we need in order to do our jobs effectively." They're one of — quite frankly, I don't believe that they're funded adequately — especially when you look at recommendations. Some of the recommendations that the minister is dealing with are about increased education in the school system on human rights and responsibilities and that there needs to be more public education. One of the recommendations that the minister is not dealing with is that the act should more strongly promote human rights and responsibilities awareness and education.

Now it's my understanding that some of the changes that we did make in phase 1 are yielding benefits for both the commission and the appeal tribunal — that it is streamlining the process — and that they are more able to deal with some of the complaints that are coming before them because they have the ability to move them directly to the appeal tribunal or decline them because of the nature of the complaint.

When I read the piece specifically about the funding, I just don't understand. I thought we had agreed that the funding should be removed. I don't know if the minister would like to respond to our reasons for consulting again on this. We believe it should be removed from the Department of Justice.

Where would it be more suitable to have the funding agent located? When I read this, it appears the minister and the department are making the argument that the funding should remain in the Department of Justice. I just don't understand why, after we made the recommendation, that the minister chose to do that.

I would also like the minister to give me the rationale and perhaps the time frame for not dealing with the other recommendations. I think this would be of great assistance to making the act more understandable — if the preamble were to provide greater guidance to the rest of the legislation. There was a recommendation that the act be written in plain language.

I don't believe that has been done. If we want to have a piece of human rights legislation for all Yukoners, then it needs to be written in language that everybody can understand, and some improvements could be made — recommendations like section 7 — prohibited grounds for discrimination of the *Human Rights Act* — could be reviewed with a view to using more contemporary language; that section 9 — prohibited discrimination of the act be amended to add protection for volunteers.

Why are we delaying that any further? That doesn't make sense to me. As I said, the preamble of the act provides greater guidance to the rest of the legislation. It makes sense to me. I recall those discussions when we were travelling around the Yukon. It's not unlike the question I was asking earlier today about Community Services, where I was citing the preamble to

the act, as providing guidance as to what the intentions of the act were.

Section 8, duty to provide for special needs of the act, be revised and modernized around the duty to accommodate — specifically, duty to provide for special needs be changed to duty to accommodate.

I don't understand why we are delaying asking Yukoners. The changes were brought in, the regulations were proclaimed. A year has passed, or more than a year has passed, and we're still leaving these things to be undone. No. 23, that further clarity be sought with respect to the application of human rights laws to self-governing Yukon First Nations, including clarification of the application of section 13(1) of the Yukon First Nation self-government agreements and the clarification of the application of the recently amended Canadian *Human Rights Act* — this was something we talked about and we went and talked to Yukoners about and we heard from Yukoners two years ago and there's no progress. I'd like the minister to tell me why — two years has passed, I believe it is, since we filed our report and she has chosen to do consultation on some issues, but she hasn't chosen to do consultation on other issues.

Seeing the time, I move we report progress.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Cardiff that Committee of the Whole report progress.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Chair: It has been moved by Ms. Taylor that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

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

Chair's report

Mr. Nordick: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 22, *Second Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, and directed me to report progress on it.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

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

The House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.