Yukon Legislative Assembly  
Whitehorse, Yukon  
Tuesday, December 4, 2012 — 1:00 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE
Withdrawal of motions
Speaker: To start with, the Chair wishes to inform the House of changes made to the Order Paper.
Motion No. 326, notice of which was given yesterday by the Member for Watson Lake, does not appear on today’s notice paper as the action requested in this motion has been taken. Also, Motion No. 330 and Motion No. 331, notice of which was given yesterday by the Leader of the Third Party, do not appear on today’s Notice Paper as they are now outdated.
We will proceed at this time with the Order Paper.

TRIBUTES
In recognition of the historic properties assistance program
Hon. Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the historic properties assistance program in honour of its 25th anniversary.
This program was created in recognition of the need to preserve Yukon’s many privately owned historic properties. This funding program preserves our heritage by making technical and financial assistance available to those who wish to undertake preservation, restoration, development and/or interpretation of their historic properties.
This program makes available contributions on a matching basis each year to applicants who own sites that are deemed historically significant. The program provides access to heritage conservation — expertise to ensure that historic properties are saved for future generations.
Prior to the fund’s creation, many important historic resources, commercial buildings and industrial structures were being lost due to neglect, inadequate resources and the sense that these places had no historical significance. The program has had a significant impact with over 200 projects completed in 12 communities. These projects include 13 historic sites owned privately or by First Nations and conservation work in 11 cemeteries.
Since 1987, the program has provided over $1.3 million to property owners. Assistance has been provided to a very broad range of projects from historic vessels such as the Yukon Rose to hotels like Bombay Peggy’s, the Caribou Hotel, Klondike Kate’s and the Keno City Hotel. Turn-of-the-century schoolhouses have been assisted as well as churches, farms, trading posts and stores and roadhouses. Thanks in part to the historic properties assistance program, we can understand and enjoy Yukon’s rich history as it is reflected in our historic places and structures.

In closing, I would like to mention one unique aspect of the delivery of this program.
One staff member has been helping to deliver the program since its inception. Mr. Bruce Barrett joined the Department of Tourism and Culture in 1985 and has worked on the historic properties assistance program from the beginning. I would like to thank Bruce for his dedication and hard work.
I would also like to congratulate all of the historic properties assistance program recipients who have worked to conserve Yukon’s heritage. The Government of Yukon is pleased to support efforts to ensure Yukoners will be able to enjoy our heritage for many more years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS
Hon. Mr. Kent: I’d like to welcome a number of F.H. Collins students joining us here in the gallery today who are concerned with the loss of the gymnasium during the construction period for the new F.H. Collins.

Applause

Ms. Hanson: I’d like the House to join me in welcoming Davina Harker and Dianne Thompson to the House.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any returns or documents for tabling?
Are there reports of committees? The Chair of the Select Committee on Whistle-blower Protection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, I have for presentation the final report of the Select Committee on Whistle-blower Protection.

Speaker: Are there any other committee reports for presentation?
Are there any petitions?
Are there any bills to be introduced?
Are there any notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION
Ms. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following motion:
THAT this House urges the Yukon government to introduce legislation governing lobbying activities that:
(1) requires the registration of lobbyists;
(2) sets out a code of conduct for lobbyists; and
(3) imposes penalties for violation of the legislation.

Mr. Barr: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following motion:
THAT this House urges the Minister of Community Services to respond to the immediate priorities set by the Carcross community and the Carcross-Tagish First Nation, and address the need for infrastructure by constructing a multi-purpose community house and a community centre, and following those priorities, to construct:
(1) a youth centre;
(2) an emergency response facility; and
(3) a seniors/elders housing complex.

Mr. Silver: I give notice of the following motion:
THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to remove from the Order Paper or call for debate today, December 4, Bill No. 48, Act to Amend the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

I also give notice of the following motion:
THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to remove from the Order Paper or call for debate today, December 4, Bill No. 49, Act to Amend the Oil and Gas Act, 2012.

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

QUESTION PERIOD
Question re: Residential Landlord and Tenant Act amendments

Ms. White: The Official Opposition is beginning to get the feeling that the Yukon Party government is done talking about the proposed Residential Landlord and Tenant Act in the Legislative Assembly, even though there is much, much more to debate. As it stands, and barring amendment, the Yukon Party’s proposed Residential Landlord and Tenant Act would place no prohibitions on price gouging. There is no protection for tenants who could theoretically have their rents jacked up by $500 in one year.

How can the Yukon Party government defend the right to raise rents by $500, by $1,000 or more?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: For the record, the government has actually been debating the Residential Landlord and Tenant Act and remains committed to making sure that the act does go through and that there is discussion, as we have had in the past number of days.

We on the government side feel that we have put forward a balanced piece of legislation that reflects the rights and the interest of both landlords and tenants, and it certainly contains a number of provisions in support of the recommendations that came forward by the Select Committee on the Landlord and Tenant Act, which comprised representation from all parties of the Legislature.

At the end of the day, property owners have a right to a return on their investment, and we as a government are very much committed to finding ways to encourage the development of more rental properties and to have a larger inventory of units on the market, and that’s in fact what we’re doing by working with Yukon Housing Corporation, by working in our own Department of Community Services and making land available. We’re not interested in discouraging landlords from doing otherwise.

Ms. White: As it stands — and barring an amendment — the Yukon Party’s proposed Residential Landlord and Tenant Act would allow tenants to be evicted without a reason. Say, for example, the landlord just doesn’t like the tenant — the tenant can be kicked out despite not breaking the tenancy agreement or any laws. How can the Yukon Party government defend the right to evict a tenant without a reason?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: As recommended by the Select Committee on the Landlord and Tenant Act, and I quote: “The Act must offer basic protection to tenants while at the same time affording landlords protection and control of their asset.”

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the new Residential Landlord and Tenant Act does, in fact, provide rules and time frames for termination, both with and without cause. When it comes to adding a minimum termination of tenancy provisions for landlords, we have added a number of new provisions, including six months’ notice for condo conversion; 18 months’ notice for mobile home park closure; two months’ notice for all other terminations — again, without cause. That is up from one month’s notice. When it comes to minimum notice to a landlord from the tenant’s perspective, that, in fact, will remain at 30 days.

The government is committed to balancing the interests and protecting the rights of both landlords and tenants. We are very proud of the bill that is going forward, which speaks to a whole host of various items, including a new dispute resolution mechanism. It talks to rent increases; it talks to ending tenancy, with or without cause.

Question re: Ross River sewage treatment

Mr. Barr: Can the Minister of Community Services provide an explanation as to why the Government of Yukon has been violating its water licence for over seven years when it comes to sewage treatment in Ross River?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: What I can say is that this government has, in fact, invested millions of dollars through the Building Canada fund and through working in collaboration with First Nation governments, municipal and unincorporated communities to address water treatment, waste-water treatment — in terms of upgrades to drinking water systems, in terms of addressing solid waste — modernizing systems across the territory, to addressing rural roads and certainly implementing green energy initiatives as well. So, again, the government is, in fact, very much working with each and every community throughout the Yukon to address deficiencies when it comes to infrastructure.

Mr. Barr: The Minister of Community Services has been along for the wild Yukon Party ride for 10 years now. Though she is relatively new to the portfolio, she has sat in Cabinet for a long, long time. I’m talking about a long, long problem afflicting the people of Ross River — about broken promises and government non-compliance with the law.

On May 21, 2003, the water licence dealing with municipal waste water and sewage for Ross River was signed and legally in effect. One of the conditions was that Community Services, the licence holder, would decommission an old up-gradient pit and “construct a new infiltration pit, designated as Phase I, at a location approximately 400 metres west of the community of Ross River;...”

This condition was supported by the Ross River Dena Council. Why has nearly 10 years of Yukon Party rule passed and sewage continues to be dumped in an old up-gradient pit, despite the concerns of the First Nation?
Hon. Ms. Taylor: As I referenced earlier, the Government of Yukon is committed to working with every community — unincorporated, incorporated, First Nation communities — and many other agencies and organizations throughout the Yukon to address deficient infrastructure. That includes waste-water treatment; it includes drinking water upgrades. When one takes a look at the community of Ross River alone, this government has invested well over $11 million in the last number of years, and that does not include the new recreation centre, which this government also committed to and which includes roughly $7 million in this year’s budget.

Mr. Speaker, a project such as arsenic treatment, road upgrades, a new public works building, trailer renovations, a new sewage truck, a subdivision environmental assessment survey, a community infrastructure plan — the list goes on. This government is working to address all infrastructure needs of communities.

Mr. Barr: Mr. Speaker, this is about safe drinking water. I have spoken with Ross River residents who are very concerned about the state of the sewage pit and the likelihood of groundwater contamination. In 2007, it was noted that drinking water samples from the community well exceeded acceptable guidelines for levels of arsenic and manganese. That is the last time samples were taken.

I want to paint a picture for the minister. Today, in violation of the water licence, the old pit continues to be used in spite of vegetative growth inside and outside the pit, which may have damaged the structural integrity of the system. As well, there is evidence that sewage has been spilled outside the old pit. The government is not monitoring, not providing information, not conducting structural inspections, is violating the water licence and continues to ignore promises made to the people of Ross River.

Will the minister take responsibility and commit to fixing the serious problem that has gone on far too long?

Speaker’s statement

Speaker: Order please. I’d like to talk to the students here who are in the gallery. I have no idea why you’re standing. I was assuming when you stood up that you were getting ready to leave in the middle of Question Period. It’s disruptive; it’s not conducive to the business here. I’d ask you to please take your seats at this time. Please sit down.

If you’re worried about your democratic right to protest and everything else, it’s not in here. It’s outside. The members who are here were elected, and they’re here to represent everybody in the Yukon and this is their opportunity to speak and do their job.

Please remain seated until you’re ready to leave. Thank you.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Again, this government is very much committed to working with all communities. I just listed a number of community infrastructure projects that we have been undertaking right within the community of Ross River, as we have in every single community.

We certainly will undertake to continue to work with the Ross River Dena Council and to continue to work with the residents of the community of Ross River to address many of the community infrastructure needs.

That is, in fact, why this government put forth on the floor of the Legislature a motion that speaks to the long-term infrastructure needs of all Yukon communities and, certainly, those across the country. We are working in collaboration with our northern counterparts in Northwest Territories and Nunavut and Canada and working with the Association of Yukon Communities, so that we continue to have the funding and the resources allowed to be necessary to address any of the deficient community infrastructure that we have. But, again, this Government of Yukon will have invested more than $265 million in support of community infrastructure projects over the last several years — all of which, I might add, the members opposite have voted against.

Question re: First Nations/government relations

Mr. Silver: Late last week — very late last week — the Premier cancelled the Yukon Forum on very short notice. Chiefs from around the territory had already travelled to Whitehorse for the meeting, only to be informed the Premier would not meet with them. It is another example of this government’s poor communications with First Nations. One of the few bright spots on the agenda was a new resource royalty agreement. On October 29, the Premier announced that a deal was in place, but he said he would not make it public until it was signed at the Yukon Forum. The Forum is now postponed indefinitely.

Can the Premier confirm that all Yukon First Nations government have, in fact, agreed to the new rates, and will he table a copy of the agreement?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: As I’ve mentioned many times, this government continues to work with all First Nations on a daily basis on many, many programs and services that are being delivered to people in all communities — First Nation people and, in fact, all Yukoners. We will continue to do so.

Resource revenue-sharing is something that this government brought up with consultation with Yukon First Nations that started or triggered a process by which we began a conversation with Canada to acknowledge Yukoners being able to keep more of the royalties or the revenues that are associated with the mining industry. It was through those negotiations that we were able to come up with a tentative deal with the Prime Minister in 2011, which, through more consultation with Yukon First Nations, we were able to then sign an agreement this summer with the Prime Minister, solidifying the bilateral agreement between Canada and the Yukon government.

We have continued to work and have announced in the past that we have an agreement with Yukon First Nations. We look forward to the opportunity to get together to sign this document.

Mr. Silver: I’m happy that the Government of Yukon is going ahead with these improvements to the resource royalty sharing agreements with the First Nations. They are based on recent changes to the Northwest Territories devolution agreement. After initially refusing to give the First Nations a bigger share, the government has finally changed its mind. As recently as August of this year, the government said it wasn’t interested
in giving the First Nations a better deal, so we’re glad to see that this has changed.

Given this government’s rocky relationships with First Nation governments, this is a good news story, and I’m glad that we’re moving forward on this issue. The Premier didn’t answer my first question, though. Can he confirm that all Yukon First Nation governments have agreed to the new rates, and will there be a tabled copy of this agreement in this House?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Again, as I mentioned, we continue to work with First Nations every day on a number of fronts. For example, as I have mentioned in the past, we have contributed millions of dollars to First Nations in accordance with the obligations we are under. We continue to consult and accommodate First Nations, not only to meet our obligations, but to exceed our obligations. We continue to hold land set aside for the three unsettled First Nations, even though they have categorically stated that they have no intention of signing a modern-day treaty and land settlement, and the federal government has no mandate to negotiate an agreement.

We continue to hold those lands for those First Nations. We work together on such areas as wildlife management plans, as I mentioned recently — bison and wolf are two examples of wildlife management plans. In fact, with this new revenue-sharing agreement, the First Nations are able to share up to an additional $4.7 million.

Mr. Silver: I guess I’ll move on. The Premier mentioned the three unsigned First Nations. Under the current royalty agreement, only settled First Nations receive royalty payments. The Kaska and the White River First Nations do not receive a share because they have not signed final agreements. The press release announcing this new deal makes no reference to the three unsigned First Nations. The government recently made public some letters regarding the Kaska and how they might receive royalties if southeast Yukon was opened for development. This side deal was never signed.

My question for the Premier: How are the three unsigned First Nations treated under the new royalty agreement?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: As I think the member opposite is aware, the three unsettled First Nations still fall under the Indian Act with the federal government, whereas the remaining 11 First Nations — the settled First Nations — have agreements that have fallen under and are based on the Umbrella Final Agreement. It is based on the formula that is agreed upon and which we continue to move forward.

This government continues to work with all First Nations, whether they have a self-government agreement, a modern-day treaty, or whether they don’t. We will continue to consult with and accommodate all First Nations. We will continue to work toward economic agreements that will be a benefit to not only the members of the unsettled First Nations but, in fact, all the people within their communities. We will continue to look for those opportunities to build capacity and to ensure that there are opportunities for jobs, for training and for business opportunities for all Yukoners.

Question re: COR certification

Ms. Moorcroft: People working in occupational health and safety often repeat the very important truth that every workplace injury is preventable. Workers and employers need to take responsibility for building a culture of safety in our workplaces and government has a huge role to play as well. In 2008, the Yukon committed to a safety certification program called COR, certificate of recognition, and this would apply to government operations, large companies operating in the Yukon and contractors bidding on government jobs. For 2012, contractors wanting to bid on government jobs valued at or above $100,000 must be COR-certified. Contracts under $100,000 are exempt from the COR safety certification.

What is the plan for 2013? Does the Minister of Highways and Public Works intend to extend the $100,000-or-less exemption from COR certification?

Hon. Mr. Graham: The current exemption, as the member opposite pointed out, is $100,000. At this point in time, we haven’t made any decision as to whether or not that should be changed, or whether it should remain or be increased. Once that decision is made, we’ll be happy to announce it.

Ms. Moorcroft: Mr. Speaker, it is very disappointing to hear that the government hasn’t made a decision, when January 1 is coming closely upon us. The government needs to be fair to contractors. They need to be clear to contractors, and they need to support workplace safety training. The original plan was for a phased-in approach for contractors so that by 2011, COR certification would be required to bid on any size of government contracts. It isn’t fair to the many contractors that in good faith got that certification to continue putting on exemptions.

When will the government make an announcement, and will they give clear direction to Yukon contractors that they are going to require all contractors to engage in the safety certification under COR?

Hon. Mr. Graham: At the present time, 72 workplaces have been COR-certified, and 51 small employers certified, with six others as owner-operators with a certificate of proficiency. We are having difficulties in the smaller communities, perhaps, achieving the COR certification that we want, especially with small or owner-operated businesses. Consequently at this time there is no movement to change the $100,000 exemption, especially for contracts released in smaller communities.

Question re: Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act amendments

Ms. Stick: The Minister of Highways and Public Works has described his amendments to the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act as minor, narrow —

Speaker’s statement

Speaker: Order please. The students in the gallery are really trying my patience. I don’t know what your purpose is, but I’m going to have to ask you to leave. Please come again when you can follow the rules of the House. If you’d like to discuss it with me at another time, please feel free to come to my office.

Member for Riverdale South, please.
Ms. Stick: The territory’s Information and Privacy Commissioner has a different opinion. He said, and I quote: “I consider this a substantial amendment to the ATIPP Act that would have better been done through a review of the ATIPP Act”. Why is the minister rejecting the first issue raised by the Information and Privacy Commissioner — that there should be a full review of the act?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: We do value the role of the Information and Privacy Commissioner — I’ve said this before — to act on behalf of the people of the Yukon to ensure that government and public bodies achieve the balance between transparency and protection. But if the public service can’t provide information with some form of confidentiality, then Cabinets will deliberate without the knowledge of the full facts. Cabinet ministers take an oath of office to keep information in confidence. If this is to occur, then it only makes sense to treat the information the same way.

Ms. Stick: The Yukon Party campaigned on being open and accountable, but it seems that public consultation only happens when it suits.

In brushing off the Information and Privacy Commissioner’s concerns, the Minister of Highways and Public Works said and I quote: “We appreciate his contributions to the legislative development process, but this is about full and fair consideration of options.”

This government has brushed off the commissioner’s concerns and will not let the public have a say. The Yukon government likes to talk about consultation, but on this issue they have shut the public out. Why is the minister refusing the public’s right to have a say on these restrictions of their democratic rights?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: We continue to make ourselves available to Yukoners to discuss our decisions. We’re discussing things today in the House. This dedicated period for questions is a good example. We also have debate in Committee of the Whole where we answer questions from the opposition. We have been and will remain fully accountable to Yukoners for our decisions. We’re making some minor changes so that our officials can provide us with clear and candid advice as we deliberate on these decisions.

Ms. Stick: Mr. Speaker — open and accountable after we’ve made our decisions. Question and answer period? Not; it’s Question Period.

The minister also said that the current act does not “effectively recognize the essential need to balance the public’s right to information with reasonable restrictions in the interest of good governance.”

Mr. Speaker, the minister is denying the right of the public to have a say. He is dismissing the serious concerns of the Information and Privacy Commissioner and he is ignoring the purpose of the act, which is to protect Yukoners’ personal information and allow for openness and transparency of government decision-making. That’s open and transparent, Mr. Speaker.

Will the minister uphold his government’s promise of open and accountable government and let the public have a say before he makes this government the most secretive?

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: As it implies, the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act is about the access to information and, equally important, it’s the protection of privacy. I spoke before about the Cabinet ministers — we have the ability to have full and frank conversations with our staff. We need our officials to be able to provide us with clear and candid advice. Open and accountable — I think today I heard that the report of the Select Committee on Whistle-blower Protection was brought through to the House — which is open and accountable.

Question re: Water quality

Ms. White: The importance of territory-wide baseline data on water quality and quantity is of vital importance to the Yukon.

This is not a matter that any government should take lightly, especially in the Yukon where chapter 14 of the Umbrella Final Agreement reads, “The objective of this chapter is to maintain the Water of the Yukon in a natural condition while providing for its sustainable use.” Currently, despite best efforts from Environment Yukon staff, the Yukon has very little baseline data and what there is is very site-specific.

Will the Minister of Environment commit to gathering territory-wide, baseline water data and tell this House when this work would start so that we can ensure adequate protection of Yukon’s water supply?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: The Department of Environment gathers data about a number of different things — environmental indicators — throughout the territory, and that includes water resources. As I’ve indicated in the House previously, we understand that that needs to be done in a more coordinated fashion that includes other branches of government and other levels of government. That is why we have committed to developing a territory-wide water strategy with both other levels of government, First Nation governments, municipalities and the public. I look forward to having that strategy coming forward in due course. As I’ve indicated before, it will be based around a number of principles which we’ll be happy to consult the public on as they come out.

At this point, we have had one meeting so far with stakeholders from various branches of government and have conducted that stakeholder workshop earlier this year. The work from that workshop will be incorporated into the product that I bring forward to my Cabinet colleagues, and I look forward to bringing that water strategy forward in due course.

Ms. White: The Yukon’s chief medical officer, in his report on Keno and the possible effects of the Alexco mine, spoke to the lack of baseline data on water. The minister has often spoken to how his department is starting to gather baseline water data in the White Gold and the Rackla areas, areas that are already under direct pressure from industrial use.

Communities want to know about the quality and quantity of their water before industrial development begins to use that water and to discharge waste into those waters. Industry has told us that they want baseline water data before they begin operations. Why is the Minister of Environment stalling on gathering this critical information, which Yukoners and industry want to see before industrial development?
Hon. Mr. Dixon: One of the initiatives already under way, pursuant to some of our commitments around water resources, is the development of the Yukon water website, which is a one-stop shop for all information relating to water. It’s able to conglomerate information from a variety of different sources and provide it to the public in a fairly interactive and simple-to-use website, which is significant in the amount of data it provides. I would encourage the member opposite to visit the website, if she hasn’t already, to see the significant amount of data that’s currently available.

We can always gather more data, and we are. The member opposite has noted that we, of course, have increased the budget for gathering baseline data in a few key areas in the Yukon that are experiencing increased activity. As activity increases throughout the territory, we’ll adjust accordingly. I have the utmost confidence in the staff in the Water Resources branch, as well as the rest of the Department of Environment, to conduct those baseline data studies and provide the data to the public vis-à-vis the Yukon water website.

**Question re: Umbrella Final Agreement anniversary**

Mr. Elias: The Yukon is a trailblazer in the realm of land claims, negotiations and self-government, not only in Canada, but around the world. The process began when the Yukon Native Brotherhood, now the Council of Yukon First Nations, presented *Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow* back in January of 1973. Since then, the Council of Yukon First Nations signed the *Umbrella Final Agreement*, 11 of Yukon’s 14 First Nations have signed their final and self-government agreements and established new governments. Soon it will be the 40th anniversary of *Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow*, the 20th anniversary of the *Umbrella Final Agreement* being signed on May 29, 1993, and also the 10th anniversary of the signing of the devolution transfer agreement.

Will the Premier and his government take this opportunity and partner with the federal and First Nation governments and celebrate all the greatness that has come to all Yukoners as a result of the historic efforts of *Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow*?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin is correct. As they say in Latin, “tempus fugit”. Time does fly, and how quickly the time has gone by, and we have come upon the 40th anniversary. In fact 20th and 10th anniversaries in 2013. Those are some significant dates that we are looking forward to being able to work together and perhaps use the opportunity to showcase to Yukoners and Canadians from where we have come to where we are today. I think that is very important. I do believe that we are already organizing some funding for the 40th anniversary for next year.

Mr. Elias: That is good to hear, Mr. Speaker.

Our First Nation final and self-government agreements position Yukon at the forefront of social, legal and constitutional development and deserve to be celebrated and have a role to play in all sectors of our economy. All we have to do is look to the sky, walk the waterfront or hike the Tombstones. The Kwanlin Dun Cultural Centre is rooted in the Kwanlin Dun self-government agreement. The Whitehorse Public Library and the cultural centre are now built on Kwanlin Dun settlement land.

The Tr’ondëk Hwëch’in First Nation agreement made the way for Tombstone Territorial Park and 2,200 square kilometres of protected area. That’s just absolutely remarkable. The Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation has signed an agreement and paved the way for the Vuntut Gwitchin to acquire 49 percent of Air North, and they have just celebrated their one-millionth passenger.

Will the Premier explain to this House how we will take this opportunity to celebrate on behalf of Yukoners what we have achieved over the last 40-some years?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: I did mention — I think it was actually announced today — the CDF funding for CYFN to help them commemorate the 40th anniversary — I think this is going to be an exciting event. I think this is an opportunity, not only to celebrate, but also to probably let Yukoners know the accomplishments that have occurred here over these time periods. I think that while we can probably sit here and acknowledge that this is something that we all look forward to, I think we’ll let the organizers do the work to find out exactly how it is that we will celebrate this. We look forward to being a participant in that and look forward to those days of celebration.

Mr. Elias: I’d like to suggest that this be more than an event, because the elements of our final agreements touched the lives of all of our citizens. I say “our” because they belong to all Yukoners. To me, our future looks bright, not cloudy. That has been exemplified in this House from time to time, and I’ve been hearing it from students, including my own son. So our children who are listening are educated about the processes and about the good that has come from defining our rights and responsibilities in our territory, and our self-determination and the right to create our own destiny.

Here’s what the Premier could do — he could dedicate May 22 to 29 as *Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow* week, in partnership with the federal and First Nation governments. He could direct this government to plan themes of celebrations that will run throughout the territory for years to come. He could dedicate May 29 as the ‘day of understanding the journey’, so that our children can exemplify what we have been successful with here, and our proud history.

Will the Premier provide direction to his government to recognize and celebrate this great event?

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: I want to thank the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin for coming up with some great ideas on how we might be able to celebrate this momentous occasion. We will continue to work with our partners, with CYFN, with all the First Nations in the Yukon, to see what would be appropriate. I’m sure we’ll also be in contact with the Government of Canada to see what the options are and how we can best acknowledge and celebrate the accomplishments that have occurred over the past 40 years.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.
Notice of opposition private members’ business

Mr. Silver: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the item standing in the name of the Third Party to be called on Wednesday, December 5, 2012. It is Motion No. 247, standing in the name of the Member for Klondike.

Ms. Stick: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the items standing in the name of the Official Opposition to be called on Wednesday, December 5, 2012. They are Motion No. 329, standing in the name of the Member for Riverdale South, and Motion No. 328, standing in the name of the Member for Whitehorse Centre.

Mr. Elias: I recognize that we have mere days remaining in this sitting. I will not be calling a motion today as we have many pieces of legislation to debate.

Speaker: We will proceed at this time with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 47: Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act — Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 47, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Kent.

Hon. Mr. Nixon: I move that Bill No. 47, entitled Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 47, entitled Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Yukon’s Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act allows a member of a pension plan or an investor in an RRSP or other registered plan to name a beneficiary who will get their benefits if they die.

Canada is in the process of enacting a new kind of retirement saving plan called a “pooled registered pension plan”. To give pooled registered pension plan participants the ability to designate a beneficiary, the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act needed to be amended to apply the new plans. A similar amendment was made when the federal government brought in the tax-free savings plan.

Our government is also establishing a regulating power to allow for future pension instruments to be brought into the plan as required by regulation rather than opening the act for each new pension type.

This addition to the regulating power is in anticipation of other pension vehicles that may be considered in the future by the federal government. The act also clarifies the application of the act regarding the home ownership savings plan that ended in the mid-1980s, but it may be possible that a plan of this nature may still indeed exist.

Our government is committed to ensuring that the legislation of the Yukon is up to date and continues to meet the needs of all Yukoners. This kind of act is not controversial and is certainly part of our responsibility as Yukon’s Legislative Assembly to ensure our citizens have the full benefit of new programs or services offered by the federal government. All jurisdictions in Canada will be required to make these small amendments to their respective legislation in order to fully implement the new pooled registration pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a step back from the specifics of the bill and turn my attention to the broader topic of retirement and pensions. I suspect many Yukoners are reflecting on their pension plans. Some of the reading I’ve been doing has been speaking to the need to revisit our investment forecasts and our investment strategies. Many commentators on this subject are advising that we need to be realistic, both about our intentions when we retire — I think many of us would like to travel — and about how much we need to be setting aside now to make those dreams possible when we do end up retiring.

I spent some time looking at www.getsmarteraboutmoney.ca. The website is provided by the Investor Education Fund, which was established as a non-profit organization by the Ontario Securities Commission. The Investor Education Fund develops and promotes unbiased, independent financial information programs and tools to help consumers make better financial and investing decisions. I would like to pass on some of the information on that website.

The first is to ask ourselves how much I need to save for retirement. Retirement planning is about managing your money so you can make the most of your retirement years. We need to ask what it is that we want to do when we retire — whether it is travelling, volunteering or perhaps spending the summers at a lakeside cottage, we’re probably going to want to have money available to us to do things like that.

Based on how we want to spend our time after we retire, we need to develop a retirement plan. That means we need to set goals, as a plan helps you set goals for retirement including the age of when you want to stop working and your lifestyle. We need to know how much money to save. How much money do you need to save to live comfortably in retirement with the lifestyle that you want to pursue? We need to choose what to invest in. A plan can guide your investment choices based on your goals and your risk tolerance.

I would like to just mention a little bit about how we decide how much money we need for retirement. The website, the question of how much you need to save depends on three things: firstly your age. When you start saving makes a big difference in how much you need to put away. The younger you are when you start, the less money you have to put aside, thanks to the power of compounding. Secondly is lifestyle: Do you plan to stay home or travel the world? The amount you need to save will depend on the lifestyle you plan to lead when you retire. Thirdly is federal government benefits. You could be entitled to government retirement benefits like the Canada Pen-
Since we are talking about the Canada Pension Plan, I think it’s appropriate for us to take a few moments to talk about that benefit as it relates to retirement planning.

In preparing for today’s debate, I spent some time reviewing the Government of Canada’s website. I’d like to share with you as you make the transition from work to retirement.

The Government of Canada is adapting the CPP to respond to the evolving needs of Canada’s aging population and to changes in the economy and the labour market. The changes the government will gradually introduce from 2011 to 2016 will give you more options so that you can make decisions that are right for you as you make the transition from work to retirement.

I’d like to summarize a few of the changes being made to the CPP. The monthly CPP retirement pension amount will increase by a larger percentage if you take it after age 65. The monthly CPP retirement pension amount will decrease by a larger percentage if you take it before the age of 65. If you are under 65 and you work while receiving your CPP retirement pension, you and your employer will have to make CPP contributions. These contributions will increase your CPP retirement benefits.

If you are age 65 to 70 and you work while receiving your CPP retirement pension, you can choose to make CPP contributions. These contributions will increase your CPP retirement benefits.

The number of years of low or zero earnings that are automatically dropped from the calculation of your CPP pension will increase. You will be able to begin receiving your CPP retirement pension without any work interruption. Your monthly CPP retirement pension amount will increase by a larger percentage if you take it after age 65. Your monthly CPP retirement pension amount will decrease by a larger percent if you take it before age 65.

I want to mention a few ways to help Yukoners prepare for their retirement. Taking advantage of any unused registered retirement savings plan contribution room — the government allows you to carry forward unused contributions each year. If you have unused contribution room, try to use it as soon as you can to take advantage of the tax-sheltered savings.

Also, invest in a tax-free savings account. At the start of the session when I started preparing for today, the limit for the tax-free savings account was $5,000 each year. Since then, on November 26, 2012, the Hon. Ted Menzies, Minister of State, Finance, and the Hon. Gail Shea, Minister of National Revenue, have announced that Canadians will be able to save an additional $500 in their tax-free savings account starting in 2013, which will raise the annual contribution limit to $5,500.

Minister Menzies stated that the TFSA has become an exceedingly valuable savings tool for so many Canadians. TFSAs have become increasingly popular with approximately 8.2 million Canadians having opened an account and roughly 2.5 million Canadians contributed to the maximum amount in 2011. I wonder how many of those are Yukoners?

The minister has highlighted the key features of the TFSA that make it a popular savings vehicle for Canadians. A TFSA is available to all Canadians 18 years and older. Any interest, dividends and capital gains earned in a TFSA are not subject to tax. The TFSA allows you to invest in a number of types of investments — be it a high interest savings account, mutual funds, guaranteed investment certificates, listed securities or other types of qualified investment products. Unused TFSA contribution room is carried forward and accumulates for future years.

Funds available in your TFSA can be withdrawn tax-free at any time for any purpose. You can re-contribute withdrawn amounts in the same year only if you have unused TFSA contribution room, otherwise you have to wait until the following year. Income earned in a TFSA and withdrawals do not affect your eligibility for federal income-tested benefits and credits.

Look for small ways to save; consider cutting back on your spending for items like lottery tickets, magazines or fancy coffees — it all adds up. It may be better to live on a little less now so you’ll have more when you really need it.

Years ago I was given a calculator that showed how much a daily decision could add up over the course of a year. A dollar a day savings is $365; if you start doing that when you’re 18 and invest that $365 every year, by the time you are 65 it works out to just under $51,000.

Take advantage of a company pension or savings plan, especially if your employer offers matching contributions. You can save your bonuses and raises. The next time you get a bonus or a raise, don’t spend it all. Try to put some of it toward your retirement savings. Consider saving less for your children’s education. If you have to choose between saving for your retirement and your children’s education, put money in your RRSP first. Let your children get jobs or borrow to help pay for their education. Later you may be able to help them pay their student loans, which carry lower interest rates.

Consider revisiting your investment strategy. Look for ways to get a little more growth without more risk than you can tolerate. If you choose only the most conservative investments for your retirement savings, your savings may not grow fast enough to give you the income you need after you retire.

While on that subject, I think it’s worth mentioning that it’s often the case that the higher return, the higher the risk. I think each one of us has to decide for ourselves how much risk we are willing to take and if the higher rate of return is worth the additional risk. That for me is a personal choice.

On the subject of adopting an investment strategy, I do want to mention one CBC on-line article I read from the beginning of this year, which noted that many Canadians are overestimating how much the annual rate of return on their investments will be. The story quoted a certified financial planner who cautions not to expect double-digit returns going forward. The bottom line of this story was that it may be too risky to use historical performance data for retirement planning projections.
I appreciate the opportunity to share with this House the relevance and importance of this amendment. I would like to conclude by first saying that our amendment today is all about helping Yukoners to ensure a future income. Our amendment today is designed to assist Yukoners prepare for the future.

Secondly, I’d like to extend my appreciation to the team at Justice for working on these important amendments. Their hard work day in and day out certainly does not go unnoticed.

Ms. Moorcroft: I rise on behalf of the Official Opposition to state that we will be supporting these amendments to the Act to Amend the Retirement Beneficiaries Act. These are housekeeping amendments in nature and as the minister said are bringing it up to date.

I would note that this legislation has been the subject of determination by the Uniform Law Conference of Canada. For those who may want to understand the Uniform Law Conference better, it has a civil section that assembles government policy lawyers and analysts, private lawyers and law reformers to consider areas in which provincial and territorial laws would benefit from harmonization.

The civil section then prepares uniform statutes that relevant governments in Canada may choose to adopt and which provide a method of harmonization where a government may want to use the bill.

These amendments before us are ones that we can support. The measure that the minister indicated — that government will be taking in these amendments to provide for regulations so that, when there are new savings plans that need to be added in, they can do that by regulation rather than bringing it back to the House — is one that many jurisdictions have done as well.

I would like the minister to indicate whether there will be any effect on public servant and government pensions. The minister spoke about getting smart about your money and managing your money for your retirement and pensions and I do think that I need to draw to the minister’s attention that there are many people who are living in poverty or even living above the poverty line who do not have the ability to put savings into a tax-free savings account. We need to invest in good public services for everyone so that those who do not have a large retirement savings or pension plan can count on health care, social services, adequate and affordable housing being there for them when they are no longer able to earn a living.

We need to have in Canada solid Canada Pension Plan and old age pension plan supplements available for all Canadians. Those have been under attack lately. The current financial crisis is casting a long shadow over money markets and that imperils the retirement savings of many and raises uncomfortable questions about how millions of Canadians have been left to fend for themselves. The Canadian Labour Congress has launched a major campaign in support of public pensions, and they have pointed out that recent events have exposed major faults at the heart of our pension system. Our public pension system, Old Age Security and the Guaranteed Income Supplement, plus the Canada Pension Plan, provide a secure income in retirement, but the maximum value of public pensions falls well short of replacing the 50 to 70 percent of pre-retirement income needed to maintain decent living standards.

Compared to many other advanced industrial countries, our public pension system is very underdeveloped. The private part of our pension system, which was meant to make up the big difference between public pensions and adequate retirement incomes, is in deep trouble. Only about one in five workers in the private sector now belong to an employee pension plan. Very few non-union workers, with the exception of managers and professionals, are covered by an employer plan and many of the plans that do exist are shaky because of low interest rates and the recent collapse of stock markets.

So ideas that could go a long way to improve retirement benefits for all workers, not simply for those who may have the luxury of having available funds to put in tax-free savings accounts and registered retirement savings plans, would be to increase benefits for the Canada Pension Plan and to increase low-income pensions so no senior lives in poverty.

I would ask that when the government is considering the future of people who are elderly in years, they do take into account the needs of every person living in our country, of all Yukoners and about the dignity and comfort that they will need in their old age to have security and, as I’ve said previously, have access to housing, health care and social services.

We will support this amendment and understand that it is housekeeping in nature, notwithstanding some of the other subjects that the minister and I have added to the debate.

Mr. Silver: I’m pleased to rise in support of Bill No. 47, Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act. This bill amends the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act to allow the Commissioner in Executive Council to proscribe additional kinds of retirement and savings plans for the purpose of the act. The bill also clarifies that RRIFs, registered retirement income funds, are included under the act. It removes a reference to a kind of federal home ownership savings plan that no longer exists and moves a portion of the defined plan into a new provision for greater clarity. It is the result of a recommendation made by the Uniform Law Conference in 2009, and I am pleased that we’re finally adopting it three years later. The Liberal caucus will be in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: If the member now speaks, he will close debate. Does any other member wish to be heard?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: I’ll be brief, and I appreciate the support coming from the members opposite.

So I’d like to conclude again by first saying that this amendment today is all about helping Yukoners to ensure a future income. This amendment today is designed to assist Yukoners as they prepare for their future.

Again, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to the team at Justice for working on these important amendments. Their hard work and their dedication, day in and day out, truly do not go unnoticed, so thank you.
Hon. Mr. Cathers: I move that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair (Ms. McLeod): Order. Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 47, entitled Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act. Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

Bill No. 47: Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 47, entitled Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act.

Hon. Mr. Nixon: I just want to extend my appreciation for the members from the Official Opposition and the Third Party for their remarks in second reading. It’s gratifying to me that they are in support of this bill.

My remarks during second reading were really explanatory for the House on the importance of keeping this legislation up to date. I’ll take this opportunity to answer one question for the Member for Copperbelt South, when the member asked if there is an effect on public sector pensions. The simple answer to that question is no, there is not. Public sector pensions are registered pensions and therefore already have the capability to designate a beneficiary.

Having already answered one question, I’ll be brief and conclude and open the floor for other remarks.

Ms. Moorcroft: The next question that I have for the minister relates to the provisions of this act where he stated in second reading that Cabinet will now be able to make changes by regulation if some funds change or if new funds are added. Does the minister anticipate that his officials will be regularly reviewing circumstances in order to add new plans? The next question would be if there are any other provisions of the act that they anticipate need to be reviewed or changed or did they take a look at that when they brought forward these amendments?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: It’s a good question coming from the member opposite; indeed, this act has been reviewed to a standard where it’s now current with others across the country. A regulation will be needed to designate the pooled registered pension plans themselves. Otherwise we anticipate no further changes at this time.

Ms. Moorcroft: Although this next question is only indirectly related, since the minister does have his officials with him, I will proceed to ask it.

Are there other bills that the Uniform Law Conference of Canada has prepared uniform statutes for that the Yukon government is anticipating looking at and perhaps amending Yukon legislation or bringing forward new legislation? If so, what areas of law are captured in that?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Although the officials participated in the Uniform Law Conference, at this time there are no other changes that are being sought in the immediate future.

Mr. Tredger: Welcome to the officials. I have just a couple of quick questions. By designating a beneficiary, will that affect the disbursal of pension accounts when there has been a spousal dispute or a divorce? I understand with pension amounts it’s an automatic 50/50 split. Will that continue and will that also affect the disbursal of RSPs and tax-free savings accounts?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: To answer the question from the member opposite, this does not change how the beneficiary is split in the case of a dispute like that — it doesn’t change marital law; it just identifies a beneficiary in case of death. I didn’t do this when I was first on my feet, but I’d really like to extend my appreciation and my thanks to the extremely hard-working officials who have truly contributed quite a lot to the Department of Justice, and I’d like to thank them for being here and offering their assistance to me.

Mr. Tredger: By designating a beneficiary, will the tax-free savings account move to that person tax free — to the designated person — or does it change the status of the amount?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: That’s correct; it will allocate to that individual, tax free.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Bill No. 47? We will now go clause by clause.

On Clause 1
Clause 1 agreed to

On Clause 2
Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3
Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4
Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5
Clause 5 agreed to

On Title
Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Madam Chair, I move that Bill No. 47, entitled Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act, be reported without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Nixon that Bill No. 47, entitled Act to Amend the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act, be reported without amendment.
Motion agreed to

Chair: We are going to move on to Vote 3, Department of Education.

We will recess for two minutes or until the officials are ready.

Recess

Chair: Committee of the Whole will resume now with Vote 3, Department of Education, general debate.

Bill No. 7: Second Appropriation Act, 2012-13 — continued

Department of Education — continued

Chair: Mr. Kent, you have 17 minutes and 56 seconds remaining.

Hon. Mr. Kent: I know we were up in debate for a full afternoon on November 20 and then very short parts of a couple of other afternoons during this session. I do have some updated information I’d like to put forward from questions from members opposite that were raised on November 20. It would be fitting for me to start with an update for members on the work at F.H. Collins, given the activities in the Legislature today.

Prior to the start of this session, the Minister of Highways and Public Works and I met with the 20 or so students who were in the gallery today to talk about the project, to give them an update on where things are at. The Deputy Minister of Education and I, and a number of senior officials, were able to attend the open house held in the F.H. Collins cafeteria on November 22. Quite a few concerns were expressed at the open house about the loss of the gym facility at F.H. Collins during the extended construction period.

In the spring of 2012, we realized that an 18-month construction period was too compressed, considering the overall design and construction sequence, so it was expanded to what was considered a more realistic two years and eight months, to allow for better planning and greater fiscal responsibility.

One of the unfortunate aspects of that good planning was the fact that the gym would be lost for another year. So we certainly heard a lot of concerns from parents, from students and from other people in the F.H. Collins school community on November 22. Since that time, department officials in Education and Highways and Public Works have been exploring options for a temporary structure on-site.

The one quote we had when speaking at the open house was for $1.3 million for a fabric structure, similar to the one that was put up during the Canada Winter Games down close to where the Kwanlin Dun Cultural Centre is now. That has been ruled out for a couple of reasons — because the heating costs would be too high and because of the condensation issues inside the tent when it’s cold outside and warm inside. It’s my understanding from officials that we would end up with moisture coming down from the ceiling during that period. Certainly, we don’t want to compromise the floor. So that is one structure that has been ruled out by officials, but there are some other options we’re looking at.

We also need to find a site on the F.H. Collins campus that is safe. Obviously, the construction of the new school is going to be in close proximity to the existing school, so we need to find a site where we can put a temporary structure that is safe for the students and doesn’t compromise other recreational aspects, such as the soccer field and the running track. My understanding during the building advisory committee time was that they wanted to make sure that that stayed intact — obviously, for the hundreds of Yukoners who play soccer as well as the running clubs that use the track there.

We’re narrowed in where we can put this and, again, in order to be fiscally responsible with this option, we need to find other uses for the building afterward. We are exploring options with Highways and Public Works on areas where we can purchase a building for short-term use at F.H. Collins, and then move it to another site afterward for other options and, again, similar challenges with the floor and making sure that we can either recycle the existing gym floor, which may or may not be feasible.

We’re still investigating those opportunities and the costs of putting a new floor in and the costs of heating the structure have to be factored in. Of course we’re weighing those against the transportation costs that are associated with busing the students back and forth to the other venues. That was the plan that we were moving forward with and developing options in the community. I think we’re fortunate in the community of Whitehorse that we have so many of those options, such as the Canada Games Centre and the pool up there, Mount Sima, Mount McIntyre and the curling club and the broomball rink, Yukon College’s gym and the use of some other infrastructure in Riverdale such as the bowling alley and Leaping Feats and another private gym that is in Riverdale.

In my conversations with the instructor at the Montessori school, he was telling me that that’s how they do gym. That is their gym class and I know the deputy met with representatives of the home-school association and that’s certainly their physical education programming too. Again, we are absolutely looking at temporary options, but those will of course preclude these other options. We do need to be fiscally responsible, so if we do end up putting a temporary gym on-site, all the other options that exist won’t be there.

Just to let Yukoners and members of the House know that we’re not looking at any structure that will remain on-site. I and I’m sure the Minister of Highways and Public Works have been approached by a number of individuals with ideas for structures and what can happen afterwards, but just so that we manage expectations, it’s important for those user groups to know we aren’t planning on leaving any structure on-site as a legacy structure. The school design will be moving forward as is after construction and again, if we can find a financially responsible way to do it, we will certainly have a temporary facility on-site for the students to use as a gym during the construction period.

So again, all those sport user groups, I guess particularly one — Tennis Yukon is the one that has approached me on a number of occasions — there are other options if they’re looking for a year-round facility using the community development
Questions raised by the Member for Mayo-Tatchun: The first one was, when will the 2011-12 high school exit survey data be available and posted on the website and all prior years on the website? The answer is that links to the 2012 high school exit survey and follow-up study can be found at both the Department of Education website, under publications, reports and handbooks, and at the Yukon Bureau of Statistics website on the home page under recently published reports or under social statistics. I do have URLs here, but I won’t read them into the record. They’re fairly long, so if members have difficulty accessing them, I can get the URLs sent down to the chiefs of staff.

The 2011 high school exit survey can be found at the Yukon Bureau of Statistics website under social statistics — again a lengthy URL. The search engine at the website can also be used to locate any of the above-named reports, and that website is the Yukon Bureau of Statistics.

Another question raised was what is the immediate availability of Old Crow land-based experiential program curriculum and guidance materials? Again this was raised by the Member for Mayo-Tatchun and the answer is the First Nation Programs and Partnerships unit is developing a plan to share the Old Crow experiential resources with other Yukon schools. We have electronic copies of the teacher’s guide and student resource booklets that are available on request and we will be considering uploading the documents to the YESNET website and developing a communications strategy for public schools. We anticipate that when the two FNPP curriculum developers are staffed and hired, we will be doing school visitations and presentations at school staff meetings.

I will make a commitment to provide those — if I haven’t already done so — to provide those resource booklets to members of the opposition, one to each party, on a memory stick. They are fairly large documents, so we can get that done, and my apologies if it already has been done but I don’t think it has.

Another question: Will the Council of Yukon First Nations be involved in the development of the residential schools curriculum? Yukon Education will work with CYFN Education staff by inviting them to the YFN Education Advisory Committee, the YFN curriculum working group and to the residential curriculum committee meetings. For more detail regarding resource materials development, I will provide members with an attached report, entitled Status Update for Materials for Yukon Residential Schools Curriculum.

I know department officials were at the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol meetings, which are the curriculum development meetings, where the Yukon is the chair this
year, and had an opportunity to speak to officials from Nunavut and from the Northwest Territories. My understanding is that they have seen quite a bit of success with their residential school curriculum so we’ll look to build on that and adapt it to a Yukon context and, again, anticipate some of the other issues that were raised by the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin yesterday.

I do have some other questions, but the answers are fairly long, and I’m not sure how much time I have left. I think maybe what I could do is entertain questions from the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin. I know he and I were engaged in debate yesterday.

One thing that I can say coming out of yesterday’s debate — and I know he spoke about celebrating First Nations and all the great things that are coming up in 2013, from the 40th anniversary of Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow and a number of other important anniversaries that are going to be celebrated.

So I have asked department officials to look into making that the theme of our Education Week for 2013. Last year, it was about innovation in the schools. So this year, I think we’re able to maybe move on to something that celebrates some of the positive aspects of First Nations involvement in the Yukon, their history and their cultural contributions to the territory, not only over the past 40 years, but years before, and everything that they have done to enhance the quality of life here in the Yukon over the past centuries and indeed longer than that.

Again, I’ll work with department officials — I will commit to the member opposite — to come up with something that incorporates celebrating some of those important milestones when we celebrate Education Week, which I believe is in April 2013.

**Mr. Elias:** I appreciate the minister’s remarks with regard to my question yesterday in the Education debate. It’s encouraging because I think, over the years, when I was a youngster and invited to the land claims negotiation table right out of high school, sitting at the land claims negotiations with the federal and territorial governments and watching that progress and actually seeing a Vuntut National Park and so many other protected areas, from the top of our territory to the bottom, come to fruition through the land claims processes, and thousands of square kilometres of land being protected in every First Nation’s traditional territory. From that to the changes I’ve seen in education and in business, and the positive changes I’ve seen most recently right on the waterfront with the Kwanlin Dun Cultural Centre, and the list goes on and on and on. I think it’s good to hear that the minister is willing to look at a theme that can exemplify the positive accomplishments that have gone on over the years with regard to the settling of modern-day treaties here in our territory.

Another aspect of this is that right down to looking into the future — and I’m starting to see this now with regard to various levels of government working together to solve a very specific and distinct problem in an area of the Yukon. Look at the monetary values alone in our territory, where you have 11 self-governing First Nations who have their own departments of education, or their own economic development departments, or their own environment or land and resources department, and have dedicated funds of well over $10 million from one First Nation to run their little governments, participating in a better Yukon with our municipal governments, our NGOs, our boards and committees and industry, and the federal government’s presence in our territory as well as the territorial government presence in our territory. There’s basically nothing we can’t do to be a powerhouse in the federation of Canada.

I’ve said that before and I think it’s great to hear the Education minister say he’s willing to create the theme for Education, where he can talk among his other bosses in the department — I say that with a smile on my face for Hansard — recognizing the officials who are in the House today.

So it’s good to hear and I hope that we can see, as I mentioned today in Question Period, that the territorial government can actually recognize this unique and historic time that is approaching in the next coming weeks when we celebrate what we’ve achieved here in the Yukon through the Umbrella Final Agreement, the First Nation final agreements and the trip to Ottawa in January 1973 with so many chiefs. There are too many of them to name, but they will be named very soon in the Legislative Assembly.

I appreciate the minister’s response to my questions over the last couple of days. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Kent:** I should have mentioned this in my previous response, and I know the Premier spoke about it today during Question Period, but the community development fund has allocated $20,000 to the Council of Yukon First Nations to assist in a celebration of the 40th anniversary of Together Today for Our Children Tomorrow. There are some other departments also chiming in on this important initiative.

**Mr. Tredger:** I just want to follow up on a couple of statements that the minister made around F.H. Collins and the planning for that.

On November 22, the minister referenced $180,000 for busing as sort of the benchmark. At the time, it wasn’t clear how those numbers were arrived at. My question for the minister is if this includes the rental of facilities and does it include time for events such as graduation, Challenge Day and any assemblies around November? All of these would typically need a gymnasium and a stretcher on-site that will have to be rented out otherwise? Would it include also the costs to get students to the facilities before and after the school day for practices and stuff like that?

Also, has the minister considered the liability issues? I know a number of years ago, we had a situation where a number of high school students left school and were going to a concert — I believe it was a volleyball game at Porter Creek. They left F.H. Collins and were involved in a car accident.

At that time, it was decided that students would not be able to drive themselves to and from events. So when there is a morning practice, does the minister envision students arriving at F.H. Collins a half-hour early — say, 6:00 a.m. or 6:30 a.m. in the morning so that they can attend a practice at 7:00 a.m. at the Canada Games Centre and then get on the bus to go back down to F.H. Collins, then get back on the bus to return to the Canada Games Centre for a phys-ed class? There are a lot of things that have come into that. What kind of planning has been
done? Is that $180,000 still firm? Does it include bus rental? Does it include any extra time for staff to attend and get things set up and ready to go? Or are we depending on volunteer time to set up stuff off-site?

Hon. Mr. Kent: The $180,000 that was referenced at the November 22 meeting includes busing for PE activities as well as facility rentals for PE activities. Some of the other extracurricular activities — of course, the graduation ceremonies have been rebooked to the High Country Inn Convention Centre — or the Yukon Convention Centre, pardon me.

This is a cost estimate just as the value of the project is a cost estimate. We won’t know what the budget is for the replacement of the school until we get a successful bid, hopefully in January or perhaps into February, depending on the number of addendums that have to come forward with the project. Of course the liability issues and the safety issues are paramount, not only when transporting students back and forth from the school to various activities that we had scheduled for them in different venues, but also the liability and the safety of having the entire student population and teacher population in very close proximity to an active construction zone. As most members will know, the new school will be attached to the existing tech and trades wing, so it’s in very, very close proximity and the new school will be over the footprint of the existing gym. Again, those are extremely important things. I’ve heard over the past number of days from some parents that they aren’t as concerned about the loss of the gym, but are more concerned about the safety of students. We are working very hard to address that.

Of course, we have some recent experience here in the Yukon with the Canada Games Centre being built and attached to the existing swimming pool, and experience, I believe, in the 1990s when the Whitehorse General Hospital was replaced on-site. Parts of the new hospital are actually parts of the old hospital. So there is experience with that. We want to make sure that students are safe, no matter if they’re travelling on buses to attend PE or being close to an active work site.

Again, with some of the extracurricular activities, we would be looking to some of the gyms in closer proximity — the early morning activities — to identify our opportunities at Selkirk gym. We’re not, of course, kicking any of the other user groups out of there. The City of Whitehorse, through our joint use agreement, is in charge of booking our gyms outside of school hours for other activities. If somebody did have Selkirk gym available, such as an adult group that has travel opportunities, perhaps they would be able to move their activities to another building they’re able to drive to. Then we could have the F.H. Collins students use Selkirk Street Elementary School for those events.

Again, if we do put a temporary gym structure on-site — if we find a way that works within the fiscal parameters we’ve set up — the need for all of these extra activities won’t exist. I guess the only thing probably that we will have to look at delivering outside of the temporary gym is probably the graduation ceremony. I’m not sure if the temporary structure will be fit for that. But, as I’ve said, we do have the High Country Inn Convention Centre booked for the 2013 grad class.

The temporary structure — one other thing I should mention about it is that we’re not planning on plumbing it. It’s going to be a movable structure. There won’t be plumbing. There will, of course, be heat, but no plumbing in it, so it won’t be suitable for some of those larger events, like the grad or the fashion show. We’ll be looking to do those off-site during the construction period.

Mr. Tredger: I’ll just reiterate what I have heard from a number of people, and that is that the school gymnasium is the heart and soul. It’s a gathering place. As we talk to more people, I hear more things the gym is being used for, and that’s why we start talking about Challenge Day and talking about various assemblies — Remembrance Day.

I can just see that $180,000 — was it designed for one year, or is that per year for the next two and a half years? Just the idea that as those costs rise, there are a number of concerns and the obvious desire on the part of parents to know that there is a plan in place and that unforeseen circumstances like this — that they’re being caught.

One of the concerns I heard as well as the rising cost and the inconveniences that involves and what it means to a student’s school life and their high school life to be in that situation — was that it’s all coming at such a late date. As you mentioned, we’ve known since the spring that the school gym wouldn’t be available for two and a half years, instead of the one year, which all the planning was based on.

Is this the first of a number of unforeseen situations? What is the minister doing to assure parents that assessments of potential risks are being done? Are there discussions now with a building committee, with teachers and staff, with administration, with parents and with other user groups? We must anticipate these so we’re not reacting at the last moment and coming up with ad hoc solutions. The more planning we can do, the more likely we are to be able to come up with a fiscally responsible, acceptable plan for everyone.

Teachers are making their yearly plans. This year’s plans are already made. Students are planning for the next two or three years of their life in high school. They deserve to know that this kind of planning is taking place well in advance, not in an ad hoc manner. So my question for the minister: What has he learned from this situation and what is he putting in place to ensure that it doesn’t happen and that things are taken into account before they happen as we go through the construction phase?

Hon. Mr. Kent: I think there have been a number of lessons learned throughout this process. Certainly I have been involved with it for a little over a year now. Of course, the plan has been set in place for even longer than that so, again, it was known, and the building advisory committee made the recommendation for a number of reasons to build the facility on-site. Again, they were operating on the assumption that they would lose the gym for a one-year time frame. We had to look at that and come up with a more realistic time frame for construction. It is a very complex project, obviously.

In discussions with the Department of Highways and Public Works, it was felt that a two-year and eight-month time frame for construction and commissioning and then opening
the new school was more realistic and more manageable and would lead to less pressure on the budget. When it comes to options, the superintendent responsible for F.H. Collins, who also chairs the building advisory committee, developed several options for PE, looking at other facilities for events such as the graduation ceremonies and that type of thing.

Risk assessment is of paramount concern — the safety of our students, not only those who have to travel to other venues for events, but also those who are actively engaged in that working zone during the construction period.

We also have the students at the Gadzoosdaa residence and the Teen Parent Centre. I did go to the Teen Parent Centre AGM — I think it was last week — and discussed, among other things, this issue and how the construction will accommodate students who are going from the Teen Parent Centre to F.H. Collins and the Gadzoosdaa residence to F.H. Collins during that time.

I guess one of the ways that we want to ensure that there is communication — I have spoken on a couple of occasions during this sitting that I won’t be asking the building advisory committee to be reconvened. There were 33 members on that committee and I have had the opportunity to thank them for providing advice to the Department of Education regarding all aspects of the planning and design of the new school, which was their role as identified in the terms of reference for the building advisory committee. What we want to do is continue to hold public open houses such as the one that was held on November 22 throughout the construction phase, making sure that we update the public, the parents and the students as much as possible during that time and also stay in regular communication with the staff and the teachers at F.H. Collins.

I know the principal of F.H. Collins recently visited Vancouver. I believe, to visit some schools that were similar not only to start to turn his attention to what the flexibility and the learning model will be for F.H. Collins once it is complete, but also to ask some questions about the challenges of having an active constructive zone right next to the school.

I guess one of the other things that I should mention too is I’ve talked to the Minister of Highways and Public Works on this and we will be reviewing the role of the building advisory committee and evaluating the role of the building advisory committee coming out of this. I think it is prudent for government to ensure that after a project is complete or the work of a specific committee is done that we take a look and see if there are any lessons that we can learn from and build on the positive and hope that we avoid any negative circumstances with respect to the role of the building advisory committee when it comes to future projects.

As members know, there are other schools in the Yukon that will need to be replaced. We want to make sure that the building advisory committee can play a meaningful role in replacing those schools, so we will conduct an evaluation of the terms of reference of the building advisory committee as soon as possible.

Again, I have to reiterate — and this is very, very important for all members — the tender is out right now for the construction of the school. It will close, I believe, in mid-January. It may be extended because of addendums; we’re not sure. Highways and Public Works is anticipating sometime in February being able to determine whether or not we have a successful bid for the replacement of F.H. Collins. At that time, we’ll know the budget and then we’ll be able to manage that project though the help of a third party firm — or a firm that we’ll contract as a third party to manage the construction so that we maintain the current scope of the project and ensure that we guard against as many change orders as possible. All members know those change orders have the ability to add significant cost to the project throughout the construction phase.

So we’re certainly committed to keeping this project, if we get a successful bid, on time and as close to the budgeted amount as we possibly can through professional project management.

I’m hoping that soon the conversation turns to what a tremendous learning facility we are going to end up with at F.H. Collins. We are investing almost $56 million in this project; I think it is by far the largest investment ever made for a school replacement in the Yukon. I think we are going to have a tremendous facility there once it’s complete. Again, I’m looking forward to discussions starting to turn toward the type of programming and the flexible learning spaces that are set up right now for more traditional learning spaces, but are being built so that they can expand in future years as the students and the faculty evolve into what we’re seeing — there’s some excitement we are seeing build in other jurisdictions around that flexible learning model. I know it will take some time for educators and students to get used to a new model of delivery, but I think that was really what drove the building advisory committee in a lot of their decisions. It was coming up with a project that will meet the needs of students, not only now, but will also have the flexibility to meet the needs of students 50 years from now.

Mr. Tredger: Madam Chair, the minister mentioned that he intends to amend the Education Act this spring, specifically around the length of the school year and hours of instruction. People are beginning to discuss it already. Concerns are being raised. What does it mean? My question for the minister: Will he be consulting with First Nation governments, with school councils, continuing discussions with YTA, involving CYFN in the consultation process, and with parents and various school groups and communities?

Hon. Mr. Kent: Just to be clear, we’re looking at two amendments to the Yukon Education Act. One of course involves hours of instruction and non-instructional hours, so increasing the hours of instruction from the current 935 up to 950 and doubling the non-instructional hours — or what members would be more familiar with, which are professional development hours — doubling them from the current 15 hours to 30.

The consultations have started. The deputy minister and I introduced the two proposed amendments at a school council workshop on December 1. We have another school council workshop scheduled for this Saturday, December 8. We’ve reached out to the Council of Yukon First Nations. We’ve done quite a bit of work with the Yukon Teachers Association through the negotiations. Obviously, as I mentioned, we will be
The one other amendment that I was just about to speak to is the school council and amending some of the school council aspects in the act such as the timing of the election, the length of the term and staggering the terms. This is something I’ve certainly heard a lot of over the past year in travelling throughout Yukon schools and meeting with various school councils. Some of the options that we’re looking at and are seeking feedback from councils on are moving the elections to possibly May.

So, right now, they’re held in October, which is a month into the school year — moving them back to May, perhaps having some overlap with newly elected school councils and the existing school councils — and, of course, being able to get all of the guaranteed reps in place for the start of the school year.

We found with the last school council election — obviously, there were some concerns with the number of individuals that put their names forward. So we’re again looking at staggering some of the terms. There are a number of options being discussed. We introduced those this past weekend at a school council workshop, and we’ll follow up again with a number of other school councils on this weekend.

Again, the amendments that we’re looking for regarding the Education Act deal specifically with increasing hours and some changes to the school council election process and terms. It’s not to do with the length of the school year or the number of days in the school year. As minister, I currently have the authority under the act to set the start date and the length of the school year.

Mr. Tredger: I look forward to a full and robust consultation process on that.

Just one last, quick question — at least, I hope it’s going to be quick. Wilson Reading — we talked about that when we were talking about the last budget, and I understand there has been no training.

Does the minister have a count on the number of schools that are currently offering Wilson Reading and whether there are requests for more? As well, I understand that the number of students of English language learners continues to increase. What support is being given to teachers who have, in some cases, over 50 percent of their class with English language learners? Finally, Reading Recovery: all three of those positions are being managed out of part of one position — sorry, Reading Recovery is not. It’s Wilson Reading, English as a Second Language and FASD that are being managed out of a part of one position. How is that working out? Is that person able to ensure that Wilson Reading, Reading Recovery, English language learners and FASD are being — teachers who encounter that are being supported?

Hon. Mr. Kent: I thank the member opposite for the question, because that was the next one in the responses that I was working my way through at the start of debate here.

Maybe what I’ll start on first is the English language learners that the member asked about. Of course, the department provides many supports to increasing numbers of English language learners who make the Yukon their home. A committee that includes school and department staff is looking at the issues related to the programming for ELL students and will be making recommendations for improving supports for students, teachers and parents. What we’ve done in the meantime is allocate an additional two FTE teachers, and we’ve added English language learner support to the role of the early learning literacy consultant. It’s my understanding that there are approximately 200 students in Yukon schools identified as English language learners. There is quite a bit of work going on with that, including the addition of those two FTE teachers.

This was a question raised by the member opposite on November 20: Please provide “...an update on Wilson Reading and Reading Recovery — I know there was no training happening this year. Will it be happening next year?” That’s a closed quote on the member’s question from that day.

So the response is that we’re continuing to support Reading Recovery at this time and are providing some training this year.

Last year, department staff did a review of literacy across the territory and found that for some students Reading Recovery was very successful, but for others the gains were not sustained over time, and some students were not successful or did not complete the program.

We all know that strong literacy skills are very important for academic success, as well as success in the workplace. The Public Schools branch is in the process of developing a comprehensive early literacy plan. Yukon Education is moving toward a more balanced literacy program, which includes a variety of teaching strategies. Wilson Reading provides one strategy that has proven to work for some students with learning disabilities. The Wilson early intervention program — called “Fundations” — is being used in some schools to address the phonetic elements of the reading process. Reading Recovery and Wilson Reading will be reviewed as to how they will fit in to the primary literacy plan.

The department staff member, who has provided Wilson training in the past, is out of the territory this year. She did, however, meet with the Wilson teachers prior to departure to support their work this year. Teachers who have provided Wilson Reading in the past are continuing to do so as part of a more balanced programming module. However, there is no training for specific Wilson Reading strategies this year.

A comprehensive K to 12 literacy strategy will be developed following the education summit on literacy that begins today. Actually, it begins this evening. The Minister of Health and Social Services and I will be speaking at the opening of that event this evening.

Ms. Moorcroft: I’d like to thank the minister and his officials and also my colleague, the Member for Mayo-Tatchun, and other opposition members, who have canvassed many of the areas within the Department of Education. I do just want to put a couple of items on the record here.

Since the minister has been speaking recently about providing us with a status update of the residential school curriculum committee members’ deliberations, I’ll start in that area.
I’ve been reviewing the Council of Ministers of Education website, which has a wealth of very helpful reports, documents and information. It was in 2004 that the Council of Ministers of Education Canada declared aboriginal education a priority. In 2005, CMEC presented an aboriginal education action plan toward a new aboriginal education strategy.

As I’ve said previously, I find it somewhat discouraging that the Yukon is not in the forefront in offering curriculum. Saskatchewan has mandatory treaty education. Here in the Yukon, we have been speaking about celebrating the first four final agreements, which have now been in effect for almost 20 years — since 1995. I would like to see there being education on those land claim final agreements and self-government agreements within our school curriculum. Certainly, when it comes to aboriginal education, we need to improve the 40-percent graduation rate of First Nation students, and we also need to have more First Nation teachers in the school system. There was debate earlier about the review of the Yukon native teacher education program that was recently done.

I’d like to point out that CMEC and other jurisdictions have been working to make aboriginal education more prominent in teacher education programs. So if we’re looking to develop a new teacher education program, I think we need to be sure that we keep all of the benefits that have come from the program that has been in place over the last number of years.

As the minister stated when he started debate on the Department of Education, there was one aboriginal teacher in the Yukon teaching in the Yukon school system in 1989 and as of 2012 there are 42. There is still an awful lot of room for improvement though, and I think that ensuring there is more First Nations relevant curriculum within the teacher education program itself as well as within the schools would be very helpful.

In the last sitting of the Legislature there was unanimous support for a motion to look at skills training. We agreed to include trade unions in the groups of agencies that would be involved to move forward on improving skills training within the Yukon. I would like to encourage the minister and through him and his officials encourage Yukon College to include labour when they’re looking at plans for skills training. I wonder if the minister has any information on whether there has been involvement between the college and the trade unions, particularly those within the skills trades that do have some expertise in the area of trades training.

The final subject that I want to bring forward and that the minister can respond to is concern about temporary foreign workers, which I have raised before on other occasions. In last spring’s budget, the federal government announced changes to the program that fast-tracked approval for temporary foreign workers from a 12- to 14-week approval process down to 10 days. It also allowed the workers to be paid 15-percent less than the average wage paid to Canadian workers for similar work, but required employers to first seek Canadian workers for the jobs. In the last month, the temporary foreign worker program made headlines after reports surfaced that migrant workers from China were being recruited to a coal mine near Tumbler Ridge, British Columbia. Even though according to the BC Federation of Labour, B.C. lost over 10,000 jobs and over 300 Canadians applied for those jobs, all were denied as they didn’t have the right training or qualifications. One of the qualifications on the job description was that they be able to speak Mandarin. Later it was discovered that many of the 200 migrants given temporary work permits to these mines had to pay up to $12,500 in recruitment fees to get these coveted jobs in Canada.

Though this is actually illegal, these practices are not uncommon. In some sectors workers have to pay up to half of their expected wages to recruiter agencies before they can even get their work permit. There is now a full review of the program. The Human Resources minister said recently in a statement: “It is clear to our government that there are some problems with the temporary foreign worker program. We take these very seriously, and are currently reviewing the program.”

I would like to ask the minister if the Yukon is participating in the review and when it will report to the public. I think I’ll stop there and allow the minister to respond and may have some follow-up questions.

Hon. Mr. Kent: Just talking firstly about some of the First Nations education initiatives. Obviously one of the things done recently was the signing of an MOU between the Yukon government, a number of Yukon First Nations, as well as the Government of Canada. I don’t know that they’ve signed off on it yet. We’re still waiting for Canada to sign off, but we understand that that will be happening, hopefully, fairly soon.

We signed earlier in November and I had the opportunity to go to leadership and start to speak about the development of a First Nation education action plan. I don’t think that anyone is pleased with the achievement outcomes or the graduation rates or the assessment rates or the overall engagement of First Nation students. I think it’s a shared responsibility, obviously, among the entire school community and, of course, the Department of Education will play a key role in that when we’re looking to address those issues that face First Nation students.

It’s not only a gap that exists in success; there is also a labour gap that exists that I think we need to address.

Of course education is something that as Education minister — we have to look far beyond the term of a government. We have to think for long-term planning. I know there have been a number of education ministers who have come before me and a number who will come after me who will continue to work on these initiatives.

I think it’s important we build on the good work done and set the foundation so that we can look to close or eliminate that gap that exists between First Nation and non-First Nation students in a time frame that I think would make sense. Again, these are time frames beyond the normal political time frames or the normal time frames of one person who sits in this chair as Minister of Education.

Some of the programs that have seen success — of course, the Old Crow experiential program. There’s a revitalizing culture program. Both of those were funded through the northern strategy. I’m very happy to see the Old Crow initiative carrying on. Also, people from Alberta were here at the launch of their curriculum on October 25 of this year and looking to adapt that. We should congratulate the people of Vuntut Gwitchin for the
sharing they’re looking to do with respect to their curriculum on that particular program — not only within the Yukon, but engaging others within Canada.

I know the advisor who set up that curriculum also presented at a CMEC meeting in Winnipeg. I wasn’t at that meeting, but I understand that her presentation was received very well. We look forward to expanding that experiential program beyond Vuntut Gwitchin and sharing it with as many as we can.

The residential schools curriculum at the CMEC meetings in Halifax that happened in July of this year — Justice Sinclair presented at those meetings and is one of the chairs of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I know that N.W.T. and Nunavut are doing great work on developing the residential schools curriculum. As I mentioned earlier, we are anxious to follow the roll-out of the curriculum in N.W.T. and Nunavut and use that template to develop Yukon-specific curriculum and other resource materials. I’m hopeful that we can get that rolled out for the 2013-14 school year. I think it’s an achievable goal and something that we can look to move on.

When it comes to skills training, we’ve had lengthy conversations in the House about the new centre for northern innovation in mining, the proposal that the Yukon College is spearheading to address providing the territory with about 558 trades, mining and apprenticeship program grads, plus up to 710 completing shorter, non-credit courses and programs. Again, I’ve spoken about the high school dual credit aspects we are looking at, strengthening partnerships with the Yukon Mine Training Association and Alaska delivering trades and tech programs at mine sites using the college’s mine simulators and mobile trade schools; offering innovative apprenticeship programming, which is going to be based on a successful model used in Ontario that incorporates all-in-school apprenticeship training, coupled with co-op opportunities over the two-year period; providing opportunities for mines to use college resources, such as the simulators, at their sites when conducting training and then with the end goal being able to provide that training to Yukoners on the skilled trades.

When it comes to the involvement of labour, I was approached earlier this year by a president of one of the local labour unions, who I believe has since moved on to other opportunities. I know he was talking about a trade school that would be driven by the union. I believe the college was engaged with him in discussions early on, but I’m not sure what the status of that project is because after that initial meeting, I haven’t — nor has the department — been given any further information on that trade school project or concept that local unions were looking at.

Again, I’m happy to engage with labour groups, when it comes to talking about providing skilled trades and training for Yukon residents.

I’m going to talk briefly about the temporary foreign workers annex, and I think the program that the member opposite was referencing — the initial one — is the federal program, the federal temporary foreign worker program. We have signed on to the temporary foreign worker annex, but we haven’t implemented it yet, and we’re doing some work on that when it comes to engaging employers to make sure that there would be uptake on this program. It is limited to 50 workers per employer. There is that limit. I’ve had some informal discussions with some people in the mining industry — very informal and just in social settings talking to them, and they have indicated that their focus would be training Yukoners for Yukon opportunities and having the Canadians, who travel here right now and return to their home communities on a work rotation schedule, make the Yukon their home. We’re working with the Department of Economic Development on addressing that for them.

When it comes to the temporary foreign worker annex, Yukon and Canada did conclude negotiations this past summer for a Yukon temporary foreign worker program to support our broader labour force strategy. Again, before formally establishing the program and committing resources to it, the department is assessing the changing labour market conditions and consulting with Yukon business, mining and tourism industries to find out how many Yukon employers will need temporary foreign workers to fill their short-term labour shortages.

But where the Yukon is leading the way in Canada on this is by partnering with the Yukon Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board in administering the program, which helps ensure that temporary foreign workers work in fair and safe environments. So this program is a four-year pilot project targeting two critical industries — the tourism and hospitality industries as well as oil and gas, mining and exploration. So there is still quite a bit of work to be done on that before we commit additional resources to that program and implement that program.

Finally, I do want to respond to a question raised by the Leader of the Liberal Party during the November 20 debate. He asked me at that time if any review had taken place of the Yukon nominee program to see if it is working in rural Yukon as compared to Whitehorse.

The answer to that question is that the Yukon nominee program was recently reviewed by Citizenship and Immigration Canada. It did not undertake a comparison of rural-based versus Whitehorse-based nominees and employers. The department is certainly aware that rural placement of workers can be more challenging for participants in the program than in Whitehorse. Some of these challenges include distance from the extended immigrant family some climate issues, more isolated conditions, and some of the additional costs that occur for living outside of Whitehorse in some of the communities.

I can give the member the 2012 numbers for active nominees working in the Yukon. These are non-permanent resident status. Of the 306 current nominees, 270 were in Whitehorse; 14 in Dawson City; seven in Haines Junction; five in Watson Lake; four in Carmacks; two in Teslin; and one each in Carcross, Destruction Bay, Eagle Plains and Faro.

What I’ll outline now for the member opposite is all the completed applications from 2007 to the present. It includes nominees who have attained their permanent resident status and are no longer active clients or active within the nominee program; they’re permanent residents or perhaps even citizens of Canada now.
Of those 678 nominees from 2007 to present, 610 were in Whitehorse, 24 in Dawson City, 11 in Haines Junction, 10 in Watson Lake, six in Carmacks, four in Teslin, two in Carcross, one in Burwash Landing, one in Destruction Bay, one in Eagle Plains, seven in Faro and one in Elsa. I hope that gives the member opposite a good breakdown of the numbers for the nominee program that he asked me about during debate on November 20.

Ms. Moorcroft: I have some subsequent questions for the minister. He started to answer my next question, which was relating to the implementation of the Yukon’s temporary foreign worker program agreement. I know it was signed in December 2010 and I’d like to know specifically what the time frame is for implementation and whether there has been consultation with the business and the labour communities or with other stakeholders on Yukon’s own temporary foreign worker program. When he brings that information back, I’d also like to ask him how many, if any, temporary foreign workers have been employed in the last year and whether the minister is aware of any applications of large numbers of temporary foreign workers in the mining or other sectors?

Hon. Mr. Kent: Just to respond to the last question that the member opposite raised, when it comes to the Yukon temporary foreign worker program, although we did conclude negotiations in the summer with Canada to bring that program into place to support our broader labour force strategy, we haven’t implemented it yet, so there are no applications under that Yukon temporary foreign worker program as of yet. I’m not aware of any large-scale requests for temporary foreign workers to come into the territory. Again, with the Yukon program, the limit will be 50 per employer. Just to repeat, what we are looking at now is — before formally establishing the program, the department is looking at the labour market conditions and consulting with the business, mining and tourism industries to find out how many Yukon employers will need temporary foreign workers to fill their short-term labour shortages.

Again, I referenced our leadership in Canada by partnering with the Yukon Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board on this initiative. Again, the member opposite referenced December 2010, when the temporary foreign worker program annex was first discussed. I guess before implementation, we do want to make sure that we consult with primarily the tourism and hospitality, oil and gas, and mining and exploration industries, as those were the critical industries that this Yukon program — in a four-year pilot project — was targeted toward.

Ms. Moorcroft: I’d also like to thank the minister and his officials — we have had a fair amount of correspondence going back and forth, with a number of detailed questions, and I appreciate the answers. I’m not going to be canvassing all of that.

But I do want to know whether — in implementing the Yukon temporary foreign worker program — the minister expects that it will, like the federal program, allow for a wage rate for temporary foreign workers to be set at 15 percent less than the average wage paid to Canadian workers. That’s obviously a concern.

The minister also spoke about his officials working with representatives of the business community in developing the implementation of temporary foreign workers. So, again, I would like to ask — because he did not address this aspect of my question — whether the government and its officials were also meeting with the labour community.

Finally, I would like the minister to respond to a question I’ve asked him before about whether there is an appetite to look at whether government would support the creation of an independent foreign worker advocate office, much like what we have for injured workers.

In a previous sitting, the minister indicated that there were plans for the immigration strategy committee in the coming months to discuss that and other options to improve the Yukon nominee program. Now, I recognize that final question is about the nominee program, and I understand the difference. But I think that he can come back to me on each of those. I’d like to know if the minister has anything to report from the discussions with the immigration strategy committee and whether he has discussed options for an advocate office and whether he has involved labour in those discussions. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Kent: I’m not sure if I mentioned this previously, but the Canadian government is reviewing their temporary foreign worker program, so the 15 percent less than average wage may be one of the things that they are considering. I’ll get back to the member opposite once I have a better idea of what’s included in the review being done by Canada — which, of course, could transfer to the Yukon temporary foreign worker program. When it comes to consultations on the temporary foreign worker program, I will ask officials if they have engaged the labour community — I think that was the question the member opposite asked, and I’ll get back to the member opposite with the answer to that. I know, primarily, right now, as we go into implementation, they have been consulting with employers and industry reps, but I will see if the labour community has been engaged and what they have been engaged on.

When it comes to the immigration committee, I didn’t get a chance to meet with them and get an update on their work as far as setting up an independent foreign workers advocate office, but I did speak to the head of the Canadian-Filipino Association of the Yukon after some events with the nominee program — or some concerns and some charges with the nominee program that occurred earlier this year.

I did indicate to her that we would also look at what other jurisdictions are doing. I know that we are a small enough jurisdiction that we’re able to conduct visits and those types of things when it comes to the nominee program and monitor and have those individual meetings between employers and nominees when they arrive, but I will have to get back to the member opposite with specific progress on that foreign-worker advocate office — whether it’s independent or whether it would continue to be done through the Department of Education and our immigration staff there.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Vote 3, Department of Education?

We’re going to line-by-line examination.
Mr. Tredger: Could I get an explanation of school initiated renovations? Were there any major ones that that covered?

Chair: If I can just clear that up for the members — $177,000 is for school initiated renovations, not necessarily restricted to F.H. Collins.

Hon. Mr. Kent: Thank you, Madam Chair. This revote is required for a number of schools to complete their school-based projects. They’re comprised of small renovation projects that began in 2011-12 for individual schools and are driven by the schools and the school councils, so there are a number of small projects. There is nothing major that is being undertaken by the schools or the councils when it comes to this line item.

School Initiated Renovations in the amount of $177,000 agreed to

Mr. Tredger: This $641,000 is quite a bit. Is this a trend that we’re beginning to see? As the buildings age, are there more repairs and more maintenance required or is it just a one-time item?

Hon. Mr. Kent: With respect to this additional amount of $641,000, it is being requested to complete a number of maintenance projects that began in 2011-12, including the replacement of the boiler and the fire alarm system at Del Van Gorder School and various other projects throughout the Yukon, including some projects at the Ross River school. When it comes to trending, a number of our facilities are getting older and do require additional capital maintenance repairs. Coming out of the Auditor General’s recommendations is the creation of a long-term facilities plan. Work is underway on that and I would expect to be able to bring that forward to this Legislature some time in 2013 — a more comprehensive, long-term facilities plan and what the repair and replacement schedule for Yukon schools will be in the coming years. Again, we should have that ready sometime in the 2013 calendar year to bring forward to members.

Capital Maintenance Repairs in the amount of $641,000 agreed to

On School Van Replacement

Mr. Tredger: I know the minister mentioned it, but just for clarification — when can we expect the vans to be in place?

Hon. Mr. Kent: The department does have resources and funding set aside to cover off the transportation requirements during the interim, but the public tender went out and two bids were received. The lowest bid came from a company in British Columbia at a total cost of $1,165,572. Delivery is scheduled for March 31, 2013.

School Van Replacement in the amount of $1,275,000 agreed to

On Advanced Education

Mr. Tredger: Could the minister provide a breakdown for this line item, please?

Hon. Mr. Kent: It’s an internal transfer to reallocate funding from the student financial assistance system to offset
higher than estimated costs for the case management system development project.

Labour Market Development Agreement in the amount of $30,000 agreed to
On Student Financial Assistance System
Student Financial Assistance System underexpenditure in the amount of $30,000 cleared
On Total of Other Capital
Total of Other Capital in the amount of nil cleared
Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of $3,866,000 agreed to
On Revenues
Revenues cleared
Chair: That completes Vote 3, Department of Education.

Department of Education agreed to

Chair: Committee of the Whole is going to carry on with line-by-line examination of Community Services, Vote 51. Committee of the Whole will recess for 15 minutes while we ensure the officials are available.

Recess

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

Department of Community Services — continued
Chair: We are going to resume line-by-line examination of Community Services, Vote 51.
On Whitehorse (and area) - Marwell Water and Sewer Upgrades

Hon. Mr. Cathers: Madam Chair, I don’t really have any further comments at this time.

Mr. Barr: Can I have a breakdown of the $1.821 million?

Chair: If I can just clear that up a little bit — my mistake. Marwell Water and Sewer Upgrades is a reduction in the amount of $1,821,000 and I simply am asking if anyone has any questions regarding that reduction.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I believe that the member opposite had raised a question, so if I may respond to the question asking for clarity of this particular line item — which I’m thrilled to do.

The $1.8-million decrease to the Marwell water and sewer upgrades — more work was completed last fiscal year on the project than was anticipated overall, which lowered the cost required for this particular fiscal year.

On Whitehorse (and area) — Marwell Water and Sewer Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of $1,821,000 cleared
On Whitehorse (and area) — Intersection Upgrade – Alaska Highway/Two Mile Hill
On Whitehorse (and area) — Intersection Upgrade – Alaska Highway/Two Mile Hill in the amount of $290,000 agreed to
On Whitehorse (and area) — Black Street Reconstruction

Mr. Barr: Could I get a breakdown of this amount — $2 million?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: This line item reflects approximately $1.8 million due to the project proceeding quicker than anticipated and $200,000 transferred from planning and administration, representing completed planning and design work.

Whitehorse (and area) — Black Street Reconstruction in the amount of $2,000,000 agreed to
On Territory-Wide — Arsenic Treatment Upgrades
On Territory-Wide — Arsenic Treatment Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of $1,364,000 cleared
On Territory-Wide — Materials Recycle/Sorting Facility
On Territory-Wide — Materials Recycle/Sorting Facility underexpenditure in the amount of $541,000 cleared
On Territory-Wide — Planning and Administration

Mr. Barr: I’m curious as to the lesser amount that would be needed here.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: The line item, again, reflects initial planning and design, which was completed on a number of projects. Therefore, general funding was transferred to a number of specific projects, including Carmacks road upgrades and resurfacing; Faro water and sewer pipe replacement; I believe there was some road upgrade work in Pelly Crossing; Ross River community road upgrades; Teslin arsenic treatment; Teslin Tlingit Council road upgrades; Watson Lake water and sewer pipe replacement and wet well; and Whitehorse Black Street reconstruction.

In addition, some planning and design was not started and won’t be completed on other projects this fiscal year, representing a further decrease. So the projects and the funding will carry forward to a future fiscal year.

Territory-wide-Planning and Administration underexpenditure in the amount of $2,655,000 cleared
On Land Development
On Land Assessment/Planning

Mr. Barr: Madam Chair, if I could beg your indulgence, before we clear this I would like to ask regarding the proper sewage pit in Ross River pertaining to the questions in Question Period. Are there plans to move forward with this and when?

Also, what would be the total of the water and sewer pipe replacement in Watson Lake and when would that be concluded?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: My apologies, could the member opposite repeat his question? I had thought that we were on land assessment planning so his questions pertained to other than land assessment and planning.

Mr. Barr: I’d ask for unanimous consent, if we could.
Chair: To return to which line, please?
Mr. Barr: I would like to return Ross River, and I would like to return to Watson Lake.

Unanimous consent re: revisiting a line
Chair: Would the member look at the list and tell me which item he wants to speak to, please?
Mr. Barr: Arsenic treatment systems.
Chair: Can we please have unanimous consent to return to a line item?
We’re now approaching 2013. I would ask the minister and I would ask to get a written answer from the minister after being waiting a long, long time. It’s a serious health concern, and the arsenic levels are well above what would be acceptable, and with great importance. We will continue to do so.

Of course our own government, we have been able to address a lot of funds and leveraging funds through other governments and of course, we have identified $1.5 million under the Building Canada fund and, of course, that’s a 75:25 split between the Government of Canada and Yukon and, as I just referenced in my earlier remarks, it is near completion.

Again, we have invested a substantive number of investments when it comes to drinking water upgrades. Safe drinking water is a very important issue for governments at all levels, and it is something that we continue to work on with all municipalities and unincorporated communities, First Nation communities and so forth. It’s very important we work collectively to ensure that we have safe drinking water supplies and, certainly, that we adhere to the regulatory framework on this particular issue.

We have been working collaboratively to address a whole range of water-related issues and, as I referenced, we have made great strides in the past number of years and it is, in large part, thanks to having infrastructure funding made available to all governments in Canada.

You know, again, we have invested in — again, I don’t want to go on about all the respective investments we have taken advantage of in the community of Ross River. We are dealing with a whole series of drinking water systems throughout the territory. Yukoners living in rural areas access drinking water through a water delivery system by truck, private wells, self-haul from community wells or rivers or from store-bought bottled water. Again, when it comes to managing drinking water, it’s a cooperative effort, and it certainly requires collaboration between all levels of government, industry and stakeholders, including individual Yukoners. Within the Government of Yukon, we have a whole host of departments that play a very important role in ensuring that we do have safe drinking water. At Community Services, we currently manage community drinking water supplies. We oversee water delivery in many of the unincorporated communities, and we provide access to loans for water well drilling on private land for qualified rural Yukoners.

Health and Social Services, on the other hand, monitor and regulate drinking water quality in the territory in accordance with the Public Health and Safety Act and regulations. Environment, of course, administers water-related policies, regulations and programs under the Waters Act. Highways and Public Works and Yukon Housing Corporation develop and operate water systems for government-owned facilities in communities throughout every corner.

They vary in every community, but generally speaking, we also work with the Government of Canada, which also provides a funding and advisory role to First Nation communities to ensure safe drinking water.
When it comes to most First Nations, both self-governing and non-self-governing, they manage all or part of their water supply and distribution to their respective citizens. In some cases, they also provide public drinking water access points for self-haul and trucked water services for rural Yukoners.

Municipalities, as members opposite may recognize, manage the water supply and distribution within their areas and in some cases also provide public drinking water points for self-haul and trucked water services. When it comes to private citizens, they have a role and we have approximately 2,000 private wells in the Yukon, so this is homeowners being responsible for their operation and maintenance of drinking water systems.

Since 1968, Health Canada has published a number of guidelines and regulations when it comes to drinking water quality. Those undergo review just as ours do as well here in the Yukon. The guidelines are being developed by all jurisdictions in the country on drinking water and have been adopted by every jurisdiction in the country. Since the major changes to the guidelines in 2006, that of course speaks to the need to reduce the allowable minimum level of naturally occurring arsenic in public drinking water supplies.

Additionally, just a few years ago, following public consultation, we too adopted new drinking water regulations. They were added to the Yukon Public Health and Safety Act for drinking water systems and bulk water delivery to meet criteria set out in the Canadian guidelines for drinking water quality.

So all of these water systems are subject to higher standards that have been set out in regulations and they apply to all segments of water use from source to tap and form the very important framework of our government delivering on safe drinking water throughout the territory.

When the regulations came into place a few years ago, we had approximately 16 large drinking water systems throughout the territory, which was inclusive of municipal and unincorporated communities. The Department of Community Services has been working since that time including an implementation of waste water training in collaboration with the college, First Nations and municipalities. In 2007, the Yukon Forum, First Nation governments and the Government of Yukon approved a $500,000 initiative to really fund the training of water and waste water system operators through Yukon College.

In just a few, short years we had over 600 students from every community who enrolled in the program and many of whom completed their certification. So we have certified water operators who are working in many of the water treatment plants from Carcross to Marsh Lake. Of course, we also work toward delivering bulk water delivery courses. We actually initiated the delivery of the course to really meet the very specific needs here in the territory — a course that was really the first of its kind in North America. Again, because of the involvement of Canada and communities and municipalities, we really worked in collaboration with all of those respective partners who, at the time — again, working to build that partnership to develop that training course for Yukon’s trucked water system operators as well. We operate and we maintain public drinking water wells in a number of communities. We also provide more than 500 citizens with water delivery in other communities, primarily unincorporated.

First Nations, I know, have worked on improvements to their drinking water supply points since 2003 when the First Nation water management strategy was first implemented by Government of Canada — all the more reason why we continue to work with First Nations though the gas tax fund, municipal rural infrastructure fund, and of course the Building Canada fund, as we have spoken to many times in this House.

So through the rural domestic water well program that we introduced back in 2004, we have also been taking steps to help improve and provide that added access to drinking water on private lands. The program continues to be offered and has so far provided over 175 residents plus in many of the unincorporated communities with access to private drinking water sources through private wells — construction thereof. It has been hugely successful.

As I’ve said on the floor of the Legislature, we’re dealing with a lot of critical infrastructure that is dating itself. When it comes to drinking water and waste-water infrastructure, much of it was constructed in the 1960s and 1970s and we recognize there are deficiencies and we recognize the need to continue to work with our communities to identify those needs and to continue to work on addressing those needs.

Since 2005, we have undertaken a lot of planning and prioritizing of much-needed infrastructure upgrades all around the territory in every corner. As you can appreciate, it’s a very large undertaking. It costs dollars and requires prioritization in terms of improving water and waste-water infrastructure in the territory. We have made significant progress over the last decade to improve public drinking water supplies and waste-water facilities — Ross River, $1.5 million supplement for addressing the arsenic treatment is almost complete and thanks to the Building Canada fund, that has come to fruition.

We have also been working with other communities. I’m not sure if I have time to get into every single community on water supplies and what we’re doing as a government to address clean drinking water standards around the territory, but we are making progress.

Facilities — a couple of which I’ve actually had the opportunity to see first-hand and see the great work of the department, the trades, and the many individuals in the communities who have been working to bring these facilities to fruition.

Water supplies, of course, are being treated to ensure that they meet water quality standards for groundwater under the direct influence of surface water. We are investing in equipment to treat arsenic, manganese and the other metals, like iron and nitrate. We continue to work with the federal government, as I mentioned — specifically under the municipal rural infrastructure fund, for example — a new drinking water well in the community of Watson Lake, rehabilitation of its pumphouse and a potable water distribution facility.

There have been drinking water infrastructure upgrades for Champagne and Aishihik First Nations. There has been a new drinking water delivery fill system for Little Salmon-Carmacks First Nation — again, to improve the community’s access to clean drinking water. We have been working on a new drinking
water system in Haines Junction — this is reflected in the supplemen
tary — that expands the water pump capacity and im-
proves the water treatment system to keep pace with the
changes in the national drinking water guidelines. The MLA
for Kluane and I had the ability to see some of those upgrades.
I know that the Village of Haines Junction is very pleased with
the progress being made and very appreciative of the infra-
structure funding made available. The gas tax has also been
accessed for drinking water projects, including Selkirk First
Nation, who accessed just under $234,000. The City of White-
horse has accessed just under $3.5 million to develop new
groundwater wells in Riverdale, as part of the Selkirk well de-
velopment, to provide drinking water that meets the regula-
tions.

The Village of Teslin has also accessed some $61,000 for
new water tanks. Faro has accessed dollars to improve energy
efficiency and reliability of their water system by replacing the
water pump’s motor in Well No. 1. Dawson City has accessed
just under $2 million for a couple of projects to improve its
well intake system and to improve the HVAC systems in its
water distribution pumphouse. Dawson has also accessed dol-
liers in terms of assessing the impact of surface water on a
number of their drinking water wells and also for a water qual-
ity program to optimize its drinking water supply and distribu-
tion.

The Little Salmon-Carmacks First Nation has accessed just
over $330,000 to build its water truck shed. In addition to that,
the Liard First Nation, for example, has accessed just over
$500,000 to evaluate landfill sites at Albert Creek subdivision
to train their own respective citizens in water quality monitor-
ing — and yes, that does have something to do with clean
drinking water.

The First Nation of Na Cho Nyäk Dun is also accessing
over $500,000 to install a geothermal heating system and cen-
tral water supply components for their new government house.
As I may have referenced in months past, Whitehorse is access-
ing just under $2.7 million for repairs and replacement of un-
derground drinking water, sewer mains and services and reme-
diating storm sewer infrastructure on Black Street.

The Selkirk First Nation has accessed over $7 million of
its gas tax allocation to replace the Selkirk water pumphouse,
which serves as the only water supply point for the village.
Kluane First Nation has also accessed dollars for retrofitting
some of their community housing units, reducing the likelihood
of mould and mildew by replacing plastic water supply tanks
with fibreglass tanks. Dawson has accessed over $500,000 to
replace the water pipes in the community and its water distribu-
tion facility, which will help provide cleaner water.

The list goes on and I have pages and pages and pages of
lists of examples of how we were working on improving drink-
ing water systems throughout the territory.

Again, we have constructed a new water treatment facility
in Ross River. As I mentioned, it is near completion. It does
meet the Canadian drinking water guidelines. It will remove the
arsenic and it certainly deals with the aesthetics. So, again, for
the member opposite, it’s but one example of many initiatives
and many examples, as I have just outlined, of the work that we
are doing to alleviate many of the issues of importance
throughout the territory when it comes to infrastructure.

Mr. Barr: Will the minister direct her Department of
Community Services to move into compliance with this spe-
cific licence — number MNO2-044 in Ross River — being that
they are presently in violation of this water licence and they
continue to ignore promises made to the people of Ross River.

I will move on also to line item: “Watson Lake — Water
and Sewer Pipe Replacement and Wet Well.” I would like to
know what the total will be when this line item is concluded.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Madam Chair, as I stated all along,
we will continue to work with every community. We’ll work
with our own respective officials; we’ll work with the citizens
of Ross River; we’ll work with the First Nation. We will cer-
tainly work toward ensuring environmental protection and pub-
lic health and safety as I have just articulated in the long list of
achievements that we have been able to work through over the
course of a number of years.

With respect to other examples of how we are working to
do just that — as I mentioned before, when it comes to Selkirk
First Nation, Kluane First Nation, Dawson City, Village of
Mayo — they are accessing dollars through infrastructure funds
to address drinking water upgrades to rejuvenate its warm-
water wells. Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation — again, accessing
almost $500,000 to purchase a new water truck and a sewer
truck to provide sewer and water delivery for Old Crow. As I
stated on the floor of the Legislature with the introduction of
the Building Canada plan, which had a dollar amount of some
$33 billion — again, Yukon has been given this ability — this
luxury — of being able to respond and to work with communi-
ties on an accelerated rate on many of these initiatives.

As we heard earlier today, the member opposite has re-
quested for the community of Carcross alone — I think there
were some five identified infrastructure initiatives — a com-
community house, a community centre, a youth centre, a health
centre, and I believe there was a new fire hall as well.

You know, Madam Chair, that’s one community, and cer-
tainly we have invested over the years in the community of
Carcross, for the benefit of not just the citizens of Carcross, but
for the benefit of all citizens in the territory. We’re committed
to working in every community. I recognize that there have
been requests for potentially a new recreation centre in the
community of Dawson City and a new recreation centre in the
community of Old Crow. There have been requests for im-
proved infrastructure in every single community. What we
have chosen to do is to really identify what the specific areas of
importance are, in terms of meeting the standards that have
either been developed through Canada, in collaboration with all
governments across the land, or even regulations that have been
developed by the Government of Yukon.

We have been able to really hone in on the important areas
of drinking water upgrades, waste-water treatment, rural roads,
green energy and solid-waste improvements, as well. All of
these are complex initiatives. They require a great deal of ca-
pacity in our territory. They require a huge amount of labour
and substantive resource dollars.
I know the member opposite has made reference to living within our means yet doing everything. I do take issue with that line because I believe that we can live within our means, but it is difficult to do everything all at once. Again, through planning and working collaboratively with our communities, we have been able to chip away at much of the needed infrastructure throughout the territory.

Just through the use of Building Canada, for example — never mind any of the other infrastructure funding — we have been able to approve some $265 million: of this, some $180 million being contributed by Canada; just under $57 million by Yukon; and of course there are resources from other governments. We have developed that long-term infrastructure plan to identify those infrastructure gaps and priorities for communities and First Nations. The infrastructure plan has identified prioritized investment on public drinking water infrastructure and, as such, projects have been advanced for approval under each of the annual capital plans and one can take a look at the website to take a look at the list of initiatives.

We work with the communities on an annual basis, which helps guide our further investments in other areas as well. For the water treatment plant that opened up in 2010, we invested just over $3.2 million at Marsh Lake in the member opposite’s own riding. It provides residents and commercial water delivery businesses with access to drinking water that meets those national standards.

There was $1.5 million in the community of Ross River for the water treatment plant and the fill point, which will provide residents with drinking water that meets national standards and is nearly complete. We have also invested just over $5.5 million in Ross River for a public works building to house that water treatment plant, as well as Protective Services, as it will house the fire truck. I had the opportunity to see that particular building. It is nearing completion soon and is an impressive building and will be put to great use.

We have invested over $580,000 for upgrading the Champlain and Aishihik First Nations water treatment facility. That was built back in 1970 in the Takhini River subdivision. As a result of these upgrades and improvements, it now provides residents with drinking water that meets the national standard.

For the Carcross-Tagish First Nation water treatment plant fill point for local residents in Tagish, there was almost $1 million in support of this particular initiative. It will provide the residents with water that meets national standards.

Over $3.4 million for the Village of Haines Junction is to replace another example of 1970s-era infrastructure to really replace or construct to the upgraded water treatment system — a pipe distribution that will provide residents with access to drinking water that meets national standards.

With respect to the member opposite’s question regarding Watson Lake — and I’ve talked about this issue on the floor a number of times — this is another example of aging drinking water, waste-water infrastructure. We’re working to replace that. It is a multi-phase initiative that will require, has required and will continue to require long-term planning on this initiative. But when complete, this multi-phase, multi-year project will provide the town with new water mains, some 50 new sewer manholes, seven fire hydrants and 3,000 metres of new sewer lines to replace infrastructure that predates 1980.

In Carcross, as I mentioned earlier, in the member opposite’s own riding there is a $4.3-million water treatment plant scheduled for completion early next year. It will treat surface water and meet the current and the future water quality guidelines — regulations, I should say. In Old Crow we have invested over $5.3 million for a new water treatment plant to replace an older, aging facility that will provide residents with a reliable source of clean drinking water that meets the Canadian drinking water guidelines. Again, this is nearly complete and it will replace a facility that dates back to, I believe, 1980.

As also referenced in the supplementary, we are investing some $6.5 million in upgrades to the water and sewer systems in Whitehorse’s Marwell area — again, another initiative that’s nearly complete and will be coming to fruition next year. Again, it will be new pipes replacing aging infrastructure.

Faro is another community that is dealing with wooden water pipes and an aging sewer system built back in 1969. They are also being updated. It’s another multi-phase project that will take a substantive amount of time and resources. The $7 million for this particular project will include infrastructure and a new pumphouse, scheduled to be completed later on. A new wellhouse motor has also been purchased to improve the efficiency and the reliability of the water system.

Rock Creek and Mendenhall — again, another example of a couple of projects valued at $2 million each. They are underway to upgrade their community water supply to meet the regulatory requirements at the specific fill point. It includes well upgrades, storage tanks, filtering systems and an addition to the facility to house new equipment.

Burwash — I was just recently in Burwash Landing with the MLA for Kluane. Again, a $1.5-million initiative has been undertaken to develop a new well this past few months and provide that protection to prevent contamination, requiring more work to be done and even a possibility of looking at the potential for providing geothermal heat.

In Teslin, there is over $4 million in support of a water treatment system that is under construction, which includes a new pumphouse. We’re looking for a completion next fall. In addition to meeting those regulations on arsenic, the plant will also reduce iron, manganese, nitrate, as well as address a whole host of other issues, to produce that safe drinking water for the community that meets national guidelines.

In Mayo, wells have been dug up in 2009 and 2010 and upgrading to provide water treatment was completed this past summer. There is more, Madam Chair.

In addition to the significant investments through infrastructure funding programs, such as MRIF and Building Canada, the department’s own budget also includes almost $900,000 for operation and maintenance when it comes to managing our drinking water supplies, which is absolutely very important to consider and to adhere to as well.

Over the past several years, Yukon government has partnered with and will continue to partner with the federal government, municipal governments, communities and First Nations to improve water infrastructure in the territory. We’ll con-
tinue to identify and consult with each of those communities and First Nation governments to identify and prioritize those projects. That dialogue will continue for many years to come, to be sure, but it is an important area and I’m very proud of the work that has been undertaken and we’ll continue to work to see further added progress in this regard.

Ms. Hanson: Let the record show that 15 minutes and eight seconds and we did not get an answer to two relatively simple and direct questions. One was a request for committed expenditure and forecast for the water and sewer pipe replacement and wet well in Watson Lake. Unfortunately the minister is either unwilling or unable to answer that.

Secondly, there was no direct answer in her area of ministerial responsibility. We heard lots of talk about various projects around the territory, but it was simply asking her: Is she going to actually exercise her ministerial accountability and responsibility to the citizens of Ross River and deal with the question raised about the violation of the water licence? The licence number was given to her. The simple answer would be, if you were expecting a responsible answer from the minister: “Of course I will direct my officials to do so.” That being said, having heard repeatedly from the minister and the Premier about the importance of managing our time well, let it be known that every question that we have asked that would take two seconds to answer, have been responded to with 15- to 20-minute responses. Excellent. Now let’s move on. Let’s clear the remaining ones so that we can do our due diligence because we are clearly not getting answers to questions. We’re simply getting repetitions. We’re getting readings of briefing notes. Good job; we know the minister can read. It’s not responsible and it’s not an effective use of our time.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Let us move to clear the remaining items.

Chair’s statement

Chair: I would caution the members against personalizing the debate. I’ll just leave it at that. This is a debate and not a place to vent personal comments.

Territory-wide — Arsenic Treatment Upgrades underexpenditure in the amount of $1,364,000 cleared
On Land Development
On Land Assessment/Planning

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I just want to make reference because I know that this area is of great importance to all members of the Legislative Assembly. I think it is important to really articulate the work that is being done by the Government of Yukon when it comes to land development; when it comes to drinking water upgrades and waste-water improvements and solid-waste improvements — the list goes on — all of which, I might just point out that unfortunately the members opposite continue to vote against; that is, the Official Opposition continues to vote against them.

It is unfortunate that they refuse to continually not recognize the importance of the work being done. That said, land development, when it comes to the Yukon government, again I have stated on the floor of the Legislature that we are very much committed to developing and maintaining a continual supply of building lots. In our 2012-13 budget, we have identified over, I believe, $35 million in support of land development initiatives.

This specific line item, of course, speaks to an overarching land assessment planning initiative that is being undertaken. It’s very important work. We’re working with all municipalities and First Nation governments — inclusive of our own City of Whitehorse — for various potential projects on a go-forward basis. It will help inform the work that we are not only doing today but in the years to come. I know the members opposite very much identify the importance of that long-term planning and identified work.

So again, we’re looking at that 20-year planning horizon to support not only land developments going forward, but really how we can make our land processes more efficient and more effective and more responsive to communities’ needs of today and tomorrow.

Mr. Elias: I believe I just heard the minister say that within the land development assessment planning, her department is working with all governments, all First Nation governments and all municipalities. I’d like to ask the minister, with regard to our community of Old Crow — in Question Period the other day, she hasn’t had a formal response to subdivision land planning in the community of Old Crow. I was just wondering if this line item was referring to the question I asked the other day in Question Period about assisting our community of Old Crow in developing residential land, namely in the Crow Mountain subdivision, that is desperately needed because we are running out of real estate on the lower bench in the community of Old Crow. Again, we need lots that are developed to facilitate more building of residential homes. So if the minister could elaborate specifically on the community of Old Crow and what work has been done, or if there has been any further communication since last week, I’d look forward to listening to the minister’s response to my question.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I’d like to thank the member opposite for his question. When it comes to this specific initiative, it has been underway, and will continue to be underway. It’s a large planning initiative and will include the community of Old Crow, in terms of a go-forward basis, identifying on a proactive basis what lands would be suitable and what the priorities are of the community. It will be community-driven, but the intent of the Government of Yukon is to engage with all communities and all First Nations and the communities at large in identifying that 20-year window, planning on the way out as well.

With respect to Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, as I mentioned earlier, if it is the priority of the First Nation to proceed with land development, our officials have a lot of expertise in this regard and would be very pleased to sit down with the chief and council or officials within the government itself to talk on a go-forward basis.

We have worked with a lot of the communities over the years at their request when it comes to really developing subdivisions and making land available based on the input of the communities when it comes down to the planning and the actual zoning and the bylaw process associated with their respective government. When it comes to self-governing First Na-
tions such as Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, I know that there is that ability to exercise the zoning, the planning and the land development powers among the First Nation itself. I couldn’t really provide an update as to where Vuntut Gwitchin is on this particular end of it, but through EMR and through our own Department of Community Services, we would be very happy to sit down with the First Nation to talk about making land available and how to get there.

Mr. Elias: Just to add to the debate today, over the course of maybe six years, I believe we’ve been having a lot of community consultation with regard to a new subdivision and providing more residential lots and pads so that people can build their homes. So this public consultation in the community of Old Crow has been going on for some time.

As the minister is well aware, we’ve also developed — the name of it escapes me right now — the community sustainability development plan, I believe it is. I forget the correct name of it. Associated with that is the community capital plan. This has been consulted upon for well over a decade. All of the capital projects in there have a timeline to them, they have a priority list associated to them and they have a community responsibility associated with them — looking for partnerships and how the federal and territorial governments can engage in that priority and that partnership. Those documents are co-signed by the Yukon territorial government — not this government, but the previous government. However, my constituents tell me that these things are still priorities to ensure that we have residential land developed. Everybody knows that the community of Old Crow is absolutely surrounded by category A settlement lands and that a partnership is required in order to ensure that families now and into the future have lots so that they can build their homes.

We’ve also engaged Yukon Electrical, in terms of ensuring that power gets from the lower bench, where the community is now, to on top of the new subdivision. So there is a whole, vast array of things that have been consulted on in the community for a long, long time — not to say that those plans are set in stone. A couple of days ago we had another summit in our community with regard to housing and some new fine-tuning ideas came out of those meetings to help alleviate and solve this housing problem in our community. It’s good to hear that the minister is willing to engage the community to provide the support of her department or her government in ensuring that some financial allocations or line items within the Department of Community Services come to fruition because it is very important to our community. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Land Assessment/Planning in the amount of $347,000 agreed to

On Total of Other Capital
Total of Other Capital in the amount of nil cleared

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of $360,000 agreed to

On Revenues
Revenues cleared

Chair: Thank you. Vote 51 has cleared.

Department of Community Services agreed to
or not we’ll in fact see an increase in corporate taxes. While I remain optimistic that we will exceed our budgeted expectations on the corporate side of income tax as well, I would not venture to assure the member at this time whether in fact that will occur or not until we actually see the numbers.

Ms. Hanson: I just have a couple of other questions although I’ll set the context for it and hopefully we can get to an answer.

Madam Chair, earlier this year — and this does pertain directly to the Minister of Finance’s issues in terms of the management of the finances — we were talking about some concerns I had raised as the Leader of the Official Opposition about the implications of one of the provisions of Bill C-38 that has to do with the provision — I made a note to myself buried someplace on page 192 — which speaks to the changes in borrowing provisions for the three northern territories. It’s the view of the Official Opposition that these are essentially changes to what we would call the constitution of the territories — the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act, the Nunavut Act.

The issue here is not really whether or not the borrowing limits should be increased for a territory but it’s really the fact that these amendments increase federal control over the territories. It’s the view of the Official Opposition that the only body that should be controlling the borrowing of the territories is really the legislative assemblies of this territory. It should not be the federal government that makes this decision.

Bill C-38 effectively changed our constitution, the Yukon Act, without consulting with us as legislators, with us in the Yukon. Earlier today the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin and the members opposite spoke about the fact that we’re coming on to the 10th anniversary of the devolution of federal responsibilities to this territory. What we’re seeing here is a re-exercise of federal power and control over the affairs of this territorial government, just as we’re gaining strength as a government.

I think these changes will continue that federal control and enable the federal Cabinet to determine what constitutes borrowing, the classes of entities or the entities that apply to the borrowing limit and the manner in which the value of borrowing can be determined. This is pretty fundamental with respect to the management and overall responsibilities the Minister of Finance in this territory does have.

It is of concern to the Official Opposition because we do believe that we should be masters in our house — maîtres chez nous. We expect that the Minister of Finance also shares that same sentiment. I would suggest that we move to report progress, but I would look forward at the next session to having the Minister of Finance’s thoughts on this very important issue.

Chair: It has been moved by Ms. Hanson that the Chair report progress.

Motion agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to