

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Thursday, November 14, 2013 — 1:00 p.m.**

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In remembrance of Richard North

Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Assembly to pay tribute to Richard North.

The Yukon loses a lot of writers. It's the kind of place that inspires people; it pulls them in from all around the world. We draw a lot more than our fair share of artists, musicians and writers, but we rarely get to keep them all for long. This is a very inspiring land, but it isn't an easy place to live. Pierre Berton lived here with his mother until he was only 12 years old. The house where he lived in Dawson has become a residence for other visiting writers. Robert Service was here for eight years. His cabin is a popular tourist attraction in Dawson. It is situated just down from the road from the museum dedicated to Jack London, who was only here for one winter.

These writers made their reputation writing about the Yukon, but spent most of their lives elsewhere. The Yukon loses a lot of writers, Mr. Speaker, and it recently lost another. Unlike London, Berton and Service, Dick North didn't leave us for the comforts of South; he passed away in September in his home in Whitehorse. In losing him, we lost a very special kind of artist, a man who was dedicated to witting about the Yukon with a voice from someone who truly knew it.

Dick North moved to the Yukon as a young journalist and he spent the bulk of his life in the territory, hiking and snowshoeing through the wilderness here. This was his home. It showed in every one of his books that he wrote; whether he was writing about the territory's history in *The Mad Trapper of Rat River* or *The Lost Patrol* — or his own history, in *Sailor on Snowshoes*. He was appointed a member of the Order of Canada in December of 2007, an honour he received with the humility and bemused pleasure one could only expect from a true bushman. He said, at the time, "It was pretty neat."

Dick's contributions aren't limited to his own writings. The Jack London Museum that I mentioned a moment ago is his brainchild. We owe its existence to his tenacity in sorting through rumours about the location of Jack London's Cabin and organizing the expedition to recover it. Thanks to Dick, that cabin has been found, has been moved to town and now sits just outside the museum on 8th Street. It is one of our most popular tourist attractions.

The Member for Riverdale South wanted me to add that Dick would often visit the bookstore and would ask to see all of his books and she would gather all of his books so that he could sign them all. Now this is a great selling point, that's for sure, for her store. You would be hard-pressed to find an unsigned Dick North book in that building.

The Yukon loses a lot of writers, Mr. Speaker, but Dick North was very special. He was one of the greats. That he stayed with us so long was not only a blessing to the communities where he lived and the people who lived in them, but to folks around the world who still read his printed words. We were very lucky to have him and we mourn his passing.

Hon. Mr. Graham: In light of the fact that the Member for Klondike was able to give a short tribute to Dick North, I thought that I would like to respond because Dick and I had a very long and, for me, beneficial relationship. I'm not so sure if it was mutually beneficial in all cases.

We began working together in the late 1960s and early 1970s at a magazine here in Whitehorse that I co-owned at the time, called *Midnight Sun*. Dick not only wrote probably 90 percent of what went into that magazine, he also did all the layout, he did the editing of anything that anyone else wrote and he took photographs. He virtually produced the magazine on his own. He was just a wonderful person. I spent many, many days working with Dick during those few years that we had *Midnight Sun* in operation, and some of the stories he told about Yukon — and I had lived here all my life — that I didn't even know were absolutely wonderful.

Just this summer, I also had the opportunity while I was in California to visit Oakland where I found the other half of Jack London's cabin. It was truly wonderful to see that Dick North was able to put together that expedition and actually move the original logs to Oakland, and there they sit in the square in Oakland on the waterfront, truly a wonderful location. I encourage all Yukoners, if they happen to get down there, to visit it. Dick was truly a unique individual — and I consider him a Yukon individual — and we'll mourn his passing.

In recognition of World Diabetes Day and Diabetes Awareness Month

Hon. Mr. Graham: Today is also World Diabetes Day. November is Diabetes Awareness Month and today, November 14, is Diabetes Day.

Between 1998 and 2009, the prevalence of diagnosed diabetes among Canadians increased by 70 percent. This is according to the Public Health Agency of Canada's 2011 report on diabetes in Canada. According to the Canadian Diabetes Association, more than nine million Canadians are living with diabetes or prediabetes, including an estimated one million persons living with undiagnosed diabetes. I think it's safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a problem in this country.

Diabetes is a complex disease. It's characterized by resistance to insulin, which helps our bodies break down

carbohydrates and turn them into glucose. This glucose in turn feeds our cells. When our bodies become resistant to insulin the cells have trouble responding to insulin and the glucose, or sugar, accumulates in our blood.

Dr. Brendan Hanley, Yukon's Chief Medical Officer of Health, gave a very concise description of what diabetes can do during a recent CBC interview that he conducted. He said that diabetes accelerates vascular disease and leads to increased risk of heart attacks and strokes. He further said that it's the leading cause of blindness, of kidney disease and non-traumatic limb amputations.

The principal causes of type 2 diabetes are genetic predisposition and lifestyle. A diet centered around processed foods linked with inactivity can change our metabolism. Dr. Hanley emphasized the value of physical activity and healthy eating as a way to control or even delay the onset of diabetes. He added that it's important to get tested to determine if we are at risk of developing the disease.

The Canadian Diabetes Association has launched a national awareness campaign, the theme of which is "Who are you fighting for?" The campaign gives a voice to people affected by diabetes, either those who have the disease or those whose loved ones have the disease.

Here at home we have two fine programs to help educate us about diabetes and provide positive help to everyone. The Diabetes Education Centre, which is run out the Whitehorse General Hospital, has nurses and dietitians who provide fact-based advice and assistance. As well, the Chronic Condition Support program of the Department of Health and Social Services has nurse educators, exercise physiologists and health coaches who can help clients and health care providers manage this chronic disease.

For Diabetes Awareness Month, the Chronic Conditions Support program is bringing up Joe Solowiejczyk on Friday. Mr. Solowiejczyk is a family therapist, diabetes nurse educator and social worker. He is also a long-time diabetic and a dynamic speaker. He will be giving presentations to health care providers during the day and a free public health talk that evening at 6:30 at the High Country Inn. He will be talking about the effect of family dynamics on diabetes. I encourage everyone to take advantage of this opportunity to learn more about a disease that has become truly an epidemic in our society.

Ms. Stick: I rise on behalf of the NDP and the Third Party to pay tribute to World Diabetes Day and diabetes month. According to our chief medical officer, the number of adults in Yukon with diabetes is five percent and growing. That is a large number of Yukoners whose health is compromised, and that percentage does not include the increasing number of young children and teens who are being diagnosed with juvenile diabetes.

Diabetes has been linked to heredity but increasingly it is linked to obesity in our population. I could go on about what diabetes is and the different types but, more importantly, I believe we need to educate ourselves on the life-threatening pathology of this disease, and we need to talk about

prevention and care. Diabetes does kill. The most common ways are heart attacks and strokes caused by accelerated vascular disease — one of the impacts of diabetes.

Diabetes is also the leading cause of blindness and non-traumatic limb amputations and the leading cause of kidney disease. The minister across the way mentioned that but I think it's important to repeat it.

All of these conditions come with a huge price tag on our health care dollars and impact not just the individual but families and communities. As I mentioned, some individuals have a genetic predisposition, while for others lifestyle is the largest cause — and that is something everyone can address. Lifestyle changes such as increased activity, less processed food, more fruit, vegetables and healthier foods can all help. I think I heard my mother say that — more activity, better food. We've all heard that mantra, if only we would listen.

If individuals have concerns or would like more information, they should be talking to their family doctors, their community nurses and asking for referrals to the Diabetes Education Centre or to the Yukon chronic disease program. This is one disease we really can do something about.

Speaker: Introduction of visitors.

Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Kent: I have for tabling the following two documents: the 2012 annual report of the Yukon Energy Corporation as well as the 2012 annual report of the Yukon Development Corporation.

Speaker: Are there other returns or documents for tabling?

Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions to be presented?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Ms. Moorcroft: I rise to give notice of the following motion for the production of papers:

THAT this House urges the federal government to adopt the principles set out in the Canadian Bar Association Resolution 13-12-A: Accommodating the Disability of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder to Improve Access to Justice and thereby reaffirm the commitment made by the federal Minister of Justice to address the issue of FASD in the Canadian legal system.

Mr. Silver: I rise to give notice of the following motion for the production of papers:

THAT this House do order the return of any and all records regarding the uptake on the down payment assistance program operated by the Yukon Housing Corporation, including:

- (1) how many individuals have applied and how many have been accepted;
- (2) the amount of money loaned to date; and
- (3) the total budget set aside for the program.

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

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Coroner's report re death at Watson Lake hospital

Ms. Hanson: Teresa Ann Scheunert died of mixed-drug toxicity at the Watson Lake hospital, a publicly funded health care facility. Her family has been trying to understand what happened to their mother and sister to prevent it from ever happening again. The family did file a complaint with the Yukon Medical Council. The College of Physicians & Surgeons of Alberta will eventually send their report to the Yukon Medical Council and to the family. It will not be made public.

Far from acting immediately, the Yukon Hospital Corporation waited almost a full year before initiating an independent patient safety review. This report will not be made public. Yukoners who own our public health care system have a right to know what happened.

How will the minister responsible for Health and Social Services, the *Hospital Act* and the Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board ensure that the public is informed about what happened before and after the tragic death of Teresa Ann Scheunert?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I'm quite surprised to hear this question, given the recent conversations with respect to the new *Health Information Privacy and Management Act* that has been tabled in this Legislature. The member opposite should know that we cannot publicly release medical records of any kind, unless authorized by the individual in question. In this case, the privacy of these medical records follow that person, even after death.

Ms. Hanson: I'm not talking about releasing private data. It's a public system, funded by the public purse and all threads of this sad story lead back to government responsibility.

Yesterday the Minister of Justice couldn't explain what law or regulation, if any, allows the coroner to sign and issue two significantly different judgments on the same death. We raised concerns about legislation that needs to be modernized and about inter-agency partnering. Mr. Speaker, it was a system failure and so far this government has refused to provide answers.

When will this government stop hiding behind its arm's-length institutions and how will the government members fulfill their ministerial responsibility for the system failure that resulted in the death of a 47-year-old registered nurse at the Watson Lake hospital?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Hospital Corporation itself — on November 7 of this session, I tabled a letter from the chair of the Yukon Hospital

Corporation that clearly addressed the changes that the Hospital Corporation has initiated as a direct result of the recommendations from the coroner's report. A Patient Safety Review is being or has been completed. I will not have that report, nor will I see it. The member opposite should understand what a Patient Safety Review report is. It's done under section 13 of the *Evidence Act* so that all the people involved, or all of the medical experts involved, can reveal what happened in a safe and secure environment to make sure that it doesn't happen again within the confines of the Yukon Hospital Corporation.

For the member opposite to ask that that now be made public is absolutely ridiculous. We understand that a high-alert medication strategy has been developed within the hospital. Another activity taking place is enhanced pharmacy support. A pharmacy operational review has taken place within the hospital. So all of these things are being done by competent medical practitioners, Mr. Speaker, and I trust them to do their job properly.

Ms. Hanson: The point was that it would not be made public. This week the minister expressed frustration that there wasn't enough cooperation in addressing the issues around Ms. Scheunert's death. Collaboration and cooperation are things the family would have loved to have had throughout this process. It's not hard to get in touch with the family. In fact, the minister has had their contact information since late January when the family wrote the minister pleading for help. This was an opportunity for the minister to arrange his own meetings and inform himself. What we have done on this side is listen to a Yukon health story and we have brought the concerns forward. It is not too late for the minister to learn more from the family about what failed and what the impacts have been on Teresa's surviving family.

Will the minister agree to meet with the family before Sunday to hear their full story, to hear from them the impacts of the system failure and commit to doing all he can to ensure nothing like this ever happens again?

Hon. Mr. Graham: I hear sounds coming from the opposite side, but I'm not sure they even listen to themselves sometimes. First of all I would like to clarify the role of the coroner. The coroner's goal is to provide facts. The coroner has the authority to correct a report at any stage. It's based not only on the act, but also on common law. Given that the coroner's job, the coroner's goal, is to provide facts, the coroner has a duty and an obligation to correct the record in light of new facts should they become available. The coroner is a quasi-judicial body, as I've said over and over in this Legislature. We don't interfere with the workings of that office. We respect the office of the coroner and we respect that office to get the job done correctly.

As to the other question, I have never, ever refused to meet with anyone. If the family would like to meet with me I would be only too happy to meet with them to hear their story, as I would have done at any time in the future.

So I look forward to that meeting Mr. Speaker. I reiterate that it's with the family.

Question re: Coroner's report re death at Watson Lake hospital

Ms. Stick: Again, Teresa Scheunert died of mixed-drug toxicity. That finding and the coroner's report will not change. One of the disturbing differences between the original coroner's report of June 14 and the significantly altered July 9 version is the disappearance of any mention of 100 tabs of dilaudid and 110 tabs of OxyNEO prescribed over three days, June 14, 18 and 19, in the week prior to Ms. Scheunert's death. I quote from the original coroner's report:

"These prescriptions were written by a physician familiar with the medications being administered to Ms. Scheunert by the Watson Lake Hospital".

All prescribed opiates should be included in the coroner's report. Why should Ms. Scheunert's family settle for the watered-down July 9 judgement of inquiry which has eliminated references to hundreds of tabs of opiates when mixed-drug toxicity has been identified as cause of death?

Speaker: The member's time has elapsed.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Obviously the member opposite hasn't read the recent release from the coroner's office explaining the reason that the information was corrected. I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that the goal of the coroner's report is to provide facts. If the coroner becomes aware that parts of what she has put in a report are not accurate, then it's not only her responsibility, but her duty to correct those facts.

I'm not here, Mr. Speaker, to explain on the coroner's behalf what happened between one report and another; that's not my job. The coroner is a quasi-judicial office, as I've stated previously. We don't interfere with the workings of that office. I realize the member opposite would be in there with her finger stirring the pot at every opportunity. We don't do that. We trust our officials and our people appointed by this government to do their job.

Ms. Stick: Mr. Speaker, oxycodone, also known as "oxyNEO", prescribed to Ms. Scheunert was detected in her post-mortem blood at an acceptable range. It was the fentanyl that was in the lethal range and, of course, it was the mixing that proved fatal. Those were facts. The coroner clearly stated that for the care providers, there was pre-existing knowledge of all medications being provided to Ms. Scheunert, both prescribed and administered at the hospital. Changes made to the coroner's second judgment appear to be an attempt to not discuss all the drugs that were prescribed.

Does the Minister of Health and Social Services see anything wrong with removing mention of hundreds of tabs of opiates in a coroner's report about a death by mixed-drug toxicity?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what part of my last answer the member opposite didn't understand. The coroner is a quasi-judicial office. She works independently. I'm not in any way responsible for what she puts in her coroner's report. I accept the fact that what she does put in that coroner's report is accurate, given the information that she has — given that it's her duty and her obligation to provide a factual report. That's what we have before us.

The final report appears to be a factual report. Why the information in there is as it is, I have no idea. I accept that report as a factual report.

Ms. Stick: Ms. Scheunert was only taking drugs prescribed at the hospital where her pain had been managed. All the opiates prescribed to Ms. Scheunert came from the physician familiar with the medications being administered. All opiates prescribed to Ms. Scheunert should be included in reports and investigations that have the goal of preventing future tragedies. The public has a right to know what happened in a public hospital funded by taxpayers. Why should the public settle for a watered-down report that just doesn't tell the whole story?

We heard from the minister that it was about her independence, but I would still like to hear how she was even allowed to make a second report from the original?

Hon. Mr. Graham: The coroner has no statutory restrictions on how she releases results of death investigations. How she conducts these investigations is covered by the *Coroners Act* and a large body of common law, as I understand it. With respect to the *Coroners Act*, the coroner is covered by her two main functions, which I have stated over and over: to ensure that facts surrounding a death aren't overlooked and the second is to prevent similar deaths from occurring in the future.

In this respect, I believe that the coroner has fulfilled her duty. Again, we don't interfere with the report or the office of the coroner. I don't quite get where the member opposite is coming from. We don't interfere. If there's clarification requested from the coroner, perhaps the member opposite should request that clarification from the coroner's office. We won't.

Question re: Economic outlook

Mr. Silver: After delaying the release of this year's economic forecast for several months, it finally saw the light of day in September. We know the Yukon's economy will grow only 0.6 percent this year and that will put us 11th out of 13 jurisdictions in Canada for 2013. On the surface, the numbers for 2014 look better but they raise a bunch of questions. The Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce, for example, has said publicly that they are a little bit skeptical and that they would like to see some facts. They didn't believe the minister's hype and neither do I, Mr. Speaker.

The forecast assumes that both Eagle Industrial Metals and Bellekeno will be producing ore in 2014. Will the minister confirm for the record that he believes this is the case? Does the minister think both these mines will be open and processing ore next year?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: It's very interesting to hear that the Liberal Party is cheering against these mining projects in the Yukon. I'll be happy to convey to the owners of those two mines — the Whitehorse Copper project and the Bellekeno mine — that the Liberal Party of Yukon would like to see those projects not proceed and that he's rooting against them and thinks they won't go forward, despite what the companies

themselves have put on the record. They have said they do plan to reopen the Bellekeno mine.

It's very disappointing to hear the member opposite from Klondike suggest that he hopes those mines won't go forward. We're very optimistic that the companies, when they put forward information, do so honestly and in proper accordance with the law and with what they're required to put out on the public record.

As to the forecasts, they aren't my predictions. They are the predictions of the economists within the Department of Economic Development and they are based on the best available data that they have as to what companies plan to do. They aren't written in stone. They aren't guarantees. They are simply forecasts. If the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce or any other chamber or body has questions or skepticism about them, that's fine. They are entitled to that. All that the department can do is publish a forecast based on the best available data at the time of publishing.

Mr. Silver: I guess berating me while I ask questions from the mining industry itself is not beneath the Minister responsible for Economic Development.

The forecasts for next year, I believe, are quite optimistic and I'm not alone. The government seems to think that they're bang on. If you support the conclusions then you must support the assumptions that go into this report. The conference board estimates are based upon Victoria Gold Corp. and Copper North Mining Corp. Carmacks projects both opening construction in 2014. Many people who I've spoken to in the mining industry don't see either of these things happening in 2014. It doesn't mean they don't want these things to happen and it doesn't mean that I don't these things to happen, it means they don't believe it. Will the minister confirm for the record that the government thinks that both of these different mines will begin construction next year?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: If a company has a proposal to build a mine and they have on paper publicly available — either through a website or reporting mechanisms through their national instruments — a plan to build a mine in a certain year, then the government takes that information very seriously. It's not the place of government to decide whether or not a project will go forward in terms of whether or not they can meet their requirements of raising capital and being able to build a mine. We have to make a forecast based on the best available data that we have. In the case of the forecast that we're talking about today, it is based on that. It's based on what companies are saying they are going to do. It's not a promise.

It's not that we are guaranteeing it's going to happen; it's simply what the companies themselves are saying they're going to do. So if the member opposite wants me to speculate whether or not I think companies are lying, I won't do that. That's not fair. All I can do is ask my economists to make a forecast based on the publicly available data.

Mr. Silver: And his economists did and we had to wait months and months to get these numbers.

It is very interesting to see the minister refuse to not make this commitment in the House. This government has been very

busy telling Yukoners to look past this year because things are going to get better next year. But now it looks like even the minister doesn't believe these optimistic numbers recorded in these forecasts. For our economy to rebound, the government is once again putting all of our eggs into one basket. It is very unfortunate that during the good times of 2010 and 2011, the government didn't put more thought into economic diversification. Last year, we lost more than 1,100 jobs in the private sector under this government's watch.

The minister is trying to have it both ways. He says, "Look at the report. Good news is on the way," but at the same time, he is unwilling to put on the record that he is confident that these mines are going to open up next year.

Why should Yukoners believe these reports when even the minister won't endorse them?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Mr. Speaker, I've explained a number of times that we've changed the timing of when we release these economic forecasts to a biannual situation and the member opposite knows that. He knows that companies publish their planned intentions for what they plan to do in the coming years. We make our forecasts based upon what they tell us and what they say they're going to do. Of course I can't promise that a mine is going to go forward. I'm not in a position to make that kind of promise or guarantee. All I can do is ask economic forecasters — the economists in the department — to make decisions and make forecasts based on the best available data.

It's very disappointing for me to hear from the Liberal Party rooting against these mines because, for them, it's a political win. He's cheering against economic development because he sees a political gain in it.

Mr. Speaker, we won't do that. We're advocates of the economy, we're advocates of creating jobs in this territory and we won't root against mining projects in the territory. What the NDP and what the Liberals would have us do is ban mining in large tracts of the territory, increase royalty rates, eliminate the free-entry staking system and undertake an online staking program as committed to by the Liberal Party in the last election.

Question re: Coroners Act

Ms. Moorcroft: Mr. Speaker, as the Yukon *Coroners Act* now stands, the coroner and coroner's legal counsel, designated in the act as Her Majesty, or in other words, Crown counsel are the only people entitled to participate in a coroner's inquest. The Yukon *Coroners Act* does not provide families the right to be represented by a lawyer at an inquest into the death of a family member. The Yukon Court of Appeal in its Silverfox v. Chief Coroner decision this year reaffirmed that family members do not have any legal standing at a coroner's inquest.

Mr. Speaker, the law must be fair. Does the Minister of Justice think it's fair that families do not have the right to legal standing or to be represented by a lawyer at an inquest into the death of a family member?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Once again, I go back to the simple fact that the coroner has the authority to correct reports

and to publish reports. Given the fact that the goal of the coroner is to provide facts, we have a duty and an obligation to provide those facts in a manner that they see fit.

The number of inquests or death investigations in the past three years has varied between 51 and 73. Twenty-six coroners serve all Yukon communities, and we average one or two inquests per year. Therefore, we feel that since is the only one that we've had this kind of difficulty with, the system appears to work fairly well under the current system.

Ms. Moorcroft: Perhaps the Minister of Health and Social Services did not hear my question. It's about the *Coroners Act*. Yukoners are concerned that the *Coroners Act* does not provide for mandatory inquests where it is unknown how or why or under what circumstances the deceased died, or where it is in the public interest, or where there is a concern for public safety.

In the Yukon currently, inquests are only mandatory for deaths of persons in custody. A family member should be able to request an inquest, have legal standing and have timely disclosure of evidence and other means to ensure that an inquest is fair and transparent.

Will the Minister of Justice direct his officials to immediately establish regulations that recognize that families of the deceased have a right to participate in a coroner's inquest?

Hon. Mr. Graham: In the preamble to the question, I know the member opposite had at least two errors in facts, so I'm not interested in responding to the question when it's preceded by non-factual — in my opinion — information.

We believe that the coroner operating under the current regime is doing a fine job. We won't interfere with the workings of that office. We respect that office, and even though this extremely unfortunate situation that we now find ourselves in has precipitated a number of these conversations, we feel it's not the appropriate time to get into this discussion.

Ms. Moorcroft: Neither the Minister of Health and Social Services nor the Minister of Justice seems to be willing to answer my question, which is about the political will of this minister and this government. The office of the Yukon's chief coroner must be unbiased and independent. However, recent events have made it painfully clear that the coroner's office does not have the legislative power, the regulatory tools or the administrative capacity it needs to do its work independently. The Minister of Health and Social Services answers and statements earlier today have made that clear.

The Yukon *Coroners Act* is out of step with current practice in other Canadian jurisdictions. Does the minister have the political will and will the Minister of Justice commit to a full review and public consultations on new legislation governing fatalities, fatality inquiries and coroner's inquests before the fall 2014 legislative sitting?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Once again we have preambles that are full of non-factual information and it's difficult to answer any question from the Opposition when it's preceded by so much — I was going to use an unparliamentary term there, Mr. Speaker, but I restrained myself.

Unlike the NDP, obviously, we have a great deal of confidence in the coroner to carry out her responsibilities under the act and regulations. Again, we go back to the same point. The goal of the coroner's report is to provide facts and to ensure that similar situations do not happen again. We are convinced that, under the current quasi-judicial system, the office is independent. I have made no reference whatsoever to experiencing difficulties within that office, Mr. Speaker, so there is one error in fact.

We believe the office is working fairly well at the present time, we respect that office, unlike members of the opposition, and we will continue to do that.

Question re: FASD and legal system

Ms. Moorcroft: I will attempt a new question to the Minister of Justice. The federal Minister of Justice has acknowledged that fetal alcohol spectrum disorder is a huge problem and committed to address the issue of FASD in the Canadian justice system. The Yukon Minister of Justice and his colleagues have played a leadership role in addressing FASD at the federal-provincial-territorial table. In August 2013, the Canadian Bar Association released a resolution urging the federal government to accommodate the disability of FASD to improve access to justice. The minister met with his colleagues today to discuss FASD.

Does the minister support the Canadian Bar Association resolution urging the federal government to amend the *Criminal Code* and other legislation to finally begin addressing the issue of FASD in the Canadian legal system?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: The remarks finally from the member opposite caught me off guard. We have been working on this for a number of years and, in fact, Yukon has taken the lead on FASD in the criminal justice system across Canada. Over the past couple of days, with my colleagues from across the country, we've had great discussion on issues pertaining to FASD and access to justice. In fact, Yukon currently is undergoing an FASD prevalence study and the whole country is looking forward to information coming from that study.

It will give us great information on assisting those with FASD within the corrections system. We continue to do the good work up here. We have been rolling up our sleeves in Yukon since 2010 specifically on this issue and bringing it to the federal, provincial and territorial justice ministers' table.

Ms. Moorcroft: Mr. Speaker, people who are diagnosed with FASD or are suspected of having FASD are living with an organic brain injury. It is a permanent disability. People living with FASD often come into conflict with the law, and the legal system ends up criminalizing someone with a disability. Assumptions behind rehabilitation and deterrents underlying criminal law are not valid for these individuals. Often people living with FASD cannot foresee the consequences of their acts and suffer from poor impulse control and impaired judgment.

Is the Minister of Justice willing to amend the *Corrections Act* to consider the relevance of FASD in our legal system?

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite was talking about the CBA resolution. Once again, we need to recognize the importance of those efforts to improve access to justice for people with FASD at their recent meeting and, of course, at our recent meeting just over the last couple of days. It is our belief that, in order to move forward in properly addressing this issue, due diligence is required to defining this complex issue, which is why we have approved the work currently being done by the federal, provincial and territorial officials. There is good work being done here in the territory and, as I said, jurisdictions from across Canada are watching very closely what we are doing.

I can also assure you that we look forward to the opportunity to further dialogue with organizations such as the CBA and other justice system professionals to address this issue and develop appropriate systems. I had indicated that we have a prevalence study underway in Yukon. I commend the federal government for their participation and relationship-building on this prevalence study. We look forward over the next couple of years to accessing more information about FASD in the correctional system.

Question re: Carcross Community Centre

Mr. Barr: Today I would like to come back to an issue I have raised many times in this House. The Carcross Community Centre is over 60 years old and was built by volunteers. It houses our territorial court. It is our local polling station. It is where community meetings happen and is a place for recreation. Until recently, the local advisory council, our local government body, met there, but because of the condition of the building they are now meeting in the local school.

When will this government build a new community centre, an important piece of community and government infrastructure that is part of the lifeblood of Carcross?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: What I would point out to the member is that we do recognize the work that has been done to assess the condition of the community centre in Carcross and we'll take that into consideration, as well as other priorities that have been identified by the community. We encourage the members of the community and the Carcross-Tagish First Nation to work together in trying to come up with a common set of priorities in terms of infrastructure development.

As the member should be well aware, there have been several different ideas and requests for government funding. Government can't build multiple structures with similar purposes but different visions in a community of that size, so there does need to be an effort by the community and First Nation to come together on common priorities and we're certainly happy to work with both of them in that regard.

Mr. Barr: Each time I raise this issue that the Carcross Community Centre needs to be replaced, the government comes up with some reason or another not to act. Community members routinely write to the minister requesting action. One prominent citizen and community leader in a recent letter states that she feels like writing to the

minister has become an annual exercise. The frustration of the letter-writer cumulates with, and I quote: "Every time we bring this request to your government we are advised that we need to get input from the community. We have had numerous community meetings, met with local organizations, done surveys, and tried to comply with all that has been requested over the past 15 years."

Mr. Speaker, frustration and disillusionment is mounting. Will this government commit to build a new community centre in Carcross in next year's capital budget?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: What I would again note is that the member is failing to recognize the significant government investments that have gone into Carcross. We work with every community in trying to gain an understanding of their priorities, but there are many competing priorities and we don't have the budgetary resources to do everything that everyone wants at once. We have to work with communities on picking realistic priorities and determining what investments can be made. Recent investments in Carcross include over \$12 million in investment in the waterfront development that was as a result of working with the community to understand their priorities.

There are few communities in Canada the size of Carcross that have seen that much investment by the territorial or provincial government in tourism development — over \$12 million in investment in recent years. We will of course work with the community in identifying future priorities, but again I point out to the member that there have been different views from the members of the community, as represented by the LAC and the First Nation, on what their infrastructure priorities are and we can't build everything at once.

Mr. Barr: The existing community centre building has plumbing and electrical problems, including not meeting current building codes. The roof does not meet the territorial building codes either. The insulation is not adequate and the building is very expensive to heat. The foundation is rotting. There is also the issue of mold. This is our court house, our polling station, the place where our local advisory council used to meet and a place for community gathering, celebrations and weddings. This is just not acceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Last year, in response to a challenge from the minister's predecessor, we held a large community meeting and got consensus on building a new community centre. What else do we need to do to get the government to act? Will the minister come with me and see the state of the Carcross Community Centre for himself?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: What the member is conveniently leaving out of his question is my understanding that the community also agreed that they would like a potlatch house and supported both a new community centre and a new potlatch house. The government is prepared to talk to both the First Nation and the LAC about advancing priority projects within Carcross and we remain open to discussing both of those potential options, but it's simply not a case that we can build both a potlatch house and a community centre and do it right away in Carcross.

There are other communities that have priorities as well. There are other areas we've had to invest in, including the water and waste-water investments in many Yukon communities, in part driven by changes to federal standards around drinking water quality.

We will work with the community of Carcross and with the First Nation in discussing and hopefully coming to a common view of what the priorities are. We also need to consider the needs of other Yukon communities and work through a budgeting process in determining where those investments can be made. We appreciate the importance the community places on this but what the member is failing to reflect is there is not at this point a common view of which project is a priority. As of the latest conversations I've had with the local advisory council, that was my understanding from them and that's my understanding from my predecessor, the Minister of Community Services.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has elapsed.

Some Hon. Member: (inaudible)

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Nixon: It gives me great pleasure to introduce some of my colleagues from across Canada. First we have Minister Meilleur, Community Safety minister from Ontario; Shane Gonsalves, chief of staff; Minister Gerretsen, the Attorney General for Ontario; Sabrina Grando, chief of staff; and finally we have Minister Swan from Manitoba and Matt Schaubroeck, special assistant.

Applause

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 58: *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act* — Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 58, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Dixon.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: I move that Bill No. 58, entitled *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Acting Minister of Justice that Bill No. 58, entitled *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Thanks to colleagues for hearing this second reading speech regarding the *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*.

I'd like to start out by first of all thanking the Justice staff who have taken the time to not only write and prepare this bill, but also prepare me as minister to present it to the House. As folks know, and I'm sure members of this House will appreciate, a significant amount of work goes into the drafting and policy work around creating legislation. It takes a lot time, resources and effort, and that effort is especially put forward by department staff. I would like to recognize the ADM of

Justice, Thomas Ullyett, as well as Lesley McCullough, Carole Williams, Lawrence Purdy, Lori Zazulak, Sue Christianson and Dan Cable for the work they've done in preparing this bill in preparation of its tabling in the Legislature.

I am here today to present the second reading of Bill No. 58, the *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*. This legislation will institute a service to recalculate child support payments when the income of a parent changes. Instead of applying to court for a variance of the original child support order, either parent could apply to this administrative service to have their child support payments recalculated.

The act covers all child support orders made in Yukon courts and those made under the federal *Divorce Act* regardless of when they were made with certain necessary exclusions.

We are entering negotiations with the federal government to include orders under the federal *Divorce Act*, which is noted as a possibility in the act. We expect an agreement to be in place by the time the act comes into effect. Similar services are in place in seven other jurisdictions and we have tailored our service to the needs of Yukoners following the consultations we conducted this summer. This legislation addresses an access to justice issue and is part of this government's commitment to support families.

We know that going to court means a commitment of time and money that some parents are unable to make. We also acknowledge that the issue of child support is an emotional one and many separated parents would rather avoid confrontational court appearances in deciding on the amount of child support to be paid. Other parents may decide that it is only in court that a full hearing of all the circumstances will result in a fair decision. This legislation therefore makes an administrative recalculation available to those parents who request it, but retains the option of going to court instead. This act will affect a sizable population in Yukon. According to the 2011 census, there were 1,915 lone-parent families in Yukon, of which 1,390 were led by women. Not all would be subject to child support orders, but in 2012, 1,365 child support orders were made and that would be close to average over the last few years.

As I'm sure any parent will tell you, the cost of raising a child is considerable. The Fraser Institute this year estimated that it costs \$3,000 to \$4,500 per year to provide basic essentials to raise a healthy child in Canada. Other experts have noted that the Fraser Institute's estimate did not include the costs of daycare, accommodation, toys, sports, music and extra educational resources.

Yukon is a great place to raise kids and all these wonderful resources are available here. Yukon parents would want their children to be able to take advantage of them if they could afford it. A minimalist approach to raising our children is probably not what most Yukon parents would want for their children.

A Supreme Court ruling in 2006 affirmed that parents have a responsibility to provide for their children to the greatest extent of their income. In these times of economic

prosperity in Yukon, incomes are going up and it is right that our children should benefit. Although parents must agree with that in general, when it comes to making arrangements to pay more for child support there might be some reluctance or procrastination in putting those arrangements in place.

This new service will make it easy for them. On application, a neutral administrative service will recalculate the child support and notify the parents of the new amount. In deciding which child support orders to include in this service, the Department of Justice contacted parents, lawyers, women's groups and First Nations. They also consulted internally with Family Law Information Centre officials and the maintenance enforcement program. Since the recalculation will necessitate timely submission of information and notification, it was decided to restrict the service to child support orders where the payor was a resident of the Yukon.

Many jurisdictions restrict their service to both payor and recipient being residents, but we thought it would be doable to have only the payor residing in Yukon. The feasibility study conducted in 2009 recommended that shared custody orders not be included because that would necessitate obtaining income information from both the payor and the recipient, but government decided, after consulting, to include them. Shared custody orders are the most common child support orders, so excluding them would lessen the effectiveness of the service. It is our intention to institute a service that is easy to administer and utilizes the formula in the child support guidelines where the income of the paying parent determines the amount of the child support. We have therefore decided to include only straightforward orders and not those where there are special circumstances so that the child support guidelines cannot be followed.

In recalculating the new child support, it should simply be a matter of inputting a revised income amount into the formula. Where there are complexities, parents always have the option of applying to the court for a variance. Although the act makes clear the child support orders that are to be included in the new recalculation service, there is also provision for future flexibility so that other child support orders can be addressed or it can be added later by regulation.

Here is how the recalculation will work. Either parent may apply to have their child support order recalculated. The recalculation officer then decides whether the child support order is eligible according to the criteria I just outlined. Notification that the recalculation is to be performed is then sent out together with a request for the latest income tax assessment of the payor. The act makes the submission of this income tax information obligatory.

This information is necessary for the accuracy of recalculation and privacy is guaranteed under the provisions of the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. On receipt of the income information, the recalculation officer makes the calculation using the child support guidelines and informs the payor and recipient of the result. This is the amount that now replaces the child support amount in the original order. If either parent disagrees with the new amount, they can apply to the court.

If the recalculation officer believes that a court might come to a different amount — for instance, because it would be able to access longer term or other income information — the recalculation officer can refuse to make the recalculation and then the applicant would have to take the application to the court.

Government has decided that the recalculation will not be performed in every subsequent year after the application has been accepted once. The reason for this is we want to make sure the service is activated by the applicant according to their circumstances and wishes, and those might change from year to year.

Although annual recalculation would reduce time, effort and stress for some applicants, for many it would be wasted effort by the officials because the payor's income had not increased sufficiently to make a significant difference in the child support. The act recognizes a difference of \$5 per month as significant enough to trigger notifying the parents of a new amount.

The new service will be located in the Family Law Information Centre on the first floor of the Law Centre, which is easily accessible to parents who are in Whitehorse. Information and applications will also be available on-line to accommodate rural parents and parents in other parts of the Yukon. We are aiming for the act to be proclaimed and come into force in June of next year. Procedural details will be published in the regulations, which will come into effect as the same time as the act. Regulations will accord with policy in the act, which has been informed by the consultations already completed.

The act before the House has been designed to fit the unique needs of single parents in Yukon. It will provide an easy and timely process for aligning child support payments with changes in income. I urge members of the House to pass the *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act* to ensure that Yukon children can receive the level of support that they deserve.

I look forward to hearing second reading input from other members of the House and will look forward to discussing this bill with the support of officials from the Department of Justice later in Committee of the Whole. I will be prepared to answer any questions that members may have at that time.

Again, I'd like to thank the Department of Justice for the work they have done on this file and the individuals that I listed earlier in my second reading speech. I thank them again for their hard work in preparing both this bill and me for presentation to the House.

Ms. Moorcroft: I rise on behalf of the Official Opposition in support of Bill No. 58, *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*.

I want to begin by thanking the Department of Justice officials who gave us a thorough presentation on the act earlier in this sitting. The Acting Minister of Justice read their names into the record in his second reading speech, so I will just add my appreciation for their work.

The 2006 Supreme Court of Canada ruled that people paying child support have an obligation to maintain a level of support to their children that is proportionate to their income underlies this work. The court also acknowledged that federal and provincial governments could enter into agreements under the *Divorce Act* for the purposes of providing recalculation services to parents and to help them meet their child support obligations. I was pleased to know that the Yukon is in negotiations and expects to reach an agreement before this act becomes implemented.

As officials informed us at the briefing, a number of other jurisdictions in Canada have adopted similar administrative services to recalculate child support without needing to go through costly and time-consuming court proceedings.

The Yukon New Democrats support access to justice for families. When families separate, children's needs must still be met by the parents. Administrative child support recalculation services are an important way in which a just and fair updating of child support can be managed between parents or guardians of children.

This is especially important, given the fact that a parent or guardian receiving child support often does not have the time and may not have the means to go to court to have a child support order changed when the payor's income or other circumstances change that warrant recalculation.

During the briefing, I asked about application of the bill to same-sex couples because we have heard from some same-sex couples about having problems in this regard, so I will be following up with the minister on that.

As the acting minister said, where there are complexities, there is an option to appear in court that remains available to parents. I understand that the recalculation service will only be applied to simple cases and that the joint custody or unstable income cases would not be considered. I'm wondering whether the government intends to expand the service at some point in the future to cover more complex cases.

I hope that the effectiveness of this service for parents will be evaluated so that improvements can be made on an ongoing basis. Ensuring a parent who is caring for their child or children gets fair support is an important part of ensuring that families and children can live in security.

One of the issues parents face in raising their children is access to affordable housing and affordable daycare. We need to recognize that there are many other factors that make it difficult for separated parents to meet the financial needs of their household. Indeed, the acting minister has pointed out that there are many lone-parent households in the Yukon and that many of these are managed by single mothers.

We understand that the service may handle some high-conflict cases and that recalculation staff will need the necessary support to deal with potential conflict. What measures will be taken to ensure that the government workers providing this service are given the proper training to deal with these situations?

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I am pleased that the government in developing this act considered input from women's groups, from First Nations, from many other Yukon

stakeholder groups and the general public and I commend that. I think it is work that needs to take place in developing legislation.

Mr. Silver: It's my pleasure to stand in support of Bill No. 58, *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*. This bill enacts the *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*. The new act creates a government service that can be updated based on changes to the payor's income — the amount of child support payment under a court order. Either the payor or the recipient of the support can request this service and it will be available for both existing and future child support orders.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to rise today on behalf of the Liberal Party to speak about this recalculation act. We will be supporting this bill, as it will help caregivers receive adequate child care support. The ability to change current arrangements through an administrative process will reduce financial burdens and personal stresses that are associated with going to court. That is all I have to say for opening remarks and I look forward to discussing this further in Committee of the Whole.

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

Hon. Mr. Dixon: I look forward to support from all parties on this. It sounds like we have agreement on passing this in second reading. I look forward to getting into Committee of the Whole and answering questions on the details, along with officials, later on today.

Motion for second reading of Bill No.58 agreed to

Bill No. 62: *Animal Health Act* — Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 62, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Dixon.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: I move that Bill No. 62, entitled *Animal Health Act*, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Environment that Bill No. 62, entitled *Animal Health Act*, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: It is a real pleasure for me to rise and speak to this *Animal Health Act*. It's something that along with my department, I have worked on over the past two years in my time as Minister of Environment. I'm pleased to finally see it come to fruition in its finality here in the Legislature in this fall sitting.

We've discussed this particular act a few times over the last few years in the House, but I'm pleased to provide a bit of background for this act and how we arrived at where we are today.

Before I do get into the details of the legislation itself, I did want to thank the officials who have made this legislation possible and their work both in drafting, writing and doing the policy work in the background as well as preparing me as minister for this legislation discussion.

The most obvious individual in the Department of Environment who has been involved in this is our chief veterinary officer, Mary VanderKop. She has been fantastic to work with, and I appreciate her guidance and patience in explaining what are sometimes very complex scientific issues to me. As a layman, I must sometimes frustrate her with my lack of knowledge of various diseases and issues, but her patience is much appreciated and her understanding and explanations are always helpful.

As well, I would be remiss if I didn't note the policy folks in Environment who have put a lot of time and effort into this. While Mary VanderKop, the chief veterinary officer, is sort of rightly the face of this legislation, folks like Diane Nikitiuk in the policy branch of Environment Yukon deserve an incredible amount of praise and thanks for her hard work. Of course, there is Dan Paleczny, as well, the director of policy, and any of the other policy staff in Environment who have had a hand in crafting this legislation. The drafters in Justice, while I don't recall their names, deserve a great deal of thanks and recognition. Drafting legislation, of course, is no easy task and takes a lot of resource time and effort.

The *Animal Health Act* came into force in 1997 originally. This legislation is shared between the departments of Energy, Mines and Resources and of Environment. The chief veterinary officer position was established in late 2009/early 2010 to provide leadership to an animal health unit consisting of a program veterinarian and a laboratory coordinator. As I said earlier, the chief veterinary officer, Mary VanderKop, and her program veterinarian, Dr. Jane Harms, have been fantastic to work with and I'd like to thank them for their work, as well as the laboratory coordinator.

These individuals make up the animal health unit of Environment Yukon. The animal health unit is responsible for education, information and disease response for issues affecting animal health in Yukon within the scope of the *Animal Health Act*.

This includes supporting Yukon's growing agriculture sector and monitoring the health of wildlife populations. The CVO provides advice to Health and Social Services and the chief medical officer of health on issues of food safety and diseases transmitted between animals and people.

The overlap between animal and human health and welfare is increasingly recognized. Yukon's *Animal Protection Act* is administered by Community Services and the CVO advises on the veterinary aspects of animal welfare along with the staff at Community Services who administer the *Animal Protection Act*.

A revised act will enable a more comprehensive response to animal diseases and ensure the Yukon government can deal with risks to livestock and wildlife health as well as support local food security and the protection of public health. It is similar to legislation in many provinces and it will support government decisions and actions that will be science-based, transparent and accountable.

A review of the current *Animal Health Act* was a key step to identifying the changes needed to ensure Yukon's legislation is current and effective. New threats to animal

health, many with human health implications, have emerged in the past decade. Examples of those include SARS, influenza, West Nile virus and many others that we see in the media from time to time since the act was last amended. It is important for government to have the legislative authority to respond appropriately to these threats.

A comparison of Yukon's *Animal Health Act* and similar legislation across Canada found opportunities that would enhance an effective response by the Yukon government to animal health concerns. Yukon stakeholders and First Nation governments were asked to comment on five key areas where changes were being considered to the *Animal Health Act*. The key issues included expanding the scope of the act, defining the role of the chief veterinary officer, addressing compensation for losses from an order under this act, introducing a process to appeal decisions and aligning penalties to other jurisdictions.

In completing the work on this act, the Department of Environment conducted a fairly robust public consultation and received significant input from the public as well as interested stakeholder groups.

This act recognizes that government action taken in the public interest can result in financial and personal loss to individuals, and thus includes provisions to address this loss. In the future, the detailed regulations required to support the modernized act will be developed through engagement of stakeholders.

As I said earlier, the Yukon public was invited to offer opinions and comments through a survey that was available from government offices or on-line. The invitation was extended through a news release and promoted through advertisements in the newspapers and television, as well as through social media, including Facebook and Twitter.

In addition, invitations to comment were mailed to 15 agriculture and wildlife stakeholder groups, 87 agricultural producers and service providers and all Yukon veterinary clinics. The review period was 60 days and that ended on May 31 of this year. Government representatives met with stakeholder groups upon request to explain the legislation review process and the proposed changes, as well as to answer any other questions individuals might have.

Meetings were held with the Yukon Agricultural Association, Yukon Game Growers Association, the Yukon Horse and Rider Association, Growers of Organic Food Yukon, and an interested group of agriculture producers. The chief veterinary officer presented information at the renewable resources councils chairs' meeting and to the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board.

In addition to the comments received, there were a number of additional questions asked. As best we could throughout the process, the staff who conducted these consultations endeavoured to answer them as completely and as wholly as possible. In all, the Yukon government received a total of 71 completed surveys and three e-mail responses. Written responses were also received from the Yukon Agricultural Association, Mayo District Renewable Resources Council, Laberge Renewable Resources Council and the

Dawson District Renewable Resources Council. Letters were received from the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations and Teslin Tlingit Council. Of course, the information and *What We Heard* document is available on-line on Environment Yukon's website.

The questions that the survey that I referenced asked related to the scope of the act, the role and the authority of the chief veterinary officer, compensation, the appeal process, increasing penalties and the highest penalty for a first offence.

As I said, we received significant input from those who participated in the public consultation. I know that in terms of feedback we received a lot, especially from the agricultural industry. While some expressed a certain degree of questions about the necessity and role of the CVO, I think in all, everyone agrees that concerns about diseases found in farm animals could detrimentally affect wildlife species and that this legislation that provides protection to wildlife — specifically wild sheep from domestic sheep and goats — is long overdue. On the whole, I think it's fair to say many Yukoners are excited to see this legislation come forward.

The process, as I said, for this will entail passing of this legislation in this sitting, including the second reading. It will then, in the coming months and years, provide government with an opportunity to create regulations pursuant to this amended act or this new modernized act. I believe that there are 20 different regulation-making powers within this act. As we move to implement them, we will consider which to begin with.

Another key component of the chief veterinary officer's role as articulated by this act relates to the education and promotion of information related to the agricultural and livestock sector. I am happy to say that the chief veterinary officer is a regular contributor to the Agriculture branch's normal mail-out, entitled *InFARMation* and she is a regular contributor to that, so her comments can be found quite regularly in various issues of that publication.

As I said, the updated act specifies clear, science-based, transparent methods to deal with health risks that will enable an effective response by government without requiring changes to existing farming practices and provides the CVO with modern tools for responding to hazards and potential problems that may occur.

One of the issues I should highlight is the ability and requirement to respond to diseases of a federally reportable nature on a list that is compiled by the federal government — the Canadian Food Inspection Agency — which maintains a list on a monthly basis. That list of federally reportable diseases is available on the federal government's website. This new animal health unit, under the modernized act, will allow a more seamless interaction between the federal government's CFIA branch and our department.

I'm very excited about the possibilities it entails for further work with CFIA, and I'm sure that will be an important part of implementing the act. A great deal of work has gone into this over a substantive amount of time and I'm very proud of the work that has been done by officials to date. I did highlight a few individual in Environment Yukon but I

would remiss if I didn't add the significant contributions of the Agriculture branch of Energy, Mines and Resources — in particular Tony Hill, the director there. He has a very strong working relationship with the chief veterinary officer as she does serve all of government, but particularly Energy, Mines and Resources and Environment.

So I would like to thank the staff in the Agriculture branch of Energy, Mines and Resources for their input and work on this piece of legislation and I look forward to discussing the details of this particular legislation in Committee of the Whole at some point in this legislative sitting. I would be happy to answer questions from members of the Legislature at that point.

With that, I'd like to commend this legislation to the House and look forward to hearing from other members on their thoughts and views on this very important piece of legislation.

Ms. White: It gives me great pleasure to speak to Bill No. 62, the *Animal Health Act*. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the excellent work of employees at Environment Yukon — and in particular, to Mary VanderKop, the chief veterinary officer, and the team that she works with. I heard from many people before I had a chance to meet her that hiring Ms. VanderKop was an exciting moment for the department and after seeing the work that she and her team have put into this bill, I can understand why.

Not being an expert in animal health and disease and how that works, the explanation is very comprehensive and has laid out a new set of rules and guidelines for both enforcement officials and owners of livestock to follow. It deals with all aspects. It encourages the reporting of hazards by making it a more transparent process so that everyone understands what happens when that is initiated.

It has new tools to control disease outbreaks in the animal/human health aspect. It has a clear list of responsibilities for both enforcement staff and animal owners. It has great aspects of the ability to appeal decisions and it gives the minister the ability to create an appeal board, which has also been very well received by the farming community. Definitely an important aspect to all of this is that it's really taking into account that for people who are involved in farming, the livestock are their livelihood. The fact that compensation is actually created right into the act has been really important and well-received, so there's no longer that fear of reporting that you might have concerns about your animal health — that that will affect your livelihood.

With all those reasons, it's a fantastic act and I look forward to discussing it more in Committee of the Whole. I just want to congratulate the department on the good work they've done.

Mr. Silver: It gives me great pleasure to rise on behalf of the Liberals to speak to Bill No. 62, *Animal Health Act*. We are glad to learn about the details of this bill from officials in Department of Environment. The chief veterinary officer and officials in her department have clearly done a lot of hard

work on this bill. The extensive consultation done in developing this bill is welcome and proof of the benefits of these consultations can be found throughout the bill.

The bill moves a long way forward in protecting Yukoners, as well as domestic and wildlife populations. Measures in the bill that provide compensation for animals that have been destroyed will help Yukon farmers and wildlife caretakers deal with disease outbreaks. This bill also helps encourage open information and self-reporting around disease outbreaks. This is critical in early identification of diseases.

Not much more to say, other than I will be supporting this bill and looking forward to asking some more questions on this bill during Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I just want to provide a few remarks in support of this particular bill coming forward, the *Animal Health Act*, and I want to commend the Minister of Environment for his efforts and to his staff of the Department of Environment for doing this very important work.

I was actually the Minister of Environment when we introduced a new animal health program that was inclusive of a new chief veterinary officer as well as support and administrative staff. At that time and leading up to the time, we all witnessed a number of changes in our environment due to climate change and other factors.

As we see these changes occur within our environment, so also have we seen changes in how we manage wildlife and livestock in the agricultural sector, particularly as we see growth in the agricultural sector.

When I served as Environment minister, there was a lot of work done and continues to be done in support of elk management, for example, and bison management. There were a number of frameworks that were developed in support of adaptive management of these particular populations. It was really directed at diseases, as we see changes in our climate and we see the arrival of diseases that have come to Yukon and we have had to adapt the way in which we manage those arrivals, whether it has been ticks or others.

I think that this legislation really speaks to the importance of the animal health program, the unit itself and the role of the chief veterinary officer. As was already mentioned by the Minister of Environment, that particular role has been very integral in working in collaboration with the chief medical officer within Health and Social Services, but also working in collaboration with Community Services, which is responsible for animal protection, and, of course, with EMR in terms of the department responsible for the agriculture industry.

I believe that what this particular piece of legislation does is provide clarity to the scope and to the role of this particular officer and it also provides clarity in terms of providing those modernized tools to be able to respond to those emerging issues of importance. The emphasis on education and promotion are of utmost importance — providing clarity and providing more tools available to those who work with livestock on a daily basis in support of Yukon families and in support of those who work within our government agencies as

well, and providing that added scope and clarity to their particular roles.

I'm very pleased to see this work coming to fruition and being able to have an individual such as our CVO able to work through all of our existing policies, regulations and our legislation and bring further clarity and modernize those particular pieces of statutes and regulatory tools, as well as respond to the challenges and the opportunities that present themselves in the 21st century.

Without further ado, I would again commend the Minister of Environment and thank the many individuals in the Department of Environment who worked very well on this progressive piece of legislation. Of course, thanks to the many individuals throughout the Yukon who also contributed to what we have here today.

Mr. Tredger: It gives me pleasure to rise on behalf of the Official Opposition and my constituents in Mayo-Tatchun to speak to Bill No. 62, *Animal Health Act*.

I'd like to begin by thanking the staff of Energy, Mines and Resources as well as Environment, particularly the staff at the Agriculture branch for the work they put into this and the careful consideration they gave to it. This is an important act. The more I read it and the more I think about it, the more I realize the magnitude of it and the importance of getting it right.

This contemplates where the expansion of our burgeoning agriculture industry meets wildlife in our less populated areas.

For thousands of years, First Nations have hunted and gathered on the land, harvesting living in harmony with their land. It is through the harvesting of animals, fish and birds that they developed their culture and transmit their culture. Their way of life, their language, the customs and their spirituality are all part of the land and part of the water.

With climate change that way of life is at a very vulnerable stage. I know in the Mayo-Tatchun area, plant life is moving north. Different animals that haven't been seen are moving. The salmon industry is threatened and declining.

On the other hand, Yukon has a burgeoning agricultural industry. We support efforts to build that industry — small entrepreneurial, innovative farmers reaching out onto the land and building an industry. It's important that when we consider and contemplate this act, we get it right and we achieve a balance between the protection of wildlife and the support for a burgeoning industry.

When I talk about a burgeoning industry, that industry has been around for over 100 years. Mines were supported and farms were developed to support our communities. There is a bit of concern in the agricultural community that sometimes the regulations are established for large-scale agriculture, modeled on agriculture developed in the south where farms are close together and much more intensive. Upon first reading of this act, it seems to have achieved a good balance. As we delve into it, I will be looking for that balance. I'll be asking questions as to how we support the agricultural industry through education, sharing of ideas, sharing of research, and if we separate those officials who will

be delivering that from those who will be involved in inspection and enforcement.

As I said, I enjoyed the read. I found it very informative.

I commend the departments and officials involved for their involvement and the way they went about consultation. I look forward to discussing the act in further detail as we get into the meat of it in future sessions.

Hon. Mr. Kent: It's my pleasure to speak at second reading to this act brought forward by the Minister of Environment. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources played a very important role in the development of the act. Much of the heavy lifting from a ministerial perspective was done by my predecessor in this role, but I was very pleased, upon assuming responsibility for Energy, Mines and Resources, to be involved with the Minister of Environment in bringing this through to its tabling and, as we progress through this bill, into third reading and assent later on this session.

As Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I am responsible for agriculture and agriculture programs. I'd like to touch on a couple of the things the government is doing to support agricultural development in the territory. The Growing Forward 2 agreement between Canada and Yukon has been renewed. It's a strong commitment to Yukon's agriculture sector by the federal and territorial governments working together in building the productivity, profitability and competitiveness of our agriculture industry.

It builds on a previous agreement, but places more emphasis on proactive strategic investments and innovation, market-based profitability, adaptability and long-term sustainable growth. What this agreement will provide is \$1.48 million annually for the next five years, which began on April 1, 2013, for a variety of agriculture and agri-food processing projects and activities. The government is committed to working with farmers and industry associations to increase the production of locally grown foods in a sustainable and profitable manner.

I had the opportunity this year to attend the North of 60 Agriculture Conference and banquet here in Whitehorse. I was able to stop in to some of the sessions during the day as that conference proceeded. Last night, I attended a meeting of the Growers of Organic Food Yukon society at Yukon College. It was very informative and well-attended. As I get more and more comfortable with the agriculture portfolio, it's important for me to reach out to organizations like that and visit with them first-hand and hear their issues and concerns. Going forward I'll also be meeting with other associations — the Yukon Agricultural Association, for example, as well as the Yukon Game Growers Association.

One committee that I'll be visiting with early in December is the Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee. It brings together a number of the stakeholder associations and community groups that are involved in agriculture to identify issues and concerns and reach some resolution, if they can, on those issues and concerns. I've heard very encouraging things from the work of that committee, the officials involved and

the organizations involved. I think it's very exciting to see that work move forward in a collaborative manner, especially on some of the tougher issues that have been raised previously in this House with respect to agriculture and the things that are going on.

I'm going to be brief at second reading here, but there are so many things that the Agriculture branch programs do to support industry. Of course, the release of agriculture land by way of spot land sales for farming and livestock grazing is incredibly important. When we talk about agriculture lands — and it came up again last night at the meeting I attended — availability, affordability and suitability seem to be certainly the buzzwords that we hear from many of the farmers who are active and many of the individuals who are trying to break into the agriculture section here.

Extension services that provide professional education and technical services to farmers and research and demonstration projects designed to improve the economic delivery of northern agriculture — I heard of some of the educational programs that are being offered by our organic farmers at the meeting last night, as well as some of the research that is currently being conducted by the agriculture research committee and the work that is being done in conjunction with the Yukon College Research Centre with respect particularly to the greenhouse that is located at Yukon College.

There are a number of meat inspection services, including operation and maintenance of the mobile abattoir and animal health testing programs.

I already spoke about the \$1.48-million annual Growing Forward 2 agreement that is now in place to address many of the projects that are brought forward — again, targeting those three strategic outcomes of innovation, competitiveness in market development, and adaptability and sustainability.

I think there are tremendous opportunities that exist within our agricultural industry here. I know this act is designed to provide some clarity to much of the game-growers and livestock owners who are active in the Yukon. We're excited about that and incredibly excited about the opportunities.

Just in closing, at the agriculture banquet I attended, it was curious for me to learn that of the \$100 million annually spent by Yukoners on food, only two percent of that comes from the local agriculture industry, so there is a lot of room to grow in that industry. I look forward to working with the stakeholders and department officials in Energy, Mines and Resources, as well as the partners in Environment, to ensure we continue to see Yukon foods and Yukon food products achieve the value that they deserve in our local market and our domestic market on a going-forward basis.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: In speaking to this legislation, I will be brief, but I did want to note a couple of key things that should be understood for those who are wondering or trying to understand what this legislation is intended to do and why it's coming forward.

In part the Canadian food system and the rules around it — primarily through CFIA — Canadian Food Inspection Agency — but also involving every province and territory — there have been changes made to the food system, particularly in the wake of events that occurred such as years ago with BSE and the issues that occurred in B.C. around the outbreak within a number of chicken farms of avian influenza.

Those are some of the things that have been driving the national agenda and the changes that CFIA and provinces have made around traceability of product and around looking at what would occur in similar situations to what happened in British Columbia. The changes that are being made to Yukon's *Animal Health Act* in part reflect the fact of what we saw from the B.C. experience and the need to have legislation that provides — in the case of an outbreak of a communicable disease within an animal population — particularly one that could be spread to humans — that every government needs to ensure it has the ability in that type of situation to take appropriate steps and that includes having legislation that allows for incremental steps to be taken to establish quarantine zones, et cetera, to avoid government using the blunt tool that governments can use in the most extreme cases of invoking their respective emergency measures acts in the provinces and territories.

A significant part of the priority of this update to the *Animal Health Act* is to allow for quarantine zones to establish for surveillance and control on the basis of science and also to put in place an appeal process for those decisions.

Another thing that was not prohibited by legislation before, but was also not explicitly provided for, was compensation to animal owners in the event of losses. That is another important change that is being made here because, should we ever get into a situation during Yukon's future where there were an outbreak of some disease that was communicable, it's appropriate that we have incremental tools to use that are proportionate to the problem and don't cause unnecessary impact to others as well as to have legislation for action to be taken quickly to prevent problems spreading and having a greater effect both on other animals and on humans. A key priority for us in amending this legislation was ensuring that there is the ability for farmers to receive compensation in that type of situation because those things can be quite devastating to a family — to their income — and in the case where B.C. was forced into the situation to take action related to an outbreak of influenza within a number of poultry farms, the economic consequences to people who were involved was also quite significant.

That's something we believe is appropriate to ensure that we have the ability, should such an unfortunate occurrence ever happen at some point in Yukon's future, to treat people compassionately in those situations and recognize both the economic and emotional value that farmers place on their livestock.

With that, I think I've addressed the key parts in that area. I would note that during the consultation that occurred, there were changes and concerns that came from Yukon farmers that there were amendments made to the draft legislation, and

we tried to incorporate what those concerns were and, where there was good input, ensure that this legislation was recognizing what we were hearing from Yukon citizens.

With that, I will conclude my remarks and thank the members opposite for their comments in support of this legislation.

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

Hon. Mr. Dixon: I'd like to thank members who have spoken earlier to this legislation in second reading and to thank them in advance for their support. From what I heard, it sounds like we will have a fairly strong degree of support for this legislation moving forward.

I did want to reiterate a few items and mention a few things that I did forget to mention in my second reading speech earlier today.

This isn't the first step forward for us in terms of animal health in the territory. We have done a number of things since I've been minister, as well as going back to previous governments that actually created the animal health unit beginning in 2009. One aspect that I did want to mention was that, as important as it is to have the tools in place to deal with the outbreak or spread of a potential disease in the territory, the best remedy we can undertake is prevention altogether. If we can prevent diseases from entering the territory, we don't have to deal with their spread.

One of the diseases that we have identified as being of great threat and something that other jurisdictions have dealt with to their detriment is chronic wasting disease. That's why I was pleased to announce earlier this year that the Yukon government is prohibiting the import or possession of cervids killed outside of the Yukon — those are members of the deer family — to minimize the risk of introducing chronic wasting disease to Yukon wild game populations, both farmed and wild.

The new rules that we put in place will help maintain Yukon's natural healthy meat supply, and it will also protect the economic interest of game farmers, outfitters and tourism operators. Chronic wasting disease has not yet been found in Yukon animals and these rules put in place earlier this year will complement the current prohibition on importing live cervids to the Yukon.

For many years the Department of Environment has asked Yukon deer and elk hunters to voluntarily refrain from bringing home certain body parts from animals harvested outside of the territory. The wildlife regulation will now ban the import, sale or possession of scent lures sold for the hunting of cervids, which include deer, elk, caribou and moose, that contain animal body fluids or tissues that could introduce disease agents, particularly CWD, to Yukon.

The import or possession of the whole carcass or any part of a cervid that has been killed or has died outside the Yukon is also banned, with the following body parts exempted: meat, not including bones, or portions of the carcass where the spinal column and head have been removed; finished

taxidermy mounts, tanned hides or raw hide kept in a protective container that will be tanned within five days of entering Yukon; teeth, if completely removed from the head; and antlers with or without an attached skull cap if no tissue or hide remains.

Cervids harvested in the Northwest Territories or in the two most northerly hunting zones in British Columbia are also exempt, as are cervids that are in a protective container and being transported through Yukon. In the event that cervids or cervid parts brought into Yukon test positive for CWD, the person responsible for importing the animal must immediately notify a conservation officer.

The new rules align with those in place in Alaska, British Columbia and Alberta. They will not prevent the natural movement of animals across borders, so the risk of introducing CWD, while low at present, is not eliminated. The new rules will be set out in a 2013-14 hunting regulations summary that is currently available and can be viewed at www.env.gov.yk.ca.

Mr. Speaker, that was one of the preventive actions we took earlier this year to limit the possibility of a particular disease — chronic wasting disease — entering Yukon. I thought it was a reasonable action to take, given the spread of the disease in southern parts of the country as well as the United States, and it was a logical next step for us.

We did take that action in consultation with a number of groups, including outfitters, both in Yukon and British Columbia who operate in northern British Columbia, and taxidermists and hunters. I think once we explained the intent and method of application of this new regulation, all those groups supported moving forward with the regulation to ban these cervid parts being brought into the Yukon.

Hunters who go down to Alberta and Saskatchewan can still bring their meat home and they can still bring their antlers home, but they can't bring those parts of the cervid body that have a high risk of transferring CWD, including the spinal column and other body fluids. As well, the risk of spreading the disease is also apparent in fluids that are drawn from an animal or a cervid and some of those fluids can be used in scents or lures that were previously available for sale in Yukon. So they are no longer available. I believe there was one store that had sold them. We were able to accommodate them to no longer import that and they were happy to do so, is my understanding.

Turning back to the animal health unit itself — I mentioned earlier today that it is made up of chief veterinary officer, Mary VanderKop, and the program veterinarian, Dr. Jane Harms. I didn't mention the laboratory coordinator, Meghan Larivee, who deserves recognition as well as being an important component of the animal health unit. So I did want to mention her name as well in thanking staff for the work they've done on developing not only this piece of legislation, but the animal health unit as a whole.

Turning back again to this legislation — as I said earlier, it's in response to Yukon's growing agriculture sector and the need to better respond to emerging animal health issues. While we have today at least focused primarily on animal

health, I think it's important to recognize that these animal health issues are also very important for human health as well. We have seen over the past several years examples of fairly high-profile disease outbreaks in animals that also pose a threat to human health. I listed a few before, but a few others are mad cow disease, E. coli, West Nile virus and avian influenza. These are all examples of animal health issues, but they have a significant impact on human health potentially as well.

The new act as it is tabled here in the House today — or as it is before us currently — will help protect livestock and wildlife health. It will also support local food security and help safeguard human health. It reflects the input received from the public review held earlier this year and supports existing farming practices and processes.

The act here differs from the current *Animal Health Act*. This modernized act ensures orders for quarantine, surveillance and control are science-based and clearly communicated to individuals. It modernizes the tools to manage hazards to animal health and it provides for compensation to animal owners in the event of losses and introduces an appeal process.

We did hear clearly through the public review that animal health decisions need to be made on the basis of science and that a new act gives government the — as I was saying, the decisions need to be based on science. The new act gives government the tools and authority to deal with hazards to animal health.

As well, the new act reflects public input that all animals are valued by Yukoners and livestock have emotional as well as economic value to farms. I think that's an important thing that needs to be understood as well. Animals, of course, have a certain relationship with humans and even livestock tends to have more than an economic value to people. It ensures that when action must be taken to control disease, owners are given fair notice and the actions are fully justified. As I mentioned earlier, the *Animal Health Act* will continue to complement the federal responsibility for animal health carried out by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.

The act offers a wide range of penalties and provides flexible options for the courts to tailor the penalty to the severity of the offence and the personal circumstances of the individual. As I said earlier today, Mr. Speaker, one of the key components of the animal health unit is providing educational materials for the public related to both animal and human health as they pertain to livestock.

I did mention the article that our chief veterinary officer provides to *InFARMation*, the Agriculture branch's newsletter. I should also note that there are a number of other ways that we are advancing educational opportunities related to animal health. Those include a number of examples prepared for distribution to the Yukon public. There are fact sheets that are available on Yukon Environment website and available in Yukon government offices and those fact sheets are on specific diseases and specific health issues related to animals that are very valuable to a lot of Yukoners.

I spoke a little bit earlier about chronic wasting disease and why CWD is a challenge and something we should be aware of.

Of course the animal health unit provides a fact sheet on CWD and how to limit the chances of bringing CWD back home if you hunt outside the Yukon. There is also information about winter ticks in Yukon, which is an issue not just in Yukon but across northern Canada. There are a number of other ones, including equine infectious anemia, but I don't need to list them all. I did want to note that there is another publication on diseases you can get from Fish and Wildlife, which has been widely distributed to hunters, trappers and farmers, and a new *Poultry Health Handbook*, which has just been finalized.

I think we have covered the gamut in terms of why this act is so important, and I look forward to voting in favour of it and speaking about it in Committee of the Whole. I look forward to members' questions at that time.

Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Pasloski: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: Agree.

Hon. Ms. Taylor: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Graham: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Kent: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Nixon: Agree.

Ms. McLeod: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Istchenko: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Agree.

Mr. Hassard: Agree.

Mr. Elias: Agree.

Ms. Hanson: Agree.

Ms. Stick: Agree.

Ms. Moorcroft: Agree.

Ms. White: Agree.

Mr. Tredger: Agree.

Mr. Barr: Agree.

Mr. Silver: Agree.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 18 yeas, nil nays.

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

Motion for second reading of Bill No. 62 agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair (Ms. McLeod): Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the committee is Bill No. 58, *Child Support Administrative Recalculation 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. 58: Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 58, entitled *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: I look forward to hearing questions from the members opposite on this important piece of legislation.

Ms. Moorcroft: As I said at second reading, the Official Opposition supports this bill and I have a few brief questions I'd like to ask the minister to respond to. I'm going to start with a matter I spoke to officials about. When it comes to the application of this act, how does it apply to same-sex couples, to common-law spouses, as well as married couples? We have had some comments from same-sex couples who have indicated they have had some challenges in child support matters.

Perhaps the minister can give a brief explanation.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: This legislation speaks to the payor and a recipient and it has no relevance on the sex or gender of the couple, so same-sex couples — or former couples, if they're separated, as they would be in this situation — would be treated no differently from anybody else as is the common practice or common law.

Ms. Moorcroft: The *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act* is designed to provide cost-efficient access to justice, and we appreciate that. The Acting Minister of Justice indicated that this act will only apply to cases that are not complex. I'm wondering if he has any information about how many cases overall would be considered complex? Is it about 10 percent of the cases that come forward, or do they have any idea of the numbers?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: We don't have a specific number, but I think we can say with confidence that it would apply to most or the vast majority of cases.

Ms. Moorcroft: Following up on the fact that the recalculation service would only be applied to simple cases —

and it's my understanding that cases involving joint custody of children or unstable income would not be considered — would all joint custody cases be precluded or are some of the joint custody cases, in fact, simple rather than complex?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Shared custody arrangements will be considered under this system.

Ms. Moorcroft: Then is shared custody the same as joint custody?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Based on the intent of the question, I think the answer is yes. I think there is some detail there. But based on where it seems the member is going, we believe the answer is yes.

Ms. Moorcroft: At the briefing that we had last week, I raised the subject of the effectiveness of the service and how it would be evaluated so improvements might be made. How will the department be monitoring how the child support administrative recalculation service is being implemented and developing potential improvements.

Hon. Mr. Dixon: At this point we already keep very detailed statistics about the cases and users of the system as it is. Of course, as we implement the new legislation and as we undertake the new services, we'll be monitoring to determine if there are new statistics or metrics we need to consider. If there are, of course, we will take that into consideration and make adjustments as necessary.

I think we're confident with the level of information that we have currently and we're confident that that amount of data and statistics should be sufficient to give us information on the effectiveness of the program going forward.

Ms. Moorcroft: Would the minister, for the record, please confirm that the new *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act* will fall under the *Interjurisdictional Support Orders Act*?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: If the pair is in Yukon, then it will apply to orders under the act the member mentioned.

Ms. Moorcroft: Just to follow up on that question, if one parent is living in the Yukon and another parent is living in another jurisdiction in Canada or elsewhere where the Yukon has an interjurisdictional agreement, will that interjurisdictional agreement fall into play?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: If the support order and the payor are resident in Yukon, they will apply.

Ms. Moorcroft: Have the other jurisdictions that have already brought forward their own child support administrative recalculation act — and there are several of them — had the act in place for long enough to have considered interjurisdictional maintenance enforcement orders and to have developed regulations or policy on that?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Not all jurisdictions do include those orders, but Yukon will.

Ms. Moorcroft: The final question that I have for the minister is also one that I mentioned in the second reading debate earlier today. We understand that the service will handle some high-conflict cases and both the recalculation staff and maintenance enforcement staff need supports to deal with potential conflict. They do a good job under what can sometimes be trying circumstances.

What measures will be taken to ensure that the government workers who are providing this service are given proper training to support them in their work to deal with any kind of high-conflict situations?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: There are opportunities available for our staff to be trained in a number of ways and those training opportunities will be made available to any staff who have to deal with the situations the member is talking about. The training opportunities include difficult conversations with challenging individuals or folks who are difficult to deal with on a personal basis. There is training provided to deal with those individuals and to deal with those difficult conversations. One particular type of training is verbal judo, I understand, and that's apparently quite useful.

Chair: Is there any further general debate? We're going to move onto 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 Clause 6

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Clause 7 agreed to

On Clause 8

Clause 8 agreed to

On Clause 9

Clause 9 agreed to

On Clause 10

Clause 10 agreed to

On Clause 11

Clause 11 agreed to

On Clause 12

Clause 12 agreed to

On Clause 13

Clause 13 agreed to

On Clause 14

Clause 14 agreed to

On Clause 15

Clause 15 agreed to

On Clause 16

Clause 16 agreed to

On Clause 17

Clause 17 agreed to

On Clause 18

Ms. Moorcroft: I would just like to ask the Acting Minister of Justice if he can give us a timetable on when he expects this bill will be brought into effect and when he anticipates that the regulations will be completed?

Hon. Mr. Dixon: We are aiming for the act to come into effect in June of 2014 and the regulations in accord with

the policy in the act, which has been informed of the consultations, will be completed then as well.

Clause 18 agreed to

On Clause 19

Clause 19 agreed to

On Clause 20

Clause 20 agreed to

On Clause 21

Clause 21 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Chair: Thank you. That clears Bill No. 58.

We're going to proceed with Bill No. 11, *Second Appropriation Act, 2013-14*, continuing on with Community Services. Committee of the Whole will break for 10 minutes.

Recess

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

Bill No. 11: *Second Appropriation Act, 2013-14* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Vote 51, Department of Community Services, in Bill No. 11, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2013-14*.

Mr. Cathers has the floor with 13 minutes and 45 seconds remaining.

Department of Community Services — *continued*

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I certainly won't take all that time here this afternoon. I look forward to hearing further questions from the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes.

Mr. Barr: Welcome back to the staff of Community Services — it's nice to have you back. I have not too many more questions left for the minister, so I'll just get right to them.

In regard to the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act*, we're still living under the old act and regulations. I understand they need to be crafted and passed for the new act to take effect. Can the minister let us know what the timelines will be for the regulations to be brought forward?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I would first of all like to note that the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* work was a significant policy initiative and I recognize the work of the former Minister of Community Services, as well as staff of Community Services, for their good work in leading this initiative — as well as other departments and agencies that were involved, including another area of my portfolio, the Yukon Housing Corporation staff — for their involvement in that. Community Services staff led the public consultation and the policy work on this and I'd like to thank people who contributed to that initiative and commented during the act.

The regulations also have a significant amount of policy work related to them. There are areas of the regulations that will be going out for consultation later this month. The

member should stay tuned for an announcement soon regarding the request for public comment on the regulations under the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act*, which will be out before the end of November.

Mr. Barr: In keeping with the regulations, I'd also like to inquire as to when the regulations for oil-fired appliances will be coming.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: First, contextually, the Yukon established an Oil-Fired Appliance Working Group to make recommendations that led in the spring of 2013 to the *Oil-Fired Appliance Safety Statutory Amendment Act*, which was passed by the Yukon Legislative Assembly. The changes provide for the ability to create new regulations to improve the safety and installation of oil-fired appliances.

Through the good work of my two predecessors in Community Services and Yukon Housing Corporation respectively, there is also input from the public in the community tours that heard what concerns were from rural Yukon. I can tell the member that in putting forward the legislation and developing the regulations, our focuses are on making improvements to the safety of Yukon heating systems, but also doing so in a practical, common-sense manner that acknowledges and understands the realities of rural Yukon in particular, and proceeds in a reasonable manner to address those concerns.

In addition to that, I would note that in the legislation we have moved forward with requiring carbon monoxide detectors in residences, which I believe is the first jurisdiction in the country to do so. Other steps include commitments we made to launching an oil-burner mechanic training program and conducting a public awareness campaign on heating system safety. The public consultation on that will enable us to ensure that we have an appropriate range of regulations that respond appropriately to the areas where we can improve safety while doing so in a realistic manner.

Mr. Barr: I must have missed when the regulations would be coming forward on that. I understand there is a lot to do. The specific question was: when can we look forward to having the regulations coming forward?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I'm not at this point able to give the member more specific details or timelines, but I look forward to being in a position to do so before too long. What I would note to the member is that, as I suspect he is probably aware — but just to reiterate to him and others — the number of policy initiatives Community Services has been working on is quite substantial. The *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* and *Oil-Fired Appliance Safety Statutory Amendment Act* are both initiatives that require significant policy and legal work, so the investment of time by staff of Community Services as well as legal drafters in the Department of Justice is significant and there are only so many things that any one person can do at one point in time. We have confidence that staff are doing the good work that is necessary in these areas.

We look forward to doing our level best to come up with an end result that reflects what we have heard from Yukon citizens and develops regulations that improve safety of oil-fired appliances, but also that we do so in a matter that

recognizes what I have heard, what my predecessor as Minister of Community Services heard — as well as my predecessor as minister responsible for Yukon Housing Corporation — and what staff of both that department and corporation heard from Yukon citizens and Yukon communities.

Mr. Barr: We on this side of the House know that there is a lot of work, and also we very much identify with the people who have been waiting for both the *Landlord and Tenant Act* and the regulations for oil-fired appliances to end up being in effect so people can actually live in and have the comfort of living in rental units with oil-fired appliances — I myself have an oil-fired appliance — and know that they are safe. I recognize the hard work of the folks in Community Services and look forward to the action coming sooner than later. I just wish them the best in their endeavours in doing this so we can get on with this important work.

I will move on to the Beaver Creek fire hall. I notice there is nothing in the budget for that. I understand that developing a plan and the budget has had some setbacks. I know that it was a major promise by the Yukon Party government.

I also recall at the time that although Carcross, to my understanding, was to be next in line for a fire hall — which has now become part of the infrastructure needs identifying Carcross. We spoke earlier today that within that facility itself, the fire hall, EMS and search and rescue be housed in one place. It is quite in disarray at this point. However, my understanding is that the government felt Beaver Creek required this work and yet there is no action as to any actual building going on. Can the minister tell me where the work is at for the Beaver Creek fire hall?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: First of all, I want to correct the record. The member had a couple things that I do need correct. First, his characterization of the status of the Beaver Creek fire hall project is portrayed in a more negative light than what is really appropriate for the situation. In fact, the project work is ongoing on that. The issue that occurred in that case is that the lowest bid received for construction of the facility came in well above the approved budget. Design changes have been approved that will reduce the complexity of the building and come back within budget.

I would point out that in this area — although this situation was a project that was separately tendered — we are making efforts and looking toward standardizing the designs for our fire halls, because we have had examples of our buildings where we know that they work and we know that they're functional. We don't need or want to see in the future designs coming in that may be very reflective of an architect's vision, but are too expensive for government resources and really go beyond what is a functional building. So we're focusing on that and have taken steps to ensure we're doing what's necessary in the future in this area.

Madam Chair, the other point I would note to the member is that in the 2011-12 facility condition index, Highways and Public Works ranked the Beaver Creek fire hall as one of the buildings most in need of action. So the member's view — and it may be a perception the member heard — that the

Carcross fire hall would be the next fire hall built and would be built before Beaver Creek — but based on information provided by officials resulted in determining that this project should be moved forward quickly. We do recognize that the Carcross fire hall does need to be looked at and that at some point in the not-too-distant future there will need to be work in that area.

The facility for Beaver Creek will house the Beaver Creek volunteer fire department, Search and Rescue and community EMS — the rural EMS crew for Beaver Creek.

The other thing that I would note — and this is something we have committed to — we are committed to getting that work done as quickly as it can be done. Because the design provided by the architect went outside the cost that we were prepared to spend and we felt we needed to spend to get a perfectly functional, operational building in that area, the architect was then asked and tasked to do some additional work and reduce the cost of the structure, while meeting the core objectives for that project and ensuring that the facility met the operational needs that were originally intended to be part of that facility. The facility will do exactly what we intended it to do, and that's why the design is being updated.

Our plan is to begin construction of a new fire hall in 2014-15, and this project is a priority that we have committed to doing and are focused on delivering in a timely manner. The revision to the design was necessary to reduce the cost of the building while achieving its core objectives.

The other thing I would just note in reference to Carcross fire hall specifically, as well as the other community projects that the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes raised — if the member will look back to one of the letters he was referring to earlier, he'll see that in fact there is a fairly long list of conceptual projects that were suggested by the author of the letter.

While we do appreciate that every one of Yukon's communities will continue to have projects into the future, there is a limited amount that can be done at one point in time and we need to work with communities to reduce the wish list that may reflect what someone would ideally like to have down to jointly coming up with what priority items are for Yukon government and municipalities or unincorporated communities to work together on — jointly get a sense of the need and the usage a community would place on various facilities and various projects.

We have to consider the priorities of other communities and the various cost pressures that are placed on all municipalities and on the Yukon government itself when we are making those budgetary decisions. That's why we work with our partners in the municipalities and with local advisory councils as well as hear from our constituents and from other Yukoners, and that's why we also work with our dedicated and capable staff to try and determine which projects can be built in any fiscal year and when we're able to proceed forward with designing other projects that will be built in future fiscal years.

Mr. Barr: I do think that it will be happy news that the folks in Beaver Creek will be looking forward to a new

facility, given the dates reflected by the minister's comments of 2014-15.

Further to my response to the comments, I would again suggest that the minister come out to Carcross — maybe meet with some of the local folks and have a look at our community centre, for example, and anything else to help the government with their vision of the priorities throughout the territory — and have a chat with some of the folks who were working on these endeavours long before I — and even before the minister opposite — was in this position. I know it has been a long time. I'm aware that other communities are vying for the same dollars, but I think it might be helpful to just come out and have a look around and see.

One of the recent letters and feelings of the community is that, as has just been pointed out and as the minister may well know, generally our potlaches and community dinners and such are held in the school gymnasium. However, recently the Department of Education has decreed that the school is not be used by the community for these events that include food and drink, as such.

It leaves us with not a lot of options. When we're trying to host 200 or 300 people, the community club just does not — I think we can maybe get 60 in there. The kitchen facilities in the club are highly questionable.

In that regard, I'd just extend the chance to come out and speak directly with some of the local community leaders who have been at this for a while. We could have a coffee after over at Caribou Commons and enjoy some of the good eats that are there now. I believe they are going to be closing in the first few weeks of December for a few months. I just put that out there.

I'll speak on solid-waste facilities, and one of the things that has come to my attention is that the lifespan of our solid-waste facilities are coming to an end. I know that in Marsh Lake, for example, it has been brought to my attention that maybe they have a year left. In Carcross they may have one or two years left — I'm not sure — and Dawson is similar.

There was a study that was brought forward. The government asked consultants from outside to maybe address this issue, and it recommended that a berm go up around the actual landfill site to extend it by maybe a couple of years. From speaking with a few of the contractors out that way, they had suggested the same thing at no charge. However, it's final and they are going to do the berms, and I think that may be what happened in Carcross.

But I guess the major concern is the vision and the planning throughout the territory that would have to be in place now — to have alternate sites for our solid-waste facilities because they are coming to their life expectancy. One of the things that adds to that life expectancy — when I was at the LAC in Carcross just the other night and it's happening around the territory in other solid-waste facilities — is that contractors, because there are no tipping fees, are driving outside of Whitehorse to off-load their material, which is filling our solid waste at a more rapid rate than we would have ever expected. I have heard some of the folks will drive as far as Dawson, so it's creating quite an issue with our

capability at a local level — the infrastructure needs, with sewage. One of the possible considerations is the groundwater levels — that it would go into the nearest creek that leads into Nares Lake, which eventually leads into the Yukon River, which passes right by Dawson and into the Bering Sea. It affects quite a broad spectrum of situations. I'll just leave it at that.

Before I do that, I'll just say some of the solutions — possibly having a brainstorming session as to how each community can best regulate who is coming, whether it's in Dawson, Marsh Lake or Pelly, and so it's local folks who are dumping off their stuff and not having construction companies showing up where there are no tipping fees.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I think some of the information the member has is not actually accurate about the age of the facilities here. What has occurred here is that most of the solid-waste facilities operated by the Yukon have been changed over to transfer stations, where household garbage is hauled to the City of Whitehorse landfill. As I mentioned before, there have been steps taken by the summer of 2012. Community Services had converted 16 of its 18 solid-waste facilities from open-pit burning to transfer stations.

I would again note that previous governments were burning garbage there and it was ourselves — we took the action to move away from burning at transfer stations. I know that the member was not in previous governments, including the previous NDP government, which continued to burn solid waste, so I will acknowledge that. I know this is his first term in the Legislature. We are proud of the fact that we are the ones who recognized that burning all of the solid waste dumped at dumps was not either an environmentally appropriate or health-appropriate method of disposing this garbage. It was a method that would result in toxins entering the air. Again as I noted, in the summer of 2012, Community Services had converted 16 of its 18 solid-waste facilities from open-pit burning to transfer stations. Moving away from burning was a key objective in the *Solid Waste Action Plan, Yukon*.

As I mentioned before in responding to questions from the member, the changeover from the simpler and cheaper solution of burning garbage is one that had a significant cost to it. It also has meant a significant increase to the volumes of solid waste that were being transferred from Yukon government facilities and the challenges that municipal facilities were facing with similar increases in volume as a result of also moving.

The steps that were taken that the Yukon government — again the *Solid Waste Action Plan, Yukon* came out in November 2009. Steps that were taken to move away from burning were very important, but also created a significant challenge in the increase of operational requirements related to the amount of garbage that was being transported as we moved from landfills to transfer stations.

The reason for doing that — for those who are not quite clear on the reasons why garbage would be transferred from areas rather than being put into a landfill — is the changes made through the Department of Environment to the standards

around our dumps and the need to test groundwater. There is also, as we move to more modern dump styles, the need to have an impermeable liner in dumps and to test for leachate as a significant cost. In fact, it's cheaper to have a limited number of landfill sites and transfer garbage than it is to operate every one as an engineered facility and to test for leachate, which is why we have done things including entering into a regional solid-waste agreement with the City of Dawson and entering into the agreement with City of Whitehorse to ship garbage in from rural areas into the Whitehorse landfill.

We've also invested in the City of Whitehorse's composting program, including an investment that I signed roughly a month or six weeks ago, I believe it was — might have even been two months ago — of roughly over \$1 million — I can't recall the exact number off the top of my head — investing in Whitehorse's composting program through the gas tax funding that we have available. We worked with them on that and provided that investment to them in accordance with their allocations identified under gas tax funding.

The simple answer to the member's question is that I think some of what he's heard about the status of the facilities is not quite accurate but we are in fact, as I noted, currently hauling household garbage from transfer stations to the Whitehorse landfill, including all of the transfer stations within the Whitehorse periphery.

The work that is being done right now is that now we have had the experience of a couple years of operating facilities at the new volumes of garbage, staff get some time to understand it and work with our partners including local advisory councils and municipalities to discuss their challenges. I personally took the opportunity this fall during my visits to Yukon communities to talk to all of Yukon's incorporated municipalities as well as to a number of the others. As I believe I mentioned earlier, I met with some, but not all, of the local advisory councils due to time constraints and some, but not all, First Nations that are involved in providing services and I look forward to continuing with those who I was not able to yet speak to. Once we're out of session, I look forward to doing more community visits.

With regard to the member's specific suggestion of visiting Carcross' facilities, I did meet with the local advisory council and discussed issues including some matters they wished to discuss that were not primarily facility related. Due to time constraints, I was not able to visit Carcross prior to session, but look forward to doing so once the House has risen. I look forward to working with the local advisory council and Carcross-Tagish First Nation to discuss their priorities to hopefully come up with a common set of agreed priorities for moving forward in the Carcross area.

As I mentioned to the member, my understanding, based on the last conversation that I had and with previous correspondence related to this matter, is that the local advisory council and the Carcross-Tagish First Nation were not of the same view in terms of what the priority was for investment in Carcross. A long list of projects that a community would like to see is helpful but, as I mentioned earlier, we need to work

together to focus on priority projects because of the limitations of the dollars we have available to us.

What else did the member ask? The member ascribed contractors dumping at transfer stations to the lack of tipping fees at those transfer stations. What I would point out is the other angle on that, which I have mentioned to several members of Whitehorse City Council during discussions at Association of Yukon Communities — the experience we've seen as a result of tipping fees — we understand why Whitehorse has done so and why others might look to doing so. But issues around garbage dumping — roadside dumping, dumping in gravel pits and dumping on First Nation land in the periphery of Whitehorse — started happening directly after Whitehorse put in place tipping fees.

One thing is that I understand the challenges they have, but in terms of whether we would look at doing that at facilities, one thing we have to take very seriously and consider is if there are people, as we have seen, who are prepared to dump their garbage somewhere to avoid a tipping fee.

If we don't have an effective and realistic enforcement program, which also has a high cost to it, and if we can't enforce and prevent roadside dumping, we have to take seriously and consider what the unintended consequences are of charging tipping fees rather than looking at other alternatives such as if fees are being charged, doing so in an upfront manner, such as occurs in a number of municipalities for certain services like water and sewer services.

So that is an area that again, I would make the point to members that, as far as contractors go, we also can't prevent them from dumping at those facilities. They are legally allowed to use them, although they are strongly encouraged not to. What we have done is taken some steps, such as the work being done by my colleague, the Minister of Environment and his department, to review the beverage container regulations to look at increased fees for recyclables and increased refunds for most currently recyclable beverage containers. As well, through Designated Materials Regulations, looking at adding additional products to it as was done with tires being an example several years ago. Charging upfront fees for certain types of products is a way that, by not penalizing someone from dumping where you want them to dump the garbage, does have an effect of reducing harm that is caused if someone dumps garbage, especially garbage with toxins in it, in a gravel pit. Then you have a contaminated site that can be difficult to clean up.

In the case of First Nation land, it poses a challenge for them and becomes an area where we aren't in a position to go in on their settlement land and take action. It poses challenges for them figuring out what steps to take to address settlement land that, because of illegal dumping, has become an area that has some potential contamination issues.

Those are some thoughts I would leave the member with and encourage him to give some thought to before suggesting that the solution to all garbage problems must be tipping fees at all facilities. We are continuing to work on these additional steps within the solid-waste operation to improve it, to find

efficiencies based on our experience to date. We are continuing to also work with the municipalities on finding ways to improve the way we are working together in the modernized solid-waste system that came about as the result of moving away from burning garbage.

Madam Chair, I would note that in modernizing solid-waste management, we're trying to adapt to current needs as well as having a system that works today and takes steps to plan for tomorrow, including increasing our efforts around recycling and diversion.

As I noted earlier, the steps taken by Environment to further encourage diversion through designated materials regulations and garbage container regulations are significant. We have also put in place for this year — and will evaluate the success of that program — credits similar to what the City of Whitehorse had put in place that have been referred to as “diversion credits.” These provide the Yukon's two recycling companies with the opportunity, rather than taking a loss on the transfer and sale of certain recyclable products, to address the issues around cardboard, in particular, by providing them with a credit for what they are diverting out of landfills based on an evaluation of their receipts when they sell those products down south.

That was something we were asked to do by both of Yukon's two recyclers in a letter they sent to me and the Minister of Environment earlier this year, and that we have put in place to provide additional incentives for the diversion of those types of materials. We will be evaluating the success of that to see whether it is something that it is appropriate to expand to other products. We are certainly very interested in composting initiatives, recycling initiatives and other realistic manners of diverting waste from our dumps and meeting our commitments around increasing diversion, but we do need to do so in a way that we're evaluating how well the programs are working and determining if there are ways that they can be improved.

That in a nutshell is also exactly what we are doing with our own solid-waste operations right now. After having some time to have them implemented, we are working with municipalities on coming up with a clear understanding of operational needs now and finding efficiencies now, as well as taking steps for and planning for what changes will mean as recycling and diversion efforts continue to gain greater results.

We are currently establishing 10-year operating plans for solid-waste facilities in unincorporated communities as well as working with municipalities on theirs to ensure they're in compliance with regulatory and permit requirements. We will continue to engage with them to acknowledge local perspectives on solid waste, to establish levels of service appropriate to each community, as well as to update and revise those plans if it becomes evident that there are ways we can find operational improvements within them, particularly for coming up with increased efficiencies in those areas.

Madam Chair, another area I should mention is insulation of groundwater-monitoring wells, which resulted in new costs for Yukon government and for municipalities that provide landfills. Those water-monitoring wells were not a

requirement years ago but it is part of moving out of the antiquated waste-management system that we inherited from the Liberals and NDP during their time in government toward a modern and environmentally sensitive —

I hear the Member for Mayo-Tatchun laughing but the facts are the facts. The NDP, during their time in government continued to burn —

Some Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Chair: Order please, Mr. Cathers has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: The NDP during their time in government continued to burn landfills. That was an issue that we inherited; it was an issue of concern and we are the ones who acted to end that practice. So the facts are the facts.

On the environment, the NDP talks a good line but we're the ones who actually take realistic, positive steps that acknowledge the importance of improving our environmental management and the steps we take to recognize health issues around things like the antiquated burning of garbage we inherited from the other two parties — which talk a good line in this area but, as with the housing file, don't do as much as we have done.

With that, in a nutshell, I think I've laid out what we're doing on the solid-waste area and look forward to continuing to work with municipalities, local advisory councils and the societies that are set up for waste management in some of our peripheral areas to find ways we can continue to improve operations and reduce costs of those operations, find efficiencies within the system and improve the management of our solid waste while increasing recycling and diversion.

Mr. Barr: I thank the minister opposite. Perhaps he misunderstood some of the questions or comments I made regarding the solid-waste facility. The actual question came forward from the LAC, which I said I would pass on, and there will be correspondence coming from the LAC on their concerns of the solid-waste facility. We know people are glad to have the recycling, although with the contracts, as the minister mentioned, there have been several bumps that have been disruptive.

But the LAC's concern is that it's the contractors who have been dumping at the facilities that are filling up the facilities themselves, and they were looking at ways of how to deal with this. They hadn't suggested tipping fees. Maybe that is what the minister thought I was getting at. It was because of the tipping fees that they're driving out with this construction material. It's a concern and they will be following up with correspondence about solutions or conversation regarding this matter.

I do look forward to seeing the Minister of Community Services in Carcross. I would be happy to be there and just have a walkabout. Those are my questions for today. I know that some of the other colleagues have some and I'll let them attend to their questions.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: Not having seen the correspondence from the LAC that the member referred to — and I don't think he specified which one — I look forward to hearing their concerns. Certainly, if there are suggestions they have, we're happy to give consideration to them.

One thing I should note in addition to the challenges that were posed as a result of moving away from burning garbage and moving toward transfer stations, I know for Yukon municipalities that has also caused challenges for them. There is concern in some of our rural communities about what the new requirements are that are coming next and whether there are additional changes there. I'd just like to reassure them that we understand the challenges those posed, although I'll let the Minister of Environment speak to the permitting issues as those are primarily his responsibility. Both the Minister of Environment and I understand the importance.

If staff were to come forward at some point in the future suggesting there should be changes to the regulations or the standard permit conditions for municipal landfills, I understand that any such changes could have an impact on municipalities. Certainly we have emphasized to staff the importance of ensuring that, before any such changes are implemented, the Yukon government consults with municipalities and shares with them any information that has caused staff to feel that there is a need to change the regulations or the standard permit conditions, and then give the municipalities time to express any concerns or suggestions they have with what staff have brought forward. But my understanding is that there is not an expectation that those permit conditions or environmental testing requirements are going to change. It has gone through a significant change recently with the requirements around testing groundwater and moving away from burning.

Our focus right now is on working within our own system, working with municipalities to help everyone understand what those operational requirements mean and ensure that we are working together to reduce those costs wherever it is possible to do so.

Just to add on that, the issues around handling of special and hazardous wastes is another area that I discussed with Yukon municipalities and with those who were at the Association of Yukon Communities meeting in Carmacks this fall. It is an area where we have joint recognition that there are some facilities that are currently not accepting certain wastes. I emphasized my view to municipalities that we need to ensure that there is a place for people to dump their hazardous wastes and their special wastes, even if it poses a cost for governments to address, both municipal and territorial.

It's something that we need to ensure that people don't become tempted — because of either fees or lack of place to dump garbage — to dispose of used oil or other special hazardous wastes in ditches, in creeks, in back yards and so on. We will work with them to determine what that means in terms of implementing that but it is one that I've discussed with municipalities and with those who were at Association of Yukon Communities and emphasized our view that where municipalities are not accepting certain wastes or any areas — if we are not dealing with it, we need to have realistic and reasonably accessible manners for people to dispose of special waste and hazardous waste.

Including even now with the changes coming down federally around moving away from incandescent light bulbs

toward compact fluorescents, one thing that a lot of people may not be really be aware of is that they shouldn't just be throwing those bulbs in the garbage because of mercury content. There is more of an issue around the disposal of those light bulbs than there has been previously with incandescents. That's another area that Environment ministers from across the country have also been discussing as a matter of national importance around what steps may need to be taken around extended producer responsibility for those types of products.

We are not the only ones who have seen a change to environmental rules and have had to change our systems as a result of it, but the Yukon went through a more dramatic change away from antiquated practices around garbage management. So with that and some of the changes that are affecting other provinces and territories, it does pose a challenge to municipalities, to LACs and to the Yukon government and we will work together on addressing it.

Mr. Silver: I would like to thank the department official for showing up today and giving us her time — much appreciated.

There are a couple more issues that haven't been addressed or some additional issues that have been addressed but I still haven't received a complete answer on.

I'm going to start with the 911 strategy. I was pleased to see that the committee struck under the Department of Justice was finally dissolved. It's my opinion that this is a basic preliminary step indicating that the Yukon Party is making some progress on the 911 file. A second step would be some form of statement that any new committee or working group would be spearheaded by the minister, not police or firefighter reps or EMS, but the minister responsible for Community Services or a designate from his office.

Since we have been down this road before, you can see why first-response officials would be less than likely to volunteer their time and their expertise on a working committee without a leadership role coming from the department. That's what happened with the Department of Justice and their 911 working group. I guess once bitten, twice shy, Madam Chair.

If the minister could provide us with an update — who is taking the lead on this file? Is there a new committee struck and is the minister's department taking the lead?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: The provision of 911 is something that I'll just note, as I did touch on it briefly earlier in the House. This is an issue we recognize that the Association of Yukon Fire Chiefs, and in particular the chair or president — I can't recall what his title is but he is the fire chief for the municipality of Dawson City, Jim Regimbal — recognized that they see this as a priority and that they believe it will result in improvement to service. We're very interested in looking at this. As I mentioned earlier, we have also heard from municipalities, including Carmacks notably, that at the current time they are thinking that they lean toward not supporting the move to 911 because they're concerned it may have a negative impact on dispatch.

What is important for us here is that the current status of the project is that we're waiting for some technical

information from Northwestel. We did receive a presentation from them in August and we have received additional information more recently, but we're waiting for an additional portion of information that we've requested.

As I said before in the House, and as I said to the Association of Yukon Communities in meeting with them, as well as with two municipalities I've met with, we're very interested in exploring the feasibility of expanding this service to communities. We also see it as very important to consider the municipal viewpoint on this and our agency partners who would be involved in this, which include the RCMP and Emergency Medical Services, including rural EMS units. We have heard that there are some who have concerns about what it would mean for dispatch and think that it's probably a step in the wrong direction.

While personally I think that there are probably ways to do it that would at some point in time improve service, not cause it to go the other way, we need to take a look at those technical issues. We need to discuss them and share them with partners, including the Association of Yukon Communities and individual municipalities. We need to share the information with the Association of Yukon Fire Chiefs.

The working group was struck. As the member I think noted, there was an inter-agency 911 management committee that was reconvened early this year. The committee struck a working group composed of representatives from first responders, the Association of Yukon Fire Chiefs and the Association of Yukon Communities. The working group has been focused on trying to get the job done. The membership of the working group includes, as I noted, representatives from municipalities, the Association of Yukon Communities, as well as the RCMP and City of Whitehorse. Discussions have been positive.

As I think I mentioned earlier, one of the first questions I've asked — we are waiting for the second part of the answer from Northwestel while we are discussing this. Because the issues around implementation and what it means for dispatch. The other issues, as I mentioned earlier — but the member might or might not have caught what I was saying at that point in time, so I'll reiterate it — was that I understand there are issues around line capacity and where it goes to Yukon communities. One of the concerns that Northwestel and providers need to look at is whether there is any possibility of calls becoming held up because of call volume or because of switch capacity in moving to a centralized system. I'm not a techie. That's my understanding of what the issues are. I will leave it to those who are to look at the types of solutions.

The simple answer to the Member for Klondike's first question is: what is the technical feasibility? We need additional information from Northwestel to discuss with all of our partners. One of the first things that I suggested we do in focusing on taking appropriate steps in this area is that, while we are working on this process, is it feasible to put in place a recording in Yukon communities that don't have 911 service so that when you dial 911 it lists the proper numbers for the community in the event that a tourist or a child or someone else — even somebody from Whitehorse who travels up to a

community and maybe doesn't know the community's prefix, or especially recent arrivals to the territory who maybe don't know which four digits to dial for which service, let alone the prefix in those communities. Would there be a way for that 911 to simply say something along the lines of, "For an emergency in your community, call this number for fire, this number for ambulance and this number for police."

Northwestel has provided part of an answer on that. We're waiting for additional information, which I'm hoping they will get to us quite quickly. All I can do from my end is to ask staff to ask Northwestel to provide us that information quickly, and I've said to them that we should convey to Northwestel that this is something we would like to work on. We want to understand the technical feasibility as it relates to putting a recording on 911 in communities while we're discussing whether centralizing dispatch through 911 is a good step for all or some Yukon communities. But taking this interim step is one that would certainly reduce the possibility of there being a gap in service. My view for Northwestel would be that they should perhaps just do it because the life they save might be one of their own — but we're prepared to pay a reasonable cost in doing so to get it done.

Again, the first question is, is this feasible? What is it going to cost? If so, when can we do it? We will continue to press Northwestel to provide us with the technical answer to that as soon as they're able to do so, and we're very interested in hopefully getting to a situation where a recording is put in place as an interim step, assuming it is feasible and reasonable to do so. Unless some surprising information comes forward, it would appear that it is.

On those broader issues around expansion, there has been a fair bit of discussion in the past. I understand the member's concern and I met personally with the chair of the Association of Yukon Fire Chiefs, Chief Regimbal, to discuss the issue. I have spoken to him a couple of times on the phone as well. Certainly we get the fact that it would be nice to determine whether we can do this and do it in as timely a manner as possible but, especially as it relates to technical information that we need to receive from Northwestel, all we can do is ask them nicely to provide us that information as quickly as they can and place a priority on doing our own work and sharing those technical specifics with all the partners who would be potentially affected by any change to the system for calling emergency services in Yukon communities.

Mr. Silver: With all due respect to the member across the floor, that was basically, in my opinion, a 20-minute "No."

It's been months that the Department of Community Services has been using the line, "We're waiting for Northwestel to get back to us." That's a long time. I would say at least eight to nine months. It was last session when we asked the same thing about 911. Where are we with 911? Oh, we can't do anything — it's Northwestel that's holding up the process. There's a couple of different things where if you just take a look at the amount of action from the member and from the department, it doesn't seem like the lead is going to be taken by this department and it sounds to me as if, like I said, the answer is "no".

I'm going to move on. I have many more questions on 911, but obviously this is not the place I'm going to get those answers.

I'm going to change gears to the Klondike River erosion question. I sent a letter to the minister from a very concerned business in Dawson, Trans North Helicopters, located just as you're coming around the bend into town in Dawson. They have a huge erosion problem. There is a berm that's on land that is that is, I guess, technically owned by Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in. It is right beside where they are and there used to be a road there. You used to be able to take the biggest pickup truck and drive through there on that berm. Last year, about 80 percent of that got destroyed by the Klondike River as the spring thaw came in. We had so much snow last year that it was just too much.

I was told by the helicopter guys there that they did have a representative of the Yukon government come out and tell them that they can't touch the bank. They are not allowed to — they had an idea to put rocks down and to build up their side of the bank. They were told that they weren't allowed to do that though by the territorial government.

So when I wrote the minister, I was writing with concern because talking to the municipality they say that, "Well, we don't own that land so that's not our issue." They were wondering as far as Department of Fisheries and Oceans goes and if it has been devolved so that that high-water mark is now the responsibility of the territorial government. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is asking the exact same thing. It's not their land that's the issue; it's the fact that you are going to have a situation where every year this is going to be an issue. I suspect that if we have a similar winter to what we did last year, that berm is gone. If that berm is gone and the beaver pond overflows, which it will, the next thing to go is the highway coming into town — the only highway coming into town — the ball field on the other side, the soccer field on the other side, not to mention the private sector business that brought this to our attention to begin with.

In the response I got from the minister's office — from the minister directly — it said, and I quote, "I am responding to your letter dated September 23, 2013, to Minister Istchenko" — because I actually sent this letter to the minister responsible for Highways and Public Works — "regarding erosion at the Trans North launch pad and base on the Klondike riverbank. The Government of Yukon appreciates the concerns about erosion and will encourage the City of Dawson and the site owner to come to a mutual agreement on potential remediation of this site."

We took pictures and explained the situation and sent those all to the office. So, if not the territory and if not Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in and if not the city and if not the minister's office, who is going to do some remediation here? We know that in Watson Lake when the banks of the Liard were overreached, the government came in and provided support — same thing with Pelly River — so are we going to wait for a breach or are we going to deal with this issue head-on beforehand?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: It appears that, despite my attempts on 911 to explain the structure of the system to the member, unfortunately the angle that he was taking on it is deciding not to listen to the response but take the partisan response to it. Whether the member likes the fact that we have to work with Northwestel as a service provider or not, we do. The reality is that Northwestel is the operator of the phone lines and has to provide us with the technical answers to what it means to make changes to the system they operate.

We did receive a proposal from Northwestel in late summer. Contrary to what the member is asserting, it's not that we haven't heard anything from Northwestel or that staff haven't been working on it. We received information from Northwestel in July and again in August. We have also received information from Northwestel within the last month relating to the question about recording capacity. We're waiting on that specific question for some additional information from them about switch capacity, particularly in those communities that are satellites off the Whitehorse switch.

So again we have been receiving some information from Northwestel and staff have certainly been working on this — in addition to, I might point out, not only continuing to manage and operate Yukon's EMS system in providing ambulance services to Yukon communities but also opening up the brand-new Protective Services emergency response centre — along with the Member for Whitehorse West and former Minister of Community Services, as well as the Premier, I had the pleasure of opening this earlier this month at the top of Two Mile Hill — which is an important part of our commitment to investing in and improving our emergency response capacity. So staff have been busily working on many fronts and are delivering results. In the area of 911, the member can choose, as he appears to be deciding to do, to want to portray this as something that is not being addressed. Once again the member is absolutely wrong.

We look forward to hearing those answers from Northwestel and determining what steps can be taken, whether it's feasible to put in place a recording for 911 on an interim basis — put it in place permanently — but while other steps are being discussed — and then we will work with and continue to share the information we receive from Northwestel with Yukon communities. Where any considered or contemplated changes would have an effect on dispatch within those communities, whether the member likes it or not, we are going to work with those communities. If they have concerns, suggestions, et cetera, related to it, we're going to take those with the respect that we believe they deserve and I look forward to continuing to do so.

Madam Chair, in the case of the questions the member answered, I don't have the letter that he sent me or that I sent him regarding the Trans North site right in front of me so I am going from memory, I don't have the specifics of the letters and our correspondence right in front of me. I point out with the issue that is there, that if the member is asking about First Nation land, that of course is First Nation responsibility. If the member is asking about private land, that's private

responsibility. If the member's asking about Crown land — including that within the ordinary high-water mark — whether or not government is the one that does any improvements that could occur, it requires a permit to undertake that work in the ordinary high-water mark.

As I noted in responding to the member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes and relaying the discussions that I have had with the Marsh Lake Local Advisory Council and the steps we've taken for homeowners there, for permits for their personally funded work for erosion protection, erosion mitigation and shoreline protection in front of their properties, just like Marsh Lake homeowners have done in making improvements around their property, nothing is preventing Trans North if they wish to do so from talking to Land Management branch about the ability to get a licence of occupation to do shoreline work that would mitigate or prevent damage there.

However, if the land is not Crown land and it is First Nation land, they do need to work with the First Nation on that. We're certainly happy to have discussions with those involved. I'm certainly open to discussing this with the municipality and to discussing it with Trans North or having staff discuss it with Trans North.

In this particular area — particularly if it relates to acquiring a licence of occupation for shoreline activities — that's actually the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister for Energy, Mines and Resources through the Land Management branch, because they are the ones that issue licences of occupation. Anyone from Trans North who is listening or reads this in the Blues, the Land Management branch is located in the Elijah Smith Building in Whitehorse. The contact information and staff directory is available on-line on the Yukon government's website. The director of Land Management branch, if they wish to speak to him personally, is Colin McDowell. I can't quote his phone number off the top of my head but that information is all on-line. They can also walk into the Elijah Smith Building and climb the stairs or take the elevator up to the centralized location of Land Management branch, Land Planning and Agriculture branch. Staff there would be very happy to assist them in doing that and I hope that has answered the question. If there are issues where the municipality would like to talk to us about efforts involving the municipality or the Yukon government of taking steps around flood mitigation, we're certainly open to those conversations but we do not have unlimited budgets either for flood activities.

We have continued to find areas where we can make investments. In areas, including within the member's riding in the community of Rock Creek, where there have been significant steps taken by government to respond to flooding in those areas and to do what we can to help homeowners receive disaster assistance for damage to their property.

Mr. Silver: I do appreciate the minister's response, but mark my words the high-water mark will be breached and I believe that that is under the jurisdiction of the territorial government and that water will go over First Nation land and it will go over the private sector's land and it will flood. The

amount of money that would then have to be spent after the fact will be a lot more than to do some kind of preliminary work now.

The problem is, as well, by the time I was phoned, the folks at Trans North had tried the government already and they were calling a few different times all summer long. Since the actual event happened, they wanted people to come out and, in their terms, they received no love.

I just got an indication from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that he will make the call and I appreciate that very much.

Moving on to the new ambulance bay, I was told that there is garage space to keep six ambulances, but to staff that number of units would actually take 12 practitioners. Fitting four people or two crews in the actual lounge part of the station is pretty much what it appears to have been designed for. You stick more than four of these practitioners in an area that small and sooner or later the fireworks will be flying. As much as I'm sure that the practitioners all do get along with each other, they do spend an awful lot of time together and sooner or later need a private place to retreat and to collect their thoughts. It's a tough job. In my opinion, any more than two crews in there might not be so practical.

Has the minister responsible heard any issues in regard to the space for these practitioners?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has indicated to me that in the wake of an e-mail that I received last night or the night before from Mayor Potoroka regarding Trans North that I forwarded on to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the assistant Deputy Minister of Sustainable Resources in Energy, Mines and Resources is up in Dawson at the moment —

Some Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I had misunderstood. My colleague is upstairs in the minister's office right now and has already been asked to ensure — in wake of my request to the minister yesterday that follow-up occurs with Trans North directly, so either he or his staff will be personally contacting Trans North.

If Trans North feels in any way, shape or form that whomever they contact regarding this issue was not providing them with the information they were looking for earlier, then that's unfortunate. I have not received a request directly from Trans North and, depending on who they were asking and what question they were asking, there may be issues in communication.

I know the member is scoffing over there. I know he sent a letter and I did respond with a specific request, but there's also an issue sometimes with how well information about the facts is communicated. With this type of situation for Trans North or others, I encourage them to talk to staff of the Land Management branch. Members — particularly the Leader of the NDP — would perhaps find they would learn more from responses if they actually paid attention rather than talking, heckling and making hissing noises.

With this specific situation I would again encourage — Trans North will be receiving a phone call from Sustainable

Resources in Energy, Mines and Resources regarding what would be involved in getting a licence of occupation. Again, I point out that if people do have questions that they feel aren't being answered, we're certainly happy to have staff provide information to them.

As a general rule, and if the member is receiving any requests from constituents related to this, where it relates to land matters, we have centralized most of the services and programs for that area in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Staff of Energy, Mines and Resources would be the ones to talk about permits for land and land activities. As a starting point, they're a good place to go. For municipalities as well — if municipalities or local advisory councils are looking for information about government programs, they can certainly contact my offices or contact our Community Affairs staff within Community Services for information on what department they should be calling regarding something.

Sometimes if the information presented is not clear and the question isn't clear, either ourselves or government staff may respond to what we think the question was from a citizen or individual, but if the specifics of their situation and what they were looking at were not 100-percent clear then sometimes our answer may not be as relevant to the topic as we would like it to be or they would like it to be. In those cases, we would point out that our phone numbers are in the book and our e-mail addresses are in the book, so they can certainly contact our office or staff of departments for assistance. I gave the member some good examples of places for people or companies to start asking questions if they aren't sure who they should be calling about something.

As well, of course, the government information desk, whose number is in the phone book, is another good place to go for information about what government department to contact. As well, I would note that in this modern electronic age, in fact there is a great deal of information about this on Yukon government websites as far as which government offer which programs, who issues permits for licence of occupation, which is I mentioned, is Energy, Mines and Resources and not Community Services.

That information is available on-line, but should people not find it clear or not know where to look, I gave a few examples of where people can go to ask those questions.

Mr. Silver: I just need to get this clear because I am new here. I have only been here for two years.

The private sector probably calls the helpline — the 1-800 phone number — or they probably get in touch with a department. The response that they got was no response. I think what normally people do in that case is they contact their MLA. In this case, they did contact their MLA. I went out and basically the same information that they sent to the government they sent to me, along with the pictures and along with the fact that they tried — they really have their own solution and they just wanted to ask if they could have permission for one part and then of course there is another issue with the land beside them. In my response letter from the minister's office, I wasn't told, "Well, maybe we should talk

with the company and go to the Lands branch." I was told that the Government of Yukon appreciates the concerns about erosion and will encourage the City of Dawson and the site owner to come to a mutual agreement on a potential remediation of the site.

So which is it? Which answer are we now giving Trans North? Because when this letter is addressed to the MLA for Klondike, that's where that business is and that's what I responded to them, based upon what the government told me. I just want to be clear for the record here. Which response are we talking about now? Is it the response that I got in a written form or is it the response that I got by having to take this to Committee of the Whole for the department?

Hon. Mr. Cathers: As I explained to the member before, the letter that we responded with was responding to the information as it had been portrayed in the letter for the Member for Klondike. He has provided additional information here today that was not shared in the letter.

I would note to the member here that, in fact, the answer to his question about where Trans North could go, and the question of what I said in the letter, is correct. We do encourage them to work with the municipality of Dawson on this matter. But the Town of the City of Dawson has indicated that some of the area is outside of their control and is within the administration and control of the Yukon, based on their understanding, and that the issue is one that is not their land.

That being said, and regardless of who pays the tab for it, we still do encourage them to work with the City of Dawson because whatever is done, even if it's 100 percent funded by the company, it is something that has an effect on an area directly upstream from the municipality of Dawson City. We would hope that they would work with the municipality in trying to come to a shared understanding about what appropriate steps are there. Staff of Land Management branch can certainly assist with any permits for shoreline mitigation. Obviously there will have to be work and consideration done in assessing and understanding what solutions there are to that problem.

I have not, since receiving the letter, been to that site and walked it personally to exactly see the issue. I believe there might have been a photograph and there was a map of the area that provided a general sense of it. I have been to the site, but I'm not an engineer and I don't profess to be one. Whatever the solutions are to that, if indeed actions needs to be taken — and I'm taking the concerns that the member has presented and those presented by Trans North at face value, not actually having reviewed the site myself — then there are steps that can be taken to come up with a solution that addresses any issues around the potential need for mitigating risks of damage from flooding and Trans North's concerns of erosion that could potentially occur due to failure of the land between it and the river.

My understanding is that the town thinks that they may not be in position to assist Trans North with remediation work, and we certainly appreciate their views on that. It is not our position that they have to assist Trans North.

At this point we are having a lot of conversation without technical experts actually looking at it and asking what needs to be done here. The member has a viewpoint about what he thinks the changes should be. I'm not dismissing his perspective, but I would certainly consider it a more accurate assessment of what the risks are and are not in the area to hear an engineer or someone who is an expert in these matters professing their opinion about the risk rather than hearing the member's view that he thinks I should mark his words about what he thinks will happen next spring. We're really not going to accomplish much in this conversation if we're having this debate.

I haven't actually even looked at the site and we haven't had a technical experts look at it. We simply have a self-professed expert, the Member for Klondike, take a look at this situation.

In closing on this issue, we are certainly happy to continue to discuss this matter with the Town of the City of Dawson. My colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, has already directed staff to contact Trans North to talk about what would be done — or what could be done as far as a licence of occupation for work within the ordinary high watermark, but there needs to be a focus on determining an appropriate solution is to this.

The permitting part is relatively easy to address. I'm saying that without it having gone to a technical review, but the process is simple. It may require an assessment through YESAB but the competent staff of Energy, Mines and Resources is more than capable of helping to explain to staff of Trans North what the permitting processes would be. We're certainly happy through Community Services to be involved in the discussion and working with them and with the City of Dawson to discuss what could be done from a flood mitigation perspective.

I would note that part of the problem that we appear to have hit in this is simply that not all of the relevant information that we needed to be able to give the right answer to the question was provided in information we received earlier. It appears that Trans North didn't contact who they should have on this. I understand that the member wasn't sure where to point them.

So, Madam Chair, those are the facts, and seeing the time I move that you report progress.

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

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Dixon: Madam Chair, I move that Bill No. 58, entitled *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*, be reported without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Dixon that Bill No. 58, entitled *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*, be reported without amendment.

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

Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Chair's report

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 58, entitled *Child Support Administrative Recalculation Act*, and directed me to report the bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole has also considered Bill No. 11, entitled *Second Appropriation Act, 2013-14*, and directed me to report progress.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

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

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

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled November 14, 2013:

33-1-95

Yukon Energy Corporation 2012 Annual Report (and audited financial statements) (Kent)

33-1-96

Yukon Development Corporation 2012 Annual Report (and audited financial statements) (Kent)