



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 199

1st Session

35th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, October 8, 2024 — 1:00 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Jeremy Harper

YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

2024 Fall Sitting

SPEAKER — Hon. Jeremy Harper, MLA, Mayo-Tatchun
DEPUTY SPEAKER and CHAIR OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Annie Blake, MLA, Vuntut Gwitchin
DEPUTY CHAIR OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Lane Tredger, MLA, Whitehorse Centre

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Ranj Pillai	Porter Creek South	Premier Minister of the Executive Council Office; Economic Development; Minister responsible for the Yukon Housing Corporation
Hon. Jeanie McLean	Mountainview	Deputy Premier Minister of Education; Minister responsible for the Women and Gender Equity Directorate
Hon. Nils Clarke	Riverdale North	Minister of Environment; Highways and Public Works
Hon. Tracy-Anne McPhee	Riverdale South	Minister of Health and Social Services; Justice
Hon. Richard Mostyn	Whitehorse West	Minister of Community Services; Minister responsible for the Workers' Safety and Compensation Board
Hon. John Streicker	Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes	Government House Leader Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources; Tourism and Culture; Minister responsible for the Yukon Development Corporation and the Yukon Energy Corporation; French Language Services Directorate
Hon. Sandy Silver	Klondike	Minister of Finance; Public Service Commission; Minister responsible for the Yukon Liquor Corporation and the Yukon Lottery Commission

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Yukon Party

Currie Dixon	Leader of the Official Opposition Copperbelt North	Scott Kent	Official Opposition House Leader Copperbelt South
Brad Cathers	Lake Laberge	Patti McLeod	Watson Lake
Yvonne Clarke	Porter Creek Centre	Geraldine Van Bibber	Porter Creek North
Wade Istchenko	Kluane	Stacey Hassard	Pelly-Nisutlin

THIRD PARTY

New Democratic Party

Kate White	Leader of the Third Party Takhini-Kopper King
Lane Tredger	Third Party House Leader Whitehorse Centre
Annie Blake	Vuntut Gwitchin

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Dan Cable
Deputy Clerk	Allison Lloyd
Sergeant-at-Arms	Karina Watson
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	Joseph Mewett
Hansard Administrator	Deana Lemke

Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Tuesday, October 8, 2024 — 1:00 p.m.

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

Prayers

Withdrawal of motions

Speaker: Prior to proceeding with the Daily Routine, the Chair wishes to inform the House of changes made to the Order Paper. The following motions have been removed from the Order Paper, as they are now outdated: Motion No. 766, standing in the name of the Minister of Health and Social Services; and Motion No. 1015, notice of which was given by the Premier yesterday.

Additionally, the following 38 motions standing in the name of the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin have been removed from the Order Paper at the request of the member: Motions No. 48, 59, 73, 79, 128, 129, 186, 198, 208, 214, 223, 268, 299, 304, 308, 447, 453, 469, 470, 487, 493, 544, 546, 547, 569, 570, 646, 657, 661, 773, 806, 820, 870, 871, 872, 896, 897, and 921.

DAILY ROUTINE

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

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Speaker: Introduction of visitors.
Visitors introduced

Speaker: Are there any tributes?

TRIBUTES

In recognition of Mental Illness Awareness Week and World Mental Health Day

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Yukon Liberal government to pay tribute to Mental Illness Awareness Week, taking place from October 6 to 12, and the World Mental Health Day on October 10. These important observances shine a spotlight on mental health and the vital need for our society to reduce stigma while advocating for better access to mental health care across our communities.

Here in the Yukon, we are fortunate to have dedicated organizations and individuals who work tirelessly to support those living with mental illness. I thank the Canadian Mental Health Association, Yukon division, which plays a critical role in offering accessible mental health services, including drop-in counselling and peer support. Their ongoing advocacy is essential in creating a compassionate and inclusive community where no one feels alone in their mental health journey.

Mental Wellness and Substance Use Services of the Department of Health and Social Services continues to provide Yukoners with rapid access to counselling, harm-reduction support, and opioid treatment services. These services are a

lifeline for those in need, ensuring that, when ready, help is never far away.

On World Mental Health Day, observed on October 10, we are reminded of the importance of promoting mental well-being in our workplaces. This year's theme, "Mental Health at Work", calls upon all employers and organizations to foster safe, supportive environments for their teams. Positive mental health practices in the workplace are crucial not just for the well-being of employees but for the overall health of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, when we create workplaces where individuals feel safe, respected, and valued, we help to prevent mental health challenges from escalating. And like all health issues, early detection and treatment is key to success. Healthy work environments benefit everyone: employees, their families, and our broader community.

I also want to highlight the support available for Indigenous and French-speaking Yukoners facing mental health challenges. Services such as the Hope for Wellness Helpline and the TAO Tel-Aide ensure that every Yukoner can access culturally sensitive and language-specific mental health care. Canada's new 9-8-8: Suicide Crisis Helpline, which launched last November, provides support from trained responders 24 hours a day. These resources are crucial in creating an inclusive territory where no one is left behind.

As we mark Mental Illness Awareness Week and World Mental Health Day, I encourage all Yukoners to reflect on the importance of mental health and to take action, whether by supporting a loved one, reaching out for help, or advocating for mental health awareness. Together, we can create a healthier, more compassionate Yukon where every individual feels supported and empowered to thrive.

Applause

Ms. Clarke: I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to recognize October 6 to 12 as Mental Illness Awareness Week, a national campaign observed to educate the public about mental health issues and promote supports and services available.

Also observed during this week is World Mental Health Day, which is focused this year on mental health in the workplace. A safe and healthy work environment is important in promoting mental wellness in the workplace.

Exposure to poor working conditions, harassment, discrimination, and more can affect not only mental health but overall quality of life. This can in turn affect people in the home and affect children and families.

According to data from Statistics Canada, in 2022, over 18 percent — or over five million — Canadians aged 15 and older met the diagnostic criteria for a mood, anxiety, or substance use disorder in that year. One in three Canadians will experience some form of mental illness or substance addiction in their lifetime.

Here in the north, those statistics are often even higher. We have higher levels of addiction, depression, and anxiety. There is hope that talking more about issues affecting Yukoners will help people to take proactive steps in their lives to help reverse

those statistics. Check in on your friends and family members, and chat with health care professionals to see what supports are available for you or your loved ones.

The Yukon division of the Canadian Mental Health Association is an excellent resource in our community. They offer programming and services, workshops, and counselling options for Yukoners experiencing mental health issues.

Thank you to all those helping to foster mental wellness in our communities.

Salamat po.

Applause

MLA Tredger: I rise on behalf of the Yukon NDP to pay tribute to Mental Health Awareness Week.

Mental health challenges are deeply personal and so it's easy to think that they are up to individuals to manage, but I often think of the quote: "Shouting 'self-care' at people who need community care is how we fail people." So, today, I want to focus on the people who are working to make sure Yukoners have access to the community care they need and deserve.

Across the Yukon government, First Nation governments, the health care system, and non-profit organizations, there are many people who are on the front lines of mental health work. It's an important and sometimes difficult thing to be present with people in some of their hardest times, and we are so grateful to all the people who are committed to walking with their fellow Yukoners in this way.

I also want to thank the behind-the-scenes people: the administrators, the managers, and support staff of all kinds who make the front-line work possible.

Finally, I want to thank all the people who provide support to their neighbours, families, and friends in little and big ways. Whether it's sending a thoughtful message to someone having a hard day or dropping off a meal for someone in crisis, your care is a lifeline for many people. Thank you.

Applause

In recognition of Fire Prevention Week

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak briefly about fire safety. Fire Prevention Week kicked off on October 6. Each year, it focuses attention on essential steps that each of us must take to protect ourselves and our families from preventable fires. I thank all Yukoners who are making fire safety and prevention activities a priority.

This year's Fire Prevention Week theme is: "Smoke alarms: Make them work for you!" This campaign works to educate everyone about the importance of having working smoke alarms in their homes. According to the National Fire Protection Association, smoke alarms cut your risk of dying in a home fire by more than half. Roughly three out of five fire deaths happen in homes with either no smoke alarms or no working smoke alarm. Make sure you install smoke alarms and carbon monoxide alarms outside of all sleeping areas and on every level of your home, including the basement. If you are a tenant, make sure that your landlord installs them. Mr. Speaker, it is the law.

Make sure smoke alarms meet the standards of all family members, including those with sensory or physical disabilities. As someone with a hearing impairment, I assure you that this is important. Test your smoke alarms once a month by pushing the test button and replace them after 10 years, even the ones that are hard-wired into your homes. The newest smoke alarms will actually prompt you to do so. Learn the sound of your smoke alarm and make sure that everyone in the home knows that when the smoke alarm sounds, it's time to get out and call 911. Ensure that your family understands how to get out of the house from any room. Plan for all your family members, including those with sensory or physical disabilities, and don't forget to include your pets.

This fall, fire departments around the Yukon will be visiting schools to talk about fire safety and distribute activity packs for households and families.

I want to take a moment to commend and thank all of Yukon's firefighters. Their daily focus is on protecting lives and homes from fire. Thank you to the fire departments across the territory working this week and throughout the year to keep Yukoners safe and informed. Together, we are building healthy and safe communities across the Yukon.

More information about fire safety and prevention is available online at www.preparedyukon.ca.

Applause

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to recognize October 6 to 12 as Fire Prevention Week in Canada. The Yukon has experienced a number of home fires in recent years, with one resulting in a tragic loss very recently, and we would like to extend our sincere condolences to family and friends and to thank the emergency responders.

Fire Prevention Week focuses on the importance of home and safety fire prevention. It is a time for families to talk about safe cooking and home heating and to check smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detectors, and fire extinguishers to ensure that they are in working order.

This year's theme focuses on the importance of smoke alarms and sharing best practices and tips to ensure that they are effective in an emergency. This includes installing smoke alarms in every bedroom and outside of sleeping areas and on every level of the home, as well as testing them every month to ensure that they are operational.

I would like to give thanks to our municipal and volunteer fire departments throughout the territory for the work that they do in fire prevention, emergency fire response, and other services. Thank you as well to the Fire Marshal's Office, Wildland Fire, and our First Nation wildfire crews for their continued service to our territory.

So, please take the time to create or review your household escape plan, go over fire safety practices with your children and family, and check your smoke alarms.

Applause

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon NDP to recognize national Fire Prevention Week. As I start my tribute, I want to acknowledge the recent losses due to home fires. To everyone affected, to everyone who is mourning, we are so sorry for your loss. This is a sobering reminder of the dangers of house fires and the need to take precautions against them. There is much we can do as individuals, as my colleagues have spoken already about the importance of having working and up-to-date fire alarms.

In the last century, we have changed the way we plan cities and changed the way we manufacture building materials and the way that we design and build our homes. Every time a fire starts and doesn't spread, there are many people and professionals behind the scenes to thank — from city planners and policy experts to architects and construction workers, and, of course — and certainly not least — I want to thank firefighters. I can't think of a better example of service to community than firefighters. Be it for work or by volunteering, those who work as firefighters put enormous amounts of time and effort into being ready to support those around them. When a fire starts, they run toward danger for their communities. We should never take for granted the knowledge that, if a fire starts, there will be people on their way to help.

Today, I want to say a huge thank you to all of the folks who help with that response: dispatchers, administrative staff, and, of course, the firefighters themselves. We are all safer because of the work you do. Thank you.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any 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?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 42: *Act of 2024 to amend the Land Titles Act, 2015* — Introduction and First Reading

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 42, entitled *Act of 2024 to amend the Land Titles Act, 2015*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 42, entitled *Act of 2024 to amend the Land Titles Act, 2015*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion for introduction and first reading of Bill No. 42 agreed to

Speaker: Are there any further bills for introduction?
Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House supports the Government of Yukon's advocacy work with the Commission for Complaints for Telecom-television Services, CCTS, to support Yukon cellular customers who wish to seek recourse against telecom service

providers and to further hold telecom providers accountable for poor cellular service across the Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House supports the proposed supplementary budget increase that will raise the volunteer firefighter honorarium.

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

THAT this House urges the Minister of Health and Social Services to ensure that the *Health Human Resources Strategy* involves health care professionals in a respectful and meaningful way and that the Health Human Resources Steering Committee works collaboratively with health care professionals to develop sustainable solutions that are inclusive of health care worker concerns and insights.

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to allow retired members of the Yukon public service to re-subscribe to the Yukon government extended health benefit even after they have opted out.

Ms. Blake: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to procure a supply of the Nuvaxovid COVID-19 vaccine produced by Novavax for Yukoners who are unable to take other COVID-19 vaccines.

Speaker: Is there a statement by a minister?

This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: *École Whitehorse Elementary School replacement*

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I asked the Minister of Education if she could name a single stakeholder who thinks building a replacement for *École Whitehorse Elementary School* in the backyard of *Takhini Elementary School* was a good idea. She refused to answer that question because the obvious answer is that no one outside of the Liberal Cabinet thinks that it's a good idea. There are significant unaddressed concerns about traffic, the loss of greenspace, the impact on the sports community, and the impact on *ÉWES* and *Takhini school communities* as well.

There is growing concern among all the affected stakeholders that the Liberal government is going to charge ahead with this regardless of what anyone tells them. So, I'm hoping the minister will address those concerns with a simple commitment.

Will the minister assure Yukoners that the construction tender for the new school in *Takhini* will not be issued before next year's election?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, our government is proud to be investing in school infrastructure to meet the needs of our growing community, and École Whitehorse Elementary School has been identified as a priority for replacement with a new, modern facility. Of course, we are also investing in the Kêts'ádañ Kù project in Burwash Landing, and we just recently opened the new Whistle Bend Elementary School.

In August 2023, Kobayashi and Zedda Architects Ltd. was awarded the prime consultant contract. They have done work on the site analysis and test fit. They did some other work on just determining the suitability of location. I and two of my Cabinet colleagues announced, in a news conference, the site selection. We certainly are working with partners around this and will continue to do that.

I have a meeting set with some of those partners later this month. We have now moved into phase 2 of the contractor's work, which includes a traffic study report and local impact development. Mr. Speaker, I am committed to building this new school, and we believe that having a French immersion elementary school in the Takhini neighbourhood will benefit that community —

Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Speaker, yet again, the minister has completely ignored the question that I asked. There are many groups and Yukoners that have significant concerns about building the largest elementary school in the Yukon in this location. The government conducted absolutely no consultation with Yukoners before choosing the lot in Takhini as the location, and now they have been scrambling to consult after that decision.

In the two weeks since the department released the document that showed the government's final decision, we have already heard from several groups that have concerns that their input was either misrepresented, as in the case of the Takhini Neighbourhood Association, or left out altogether, as in the case with Softball Yukon.

If the government does go ahead with awarding a contract for the construction of this school, it will tie the hands of a future government. So, will the Liberals agree to hold off on tendering the construction of this school until after the next election so that Yukoners can have a clear choice between what the Liberals are pushing and what everyone else wants?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, again, we are very proud to be investing in new infrastructure for our education system. I have cited a couple of other projects that we are very proud of. We have also built a new francophone school in Riverdale.

In terms of the site selection for this — on the Takhini Educational Land Reserve — it is one of the largest in Whitehorse and has enough room for two schools. There are not a lot of other sites that are centrally located and would meet the needs of a new school. There is not a lot of vacant land in general that is centrally located. To look at a different site would entail having to go through a lengthy territorial and municipal rezoning process followed by those sites needing to be serviced for sewer and electrical. This is not viable given the urgent need to replace school infrastructure.

You know, the Yukon Party — it's very rich for them to be — they did not make this a priority when they were in government. They had 14 years in government and did not make school infrastructure a priority for them.

Mr. Dixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, the government made this announcement over two years ago that they would be selecting this site. They could have done all of the things that the minister just listed over the last two years.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is only one party in this building that thinks that building the biggest elementary school in the Yukon in the backyard of another elementary school on one of Whitehorse's most congested streets on top of the field that supports the biggest and most popular summer sport in the Yukon is a good idea — and that's the Liberals.

It's a controversial decision and one that was made without sufficient consultation, so my request is simple: Will the Liberals agree to hold off on tendering the construction of this new school until Yukoners have had a chance to let their views be known at the ballot box in next year's election?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, again, we are very proud that we are investing in school infrastructure and so glad that there are young people here today who are able to hear our commitment to school infrastructure. We have worked with our partners. In March 2024, we had a number of partners and stakeholders invited to a session where we reviewed the site analysis, talked about what the options were. That included some 18 partners, including the project advisory committee that was made up of the Whitehorse Elementary School Council, Whitehorse Elementary administration, the City of Whitehorse, Government of Yukon, Ta'an Kwäch'än, Kwanlin Dün, and the Takhini Neighbourhood Association.

We did follow up with a number of meetings with those stakeholders and are committed to continuing to have those discussions. We certainly had the sporting community there and we have had a number of meetings with them — through our officials. I and my two colleagues who are involved in this file will be meeting with those sporting organizations later this month to hear them directly and to work toward any issues that they may have and to continue on with our project, Mr. Speaker.

Question re: Yukon Association of Education Professionals collective agreement bargaining

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Finance followed up his public statement about the state of negotiations between the Yukon government and the Yukon Association of Education Professionals with an extended discussion about those negotiations in the Legislature. The minister stated the Yukon government's bargaining position, the teachers' bargaining position, the financial amounts that were being discussed on both sides, where the negotiations had broken down, the dates the meetings occurred on, and several other factors influencing YG's negotiating position, including comparisons from other jurisdictions and unions.

So, how can the minister reveal all this information and then say with a straight face that he won't discuss the details of the negotiations in public?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to our statements, YG is not and will not bargain in public or in bad faith. Questions came out based on a communication that we saw from the association's communication. If that communication didn't happen, then we would not be in a situation where we have to correct the record where it was misleading.

YG has provided clarification in light of YAEP's communication, which caused questions and concerns for parents and our educating partners. I guess that is not important to the Yukon Party. YG remains very committed to the process in working with YAEP throughout the processes as we move forward.

Now, YAEP issued a press release stating that its members voted for job action. This is misleading; there was no legal strike vote. Also misleading was that YG had produced a final offer; that is not true. We would love to continue the negotiations. Our communication is in response to YAEP's communication that disclosed YG's position at the table, characterizing it as a final offer and arguing that YG return to the table.

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that there is a huge and obvious inconsistency between the minister claiming that he won't negotiate in public and his decision to reveal almost every single detail about the negotiations in his public statement and on the floor of the Legislature.

So, my question is simple: How can Yukon teachers expect to bargain in good faith when this minister is sharing so many of the details of the negotiations in public?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite would listen to the answers that we are providing — again, we would not have made our statement if YAEP's communication didn't disclose YG's position at the table, which it did, characterizing it as a final offer and urging YG to return to the table. Again, YAEP's communication is not accurate; YG has not made a final offer.

Further, YG and YAEP mutually agreed that further bargaining at this time would not be productive because of the widening gap on monetary issues. It was necessary to clarify the gap between the parties and the reason for the impasse in these circumstances.

Again, working with the association, we have made great strides on the non-monetary pieces. We want to get back to the table and continue this process to make sure that Yukon teachers continue to be among the highest paid teachers in Canada. We just wanted to also clear the record, and without that communication coming out from the YAEP, we wouldn't have had the parents and the teachers getting in touch with us and asking these questions and we wouldn't have made that statement.

Ms. McLeod: Not only did the minister reveal extensive details about the negotiations in public, the minister even took the unusual step of sending all those details to every single Yukon parent or caregiver using the government's education community mailing list. However, when asked about this yesterday in the Legislature, he seemed surprised that the

department had e-mailed that statement out to the entire education community.

So, my question is for the Minister of Education. Why did her department e-mail the Minister of the Public Service Commission's statement, which included the details of negotiations and the government's position in those negotiations, to every Yukon family?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, if YAEP did not send out misleading information, then we would not have felt it necessary to correct the record from our perspective — again, the Yukon Party misleading people in this debate as well.

YG has not set — the Yukon Party continues to say that we're trying to avoid the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly. Any suggestion that YG has attempted to avoid legislative scrutiny is counter to the facts, including that the impasse in negotiation and proceedings to conciliation or arbitration has obviously been subject to legislative scrutiny.

Also, we laid out all of the meetings and the availability that we had throughout the summer to continue negotiations, to have negotiations. We offered to meet on several dates in the spring as well in 2024 and again offered several dates in the fall.

YG's dates to negotiation with YEU — again, a separate issue — those were set in April, and they were not manufactured to avoid negotiations with YAEP — again, just to correct the record.

When it comes to communication, the debate in the Legislative Assembly — I'm not the Minister of Education. I don't know the timelines on which certain things are produced to be sent out to parents and teachers, but now that I went back and spoke with my colleague and spoke with the commission, again, they just put out the PDF — the statement that we were making to make sure that we clarify the record — for the teachers and for the parents.

Question re: Government relationship with health care workers

Ms. White: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, both unions that represent health care workers in the Yukon made the difficult decision to leave the Health Human Resources Steering Committee. In a joint press release, the union said that they could no longer be part of a process that is largely symbolic. The Yukon Employees' Union president said that the interest of health care workers is being tokenized by the Yukon government and the Yukon Hospital Corporation. Their press release highlights a massive disconnect between the reality on the ground and what the Minister of Health and Social Services says here in the Assembly. She boasts that her government's *Health Human Resources Strategy* is the answer to the Yukon's health care crisis, and the same minister says that supporting health care workers is a priority for her and her government, but that's not what we're hearing from those on the ground.

Can the minister explain how this relationship deteriorated to such a state that the unions had to walk away from the steering committee table?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand today to address this question. The Yukon Employees' Union

and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada issued a press release yesterday, October 7, announcing their withdrawal from the HHR Steering Committee — Health Human Resources Steering Committee. The Health Human Resources Steering Committee met yesterday. Those union representatives attended that meeting and provided a copy of that news release, which was the first that matter had been addressed at that table with respect to those concerns.

We do remain committed to ensuring that labour voices are heard at the implementation of the *Health Human Resources Strategy*, a strategy that the two unions participated in developing through their previous representation on that committee. Unions are truly essential partners in shaping solutions for the health care workforce. The steering committee is being tasked with implementing the *Health Human Resources Strategy*. We are disappointed by their decision to step away from the committee. The door remains open for continued dialogue, and we are planning to meet with them very shortly to address issues.

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, here is the situation: Health care workers have been forced to walk away from the very committee that was formed to recruit, retain, and support health care workers. This says quite a lot about the Yukon government's ability to collaborate. It says even more about the lack of faith that health care workers have in this government's ability to make any kind of genuine effort to include their voices. We have already seen the Liberals alienate the teachers' union, and now it looks like they're using the same playbook with health care unions.

The minister says that her government is listening to health care workers, but these very same workers are feeling so unheard that they have walked away from the table. How will the minister repair the damage done to this relationship?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Relationships are, in fact, key to achieving improvements in our health care system. Our government has given serious focus and spent a serious amount of time repairing previous relationships and building ones that will take us forward as we work to transform Yukon's health care system — relationships with the Yukon Hospital Corporation, with the YMA — Yukon Medical Association — with the nurses' associations here in the territory, and hopefully with both of the unions I mentioned earlier.

The overarching *Health Human Resources Strategy* was developed for the Yukon to address the challenges of our health workforce. The plan is for all health and wellness workers, including physicians, nurses, allied health professionals, traditional healers, social services, and support staff.

We have worked tirelessly, and one of the comments earlier today is, in fact, correct: This is a unique situation. This is a table to which unions have not been previously invited to participate as stakeholders, and that is, in fact, because no such tables have existed before. This *Health Human Resources Strategy* was built by a unique community of decision-makers, and we hope the unions will continue to participate.

Ms. White: With the government's unilateral decision-making about hospice relocation and cuts to surgical and imaging services, the government is anything but responsive to

what is really going on in Yukon's health care system. Time and time again, we see Liberals say one thing and then do the opposite when it comes to health care.

Doctors and other health care workers repeatedly describe a system that is overwhelmed and in crisis. Earlier this fall, we even heard a doctor say that this government was so desperate for a good news story that they had to embellish the facts of hospital funding.

We hear solutions for health care challenges from front-line workers and health care professionals across the board only to learn that their voices are consistently ignored, downplayed, and dismissed. What the unions have shown us is that if the relationship is toxic, you need to put in boundaries and then walk away.

So, when is this government going to listen to health care workers about how to fix this broken system?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to address this question. The Health Human Resources Steering Committee was initially brought together for exactly the purpose just described by the member opposite: to focus on our workforce, to focus on the Yukon, which is no exception here in Canada. Currently, our health system is going through a time of change here in the territory. We have taken the opportunity, driven by the wishes of Yukoners, through the *Putting People First* process, to transform our health care system into one that works for Yukoners.

The health workforce and our health system partners are continuing to recover from a pandemic, coping with an ongoing substance use health emergency, and managing a rising complexity of care of an aging and growing population here in the territory. Our health care workers are struggling to manage these pressures.

We recognize that. A health human resources committee was struck for the purpose of putting in place a strategy. We know that strategy is working; we know that our vacancy rates are coming down; we know that the hiring of nurses and other allied health professionals is growing, and we know that this work can only be done together.

Question re: Dawson City Chamber of Commerce

Ms. Van Bibber: Mr. Speaker, following my questions last week about cuts to the employment service office in Dawson City, it was shared with me that it was not the only organization that had its funding cut by the Liberal government. Business owners in Dawson have told me that the government has also cut its funding to the Dawson City Chamber of Commerce. This is yet another concerning cut to services and programs in rural Yukon.

Can the Minister of Finance explain why the funding was cut to the Dawson City Chamber of Commerce?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, since the funding agreements with the chamber originate in Economic Development, I'm happy to stand.

First, I want to go back to the question from last week, and it was about a funding cut to a TPA — transfer payment agreement — to an organization in Dawson. I just wanted to flag for the House a couple of things that I have found out.

I have been made aware that the board — and can ground-truth this. But I know that the board of the organization was trying to decide if they were going to be moving forward with the service. They provide short-term employment guidance, but they also do case management. In the last year of service, only one client was provided from all of 2023 to 2024. The organization has requested \$100,000 more on top of their agreement — I think to get from November 1 until March.

So, I shared last week that we have had a funding cut from the federal government — at least \$800,000 this year — so we are working with all organizations to ensure that they work within their budgets. So, if there is more that we can talk about on that — absolutely. I have asked my staff to get a bit more information. I know that the board had put most of the folks on short-term contracts — but look forward to the conversation with the Chamber for questions 2 and 3.

Ms. Van Bibber: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a concerning trend of cuts to services and programs in rural Yukon under this Liberal government. The mandate of the Dawson City Chamber of Commerce is to enhance business growth and economic development in Dawson City and the surrounding areas. This is important work.

Will the Minister of Finance agree to fully restore the funding to the Dawson City Chamber of Commerce?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I would just say to the member opposite again that it's actually the Department of Economic Development — versus Finance — that works with the organizations.

I would challenge the way that the question was tabled, because I just met in a virtual meeting with the acting executive director of the Dawson City Chamber of Commerce over the last number of weeks. I do apologize to businesses in Dawson. I was planning to meet with them a couple of weeks ago, but the day before, I got a call and was asked to do an announcement on the grid connection from British Columbia and the \$53 million that was coming into place, and that was in Vancouver, so I stopped and did the announcement and have asked my team to reschedule.

But in my discussion with the chamber, we brought in teams from Economic Development to find where we can provide funding, whether that is funding for specific projects — or help them with their needs. Again, nobody here is not trying to support their chamber. I want to make sure that they do important work and I will have an opportunity to understand some of the projects. Again, I think — a little inaccurate, the way that the question was tabled today. That is okay. I have huge respect for these organizations in rural Yukon and will always continue to support them.

Question re: Rural communities funding and support

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has noted, there seems to be a disturbing trend of cuts to rural services and programs under this Liberal government. In most cases, rural Yukoners are being told to go to Whitehorse for programs and services that used to be available in the communities. In my

community of Teslin, we are seeing this first-hand. Currently, there is no territorial agent or housing manager in Teslin.

Yet another example of the Liberal government cutting or reducing services to rural Yukon is that the Department of Environment office has also been significantly reduced in services. This means that folks in Teslin must travel to Whitehorse for a long list of front-line government services.

When will the Liberal government stop cutting services in rural Yukon and ensure that these services are actually fully restored?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, look, we will dig in. I think that it is a fun narrative for the opposition. One of my last trips to Teslin, sitting there — you know, we have been lucky. We have had long-time Teslin residents in these roles who have done incredible work. I don't believe that there have been any positions moved. I think — probably we have had people retire. I think that it is important for us to come back. I am happy to — either through a legislative return or to come back to the House to speak — if these positions are currently posted and they are looking for individuals to be hired in those positions and therefore to have the representation in the community.

The question started with talking about a trend — a trend that was debunked in the answers to the first question to the other member.

I think we are going to see this. We are going to have a challenge around the discussion on transfer stations. We are continuing to work with all of those organizations. Any chance that we have to have positions, especially when there are individuals who want to move to Teslin or Haines Junction or Watson Lake or Dawson and can work there and provide a service here, we're absolutely open to that.

I think that making sure that as many public servants who can work in our communities is absolutely important. It's a good thing for the Government of Yukon to do. It is something we have talked about in our agreement with the NDP.

Again, sadly, the narrative does not stick; it's actually not accurate. Again, I look forward to making sure those positions are filled and we continue to have —

Speaker: Order, please.

Question re: School discretionary budgets

Mr. Kent: So, we continue to hear concerns from schools that have had their discretionary budgets frozen to start the school year by a Liberal government that finds itself in a cash crunch. In particular, the budget allocated for each school for small capital purchases, like chairs, desks, or white boards, has been frozen, and school administrators can't access it.

One school council has even told us about a swing set that they purchased and have ready to go, but they don't have the few thousands of dollars available to them to install it.

As far as we can tell, this is the first time this has ever happened, so can the Minister of Education explain why she and her Liberal government are trying to manage their fiscal problems on the backs of our students?

Hon. Ms. McLean: The government's approach to capital spending is driven by its overarching priorities and fiscal responsibilities. All departments, including the

Department of Education, follow established guidelines to ensure that funding is allocated efficiently and effectively across the public service.

At this time, all government departments are deferring discretionary capital spending until later in the fiscal year. But for clarity, non-discretionary capital has not been deferred and it's not frozen. That is incorrect.

I had the question yesterday in Committee of the Whole and I corrected the member opposite then. Non-discretionary capital spending that is necessary to ensure the health, safety, and well-being of students and employees or to fulfill contractual agreements remains a priority for schools.

The Department of Education has a structured process for schools and program areas to request discretionary spending. As with any funding request, it requires detailed justification and must demonstrate why a request is non-discretionary. Each request is evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure alignment with the government's goals in maintaining essential services while managing public resources.

Again, just to correct the record, this spending is not frozen; it's deferred.

Mr. Kent: So, everyone I talk to, other than the minister, describes this funding as "frozen", as it's not currently available to them to spend. Yesterday during debate when I asked about the phrase, the minister said the following — and I'll quote: "The directive was received on July 5 of this year, and the Department of Education advised administrators through an administrators' update at the beginning of the school year."

So, many schools were planning small capital purchases from this fund at the end of the previous school year. Why did it take so long for the department to advise the schools that they were having their capital budgets frozen to start the school year?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, that's misleading, and it's not — the budget's not frozen.

As a department — and hearing some of the debate in Committee of the Whole yesterday — as the department has learned about some confusion around this process, we've issued a clarification in the administrators' update, as I talked about yesterday. Superintendents are providing clarification to school councils at their meetings, and we'll continue to work with principals over this next week.

Finance will also provide an update to school administrators on October 10, this week, at the administrators' meeting.

In terms of the deferral, it is only in place for discretionary capital budgets in schools. Other non-discretionary capital projects or capital budgets currently under contract are not subject to deferral. The deferral process is in place for discretionary capital funds until the end of November. This timing schedule is expected to allow discretionary capital funds to be accessed at this time, and we'll update our administrators at that time.

So, again, the member is not being accurate in terms of how he is framing this.

Mr. Kent: So, a directive was issued on July 5 to freeze discretionary capital budgets for schools, and the schools themselves were informed in late August of this change.

My previous question was: Why did it take so long? The minister never answered that question.

So, the Liberals are using needed capital assigned to schools to deal with the poor fiscal situation that they find themselves in. So, what other line items in the education budget were considered for this freeze, or was it only the discretionary capital budgets for schools managed by the department?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Again, I will correct the member. There isn't a freeze. Non-discretionary capital spending that is necessary to ensure the health, safety, and well-being of students and employees or to fulfill contractual agreements remains a priority for schools.

The Department of Education has a very structured process for schools and program areas to request discretionary spending, and as I have stated, the superintendents are providing clarification to school councils at their meetings and working with the administration. Folks will continue to communicate with them and work with them. We are reaching out this week, as we're hearing that there is some confusion around this, which I'm hearing from the member opposite.

Again, our priority is to ensure that the health, safety, and well-being of students and employees are fulfilled. I would ask the member opposite again, if there are folks who are reaching out who may have some confusion around it, to please contact the Department of Education or contact my office. I would be happy to ensure that they are put in contact with the right person.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

Notice of opposition private members' business

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the items standing in the name of the Third Party to be called on Wednesday, October 9, 2024. They are Bill No. 308, standing in the name of the Member for Takhini-Kopper King, and Motion No. 1021, standing in the name of the Member for Takhini-Kopper King.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the item standing in the name of the Official Opposition to be called on Wednesday, October 9, 2024. It is Motion No. 378, standing in the name of the Member for Porter Creek Centre.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

Bill No. 44: *Traffic Safety Act* — Second Reading

Clerk: Second reading, Bill No. 44, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Clarke.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I move that Bill No. 44, entitled *Traffic Safety Act*, be now read a second time.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 44, entitled *Traffic Safety Act*, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward Bill No. 44 for second reading. This bill is a modern, comprehensive piece of legislation to govern traffic of all types, be it motor vehicle, cyclist, pedestrian, or other, on Yukon highways. It will replace the Yukon's outdated *Motor Vehicles Act*, which was drafted in 1977.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a legislative framework that will improve safety for all road users and deter dangerous driving behaviour by strengthening penalties, updating enforcement authorities, and modernizing programs.

When the *Motor Vehicles Act* was first proclaimed 47 years ago, Yukon was very different. It had a population of approximately 21,000 people; we had far fewer vehicles on the roads; and other modes of transportation, such as cycling, were not as common. Speaking of roads, Mr. Speaker, many of them were still gravel, including a decent portion of the Alaska Highway, as well as portions of downtown Whitehorse. We were also dealing with bias-ply tires, optional seatbelts, and leaded gasoline, among other things.

I was also canvassing my officials with respect to whether there were, in fact, any traffic lights in the Yukon in 1977, and the verdict was mixed, but if there were, there were either one or two, perhaps at Main Street and Second Avenue and perhaps at Lewes and Alsek — in any event, a significantly different Yukon.

The use of seatbelts was not mandatory and would not be for another 14 years — wow — and vehicles that could drive themselves were a far-off dream found in science fiction novels. While the *Motor Vehicles Act* has undergone numerous amendments over the years, this has created a patchwork of revisions, leaving a framework that was in desperate need of revamping.

That act was written for a territory with fewer people, a less diverse population, and far less development than we have today. It can no longer meet our current and future needs or enable the tools we need to keep Yukoners safe on the road — needs such as the desire of the Yukon's growing Sikh community to be able to exercise their religious freedoms and legally recognizing Sikh articles of faith and particularly the turban.

Mr. Speaker, by modernizing this act and enabling a helmet exemption for turban-wearing Sikhs, the Yukon will be joining jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom, Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden, and the Canadian jurisdictions of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Ontario. These are some of the reasons why our government took on the herculean task of rewriting the *Motor Vehicles Act*.

The bill before us today, the *Traffic Safety Act*, is the result of years of dedicated work, research, and engagement. The title, *Traffic Safety Act*, was chosen carefully. The change from *Motor Vehicles Act* to *Traffic Safety Act* reflects a deliberate shift in emphasis from regulating motor vehicles to ensuring the safety of all highway users, regardless of whether the user is a

pedestrian, cyclist, or operating a vehicle. This new act conceives of "traffic" in the broadest sense of the term, and it contains rules that apply to pedestrian traffic, cyclist traffic, skateboarders, motorists, and anyone else who travels on a highway. It seeks to protect all road users. The framework that it lays out will allow us to address issues that are dear to many Yukoners and make our roads safer for everyone.

This bill contains general rules, authorities, and prohibitions and enables more specific rules and provisions in the coming regulations. It is designed and written in a way that makes it agile and adaptable in the face of constant change. With this new nimble legislation in hand, government will be better equipped to react quickly to changing demands. As we have seen with the current *Motor Vehicles Act*, frequently amending an act can lead to legislation that is difficult to interpret and administer and even more difficult to enforce.

In contrast, regulations are far simpler to introduce, amend, or rescind, allowing us to make sure that our laws remain current and relevant. This legislation is enabling in nature and creates a framework for more detailed regulations. This means that Bill No. 44 is forward-thinking and flexible enough to effectively govern our highways when we develop infrastructure that does not yet exist in the Yukon and can also respond to emerging technologies. Through this bill, we are addressing issues that are relevant today, like technologies that improve traffic safety and new practices for addressing unsafe and impaired driving.

We are allowing room for a growing population, evolving technologies, and unforeseen traffic safety challenges. By writing this bill in a modern, enabling, drafting style, our government has ensured that this piece of legislation can grow and evolve with us. This act has the potential to affect every Yukoner, whether or not that person drives a motor vehicle. Anyone who uses the road, be that walking, cycling, driving, or riding in a car, is affected by this legislation. Going beyond road users, there are also significant impacts to those who are responsible for enforcing and implementing the provisions in this bill, like our policing partners and Yukon municipalities.

This is why our government committed to engaging with Yukoners as we drafted this bill. We underwent an extensive consultation process, which included a broad public engagement in 2019. We wanted to know how Yukoners felt about topics like impaired driving, fees, fines, and road user safety.

First, we issued a public survey in the spring of 2019 that was completed by over 2,800 respondents. This was the second most responded to public survey after the cannabis public survey. In addition, we compiled written and in-person feedback by working with businesses, tourism organizations, municipalities, local advisory councils, the RCMP, Yukon First Nations and transboundary Indigenous governments and organizations, and various interest groups across the territory. Our project team also hosted open houses in 13 Yukon communities, where they met with community members, answered questions, and collected feedback.

During this engagement, we learned Yukoners' thoughts and concerns about the current state of road safety and

enforcement, and their hopes and preferences for future legislation. We used the feedback we received to develop options and inform the decision-making process. Feedback from the engagement was summarized and published in a “what we heard” report, which is available on yukon.ca.

In 2023, we conducted a second targeted engagement with those stakeholders, governments, and organizations whose operations or interests would be directly affected by this new legislation. Mr. Speaker, we invited businesses, municipalities, Indigenous governments, organizations, and special interest groups to attend either a meeting or a three-day virtual workshop in June 2023.

We held meetings with Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the Association of Yukon Communities, and other stakeholders upon request. We also shared provisions with the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner and the Public Prosecution Service of Canada. Finally, we have maintained ongoing engagement with key stakeholders such as the City of Whitehorse, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and federal and territorial prosecutors during the course of developing the legislation. Their input and subject matter expertise was invaluable in identifying and addressing potential implementation challenges.

By conducting in-depth engagements and including key stakeholders throughout the process of drafting this bill, we have made sure that the feedback from those who enforce, administer, interpret, and are governed by this legislation has been fully considered.

Our government knows that this bill will affect nearly all Yukoners. The *Motor Vehicles Act* was not only out of date, but its convoluted nature makes it difficult to interpret and enforce. As evidence of this, I would like to quote a decision from Judge Faulkner of the Yukon Territorial Court who, when delivering a case’s decision, likened the *Motor Vehicles Act* to a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. I am relatively certain that I was not defence counsel on that. I am advised that we can thank Winston Churchill for providing the judge with the language for this apt comparison. While it may make us chuckle, I think that we can all agree that Yukon legislation should be not difficult to interpret or apply and that this should not be the opinion that we receive from the courts in the future. I believe that, through this bill, our government is addressing the concerns of those who administer, enforce, interpret, and are governed by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, all good things take time and this bill is one of them. The Government of Yukon has worked for years to make sure that this bill will meet the needs of anyone who uses a highway in the Yukon for years to come. We have engaged with the Yukon public, the business community, Yukon First Nations, transboundary Indigenous governments and organizations, and, as indicated previously, partners like the Yukon RCMP and Mothers Against Drunk Driving and many, many others to develop this legislation. We know that by implementing this legislation, we are paving the way for safer roads in our territory.

With this bill, we are providing clear, functional legislation with practical measures that bring us in line with current

standards in other jurisdictions across the country, measures that will enable effective and efficient enforcement, reduce administrative burdens on government and the Yukon’s judiciary, and provide peace of mind to Yukoners who are concerned for their safety when using our roads.

Mr. Speaker, we are bringing the laws governing the safety of the Yukon’s highways into the 21st century, making sure that we are able to keep up with whatever the future brings.

Finally, I look forward to elaborating on the finer details of this bill and how our government will begin to bring it into force in Committee of the Whole.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and once again, thanks again to the Sikh community for attending today’s second reading as well as Jacquie Van Marck.

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill No. 44, the *Traffic Safety Act*, here at second reading. Obviously, the intent of this bill is to replace the existing *Motor Vehicles Act* with a completely new piece of legislation. While many things are adopted from the old legislation, there are certainly many new ideas and rules in the act as well.

This is a substantial bill and I just want to acknowledge all of the folks who have spent a long time — as the minister talked about back in 2018 and 2019. Some of those people are still there working on it — Vern Janz, for example. This has been a large part of his career in the last few years. We certainly appreciate all of the work that the likes of him have done on this.

Obviously, we have questions regarding certain parts of the bill, as it is a very large bill, so there are a lot of things to talk about. We will be supporting the bill at second reading and I certainly look forward to getting into Committee of the Whole to dig into some of those questions that we have had posed to us by citizens of the Yukon.

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, it’s both a privilege and, of course, a responsibility to stand and speak to second reading of the *Traffic Safety Act*. I am grateful to the community that has come to the Assembly because I’m really excited to see our community members able to fully participate without fear of breaking the law. So, the very first time I saw someone in the Yukon riding a motorcycle with a turban, I was really excited because that is part of a growing community and the ability to have people feel comfortable and like they belong. So, I’m excited that we’re about to see these changes to the *Traffic Safety Act*.

I’m also grateful for Mothers Against Drunk Driving, which has never given up on us, including when we failed almost every national report for more than a decade because we hadn’t done enough for traffic safety or for recognition of the harm done by those in vehicles.

Similar to my colleague from Pelly-Nisutlin, I have lots of questions for Committee of the Whole. I do want to express my gratitude, actually, for those within the department who worked — well, I can’t even guess how long — on getting this piece of legislation together, and I know that they are busy working on regulations as we speak. Dragging the Yukon kicking and

screaming into the modern age — I don't think it has been easy, but it's really important, so I look forward to having further conversations in Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to my colleagues who have spoken on the importance of bringing a new traffic safety act here to the territory. I have been keenly involved, as have the Department of Justice and the specialized individuals who have been named to work on this piece of legislation throughout our time here. I would certainly like to thank the Minister of Highways and Public Works for his leadership, as well as the previous minister, and for their dedication to modernizing and to improvements to this important piece of legislation.

I truly appreciate the opportunity to speak about the importance of Bill No. 44, the *Traffic Safety Act*, today about highways. The *Traffic Safety Act* introduces provisions that will improve safety for all road users in the Yukon. Those of you who know anything or have heard me talk about pieces of legislation here in the territory know that I am in favour of a preamble to pieces of legislation, certainly ones as complicated and detailed as the *Traffic Safety Act*. I believe that they help individuals who don't read legislation every day be able to understand the purpose and the statement made by the legislation in a way more broadly than just reading sections of the act.

The *Traffic Safety Act* and the privilege of driving here in the territory is conditional on compliance with rules for the purposes of protecting and promoting the safety of the public.

Improving road safety for all persons in the Yukon is the dedication of this project — the dedication, I know, of the individuals who work at Highways and Public Works and who have dedicated much of their careers to making sure that these changes would make it to the floor of this Legislative Assembly today and to go on to be debated by the members.

Our Yukon society is well served — and this is a quote from the preamble of the *Traffic Safety Act*: “Yukon society is well served by efficient and effective laws for driving a vehicle on a highway that incorporate strong deterrent measures for driving dangerously, including where a driver drives a vehicle while having alcohol or a drug in their body, because such conduct presents a threat to the life, health and safety of all persons in Yukon...”

That's truly why we are here today. The *Traffic Safety Act* — aptly named — deals with all sorts of traffic. It is about safety for Yukoners. It is about the opportunity to make sure that Yukoners have the ability to get home safe from their workplace, to their homes and back and about their business in the territory where that doesn't always happen every day.

The *Traffic Safety Act* has been written to modernize our law. It has an enabling drafting style. It contains general rules, authorities, and prohibitions that function as a framework for the specific rules and processes that will be contained in the regulations, as mentioned by the Leader of the Third Party. It really is a signpost act that signals future government direction.

The act contains major policy shifts that will enhance traffic safety for years to come. It's all designed to do so to

modernize our current state of legislation to fix long-standing issues with the legislation — as maybe aptly or appropriately noted by Judge Faulkner in the past — by enhancing the administration of services under the act, and as a result, the new act will be much more future-proof — or take us into the future — with respect to details that will be contained in regulations and many enabling provisions of the legislation itself.

The draft act, as introduced, improves road safety for all users and deters dangerous driving behaviours through enabling — among other things — higher fines and penalties for dangerous driving behaviours. It also enables the creation of a new administrative sanctions regime which will serve to further sanction impaired or high-risk driving — impaired by drugs or alcohol.

This is incredibly important as the individual who is currently responsible for the Department of Justice, for the work that the RCMP do every day on behalf of Yukoners to ensure road safety and to unfortunately respond when individuals choose to drive in a state of alcohol- or drug-impairment and/or ultimately must respond to very difficult accident scenes where individuals can be harmed or killed.

This legislation works to close common loopholes that have been identified over the years that allow dangerous drivers to continue driving and/or endangering other Yukoners. It includes new inspection authorities for both commercial and non-commercial vehicles to enhance enforcement and compliance with safety requirements. It works to create a future automated enforcement regime as well — so, enabling into the future. It expands sanctions for individuals who fail to comply with maintenance enforcement orders, which our current act does, but will do so in this legislation to a better ability, and it updates programs like the graduated driver's licensing program as well as remedial programming and alcohol ignition interlock requirements — all of these incredibly important to the safety of Yukoners.

I do look forward to the debate of this piece of legislation. This is a matter of highway safety that we should all take very seriously, particularly in acknowledgement of the fatalities on our roads in recent months — far too many.

Since 2019, I can note that the Department of Justice has been, previous to that, involved and continues to support road safety. Perhaps it might be obvious through their funding agreements and partnership with the RCMP, but since 2019, the Government of Yukon has had a drug-impaired driving contribution agreement with the Government of Canada, which provides funding for RCMP standardized field sobriety test training, public education, and testing equipment to reduce drug-impaired driving.

In 2024, additional funding was also provided to M Division of the RCMP for additional members by our government. The additional capacity works to support improving all services and can focus at times on monitoring and traffic safety violations.

The Department of Justice is currently working on progress to support traffic safety enforcement to enable enforcement provisions that will be introduced by Bill No. 44, should it pass this Legislative Assembly. The Department of

Justice will focus efforts on making necessary changes to the *Summary Convictions Act* and the regulations under that act to provide an enforcement framework for territorial offences and incorporates provisions of the *Criminal Code* that relate to summary conviction matters.

The Department of Justice has also been collaborating with Highways and Public Works to determine the provisions that are required in the summary convictions regulations that will relate to the provisions of the *Traffic Safety Act* — again, should the *Traffic Safety Act* pass this Legislative Assembly. A focus area has been ticketing procedures and enforcement of fines relating to traffic safety offences. We are also exploring potential amendments to the *Summary Convictions Act* that intend to modernize procedures and clarify language relating to ticketing and enforcement. This is an opportunity that will be presented as a result, should the *Traffic Safety Act* pass. Our work will be focused on a smooth transition in our enforcement framework as parts of the *Traffic Safety Act* come into force and how the Department of Justice supports that work.

I would just like to take a moment to thank our legal counsel office, legislative counsel office, our team, and the individuals who have worked so hard on completing this *Traffic Safety Act* for the 2024 Fall Sitting. It's truly a complex piece of legislation. I so appreciate their dedication and the collaboration that went into finalizing the bill, the consultation that took place, listening to Yukoners and to individuals who have opinions about how to modernize this legislation. I really look forward to the debate and to the questions that will be brought by the members of the opposition and to the conversation that we will have as this *Traffic Safety Act* proceeds through the House. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Mr. Speaker, it is an absolute pleasure to be on my feet this afternoon to talk about the *Traffic Safety Act*, which hit the floor of the House this afternoon.

This has been a long time coming — a long time coming. For me, this journey began before 2011. I have been hunting for the specific date, but it was so long ago and my processor is so dim that I don't have the exact date in my mind, but I will say that I was a journalist back then. As I recall and as my good colleague has also mentioned today, Territorial Court Judge John Faulkner lamented about the terrible state of the Yukon *Motor Vehicles Act*. As I said, I was a journalist; this came across my newsroom — the remarks of the judge. As my colleague said — borrowing from Winston Churchill — the judge declared the legislation “a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma”. I believe that was the quote — something close to that, anyway. Basically, Judge Faulkner was saying that the legislation was out of date, terrible, and almost impossible to enforce.

Okay, fast-forward to March 2016 — and I was a lowly citizen on the hustings talking to neighbours about their concerns about the state of the Yukon, starting to lay a groundwork for a potential election and a potential hopefully successful bid to get into this Chamber, and I heard a lot of stuff — I heard a lot of stuff when I was out in the neighbourhood

for those months. I heard about failures in procurement. That was a huge topic back there in 2016. I heard about the government's refusal to hire local contractors — that they were hiring everybody from out of town. Local contractors were upset that they could not get jobs with the Yukon government building schools, building infrastructure. I heard about the woeful state of our communities, that people were not investing in our communities at all from the Yukon Party. Most of the people on the benches on the opposite side were in that Cabinet.

I heard about the government's refusal to listen to citizens, its refusal to build elementary schools, which hadn't been built at that time in 15 years, at least. I heard about the government's bungling of the F.H. Collins school replacement — they built it too small; they imported not only Alberta designs without using local designers, but they also brought in local contractors to build the thing, and then they built it 35 percent smaller than it should have been.

They tossed out a consultative — a design/build on community consultation — turfed it out because it was too expensive, rebuilt the school — it's now more expensive than it would have been had they just gone and done the design — but, Madam Deputy Speaker, I digress.

I heard a lot of stuff.

On Zircon, one of the streets in my riding, I spoke to one civil servant whose remarks resonated with me. It stuck with me; it still sticks with me today. I'm not going to name her today, but I want her to know that she had a profound effect on me that evening when we spoke. She was in the traffic safety field, and she lamented the fact that the *Motor Vehicles Act* had not been fixed. She talked to me about how difficult it was to work under the current law. She painted a very compelling portrait of the failings of the legislation and how it was affecting society, how it was affecting her, how it was affecting her neighbours. It echoed the sentiment of John Faulkner.

Again, that conversation happened in March 2016, before I was in this House. That, for me, was the genesis of the legislation that's before us today. It was that conversation with that constituent that was so beautifully — it was beautifully and succinctly summarized — the problems — and it stuck with me, building on the case that Judge Faulkner made.

So, after I was elected and made Highways minister, I championed the rewriting of the *Motor Vehicles Act*, and that was in early 2017, and here we are.

This is a very happy day for me to be here today and see all the work that my good colleagues, that the current Minister of Highways and Public Works, have done to bring it to this Chamber today — remarkable.

There's much to talk about. I mean, the initial legislation was written in 1977, as we heard earlier this afternoon. That was a significant date, because that date — 1977 — was, I believe, somewhere between 11 and — maybe 11 years, maybe 12 years — before the Yukon rolled back and made illegal drinking and driving in the territory — maybe it was 1986 — several years before drinking and driving was outlawed in the territory.

The legislation did not address driving while intoxicated because it wasn't a thing. That was the society that passed that

law, woefully out of step with what we were to learn was a national tragedy — an international tragedy, really. That legacy is still with us today. I see Jacquie Van Marck here today, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and every year, she invites the Solicitor General and me to a check stop. Others have come too — I know that many of us have been there and at the traffic stop in the fall to see first-hand what is happening on our streets. It is usually cold; we're there with the RCMP — it is usually the coldest night of the year, actually, I think, but we are out there and we are seeing what happens. We see how many people are driving while intoxicated. Every year, Mothers Against Drunk Driving invites the two of us — the mayor of Whitehorse as well and the RCMP — to speak publicly against driving while intoxicated.

In an attempt to shift public behaviour, we have tributes in this House every year to this very same thing. You know what is saddening? It hurts me to see how little progress we are making. I often think that it is because the legislation under which the territory is currently governed is woefully out of step with where society is today. My colleague has mentioned that in his opening remarks. I wholeheartedly agree with him. So, here we are still dealing with this scourge and others. I find it sad and frustrating that we are still here. Things are not changing; they are not changing enough, and they are not changing fast enough. Every year, the rates of intoxicated driving have remained far too stable; they haven't changed very much.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do better, and this legislation — as I said, it was before 2011 that Judge Faulkner made his remarks. We knew about this and nothing happened. So, here we are. I'm glad that it is here today, and I look forward to the coming debate. This legislation today will begin the process of changing society's behaviour, changing the way we view how we drive in our vehicles, in this motorized society that we have built, and that is because this modern legislation has been written for the times and reflects the will of our society.

There has been an amazing amount of consultation on this piece of legislation over the last many years. The work has been extensive, and my colleague has outlined some of the consultation and work that has gone into this new bill. In my community, indeed, in my travels throughout the territory, Yukoners have complained about the state of our roads. I know that we have all heard it. Our constituents are totally in agreement. I have no doubt that we hear about what? We hear that people drive too fast, that they drive erratically, that they are often distracted, that they don't respect school zones or school bus rules, and that they don't respect construction zones. The Member for Pelly-Nisutlin and I have had that debate when he wanted to do a unique piece of legislation to address that one concern. Instead, we have this act, and that's what I've been talking about for years. It's a better way of doing it.

People abandon vehicles. They drive without insurance or on suspended licences. They do so because they can. They do so because they can and because the fines are too low — woefully out of date. The Solicitor General and I, when I was Highways and Public Works minister, tried to get the fines up as high as we could within the limits of the legislation. We're

bumping against — we need new legislation in order to do it properly because we can't, within the confines of that ridiculous law, do any more. It's not high enough by any stretch. That's why we are not seeing the changes on our roads that need to happen.

They do so also because the penalties are too light. Again, we are going to address that starting with this legislation. They do so because this law is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma — the old law, to be perfectly clear. The old law is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma, as Judge Faulkner said so many years ago. It is almost impossible to enforce, and this has been the state of play for decades. It is totally and utterly beyond belief that we are still here, so I'm very happy to have this legislation in the House today.

I could go into — I have statistics. I know that we will be talking about this a lot more. There are statistics from newspaper stories with the former chief medical officer of health talking about the poor, poor state of driving in the territory. He had a number of recommendations in his report. We have legislation now to address that. This legislation is a public expression of society's views on driving and what we need to fix. It is a foundational piece to my constituent's remarks many years ago.

The law sets the foundation, sets the rules under which we drive and use our roads. From bicycles, self-driving cars to electric vehicles to scooters — the whole bit — will be eventually captured — helmets, the whole bit — will be captured by legislation, and it's important to talk about.

I've gone on long enough. I'm passionate about this. I'm glad it's here. Again, I thank my colleagues for bringing it forward, for doing all the work, for supporting me in the role of Highways minister and for then — in the handoff — my good colleague to do so much incredible work with his team to get it here today. I'm talking about Vern Janz, who has spoken eloquently about how long he has been waiting for this. It has been his lifetime, really. It has been a life's work for him. Chris Butler, of course, and there's a whole host of other people — the drafters, Justice department. It has been an incredible effort on behalf of the entire civil service. There have been so many tendrils, synapses, developed through drafting of this legislation. It affects all of us, but it will affect society positively into the future.

I welcome the debate. I want to hear what the opposition has to say on this. It is a good piece of legislation. It is an absolutely necessary piece of legislation for the territory — a piece of legislation drafted at a time when we take a dim view of driving while intoxicated, of driving while distracted, and a whole host of other things. I know that, within Highways, the legislation will also help with the civil service as it struggles to manage traffic in the territory.

So, with all that, I'm excited about this. I'm glad we're here. I'm glad to see people here to see it happen, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take my seat and let the games begin.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a couple of minutes. I know — or I have been told by the drafters and the Department of Highways and Public Works that this

piece of legislation is the most used piece of legislation for Yukoners. Like, it has the most impact on day-to-day life, and I also know that it's — of all of the pieces of legislation that we have worked on, we have had the most meetings on this one. I look forward to Committee of the Whole and hearing from the members opposite through their questions about what things they have of interest and concern.

Because you don't get that many times to rise on the government side, I just want to take a minute, because in all of my meetings in the communities back when I was the Minister of Community Services but even now as the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes, the most common conversation that I get into with neighbours and constituents is issues about our roads and driving. It's about signs or it's about brushing or — it's definitely about distracted driving and drunk driving, and most often, it's about speeding. It's the most common topic that I get into with Yukoners. So, I'm really happy to see it, and I just wanted to add one anecdote.

Late last week or maybe it was early this week — you start to lose track of time when we're in session — I went to Golden Horn school for one of the school council meetings, and they asked me a question about what was happening. We were talking about school buses and school bus safety, and I let them know that this piece of legislation was about to be tabled, and they cheered. You don't usually get that with constituents talking about legislation, so I really think it is an important piece of legislation. I think it's going to be very meaningful for Yukoners.

Like my colleagues, I would just like to thank all of the people who worked so hard to get here, whether that's members of our community who have brought their concerns forward or whether that's the team from Highways and Public Works and the legislative counsel office. My sincere thanks for all of that hard, hard work, and I am looking forward to — I hope that we modernize our legislation.

Speaker: If the member now speaks, he will close debate.

Does any other member wish to be heard?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank members of this Assembly for their observations today, particularly the dynamic and energized comments from the Minister of Community Services.

I certainly thank him for his dogged support between 2016 and 2021 with respect to this important legislation. I certainly look forward to further discussion on this important bill during Committee of the Whole.

This bill addresses three priorities that we heard as nearly unanimous priorities from across the territory. These three priorities are: enhancing road safety for all road users; creating administrative efficiency and improved services; and planning for the future. This bill is drafted in a way that ensures that it will meet the needs of Yukoners for many years to come. This modern drafting style allows for a robust regulatory regime that can be more easily updated to accommodate changes. This means that Bill No. 44 is forward-looking and flexible enough

to effectively govern our highways when we develop infrastructure that does not yet exist in the Yukon and can also respond to emerging technologies. We are allowing room for a growing population, evolving technologies, and unforeseen traffic safety challenges.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, our government has worked tirelessly to make sure that this bill addresses what is important to Yukoners. By writing this bill in a modern, enabling drafting style, the government has ensured that this piece of legislation can grow and evolve with us.

As I mentioned earlier, public and stakeholder input has been instrumental in the development of this bill. The Department of Highways and Public Works has conducted several public and targeted engagements since 2019 in order to gather input from Yukoners in order to inform policy direction. We have heard resounding support for enhancing safety for all road users from Yukoners across the territory. We look forward to further discussions with Yukoners as the regulations are developed.

As members of this Assembly have indicated — the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin and the Member for Takhini-Kopper King, the Leader of the Third Party, as well — this legislation is long overdue. During Committee of the Whole, we will delve into many of the matters raised by the members opposite and I look forward to those discussions. Perhaps I would be remiss — for Hansard and for the advocacy of Hansard, I am sure that now retired Judge John Faulkner would now be amused. I think he would be amused and have a wry smile about his name being mentioned a number of times with respect to his observations of the hopefully soon to be outdated *Motor Vehicles Act*.

I had the opportunity to appear in front of Judge Faulkner many times in many communities over the years. I certainly appreciate his dry sense of humour, and this was but one example of him having that dry humour on full display.

In any event, I digress, and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to voting on second reading of this bill and hope to proceed to Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

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. Pillai: Agree.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Agree.

Hon. Ms. McLean: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Silver: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Agree.

Mr. Dixon: Agree.

Mr. Kent: Agree.

Ms. Clarke: Agree.

Mr. Cathers: Agree.

Ms. McLeod: Agree.

Ms. Van Bibber: Agree.

Mr. Hassard: Agree.

Mr. Istchenko: Agree.

Ms. White: Agree.

Ms. Blake: Agree.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 17 yeas, nil nays.

Speaker: The yeas have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Motion for second reading of Bill No. 44 agreed to

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

Speaker: It has been moved by the 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. Blake): Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

The matter before the Committee is general debate on Bill No. 44, entitled *Traffic Safety 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. 44: *Traffic Safety Act*

Chair: The matter before the Committee is general debate on Bill No. 44, entitled *Traffic Safety Act*.

Is there any general debate?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Madam Chair, thank you for the opportunity to speak in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 44, *Traffic Safety Act*. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce, to my left, Vern Janz, who is one of the policy specialists on a lot of background work on the *Traffic Safety Act*. To my immediate right is Deputy Minister Tracy Allen, and to her right is another one of the many HPW team policy specialists, Chris Butler. And there will be a team listening and providing advice as well.

I do have some introductory comments and then look forward to answering questions from the members opposite.

In my earlier remarks during second reading, I provided an overview of Bill No. 44, the *Traffic Safety Act*. I would like to expand further on just how this bill will enhance safety for all Yukon road users.

We all know that Bill No. 44 has been a long time in the making, but when you think on the scope of this bill and how many factors must be considered to provide a comprehensive approach to improving traffic safety, it's daunting. We performed extensive engagement in the process of developing this legislation to make sure this bill would address the issues that are important to Yukoners. We have listened to Yukoners' concerns and referred to best practices across the country in order to create legislation that deters dangerous driving behaviour and increases administrative efficiency while also accounting for the future.

When our government first committed to rewriting the *Motor Vehicles Act*, there were several contributing factors beyond those that I have mentioned previously. The federally mandated legalization of cannabis and amendments to the *Criminal Code of Canada* to strengthen impaired driving laws would have required amendments to the act. Adding to this, several of our partners and stakeholders, including the RCMP, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and the Yukon judiciary, had identified issues with the *Motor Vehicles Act*. Foremost among the issues that our government has set out to address through the bill before us today is impaired and dangerous driving prevention and enforcement.

Our government is continually working toward creating safer roads for Yukoners and visitors alike, and we know that impaired driving and collision rates are linked. In fact, in 2022, impaired driving was a factor in 23 percent of all fatal motor vehicle collisions in Canada over the last 20 years. Yukon has often ranked among the highest rates in Canada for motor vehicle collision fatalities and injuries. This is not a ranking to be proud of. We cannot work toward safer roads without addressing the high collision rates that we see in the territory.

Through the provision in this bill, we will enable more effective and efficient enforcement of impaired and dangerous driving behaviours, leading to safer roads with few collisions. Under the bill before us today, peace officers will be empowered to issue roadside administrative sanctions for certain contraventions under the new legislation. Roadside administrative sanctions are penalties imposed outside of the court system, such as a driving qualification or an impoundment of the driver's vehicle.

These sanctions include immediate penalties for criminal levels of impaired driving and dangerous driving offences, such as manslaughter by motor vehicle, flight from a peace officer, and more.

The bill also includes new contraventions to which roadside administrative sanctions will apply that did not exist in the *Motor Vehicles Act*. Roadside administrative sanctions will apply to new drivers or drivers of commercial vehicles who contravene zero-tolerance requirements for alcohol and drugs in their body. Consistent with other Canadian jurisdictions, roadside administrative sanctions will also apply to all drivers who are driving with a blood alcohol content that is between 0.05 and 0.08 percent, the latter of which is the threshold for criminal impaired driving. When issued, these sanctions will take effect immediately at the roadside. These are measures that we can take that will help to improve safety for all road users

by having dangerous drivers removed from our roads without delay right there on the spot. They will also be processed far quicker than *Criminal Code* offences, meaning that officers can get back on the road faster to continue addressing traffic safety violations.

Our provincial counterparts in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Ontario all employ strong impaired driving laws with roadside administrative sanctions. It is important to note that, according to the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction, these jurisdictions have experienced a marked decline in alcohol-related motor vehicle collisions and deaths as a result of having implemented their respective roadside administrative sanction regimes.

We know that roadside administrative sanctions are an effective tool for deterring dangerous and impaired driving; however, we also recognize that an essential component of administrative justice is an efficient and effective way for people to have these sanctions reviewed. This administrative fairness is provided within the responsibilities of the Traffic Safety Review Board under this bill. The board will manage the functions of the existing Driver Control Board and the National Safety Code Review Board and provide a way for a person to apply for a review of a roadside administrative sanction. By enabling the functions of a Traffic Safety Review Board, the bill establishes a robust mechanism for reviewing these applications. The federal-provincial-territorial Justice ministers working group on impaired driving has advocated an approach such as this, as it balances the need for swift punishment in the case of impaired and dangerous driving with the need to provide due process for the accused person.

There is no doubt that this bill provides a significantly improved framework to aid in deterring unsafe driving behaviours. During our extensive public engagement for this bill, we heard that Yukoners are deeply concerned about poor driving practices and the life-altering effects that they can have on our families, friends, and communities.

When collisions happen, there is not only a high cost to our emotional well-being and sense of safety but also a significant monetary cost. According to Transport Canada, the social cost of collisions in Canada totalled \$36 billion in 2020. For these reasons, we have structured this bill to enable automatic enforcement technology, updated peace officer authorities for stopping vehicles, and increased the maximum fines for certain offences. These updates will bring our legislation in line with other Canadian jurisdictions and ultimately improve safety for all Yukon road users.

In fact, in creating this bill, we worked to make sure that we aligned with other jurisdictions, such as British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario, as much as is reasonably possible. This is why we have broadened Yukon municipalities' existing traffic-related bylaw-making authorities under this bill. This update is something that the Yukon municipalities expressed a need for during our engagements and would align our municipal authorities with other Canadian jurisdictions.

While the Government of Yukon has authority over the Yukon's highways, many of the roads that Yukoners use every day are within a municipality. The bill not only enhances

municipalities' existing authorities but also enables new authorities. These new authorities would allow municipalities to implement certain measures such as bylaws that enable high-occupancy vehicle lanes, if they choose.

In regard to driver's licensing, many of the provisions in this bill have been carried over from the current *Motor Vehicles Act* — provisions like those dictating that a person must not drive a motor vehicle on a highway without a valid driver's licence are common sense, necessary laws. As with other sections of this bill, we have included regulation-enabling provisions that will allow us to meet the needs of our growing territory now and into the future. Similar to driver's licensing, rules of the road prohibitions will be mostly carried forward from the current *Motor Vehicles Act*. However, the bill before us today will also allow for robust regulations, setting out traffic safety rules enabling future regulatory changes, like requiring drivers to slow down and change lanes when passing emergency vehicles, limiting the number of occupants in a vehicle to the number of operational seatbelts, and introducing a mandatory passing distance for motor vehicles passing cyclists.

Rules of the road apply to all traffic on Yukon highways. This includes the operation of off-road vehicles on Yukon highways, which is why we plan to carry forward the current requirements that apply to off-road vehicles under the *Motor Vehicles Act*.

Similar to other jurisdictions, this bill establishes the framework for regulating businesses whose activities directly impact road safety. We know that Yukon businesses that deal with vehicles — such as commercial carriers, driver training schools, and dealerships — are incredibly busy providing Yukoners with vital services. Rest assured that regulating vehicle businesses is not done to punish rule-abiding, ethically operated businesses. They are safeguards in order to ensure that peace officers have the means to deter or put an end to problematic vehicle business practices that would risk the safety of Yukoners. Things like incomplete or fraudulent vehicle inspections or the improper or unsecured loading of large commercial trucks can not only cause dangerous conditions for other traffic on the roads, but they may also affect the reputation and public opinion of rule-abiding businesses.

Under the current *Motor Vehicles Act*, this regulation-making authority only applies to businesses operating as commercial carriers, driver training schools, and vehicle inspection and testing facilities. In this bill, we are carrying forward the existing regulatory framework that is applicable to commercial truck and bus transport under the National Safety Code from the *Motor Vehicles Act*. The framework in this bill enables the ability to regulate other vehicle businesses' activities in the future, should the need arise, that would have the potential to affect road safety. However, the finer details will be established in the upcoming regulations.

Yukoners are a passionate group of people, and our government has heard them loud and clear on the subject of unattended vehicles. Unattended vehicles may be unsightly, cause safety issues by impeding sight lines in the highway

right-of-way, and can become environmental hazards. These unattended vehicles include abandoned vehicles, improperly parked vehicles, and vehicles that are damaged in a collision and must be towed away. With this bill, we have worked to more effectively address this issue and provide a clear framework for the management of unattended vehicles. The regulations will expand on how impoundment functions for each category of vehicle and provide further details about the process of impoundment, including release, disposal, and fees.

Should Bill No. 44 receive assent, it will not come into force fully until several regulations integral to its function are completed; however, as you may have noticed, our government takes traffic safety extremely seriously, so seriously that, in fact, we are taking immediate steps to address traffic safety matters. These steps include several transitional provisions that will allow us to update fine amounts for certain unsafe driving offences to levels that will appropriately deter unsafe driving behaviour and also update and expand the bylaw-making authorities for a municipality to manage traffic safety matters, as the municipality sees fit. These provisions would come into force once the transitional regulations are drafted. This is expected to occur in the coming year.

The government has worked diligently for years to address the myriad issues with the current *Motor Vehicles Act*. I believe we have produced a bill that will stand up to whatever challenges the future may present — a bill that provides a clear, functional legislative framework for those tasked with enforcing, administering, and interpreting it. By implementing this legislation, we are improving safety for all road users and deterring dangerous driving behaviour by increasing penalties, updating enforcement authorities, and modernizing programs.

Madam Chair, the Yukon has limped the *Motor Vehicles Act* along for 47 long years. I think we can all agree that it is time to give it the retirement that it deserves. Bill No. 44 provides the framework that the Yukon has needed for decades, and I look forward to seeing it passed in this House soon.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I look forward to questions from members opposite.

Mr. Hassard: I thank the minister for his opening remarks. I do want to remind him right off the bat, though, that 47 years isn't that long, so —

I would also like to thank the officials for being here today and for the briefings that they provided to the opposition members earlier. It certainly makes things a little easier.

I guess, just a note for Vern that I hope that we pass this legislation, if nothing else, so that you can retire.

The first question I have for the minister is regarding “slow down, move over”. It's something that we've talked about at length in this Legislature, and when I actually brought a motion forward regarding “slow down, move over” a couple of years ago, the discussion turned to the fact that it would fall under this new act.

I'm wondering if the minister can just provide some clarification to Yukoners as to where in the act it is and how it will be implemented, I guess.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I would advise that it will be in section 37 of the new act and regulations under “unsafe

driving”, and it will be provided for a fine and demerit points. I think, to your point — and I did hear the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin over the years on this topic — we heard many comments during engagement regarding school bus safety, including requests for increased penalties for passing a school bus. That's not entirely — it's the same type of topic.

The act provides authorities to create new rules of the road in the regulations to address concerns during engagement to make Yukon roads safer. One of these is anticipated to be a requirement for drivers to slow down or change lanes when passing emergency vehicles. This is responsive to a request from stakeholders and will increase safety for first responders and is currently the law in most other Canadian jurisdictions. Another example is increasing the fines and potentially introducing demerits as penalties for drivers who speed through construction zones. Finally, another change that you can expect to see is introducing a minimum passing distance for motor vehicles passing cyclists, which I talked about. This is intended to protect cyclists travelling on the highway from vehicles driving too close to avoid the potential for high-consequence motor vehicle-cyclist collisions.

The answer is that it was provided for in section 37. The regulations would be provided for in section 37.

Mr. Hassard: I thank the minister for that.

During second reading speeches earlier today, the Minister of Community Services talked about distracted driving in this *Traffic Safety Act*. I am wondering if the minister could provide a little bit of clarity or expand on how this act will deal with distracted driving. Is there a definition of “distracted driving”? What constitutes distracted driving and things like that?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will wait for a specific answer with respect to where the definition of “distracted driving” might be, but I do have some background with respect to distracted driving. Using a cellphone while driving is associated with a significantly increased risk of collision. According to a report issued by the Yukon's chief medical officer of health, in 2020, the number one contributing factor to collisions between 2011 and 2017 was distracted driving. The current distracted driving laws in the *Motor Vehicles Act* are outdated and inadvertently limit the scope of the offence to using only cellphones and electronic communication devices while driving.

Under the new *Traffic Safety Act*, distracted driving rules will be included in the regulations to ensure that updates can be made more easily as technology evolves. We are planning to broaden the scope of distracted driving and regulations to prohibit the use of other electronic devices while driving, such as e-readers, as well as prohibiting reading printed material, writing, and personal grooming while driving. The current exemptions for hands-free cellphone use, two-way radios, and cellphone use for emergency responders will be maintained. Since the Yukon doubled the fine for distracted driving to \$500 in 2018, we are largely aligned with other Canadian jurisdictions. As part of the development of the regulations, the penalty for this offence will be reviewed against those in other jurisdictions in order to ensure that it provides adequate deterrence. Whether I have a more specific definition of “distracted driving” — I understand that I might be able to

provide the House and the member opposite with a more detailed definition of “distracted driving”.

Madam Chair, it’s largely consistent with the information that I just provided to the House, but there is also a definition on page 21 of the bill and that specifically speaks to electronic devices: “‘electronic device’ means (a) a device, other than a permitted device, that is either or both of the following: (i) a cellular telephone or another device that includes a telephone function, (ii) a device that is capable of transmitting or receiving email or other text-based messages, and (b) any other device prescribed by the regulations as an electronic device...”

I am also advised, Madam Chair, that under section 40(f) is where the act provides for the development of regulatory rules regarding distracted driving.

I talked about some of the other examples which were not limited to cellphones. I don’t have the list here anymore, but it was actually reading written materials or newspapers or, as I recall, personal grooming. In any event, that is section 40(f) which provides for the development of regulatory rules regarding distracted driving. I certainly agree with the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin that it is certainly incredibly important and the statistics bear it out — with respect to one of the largest causes of collisions being distracted driving.

Mr. Hassard: I thank the minister for that. I know that there was talk a while back with regard to distracted driving — animals in vehicles and the possibility of making drivers secure the animals, whether that be in cages or whatever the case may be. I am curious if there was any thought given or if there is anything in here in regard to — I guess the other thing too, while the minister is on his feet, would be in regard to eating — as well as animals in vehicles or dealing with children.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I believe that this will likely be a response that I will provide a number of times.

I am getting a section reference here.

So, it’s section 37(2)(g): “where that person is the driver of a motor vehicle, permit any person, animal or thing to occupy the front seat of the motor vehicle in such a manner so as to impede the driver in the free and uninterrupted access to and use of the steering wheel, brakes and other equipment required to be used for the safe operation of the motor vehicle...” — so, that drivers are responsible for ensuring that they have free and uninterrupted access to what we call “impertinences” in the vehicle — that person, the driver of the vehicle, to permit any person, animal, or thing in or on the vehicle to cause any obstruction to the driver’s clear vision in any direction — it’s certainly contemplated in that section.

And the issue of eating — well, the answer that I will provide in a number of my preliminary answers is that, of course, the Department of Highways and Public Works will continue to engage on the regulations, and if eating bubbles to the surface or becomes a bit of an issue, we’re certainly open to engaging on that topic. But it appears that the drivers will be responsible for ensuring that animals are not impeding the safe operation of motor vehicles.

Mr. Hassard: I thank the minister for that. I’m not asking him to create any more rules; I just wanted clarification.

I have some questions regarding the towing and impounding of vehicles. I know that in the minister’s opening remarks, he talked about this a little bit, but I’m just wondering if we could just get it on record for clarity that he said — correct me if I’m wrong — that the rates for impoundment would be done in the regulations. I’m wondering if he can give us any update or any clarification around the moving of abandoned vehicles. Are there going to be timelines?

What would be the process for the towing companies to find out about moving vehicles that appear to be abandoned, whether they be on the highway or on private property? Just a little bit of clarification around those rules.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I do have a fair bit of detail on this, so indulge me on this response.

The new *Traffic Safety Act* carries forward the current authority for an officer to seize and impound a vehicle, with a few changes to the impound and release process. These changes are designed to enforce the payment of debts and reduce the number of abandoned vehicles on the roadside. One key change is shifting the debt for unclaimed vehicles in an impoundment yard from the impound and towing business to the Yukon government. This removes a disincentive to tow abandoned vehicles on operators who find it difficult to collect on debts in the past, particularly when vehicle owners moved away from the Yukon.

Another change relates to registrar authority. Currently, under the *Motor Vehicles Act*, if a vehicle owner has unpaid debts, such as from impoundment of their vehicle, the registrar of motor vehicles may refuse to register that owner’s vehicle until the outstanding debt is paid. The *Traffic Safety Act* extends the registrar’s discretion in these situations by also allowing the registrar to refuse to renew a driver’s licence or provide other motor vehicle services to a vehicle owner until the outstanding debt for impounded vehicles is paid.

Another change is the reduction of time when a vehicle owner may apply for release of their vehicle from impoundment. Under the current law, a vehicle owner has 30 days to apply for the release of a vehicle after the date of impoundment or, if there is a mandatory period of impoundment, 30 days after the mandatory period of impoundment. The 30-day window will be shortened to 15 days under the *Traffic Safety Act*. After the 15-day period, the vehicle may be disposed of by the registrar of motor vehicles in a manner to be set out in regulations, such as by sale or direct transfer. A 15-day window for a vehicle owner to retrieve their impounded vehicle is consistent with other jurisdictions, such as Saskatchewan, which also has a 15-day window, and British Columbia, which has a 14-day window for retrieval after the owner is notified. Changing the period to apply for release of a vehicle impounded under the new *Traffic Safety Act* will reduce the cost of storing vehicles in the impound lot, free up limited storage space, and mitigate financial risk to the Yukon government for unpaid debts.

The question is how a vehicle may be impounded under the new *Traffic Safety Act*. There are three scenarios that may lead to a vehicle being seized and impounded under the *Traffic Safety Act*. The first scenario is if the vehicle is unattended for

a period of time. This includes abandoned vehicles, improperly parked vehicles, and vehicles that have been damaged in a collision to the extent that the vehicle cannot be driven from the scene of the collision. The second scenario covers impoundments of an administrative nature. For example, a vehicle may be impounded if it does not display a valid licence plate, the registration certificate is expired, or the driver does not have valid insurance for the vehicle.

The third scenario relates to the new roadside administration sanctions regime under the *Traffic Safety Act*. A vehicle may be impounded if a driver is sanctioned under the *Traffic Safety Act* or a contravention of the act, such as impaired, high-risk, or *Criminal Code* dangerous driving. The amount of time a vehicle may be impounded for and more details on how these impoundments work will be developed and set out in the regulations for each category of impoundment.

A person whose vehicle is impounded as part of an administrative sanction, such as impaired, high-risk, or *Criminal Code* dangerous driving, may apply to an adjudicator for the early release of the vehicle on specific grounds. The grounds will be set out in regulation but could include, for example, that the person has a dependent who relies on the vehicle to get to work or drive their children to school.

I think that probably doesn't answer all of that question, but it does sound like there are three scenarios for impoundment, and some of the details with respect to each of those scenarios will be worked out through the regulations. I know that the Member for Copperbelt South, last year, certainly brought it to my attention in doing the good work on behalf of his constituents with respect to abandoned vehicles.

I just want to commend the Department of Highways and Public Works for their great work that was done last year in removing vehicles, but I think, to the points I made with respect to this new legislation, that involved a pretty significant cost to the government to remove the abandoned vehicles. I certainly don't disagree that they ought to be removed as quickly as possible, but if there aren't strong disincentives for abandonment, then it's difficult to stay on top of that file, because there's incentive for those persons who are so inclined to do so to abandon vehicles that are no longer operational or have any value. That will be part of the — and I have some stats.

I'm not sure how much time I have left here, but on average every week, two to three vehicles are abandoned somewhere in the Yukon. In 2023-24, 125 abandoned vehicles were towed. Highways and Public Works, the RCMP, and local towing companies facilitate the removal of abandoned vehicles in the right-of-way as quickly as possible. Our highway crews have been tasked with the identification of abandoned vehicles so that removal can be actioned quickly. Towing companies are selected based on their proximity to the abandoned vehicle, the services that each company can provide, and their respective availability.

In some cases, it may take longer for the vehicle to be removed due to tow operator availability and space at secure storage facilities.

We certainly want to make this a more streamlined and better process and absolutely disincentivize abandonment of vehicles.

Mr. Hassard: So, there were two other parts to that question, if the minister could provide a little more information. The first was regarding the fees for the impoundment. Does the minister foresee those changing? I believe it's \$7 a day right now, which, in the opinion of some, is too low. I'm curious what the government's thought is on that.

The other part of the question was: If someone abandons their vehicle but gets it off of the highway onto private property, what is the process there? I mean, is it now the responsibility of the property owner to have that vehicle removed, and are they then responsible for the costs? Or is that something that would be covered under this new *Traffic Safety Act*?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: With respect to those two specific questions from the member opposite, yes, it's likely that the fees for impoundment will be increased. That will be part of the engagement with respect to the regulations, but I don't disagree that those are likely not a suitable number in 2024 and probably would not survive a cross-jurisdictional scan in Canada.

With respect to impoundment or abandoned vehicles on private property, the *Traffic Safety Act* also maintains officer authority — which I believe means that it's within the *Motor Vehicles Act* — but the *Traffic Safety Act* also maintains officer authority to seize and impound at any time a vehicle that has been left standing or parked on private property without consent. That is section 70(2)(f). The preamble says, "Subject to the regulations, an officer may seize and impound a vehicle if the officer or another officer believes on reasonable grounds that the vehicle ... (f) has been left standing or parked on private property without the consent of the owner of the property..."

Mr. Hassard: I thank the minister for that clarification.

I wanted to talk a little bit about school bus safety, and I know that I brought this up at the briefing and that the officials have spoken to this to some degree already. But just for the purposes of getting it on record so that people can have somewhere to go and actually read what is being discussed, I know that, in February 2020, the Yukon was a signatory to a document that was entitled *Strengthening School Bus Safety in Canada*, a report of the Task Force on School Bus Safety.

From that report, there were four recommendations: The first was infraction cameras to help prevent dangerous incidents caused by passing motorists; the second was extended stop arms to further deter motorists from passing while children are entering or leaving the bus; the third was exterior 360-degree cameras as a means of better detecting and protecting children and other vulnerable road users around the exterior of the bus; and fourth was automatic emergency braking, and this, of course, is to help reduce the severity of a collision or avoid it entirely. Consideration should also be given to exploring ways to pair this feature with other technologies for increased safety.

So, if the minister can just provide some clarity around that and tell Yukoners where we are in regard to those recommendations from that report.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The safety of Yukon's children is, of course, paramount for our government. It is the law for drivers to respect the flashing lights and stop signs on school buses that are intended to keep our children safe. Along with increasing the general maximum fine for rules of the road offences, the *Traffic Safety Act* also enables broad regulation-making authority to govern driver behaviour around school buses. As the member opposite indicated, one potential tool may be the use of automated enforcement. Cameras mounted on school buses could be used to capture driver contraventions such as passing a stopped school bus. Rules regarding the use of automated enforcement tools in relation to school buses will be refined during drafting of the regulations and further discussion and research.

We heard many comments during engagement regarding school bus safety, including requests for increased penalties for passing a school bus while the lights are flashing.

In 2019, we acted immediately to increase the demerit points for the offences of failing to stop for a school bus and for passing a school bus with lights flashing. We also increased the fines for those offences to \$500, the maximum that is currently allowable under the *Motor Vehicles Act*.

Many Canadian jurisdictions are introducing stiffer penalties for offences related to school buses, including Prince Edward Island, which introduced a \$5,000 and a three-month licence suspension for passing a school bus when the red lights of the bus are flashing.

Though you may not see any specific rules in the act, we will carry over the rules related to school bus safety in the regulations alongside stronger fines and demerits for these offences. The direction of automated enforcement technology may also assist in the enforcement of school bus safety laws. The development of the automated enforcement regulation is planned to consider the possibility of enforcing school bus safety offences through the use of cameras installed on those buses. Extended stop arms and seat belts are mandated under federal legislation.

Yukon participated in the 2020 initiative, but it is led by Transport Canada. Yukon will follow Transport Canada's lead on any changes to school bus safety that is under their jurisdiction.

I think there was one about the automatic breaking — and I'm sure that the HPW team on this file certainly is aware of those four recommendations and is obviously open to considering those recommendations, of course. School bus safety is paramount for all Yukon children, and it's also instructive to see that Prince Edward Island has taken the lead and is providing for fines of up to \$5,000 with respect to contraventions. It may very well be that the Yukon has some work to do with respect to disincentivizing and, in fact, punishing bad behaviour around school buses.

As recently as last week, Highways and Public Works received a complaint about a close call. We certainly don't want those. We want to limit any harm to Yukon children.

Mr. Hassard: Something that I've heard from constituents regarding this bill is the fact that the overarching trend of this bill is to remove a number of issues from

legislation and move them into regulation. Of course, the reason that this is concerning is that it significantly broadens the power of Cabinet and gives them the ability to take actions in these areas where such changes are no longer subject to the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly. In fact, this bill includes the ability for Cabinet to pass regulations that directly contradict or conflict with the act itself.

According to the bill, the regulations that contradict the act can be in place for up to a five-year period. Practically speaking, this means that they can be renewed at the five-year mark, despite actually changing the intent of parts of the act. I guess my question to the minister would be: Why was this decision made, and further to that, what aspects of the act that the minister intends to use regulations for might contradict the act itself?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Madam Chair, broadly speaking, there would be three areas. We have the transitional provisions, which I will speak to, but also, there would be potentially pilot projects. Within part 10 of the act, there is broad authority to create regulations governing new technologies and practices, including rules governing the ability to test drive a new or emerging technology or try out a new way of doing things by setting up a pilot project. For example, a pilot project could be created to test the battery effectiveness in cold weather of electric modes of transportation such as e-scooters, or a pilot project could research the safety of self-driving cars on the Yukon's road network.

A regulation will be developed to govern each pilot project, including who was involved in the project, the goal of the project, and the scope of the project. The act limits the length of pilot projects to five years maximum. This is the necessary limitation because, in some instances, a pilot project may temporarily override some provisions in the act, if necessary, to carry out the project properly. Although it is an emerging area of law, other jurisdictions have enabled pilot projects in their motor vehicle legislation.

In 2016, Ontario began a 10-year pilot program to allow testing of automated vehicles on Ontario's roads. The project had strict terms and conditions, including requiring a driver to be present for safety reasons. The project was updated in 2019 to reflect changes in automated vehicle technology. Saskatchewan's *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2020* was enacted to govern the regulation of autonomous vehicles in the province, although provisions related to the use of these vehicles are not yet in place or in force. Manitoba enabled pilot projects through an amendment to its highway traffic act in 2022. British Columbia's *Motor Vehicle Act* was amended in April 2024. The amendment permits four-year pilot projects to be established by regulation. Prince Edward Island provides for pilot projects in its OHV legislation, and Nova Scotia's new *Traffic Safety Act* will govern autonomous vehicles once it is in force. Using pilot projects to test emerging technologies and safe transportation on the roadway is important as technology affecting modes of transportation continues to evolve. So, that is one instance — answering the member opposite's question.

The other is with respect to transitional provisions, which we hope to have in force and effect in 2025. It will take some

time to draft the approximately 11 regulations needed to bring the act into force, including conducting further research and participating in discussions with stakeholders. However, it is critical to advance the goals of road safety without delay. This is why some areas of the *Traffic Safety Act* are planned to come into force earlier than the rest of the provisions.

The two areas coming into force early are penalties that will apply to some unsafe driving offences and several municipal bylaw-making authorities. For example, the regulations will allow new higher minimum and maximum fine levels for certain offences to override the lower ones that presently exist within the *Motor Vehicles Act*, and higher fines will help deter bad driving behaviour, especially for repeat offenders, who will pay a higher fine on a second conviction. Also, enabling municipalities to more broadly govern traffic safety issues on municipal roads also works toward the goal of road safety and allows municipalities to expand their bylaws without waiting for the entire act to be in force. The power to override acts with a regulation is notable but is not an uncommon legislative tool. In this case, its application is warranted, in our view, and Yukoners will not want to wait for the higher minimum/maximum fine levels for certain serious offences. We are also listening to the municipalities to provide them with authority to expand their bylaws in a timely fashion.

Mr. Hassard: I guess my concern with that would be — I will use CEMA as an example. It was very controversial. A lot of people were very concerned with the fact that the government had these overarching powers to essentially do things without any scrutiny. I guess I am curious as to what the logic is of the government by moving some of these very important, controversial provisions out of the legislation and into the power of Cabinet. For all intents and purposes, decisions made in Cabinet are — without it sounding bad — secret. The average citizen doesn't know what the decisions being made in Cabinet are, so I'm curious as to what the logic was for doing that.

Chair: Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 44, entitled *Traffic Safety Act*. Is there any further general debate?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The question from the member opposite really comes down to the now pretty much accepted drafting style of modern legislation, so I have a few notes here and then perhaps a few observations.

The *Traffic Safety Act* is written in a modern, enabling drafting style. This means that the act contains general rules, authorities, and prohibitions that function as an overall framework to accomplish the objectives of the new law.

Drafting the act in this way permits the specific rules and processes needed to operationalize the act to be written into

regulations rather than in the act itself. Regulations can be updated more quickly and easily than amending the act. This makes the overall legislation more responsive to the needs of Yukoners in the future.

I have more, but I am just repeating myself from my second reading speech. Just to emphasize that it ran and had become a — to use the vernacular — “bit of a jalopy” that was not really even roadworthy anymore, but it was out of date. The *Motor Vehicles Act* was not only out of date, but its convoluted nature made it difficult to interpret and enforce. Once again, I will just quote Judge Faulkner of the Territorial Court of the Yukon, who likened the *Motor Vehicles Act* to a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside of an enigma. I think that we can all agree that Yukon legislation should not be difficult to interpret or apply and that this should not be the opinion that we receive from courts in the future. That has been 47 years of trying to interpret an act that is not in the modern drafting style.

As the member opposite knows, regulations can be updated more quickly and easily than the amending act. This is an ever-evolving space and one in which change occurs quickly. Organizing the law in this way will enable government to react nimbly to changes in the environment. This approach will result in legislation that is more responsive to the needs of Yukoners, both now and into the future.

This is an enabling act, meaning that the majority of the rules will be found in the regulations. The project team is already hard at work on the regulations, and engagement done to date has focused on both act and regulation issues. Due to the amount of content anticipated to be contained in the regulation, further research and discussion with affected stakeholders is planned for the coming months and further into the future. As regulation development continues, the department will endeavour to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to provide further input into the process where possible.

In summary, it is a modern, enabling drafting style, certainly preferred versus the 47-year-old *Motor Vehicles Act*, where it was just add-ons and workarounds with respect to that act, which the Territorial Court ultimately found to be almost unworkable and unenforceable. This is the right way to go, and certainly, in 47 years, that saw many different territorial governments.

Mr. Hassard: I don't think there are many people in the Yukon — certainly probably not any in this room — who would disagree that the *Motor Vehicles Act* was outdated and needed to be replaced. However, I think it's still concerning to many — or it will be concerning to many — that Cabinet has this overreaching power. And as I used the example of CEMA, I mean, it was clearly demonstrated by some people that they were not happy with the fact that Cabinet had this overreaching power. As much as it pains me to say it, there are people out there who don't trust politicians, so we can't — we have to understand the reasons for their concerns, but I'll move on.

Another aspect of this bill that people may have concerns with is in relation to off-road vehicles. Now, we know that, with the passage of this bill, major decisions that have also been controversial or of great interest to Yukoners will now again be

removed from law and put into regulation, which again is subject to the will of Cabinet, and again, that decision-making is done in the secret of Cabinet.

I'm sure that the minister is quite aware of the fact that there was an all-party committee on the safe operation and use of off-road vehicles. That committee held public consultation beginning in 2009, and that ended in 2011. If memory serves me correctly, there were approximately 2,500 participants in that. There were paper surveys completed, public meetings, and the committee also received written submissions from stakeholders and met directly with some of those stakeholders.

Madam Chair, the committee voted unanimously to its recommendations, and they included — and I'll quote: "THAT, the definition of 'highway' in the *Motor Vehicles Act* be clarified and THAT, the terms 'on-road' and 'off-road' be clearly defined in the Act."

So, now I don't see in this bill either term or a replacement term to describe "off-road" or "on-road", so I'm curious if the minister can enlighten me on some of this.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I guess the preliminary answer is that it is intended that all current off-road vehicle rules and regulations in the current *Motor Vehicles Act* will be subsumed by and become part of the rules of the road regulations in the new *Traffic Safety Act*.

The regulation of off-road vehicles, including ATVs and snowmobiles, was a top interest for many stakeholders in the public during engagement. The *Traffic Safety Act* includes broad regulation-making authorities applicable to off-road vehicles both on and off highways. This provides flexibility to set out specific rules for these vehicle types in the regulations.

A common theme that we heard during engagement is that off-road vehicles are an important part of recreation and tradition in the Yukon. Many Yukoners feel a strong sense of attachment to off-road vehicles, as they allow them to access our vast backcountry and facilitate important traditional activities, like fishing, harvesting, and hunting.

We received mixed feedback regarding increased regulation of off-road vehicles on highways. When the act comes into force, it is anticipated that the regulations will not reflect any changes to the way that off-road vehicles are currently regulated when driving on highways. This means that a driver's licence, insurance, and registration as well as adherence to the rules of the road, such as speeding, will continue to be required when driving an off-road vehicle on the highway. There are currently exemptions to most rules related to off-road vehicles on the roads within nine Yukon communities. This approach also means that these exemptions will be maintained, although the act is structured in such a way that this can be revisited at a future date.

HPW has engaged as well with Energy, Mines and Resources on areas of mutual off-road vehicle interest over the last several years. Just to be clear for those who may be listening this afternoon or reading Hansard at some point in the future, just to be clear with respect to Cabinet — and the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin and a number of the other members opposite do know this — the deliberations of Cabinet are in confidence, of course, but the decision-making results of those

deliberations are public and are subject to all scrutiny, criticism, and review.

To be somewhat repetitive, this currently existing act has had 47 years of, as I said, add-ons, workarounds, bailing wire to keep it going — just an example of what old and not currently preferred drafting style is with respect to current, modern Canadian legislation. So, I think I did answer the question with respect to off-road vehicles and the intent of where the regulations will go in the new transportation safety act.

Mr. Hassard: Again, I will say that I am not here to dispute the fact that the *Motor Vehicles Act* is outdated and needs to be replaced, but again, I will reiterate the fact that people do have concerns when Cabinet has the ability to make these decisions. I know that the minister says that they are still subject to scrutiny and people disagreeing with it, but the fact of the matter is that it is still done behind closed doors and it's not talked about or hashed out in the Legislature. The decision is made behind closed doors, and people essentially have to live with it until such time as it can be changed. So, it is certainly different from it being in an act where we can openly discuss it, talk about it, and argue about it or whatever we so choose to do here in the Legislature.

I will move on, Madam Chair.

There are some questions regarding the roadside licence suspensions and immediate vehicle impoundment for drivers with trace amounts of alcohol or drugs in their body. It appears that the bill will allow for immediate loss of licence and impoundment of a vehicle for a period of time that will be set in regulation. It sounded like that length of time would be longer than just a 24-hour suspension, so I'm curious if there is some clarity on that.

I guess the other question around that is if the minister could provide us with some idea of how that specific issue was consulted on and what input Yukoners provided specifically to this issue.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Impaired driving continues to be a significant public safety concern in the Yukon, although rates have declined substantially across the rest of Canada since the mid-1980s.

The per capita rate of police-reported alcohol-impaired driving in Yukon was 10 times the national average in 2019.

An important part of increasing road safety is to deter dangerous driving behaviours like impaired driving, and this is one of the main goals of the *Traffic Safety Act*.

The *Traffic Safety Act* will accomplish this through a new roadside administrative sanction regime allowing officers to sanction suspended impaired drivers immediately at roadside, higher penalties for repeat offenders who continue to drive impaired, a longer zero-tolerance period for new drivers for having any drugs or alcohol in their system, and applying the zero-tolerance rule for drugs or alcohol to commercial drivers.

The new roadside administrative sanctions regime works in conjunction with the *Criminal Code of Canada*. This means that if a police officer believes, on reasonable grounds, that a person has committed an offence under the *Criminal Code*, such as driving impaired with alcohol in their blood greater than or equal to 80 milligrams per 100 millilitres of blood, the officer

may sanction the driver immediately at roadside under the new regime while continuing to charge the driver for impaired driving under the *Criminal Code*. These roadside administrative sanctions are in addition to penalties that may be imposed on a driver under the *Criminal Code* for the same incident. The administrative sanctions that may be imposed under this act for an impaired driving contravention are: disqualifying the driver from driving immediately at roadside, seizing and impounding the vehicle, imposing a monetary penalty on the driver, and imposing additional fees or conditions. The length of time that a driver may be disqualified will be determined in regulations, but the drivers could face a disqualification of up to 90 days.

The *Traffic Safety Act* also authorizes an officer to sanction a driver affected by alcohol or a drug such as cannabis at an amount lower than the threshold set out in the *Criminal Code*. This new authority is necessary because a growing body of evidence shows that drivers experience impairment at even low levels of alcohol or drugs, such as below 50 milligrams per 100 millilitres of blood, and are more likely to be involved in a collision.

I know that the member opposite asked a question about trace alcohol — and perhaps I could get clarification after I sit down — but the trace is for new drivers and for commercial drivers and perhaps some other circumstances but primarily new drivers and commercial drivers. It is not zero — 50 milligrams of alcohol per 100 millilitres of blood is not “trace” and I believe that Yukoners would agree that it is not “trace”.

The low blood alcohol content threshold is consistent with eight other Canadian jurisdictions. Every province in Canada, aside from Québec, has implemented roadside administrative sanctions for driving with below *Criminal Code* blood alcohol and drug levels.

As one might expect, there was extensive engagement with MADD Canada in 2019 and 2023 with respect to roadside administrative sanctions and, of course, there were ongoing discussions with the RCMP as well. The new zero-tolerance rule means that if a commercial driver is stopped by a police officer and is found to have any amount of a drug or alcohol in their body, the driver may be sanctioned under the new roadside administrative sanction regime. The majority of Canadian provinces have imposed a zero-tolerance rule for drugs and alcohol for drivers of commercial vehicles.

New and young drivers already have a higher risk of collisions due to inexperience. Alcohol and drugs further affect their driving abilities, significantly increasing their risk. Given this increased risk, the proportion of drivers in the graduated driver licensing program who test for alcohol or drugs in Yukon’s 2022 roadside survey is concerning. Approximately 13 percent of these drivers — drivers who are subject to zero-tolerance requirements — tested positive for alcohol, while 20 percent tested positive for drugs. Our zero-tolerance laws help reinforce the separation of drinking and drug use from the task of driving at the outset of their driving careers and for an extended period afterwards. That is establishing good habits that are more likely to last a lifetime.

These new roadside administrative sanctions for new drivers are in response to recommendations by Mothers Against Drunk Driving, or MADD. We wish to send a clear message to new drivers from the moment that they are handed their first set of keys that any amount of alcohol or drugs is unacceptable when driving. There are no safe limits.

I think that there were a few more follow-up questions. Maybe I will sit down so that the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin can continue, but I was just a bit thrown off by the trace amount of alcohol comment because that’s for the new drivers and commercial drivers but not the general driving public — that’s between 0.5 and 0.79 percent that the so-called “low alcohol consumption” regime would engage.

Mr. Hassard: I will agree with the minister on the importance of curbing impaired driving, for sure. In light of the time — and we try to share the time in the Legislature — I would like to turn it over to the Leader of the NDP.

Just in closing, I would like to thank the officials for being here today and look forward to them returning so we can carry on with this great conversation, so thank you.

Ms. White: Of course, I welcome the officials, with whom I had a lot of time to talk about this legislation, which I really appreciate.

I’m going to take a different angle — just for the minister so he knows. I think that there are a couple of sections in this act that are — I’m less interested in talking about what we used to have and more interested in talking about what we will have. So, I’m going to just kind of go toward the parts or the divisions that I’m really interested in.

I would like to start with division 3 on automated enforcement. Of course, that starts up on page 83 at the bottom. Now, the reason why I’m starting on automated enforcement is that I and many others have heard from municipalities about the importance, for example, of being able to install things like red light cameras or speed traps. So, I believe that division 3 on automated enforcement is that window; it’s that opportunity of going toward that. So, maybe the minister would like to walk us through a bit about the section. Then I’m also interested to know — because I appreciate that what is included here isn’t regulation, so if the minister can let me know the hope of where the regulations will go for this.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Thank you for the opportunity to answer the questions from the Leader of the Third Party.

During engagement with the public and stakeholders about the new *Traffic Safety Act*, many commenters spoke about a perception that traffic safety rules are not being adequately enforced, particularly with respect to speeding offences. A passive speed collection project run by the Department of Highways and Public Works during 2020 and 2021 indicated that more than 50 percent of drivers are speeding in some areas of Whitehorse.

The use of automated enforcement has been proposed by several stakeholders as a potential way to increase enforcement, especially within municipalities. Automated enforcement is an automated system that uses a camera and measuring device to detect and capture images of vehicles committing offences, such as speeding or running a red light. This technology is

commonly used in several other Canadian jurisdictions, including BC and Alberta, and when properly implemented, has been shown to be an effective tool for reducing speeding rates and positively impacting traffic safety. While the new act will enable the use of automated enforcement technology, a regulation providing further specifics will be necessary before automated enforcement is implemented on Yukon roads.

As this regulation is not strictly necessary for the act to come into force, the department is planning to begin the development of an automated enforcement regulation after those regulations necessary for the coming into force of the act have been completed.

The new *Traffic Safety Act* enables the use of automated enforcement technology but constrains it within certain parameters to ensure that it is used to mitigate public risk rather than as a source of revenue generation. These parameters include requiring signage, only permitting the use of these systems in specified high-risk areas, and more.

The parameters set in the act will guide the development of associated regulation, which will, in turn, set out additional rules on the use of the technology. The act is designed to allow a high degree of flexibility for this regulation so that the automated enforcement regime in the Yukon can be highly responsive to traffic safety needs.

Our current intention is to conduct further engagement on automated enforcement prior to implementing the program. The results of Highways and Public Works' public engagement in the spring of 2019 had mixed results, indicating that there was not an insubstantial portion of Yukoners who were not supportive of automated enforcement technology. However, the Association of Yukon Communities passed resolutions in both 2018 and 2024 requesting the ability for municipalities to utilize automated enforcement technology and collect all the associated fines.

There is no automated enforcement technology currently in place in the north — so, neither in the Northwest Territories or Nunavut or the Yukon — but it is in place in all 10 provinces, which is the long way of saying that the new act does enable it, but there is more work to be done.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that. I think that it may be worthy right now to have a discussion or for the minister to share some numbers on Yukon-specific data when it comes to, for example, either collisions or the cost of collisions in the territory, because really, when we talk about enforcement and we talk about speed and other things, I think that the cost right now to the territory is probably significant. So, if the minister has any of that data to share, I think that it would be worthy.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Madam Chair, thank you for the question from the member opposite. I do have some data, and perhaps the team will be collecting a bit more data here over the course of the next few minutes, but I will just start by saying — as I said in my preliminary comments — yes, of course, the rates of impaired driving and speed and collisions is off the charts with respect to southern Canada. That is one of the absolutely significant motivators to bring this legislation

forward. Ultimately, we hope to pass it. It's provided for in the preamble of the act as well.

In any event, it provides some information for the record. Between 2018 and 2023, there were 1,071 collisions at intersections in the Yukon. According to Motor Vehicles, between 2016 and 2022, driving too fast for road conditions or exceeding the speed limit contributed to 28 percent of Yukon's on-road fatalities. Research from the Traffic Injury Research Foundation reveals that driving 10 kilometres per hour above the speed limit more than doubles crash risk, while driving 20 kilometres per hour above the limit increases the risk of crash up to six times. A passive speed collection project at various locations — as I think I indicated in my previous comments, in Whitehorse over 22 weeks during 2020 and 2021 indicated that, in some areas of the city, over 50 percent of drivers were speeding. Transport Canada has estimated that the social cost of collisions in the Yukon is significant, with costs of \$95.7 million. In 2007 — actually, I have to check this, but it seems like the numbers came down a bit in 2015 to \$68 million.

Automated enforcement is one potential tool to address the risk of damage, injury, or death from speeding on the Yukon's roads.

Just before I sit down, just briefly to personalize it, yes, I am very aware that when there are high-speed collisions, all manner of services are engaged, so I am absolutely aware that this legislation will assist.

We certainly hope that there will be sufficient and meaningful deterrence and enforcement with respect to speeding and impaired by alcohol and drug driving, the consequence being that the Yukon will not be number one in the worst way possible with respect to our impaired driving rates. This government is of the view that tabling Bill No. 44, *Traffic Safety Act*, certainly goes a certain distance to beginning to address the scourge and the carnage that exists on Yukon highways.

Ms. White: So, understanding that we could be moving toward a new technology toward enforcement, is there a sense of what kind of the cost is for this kind of technology to use to help with enforcement?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The implementation of this act is anticipated to generate costs to government in some areas. A large portion of these costs are anticipated to be covered within current operational budgets. Specific costs are largely dependent on the content of the regulations, which, of course, have not yet been fully developed. As such, specific financial implications will be determined during the development of the regulations in the coming years. Some parts of the act that are anticipated to generate costs to government include but are not limited to: IT upgrades; new processes for, as I discussed previously, abandoned and impounded vehicles; the transition of the current Driver Control Board to the new Traffic Safety Review Board, including appointing adjudicators; updating Court Services' systems and policing processes; and training those responsible for administering the act on changes that we are bringing into effect.

With respect to automated enforcement, HPW is in the process of determining specific costs for that program.

Engagement with stakeholders is essential to determine what it will look like, which will inform the costs. So, obviously, not being an expert in this whatsoever, but I would think that one can take some — through a cross-jurisdictional scan, I'm sure that HPW will be able to determine what sort of costs they would be looking at and what sort of recoveries they would be looking at.

I'm mindful in my discussions with the team over the course of the last three and a half years with respect to automating enforcement, the reason that — there are some reasons, but the reasons why it's not popular — and it's not popular if it's just seen as a metaphorical butterfly net of capturing persons in zones where speeds have just changed from one point to the next and police are there within 100 metres of the speed change. I think in my prior comments I had indicated that I think Yukoners would generally be in favour of automated enforcement if it were done in a fair and transparent manner and not just as a revenue generator, but I wouldn't disagree that we require all possible tools to reduce serious injury and death on Yukon roadways.

Ms. White: I don't think I was insinuating that it was going to be a money grab or anything. I guess I was mostly just again opening the door to the conversation about the initial investment — the upfront investment — which I imagine could be substantial.

As an example, I live in Takhini. I often ride my bicycle, which there are lots of safety issues with that as it is, but coming from Range Road, turning left on the Two Mile Hill, the current traffic is a nightmare. If École Whitehorse Elementary gets relocated to Takhini, it won't just be a nightmare; it will be an absolute disaster.

So, as an example, red light cameras at those intersections will be very helpful, because as it stands right now, I probably count up to five per light change, first thing in the morning, of people running through red lights. Sometimes, a financial penalty will change habits, because if it's not just changing habits for the sake of safety, then let the pocketbook do that.

I got a speeding ticket on the Coquihalla Highway when I was in my 20s, keeping in mind I'm closer to 50 now, and it was more than \$275. So, let's just say that I didn't speed on the Coquihalla Highway in the same way on my way back to wherever I was living at the time, but I sure did on the way there.

I think it's about changing habits, and it's about making roads safer.

So, I thought that a really interesting part of the *Traffic Safety Act* was that big change. I think another one that was quite interesting was in part 6, division 10, the "Reviews by Adjudicators". That is on page 97, and I think that this is a change, is my understanding, from the previous act to the new one. Maybe the minister can start by walking us through division 10, "Reviews by Adjudicators".

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Because the *Traffic Safety Act* will establish a new roadside administrative sanction regime, it is also necessary to provide a way for an accused person to challenge those sanctions and potentially have them dismissed. Government must balance the public interest in swiftly meting

out punishments for impaired and dangerous driving with the need to provide due process to accused persons. Reviewing roadside sanctions will require specialized knowledge, training, and expertise to consider the associated legal and evidentiary issues. This is why this act includes an adjudicative review model for the new roadside administrative sanction regime. This means that adjudicators will be appointed to conduct reviews of administrative sanctions for impaired, high-risk, and dangerous driving contraventions.

The project team will investigate options to recruit adjudicators during the development of the regulations, which may include a staffing, contracting, or other process. Adjudicators will ensure that parties have a fair and impartial hearing. These adjudicative proceedings will provide an alternative to traditional court proceedings, offering a more flexible, efficient, and accessible means of dispute resolution.

A person who is issued a roadside administrative sanction may apply to have an adjudicator assigned to review their case. Upon review, the adjudicator must decide the matter and uphold, vary, or overturn the sanction. The rules for this process will be set out in the regulations.

If the registrar of the motor vehicle or the person who applied for the review wishes to challenge the adjudicator's decision, they may file for an application of a judicial review with the Supreme Court within 60 days of the adjudicator's decision. A driver who receives a notice of a roadside administrative sanction will be eligible to apply for a review of: (1) the issuance of the notice — for instance, whether the notice should have been issued in the first place; (2) the disqualification period indicated on the notice; (3) the monetary penalty imposed under the notice; or (4) any fees or conditions for reinstatement of the person's driver's licence imposed under the notice. The owner of the motor vehicle that was impounded under a notice of roadside administrative sanction will be eligible to apply for a review of the impoundment period and any restrictions or requirements that apply to the owner's vehicle.

With respect to general procedural fairness and judicial review, the new administrative sanctions are balanced by provisions in the act that promote procedural fairness and work to safeguard a person's Charter rights. For example, if a driver registers the presence of a drug or alcohol in their body, a police officer must inform the driver that they have the right to ask for a second test. If the second test is performed, the officer must use the lower result of the two tests. Drivers who are sanctioned under the roadside administrative sanction regime may also apply to the Traffic Safety Review Board, which I just spoke about, for review of the sanctions.

The board will be comprised of skilled adjudicators with the necessary knowledge and training to carry out the reviews fairly. If the applicant is dissatisfied, as I indicated, with the board's decision, the next step is to ultimately apply to the court for the judicial review of the decision.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that.

Has the Yukon looked to other jurisdictions when we are talking about the reviews by adjudicators, especially when we're talking about the review of notice of the roadside

administrative sanctions? Are we looking to other jurisdictions as to what they have done and how they have done it? If so, which ones are we looking to? I am just trying to get a sense of where this is coming from.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: With respect to sort of a cross-jurisdictional analysis or the best practices that were surveyed by the team in the policy development with respect to the adjudicators or adjudication process, the five jurisdictions that were relied upon — some more heavily than others — are Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Nova Scotia. In some of these provinces, there is public insurance — most notably, as Yukoners will know, British Columbia still has ICBC — and we, of course, in the Yukon have private insurance, so that made it a little bit different with respect to considerations. I'm also advised that in Alberta, there are in-house staff who conduct the adjudication, and it was determined to not proceed with in-house staff in the proposed new Yukon legislation.

I can certainly get more information with respect to the genesis or how this sort of organically came to be, but that is the information that I have with respect to the provincial models that were looked at and where the best practices from those jurisdictions were integrated into the made-in-Yukon proposal.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that. I think that it's really helpful when we're looking at something that is so vastly different — and us trying to move — as has been said multiple times — a 47-year-old piece of legislation forward — to be able to use the examples that we have looked to because those jurisdictions have — I'm going to suggest — more mature legislation at this point, especially around this act, so it's just a helpful thing.

The minister has touched on the roadside administrative sanctions in division 2 already, but I think that it's worthwhile going back to. When we had the president of Mothers Against Drunk Driving in the Assembly today, I pointed out that for years during the tribute that I would do to MADD, I would highlight that we as Yukon had failed again in their cross-jurisdictional report about making the roads safer — to the point where we were finally removed from the report altogether because it had been so long that we had failed that they stopped even looking toward Yukon as to making any improvements.

So, I think that when we talk about the roadside administrative sanctions, this is one section that is really important. I appreciate the zero tolerance for those with graduated licences or professional drivers. I think that is critically important. So, if the minister just wants to again talk a bit about the roadside administrative sanctions — the timeline, as an example — I think, in some cases, it's not for long — it's 24 hours. Anyway, if the minister could just fill us in a bit more again.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: An administrative sanction is the penalty that is imposed outside of the court system in response to the contravention of a law, whereas the prosecution of an offence requires the laying of a charge and a conviction before punishment can be meted out. An administrative sanction can be levied immediately in response to a contravention.

Under the model reflected in the new *Traffic Safety Act*, sanctions would be imposed by police at roadside immediately upon forming reasonable grounds to suspect an individual has committed certain contraventions under the new act. These contraventions relate to operating a motor vehicle when a driver has alcohol or drugs in their system.

The contraventions are: high blood alcohol or drug content; low blood alcohol or drug content; zero tolerance for alcohol or drugs for new drivers, as indicated previously; zero tolerance for alcohol or drugs for commercial drivers; criminal dangerous driving and driving while disqualified; and high-risk driving.

Examples of administrative sanctions in a road safety context include driver's licence disqualifications, vehicle impoundments, monetary penalties, education and remedial programs, ignition interlock programs, and licence reinstatement fees. The sanctions applicable under this regime will be outlined in future regulations.

Roadside administrative sanction regimes such as the one proposed in the new *Traffic Safety Act* exist in other jurisdictions across Canada.

The experiences of our neighbours in British Columbia and Alberta indicate that immediate roadside administrative measures are less time intensive, which in turn allows police officers to focus on their enforcement activities.

Additionally, these types of sanctions imposed and reviewed outside of the court system can also alleviate pressures on the courts. Studies of roadside administrative sanction regimes in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Ontario have shown significant success in reducing impaired driving rates and fatalities.

This would be a fundamental change, but it is the administrative sanction regime that Yukoners may be familiar with and maybe have heard about in British Columbia. The *Traffic Safety Act* provides the ability for a peace officer to sanction, under this act, for high blood alcohol or drug content contraventions instead of proceeding with a charge under the *Criminal Code* in very limited circumstances. The officer's ability to proceed with a roadside administrative sanction rather than a *Criminal Code* charge is only available when certain aggravating factors are not present. This means that the driver must meet all of the following criteria: first, no previous administrative sanctions, *Criminal Code* convictions, or impaired offences in the past 10 years; second, no reason for the officer to suspect that the driver has contravened any other provision of the *Traffic Safety Act* or the *Criminal Code*; third, no passengers under the age of 16; and fourth, not driving a zero-tolerance commercial vehicle.

Part of the rationale behind allowing officer discretion in these limited circumstances is to penalize a first-time impaired driver with appropriate sanctions for their unsafe driving behaviour but avoid a potential criminal record for a first offence. This incentivizes a first-time offender to learn from their mistake or error in judgment. If they are stopped for impaired driving again, the officer does not have the discretion to proceed with a roadside administrative sanction; instead, the

driver will face a charge under the *Criminal Code* and potentially a criminal record.

Officer discretion to proceed with a roadside administrative sanction instead of a *Criminal Code* charge is informed by input from Mothers Against Drunk Driving, who are supportive of this measure, as well as the approach of other jurisdictions, such as British Columbia and Alberta.

Madam Chair, thank you very much for the opportunity today to begin the process of Committee of the Whole in relation to Bill No. 44, the *Traffic Safety Act*, but given the time, at this time, I move that you report progress.

Chair: It has been moved by the Member for Riverdale North that the Chair report progress.

Motion agreed to

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

Chair: It has been moved by the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

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

Chair's report

Ms. Blake: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 44, entitled *Traffic Safety Act*, and directed me to report progress.

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

Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

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

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

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Written notice was given of the following motion October 8, 2024:

Motion No. 1028

Re: condemning anti-Semitism (Dixon)